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ABSTRACT

This doctoral thesis, as a whole, intends to give more insight into teaching culture in general, and in developing intercultural competence in particular in the foreign language classroom. The aim of the research is to reveal what potential the investigated coursebooks have for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence (ICC); to provide an instrument for evaluating the intercultural component of the foreign language coursebooks; and, to suggest recommendations on enhancing the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC.

In this research I investigate the intercultural component in foreign language (FL) coursebooks. The objects of investigation are the most widely used coursebooks for teaching English, Russian and Spanish languages to adult language learners in Hungary.

The first part is concerned with various theoretical issues. It starts with an overview of the relationship between culture and foreign language teaching. Here, various definitions of the concept of culture and the best-known models of culture are discussed; a brief history of culture in FL teaching, i.e. the treatment of culture by the main methods and approaches is overviewed. The second chapter deals with intercultural language learning. In this chapter the history of the field of intercultural communication and its influence on the teaching and learning of foreign languages and cultures; and, the need for transition from teaching communicative competence to teaching intercultural communicative competence are discussed briefly. Also, the concept of 'intercultural speaker' is defined, and the process of intercultural learning together with the challenges of intercultural language learning (ILL) is described. In the third chapter I tried to clarify the role of foreign language coursebooks in the process of acquisition of intercultural communicative competence. This chapter is concerned with the analysis of the role of coursebooks (and textbooks in general) in foreign language teaching and learning and with the methods of evaluating them. It also gives an overview of studies on culture in foreign language coursebooks and discusses the importance of authenticity in interculturally-oriented language coursebooks. The chapter ends with a summary of intercultural language learning tasks and activities. The first part ends by giving the rationale of the research.

The second part deals with the research itself. Adults have been chosen because I consider it extremely useful to do research into lifelong learning. A corpus of coursebooks was chosen for an analysis based upon the information received from the institutions that organise foreign language courses for adults. The coursebooks for teaching three foreign languages – namely English, Russian and Spanish – have been analysed. Beyond personal
reasons for this choice of languages, there were others as well. Among them the main reason is that the three above-mentioned languages are, without any doubt, important means of intercultural communication, so-called “lingua francas” in large areas of the world. They not only pertain to different language groups (Germanic, Slavonic and Romance), but through these languages, various cultures find their expression. Hence, speaking at least one language from each of these groups may help not only to become a plurilingual person, but also to become an intercultural one too. Also, English, Russian and Spanish differ a lot from the point of view of their status in Hungary nowadays (see Language Education Policy Profile. Hungary. 2002-2003). Russian, which was for decades a compulsory language in Hungarian foreign language education, suddenly lost its position at the beginning of 1990s. Although some positive tendencies show that there is an increasing interest in this language, it is still one of the less taught foreign languages in Hungary (according to Bakonyi 2001, only 1% of language learners learn Russian). Since then, English (together with German, but to a much lesser degree) has been dominating, which undoubtedly reflects in the Hungarian foreign language textbook market. And, Spanish (together with other less taught languages in Hungary) is becoming more and more popular, but still an extremely low number learn Spanish in Hungary. Although it is not the purpose of this research to provide an overview on the questions of language policy or to study the coursebook market in Hungary, I considered it important to mention the status of these languages, because it explains the assortment of language coursebooks on the Hungarian book market. To summarise the reasons for the choice of the languages for my research, I would like to stress that this choice provides a really colourful palette.

The methodology employed to evaluate the intercultural component in English, Russian and Spanish coursebooks used for teaching adults in Hungary consists in the modelling of a scheme of intercultural analysis (or simply, a table). The idea of a table consisting of four blocks — objectives, contents, methodology, and assessment — is not original. It was adapted from Méndez García (2003:59-69), and new parameters (variables) were added. As yet not one theory of ILL is available, insights from various disciplines had to be combined for the elaboration of criteria for coursebook evaluation. The theoretical findings of such researchers as Byram, Esarte-Sarries, Gullestrup, Hall and Hall, Hofstede, Méndez García, Sercu, Stem, Trompenaars and others were taken into account when choosing the parameters for coursebook analysis. In total, the table of analysis consists of 63 variables and 385 options. Its main difference from that of Méndez García is the purpose of use: it not only serves to investigate coursebooks in terms of sociocultural information offered, but it rather serves to find the elements of coursebooks that may promote the acquisition of intercultural communicative
competence in users.

This (second) part is structured according to the following sections: the introduction; the research design; the presentation of a detailed analysis of each of the selected coursebooks; the comparison of analysed English, Russian and Spanish language coursebooks; and, finally, the cross-cultural recommendations for developing an intercultural component in FL coursebooks.

In the final (third) part (Summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations) my intention is to summarise the previous two parts and to give recommendations on developing the intercultural component of FL coursebooks. In this part I also try to reveal what aspects of culture and intercultural communication have been neglected in FL coursebooks, and to advise to which of them more attention should be paid. I attempt to show how teaching of culture and development of intercultural competence in the FL classrooms can be made in a more structured way. It may be considered a humble contribution of my research to FLT.

I absolutely agree that learning culture in general, and acquiring intercultural communicative competence in particular, is very motivating for language learners, as with no intercultural communicative competence, any linguistic knowledge (be that grammar, vocabulary or pronunciation) loses its sense.
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Introduction

The need for change in education is always caused by political and/or economical changes. Since Hungary joined the European Union the policy of intercultural dialogue plays a vital role: the number of cross-border negotiations is constantly growing; Hungary is becoming more and more attractive to foreigners for living and working here (including migrants and refugees). There are also more Hungarians going to work and live in other European countries and thus the number of intercultural contacts is growing. Therefore, bringing an intercultural dimension into education in general and in foreign language teaching (FLT) in particular is no longer a fashion but the only possible way to solve problems and manage conflicts at all levels (political, economical, diplomatic, social, etc). The understanding of it started growing after the shocking events of September 11th, 2001, when terrorists flew into the buildings of the World Trade Center, New York (USA). In 2002 the academic community invited the European Union to strengthen the policy of intercultural dialogue (see the Declaration of the Conference on Intercultural Dialogue – Brussels 20-21/3/2002). As a priority field of action, education “in the spirit of tolerance, comprehension and respect of the other” was mentioned (the Declaration of the Conference on Intercultural Dialogue – Brussels 20-21/3/2002, from web).

One of the possibilities for intercultural education is to integrate in the process of FLT. Culture had always been, explicitly or implicitly, more or less present in foreign language teaching and since the end of the sixties in the past (20th) century it became clear that culture should be part of the foreign language curriculum.

Every year a lot of new books appear in the foreign language textbook market. It is really difficult for teachers to make the right choice. When making their decision which coursebooks to choose, teachers (or those who are in charge of this) usually take into account many criteria, but rarely pay attention to the intercultural component in a given coursebook. In the light of this, it seems very important to provide a reliable instrument to evaluate the intercultural component in FL coursebooks. Though there are more and more studies in intercultural issues, it is still not clear in which way the intercultural component should be integrated into coursebooks to become an effective instrument for developing intercultural competence (IC). This is the main reason why I started this research.

There were also other reasons to do this research, mainly personal ones. Life has given me a chance to learn “from the inside” more than one culture. Although born in Hungary, I was brought up in Russia; my studies and my professional career allowed me to spend quite a lot of time in Spain, and some in North America, and my personal life brought me back to Hungary. Considering myself a multicultural person, I deeply understand the
importance of intercultural learning (IL) in today’s world.

The second personal reason is tightly connected to the previous one. Being a plurilingual person, I learnt languages in different ways. Russian was my first language; I started to learn English and Spanish when I went to primary school. I learnt Portuguese in an auto-didactic way during my years at university, and right after graduation I came to Hungary, where I learnt Hungarian just in everyday communication, without attending any courses. I had the chance to appreciate the enormous motivating role of target cultures in the process of FLs learning and the primacy of intercultural skills. These were the reasons from which this study arose.

Object and purpose of the research

The research reported on here is aimed at revealing what potential the investigated coursebooks have for promoting the acquisition of ICC; at providing an instrument for evaluating the intercultural component of foreign language coursebooks; and, at suggesting recommendations on enhancing the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC.

In my research I investigated the intercultural component in FL coursebooks. The objects of investigation are the most widely used coursebooks for teaching English, Russian and Spanish languages for adult language learners in Hungary. Considering the significant role that language coursebooks play in FLT in Hungary, coursebooks are seen as a possible tool for re-orienting FLT in Hungary in order to promote the development of ICC (intercultural communicative competence).

This research aimed to reveal whether and – if yes – to what extent English, Russian and Spanish coursebooks (which are currently in use in Hungary for teaching adult language learners) have the potential for promoting the acquisition of ICC. Although I absolutely agree with Sercu (2000:14) that for the potential to be realised it is important how coursebooks are handled in a given FL classroom, my research centred upon the analysis of the potential of the coursebooks and not on classroom work or teachers’ endeavour. Unlike earlier textbook investigations, which focused on the cultural contents of FLT materials, I decided not to limit my research to the description of the kinds and amounts of cultural information on the target cultures. Instead, I analysed the way the intercultural component is included in the coursebooks under investigation to provide recommendations for enhancing their potential in promoting the acquisition of ICC.

I had been inspired by the insightful research done by Sercu (2000). I adapted her research questions (Sercu 2000:14) to investigate FL coursebooks used in Hungary for teaching adults.
Thus, the following research questions had to be answered:

*What potential do English, Russian and Spanish language coursebooks (which are currently in use in Hungary for teaching adult language learners) have for promoting acquisition of ICC at the beginner to elementary levels?*

and

*What cross-cultural recommendations can be suggested for enhancing the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC?*

Although these research questions are similar to those put by Sercu (2000:14), my research differs from hers in its method.

**Theoretical framework**

To analyse the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC, a specific research design was needed. The main problem was the lack of a comprehensive theory of ILL. For this reason, to build a theoretical framework for my research, I had to combine the insights from such fields and disciplines as *anthropology, sociology, psychology, applied linguistics, foreign language teaching methodology* and the theoretical field of *intercultural communication* (cf. Sercu 2000:15). All the above-mentioned theoretical fields or disciplines – directly or indirectly – provide explanation for the process of intercultural language learning, and for the factors determining the intercultural potential of FL coursebooks.

**Methods of research**

The present research can be defined as descriptive and comparative; evaluative and applied; and as combining qualitative and quantitative methods of research. It is *descriptive*, because its aim is to examine and describe the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC. It is *comparative* because it compares the data collected in English, Russian and Spanish coursebooks. It is *evaluative* and *applied*, because the present research (following Sercu 2000) aims at assessing the potential of FL coursebooks and at suggesting recommendations for enhancing it. And, the final tenet underlying the present research is the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods of research. Quantitative techniques helped to collect and analyse coursebook data. Qualitative techniques helped to interpret and generalise the statistical data. Accordingly, the data collected during the investigation will be presented in both forms: (1) statistical – summarised in tables, diagrams and graphs; and (2)
interpretative – supported with examples and illustrations from analysed coursebooks.

Composition of dissertation

The composition of my dissertation is easy to follow. It was built according to the three main parts: first, the Theoretical Framework; second, the Research of the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence, in which the collected coursebook data are analysed and evaluated; and third, Summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations, in which the general findings and recommendations are expressed in detail.

In conclusion, I confirm that doing this research has been a valuable experience for me and I hope it will serve as my humble contribution to the field of foreign language teaching.
1. Theoretical Framework

1.0. Introduction

Since the end of the sixties in the twentieth century, it is usually asserted that culture should be part of the foreign language curriculum. The Hungarian National Curriculum also recognises culture as an integral part of foreign language teaching (see Nemzetí alapokterv 1995; Kurtán 2001:81).

This part deals with mainly theoretical issues, and they are enlightened not only from the perspectives of applied linguistics and foreign language teaching methodology, but also psychology, sociology, and anthropology. This is a very wide area so it has been necessary to organise the content according to four chapters.

The first chapter Culture and Foreign Language Teaching (1.1) starts with an overview of various definitions of culture (1.1.1) and the best-known models of culture (1.1.2). It ends with a brief history of culture in FLT (1.1.3). The second chapter is dedicated to Intercultural Language Learning (1.2). It starts with A brief history of the field of intercultural communication (and its influence on the teaching and learning foreign languages and cultures) (1.2.1). In section 1.2.2 I try to clarify the necessity of transition from teaching communicative competence to teaching intercultural and intercultural communicative competence. Defining the concept of "intercultural speaker" (1.2.3), and describing the process of intercultural learning (1.2.4), as well as discussing the challenges of the process (1.2.5) follows it. The role of coursebooks in the process of acquisition of ICC is discussed in the third chapter (1.3). The part ends by giving the rationale of research (1.4).

1.1. Culture and Foreign Language Teaching

1.1.1. Defining culture

I consider it very important to start the discussion of the theoretical framework of this research with the discussion of the concept of culture because all ideas about intercultural learning and ICC, are built on the idea about culture. In many modern languages this word sounds similarly: ‘culture’ (in English), ‘kultúra’ (in Hungarian), ‘культура’ (in Russian), ‘cultura’ (in Spanish), etc., because it etymologizes from the Latin ‘cultura’ stemming from the word ‘colere’ (in English: ‘to till’, ‘to cultivate’, etc.). Accordingly, ‘culture’ is normally viewed as something created, or ‘cultivated’. Although in everyday language ‘culture’ may have quite distinct meanings, in its abstract understanding this word means something that is ‘human-made’, be that artefacts, concepts, values or behavioural patterns. But the complexity of the concept always provokes polemics around the definition of ‘culture’ among
anthropologists, sociologists, philosophers, psychologists, etc.

There are plenty of well-known and often-cited definitions of culture. One of them was given by Tylor (1871) (the founder of anthropology), who defined culture as:

[...] that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as member of society. (Tylor 1871/1958:1)

It can be argued that most definitions offered till now are modifications of Tylor’s definition. The difference between definitions can mainly be explained by the fact that different disciplines investigate different ‘layers’ of culture.

Two American cultural anthropologists, Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952), made the analysis of definitions of the concept of culture. They reported that between 1871 and 1919 there were about 7 different definitions of culture, between 1920 and 1950 their number grew to more than 150. Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) suggested their classification of these numerous definitions under the six headings, according to the presupposed reading of the concept:

1. *Descriptive* definitions that contain the enumeration of the items such as customs, beliefs, etc. shared by a group of people;
2. *Historical* definitions that stress a collective cultural heritage;
3. *Normative* definitions that describe culture as a sum of behaviour rules;
4. *Psychological* definitions that link culture to such processes as “socialisation”, “learning”, “development”, etc.;
5. *Structural* definitions that stress systems and regularities;
6. *Genetic* definitions that describe culture in terms of ideas, symbols, etc.

Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) not only reviewed definitions, but also offered their reading of the concept of culture:

Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behaviour acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, and on the other as conditioning elements of further action. (1952:181)

Later other professionals (including psychologists, educators, etc.) joined anthropologists and sociologists in their attempt to define this extremely complex concept. Among uncountable definitions given, I would like to quote those that have influenced not only today’s understanding of culture, but also are important for providing a theoretical basis for intercultural learning. These definitions range from one-liners to rather detailed ones, and are quoted in the order of time when they appeared (starting from late 1950s till the present day).
Hall, who is considered to be the father of the field of intercultural research, gave a very brief definition saying: “Culture is communication and communication is culture” (Hall 1959:186) (more about Hall and his research see in section 1.2.1).

According to Brooks (1968):

Culture (relating to patterns of living) refers to the individual’s role in the unending kaleidoscope of life situations of every kind and the rules or models for attitude and conduct in them. By reference to these models, all human beings, from infancy onward, justify the world to themselves as best they can, associate with those around them, and relate to the social order to which they are attached […] What is important in culture […] is what one is expected to think, believe, say, do, eat, wear, pay, endure, resent, honour, laugh at, fight for, and worship, in typical life situations […] (Brooks 1968:210-211 quoted in Oxford & Searcelia 1992:183, square brackets added by me)

In this definition Brooks (1968) emphasised the role of culture as something that can be referred to in various life situations.

Almost two decades later after his well-known definition, in 1976, Hall rethought the concept of culture stressing that one of “the functions of culture is to provide a highly selective screen between man and the outside world” (Hall 1976:85).

Barnouw (1979) offered another reading of the concept of culture describing it as “patterns of learned behaviour”:

[...] a culture is a way of life of a group of people, the configuration of all of the more or less stereotyped patterns of learned behaviour, which are handed down from one generation to the next through the means of language and imitation. (Barnouw 1979:4, my emphasis and square brackets)

In this definition the word “stereotyped” caught my attention. Later, when discussing the role of stereotyping in the process of culture learning (see section 1.2.4), I will return to Barnouw’s definition (see p.50).

According to Gudykunst and Kim (1984), “Culture refers to that relatively unified set of shared symbolic ideas associated with societal patterns of cultural ordering” (Gudykunst & Kim 1984:11 as quoted in Damen 1987:73). Similarly, Carrol (1982) described culture as something that is shared by the majority of a social group, that the younger members of a group inherit from the older ones, and something that affects one’s perception of the world and behaviour.

In 1983 Hall again made attempts to define culture. According to this definition (Hall 1983), culture is an invisible control mechanism which operates in our brains. Viewing culture as something subconscious is not surprising as Hall – according to himself – was strongly influenced by the psychoanalytic theory of Freud (Rogers et al. 2002). In Hall’s view, people discover the existence of this invisible control mechanism only when they are brought into contact with another culture. According to Hall (1983), people usually behave within the limits which they internalised as ‘culturally acceptable’:
Culture has always dictated where to draw the line separating one thing from another. These lines are arbitrary, but once learned and internalised they are treated as real. In the West a line is drawn between normal sex and rape, whereas in the Arab world is much more difficult, for a variety of reasons, to separate these two events. (Hall 1983:230)

Argyle (1982) considered it important to include technology and material culture in the definition. In Argyle’s view culture is:

[…] whole way of life- […] language, ways of perceiving, categorising and thinking about the world, forms of non-verbal communication and social interaction, rules and conventions about behaviour, moral values and ideas, technology and material culture, art, science, literature and history. (Argyle 1982:177, square brackets added by me)

Damen (1987) understands culture as:

[…] learned and shared human patterns or models for living; day-to-day living patterns. These patterns and models pervade all aspects of human social interactions. Culture is mankind’s primary adaptive mechanism. (Damen 1987:369, square brackets added by me)

In her view, the main point is that culture plays the role of an ‘adaptive mechanism’.

Alptekin’s (1993/96) definition is important to be quoted because of its relevance to this research. It stresses the role of culture in cognition:

Culture, aside from its reference to the artefacts of a given community, involves socially acquired knowledge. This knowledge is organized in culture-specific ways which normally frame our perception of reality such that we largely define the world through the filter of our world view. […] Culture, then, as ‘socially acquired knowledge’, can be said to play a central role in cognition. (Alptekin 1996:53)

According to Brislin (1993), culture consists of „values, ideals, and assumptions about life that are widely shared among people and that guide specific behaviors” (1993:4). Brislin (1993:4) stresses that being passed over from one generation to another, culture exists for a long period of time in a society; and a fast change usually causes strong emotional reactions, because people are very sensitive if they feel that somebody violates their cultural values.

Hofstede defines culture in quite a modern way as “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another” (Hofstede 1994:5). Hofstede introduces the concept of ‘collective programming’, which helps to understand why there are so many differences between people within any one culture. According to Hofstede, culture is situated somewhere between ‘not programmable’ human nature and the individual’s personality. His expression ‘software of the mind’ for describing the phenomenon of culture (Hofstede 1991, 2003) has also become extremely popular.

Similarly, very short, but shooting at the target, is the definition given by Ferraro summing up that “culture is everything that people have, think, do as members of their society” (Ferraro 1990:18, my emphasis).

Gullestrup (1992), whose model of culture will be described in section 1.1.2, defines culture as comprising:
the view of life and the values, norms and actual behaviour – as well as the material and immaterial productions resulting from these – which man takes over from a previous generation, and which he passes on to the next generation, possibly in a modified form; and which in one way or another distinguishes him from people belonging to other cultures (as quoted in Kuada & Gullestrup 1997:5)

This definition makes it clear why Gullestrup differs on three main dimensions in his model and views culture from a horizontal, vertical, and temporal perspective (see section 1.1.2).

Levine’s (1993) definition of culture is based on the idea of the iceberg with its visible and invisible parts (the detailed description of the Iceberg Model of Culture will be given in the section 1.1.2.):

Culture: a shared background (for example, national, ethnic, religious) resulting from a common language and communication style, customs, beliefs, attitudes and values. [...] It refers to the informal and often hidden patterns of human interactions, expressions, and viewpoints that people in one culture share. The hidden nature of culture has been compared to an iceberg, most of which is hidden underwater. Like the iceberg, much of the influence of culture on an individual cannot be seen. The part of culture that is exposed is not always that which creates cross-cultural difficulties; the hidden aspects of culture have significant effects on behaviour and on interactions with others. (Levine 1993:xvii as quoted in Holló & Lázár 2000a:4)

Although the view of culture as an iceberg is not new, this definition is important for this research because – as Holló & Lázár (2000a) highlighted – it stresses the importance of teaching LLs about the hidden layers of culture.

To Spencer-Oatey (2000), the concept of culture is much broader. Her definition contains not only values, behaviour, etc., but also includes an interpretative element:

Culture is a fuzzy set of attitudes, beliefs, behavioural conventions, and basic assumptions and values that are shared by a group of people, and that influence each member’s behaviour and each member’s interpretations of the ‘meaning’ of other people’s behaviour. (Spencer-Oatey 2000:4)

Thus Spencer-Oatey’s definition not only describes what culture is, but also includes an interpretative element, i.e. culture is seen as something that influences one’s behaviour and – at the same time – as something that helps to interpret one’s behaviour. This interpretative role of culture makes this definition particularly important when building a theoretical background of intercultural language learning.

Beamer & Varner’s (2001) definition is relevant to this research not only because it helps in understanding of intercultural issues in general, but because it gives direction for intercultural learning. They define culture as

the coherent, learned, shared view a group of people has about life’s concerns that ranks what is important, instils attitudes about what things are appropriate, and prescribes behaviour, given that some things have more significance than others. (Beamer & Varner 2001:3)

Very often-cited ‘culture’ definition is the one given by Samovar and Porter, in which they define culture as

the deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, social hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relations, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions acquired by a group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving.
This definition has hardly changed over more than thirty years: cf. Samovar & Porter 2003 and Samovar & Porter 1972; see also Samovar, Porter & Jain 1981; Samovar, Porter & Stefani 1998, Samovar & Porter 2001, etc.

In spite of certain disagreements on the concept of culture, all of the above-listed definitions agree on the following: culture is something learnt, interrelated, shared and variable. From the point of view of learning foreign language(s) and culture(s), those of the above-quoted definitions are of the most interest which stress that people (in our case – language learners) develop their interpretations of culture, or rather say, are free to develop their own cultural interpretations. “This approach suggests that culture learning is an ongoing, dynamic process in which learners’ cultural perceptions can change, unfold, and mature over time” (Oxford & Scardella 1992:183). On the whole, it can be concluded that through the years understanding of the concept of culture has changed: culture is no longer seen as something static, it is seen as a dynamic, multidimensional phenomenon which consists of both visible and invisible elements.

1.1.2. Dimensions and Models of Culture

The discussion of the definitions of culture shows that this concept is extremely complex. That is the reason why many scholars offered models to define ‘culture’ differentiating various dimensions of it. In this section the most well known ones will be discussed.

Probably, the most often mentioned one is The Iceberg model of culture. As an idea it has been used for ages and in various sciences: e.g. Freud used the Iceberg model to show the conscious, subconscious and unconscious; in medicine it is used for a so-called model of health, and so on. It has also been adapted to illustrate the concept of culture. Different modifications of ‘culture’ iceberg exist: from simplified representations (see Fig. 1 in Appendix I) to those that go deeper into detail (see Fig. 2 in Appendix I), and also see Hall (1966). But essentially they are built on the same idea. They show that a very small portion of “the iceberg” (culture in se) can be seen above the water line (i.e. only a few elements of culture are visible). The much larger part of the iceberg supports it from underneath the water (i.e. the invisible elements of culture are hard to be discovered). Without understanding the so-called invisible part of culture (norms, values, etc.), it is impossible to understand its visible part (behaviour, literature, cooking, etc.). Although the iceberg model visualises culture in quite a simplified way, it helps us to better interpret the meaning of intercultural learning. To understand the differences between our cultural behaviour we must learn more about the “underneath” part of the other culture, the study of the “visible” part may often be
misleading, like e.g. in the case of young people from different cultures. Despite the fact that many young people listen to the same music, wear the same trademark, eat in the same “junk-food” restaurant and are members of the same subculture group, in fact – being from different cultures – they have different assumptions about time, space, etc. Or, as another example, the world of science may be brought up. One would believe that scientists around the world should keep ‘up’ cultural differences because they are lead by pure facts and logic. But it is not always true. In medicine, for instance, there is still no agreement on attitude to abortions: for some life starts at the moment of birth for others at the embryo stage.

In short, the relevance of the Iceberg model to my research is that it shows that to avoid intercultural misunderstandings we need a better understanding of the invisible part of the “iceberg” (i.e. cultural values, beliefs, etc.). Hence IL (intercultural learning) should concentrate on discovering the “underneath” part of “the iceberg”.

Edward Twitchell and Mildred Reed Hall (1990) went further in their study of culture. They offered several dimensions to explain differences between cultures. They classified cultures using the following characteristics, which – according to Hall & Hall (1990) – are interrelated:

- fast / slow messages (i.e. how fast messages can be decoded in a given culture; for example, how long it takes to make friends in this culture),
- high / low context (i.e. how much information is needed; for example, if you know someone very well, only one glimpse is enough to understand what this person feels or is thinking about),
- territoriality (i.e. what is considered to be one’s territory; whether, for example, it is possible to take something from the other’s table without asking),
- personal space (i.e. what distance one is expected to keep in case of intimate, social, or public interactions; see for illustration a photo in Appendix II),
- monochronic / polychronic time (i.e. whether time is considered linear or not; for example, some people can do many things at the same time).

These dimensions were originally developed for American diplomats and businessmen who were travelling a lot to give them advice on how to deal with other cultures and how to adapt to a new way of behaving through recognising cultural differences. The Hall & Hall’s approach is obviously useful from the point of view of intercultural learning. The dimensions offered by them not only provide a framework for interpreting cultural differences, but they “open one’s eyes” in understanding that there are not “better” or “worse” cultures, that they are just different. However, Hall and Hall can be criticized for simplifying these differences.
and for building a “one-dimensional” model, in which cultures are ordered on a continuum. They do not give an explanation of the origin ("roots") of these characteristics, the way they may develop or change. It remains unclear how people manage to control their behaviour in new intercultural situations in the case when it is in complete discordance with their own cultural background.

Quite similar to Hall & Hall’s dimensions is Hofstede’s model (Hofstede 1980, Hofstede & Bond 1988). Although the dimensions identified by Hofstede and Bond (Hofstede 1980, Hofstede & Bond 1988) differ (see below), his model can be criticized for the same deficiencies: (1) it is static not dynamic; (2) it does not give the explanations of these cultural differences (their “roots”); (3) very little is said about people dealing with their own cultural background in case they “immerse” in different culture.

Hofstede (cf. 1980, 1991, 2001, 2003) identified the following dimensions of culture:

- power distance (i.e. to which extent the unequal distribution of power is accepted by individuals; for example, the estimated value of power distance index (PDI) for Hungary is 46; for comparison with other countries see Hofstede, 2003 and http://www.geerthofstede.com),

- individualism/collectivism (i.e. to which extent are the individuals expected to be loyal to their group; for example, the estimated value of individualism/collectivism (IDV) for Hungary and Austria is the same – 55, for comparison with other countries see ibid.),

- masculinity/femininity (i.e. to which extent gender influences the role one may have in society; for example, according to Hofstede, Hungary in comparison to Russia, Spain, Chile, Canada, Australia, the USA and UK is a highly “masculine” country, see ibid.),

- uncertainty avoidance (i.e. to which extent ambiguous situations are tolerated; for example, in cultures with high positive scores on the uncertainty avoidance index (UAI), like in Hungary, people prefer to avoid conflicts and risk),

And one more dimension which was added later, after some additional research together with Bond (see Hofstede & Bond 1988):

- time orientation (i.e. how important are present tense gains for a society; for example, for Russia, the USA and UK it is typical to foster “virtues related to the past and present” (Hofstede 2001:359); on the contrary, in East Asian cultures based on Confucian philosophy “the fostering of virtues oriented towards future rewards, in particular, perseverance and thrift” is typical (2001:359)).
This is the reason why the fifth dimension (time orientation) was labelled "The Confucian Dynamism".

Of course, it is arguable whether these five dimensions are sufficient to describe a culture, but it should be admitted that they offer an intelligible scheme to explain cultural misunderstandings. Although Hofstede's model disregards 'typical' for modern societies cultural diversity and sees culture as something static rather than dynamic, it is relevant to my research: with its help cultural misunderstandings between Hungarian LLs and representatives of other cultures can be interpreted. Also, Hofstede's interpretation of culture may serve as an argument that it is not the same for a Hungarian adult learner whether to learn English, Russian, or Spanish language-and-culture, as these cultures differ from Hungarian but not to the same degree.

Graph 1 compares Hungarian culture with cultures of Argentina (as an example of Latin American country), Russia, Spain, the UK and US, on the basis of Hofstede's dimensions. This graph shows that Hungary is quite similar to Argentina, United States and United Kingdom in terms of power distance. Also it shows that Hungarian culture differs enormously from Russian culture in terms of power distance and masculinity/femininity. In other parameters (individualism/collectivism and uncertainty avoidance), it has similar characteristics to Spanish and Argentinian cultures and is opposite to the cultures of the UK and the USA.

It is not the purpose of this study to investigate which culture is easier to be learnt for the Hungarian language learner, but – on the basis of the above-mentioned – we can guess that the difference exists.

In 1993, another model of culture (a seven-dimension model) was suggested by
Trompenaars (1993) and later revisited together with Hampden-Turner (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner 2001). They identified the following seven dimensions of culture:

1. Dimensions concerning human relationships (based on Parson’s relational orientations, Parson 1951)
   - universalism vs. particularism (i.e. how rules of morals are applied in a society; for example, for the USA it is typical that there is one truth, rules are to be applied in any situation without exception)
   - individualism vs. communitarianism (i.e. whether in a given society individual success is important or loyalty to the group; cf. Hofstede’s *individualism / collectivism*)
   - neutral vs. emotional (i.e. whether people are expected to hide their emotions or show them, both verbally and non-verbally; for example in such “emotional” cultures as the Spanish, people use a lot of gestures)
   - specific vs. diffuse (i.e. how big the area of privacy is; for example, in the USA private life is clearly separated from the public life)
   - achievement vs. ascription (i.e. whether the status of the people in the society depends on their achievement or their class, age, connections; in other words: in case of *achievement* cultures the focus is made on what someone does, in *ascription* cultures the focus is on what someone is.)

2. Dimension concerning time
   - attitude to time (i.e. whether time is considered linear or not; cf. Hall & Hall’s *monochronic/ polychronic time*; and also, which orientation – past, present or future – is more important, cf. Hofstede & Bond’s *time orientation*)

3. Dimension concerning the environment
   - attitude to the environment (i.e. how nature is seen by people; for example, in such inner-directed cultures as the USA, Canada and Australia people believe that nature should be controlled, but in China, Japan, Singapore people try to live in harmony with it)

In comparison with Hall & Hall’s and Hofstede’s approach, Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner’s multidimensional model seems to be more eclectic. It tries to show culture from various (multiple) perspectives, thus helping to understand intercultural conflicts of a wider range.

What these three models (Hall & Hall’s, Hofstede’s, Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner’s) have in common is that they can be praised for helping to better understand the
origin of intercultural misunderstandings. And what is extremely important – thanks to the offered dimensions – every culture can be equally valued, avoiding classification on “better” or “worse”. I consider them all relevant to my research because they point out to which aspects of culture should attention be paid in the process of intercultural learning.

The next model represents interest for this research because it tries to picture culture as a dynamic phenomenon (what is missing in the above-mentioned models). It is so-called Gullestrup’s model (see Appendix III). In his model Gullestrup (1992) makes differences between:

- the horizontal cultural dimension
- the vertical cultural dimension
- the temporal cultural dimension.

(For better understanding see Gullestrup’s (1992) definition of culture in section 1.1.1)

The horizontal dimension of Gullestrup’s (1992) model consists of the eight segments:

1. Technology (how nature is processed)
2. Economic institutions (how output is distributed)
3. Social institutions (how individuals live together)
4. Political institutions (who controls whom)
5. Language and Communication (how knowledge, ideas and values are disseminated among individuals and groups)
6. Reproduction and Socialisation (how individuals and unity are integrated, kept up and developed)
7. Ideology (how a common identity is created and preserved)
8. Religious institutions (how the view of the relationship between life and death is manifested) (Based on Kuada & Gullestrup 1997:6)

These segments of culture are visible (this part of Gullestrup’s model echoes with the Iceberg Model). In FLT they can be used as a kind of checklist to analyse how wide the range of aspects of culture, which are dealt with, is.

Gullestrup (1992) divided the model into six levels/layers (see Fig. 3 in Appendix III):

1. The level of immediately observable symptoms,
2. The level of difficult observable structures,
3. The governing morals and norms,
4. The partially legitimating values,
5. The generally accepted highest values,
6. The fundamental philosophy of life. (Based on Kuada & Gullestrup 1997:7)

As figure 3 (Appendix III) illustrates, the first three layers are visible (i.e. they compose "manifest culture"); the other three layers compose the so-called core culture and are hidden. These layers are vertically arranged, that is why the second dimension is called vertical (see Fig. 3 in Appendix III).

Probably, the most positive feature of Gullestrup’s model is that it pictures culture as a dynamic phenomenon. It is reflected in the third dimension of his culture model, namely the "temporal cultural dimension" (see Fig. 4 in Appendix III). In Gullestrup’s model, culture is constantly subjected to change from both internal and external factors. So-called initiating factors of change start the process, however the direction of changes is determined by so-called determining factors of change. The degree of homogeneity and the degree of integration also play a very important role.

The degree of integration is an expression of the degree of conformity between the different values within the culture, whereas the degree of homogeneity is an expression of the width and depth of the total knowledge and insight of the culture observed. (Kuada & Gullestrup 1997:9)

These are the “decisive factors of change” (Kuada & Gullestrup 1997:9). In so-called manifest level cultural changes take place more rapidly (see Fig. 4 in Appendix III). As an example, Kuaca and Gullestrup (1997:10) bring the fact of a quick change after the Second World War (WWII), when “people in Northern Europe started to replace the potatoes on their dinner tables with rice and pasta” (1997:10). Changes in the deeper levels of the core culture (see Fig. 4 in Appendix III) usually happen very slowly. That is why some cultures look very similar, but deeper inside they are very different.

The relevance of Gullestrup’s model to my research is that: (1) it helps to determine ‘visible areas’ in a culture to be covered in a FL coursebook (technology, economy, social institutions, political institutions, language and communication, socialisation, ideology and religion); (2) it stresses the importance of understanding the underlying values; (3) it can be well-applied for justifying the introduction of reflective thinking techniques in culture learning; and (4) it shows the dynamic nature of culture.

The above-discussed models differ in their perspective on culture. Therefore, they cannot be compared. In the following table (see Table 1), I list the components of these models without making an attempt to find a parallel among them, but to simply summarise and show how detailed was each of them. In spite of being very different, all these taxonomies are very useful because they allow describing cultures without classifying them as ‘good’ or ‘bad’. With their help we can talk about various aspects of culture in a non-judgmental way. I agree with Beneke (2000) who considers it extremely important not to
make ‘judgments’ when discussing cultures. The dimensions discussed above and summarised in table 1 offer this language tool, which helps in developing learners’ savoir s’engager, in Byram’s view the most important element of IC (see Golubeva 2006:65).

**Table 1: Models of culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models of Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Iceberg Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall &amp; Hall’s behavioural components of culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede &amp; Bond’s model of cultural dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trompenaars &amp; Hampden-Turner’s multidimensional model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gullstroup’s stratified model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Visible part</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fast/ Slow Messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High/ Low Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Territoriality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Polychronic/ Monochronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Power distance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individualism/ Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Masculinity/ Femininity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uncertainty avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time orientation (Confucian dynamism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Universalism/ Particularism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individualism/ Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communitarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neutral/Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Specific/ Diffuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Achievement/ Ascription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Attitude to time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Attitude to environment (nature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Horizontal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vertical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Temporal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.3. A brief history of culture in FL teaching (overview of treating culture by the main methods and approaches)

The disadvantage of men not knowing the past is that they do not know the present. History is a hill or high point of vantage, from which alone men see the town in which they live or the age in which they are living.

Chesterton, 1933:66

The relationship between language and culture can be considered one of the most interdisciplinary subjects of investigation: it has been a matter of great interest not only to language educators and FL researchers, but anthropologists, intercultural communication scholars, psychologists, sociologists, etc. (e.g. Sapir 1921, Whorf in Carroll 1956, Hall 1976, to name but a few). The integration of culture in the process of FLT is not a new idea either. Byram (2000:8) claims that “[i]t dates back to the beginnings of modern language teaching in the nineteenth century, and of course to the teaching of the classics far beyond that”. It can be confirmed by quoting Kelly (1969):

[…] nobody really knows what is new or what is old in present-day language teaching procedures […] In any case, much that is being claimed as revolutionary in this century is merely a rethinking and renaming of early ideas and procedures. (Kelly 1969:ix, square brackets added by me)

Still, in practice of FLT the realisation of the principle of “language-culture” inseparability is problematic (especially, on the level of curriculum design).

In this section I will try to show briefly the treatment of culture in the early period of
FLT and by main methods and approaches, namely, the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method, the Audio-Lingual Method, the Cognitive Approach and the Functional Approach (following Bárdos’ (2005) taxonomy of main methods and approaches, see Fig. 5 in Appendix IV). I will neither touch all the existing methods and approaches, nor give the description of the methods themselves. (For excellent summary of FLT methods and approaches see Howatt & Widdowson 2004; Mackey 1965; Titone 1968; Kelly 1969; Long-Fu 2001 and Bárdos 1987, 1988, 1992, 2000, 2005).

Starting from the very early years of FLT many practitioners and theorists have claimed the importance of integrating culture in FLT. Even today many FL educators believe that before and during the Grammar-Translation period FLT had an exclusively linguistic aspect. However, the deeper insight into the history of FLT shows that culture, explicitly or implicitly, was always present in a greater or smaller degree. Here are some examples:

In the Middle Ages, teachers very broadly used dialogues to teach Latin. These dialogues contained a lot of information on the target (C2) culture:

The best-known example of a Latin-teaching dialogue, or colloquy, as they were usually called, is one by Aelfric, Abbot of Eynsham, written in the eleventh century, before the Norman Conquest. The Latin text, which is accompanied by an interlinear translation in Anglo-Saxon, consists of a series of questions and answers relating to topics and activities of everyday rural life, farming, hunting, trading and so on. (Howatt & Widdowson 2004:11)

Another good example is the EFL textbook written by William Caxton in the 15th century (Howatt & Widdowson 2004:12-13). Being a very good merchant, Caxton focused on the merchant needs of the users of his textbook. Thus, his textbook can be considered as pioneering, because he put the emphasis on the communicative aspect of FL acquisition.

The same approach can be found in the 16th century in Bellot’s texts. Written “mainly for self-instruction at home” (Howatt & Widdowson 2004:23), his Familiar Dialogues (1586) included ‘semi-phonetic’ transcription. These dialogues looked very much like those that became popular in the middle of the last (twentieth) century because of their unambiguous situational context. (See Howatt & Widdowson 2004:23-25)

Other examples discussed by Howatt & Widdowson (2004) are the books written by John Florio: First Fruits (1578) and Second Fruits (1591) because of their focus on the sociocultural dimension of FLT. In Florio’s textbooks one can find

[...] everyday phrases and the practical language of the ‘Grand Tour': finding the way, arranging accommodation, dealing with landlords, etc. He also includes some interesting dialogues that explore different modes of address: how to talk to a gentleman, a lady, a servant, and so on. (Howatt & Widdowson 2004:32)

Analysing these examples one may even say that these early language educators and FL textbook writers proved their sensitiveness to the communicative aspect of FLT, made an
attempt to introduce a *functional syllabus* and tried to integrate small 'c' culture.

In the seventeenth century the same approach was discernible in the work of John Amos Comenius (for detailed reference, see Bárdos 2005).

As a proof of culture integration in the process of FLT in the Middle Ages Kelly (1969) mentions songs and drama and the tradition of employing extensive reading in FLT to introduce foreign culture. Another very curious practice in the seventeenth century, FLT described by Kelly (1969) was the classification of vocabulary according to the criterion of importance in daily life.

Kelly states that "[...] nobody really knows what is new or what is old in present-day language teaching procedures [...]" (Kelly 1969:ix), and provides an example of students exchange to prove his statement. The exchange of university students (so popular nowadays) is believed to be an idea of modern times. Among other benefits, it helps to get an insight into the target culture. In reality, this practice was used a long time ago:

The custom spans two thousand years from the great schools of Athens, which received Roman boys on the threshold of a public career, to the modern graduate student, who very often, studies in a foreign language university. This reached its peak during the Middle Ages, when the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Paris were truly international societies, with all the teaching in Latin. (Kelly 1969:295)

The above-mentioned examples serve as the evidence of the early tentatives to introduce culture in FLT. Moreover, the unconsciousness, or better – the intuitiveness, of these attempts, proves the inseparability of language and culture. And vice versa, due to this inseparability, culture was always present in FLT. So, it would not be right to state that the integration of culture in the process of FLT is something revolutionarily new.

In modern times the integration of culture in FLT also had various forms. For example, those who followed the *Grammar-Translation Method* (GTM) considered translation the only reliable way to transmit meaning. GTM had a goal to prepare language learners to appreciate great literature. In other words, this method involved only the high ("C") culture. Such modern educators as Rivers (1968) and Omaggio (1986) strongly criticized the method for neglecting spoken language and not teaching culture on an everyday level.

But, we should not forget that every FLT method is the product of its times. Therefore, very often what seems a deficiency of the methods from today's point of view, could be explained after investigation of the requirements of the society at that time. In the time of GTM, usually there was no need to teach learners to communicate due to the rare personal contacts between people from different cultures, or what we call today 'intercultural communication'. Many people lived their lives without leaving their villages or towns. That
is why the criticism of GTM regarding the integration of culture may seem unfair. One may even argue that this method well fitted the requirements to FLs in the society of those days.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century general progress in technology and sciences led to rapid industrialisation in Europe. People started to travel more; they had more commercial and social contacts. So, GTM was not able to satisfy their communicative needs any more. There was an urgent claim for a new method, so the Direct Method (DM) started gaining the FLT market (see for reference Bárđos 2005 and Fig. 6 in Appendix IV).

The new method (also known by other names, e.g. the Oral Method, the Reformed Method) used as the starting point the idea that a FL should be learnt as the native language: by listening to it and speaking it a lot. Starting from the beginner’s level they avoided the use of the native language, and they used situations from everyday life, thus introducing the target culture. Very soon the Direct Method became quite spread (e.g. at the beginning of the twentieth century in the 25th revised edition of the Berlitz Method (Berlitz 1902) more than 110 of the Berlitz Schools of Language were listed).

Although the Direct Method can be criticized for many reasons, the integration of culture in FLT is evident. At the beginner and elementary levels the material (including culturally oriented pictures) contained mainly small ‘c’ culture, at more advanced levels – capital ‘C’ culture. Culture was considered the integral part of FLT, e.g.: a whole chapter of Gouin’s book (1880) deals with the importance of culture. Similarly, Jespersen (1904) stresses the importance of culture, emphasising the capital ‘C’ culture:

The highest purpose in the teaching of languages may perhaps be said to be the access to the best thoughts and institutions of a foreign nation, its literature, culture – in short, the spirit of the nation in the widest sense of the word. (1904:9 as quoted in Rivers 1968:261)

Moreover, LLs were expected to be enthusiastic about the target language culture (Bárđos 2005).

Unfortunately, the teaching of culture was rather incidental than well-structured. Very little attention was paid to sociocultural aspects to make the use of foreign language successful beyond the language classroom (Finocchiaro and Brumfit 1983). This is how Stern (1983) comments on the limitations of DM:

Even the shift towards an attention to the spoken form, which occurred by the end of the nineteenth century, did not bring about a fundamentally new approach to language in society. Language learning in the classroom continued to be conceived as training rather than as ‘real’ communication or as an introduction to a foreign society. (Stern 1983:247)

In the 1940s after the fiasco of the previous methods and because of the urgent need to be able to use a foreign language in real communication, another FLT method appeared: the Audio-Lingual (see Appendix IV). With its roots in behaviourism (in psychology) and
structuralism (in linguistics), the *Audio-Lingual Method* (ALM) aimed at providing FL knowledge within a short time. Teaching foreign languages with the use of ALM focused not only on linguistic but cultural aspects as well:

The objectives of the audio-lingual method are clearly stated to be the development of mastery, at various levels of competency, in all four language skills – beginning with listening and speaking, and using these as a basis for the teaching of reading and writing. Paralleling this linguistic aim is the endeavour to develop understanding of the foreign culture and the foreign people through experience with their language. These aims are undoubtedly appropriate in the present age when ability to use a foreign language actively and to understand people of other cultures is thrust upon us, in no matter what country we live. (Rivers 1968:44, my emphasis)

ALM emphasised small 'c' culture, and focus was made on the authenticity:

Another characteristic of the dialogue in early audio-lingual text was that they were to be linguistically and culturally authentic. Linguistic authenticity meant that the utterance in the dialogue were to be true to native speech...Cultural authenticity meant that the conversation was to take place in the second culture and be appropriate to the dialogue situation. (Chastain 1976:114)

Despite such interest in cultural dimension, culture occupied just a secondary place in ALM (Stern 1983). In the 1960s the interest towards a language laboratory de-emphasised the interest in cultural aspects. The number of critics grew; a new method was to come. It was the *Cognitive Approach*. This approach was based on cognitive theories of learning (in psychology) and on the theory of Chomsky (in linguistics). Both psychologists and linguists who were advocating the method, stressed the meaningfulness of the process of learning: “the acquisition of large body of knowledge is simply impossible in the absence of meaningful learning” (Ausubel 1968:61). A similar position had Chomsky, who with his two publications – *Syntactic Structures* (1957) and *A Review of Skinner's Verbal Behaviour* (1959) – made revolution in linguistics.

As it follows from the description of the main features of the Cognitive Approach (Chastain 1976, Omaggio 1986, Bárdos 2005), its relation to the cultural aspects of FLT is not quite clear. However, one thing that can be stated almost for sure is that in the cultural dimension (as well as in the linguistic one) the emphasis was put on the principal of meaningfulness. Reference to it can be found in Omaggio (1986): “cognitive psychologists in the late 1960s placed great importance of meaningfulness and organisation of background knowledge in the learning process” (Omaggio 1986:114).

It is worth noting that “as a fully-fledged language teaching theory the cognitive method has not as yet been critically examined” (Stern 1983:469), because in the early eighties “its contribution has been overshadowed by the increasing shift of interest to the communicative approach” (1983:469).

The Communicative Approach developed mainly due to the processes in the world economy: the number of international contacts and exchanges in various areas (such as
science, education, culture) was dramatically increasing. In the new multicultural society it was already not enough just to be able to ‘read’ or to ‘speak’ a foreign language. Learning FL without learning target culture was considered to be odd, or as Bakonyi called it in Russian «ущербный» (a word with much stronger connotation than the English word „defective”) (Bakonyi [Бакони] 2001:239).

Such works as van Ek’s *Threshold Level* (1975), Wilkins’ *Notional Syllabus* (1976), van Ek and others’ *Waystage English* (van Ek, Alexander and Fitzpatrick 1977), and Brumfit’s *Teaching Language as Communication* (1978), served as the basis for the new approach.

According to Finocchiaro & Brumfit (1983) and Bárdos (2005), one of the major characteristics of the approach is the teaching of *everyday* language. In this approach material is graded with regard to its priority in real communication. So, language learning is seen as learning to communicate, and communicative competence is the only goal, which can be reached only through the constant endeavour to communicate. From sociolinguistic viewpoint, Communicative Approach tries to set a clear sociocultural context.

Communicative competence no doubt implies linguistic competence but its main focus is the intuitive grasp of social and cultural rules and meanings that are carried by any utterance (Stern 1983:299). The Communicative Approach to FLT has been widely accepted and applied in many classrooms throughout the world. At the same time, plenty of new coursebooks have been edited all over the world in order to conform to the teaching objectives dictated by the new approach. Although the Communicative Approach to language teaching has received widespread acceptance the world over as a standard practice, it was criticized for viewing „the learner as an incomplete native speaker” (see Byram 1997:11). According to Byram (1997:8), in the Communicative Approach the learner is expected to model on the native speaker and his/her own identity is disregarded, which leads to creating:

1. „an impossible target and consequently inevitable failure”, because LLs are expected to „have the same mastery over a language as an (educated) native speaker” (Byram 1997:11);

2. „the wrong kind of competence”, because it implies „becoming accepted as a native speaker by other native speakers”, and „suggests separation from one’s own culture and the acquisition of a native sociocultural competence, and a new sociocultural identity” (Byram 1997:11-12).

Also, the Communicative Approach is criticized for the limitedness of its materials. In Byram’s opinion, a series which present the target culture from an outsider’s view or a so-called ‘tourist view’ keeps LLs far from a real social interaction (Byram 1997). The ‘tourist’
information such as buying a ticket at a railway station, asking time, etc.; and the incomplete and superficial representation of C2 simply impede LIs understanding of the target culture from within. And what I consider even the bigger problem, is that the learner’s own culture (C1) is hardly involved. Savignon (1983) criticized the kind of presentation of the participants when their age, occupation, the situation of happening and the cultural context are not identified. In her opinion, it can be misleading. Paulston (1974:40) had a similar viewpoint, maintaining that “[…] in the artificial world of language classrooms there are communicative activities which lack specific deep structures of social meaning” (square brackets added by me).

Discussing the ‘limitedness’ of cultural dimension of the Communicative Approach in the practice of FLT, Byram and others (Byram, Esarte-Sarries & Taylor 1991) summarised that “the effect of language teaching on pupils’ view is disappointing, which does not amount to an understanding of or insight into another people’s way of life and thinking” (Byram, Esarte-Sarries & Taylor 1991:380). The explanation for it was later given by Byram himself (Byram 2000). According to him, “the ‘communicative turn’ in language teaching, particularly in English as a Foreign Language, tended to emphasise speech act and discourse competence, rather than (socio-)cultural competence” (Byram 2000:8). Even though, he stressed, „this was a misinterpretation of the original definition proposed by Hymes (1972)” (Byram 2000:8). Criticizing teaching FL ‘for touring’, Byram claimed that:

> the more desirable outcome is a learner with the ability to see and manage the relationship between themselves and their own cultural beliefs, behaviours and meanings, as expressed in a foreign language, and those of their interlocutors, expressed in the same language — or even a combination of languages — which may be the interlocutor’s native language, or not. (1997:12)

In other words, Byram emphasised the need of a shift to the teaching of FLs for intercultural understanding.

Having done a brief overview of treating culture by the main methods and approaches, I would like to summarise the two major trends in the teaching of culture in the modern FLT practice. The first one — represented among others by Brooks (1964), Rivers (1968) and Chastain (1976) — emphasises the integration of culture in FLT in its broad definition. To them, culture should be taught through the actual teaching of the language (which is seen as a tool of communication) and teaching of target culture (only!) should be integrated. Such educators as Lafayette (1978), Seelye (1984), Omaggio (1986), and Kramsch (1993) seem to follow this approach; and, the ideas offered by them are quite eclectic and pragmatic. According to this approach, culture learning can be easily integrated into grammar or vocabulary learning through the use of contextualised exercises, “where disparate linguistic or cultural phenomena can be brought together and attached to more abstract principles of
both base (C1) and target (C2) language and culture” (Kramsch 1991:229), e.g.: time can be presented through comparing mealtimes in C1 and C2 (see Kramsch 1991). In this process the FL teachers have to

[...] confront students with the meanings associated with the specific uses of words, not with disembodied ideas and beliefs. People are not what we believe they are, but what they say they are. The responsibility of the language teacher is to teach culture as it is mediated through language, not as it is studied by social scientists and anthropologists. The privilege of the intercultural speaker must be accompanied by an increased sense of personal and individual responsibility in the use of words and in the ownership of their meanings. (Kramsch 1998:31, square brackets added by me)

The main deficiency of this approach is that usually culture is integrated in FLT when this is desired or needed.

The second approach is based on the ideas collected from anthropology, psychology, sociology and sociolinguistics. Such researchers as Byram (1988, 1989), Morgan (Byram & Morgan 1994), and Murphy (1988) (to name just a few) worked on developing the theories underlying this approach. Taking a broader view on culture and emphasising the importance of anthropological cultural studies in FLT, they suggested a new approach, which got the name of the Cultural Studies Approach. They also recognised developing IC as the major goal of FL education. As a main technique the constant comparison between C1 and C2 was suggested (see Byram 1989, Byram & Morgan 1994).

Kramsch (1991) describes the difference between the two approaches as follows,

If the American view might be seen as too much focused on language as a tool for action, the European view might be considered to be too concerned with language as an object of linguistic or social reflection. Both views illustrate two complementary aspects of culture: culture as performance, culture as competence. (1991:226)

Despite the obvious concern of the scholars, in practice the integration of culture in FLT is still incidental and unstructured. This issue has been discussed since the beginning of 1970s. Ten years later, Stern (1983) expresses his opinion on the results: “Next to nothing has been done to describe cultural aspects of languages commonly taught” (1983:64). His critics are mainly targeted on social scientists being “somewhat indifferent to language pedagogy” and having “hardly recognised the importance of theories and descriptions of society and culture for language teaching” (1983:246). To Stern, “language teaching theory today is fast acquiring a sociolinguistic component but still lacks a well-defined sociocultural emphasis” (1983:284). Similar critical opinion can be read in Byram (1989:78):

(1) despite a wide range of writings, cultural studies lacks direction and fails to attract serious attention, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon world, and consequently lacks status;
(2) existing research is mainly exploratory and theoretical, dealing with concept definition, delimitation of the field of interest and discussion of aims and purposes;
(3) theorists draw on a wider range of academic disciplines than those to which language teachers are usually exposed;
(4) what empirical research and development does exist is usually on a small scale, often arising out of
teachers’ individual practice, without reference to theory, and concerned with outcomes rather than processes of teaching and learning.

Already in 1989 Byram emphasised that “The task for the future is to improve the situation by bringing together the theory and the practical experience, by theoretically well-founded empirical research” (Byram 1989:79).

Summarising the overview, two major conclusions can be made:

1. Although there are a lot of FL researchers and teachers who regard the integration of culture in FLT as a phenomenon of present days, the closer insight into the history of FLT shows that to some degree culture was always there.

2. In spite of many attempts to integrate culture in FLT, in practice the progress is extremely slow.

What usually ‘Background Studies’, ‘Civilización’, ‘Országismertet’, ‘Landeskunde’ and ‘Stranoved’entije’ (страноведение) offer cannot be considered satisfactory, because these subjects as a rule do not support reflective learning, nor do they aim at enhancing the learners’ intercultural competence. However, a positive shift among the FLT profession – the recognition of the need of a more systematic and structured way of teaching culture – can be noticed. More and more teachers understand that it is impossible to teach FLs in a culture-free way (whichever approach or method they choose), because of the inseparability of language and culture.

1.2. Intercultural Language Learning

Now, when understanding of the necessity of changes in FLT is growing, it is not easy to decide whether the Communicative Language Teaching Approach should be revised, or an alternative method should be developed. In other words, is the inclusion of intercultural learning in the process of foreign language learning a result of a reconsideration of Hymes’ definition of communicative competence (see in section 1.1.3 Byram’s opinion about the limitedness of Communicative Approach in teaching culture due to misinterpretation of this definition); or, following Bárdos’ logics (Bárdos 2000), intercultural language learning may become a new method of FLT?

Bárdos (2000:26) applies the philosophy law of ‘thesis – antithesis’ for the explanation of FLT methods progress (see Fig. 7 in Appendix IV): a method (antithesis, for example, Direct Method) appears as an alternative to another method (thesis, for example, Grammar-Translation Method); as a result of synthesis a new method is developed (e.g. Reading, Intensive or Audio-Visual), etc.. Thus, accordingly, the Communicative Approach
should be followed on by a new method. Then, the logical question emerges: *Can it be an Intercultural Language Learning Approach?*

We had better let future generations answer this question, because from their perspective they will clearly see today’s progress in FLT. What I try to do in this chapter is: (1) to show the origins of the ‘intercultural paradigm’ in FLT through briefly discussing the history of the field of *intercultural communication* (section 1.2.1); (2) to put clearly the differences between ‘communicative’, ‘intercultural’ and ‘intercultural communicative’ competences (section 1.2.2); (3) to define the concept of ‘intercultural speaker’ (section 1.2.3); (4) to describe the process of IIL (section 1.2.4); and (5) to give insight into the main challenges of ILL (section 1.2.5).

1.2.1. A brief history of the field of intercultural communication (and its influence on the teaching and learning foreign languages and cultures)

To study history means submitting to chaos and nevertheless retaining faith in order and meaning. It is a very serious task, [...] and possibly a tragic one.

Hesse, 2002:169

The field of intercultural communication is quite young, and “ [...] still has little history written about it” (Leeds-Hurwitz 1990:262). So, very little documented history of the field can be found, usually quite brief (see e.g. Jandt 1995). As an exception two articles should be mentioned – one written by Leeds-Hurwitz (1990), the other by Hart (1996) – which try to fill the void in intercultural communication study. The third article to mention is written by Rogers, Hart & Miike (2002) and it is also very insightful, but they mostly touch the development of the field in the USA and Japan.

According to Rogers and others (2002), intercultural research went further in these two countries for the following reasons:

1. the two countries (Japan and the USA) are the largest economic powers, so the number of contacts is really high, and the effective intercultural communication is essential;
2. some of the most influential researchers in the early time of the field had rich personal experience in American-Japanese communication (e.g. Clifford Clarke, John C. Condon, and William B. Gudykunst);
3. Japanese and American researchers regularly met for exchange on professional meetings (conferences, workshops, etc.) held in Japan;
4. in Japan this field is perceived as particularly useful, and courses in intercultural communication are not only offered in departments of communication, but e.g. in schools of business, etc.
Through time, the field of intercultural communication widely spread outside the USA and Japan, and became quite fashionable.

Although the purpose of this chapter is not to write a detailed history of the field and name all the scholars who deserve it, but to give an outline for better understanding of the context of my research, I cannot omit the mention of the outstanding scholar, the founder of this field, Edward Twitchell Hall. See Table 2 in Appendix V (based on Hart 1996, Leeds-Hurwitz 1990, Rogers & Steinfatt 1999, Rogers et al. 2002, etc.) for the major events in Hall’s life that contributed to the development of the field of intercultural communication.

According to Rogers and others (Rogers et al. 2002), the most important influence on Hall and his views was the experience he got when working with the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and during WWII. As he himself remembers later, work with the Indians helped him to become aware of “the details and complexities of one of the world’s most significant problems: Intercultural relations” (Hall 1992:76 quoted in Rogers et al. 2002:5). Hall himself mentions that in his work he was influenced most of all by cultural anthropology, linguistics, ethology and Freudian psychoanalytic theory (see for more detail Hall 1992; Sorrells 1998; Rogers et al. 2002). Surprisingly enough, such theories as (1) Georg Simmel’s (1908, 1921) theory of stranger; and (2) Charles Darwin’s (1872/1965) research on the non-verbal communication of facial expressions, which are today considered important roots of intercultural communication (cf. Gudykunst & Kim 1984; Rogers & Steinfatt 1999; Rogers 1999), were never cited in any writings of Hall (Rogers et al. 2002). Rogers and others (Rogers et al. 2002) suggested a figure to illustrate the intellectual influences on Hall (see Rogers et al. 2002:7).

At the beginning Hall and his colleagues from the FSI (Foreign Service Institute) taught their trainees – mainly diplomats – about the concept of culture and about the macro-level of culture. Soon he realized that: “There seemed to be no ‘practical’ value attached to either what the anthropologist did or what he made of his discoveries” (Hall 1959:32). In his opinion, it was useless to deal with culture on the meta-level (Hall 1959), it could not help the trainees to understand how to communicate effectively with individuals from different cultures. Therefore, Hall started discussing with Trager what changes should be made in the FSI curriculum and how to bring together anthropological and linguistic perspectives (Hall 1992; Sorrells 1998; Rogers et al. 2002). As a result, they (Hall & Trager 1953) created a matrix for mapping cultures. Hall’s definition of culture, I already mentioned in 1.1.1 (“Culture is communication and communication is culture” Hall 1959:186), appeared as a conclusion of Hall’s common work with Trager, the focus of which was on intercultural communication. The ideas formulated at the FSI were expressed by Hall in his broadly-

According to Dodd (1995), the publication of *The Silent Language* “marked the birth of intercultural communication since it synthesized what are now considered fundamental issues in understanding culture and communication” (1995:24), although Hall never considered himself as the founder of the new scientific field. Opposite to Dodd (1995), Asante and Gudykunst (1989) considered the 1970s as the time of the “birth” of intercultural communication: according to them, “the conception of the field of intercultural communication took place in the 1950s” (1989:7), not its birth.

In the 1970s the first intercultural university courses were established; first intercultural societies were founded (e.g. SIETAR – Society of Intercultural Education, Training and Research in 1974); and first textbooks and journals on intercultural communication were published, among which the following should be highlighted: *Communication and Culture* (Smith 1966), *Intercultural Communication: A Reader* (Samovar & Porter 1972), *Intercultural Communication* (Harms 1973), *International and Intercultural Communication Annals* (Casmir 1974, 1975, 1976), *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* (Condon & Yousef 1975), *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* (Landis 1977).

Using the same metaphor, intercultural communication swiftly “moved from its formative stage of carefree infancy to a somewhat mature stage of adulthood” (Saral 1979:396). The following two decades of the 1980s and the 1990s can be named the period of maturation. In 1998 the International Academy of Intercultural Relations was founded. Plenty of publications appeared in the 90s, just to name but a few: Bennett (1998), Borden (1991), Brislin (1993), Brislin & Cushner (1996), Brislin & Yoshida (1994), Ito (1992), Scollon & Scollon (1995) and many others. In Hungary, the interest in the field has also been growing, which reflects in increasing numbers of publications: Borgulya (1996), Falkné Bánó (2001, 2003), Hidasi (2003, 2004), etc. Földes (2007), for example, offers an intercultural paradigm of linguistics. Moreover, a positive tendency shows a growing interest among the researchers in pedagogy towards the issue of intercultural education (see Csapó & Czachesz 1995, Czachesz 1998, Kovács 1997, Kozma 1995, etc.). But still Hall’s work remains the most often-cited.

One of the most challenging objectives of intercultural research is to find ways of teaching/training individuals to become successful ‘intercultural speakers’ (this concept to be discussed in 1.2.3). There are a lot of questions to be answered. For instance, it is not clear what material exactly should be learnt; whether the culture-specific or the culture-general should be stressed, what culture teaching methods should be applied, etc. (see Jæger 2000).
Unfortunately, in spite of numerous unanswered questions, until this moment very little research on the culture learning process has taken place.

1.2.2. From teaching communicative competence to teaching intercultural communicative competence

Culture is communication and communication is culture.
Hall, 1959:186

The idea of inseparability of culture and communication, as it is stressed in the above quoted Hall’s definition of culture, which was already mentioned in 1.1.1, has been widely accepted. Consequently, for successful intercultural communication, the culture associated with the communication patterns has to be taken into account. Looking at culture implies looking at the interaction of cultures. There is much truth in the statement that, “if it were not for the existence of more than one culture, we would not think about culture at all” (Martinelli & Taylor 2000:18). Therefore, “culture [...] cannot be thought of simply as “culture”, it has to be thought of as “cultures”” (2000:18, square brackets added by me), and I would paraphrase that culture cannot be taught simply as “culture”, it has to be taught as “cultures”.

As was previously discussed in section 1.1.3, there seems to be a need for rethinking the concept of ‘communicative language teaching’ (CLT), and for advancing from the development of communicative competence to the development of intercultural communicative competence. In this section I am not going to discuss the concept of competence in general (for insightful discussion see Chen & Starosta 1996; Bowden & Marton 1998; Lustig & Koester 2003; Nagy 2000, 2003; Zsolnai 2003; Csapó 2004), instead I will try to show the difference between communicative, intercultural and intercultural communicative competences. I will start with the concept of ‘communicative competence’ because the other two – ‘intercultural competence’ and ‘intercultural communicative competence’ – always imply it.

The development of communicative competence is the major aim of Communicative Approach. Despite the different definitions of the term (in chronological order: Hymes 1971, Canale & Swain 1980, Savignon 1983, Bachman 1990), one important component was always present, namely the sociolinguistic one. Therefore, the limitedness of cultural dimension of the approach, is due not to the definition itself, but to its “misinterpretation” (Byram 2000:8). To Byram (1997), the cultural dimension is limited due to the implicit expectation that FL learners should imitate natives, and therefore they are viewed as incomplete native speakers (see section 1.1.3), which is quite disappointing. Medgyes (Medgyes 1994, 1996a, 1997; Medgyes & Major 2004) also strongly criticizes “nativeness”
as the final aim of FL learning process. He reasons, "non-native speakers can never achieve a native speaker's competence" (Medgyes 1996a:34). Moreover, the focus made in CLT on communication with native speakers is also misleading, because it ignores the communication in target language with representatives of other cultures.

It seems that in CLT the stress is not so much on intercultural, but bicultural communication. In this sense, the shift should be made from teaching communicative competence to teaching an intercultural (communicative) one.

Before starting discussing intercultural competence, I would like to clarify the terminology. Almost two decades ago Damen (1987) mentioned this problem in connection with 'intercultural communication', which was identified by many names: 'cross-cultural communication', 'transcultural communication', 'inter-racial communication', 'international communication', or even 'contracultural communication'. The reason, she explained, was that "Each name has served to designate a particular focus or interest" (Damen 1987:23).

In the case of 'intercultural competence' various terms are often mixed up substituting each other, which makes the literature very confusing. For instance, the terms 'multicultural' and 'intercultural' may often be found in the literature as if they were synonymous, but rigorously speaking the semantic distinction inherent in the prefixes 'multi-' and 'inter-' should be adhered to.

It is also well to clarify the meaning of another term, namely 'cross-cultural', which is sometimes being used as interchangeable with 'intercultural', but actually its meaning also differs. Opposite to intercultural research which deals with study of "interactions among people from different cultures", a cross-cultural study involves an intracultural analyses (i.e. analyses of "interactions among people from the same culture") followed by comparing cultures on the issue of interest (Lustig & Koester 2003:54).

I also feel it important to clarify the difference between international and intercultural communication. The term 'international communication' is appropriate when we talk about contacts on political or governmental level (Samovar & Porter 2001), while the term 'intercultural communication' is used for communication on interpersonal level.

Another important note to be done is that for a long period of time, the terms 'socio-cultural' and 'intercultural' has been used as synonymous, but under the influence of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEF), the term 'intercultural' has become more widely used (cf. the use of terms in the CEF 2001, Byram 1997, Byram & Zarate 1997).

The important role of the CEF (2001) concludes not only in promoting the term itself, but also in providing the basic understanding of the concept of 'intercultural competence'
(IC), which is referred to in the majority of writings on intercultural learning. The CEF (2001:101-108) gives descriptions of four “savoirs”: (1) savoir (declarative knowledge), (2) savoir faire (skills and know-how), (3) savoir être (‘existential’ competence), and (4) savoir apprendre (ability to learn).

Although in literature on intercultural education in FLT, as a starting point very often the CEF (2001) is used, I should make a very important note here. More than ten years ago Michael Byram together with Genevieve Zarate were invited to write a paper which was to be a basis for the CEF (Byram & Zarate 1994). That is the reason that in the CEF only (1) savoirs, (2) savoir faire, (3) savoir être and (4) savoir apprendre can be found. Later, Byram (1997) made changes in this model: savoir comprendre and savoir s'engager were added, and savoir apprendre and savoir faire were put together (see Fig. 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of self and other; of interaction; individual and societal (savoirs)</td>
<td>Of self and other; of interaction; individual and societal (savoirs)</td>
<td>Of self and other; of interaction; individual and societal (savoirs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(savoir comprendre)</td>
<td>(savoir comprendre)</td>
<td>(savoir comprendre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(savoir faire)</td>
<td>(savoir faire)</td>
<td>(savoir faire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(savoir s'engager)</td>
<td>(savoir s'engager)</td>
<td>(savoir s'engager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(savoir être)</td>
<td>(savoir être)</td>
<td>(savoir être)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(savoir apprendre/ faire)</td>
<td>(savoir apprendre/ faire)</td>
<td>(savoir apprendre/ faire)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8: Factors of intercultural competence (IC) interacting in intercultural communication.**
(from Kramer 2001:46, source Byram 1997:34)

Despite this, the first one (accepted for the CEF) remains the most cited. However, as a basis for this research I took the later model of Byram. According to Byram himself (Byram in his interview to Golubeva 2006: 65), savoir s'engager (‘critical cultural awareness’) is the central element of the model of IC and, therefore, the most important one (see Fig. 8).

Byram (1997:50-53) defines these five elements of IC as follows:

- **Attitudes**: curiosity and openness, readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief about one’s own (1997:50);
- **Knowledge**: of social groups and their products and practices in one’s own and in one’s interlocutor’s country, and of the general processes of societal and individual interaction (1997:51);
- **Skills of interpreting and relating**: ability to interpret a document or event from another
culture, to explain it and relate it to documents from one’s own (1997:52);

- **Skills of discovery and interaction**: ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices and the ability to operate knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction (1997:52);

- **Critical cultural awareness / political education**: an ability to evaluate critically and on the basis of explicit criteria perspectives, practices and products in one’s own and other cultures and countries (1997:53).

Traditionally, IC is viewed as a complex of cognitive, affective and behavioural factors. This view is based on Bloom’s well-known taxonomy (Bloom & Krathwohl 1956; Bloom, Krathwohl & Masia 1964). According to this, the task is to describe the knowledge to be taught, the beliefs and attitudes to be changed during the process of education, and to decide the use of what strategies should be trained. Usually, what is done in FLT is providing information about FL culture, mainly, so-called capital 'C'-culture (facts, names, events, etc.), rather than teaching for cultural understanding and IC (Ryan 1994). It is still not defined, what the minimum knowledge is that is enough to be successful in intercultural communication (so, what seems to be easy is not that at all). Intercultural trainers, opposite to FL teachers, focus on developing skills and training strategies, i.e. on behavioural component rather than on cognitive (although it is arguable how efficient the superficial changes in behaviour are). Probably the most challenging task is to change people’s attitudes, especially in the case of adults. Risager sees the affective dimension as being the primary dimension, “in the sense that its development stems from the first years of life” (Risager 2000:15). The basic trust one has in other people and one’s positive self-image is an important pre-condition for openness, tolerance and willingness to dismiss – both negative and positive – prejudices.

For an interculturally competent person these characteristics are the most important.

There are many other questions to be answered, e.g. (Risager 2000, from web):

- What happens mentally when one uses a foreign language?
- Does one feel elated or insecure?
- What does it mean to be able to use language other than one’s native language?
- Is it nice, even a relief, to ‘assume’ another identity as a user of that language, or is it connected with unpleasant experiences and fear?
- What role does the linguistic perfection requirement play in how one sees oneself?

Undoubtedly, the ideal way to learn is through one’s own experience – in situations that involve such dimensions as cognition, emotion, and action. According to Sercu (2004), these three are not enough. She added the fourth dimension, namely the **personality traits**. According to Sercu, “The personality traits that are conducive to intercultural competence are: empathy, respect, interest in cultures, flexibility, tolerance, open-mindedness, initiative,
sociability and positive self-image” (Sercu 2004:76 referring to Kealey & Ruben 1983).

As was discussed above, there is not conclusive agreement either on the use of terminology or on the dimensions of intercultural competence. Accordingly, there is not conclusive agreement on the definition of the concept of IC. Scholars more or less agree that IC involves knowledge, skills, and attitudes, but their definitions differ in the degree of refinement of these components. Moreover, some definitions contain further constructs such as motivation, adaptability, etc. For the present research, probably the main problem is that there is disagreement in defining the role of linguistic competence: whether it is more general or more specific? Also, there is the risk to either oversimplify or overcomplicate the definition of IC. In addition, many IC definitions are affected by Western culture, which makes them quite limited (Chen 1993, Samovar, Porter & Stefani 1998, Deardorff 2004).

One of the first attempts to define IC was made by Hanvey (1976), but he called it a ‘global perspective’. He ‘sketched’ the following five dimensions of the ‘global perspective’ (Hanvey 1976):

- Perspective consciousness,
- "State of the planet" awareness,
- Cross-cultural awareness,
- Knowledge of global dynamics,
- Awareness of human choices.

Tye (1990), discussing ‘global education’, stresses the importance of “seeing things through the eyes and minds of others”, or – in other words – “perspective taking” (1990:163).

Lustig and Koester (2003) put accent on “the relationships and situations within which the communication occurs” (2003:65) and outline the following three elements of IC:

- interpersonal and situational context,
- the degree of appropriateness and effectiveness of the interaction,
- sufficient knowledge, motivations, and actions.

They say that “judgments of intercultural competence also depend on cultural expectations about the permitted behaviors that characterize the settings or situations within which people communicate” (2003:65). This can be considered a very positive shift in IC research, because very often it has focused only on the person with little or no attention to the situation within which people communicate. However, to them, personal traits should not be taken into account; “the association between individuals” is considered to be much more important (2003:65) (cf. Sercu 2004:76, see p.46 below). While Sercu (see p.46) states that personal traits are important for one to become intercultural, Lustig & Koester (2003) argue that “there is no prescriptive set of characteristics that inevitably guarantees competence in all
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intercultural relationships and situations" (2003:65).

To Samovar and Porter (2001), who also have contributed to the understanding of the concept of IC, most definitions of IC are similar regarding components included; and, at the same time, these definitions differ in their approach: culture-specific, context-specific (i.e. business, healthcare), and culture-general.

According to Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (2000), whose multidimensional model was described in section 1.1.2, “intercultural competence can be achieved by recognising cultural differences, respecting them, and ultimately reconciling them” through transformation of “conflicting values” into “complementary values” (2000:249).

In an interview Byram defined it loosely as “the ability to see yourself as others see you, to respond to them in the light of that, and to interact with them in the light of that” (Bandura 2003, from web).

For better understanding of IC the following figure (Fig. 9), which strikes a balance between Second Language Acquisition, L2-classroom research, Applied Linguistics on the one hand, and linguistic and intercultural competence on the other, is important.

![Figure 9: Intercultural Competence (Source Kramer 2001:45)](image)

According to Kramer (2001),

In this understanding, IC does not determine the contributions of the other factors but, rather, pervades or informs them. In doing so, IC selects and combines linguistic competence and communicative strategies as well as knowledge about the foreign language and culture, in such a way as to enable the learners to confront their communicative practice. In this practice, i.e. in their interaction with speakers of another culture, they have to negotiate the necessary communicative processes and their contexts and, thereby, become intercultural speakers, developing intercultural communicative competence.

(2001:46)

In her doctoral study Deardorff (2004) with the help of a panel of well-known intercultural experts (21), and using a 3-round Delphi technique, tried to determine a definition of IC. Such intercultural experts took part in this study as Janet Bennett (Intercultural Communication Institute, Oregon), Michael Byram (University of Durham, England), Jolene
Koester (California State University, Northridge), L. Robert Kohls (Institute for Intercultural Leadership, California), R. Michael Paige (University of Minnesota), to name but a few of those who are also well-known in Hungary. She collected 16 different items in a table as the results of her study. In definitions given by these experts the most often emphasised attributes of intercultural communication were *effectiveness* and *appropriateness* (see Deardorf 2004:301).

Thus, summarising the previous discussion of the concept of IC and the result of the above-mentioned study, IC can be defined as *capability to communicate appropriately and effectively in intercultural situations and to manage such challenges of intercultural communication as cultural differences, misunderstandings or even conflicts, and caused by them stress and culture shock*. This will serve as a working definition for this research. In this definition under *intercultural communication* I mean not only situations when the learner communicates with people from C2 but also with any other culture. I consider it extremely important to stress that IC should not simply be perceived as ‘bicultural’.

Another important note to be mentioned is that nowadays (starting with Byram 1997) more and more authors use the term ‘intercultural communicative competence’ (ICC). The figure offered by Kramer (2001) helps to understand what ICC is (see Fig. 10 below).

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 10: The development of intercultural communicative competence* (Source Kramer 2001:47).

This figure illustrates that there is close interaction between linguistic competence, intercultural competence, intercultural communicative competence and intercultural communicative practice, and it also helps to understand the hierarchy between competencies. In intercultural communicative competence ‘communicative’ is sometimes understood as ‘linguistic’, though ‘communicative’ has a much broader meaning.

It is curious that the most outstanding researchers in interculturalism, sometimes use
these two terms ‘intercultural competence’ and ‘intercultural communicative competence’ as synonyms. For example, Byram in 2003 uses the same words for description of ICC (see Byram 2003:62) as he used earlier for IC (see the list of savoirs, Byram 2000).

1.2.3. Defining intercultural speaker

If one has intercultural communicative competence that does not only mean to communicate linguistically better, but to better understand the world. An interculturally competent person, according to Risager (2000), is “one who is capable of living as a world citizen in this multicultural, globalised world!” (2000:14).

In the process of FL learning the aim should not be to become a native speaker of that language, but to become what Byram and others (Byram, Gribkova & Starkey 2002:5) call an intercultural speaker or mediator, i.e. a person who is “able to engage with complexity and multiple identities and to avoid the stereotyping which accompanies perceiving someone through a single identity” (Byram et al. 2002:5). According to Byram, to become an intercultural speaker one should be intercultural in attitude, i.e. should always learn and always be willing to do that (Bandura 2003). In turn, to Kramsch (1993:257), to become an intercultural speaker one has to “find” ‘a third place’, i.e. to create a special personal linguistic and cultural identity. From this ‘third place’, one can better understand both the other’s culture and one’s own culture, and also can evaluate the interaction between the two cultures from the outsider’s position.

Alred, Byram and Fleming (2003:3-4) insist on making differences between having ‘intercultural experience’ (i.e. which “is simply a statement of fact, of an encounter between particular groups”) and ‘being intercultural’ (i.e. which “implies a more qualitative judgment about the nature of such an encounter”). They claim:

Experience of otherness in a range of ways creates a potential for questioning the taken-for-granted in one’s own self and environment. Being intercultural is, however, more than this. It is the capacity to reflect on the relationships among groups and the experience of those relationships. It is both the awareness of the experiencing otherness and the ability to analyse the experience and act upon the insights into self and other which the analysis brings. Experience alone is therefore not enough. (Alred et al. 2003:4, my emphasis)

Alred and others (2003:4) also stress that it is not the same to be intercultural and to be international, or ‘a constant traveller’.

Byram next to ‘intercultural speaker’ uses the term ‘intercultural mediator’ (Byram 2003). If the first term emphasises a linguistic element, the second one stresses the function of mediating. According to Byram (2003:61), an ‘intercultural mediator’ should be sensitive to the language varieties and cultural differences inside his own society. “[B]eing intercultural” – in his view– “is an activity” (Byram 2003:61, square brackets added by me).
In 2004 Sercu, referring to Chen & Starosta (1996) and Kealey & Ruben (1983), attempts to give the description of an effective interculturalist. She uses as a starting point four dimensions of IC, viz. knowledge, skills, attitudes and traits:

*Affectionately speaking*, the effective interculturalist is said to have a positive self-concept, to be open-minded, non-judgmental and relaxed in social interaction. *Cognitively speaking*, the effective interculturalist possesses cultural self-awareness and cultural awareness, which help to reduce the ambiguity and uncertainty that are inherent in intercultural interaction. *Behaviourally speaking*, the effective interculturalist possesses good message skills, technical skill, the skill of appropriate self-disclosure and interaction management, behavioural flexibility, as well as social skills, in both the verbal and non-verbal domains. The *personality traits* that are conducive to intercultural competence are: empathy, respect, interest in cultures, flexibility, tolerance, open-mindedness, initiative, sociability and positive self-image (Sercu 2004:76 referring to Kealey & Ruben 1983).

This description may serve as a guide in the work on developing one’s intercultural (communicative) competence.

### 1.2.4. The process of intercultural learning

Usually, the means of intercultural communication is a foreign language, at least for one participant, but very often for both. For example, in 80% of the cases when the English language is used for communication, both sides are non-native speakers (Beneke 1991). There was a similar situation in the Soviet Union when the Russian language was used as ‘lingua franca’ (and it has not changed a lot since then). In the light of this, it seems extremely important to develop the intercultural competence of FL learners. And, fortunately, there is a growing understanding of this nowadays.

Intercultural learning never starts ‘from zero’, because LLs ‘bring’ with them pre-established concepts of C2 (see Byram, Zarate & Neuner 1997). It is not easy to widen one’s horizons, especially, in the case of adult FL learners. For this, learners IC should be developed, which includes such intercultural skills and ‘know-how’ as:

- The ability to bring the culture of origin and the foreign culture into relation with each other;
- Cultural sensitivity and the ability to identify and use a variety of strategies for contact with those from other cultures;
- The capacity to fulfill the role of cultural intermediary between one’s own culture and the foreign culture and to deal effectively with intercultural misunderstanding and conflict situations;
- The ability to overcome stereotyped relationships. (CEF 2001:104-105)

In intercultural learning, people become aware of their cultural orientation through confrontation with a different standard. As a consequence, people become aware of their own cultural orientation and also widen the range of their behaviour norms in order to fit both cultures. However, the wider range is normally accompanied by higher insecurity (see Demorgon & Molz 1996). And, this, in its turn, explains the stressfulness and discomfort that may arise in the process of IL. Here I would like to note, that in the case of adult LLs, the
feeling of insecurity is characteristic for the whole process of FL learning.

Undoubtedly, the easiest way to gain intercultural experiences and to enlarge one's own 'range' is through non-formal communication. But this research focuses on the formal process of developing IC, i.e. in the FL classroom. FL learning does not lead automatically to raising students' intercultural awareness (according to Byram, it is "total fallacy" to believe so). What is the way then? Three of the known models of culture learning / intercultural learning will be discussed below: (1) a conceptual model of culture learning; (2) the developmental model of intercultural sensitivity; and (3) the model of raising intercultural awareness. Each of the models has its "allies" among modern interculturalists.

The first model – *A conceptual model of culture learning* (Fig. 9.1 in Paige et al. 2003:178) – differs from the earlier ones as it views culture as something dynamic. The authors of this model (Paige, Jorstad, Siaya, Klein & Colby 2003:176) emphasise the need of a shift from "culture-specific to culture-general", from "cultural stereotypes to cultural generalizations", and from "culture as distinct from language to culture as integral to language". Culture learning is described as the process which includes (Paige et al. 2003:177 referring to Paige & Stringer 1997):

- learning about the self as a cultural being,
- learning about culture and its impact on human communication, behaviour, and identity,
- culture-general learning, i.e. learning about universal, cross-cultural phenomena such as cultural adjustment,
- culture-specific learning, i.e. learning about a particular culture, including its language, and,
- learning how to learn, i.e. becoming an effective language and culture learner.

As it can be observed, this process does not exclude *culture-specific learning*: learning of C2 represents part of it. However, *culture-general learning* occupies the first place in each of the three components (namely, 'knowledge', 'behaviour', 'attitudes', for reference see Fig. 9.1 in Paige et al. 2003:178). According to the authors of the model (Paige et al. 2003:179), their idea of distinguishing between the cognitive, behavioural, and affective aspects of culture learning originates from the work of outstanding interculturalists (for detailed reference see Damen 1987) and psychologists, especially Bloom (1964).

Unfortunately, the last item of this model – 'learning how to learn', – which in my opinion is essential, is usually ignored in FLT practice. Teachers should not forget that LLs will not be able learn culture effectively if they do not possess the necessary strategies, such as problem-solving, learning management, reflective observation, experimentation and others (for more about *experiential learning* see Kolb & Fry 1975; Kolb 1984; Kolb & Kolb 2001).

This model was acknowledged by numerous scholars (e.g. Seelye 1981, 1994; Butjies
& Byram 1991; Byram & Morgan 1994). For my research, the conceptual model represents interest because (1) it makes the above-mentioned distinction between three aspects of culture learning (cognitive, behavioural, and affective); (2) it stresses the need of a shift from culture-specific to culture-general; and also because (3) it includes such item as ‘learning to learn’.

Another model to be discussed here is the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) offered by Bennett (see Bennett 1986, 1993, 1998). Through description of people’s reaction to cultural differences this model shows how one’s IC grows. Benett (1993) distinguishes six ‘stages’ classifying them into two groups (see fig. in Bennett 1993:29):

- **ethnocentric**, i.e. “the worldview of one’s culture is central to all reality” (Bennett 1993:30)
  - denial
  - defense
  - minimization
- **ethnorelativity**, i.e. “cultures can only be understood relative to one another and that particular behavior can only be understood within a cultural context” (Bennett 1993:46)
  - acceptance
  - adaptation
  - integration

Going through these stages one’s state changes from ‘isolation’ from other cultures to ‘integration’ into them. However, according to Bennett (1993), this process is not always ‘smooth’, it may regress.

DMIS suggests that the process of intercultural learning is to some extent predictable, which makes this model widely used for the design of courses that deal with developing intercultural sensitivity.

The importance of Bennett’s model in my research is (1) that it claims for the ethnorelativity; (2) that it suggests that the goal of IL is to reach the stage of integration when differences between C1 and C2 are viewed as normal; and (3) that it claims that the development of IC to some extent is predictable. The acknowledgement of these assumptions makes intercultural learning planning easier.

The third model to be mentioned is the so-called Intercultural Awareness Raising (IAR) approach offered by Hall & Toll (1999). It is probably less known than the two previously discussed models.

Hall and Toll (1999) studied the possible ways of preparing students to reside abroad, or exactly how students can gain intercultural awareness. According to IAR approach, the techniques to develop IC can be presented in four steps (Hall & Toll 1999: from web):
• introduction of examples of potentially problematic interactions;
• familiarisation with specific pragmatic issues;
• analysis of these issues with the support of the learners’ L1, and
• analysis of similar phenomena occurring in the target language and culture.

This approach is important for my research because it can be used in the process of working with FL coursebooks: a FL teacher using coursebook material as a starting point may use the above-mentioned steps for follow-up activities.

Having overviewed the above models, I feel it important to follow this section with discussion of such an issue as culture shock, without which the description of IL would not be complete. Numerous features affect the process of language-and-culture learning, e.g.: self-esteem, tolerance of ambiguity, risk-taking, cooperation, competition, etc.; and, numerous FL classroom activities and tasks cause so-called performance anxiety (especially, in adult language learners). Usually, anxiety originates from a fear of a failure. Without habitual cultural symbols and signs people get culture shock (Bennett 1998, Hidasi 2004). Culture shock may involve such symptoms as panic, anger, emotional regression, sadness, self-pity, indecision, alienation, and even physical illness (for reference see Adler 1975).

Very often, even academically recognised authors (e.g. Pedersen 1995) erroneously claim that the term of culture shock was first introduced by Kalvero Oberg in 1960. Actually, as Oberg (1954) refers, the term was already in use much earlier in DuBois (1951). Oberg (1954) started using this term with regard to all people who come into contact with a new culture while travelling abroad. In Oberg’s (1954) understanding culture shock is „the anxiety that results from losing all our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse” (1954, from web). Although, some changes can be noted nowadays in understanding the phenomenon of culture shock (for instance, that culture shock applies to any new situation, job or relationship, and not only to people who travel abroad), still the two models are the most cited: (1) Oberg’s (1960) model of „honeymoon-crisis-recovery-adjustment”, and (2) Adler’s (1975) model of „contact-disintegration-reintegration-autonomy-independence”. To cope with culture shock one can be advised the following:

• Gather information: the more one knows about a place or its people, the less foreign or threatening they seem.

• Avoid criticizing the host culture: one should resist the temptation of judging negatively the host people and their way of life;

• Find a friend: it is very helpful if one finds a person who can serve as a „cultural informant” to introduce parts of local life that are normally not accessible to foreigners;
Create a „big picture“: to find interrelations that explain what is going on so that it no longer seems confusing.

No doubt, “meeting” a new culture is a disturbing and often shocking experience; it usually makes people re-evaluate their native culture. This may either promote the development of IC or impede it. Therefore, in the process of intercultural learning special attention should be paid to culture shock.

Other phenomena to be discussed in this section are stereotypes and their role in the process of learning culture. In 2001 CEF outlined as one of the most important goals for FLT to combat intolerance and xenophobia by improving communication and mutual understanding between individuals. The first step to it is mastering of stereotypes. In practice, it is more difficult than it seems to be at first sight: remember Barnouw’s (1979) definition of culture quoted in section 1.1.1 (see p.16):

[...] a culture is a way of life of a group of people, the configuration of all of the more or less stereotyped patterns of learned behaviour, which are handed down from one generation to the next through the means of language and imitation. (Barnouw 1979:4, my emphasis).

From, this definition it follows that stereotypes are “inherited” together with culture itself.

Countries all over the world are not monocultural any more. Each country is less or more multicultural. It brings difficulties and conflicts in everyday life. It can be explained in the following way: while monocultural communication is based on similarities, intercultural communication is based on differences. In the case of intercultural communication, people lose the stable base of common language, culture, values and behaviour rules. To cope with novelty people start creating stereotypes. It is important to mention that not only negative stereotypes, but positive as well, are obstacles to successful intercultural communication. As the following figure illustrates (Fig. 11), the roots of such stereotyping lie in ethnocentrism (when a group of people overestimate themselves and underestimate the others).

![Figure 11: Obstacles to intercultural communication. (Based on Lustig & Koester 2003)](image-url)
When someone pre-judges a particular group or individual based on his/her own stereotypical assumptions or ignorance the prejudice occurs. Both stereotypes and prejudices are based on feelings rather than reason. If these feelings find their reflection in the practice of treating one person or a group of people less fairly than other people it is already discrimination. Sometimes discrimination can lead even to the manifestations of racism.

Stereotypes represent a problem in the process of FLT, and can be very often found in FL materials. There are different views of what stereotypes are. They have been the object of analysis in several disciplines: anthropology, sociology, cognitive psychology, cultural studies, literature, linguistics (sociolinguistics, semantics, critical discourse analysis, text pragmatics), and now language pedagogy (e.g.: Holló & Lázár 2000a). According to Pickering (2001), stereotypes have dual nature, i.e (1) they are misinformed pictures quite differing from reality; (2) they help to classify big amounts of incoming information. Fowler (1991:17) defines them as socially constructed mental categories for sorting events and individuals, categories that we project on to the world to make sense of it. But there are those who argue that “a stereotype is not identical with a category; it is rather a fixed idea that accompanies the category” (Allport 1954/1979:191). Berting and Villain-Gandossi (1994) define stereotype as a “judgement – negative or positive – that is connected with a conviction. Its genesis is social; it is transmitted to the individual as an expression of the public opinion” (1994:11). They occur when traits of individual members of the group (be that negative or positive) are exaggerated, over-generalised, and then applied to each member of that group. As a rule, stereotypes are quite pertinent. In spite of having various views on stereotypes, everybody agrees on one thing, viz. that stereotypes should not be underestimated, especially not in FLT (Holló & Lázár 2000a).

From the point of view of FLT, the difference between „first-hand“ and „second-hand“ stereotypes should be made. The first result directly from personal experience, acquired due to geographic proximity, cultural influence, trade, political alliances and hostilities, etc. The second result indirectly through getting information from textbooks, literature, FL teachers, or imported from other cultures. We can hear them regularly in everyday life: ‘the English are reserved’, ‘Spanish are machos’, ‘Italians are loud’, ‘Germans are punctual’, etc. Different categories are used for labelling people: by regions of the world (e.g. Arabs), by race (e.g. Africans), by country (e.g. Chinese), by culture (e.g. Latino), by religion (e.g. Muslim, Jewish), by profession (e.g. doctors, teachers), etc. These are only some of the categories that are used to form stereotypes about groups of people, and they are often manipulated. Imagine that one’s mother is African, and father Asian. In the case that he works well, then people will think: „He’s smart, because he’s Asian”. In the case
where he works badly, people will have another stereotype: „He’s lazy because he’s African”. Often stereotypes are cross-cultural, different nations have the same stereotypes about certain nations: the English and the Spanish reproach the French for leaving without saying good-bye, („to take a French leave” in English; “despedirse/ marcharse/ irse a la francesa” in Spanish), but in other countries the English are reproached for the same (in France: „filer a l’anglaise”); in Italy: „andarsene all’inglese”; in Hungary: „angolosan távozn” and in Russia: «ходить по-английски»). The EU-countries for now share common stereotypes. In almost every souvenir shop you can buy a funny plate with caricatures and ironical remarks about all EU-members under the title „The perfect European should be...”: „sober as the Irish”, „cooking as a Brit”, „humble as a Spaniard”, „available as a Belgian”, „generous as a Dutchman”, „humorous as a German”, „flexible as a Swede”, „talkative as a Finn”, „famous as a Luxembourger”, „controlled as an Italian”, „patient as an Austrian”, „organised as a Greek”, „driving like French”, „technical as a Portuguese”, „discrete as a Dane”. How much time will it take to create stereotypes about Hungarians and other new members of EU? Or do they already exist? Often, people fall into several categories of stereotypes (see fig. in Sysoyev 2001a:37); and at the same time are “labelled” as e.g.: “Russian woman”, “blond”, “teacher”, etc.

To gain intercultural competence one has to combat stereotypes, to break them down and go beyond them. Above the process of intercultural learning and gaining of intercultural competence has been already discussed. Now, in Fig. 12 this process is illustrated through working with stereotypes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Lack of cultural knowledge and skills → forming stereotypes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Facts, personal experiences → breaking down the stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In-depth comprehension of other cultures → acceptance of otherness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decreasing cultural distance → empathy towards other cultures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: The process of developing of intercultural competence (Based on Hanvey 1976, 1987; Oxford & Scarcella 1992).

There should not be fear of stereotypes. Creating them is a natural process, but they should be properly treated in the process of FLT. In case we develop the flexibility of thinking, we will
always be open to change our mind and overcome stereotypes. Certainly, to promote the
development of such flexibility, changes should be brought into the designing of FL
coursebooks. To Alptekin (1996), "the generally stereotypical representation of the target
culture in much instructional material" is "what further exacerbates the problem of
presentation of the target language in relation to its own culture" (Alptekin 1996:59). To
illustrate, Alptekin (1996:59) makes reference to an overview of gender stereotypes in
American EFL books (Hartman & Judd 1978). The situation has changed only slightly since
then; to Sunderland (1996), the stereotypes in gender are still typical for FL coursebooks:

Females tend to be relatively rare, of lower-status occupations, younger, more often defined in
relationship to the opposite sex, and relatively inactive, and quieter, speaking proportionately less, and
being responders in rather than initiators of conversation. (Sunderland 1996:93 referring to ETHEL

According to Sunderland’s (1996) report, for example, one of the most criticized EFL books
was Streamline English (Hartley & Viney 1978).

In general, the following explanation can be given to the lack of balance in
representation of genders: (a) the concept of ‘male as norm’ in conjunction with the fact that
most textbook writers are male; (b) (an expectation that) male students are unwilling to read
about female characters, whereas the reverse is not true; (c) male textbook writers are
unaware of the phenomenon and are simply accepting a ‘genre norm’ (Gupta & Yin
1990:41).

Similar problems emerge when examining the representation of such areas as race,
nationality, class, religion, etc. (e.g. see Clarke & Clarke 1990). Therefore, it seems more
useful if FL coursebook authors instead of giving simplistic insight into a target-language
culture follow the advice of Alptekin (1996) and try to help LLs to discover and interpret the
culturally familiar and the unfamiliar elements in a given target culture by using
“comparisons as techniques of cross-cultural comprehension or the exploitation of universal
concepts of human experience as reference points for the interpretation of unfamiliar data”
(Alptekin 1996:60).

Summarising, the following conclusions can be made:

1. Despite the obvious inaccuracy in use of terms, differences in IC definitions and models
of its development, apparently there is agreement regarding the goals of intercultural
learning and its importance in FL education.

2. Intercultural learning is an enriching process; it is aimed at developing one’s IC, and
helping language learners to overcome stereotypes and to cope with culture shock.
3. At the same time, IL is undoubtedly a challenging process. It requires empathy and knowledge of oneself. Also, it challenges one’s identity: LLs have to rethink their cultural values, etc. (what seems particular in adult age, see section 1.2.5.1.2).

1.2.5. Challenges of Intercultural Language Learning

In ILL culture, language and learning are fundamentally interrelated concepts. ILL is a ‘dialogic’ process which aims to develop reflective understanding of one’s own and other cultures and languages. Liddicoat, Scarino, Papademetre & Kohler (2003:46) define the following goals of ILL:

- understanding and valuing all languages and cultures;
- understanding and valuing one’s own language(s) and culture(s);
- understanding and valuing one’s target language(s) and culture(s);
- understanding and valuing how to mediate among languages and cultures;
- developing intercultural sensitivity as an ongoing goal. (Liddicoat et al. 2003:46)

I would place the “understanding and valuing one’s own language(s) and culture(s)” in the first place, because I consider it crucial for one to become an intercultural person (without it, it is impossible to understand and value other cultures!). In addition, goals should be mentioned such as:

- developing the ability to communicate in two or more languages, when communicative needs and resources differ from those of a native speaker of those languages;
- developing the capability for reflecting on one’s own successes, failures, and uncertainties in intercultural communication;
- developing the responsibility for oneself as a participant in intercultural interaction.

Probably the most important thing about ILL is that it develops in learners the procedural knowledge for recognising, valuing, and responding to linguistic and cultural variability through processes of inferring, comparing, interpreting, discussing and negotiating meaning in a non-judgmental manner. (Liddicoat et al. 2003:46, my emphasis)

That is the main difference and advantage of ILL in contrast with the simple integration of cultural facts in FLT.

Despite all the advantages ILL hold, it is a utopia to assume that the process of intercultural language learning flows smoothly. The challenges and the variables of the process of ILL will be discussed in the sections below.
1.2.5.1. Human variables in the process of Intercultural Language Learning

1.2.5.1.1. Teacher’s variable

Foreign language teachers are, for obvious reasons, among the most internationally-minded people.

International-mindedness, according to Medgyes (1996:31), “entails the rejection of any kind of discrimination, whether on grounds of race, sex, religion, education, intelligence, or mother tongue”. In other words, international-mindedness implies intercultural competence. Then, the question emerges, why for foreign language teachers, who are told to be “the most internationally-minded people” (Trim 1978:4), the (inter)cultural component is the last one to be included in the everyday practice of language classrooms (if not completely omitted).

As one of the reasons, teachers themselves name the lack of time. In Hungary teachers are usually under pressure of developing exclusively those skills that are tested in the language exam. And, since the testing of ICC is not included in any of the language exams, it is neglected in the FL classroom as well. Teachers focus on teaching grammar, vocabulary and the four skills, and claim they have no time to deal with (inter)cultural issues in the language classroom. It shows that teachers are not only unaware that activities dealing with grammar, vocabulary and the four skills, can easily be culture-related at the same time (see Aleksandrowicz-Pędich & Lázár 2002), but they also ignore that National Core Curriculum (Nemzeti alaptanterv 1995) as well as the CEF (2001) require that LLs develop their cultural awareness and ICC.

The majority of FL teachers do not have special preparation. Still in many pre-service teacher-training courses (at both – college and university – levels) Intercultural Studies (or Communication) are not included. Of course, there are exceptions: e.g. in Eötvös Lorand University (Budapest) Lázár has been teaching the course on English as a Foreign Language for Intercultural Competence since 1999. Due to the lack of such preparation many FL teachers very often instead of incorporating an intercultural component into FLT, simply teach “Civilisation” (capital “C” culture), which is also important but not sufficient.

Moreover, providing LLs with solely declarative knowledge also has its limitations “[s]ince the list of significant elements of culture is limitless”, and therefore “it is impossible to equip language learners with everything they might need” (Holló & Lázár 2000a:8). As solution, Holló and Lázár (2000a, 2000b) suggest supplementing “the teaching of facts with the conscious development of the skills that help improve the learner’s ability to understand and adapt to new situations” (Holló & Lázár 2000a:8). They say:
This ability is usually referred to as cultural awareness – a concept that is inseparable from teaching and learning culture and that can be enhanced by developing learners’ skills of observation, interpretation, empathy, acceptance, tolerance, adaptability and comparison. These skills not only contribute to personal growth, but are easy to connect to language learning activities. (Holló & Lázár 2000a:8)

Another problem is that the majority of teachers believe that culture learning should be introduced at intermediate or higher levels. I must disagree. In my opinion, the development of ICC is extremely important starting from the beginning of the FL learning process. We should not forget the motivating role of culture learning. This “short-sightedness” of some teachers again may result from a lack of teachers’ training in the field of developing ICC. And, probably, the last major problem is that due to already mentioned lack of time and special preparation, and due to focus on language exams, teachers heavily rely on coursebooks, many of which offer the limited representation of foreign culture through ‘Red Square’, ‘Tower Bridge’ or ‘paella’. These are the main reasons — in my view — why teachers are not dealing with the intercultural component in FLT in their everyday practice.

All the above-mentioned can be supported by findings of a research project carried out under the auspices of the European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe in Graz (ECML) (see Aleksandrowicz-Pędich & Lázár 2002). One of the purposes of the research project was to learn about the EFL teachers’ attitudes towards the issues of culture and ICC. They found answers to many questions, for example:

1. How often do teachers of English do activities related to the civilization of the target cultures in their EFL classes?

2. How often do teachers of English do lower-case “c” culture-related activities in their EFL classes?

3. Does the frequency of culture-related activities depend on how much time the teacher has spent abroad?

4. Does the frequency of culture-related activities depend on the teacher’s formal cultural awareness or intercultural communication training? (Aleksandrowicz-Pędich & Lázár 2002:140)

It was interesting to know that for inducing in teachers the willingness to incorporate the (inter)cultural component in their teaching, staying abroad (even for a longer time) has less influence than providing teachers with special training and educating them in the importance of the intercultural component in FLT (cf. Golubeva 2002). The questionnaire study (Aleksandrowicz-Pędich & Lázár 2002) showed that those respondents who had received some form of (inter)cultural training do nearly all of the culture-related activities significantly more often:

The percentage of teachers who often discuss cultural differences and current events, use photos and videos, and always make sure to talk about appropriate discussion topics, proximity and the dangers of negative stereotyping, nearly doubled among the teachers who had some previous training in this field. [...] [T]he ratio of teachers who always discuss culture shock with their students tripled among the respondents with some intercultural communication training. (Aleksandrowicz-Pędich & Lázár 2002:144, my emphasis)
The study proved the usefulness of even very short trainings and workshops in raising teachers’ awareness, but – according to the same group of researchers – “a workshop or a short training course may not give enough assistance for teachers in learning how, why and when to incorporate culture-related activities in their syllabus” (Aleksandrowicz-Pędich & Lázár 2002:145). For this, teachers have to become ‘reflective practitioners’ (Aleksandrowicz-Pędich & Lázár 2002).

The introduction of intercultural learning in FL classrooms implies a redefinition of the teacher’s role. Until recently, FL teachers have been expected to perform two main roles (Tudor 1996): (1) the role of knower; and (2) the role of activity organiser. Performing his first role, “the teacher is a source of knowledge in terms of both the target language and the choice of methodology”; he “is a figure of authority who decides on what should be learnt and how this should be learnt” (1996:273). Filling his second role, “the teacher sets up and steers learning activities in the right direction, motivates and encourages students, and provides authoritative feedback on students’ performance” (1996:274). In case the teacher wants to follow the intercultural approach, he – in addition to the above-mentioned roles – should undertake one more function: the one of intercultural counsellor, or mediator.

1.2.5.1.2. Learner’s variable

Very often LLs are convinced that to reach the excellence they have to assimilate into target language culture. But, even in the case of widely used and learnt English language, in more than three quarters of cases none of the interlocutors taking part in communication is native. Of course, in case both/all of them were perfectly assimilated into the target culture, it would simplify the mutual understanding. But, in case they are not, the interference of their own cultures can easily make the understanding more difficult. So, the ideal language learner should aim the acquisition of ICC rather than the assimilation into target culture. Otherwise, s/he will experience many frustrating situations in communicating in a foreign language. To help language learners, Intercultural Language Learning should be promoted in a FLT classroom, although it can be quite challenging.

Language learners (especially adults) should be involved in the process of introduction of intercultural approach into FLT. Potentially, they can become involved in most levels of decision-making, but of course, only to a certain extent:

- Planning course structure (e.g. self-access, components for independent study, etc.);
- Goal-setting;
- Activity selection and organisation;
- Both, linguistic and intercultural, syllabus building (e.g. learners may report what causes
the main problem for them, on which material the stress should be made);

- Choice of materials (especially, in the case of choosing additional materials. For example, in the case of learning a foreign language for specific purposes (LSP), adult language learners, often being professionally more competent than their teachers, can provide materials directly relevant to their learning goals);

- Topic selection;

- Evaluation;

- Independent study. (Adapted from Tudor 1996:279)

It is important to mention that students’ involvement is not always efficient. For this, LLs have to be mature enough; and the teacher has to be open, co-operative and well-prepared. The traditional mode of teaching is easier and for many teachers more comfortable. And it is more comfortable for those LLs who are not mature enough to make decisions and prefer a classic “teacher-knows-best-so-do-as-you’re-told” type of lesson.

For effective FL learning in general, and acquisition of ICC in particular, LLs should become autonomous learners. ‘Autonomous learner’ is quite a complex concept. One can be considered ‘autonomous learner’ in case s/he is able to choose independently the most beneficial method. Holec (1981) defines learner autonomy as „the ability to take charge of one’s own learning”, i.e. „to have, and to hold, the responsibility for all the decisions concerning all aspects of this learning” (1981:3).

I do agree with Fenner (2000) who believes “that certain aspects of learner autonomy can be promoted with the textbook as a useful tool”, but it is only possible if certain principles of autonomous learning are adhered to in the texts and tasks provided (2000:78). According to Fenner, “[v]arious approaches towards learner autonomy in the textbook can initiate a necessary change of focus in the classroom from teaching to learning and from teacher to learner” (Fenner 2000:78). She advises authors to provide LLs with the following options (Fenner 2000:80-81):

- choice of subject-matter,
- choice of different types of texts,
- choice of different levels,
- choice of varying amount (of texts and tasks),
- choice of approach to a text,
- choice of tasks,
- choice of approach to tasks,
- choice of progression.

But, of course, coursebooks can provide only a very limited number of options. Fenner (2000) claims that when LL “reaches a certain level of awareness of his own learning, he will
realise that he needs or wants to go beyond the textbook to search for more material" (2000:81). Thus autonomous learning goes beyond a classroom context.

For adult LLs, the autonomous approach is important because it promotes life-long learning. Autonomous LLs are able to identify which learning strategies and methods are effective for them. Unfortunately, even among adult LLs, many are acquainted with quite poor 'repertoire' of methods and FL learning strategies. In this, the coursebook can serve as an aid with the help of which LLs get acquainted with new approaches to FL learning. Fenner (2000) states,

If the textbook contains a rich variety of methods in the form of suggestions and options, all the time leaving it up to the learner to choose and add his own suggestions, the learner's experience will increase and the scope within which his choices are made will widen. In this way he will be able to discover his own learning styles and find strategies which will suit his personal learning process. (2000:83)

In the light of this, the role of the coursebook then is to “illustrate a variety of suggestions for tasks that will provide the learner with examples on which he can model his own personal approaches” (Fenner 2000:83). Furthermore, coursebooks can encourage reflection on ILL itself through questions and tasks. The following issues may be included in “metacommunication” about ILL:

- what the learner already knows about culture and intercultural issues,
- what the learner wants to/needs to learn about culture and intercultural issues,
- reflection on choices made,
- reflection on outcome,
- what has been learnt. (Adapted from Fenner 2000:83)

The purpose of the development of the FL coursebooks in such a direction is not to minimize the role of the teacher, but to help LLs to become more independent and more autonomous. For the same purpose, more attention should be paid to self-evaluation, which is an essential for learner autonomy, especially in the case of ILL. The right evaluation of what is already known helps to determine further learning. If in the traditional classroom it is the teacher who does this, in an autonomous approach the learner him-/herself is seen to be the only person who can evaluate in its depth his/her own knowledge and how s/he learns. Evaluation completed by the teacher is considered to be not sufficient. The coursebook may provide tasks to incite the learner to evaluate his/her achievements through, for example, self-assessment checklists, open-ended questions or portfolio (e.g. see INCA manuals).

Another important issue to be mentioned here is learner’s identity. One of the key questions of intercultural communication is whether a language learner identifies him-/herself
with one of the cultures or creates a new identity.

In broad meaning, under “identity” the awareness of a person of belonging to a particular group is understood. One’s identity helps him/her to orient in the surrounding world. It is necessary to organise one’s life in society, it helps to accept the rules, norms, values, beliefs, tastes, etc. of given society. It makes one’s life more predictable and gives a good feeling of sharing with other members of the same group (e.g. culture, nation, etc.).

The essential role of cultural identity is the conscious acceptance of certain cultural norms, values, beliefs, behavioural frames, and understanding of “ego” from the position of the above-mentioned cultural characteristics. It plays a determining role in the process of intercultural communication where, on the one hand, it makes the process of communication more predictable, and therefore easier; on the other hand, restricts it in order to avoid conflicting situations.

In the global world the increase of contacts between different cultures leads to a slow decrease in differences between them. Especially, it can be noticed in youth culture: they follow the same clothing and music fashion, idolise the same “stars”, have the same ideals concerning appearance, career, life-style, etc. The older generations – as the results of a survey of the European Commission (How Europeans see themselves 2001) prove it – in contrary, try to preserve their cultural identity. According to this survey, a truly European identity still does not exist. For the majority of EU citizens, national identity remains quite strong see Graph 6, How Europeans see themselves 2001). Only few (ranging from 1% to 6% depending on country, except for Luxembourg with 20%) feel “European only”. 38% of EU citizens agree that there is a shared European cultural identity and 49% disagree (see Graph 7, How Europeans see themselves 2001). It is to note that feeling European and believing in the existence of a shared European cultural identity do not go hand in hand. Even more interesting are the results of the survey of fears among EU citizens (see Graph 20, How Europeans see themselves 2001): almost half of the public (46%) is afraid that they will lose their national identity and culture. But, among young people very few feel that the EU represents negative elements like the loss of Europe’s cultural diversity (see Graph 46, How Europeans see themselves 2001).

Since this survey was done before the enlargement of 2004, it is also important to mention what attitudes the citizens of the fifteen EU-countries had about it. Although the results indicated that the public was quite hesitant about new countries joining the EU, general attitudes about enlargement were quite positive (see Graph 30, How Europeans see themselves 2001). For example, 64% agreed that “with more member countries, Europe will be culturally richer” (How Europeans see themselves 2001:39).

In this survey two types of identity were mentioned: “cultural” and “national”.
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Although there are other types of identity (ethnic, racial, etc., see more about different types of identity in Strauss 1959; Tajfel 1982; Kramsch 2000; Phinney 2000, 2003), in this section only these two plus "personal identity" will be discussed.

Traditionally, cultural identity meant not only belonging to a certain cultural group but national as well. Nations were always considered as the most stable kind of groups. With the growing number of intercultural contacts, when the world becomes harder to be understood, people start looking for stability. In this situation the national identity becomes more important (even for younger generations). It gives the feeling of protection, leads to growing in-group solidarity, and sometimes, to discrimination of the excluded. People start dividing nations on "similar to" or "different from" their own. As a base for comparison of different cultures and nations the sum of values, beliefs, ideas, opinions, attitudes and behavioural frames serves. These values, beliefs etc. form in the process of intracultural socialisation, but find reflection in intercultural communication.

National identity, together with the cultural one, plays a very important role in intercultural communication. But, since intercultural communication is happening mainly on an interpersonal level, it is probably the third type of identity – the personal one – that plays the crucial/vital role. Interpersonal communication is mostly determined by the self-image of people taking part in it. To a certain extent every person is a 'product' of his/her culture, even if in everyday life he himself/she herself does not notice it (is not aware of it). The specific particularities are seen as something given, but in intercultural encounters they become obvious and visible; and people become aware of existing differences between cultures. These impressions in individual's conscience transform into ideas, beliefs, values, stereotypes and expectations, which start to regulate his/her communicative behaviour. In this process the individual's personal identity forms. The personal identity is what makes us so different from each other, even if we have the same cultural and/or national background.

The importance of study of the issue of identity in FL learning has been widely recognised in applied linguistics (see e.g. Pierce 1995; Byram 1998; Byram, Zarate & Neuner 1997; Byram & Risager 1999; Norton (formerly Pierce) 2000; Byram, Nichols & Stevens 2001; Sysoyev 2001a, 2001b, 2002). According to Sysoyev (2001a), one's identity has various facets (see fig. in Sysoyev 2001a:37), which become "visible" only in particular situations. The number of the facets is infinite; and each of them (racial, ethnic, geopolitical, territorial, religious, gender, language, social, economic, etc.) covers a specific membership of a person. These "collective identities", how Kramsch calls them, "are likely not only to change over time in dialogue with others, but are liable to be in conflict with one another" (Kramsch 2000:67). It is always the specific context of a given communication situation that
‘ordains’ one of the facets.

Since language is considered to be the main tool of identity formation, FL education is a suitable context for developing one’s cultural identity.

As Byram (2003:62) stresses, there is a relationship between becoming intercultural and one’s identity. In the process of FL learning, language learners “undergo a further, tertiary, stage of socialisation” (Byram 2003:62 referring to Doyé 1992):

 [...] they are required to re-live some of the primary and secondary socialisation in a new way. For example, they have to re-learn how to count, or what the names of colours are, and this usually means a new way of linking language to reality because the names of colours and numbers do not have a one-to-one relationship with the approximate equivalent in their first language. At a more advanced stage, they learn that their concepts of ‘freedom’, ‘friendship’ or ‘homeland’ are not universal and are understood differently elsewhere (Wierzbicka 1997). (Byram 2003:62)

The most pursuing question is whether adult LLs “will [...] wish to take on this new identity” (Byram 2003:63, square brackets added by me). According to Alptekin (1996:57, square brackets added by me), “developing a new identity [...] is likely to cause a split between experience and thought which is conducive to serious socio-psychological problems”, such as anomie (Alptekin 1981), regression (Green 1977), schizophrenia (Clarke 1976, Meara 1977) and others. But, of course, not all exposure to other cultures leads to such serious problems and to ‘resistance’ to intercultural learning.

1.2.5.2. Assessing Intercultural (Communicative) Competence

DILEMMA:
What it is not tested is not taught.
OR
Not everything that counts can be counted, and not everything that can be counted, counts.

One of the reasons for not taking seriously the development of intercultural communicative competence in FLT is that its assessment is not developed yet. In Hungary, where FLs are mainly learnt for pragmatic purposes, especially in the case of adult LLs, this is even more important. Many LLs in Hungary learn FLs just to be able to pass the language exam. Therefore, they want to learn only what they need for passing this exam. In this situation, teachers are forced to train their students for a special type of exam not for teaching the language itself. LLs always want to know through completing tests how far or how close they are to the “desired aim”. Since assessing (C)C is not included in the language exam, intercultural learning does not seem to be important neither to teachers nor to learners. But, even in cases when the importance of acquiring ICC is recognised, and language is learnt not for passing the exam but for purposes of successful intercultural communication, both teachers and learners want to have feedback on whether the learners have benefitted or not.
from the intercultural teaching / learning.

Assessment of I(C)C is the least-developed dimension of intercultural language teaching. The first attempts to develop assessment approaches were limited to the assessment of cultural knowledge, which is not sufficient albeit understandable. Such tests focused mainly on factual material: history, arts, geography, etc. (see Hughes 1986, Valette 1986). Many key questions were left in abeyance, for example: (1) how to define culture knowledge; (2) what culture knowledge is necessary in intercultural communication; (3) how to take cultural diversity into consideration, (4) how to make culture tests objective, etc. According to some researchers (see Sercu 2004:78 referring to Atkinson 1999 and Sercu 2002), it is impossible to objectively assess I(C)C because culture is always interpreted in a subjective way. Albeit some interesting attempts have been made to develop the assessment of I(C)C (see Lessard-Clouston 1992, Seelye 1994, Byram 1997, INCA Project, Sercu 2004). Interestingly, “[m]any of assessment techniques proposed […] – cultural minidramas, critical incidents, culture assimilators, simulation games and documents originating from a foreign culture can be used” for both teaching and “assessment purposes” (Sercu 2004:74). There are attempts to combine self-assessment with teacher assessment. Then, in 2000, when ELP (European Language Portfolio) was not published yet, Byram was already proposing to use it as a basis for assessment of ICC (Byram 2000). He discussed the role of its three parts – the Passport, the Language Biography and the Dossier – in the self-assessment (for detailed discussion see Byram 2000). As a result, Byram proposed two versions of the format for such self-assessment (see Tab.3 & 4).

Table 3: Version N 1 of the format for self-assessment of intercultural communicative competence
(Source: Byram 2000, from web)

A record of my Intercultural Experience
- in language: (learner inserts language)
- place, period of time, age:
A. Feelings
• Ways in which my curiosity and interest were aroused: (examples from ordinary daily life, especially when they made me re-consider my own culture)
• Periods when I felt uncomfortable/homesick (what made me feel like this, with particular examples if possible)
• Periods when I felt at home and comfortable (what made me feel like this, with particular examples if possible)
B. Knowledge
• The most important things I learnt about family life and/or life at school
• The most important things I have learnt about the country, the nation, the state where I stayed - in the present and in its past
• What I have learnt about customs and conventions of talking with people (topics which interest them, topics to avoid, how to greet people and take leave from them)
C. Actions
• Incidents or problems which I resolved by explaining different cultures to people, helping them see the points of view of different cultures and how misunderstandings can happen.
• Examples of times when I have had to ask questions and work out my own answers (from 'asking the way' to understanding cultural customs and beliefs)
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The second version (see Tab.4) was proposed to be used "as well as" or "instead" of the above (see Tab.3).

**Table 4: Version N 2 of the format for self-assessment of intercultural communicative competence**
(Source: Byram 2000, from web)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A self-assessment of my Intercultural Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Interest in other people's way of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I am interested in other people's experience of daily life, particularly those things not usually presented to outsiders through the media. Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I am also interested in the daily experience of a variety of social groups within a society and not only the dominant culture. Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ability to change perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I have realised that I can understand other cultures by seeing things from a different point of view and by looking at my culture from their perspective. Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ability to cope with living in a different culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I am able to cope with a range of reactions I have to living in a different culture (euphoria, homesickness, physical and mental discomfort etc) Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Knowledge about another country and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I know some important facts about living in the other culture and about the country, state and peoples. Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I know how to engage in conversation with people of the other culture and maintain a conversation. Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Knowledge about intercultural communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I know how to resolve misunderstandings which arise from people's lack of awareness of the view point of another culture. Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I know how to discover new information and new aspects of the other culture for myself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When in the 1990s Byram and Zarate worked on the proposal for CEF (2001), the problem of assessment of IC was not solved. Since all other material for the CEF was ready, Byram and Zarate decided to ‘pause’ their attempts to define the competence levels and methods of its assessment; and so, the version written in 1994 (Byram & Zarate 1994) was included into the CEF. Later Byram (1997) continued his work on defining ICC levels to make ICC assessable. He re-thought what they had written together with Zarate (Byram & Zarate 1994). The most important element he added was the ‘critical cultural awareness’, or savoir s'engager. Thus, the educational aspect was introduced: “the model became not just a descriptive model of the competences of an intercultural speaker, but a prescriptive model of how an intercultural speaker ought to be ...” (Byram in Golubeva 2006:65, my emphasis). It gave a push to the further development of assessment of I(C)C.

The progress in developing assessment of I(C)C still seems to be very slow. There are many problems to be solved and questions to be answered. The main questions were mentioned by Sercu in her paper on Assessing intercultural competence... (Sercu 2004:77-78):

> Can intercultural competence be assessed holistically? (2004:77)

> Is it possible to design a test that investigates whether a person is or is not interculturally competent in the sense described above? (2004:77)
If this is not possible, can we then design tools and tasks that can assess competence in any of the different dimensions distinguished? (2004:77)

Then she follows raising questions regarding the assessment of learners’ cognitive and metacognitive strategies:

- Does the fact that a learner cannot make explicit what strategies s/he used also mean that s/he is not an able problem-solver or intercultural learner? (on base of Sercu 2004:78)

- If learners cannot solve a particular intercultural problem, is it because they are not skilful with respect to the savoir-apprendre or savoir-comprendre dimensions of intercultural competence, or are inadequate savoirs the reason for their failure to complete an assessment task adequately? (Sercu 2004:78)

With respect to the assessment of the affective dimension of intercultural competence, Sercu raises the following question:

- Is it desirable that learners be assessed with respect to particular attitudes or personality traits?

- Does education want to be prescriptive about the intercultural attitudes learners should develop?

- Can learners be punished for not having particular desired personality traits, such as 'interest in cultures' or 'positive self-image', which are traits which have been identified as characteristic of the effective intercultural person? (Sercu 2004:78)

During an interview with Byram (Golubeva 2006), to one of my questions the professor gave the answer that can be considered as the answer to the last three questions raised by Sercu. His answer was:

It is this moral dimension which creates the problem of assessment by assessors / teachers as opposed to self-assessment. I certainly think that everyone must ask themselves what their position is with respect to assessing a quality in a learner which has a moral dimension, particularly if the assessment is going to have a significant impact on the person's career and life. It seems that people in general education have more qualms about this than some people in industry. Of course it can be argued that it is better for someone who might be sent to work abroad to know that they are likely to find it difficult because they are not very 'tolerant of ambiguity' and that an honest evaluation should be made. I can see that this is perfectly valid in such circumstances, but it is a different matter simply to make such a judgement without a specific purpose as might happen in general education in schools. (Byram in Golubeva 2006:66-67)

Sercu (2004) warns assessors to take into account the “interdependence” of the dimensions of intercultural competence:

When designing tests for assessing savoir comprendre, for example, they should be aware of the role which savoirs, i.e. culture-specific and culture-general knowledge, play. When designing ways to assess the acquisition of cognitive or metacognitive strategies, they should reflect on the [...] culture-specific nature of particular task types, and on the particular attitudes which learners may bring to the assessment task. And of course, at all times, assessors must realize that differences in communicative competence in the foreign language may cause test-takers with the same level of intercultural competence to perform differently (Sercu 2004:78).

She (Sercu 2004:80) also presents a framework for the assessment of test quality, and discusses a number of criteria that affect the quality of tools for assessing intercultural competence (see Table in Sercu 2004: 80).
Paige and others (Paige et al. 2003:216-217) offer the following types of tests for assessing intercultural skills:

- *Attitudinal tests*, which aim at measuring people’s reactions to members of other cultures. Learners have to mark their answer on a scale showing to which extent they (dis)agree with an offered statement (e.g. see Cadd 1994, Seelye 1994). These tests are criticized for their simplistic approach and also for promoting the creation of cultural stereotypes.

- *Culture assimilator tests*, in which learners have to react to provided (in the form of critical incidents) contextual information (e.g. see Brislin, Cushner, Cherrie & Yong 1986). Usually, they have to select a statement as “the best explanation”, or to offer their own explanation. In these tests learners’ ability to interpret the critical incident from C2 perspective is measured. The deficiency of culture assimilator tests is that they cannot assess the ability of LLs’ to adjust their cultural behaviour.

- *Cultural awareness tests* (in Paige et al.: “culture awareness tests”), which are designed to assess cultural knowledge. They are based on the production of various types of text, including cultural minidramas (e.g. see Baugh 1994, Byram 1997, Byram & Morgan 1994, Liddicoat & Crozet 2001). These tests show how learners apply their cultural knowledge in intercultural situations.
  
  (Based on Paige et al. 2003:216-217)

As can be noticed, none of the tests discussed in Paige and others (2003) can determine the level of an individual’s ICC. In literature (Liddicoat et al. 2003:31-32), also the description of the following tasks applicable for assessing intercultural skills can been found:

- *Role-plays*, which can be used to assess pragmatic norms (Kasper & Dahl 1991; Hudson, Detmer & Brown 1992) and norms of interaction (Crozet 1998, Liddicoat & Crozet 2001);

- *Text construction tasks*, which can be used for assessing knowledge of texts genres (Liddicoat 2002a);

- *Reflective writing or speaking tasks*, which can be used to assess learners’ ability to interpret and mediate (Kordes 1991, Meyer 1991, Byram & Morgan 1994, Byram 1997);

- *Discourse completion tasks*, which can be used to assess pragmatic norms through asking learners to provide a response to a stimulus scenario (Kasper & Dahl 1991).
  
  (Based on Liddicoat et al. 2003: 31-32)
Byram mentions two new approaches of the assessment of IC (see Golubeva 2006). The first one was developed during a Leonardo project led from CILT (the National Centre for Languages) in London. Taking the CEF as a starting point, Byram together with Kühlmann and Müller-Jacquier created a model, which was focusing on the competences required for young engineers interacting with other engineers in or from other countries (Golubeva 2006:66). The following levels for self-assessment were defined (see Tab.5):

Table 5: Levels of intercultural competence for self-assessment (Source:
INCA – Intercultural Competence Assessment Project – Assessee Manual INCA 2004, 5-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Intercultural Competence (assessee version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1 – Basic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are already willing to interact successfully with people of other cultures. You tend to pick things up and learn from them as you go along, but you haven’t yet the experience to work out any system of dealing with intercultural situations in general. You respond to events, rather than planning for them. At this stage you are reasonably tolerant of other values, customs and practices although you may find them odd or surprising and approve or disapprove.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2 – Intermediate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of experience and/or training, you are beginning to view more coherently some of the aspects of intercultural encounters you used to deal with in a ‘one-off’ way. You have a mental ‘map’ or ‘checklists’ of the sort of situations you are likely to need to deal with and are developing your skills to cope with them. This means that you are more prepared for the need to respond and adapt to the demands of unfamiliar situations. You are quicker to see patterns in the various experiences you have and you are beginning to draw conclusions without having to seek advice. You find it easier to respond in a neutral way to difference, rather than approving or disapproving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3 – Full</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the competences you developed consciously at level 2 have become intuitive. You are constantly ready for situations and encounters in which you will exercise your knowledge, judgement and skills and have a large repertoire of strategies for dealing with differences in values, customs and practices among members of the intercultural group. You not only accept that people can see things from widely varying perspectives and are entitled to do so, but are able to put yourself in their place and avoid behaviour you sense would be hurtful or offensive. At this level of operation you are able to intervene when difficulties arise and tactfully support other members of the group in understanding each other. You are confident enough of your position to take a polite stand over issues despite your respect for the viewpoint of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Byram mentioned in his interview, “[t]hese are not empirically based in the way that the CEF levels are”, and must be “carefully distinguished from the tests and other means of assessment by assessors which the project has also produced” (for Assessee and Assessor versions of INCA framework see www.incaproject.org) (Byram in Golubeva 2006:66). Furthermore, according to Byram, “[t]he levels awarded by assessors on the basis of the tests cannot be transferred directly into the Portfolio” (Byram in Golubeva 2006:66). Therefore these levels cannot be considered the solution to the problem put to Byram and Zarate by the Council of Europe in the 1990s (Golubeva 2006:66).

The second approach mentioned by Byram in this interview (Golubeva 2006:66) had been developed by another project based at the Council of Europe. They had been attempting to create “a more general model and a means of self-assessment which can be introduced into
the European Language Portfolio” (Golubeva 2006:66). As Byram himself summarised, “[n]one of the models is exhaustive in the sense of describing and defining everything which is involved in being interculturally competent” (Byram in Golubeva 2006:66).

Since the description of levels of ICC and its assessment cannot be considered as developed yet, I was concerned regarding my research as to whether the process of creating really ‘intercultural’ language coursebooks can be initiated at all, and whether improving coursebooks content and task levels can enhance their potential for promoting the acquisition of ICC. But Byram did not share my concerns. According to him, if coursebook content and tasks are developed on an appropriate model, then it is sufficient for teaching purposes:

The teacher and/or the learner can then assess in a qualitative way, by collecting evidence about whether they are being successful. It is not necessary to be able to identify quantifiable levels unless there is to be formal assessment for examinations. (Byram in Golubeva 2006:67)

Although it contradicts with what Byram earlier wrote in his article on assessing IC: “If it isn’t tested, it’s not taught” (Byram 2000:8), I am more likely to agree with it. Summing up the discussion of assessing I(C)C, I rather prefer to quote the words attributed to Albert Einstein: “Not everything that counts can be counted, and not everything that can be counted, counts”. The fact that we do not have an instrument for assessing ICC does not imply that we should not teach it.

1.3. The view on the role of the coursebooks in the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence

This section focuses on the foreign language coursebook and its role in culture teaching in general and developing ICC in particular.

There are plenty of other tools that can be used in the language classroom, especially for culture teaching and learning. Their number is constantly growing: from widely used tapes, videocassettes, newspapers, etc. to the new ones, such as CD-ROMs, DVDs, Internet. This study does not aim to discuss whether the media or the coursebook is a more efficient tool for language-and-culture teaching-and-learning. Many authors (e.g. Brammerts 1995, Edginton & Montgomery 1996, etc.) discuss the use of media in the FL classroom. Some of them discuss the possibilities of media use for intercultural/culture learning (e.g. Blatchford 1973, Durant 1997, Pulverness et al. 1998, etc.). For example, in a well-known resource book for teachers Cultural Awareness (Tomalin & Stemplaski 1993) out of eighty-two activities on raising cultural awareness, encouraging critical thinking about cultural stereotypes, and developing tolerance: seventeen (21 % approximately) are linked to the media (mostly newspapers, radio and television). Needless to say, in the case of appropriate choice and use,
the role of other than coursebook tools in acquiring ICC is important. However, among the above-mentioned tools only the coursebook may play the role of "the mirror of curriculum" as Kurtán called it (2001:129). This should be the main reason why the coursebook is still seen as central to FL teaching and learning in almost all national educational systems including Hungary.

Although in my research only the coursebooks are the objects of investigation, in this chapter both words — textbook and coursebook — will be used (dependent on the use of the author referred to).

In English, the first written occurrences of the word 'textbook' can be traced back to the end of the eighteenth century (Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1997). But the concept itself has a much older history, e.g. in Hungary, in Pannonhalma, according to Öri (1997), first textbooks — hand-written, of course — were already in use in the VIII–IX centuries. Jan Amos Komensky (John Comenius, in English), wrote his famous textbook Orbis Sensualium Pictus (The Visible World) in 1658.

‘Textbook’ can be defined as a book designed for well-determined specific instructional purposes. But there are many other definitions of ‘textbook’, e.g. Kurtán (Kurtán 2001:126) quotes the one offered by Richardeau (1979), according to which, a textbook is any printed, structured, and systematically built book, written for being used in the learning process. Hutchinson and Hutchinson (1996), for example, use the ‘textbook’ in the broad sense of “an organized and pre-packaged set of teaching/learning materials” (1996:322-323). The materials may be bound in just one book or distributed in a package, such as the familiar coursebook, workbook, teacher’s book/guide, cassettes, CDs, etc. They (Hutchinson & Hutchinson 1996) use the term ‘textbook’ in both cases — the individual book and the package. In this writing I will use the word ‘coursebook’ for that type of language textbook which is designed for regular use in the language classroom, teaching/learning language in a complex (not only grammar, speaking or writing skills), and usually for a special group of LLS (level, age, type of school, etc.). The term ‘textbook’ will be used (1) when talking about a book for instructional purposes, in general; or (2) when referring to other authors who while talking about a coursebook (e.g. Streamline, Grapevine, etc.), use the word ‘textbook’.

1.3.1. Role of course-/textbooks in foreign language teaching and learning

Coursebooks are tools which only have life and meaning when there is a teacher present.

Bell & Gower, 1998:118

At the beginning of the 80s there was a debate between Allwright (1981) and O’Neill (1982), who in their articles, respectively entitled What do we want teaching materials for? and Why
use textbooks?, argued about "the role of published materials in the management of language learning", and also "the potential and the limitations of such materials for 'guiding' students through the learning process" (Hedge & Whitney 1996:235).

Cunningsworth (1984:1) warns that coursebooks of "good servants" may easily become "poor masters" in case the teacher starts viewing the coursebook as the curriculum itself, and the learners' needs become subjugated to the coursebook.

The debate about the desirability of course-/textbooks continued in the 1990s as well. For example, Swan (1992) warns:

The danger with ready-made textbooks is that they can seem to absolve teachers of responsibility. Instead of participating in the day-to-day decisions that have to be made about what to teach and how to teach it, it is easy to just sit back and operate the system, secure in the belief that the wise and virtuous people who produced the textbook knew what was good for us. Unfortunately this is rarely the case. (1992:33)

This idea echoes with the conclusions Littlejohn (1992) made as the result of his study of textbooks: "the precise instructions which the materials give reduce the teacher's role to one of managing or overseeing a preplanned classroom event" (Littlejohn 1992:84 quoted in Hutchinson & Hutchinson 1996:307-308).

In the 1990s there was a strong debate between those who protested against the use of coursebooks, viewing them either as "instruments of institutional control supported by a range of commercial interests" or as "destroyers of teacher and learner creativity", and those who defended coursebooks, arguing that they serve as providers of professionally developed and thoroughly tested materials, which help teachers to save their time (Bell & Gower 1998:116). Nowadays, the CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning) researchers try to convince everybody on the beneficial use of computers, therefore belittling the merits of coursebooks.

Despite this, the number of new course- and textbooks being produced is constantly growing. And in spite of the fact that both sides – practitioners as well as researchers – very often argue that the quality of many books is poor, books are used by most language teachers.

Since one of the main accusations against course- and textbooks is that they destroy teachers' creativity, the fact that "each new generation of books is more comprehensive and more highly structured than the last" is, according to Hutchinson & Hutchinson (1996:308), "even more striking". As an example they compare Streamline (Hartley & Viney 1978) and Grapevine (Viney & Viney 1989), both by the same author (with different co-authors) written a decade apart, which illustrate this trend well. Streamline consists mainly of texts, questions and substitution drills; its modern successor, Grapevine, goes with supplementary video material and contains new activities (role-plays, information-gap activities, games, tasks for
the development of reading, writing, and listening skills, songs), and also grammar summaries and tape transcripts. As well as containing a greater range of content, *Grapevine* has explicit rubrics for activities, whereas *Streamline* simply gives the exercise number and an example. The instructions in the *Grapevine* teacher's book are also more detailed and give more information about the 'why?' and the 'how?' of each activity. Far from becoming looser, the structure of the coursebook is becoming much tighter and more explicit – more like a prepared script. Less and less appears to be left to the teacher to decide and work out.

The results of a preliminary research (Golubeva 2002) showed that course-/textbook is the more often used tool in FL classroom in comparison with other published materials and such tools as tapes, videos, CD-s, etc. Among Hungarian teachers who took part in this questionnaire study 100% used course- and textbooks in their lessons. Some use them from beginning to end, whilst others, who “perhaps have more freedom and are happier when creating their own teaching programme” (Cunningsworth 1984:1), take texts and exercises from several sources, adapting them and making amendments where necessary and supplementing them with material they have produced themselves. It is rare however to meet a teacher who does not use a book in the classroom at all.

Of course, I recognise that there are good quality and bad quality text- and coursebooks, and I also agree that even good coursebooks can be used badly, and therefore negatively influence the opinion about the coursebook as a medium. So, what are the reasons why coursebooks are so heavily utilised?

The first reason to be mentioned is that developing their own classroom materials is an extremely difficult and time-consuming process for teachers (Cunningsworth 1984, Sheldon 1988). Secondly, coursebooks are normally written by experienced and well-qualified (group of) people and the material contained in them is usually carefully tested in pilot studies in an actual teaching situation before being published. “Teachers can therefore be assured that coursebooks from reputable publishers will serve them well, if properly selected and used” (Cunningsworth 1984:1, my emphasis). (This explains why national coursebooks written by individual authors or small teams very often lose competition against big publishing houses: they cannot provide careful testing of the materials!)

Many Hungarian researchers also agree that in the FL teaching process, coursebooks are central (Horváth 1961, Karlovitz 1997, Kurtán 2001, and myself Golubeva 2002, 2004, 2005). According to Kurtán (2001), this is due to the functions coursebooks fulfil in the process of FLT. She lists the following functions of FL textbooks (Kurtán 2001:126-128): the first three are scientific, pedagogic and institutional (mentioned by Richaudeau 1979); the forth – presentation of information and language model (distinguished by Allwright 1981);
the fifth — providing opportunity for language learning and therefore motivating (mentioned by Hutchinson & Waters 1987); the sixth — providing interactive support (mentioned by Davies 1991, Kast & Neuner 1994); and the last — organising, systematising and guiding functions (mentioned by Allwright 1981). The role the coursebook plays in management of the learning process was discussed by Hutchinson and Hutchinson (1996). They adapted the model of Allwright (see Hutchinson & Hutchinson 1996:310), according to whom the lesson is an interaction among the three elements of teacher, learners, and materials. What this interaction produces are opportunities to learn. As the results of a study (Hutchinson & Hutchinson 1996) show, both teachers and learners understand the importance of the role of the coursebook in the management of the lessons. As they report in their article (Hutchinson & Hutchinson 1996:311), teachers see the role of the coursebook as facilitating (it „saves time, gives direction to lessons, guides discussion, facilitates giving of homework”; makes teaching easier, better organised, more convenient, and learning easier, faster, better; provides security and confidence). Why the management is so important in FL classroom? According to the observation done by Wong-Fillmore (1985), a good lesson is a structured one, when lesson phases are clearly marked. Thus, the coursebook should be seen not as an undesirable constraint, but rather as a potentially beneficial phenomenon that imposes a structure on the interaction of the lesson and is welcomed by both teacher and learner.

Another positive reason why course-/textbooks should be used in the FL classroom is that they play an important role in introducing innovations. Hutchinson and Hutchinson (1996:316) argue that textbooks “can provide constant support” in a potentially disturbing and “threatening process” of “adjustment to change” (and the incorporation of intercultural learning in FL education is such). They suggest that textbooks “can really provide the level of structure that appears to be necessary for teachers to fully understand and ‘routinize’ change” (1996:317). And it is very important because the number of changes in FLT is growing with a ‘snowball’ effect. Last century (especially the second part of it) offered a lot of new methods and approaches to FLT (Bárdos 2005), including new approaches to syllabus design, or new concepts (e.g. intercultural language learning). According to Hutchinson and Hutchinson (1996),

The fundamental problem of change is that it […] challenges, and thereby potentially threatens, the values, attitudes, and beliefs that enable us to make experience meaningful and predictable. Yet, […] no development is possible without such disturbance. […] therefore, the disturbance that change inevitably brings must be kept within manageable limits. If it exceeds these limits, it will engender feelings of anxiety and insecurity and thereby provoke what Marris (1986) calls ‘the conservative impulse’, i.e. a determination to resist the change and maintain the existing context within the individual feels secure. (1996:314)

The introduction of the intercultural component in FLT in general, and in FL coursebooks in
particular, means a significant change (and challenge) for teachers. For it to be successful, the necessary conditions should be provided. Hutchinson and Hutchinson (1996, referring to Blackler & Shimmin 1984, Handy 1985 and Marris 1986) list such conditions and prove that the textbook is an effective 'agent of change' (see Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions for change (Hutchinson &amp; Hutchinson 1996:315)</th>
<th>Supportive potential of textbook in providing conditions for change (Hutchinson &amp; Hutchinson 1996:316-317)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Only a certain amount of change can be accommodated at any one time.</td>
<td>The coursebook can introduce changes gradually within a structured framework enabling teachers and learners to develop in harmony with the introduction of new ideas. The coursebook can be [...] also a vehicle for teacher and learner training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adjusting to change takes time and energy. To make the adjustment, therefore, individuals need relief from other pressures, and constant reassurance and support.</td>
<td>[...] the structure provided by the textbook saves the teacher work and helps him or her to manage the class. This frees the teacher to concentrate attention on coping with new content and procedures. Furthermore, since it is used on a daily basis, is portable and permanent, the textbook can provide constant support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To reduce feelings of insecurity, people need as complete a picture as possible of what the change will look like in practice.</td>
<td>Through structured scripts particularly when supported by a teacher's guide, it can show as explicitly as possible what to do [...].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Individuals find it difficult to carry the burden of change alone. The support of a group helps individuals by sharing the burden.</td>
<td>[...] the textbook gets the support of the group behind the individual teacher, and thus relieves the teacher of much of the burden of the responsibility for introducing changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree with Hutchinson and Hutchinson (1996:317), who claim that “the good textbook, properly used, can provide an excellent vehicle for effective and long-lasting change” (my emphasis). They are convinced that without a textbook it is more difficult “to accommodate the change” (Hutchinson & Hutchinson 1996:317). That is why

the move to more highly structured textbooks [...] is not something to be deplored, but rather to be welcomed as a natural and beneficial response to a period of rapid change. (1996:317)

The use of “more highly structured textbooks” does not lead to the “de-skilling of teachers” because few are the teachers who teach strictly by the book (Hutchinson & Hutchinson 1996:319 referring to Stodolsky 1988:180):

Most often teachers follow their own scripts by adapting or changing textbook-based tasks, adding new tasks or deleting some, changing the management of the tasks, changing task inputs or expected outputs, and so on. (1996:319)

Therefore, Hutchinson and Hutchinson (1996) conclude, “The textbook [...] should be seen as a means of ‘re-skilling’ not ‘de-skilling’” (1996:320).

Of course, to fulfil the role of the ‘agent of change’ a coursebook should be of high quality, and also it should be properly used. For improving teachers’ use of books, in pre- and in-service courses more attention should be paid to:
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• How to choose a coursebook;
• How to use a coursebook;
• How to evaluate a coursebook;
• How to adapt a coursebook;
• How to supplement/ find and use the additional materials to a given coursebook.

Even when the coursebook is properly chosen and used, it cannot meet the needs of any individual teaching–learning situation nor the needs of the individuals within it; but because of this, Hutchinson and Hutchinson (1996) argue, they (books) should not be done away with. They (Hutchinson & Hutchinson 1996) stress,

Given that a reasonable amount of thought has gone into the creation of the textbook by the publisher, and to the choice of the textbook by the teachers, there is no reason to assume that any other materials would be any better, and many reasons why they may be worse. (1996:320)

They follow,

Wouldn’t it be better if we all baked our own bread, preferably from our own home-grown, organic wheat, rather buying a cut-and-wrapped loaf at the supermarket is overwhelming in determining our choice. The important conclusion to draw, surely, is not that we should encourage everyone to make their own bread, but that we should educate people to be more informed, more discerning, and more influential consumers. (Hutchinson and Hutchinson 1996:320)

As I already mentioned, for teachers to become better “consumers”, both in pre- and in-service training more stress should be made on the issue of textbooks, e.g.: how to choose, how to use, how to evaluate, etc. (see the list above). And, I completely agree with Hutchinson and Hutchinson (1996), who note,

we need to abandon the generally hostile attitude to textbooks that pervades much teacher training, and stop wasting so much time and effort on teaching teachers to do without or simply substitute for a textbook. Instead a central feature of all teacher training and development should be to help teachers become better consumers of textbooks by teaching them how to select and use textbooks properly, exploit them in the class, and adapt and supplement them where necessary. (1996:321-322)

Among the above-mentioned issues, probably, the evaluation of coursebooks seems to be most important. Therefore, the following section will deal with this in more detail.

1.3.2. Methods of evaluation of foreign language coursebooks

It is ironic that those teachers who rely most heavily on the textbooks are the ones least qualified to interpret its intentions or evaluate its content and method.

Williams, 1983:251

Evaluation of coursebooks is extremely important, but only for those teachers, who want to use coursebooks in a sensible way, not for those who „express their teaching objectives in terms such as 'finishing unit 16', 'doing the first eight chapters' or 'reaching page 81'“ (Cunningsworth 1984:1), because they are acting as „servant of the coursebook […] (unless
of course they are only using a convenient shorthand for well thought-out objectives)" (1984:1). Evaluation is important for the teacher who wants to be a „master” of the coursebook, who, according to Cunningsworth (1984):

firstly, has established and defined his objectives (probably in terms of what the students should be able to do in English, and then in terms of the structures, vocabulary, etc. necessary to equip them to do it) and, secondly, actively searches out teaching materials which will positively help in achieving these objectives. (1984:1)

It is to this, second, kind of teacher that the knowledge of different methods of coursebook (and other materials) evaluation will be useful.

Since Cunningsworth (1984) wrote his book, the design and evaluation of the materials has become one of the most important and – probably – the most problematic areas within FLT. Very often the three main participants of the process of FL teaching-and-learning (administrators, teachers and students) have quite distinct opinions about what a ‘good’ coursebook is. Still, very often – in spite of the vast number of literature on textbook evaluation and selection – the people responsible for making an informed decision fail to select a ‘fitting’ book.

As I mentioned, many scholars have offered ideas (evaluation schemes, checklists, criteria) in order to help teachers to become more objective evaluators. Just to name but a few, to whom I refer in this study: Tucker (1975); Chastain (1976); Candlin and Breen (1979, 1987); Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979); Williams (1983); Cunningsworth (1984, 1995); Hutchinson and Waters (1987); Sheldon (1988); Skierso (1991); Littlejohn (1992); Tomlinson (1998). In Hungary, also great attention has been paid to textbooks in general (e.g. see Herváth 1970; Tóth 1974; Karlovitz 1980, 1986, 1988, 1994), and FL textbook evaluation in particular (Némethné Hock & Ötvösné Vadnay 1997; Zalánne Szablyár & Petneki 1997; Kurtán 2001). It is impossible to analyse all existing checklists, therefore I will try to overview those that have gained most influence in the field.

More than thirty years ago, Tucker (1975) offered a scheme for evaluating beginning EFL and ESL textbooks. This scheme consisted of two parts: internal criteria (related to language teaching) and external criteria (focused on general evaluation of a given textbook) (see Tucker, 1975:357).

If we compare this scheme to that offered two decades later by Ur (1996:186), we will realise that the authors had quite a similar approach to textbook evaluation. For instance, Tucker offers as one of the criteria the „adequacy of practice” in grammar (1975:357), and Ur – “good grammar […] practice” (1996:186, square brackets added by me). None of them mention any criterion for the evaluation of (inter)cultural component. Both checklists strongly depend on the theoretical streamlines of the time they
were created.

In general, it can be considered as a typical characteristic of textbook evaluation checklists (schemes) that they clearly reflect the newest trends in FLT. That is the reason why some checklists lose their “appropriateness” over the years and new ones replace them.

But not all checklists have such “nemesis”. For example, some general principles for materials evaluation offered by Cunningworth (1984) more than twenty years ago are still often-cited and widely-recognised. These are (Cunningworth 1984:5-7):

1. Relate the teaching materials to aims and objectives;
2. Be aware of what language is for and select teaching materials which will help equip students to use language effectively for their own purposes;
3. Keep students’ learning needs in mind;
4. Consider the relationship between language, the learning process and the learner.

The author himself does not change his opinion over the years: in his later book *Choosing your coursebook* (Cunningworth 1995) he lists the same principles.

Discussing the issue of coursebook evaluation, Cunningworth (1984) advised not to look for answers to questions like ‘Is course X a good course or a bad course? Is it better than course Y?’, and not to attempt to make absolute judgments; but, taking the learning situation into consideration, to be concerned with making relative judgments, and look for answers to question like ‘Good for what and bad for whom?’. The special interest represents chapter 7 of Cunningworth’s (1984) book where, among other motivating factors, he discussed the cultural content of coursebooks (see also section 1.3.3).

Cunningworth (1984:61-63) discussed the following variables of cultural content of a coursebook (on the example of EFL coursebook) which should be evaluated:

1. Geographical setting.
2. Age range and class.
3. Advantages and limitation of culture-specific coursebooks.
4. Teaching cultural background with the language.
5. English as a second language.
6. Anthropological aspects of language.

*Geographical setting* usually depends upon where the book is published (e.g., in case of EFL coursebooks, Britain or the United States) and the market for which it is intended. Courses may have, as a setting, a non-English speaking country, and, according to Cunningworth, “There is nothing strange or unreal in depicting two Indians or Nigerians using English to communicate with each other” (1984:61).

*Age range and class* together with occupation are viewed as important variables
affecting the cultural content of a course. Cunningworth mentions that usually the age range depicted and catered for is that of late teens and twenties; the characters appearing in the coursebooks tend to be middle class people who have interesting jobs such as that of a journalist or a pilot.

Cunningworth also discusses advantages and limitation of culture-specific coursebook. The main advantages he views in that

it provides a range of clearly identifiable situations for the presentation and subsequent practice of language items and so gives the course writer the opportunity to make his material meaningful through being contextualised. It also lends itself to the creation of recognisable characters who appear regularly throughout the course, giving a degree of continuity to the material and providing a sense of security for the student, who may well feature in a serial story in the coursebook, providing the learner with added motivation to work through the course to the end. (Cunningworth 1984:61)

Opposite, a limitation of the culture-specific coursebook, according to him, is that

It will only be of relevance to students who understand the cultural background in which it is set. European learners, for example, would readily comprehend most cultural settings in Britain or the U.S.A., but the same cannot be said of learners in Iraq, Thailand, the Sudan or China, where cultural norms are vastly different. Indeed in these situations a strong portrayal of British life might well prove to be an impediment rather than a help to the learner. (Cunningworth 1984:61-62)

Cunningworth brings as an example First Things First (Alexander 1967), explaining its vast success with its “relative lack of culture specificity and the transparency of the situations in which language items are presented” (1984:62). He claims, this is what makes “the book readily acceptable in almost any country in the world” (1984:62).

Another variable of the cultural content of a coursebook discussed by Cunningworth is teaching cultural background with the language. He points that it is important to evaluate whether “the overall picture given is representative of reality, whether the material is up-to-date and presents contemporary scene rather than giving a historical perspective of life say twenty years ago, and whether there is any obvious bias for political or other reasons” (Cunningworth 1984:62). Cunningworth claims that a coursebook should make clear and explicit links between social situations and language. He also warns that there is a danger in teaching language and cultural background together – “the temptation to use at an early stage authentic (usually literary) texts which are far too advanced and lead the learner into a plodding process of literal translation” (Cunningworth 1984:62). Even worse, he says, is the use of texts which no longer reflect current language usage (e.g. extracts from Dickens) and therefore cannot provide the learners with a useful model of the language.

The sixth variable, English as a second language, can be relevant to other languages which are used as lingua franca and taught as a second language, but it is not really relevant to this research, as it focuses on teaching languages as foreign, not second.

Anthropological aspects of language is the last variable discussed. Here
Cunningsworth mentions that any language learning programme has a cultural content if we take culture in its anthropological sense: the learner not only has to learn the language forms but also the conceptual system of that language. For example, Hungarians as with many others who learn English, have difficulty with the use of the present perfect because of the different conception of time relations. So, even learning grammar they are learning an aspect of culture about how the native English-speakers perceive reality.

Following Cunningsworth (1984), many others considered and still consider it important to produce very detailed evaluation checklists. As an example, the checklist offered by Sheldon (1988) may serve. It contains all ranges of criteria: from graphics to authenticity.

Some experts go beyond evaluation of textbook contents and try to evaluate affective or cognitive factors as well. For example, Skierso (1991) applies Bloom’s Taxonomy to evaluate textbooks, i.e. assesses the cognitive skills a given textbook demands from the learner. The author rates a book which uses analysis as more valuable than one that requires only comprehension.

Another example of evaluating textbooks within a broader context is the work of Littlejohn and Windeatt (1989). They suggest to “look beyond the goals of language learning itself” (1989:174). So, they offer such criteria as: “learners’ perceptions of knowledge”, “language learning and roles”, learners’ world view and general knowledge, and learners’ affective and cognitive development (Littlejohn & Windeatt 1989:174).

One more book to be mentioned is Materials Evaluation and Design for Language Teaching by McGrath (2002). McGrath discusses the pros and cons of using textbooks, highlights the importance of teachers as material evaluators and divides the process of evaluation in “pre-use”, “in-use”, and “post-use” evaluation (cf. Rea-Dickins 1994). This division of evaluation in three steps reflects the tension – and often disagreement – between FL teachers and scholars. The author gives an in-depth critique of some existing checklists and comes to a painful admission that “the final decision [...] has to be made on the basis of instinct, feel, or general impression” (McGrath 2002:53). Though in conclusion he adds that “There is inevitably a subjective element in textbook selection but we can seek to minimise this” (McGrath 2002:53).

McGrath’s discussion of the issue of ‘Materials and culture’ is of special interest for this research (what kind of cultural information to include; whose culture to project, global or local? etc.). I also share McGrath’s opinion about the tension between market pressure (publishers, sponsors, etc.) and the ‘ideal’ process based on research in FLT. I agree that even if we provide FL teachers with a well-thought-out evaluation checklist, still there is a real risk that they cannot make use of it for simple lack of power in decision making. And, it is true
not only in the “pre-use” stage. It also refers to the following two stages, because still there are no channels through which systematic in-use and post-use evaluation of coursebooks can be fed back to either the materials producers to be reflected in future production, or to other decision-makers.

1.3.3. A brief overview of studies on culture in foreign language coursebooks

[...] culture would find its way to the language classroom more easily if coursebooks catered more for this area of interest [...] 
Aleksandrowicz-Pędich & Lázár, 2002:146

Coursebooks can be characterized by their intrinsically challenging nature. As Price-Machado (1998) acknowledges, the development of a textbook is a long and complex process, and many individuals contribute along the way. Bárdos (2005) stresses that although FL course-/textbooks have suffered enormous changes, these cannot always be qualified as progressive ones.

A big change in FL coursebooks design could be noted when the CLT became widespread. In the 1980s “cuttings” from the newspapers (articles, ads, photos, etc.) and role-plays (practising communication in such situations as shopping, checking-in, etc.) appeared in many FL coursebooks. Extracts from the radio interviews and news programs, pop and rock music ‘hits’ started to be used in listening comprehension tasks. The ‘break-in’ of modern technologies allowed to record and to use videos for FLT purposes. Editors dramatically increased their investments on FL textbooks design, promotion and sales. Despite this attempt to improve the quality of FL textbooks by all means, the issue of inclusion of (inter)cultural component into FL coursebooks seemed to be left out. Culture learning was approached as the learning of C2 facts. But even, the factual material that could be found in coursebooks was often “shallow and superficial” (Paige et al. 2003:224). It made them (books) unable to serve the goal of teaching culture in its deeper sense. Moreover, the inaccurate representation of culture favoured the creation of stereotypes (Paige et al. 2003:225). The assessment of the (inter)cultural component was almost completely missing from FL coursebooks, and where it was found, it was limited to testing for culture facts.

It can be explained by the compromise that is usually made in the process of coursebook writing (see Bell & Gower 1998). The publisher is interested in creating a coursebook that is easy to sell to make as much money out of it as possible. In other words, the publisher is interested in production of a ‘global’ coursebook – “which means a coursebook for a restricted number of teaching situations in many different countries rather than all teaching situations in all countries” (Bell & Gower 1998:117). Such books are often critically called ‘imperialist’ or ‘new colonialist’, which points out that the most problematic
aspect of ‘global’ coursebooks is their cultural context. That is why there are so many over-cautious coursebooks.

Paige and others (2003:225) call for the “research on alternative textbooks [...] which incorporate a far wider range of cultural elements and involve the learner more actively in the culture learning process” (square brackets added by me).

It is very difficult to define the accessible degree of cultural reference. Although the principle ‘input + I’ seems reasonable in the case of culture learning to the same extent as in case of language learning. But, at today’s level of development of culture teaching methodology these ambitions seem to be unrealistic. Alptekin (1996) in his discussion of the introduction of target-language culture in EFL materials (like Widdowson 1990) makes the difference between two types of knowledge which a given language involves – systemic and schematic. The first (‘systemic’) refers to “the formal properties of language, involving both its semantic and syntactic systems” (Alptekin 1996:53). ‘Schematic’ knowledge is socially acquired and it is an important part of the ‘fit’ which exists between people’s culture-specific cognition and their native language. According to Alptekin, in learning L1, “the child’s schematic and systemic knowledge are said to develop concurrently, each supportive of the other” (Alptekin 1996:53). However, the process of learning FL, to Widdowson (1990), significantly differs from learning native language:

Here learners have already been socialized into the schematic knowledge associated with their mother tongue: they are initiated into their culture in the very process of language learning. (Widdowson 1990:110 as quoted in Alptekin 1996:53)

In case of the acquisition of FLs, the conflict between the LLs’ schemes and new cultural information arise (Alptekin 1996). Thus, the essential task is to determine “the type of schematic input to be presented to the learners”, which is very difficult because it is culture-specific (Alptekin 1996:55). But, Alptekin (1996) makes an interesting note that while acquiring new systemic knowledge LLs acquire the cultural system entailed (1996:56).

The inclusion of such aspects of culture as values, beliefs and attitudes is also problematic, e.g. topics like sex, religion, etc. are still viewed as taboo in FL coursebooks. However, without touching these issues the understanding of other cultures seems impossible.

To overcome all the above challenges in connection with the inclusion of (inter)cultural component in FL coursebooks, culture in FLT materials should be viewed first of all as a vehicle for teaching the language.
1.3.4. The importance of authenticity in interculturally-oriented language coursebooks

Another issue, which deserves separate discussion, is that of coursebook and authenticity. This issue gained a special importance in CLT, because, “from the communicative language teaching perspective, students need to constantly refer to the contextually appropriate ways native speakers actually put the target language in use” (Feng & Byram 2000, from web). As a consequence, authentic materials were included in FL text- and coursebooks. Feng and Byram (2000, from web) provide a long list of EFL textbooks in which the authentic material is included: Developing strategies (Abbs & Freebairn 1980); Developing reading skills (Grellet 1981); Authentic reading... (Walter 1982); English for life Book 3... (Cook 1983); Counterpoint Book 4... (Ellis & Ellis 1987) and Time: We the people (Schinke-Llano 1989). They also mention that many specialists started to investigate the methods and the effects of inclusion of authentic materials, e.g.: Morrison 1989, Morton 1999, Peacock 1997, Swaffar 1985, Zhu 1984.

According to Widdowson (1979:80), there is a difference between authenticity and genuineness:

* Genuineness is a characteristic of the passage and is an absolute quality;
* Authenticity is a characteristic of the relationship between the passage and the reader and it has to do with appropriate response.

Later, in 1990 Widdowson claims:

Authenticity of language in the classroom is bound to be, to some extent, an illusion. This is because it does not depend on the source from which the language as an object is drawn but on the learners’ engagement with it. In actual language use [...] meanings are achieved by human agency [...]. (Widdowson 1990:44)

Newby (2000a) goes further in discussing the concept of authenticity,

At first sight the issue of authenticity is deceptively simple, especially if we reduce our interpretation of the term to a superficial polarisation between the apparently artificial world of the traditional classroom and the real, dynamic world outside. (2000a:16)

“According to this”, – as Newby (2000a:16) labels, – „reductionist interpretation of authenticity, it should be the aim of the teacher and textbook to take steps to bring as much ‘reality’ as possible into the classroom, as indicated in figure [...]” (see fig. in Newby 2000a:16). He (Newby 2000a:16) is convinced that the view on the concept of authenticity should be changed and made “more differentiated”. It is especially important for coursebook writers. “In order to take this differentiated view”, Newby (2000a:16) advises to ask three questions:

1. What is authenticity and what different types exist?
2. Why might authenticity be, or not be, a desirable goal in textbooks?
3. What kinds of 'worlds' should be reflected in a textbook?

Newby (2000a:17) discusses three categories of authenticity:

a) **Authenticity of text**: the texts – spoken, written and graphic – used in textbooks and which the students read, hear or see;

b) **Authenticity of behaviour**: the tasks, language activities and exercises which students perform and also the texts that they themselves produce;

c) **Personal authenticity**: the students' own attitude towards, and acceptance or rejection of a) and b).

Discussing the first category of authenticity, namely "authenticity of text", Newby (2000a:17-18) uses the word 'text' in its broader meaning, encompassing not only written/spoken text, but graphics as well (pictures, cartoons, adverts, comic strips, etc.). That is to say, anything that the student reads, sees, or hears in the coursebook. He defines two types of texts: 'genuine' and 'simulated'.

*Genuine text* can be defined as a text that "was originally created for a non-pedagogic purpose but which has been ‘borrowed’ by a textbook writer" (Newby 2000a:17). *Simulated text* is created for a pedagogical purpose and may vary considerably in the degree to which it attempts to replicate certain features of a genuine text (Newby 2000a:17).

Very often when coursebook writers use genuine texts they have to make amendments. The so-called "authenticity hard-liners" claim that such amendments violate the authenticity of texts (Newby 2000a:17). But, according to Newby (2000a),

there is no such thing as a totally genuine text in a language coursebook since the mere act of transplanting it into a pedagogical setting immediately deprives it of certain contextual features which may well be part of its overall message. (Newby 2000a:17)

It echoes with Widdowson's (1998) opinion, according to which, the necessity for authentic language learning context and conditions cannot be provided in a FL classroom.

Discussing the second category of authenticity, namely "authenticity of behaviour", Newby (2000a:18-19) differs on two types: **pragmatic authenticity** and **process authenticity**.

‘Pragmatic authenticity’ can be described as "normal language behaviour in pursuit of an outcome" (Widdowson 1990:46 as quoted in Newby 2000a:18). ‘Process authenticity’ is “psycholinguistic in nature” and “concerns the mental processes people employ both in language production and comprehension” (Newby 2000a:18).

The above-discussed authenticity of text and authenticity of behaviour concern the coursebook writer "since decisions that are made in these areas will have consequences on the texts and activities which are used in the book" (Newby 2000a:19). In opposition, 'personal authenticity' – as Newby (2000a:19) stresses – "concerns the learner", and its degree "will ultimately be determined by the learner and, to some extent, by the teacher".

Newby (2000a:19) explains "the relation and interdependence of these different types
of authenticity" through giving the example of role-plays:

The textbook may provide genuine texts on a particular topic to serve as input to an activity (authenticity of text), it may provide a framework for the activity which takes into account pragmatic aspects by stipulating participants and setting and by giving a concrete task (authenticity of behaviour) but the student may then either engage with the role play or reject its relevance or validity and refuse to authenticate it. (Newby 2000a:19)

Newby claims for “an integrated view of authenticity in which all aspects play their role, as shown in figure […]” (see Newby 2000a:20). To him (Newby 2000a:19), “[a]uthenticity should be seen through the eyes of the learner”, because:

rather than being a product of materials and of methodology, it is the result of a process of engagement or interaction with classroom materials and with language. Seen in this light, we should not talk of ‘authentic materials’, but of authentication on the part of the learner. […] ultimately it is the students themselves who will set their own criteria for authenticity based on their own interpretation of relevance to their emotional and functional needs, interests etc. (Newby 2000a:19, square brackets added by me)

Another very important issue that Newby (2000a:21) discusses is Why might authenticity be or not be a desirable goal in textbook? To him, “textbook writers and teachers should bring as much of the ‘reality’ of the outside world as possible into supposedly artificial classroom” (2000a:21). Newby (2000a:21) tries to defend his point of view by calling our attention to the point that although “the classroom is not the outside world”,

It is a setting which, in comparison with the outside world where language is used authentically, both imposes constraints on communication and also offers opportunities for facilitating and accelerating learning (Newby 2000a:21, my emphasis).

One of the most problematic areas of authenticity in FL coursebooks is the choice of topics (Newby 2000a):

A purely ‘authentic’ approach to topics would preclude any reference to literature or treatment of topics of social or political interest on the grounds that they are not part of the students’ world. On the other hand, textbooks are well-known for their tendency to focus on topics remote from the needs and interests of students which have a strongly alienating effect. For the author, the difficult task is to get the balance right between entering the students’ world and pointing the student towards different worlds. Once more, the concept of authentication by the student seems to be the key to the question. (Newby 2000a:22)

Both Risager (1991) and Byram & Esarte-Sarries (1991) offer the criteria of ‘literary realism’ as a basis for analysis of the content of a coursebook. The four dimensions listed below may serve as a kind of checklist for the coursebook authors (based on Byram & Esarte-Sarries 1991:173-184):

• analysis at the micro-social level of the social identity of individuals, of their social environment, of their personality;

• analysis at the macro-social level of socio-economic, geographic and historical representations;
• analysis of the viewpoint taken by the author, either explicitly or implicitly;
• analysis at the intercultural level of mutual representations and recognition by the nature of foreign cultures.

Following this model will help coursebook writers to make their books more interculturally-oriented.

1.3.5. Intercultural language learning tasks and activities

Fortunately, FLT practice has started to deal with developing tasks and activities for ILL. As one of the earliest resource books for teachers, *Cultural Awareness* by Tomalin and Stempleski (1993) can be mentioned. In Hungary, a book by Lázár (2006) deserves to be mentioned. In this book the author offers tasks and activities which can be used not only in the FL classroom, but in FL teachers’ training as well.

In this section those intercultural language learning tasks will be discussed which can be easily included in the FL coursebook. To be effective these tasks should respond to the following requirements:

• There must be an intercultural communication purpose;
• There must be a focus on message rather than on the linguistic code;
• There must be some kind of ‘cultural gap’;
• There must be opportunity for negotiation when performing the task;
• The learners may choose the resources – verbal and non-verbal – required for performing the task (adapted from Ellis 1982 and Nobuyoshi & Ellis 1993).

And, I would add one more requirement to the above-listed ones:

• The tasks should be authentic (see section 1.3.4).

Taking into account the above-mentioned requirements, perhaps the most straightforward approach is *role-play*, because it can provide an excellent way for LLs to practise not only their speaking but their pragmatic and intercultural skills.

A particular type of role-play is *drama*, or *simulation*. LLs perform it before the group, the stimulus is provided by the FL coursebook.

*Photos* may also be effectively used for intercultural learning (Newby 2000b). According to Newby, "The use of original photos helps to increase the feeling of authenticity and may add important contextual information" (2000b:42), like e.g. gestures, postures, clothing, style, etc.
According to Newby (2000b), *comics* and *cartoons* may also be effectively used, because they

have the advantage for beginners learning a foreign language that the language is economical but strong in meaning content and communicative value; meanings are supported by visual information. In addition, they represent one of the few text types in which informal spoken language can be found in written form. For this reason, they may be regarded as a more authentic form that the dialogues found in many textbooks. (2000b:28)

Another visual material that can be easily and meaningfully included in the FL coursebook are *maps*. A map (or another tourist realia, like a ticket) is “a good means of bringing authentic situations into the classroom”, because these materials „provide a bridge to pragmatic authenticity since they lead quite naturally to a variety of simple role play tasks” (Newby 2000b:36).

The two main types of coursebook texts (*genuine* and *simulated*) and their role in intercultural learning were discussed in section 1.3.4 above. However, I would like to call attention to such texts as *newspaper cuttings, advertisements, literary texts, personal letters,* and *greeting cards.* The inclusion of *newspaper cuttings* in FL coursebooks is also beneficial, although the difficulty of language used in the newspaper articles may cause problems. In order to cope with this problem, Newby (2000b) advises to use preferably short extracts. To him, these texts are ‘information-oriented’, and so – with proper follow-up tasks – have so-called *pragmatic authenticity* (see section 1.3.4.).

Unfortunately, very rare *genuine literary texts* are included in FL coursebooks: even in coursebooks for teaching Russian as a foreign language, where before literature was often referred to. Such texts may play an important role in intercultural learning. Poems also can be used for introducing LLs to the target language literature (and therefore, culture).

*Personal letters*, or so wide-spread *e-mails*, belong to that type of text which is relatively simple, and therefore can be successfully used for developing productive skills. *Greeting cards* assist in providing insight into specific cultural customs because they show the differences in celebrating various occasions around the world. (See for reference and examples Newby 2000b.)

Working with *specially recorded dialogues* is also a very good task for ILL. Even while teaching such languages as Latin (!) authentic materials are available: Newby (2000b) gives an interesting example of an interview which was made in Latin with a Catholic prelate during his visit to Vatican. The interview touched

not only on historical aspects relating to the classical period but also [...] personal questions about the interviewee and reference to Finland, the home country of the students. (2000b:48)

Of course, this is not the complete range of tasks for ILL, but only the widely-used ones that
can be easily included in FL coursebooks. From the point of view of the subject matter of present research, another classification of tasks for ILL proves to be useful and will be included as a parameter for analysing the intercultural component of a FL coursebook – the one adapted from Sercu (2004). She distinguishes the following types of tasks (Sercu 2004:81):

- **Cognitive** task, in which LLs are asked to name, identify, reflect on, describe, give examples of, list, compare, or analyse (e.g. "reflect on the norms of your own culture with respect to topic x"); "reflect on differences in non-verbal behaviour between x and y"); "interpret the information in the text in the light of what we discussed with respect to the possible causes of misunderstandings").

- **Cognitive-attitudinal** tasks, which require LLs to empathize with foreign points of view, address the affective side of intercultural contact situations, or reflect on how stereotypes and attitudes may affect intercultural interaction.

- **Exploration** tasks, which ask LLs to explore or research a particular cultural aspect (e.g. the role of language in culture; the target culture’s norms and expectations with respect to a particular topic).

- **Production** tasks, which include instructions, such as “report your research results”, “write an essay on”, or “make a 3-minute video-film on”.

- **Enactment** tasks, which ask LLs to take part in a role-play, mediate between cultures in an intercultural situation, enact a cultural mini-drama or take part in a simulation game.

Applying this classification allows more precise evaluation of methodology for intercultural learning included in the FL coursebook.

Summarising, I would like to stress that tasks should be relevant to the LL’s age, maturity, education and intellectual level, particularly in case of adults.

1.4. Rationale of research

In this (first) part of my dissertation the discussion of the importance of ICC acquisition has been prevailing. It has been proved that it is not sufficient to present FL learners with a body of knowledge about C2 if we want to develop their intercultural communicative competence. The essential thing is to help them acquire such skills and develop such attitudes which they could later apply when dealing with hitherto unknown intercultural situations outside the language classroom.

In Hungary, as in other countries, the number of interactions with people from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds is constantly growing. Hence, one of the most important tasks in FLT is to promote the learners’ acquisition of ICC. However, in adult education still other objectives have priority. In Hungary, for the majority of adult LLs, the reason why they learn FL(s) is to get a better job, or to get a university degree (since FL knowledge is a compulsory prerequisite to get a diploma). Only few adult LLs learn FL(s) for fun, or because they are interested in target language culture, or want to assimilate in a culture and society where the target language is spoken. For the majority, *culture remains*
something additional, or secondary to acquiring linguistic skills. Since coursebooks still have a central role in the FLT process, and since culture learning plays only a secondary role in this process, it seems logical that the cultural content of a coursebook influences, to a great extent, the degree in which culture is present (or absent) in the language classroom. Therefore, I felt it urgent to investigate FL coursebooks currently in use in adult language classrooms in Hungary, and thus provide an empirical basis for reviewing them.

In other words, the rationale for this study originated from a deep gap between the current theoretical changes within the field of FLT and the local practice and conditions of FLT in Hungary. Here I do wish to stress that these conditions are very similar to the ones in other European countries, not worse (e.g. see Sercu 2000).

Based on the case of teaching English, Russian and Spanish to adults, this study aims to recommend theoretically well-founded and operative ways for introducing intercultural education in FLT in Hungary, where the FL coursebook is seen as a means for change.

This research aimed to reveal whether and – if yes – to what extent English, Russian and Spanish coursebooks (which are currently in use in Hungary for teaching adult LLs) have the potential for promoting the acquisition of ICC.

The theoretical framework on which the study is founded has been presented in this (first) part of my dissertation. As yet not one theory of intercultural language learning is available, I had to overview ideas and theories from various disciplines and fields of science in order to build such theoretical framework. This explains the extent (size) of the first part.

In the first chapter of this part the concept of culture and the best-known models of culture have been discussed. Also, the treatment of culture by the main methods and approaches has been overviewed. As a result, it has been shown that culture was always, explicitly or implicitly, more or less present in foreign language teaching. But, even the Communicative Approach proved to be limited regarding the cultural aspect of FLT, because of neglecting the development of ICC. The question of the necessity of the shift to Intercultural Language Learning has arisen.

In the second chapter of this part the concept, components and the model of ICC, and the importance of its acquisition have been discussed in detail.

Such thorough presentation of the theoretical issues in the first two chapters is justified. On the one hand, it has provided a well-founded theoretical framework for my research (it was necessary because still there is not a single comprehensive theory of ILL). On the other hand, the detailed discussion of the models (together with their application in the Scheme for analysis of intercultural component in FL coursebooks offered in the following second part), has shown the practical value of these models and theories underlying them.
(These two can be considered the contribution of my dissertation.)

In the third chapter the role of FL coursebooks in the process of acquisition of ICC has been clarified. To prove it, the analysis of the role of coursebooks in general has been provided, and especially, their role as ‘agents of change’ has been discussed. Also, the methods of evaluation of FL coursebooks have been overviewed (it is important because in the second chapter a new scheme for analysis of FL coursebooks has been offered). (This can be considered another contribution of my dissertation.)

Thus, no single theoretical issue has been discussed without purpose: all of them constitute a part of the theoretical framework that justifies the inclusion of the various elements of the scheme for analysis of intercultural component in FL coursebooks in the second (research part) of my dissertation.
2. Research of the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence

2.0. Introduction

Having outlined the context of the research and the theoretical framework in the previous part, I can turn now to the research itself. In the first chapter of the second part (2.1) an overview of the research design, the main principles on which it is founded, and the procedures adopted for collecting and analysing research data regarding the main research question are described.

In the second chapter of this part (2.2) a detailed analysis of the selected coursebooks, grouped according to the three languages (English, Russian and Spanish), is presented. In the third chapter (2.3) the analysed English, Russian and Spanish language coursebooks are compared. And, finally, in chapter 2.4 the Cross-cultural recommendations for developing intercultural component in foreign language coursebooks are given.

This way, in the second part the potential of FL coursebooks under investigation for promoting the acquisition of ICC will be described and the general recommendations for enhancing it will be given.

2.1. Research design

2.1.1. Research questions

The main research questions are adapted from Sercu (2000:14). The first is formulated as:

*What potential do English, Russian and Spanish language coursebooks (which are currently in use in Hungary for teaching adult language learners) have for promoting acquisition of ICC at the beginner to elementary levels?*

The question clearly reveals the subject and the objects of investigation. In this research I investigate the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC. The objects of investigation are the most widely used coursebooks for teaching English, Russian and Spanish languages to adult LLs in Hungary. The question also clearly situates the research within the field concerned with intercultural communication and intercultural language learning.

The other question (adapted from Sercu, ibid.) I would like to find the answer to is:

*What cross-cultural recommendations can be suggested for enhancing the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC?*

As it follows from the above-mentioned research questions, one of the central concepts of this
research is ‘the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence’. Paraphrasing, it means, that what is to be evaluated is how good FL coursebooks are for the purpose of promoting the acquisition of ICC.

2.1.2. Selection of the coursebook corpus for analysis

Purposive sampling is based on the assumption that one wants to discover, understand, gain insight; therefore one needs to select a sample from which one can learn most.

Merriam, 1988:48

The materials for this study were collected in the school year 2004-2005 in 25 educational centres where adult learners are taught foreign languages: 12 language schools, 3 vocational schools, 4 colleges, 3 universities and 3 language centres. The data requested were referring only to adult (18+) students learning English, Russian or/and Spanish. (Data about other languages taught in these institutions were not requested, as it is not the purpose of my research to give an overview on the present situation in Hungarian language education concerning the percentage of LLs studying various FLs). Originally, more than 100 educational centres were requested (via Internet, telephone or personal interview) the information about (1) how many adult LLs learn English, Russian and/or Spanish, and (2) from which coursebooks they learnt at the time of data collection. Less than one quarter of the institutions (altogether 25) provided the information. (Here I would like to note that this proportion was predictable, and the researchers usually meet these kinds of difficulties on their way.) However, the collected data can be considered insightful, because these data represent 5709 adult LLs from 11 Hungarian towns, namely Budapest, Debrecen, Győr, Kecskemét, Nagykanizsa, Szeged, Szekszárd, Székesfehérvár, Szombathely, Tatabánya, and Veszprém. Out of 5709 adult LLs only 667 learn Spanish, 382 - Russian, the rest (4660 adults) learn English. The data collected for English, Russian and Spanish perfectly represent the situation in Hungarian language education: Russian lost its position in the early 1990s (but the interest has recently started growing); English (together with German) enjoys monopoly; and Spanish (like Italian, Portuguese, etc.) is still among those FLs that are less widely used and taught in Hungary. These data (see Table 7 in Appendix VI) echo the results of other Hungarian studies (cf. Cs. Jónás & Fedoszov 1999; Fekete, Major & Nikolov 1999; Győri 2001a, b; Halász & Lannert 2003; and Statisztikai Tájékozttató).

The corpus of coursebooks to be analysed was selected on the basis of the same data. First of all, I counted how many LLs used a given coursebook at the time of data collection (see tables 8, 9, 10 in Appendix VII) for English, Russian, Spanish coursebooks respectively. As in some cases adult LLs used exclusively textbooks for learning LSP or for
preparation to a specific FL exam, these books will not be mentioned in the tables.

In the case of English language coursebooks, 70 different titles were mentioned, which were in use in the school year 2004-2005 for teaching English to (4660) adults in Hungary. Among them 31 (less than a half) are the coursebooks that are designed for teaching general language skills. But they are used by the majority of adult EFL learners: 66.2% (3085). These data are represented in table 8 (see Appendix VII): the coursebooks are grouped according to series titles, and the series are put in order from the most used at the top to the less used at the bottom of the table. As the table clearly shows, the most widely used coursebook series in the surveyed institutions (n=25) to teach general English to adults in school year 2004-2005 was Headway (OUP): 43.7% of adults (1347 of 3085) used this series. The second most popular series was English File (OUP): 24.9% of adults (769 of 3085) used it. There is not much difference between number of adult EFL learners using Lifelines (OUP) (6.7%) and Inside Out (MacMillan) (6.6%). The rest of the coursebooks were used by an insignificant number of adult LLs.

In the case of Russian language, the situation differs. Out of 22 different books that were used to teach (382) adults in the surveyed institutions in school year 2004-2005, only 9 can be considered coursebooks for teaching general Russian language, but with reservations. That means, the majority of them cannot be compared with coursebooks published by such publishing houses as Oxford University Press, Longman, Cambridge University Press, Edelsa, SM, just to name but a few, who spend huge amounts of money on producing and trying out coursebooks. Russian language coursebooks used in Hungary are often designed for quite a limited national market. The authors do not have the strong financial support of a publishing house behind them. Books are often black-and-white, and the design gives the impression of being rather amateurish (by this remark I do not intend to under-appreciate the enthusiastic and, at the same time, very exhausting work of the authors). Anyway, it is very difficult to objectively compare these kind of books with the courses that are produced for the international market, and attract by being colourful, well-designed, and being accompanied with teacher’s books, workbooks, tapes, videos, CD-s, and even DVD-s. But, probably the main deficiency of Russian language coursebooks used in Hungary is that there are no series, i.e. the LL cannot use a particular series of coursebooks to get from absolute beginner to advanced level. Moreover, the lack of Russian coursebooks on the market sometimes leads to the use of books that originally were designed for children, for example, Русский? Да! (Beccs, Dudics & Vokhmina 2003). This lack of adult coursebooks series may serve as an explanation of the reason why, when teaching the Russian language, “own” teaching materials (i.e. made by teachers themselves) are used. This does not happen so much when teaching English or Spanish. Table 9 (see Appendix VII) shows the coursebooks that 56.9% of adult LLs (214 of
use for learning general Russian. The coursebooks are ranked from the most used at the top to the less used at the bottom. According to the data collected, in school year 2004-2005 the most successful coursebook which was published in Hungary was – Иллюстраци (Székely & Székely 1999): 51,4% of adult learners of general Russian used it. The second on the list – far less popular – was Поездку (Чернышов 2003): only 13,1% of adult learners of general Russian used it. The third, with a very close rate to the previous coursebook, is Перспективы (Костина, Александрова, Василина, Костина 2000): 11,7% used it. The rest of the coursebooks were much less widely used.

The situation with Spanish language coursebooks is getting much better than, for example, it was 10 years ago (see for insightful analysis Jámbor 2001, 2003, 2004a, b). More and more series produced in Spain for international “consuming” have become available in Hungary. In the school year of 2004-2005, I collected the data of about 667 adult Spanish language learners, who used 14 different books. 9 of these books were coursebooks for teaching general Spanish, and 86,4% of adult Spanish language learners (576 of 667) used them (see Table 10 in Appendix VII). According to collected data, the most popular series in school year 2004-2005 was Nuevo ELE (SM): 66,0% of adults learning general Spanish used it. The second most popular series is published in Hungary Spanyol Nyelvkönyv (Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó): 28,5% of adult learners of general Spanish used it. The rest of the coursebooks were much less widely used.

This was the first step to select the corpus of coursebooks to be analysed. As the second step, it seemed interesting to analyse at what levels the majority of Hungarian adults learning FLs for gaining general skills were. The conclusions were made on the basis of the data collected about the coursebooks used. This means, that from one point of view it may be considered as quite insightful: in the case of English – the data were collected from about 3085 adult learners, in the case of Russian – about 214, and in the case of Spanish – about 576. From the other point of view, it can be considered as reliable only when we assume that the centres where the data were collected (universities, colleges, language schools, etc.), when choosing a coursebook for their students, took the level of a given person into account on the basis of a reliable test. Considering the Hungarian specifics, i.e. that the majority of adults take Hungarian state language exams, I classified the population under investigation in three groups: [1] – those who are achieving Hungarian “alapfok” (ca. elementary, closer to pre-intermediate level); [2] – those who are achieving Hungarian “középfok” (intermediate level), and [3] – those who are achieving Hungarian “felsőfok” (advanced level). The results of this analysis are shown in Graph 2.
Graph 2: The proportion of adult LLs at different levels.

As the graph clearly shows, the majority of LLs are at level 1. And the number of LLs at level 1 is higher than for levels 2 and 3. The following diagrams show (see Diagram 1, 2, 3) the proportion of LLs at each level for each language separately.

Diagram 1: The proportion of Hungarian adults learning general English language at levels 1, 2 and 3.

Diagram 2: The proportion of Hungarian adults learning general Russian language at levels 1, 2 and 3.

Diagram 3: The proportion of Hungarian adults learning general Spanish language at levels 1, 2 and 3.

As these diagrams clearly show, the situation is almost similar in the case of the three
languages with respect to the proportion of adult learners according to levels: the majority of them are at level 1. At the other two levels the number of LLs is lower.

The data collected about the number of adult LLs using each coursebook, and the analysis made on diagnosing the number of learners at each level made it possible to narrow the number of coursebooks to be analysed. For each language I took the most widely used coursebooks at level 1 for analysis. In the case of English, these turned out to be *New Headway beginner* (Soars & Soars 2002) and *New Headway elementary* (Soars & Soars 2000). In the case of Russian, *Шаг за шагом* (Székely & Székely 1999), and *Поехали!* (Чернышов 2003). And, in the case of Spanish, *Nuevo ELE inicial 1* (Borobio 2002), and *Nuevo ELE inicial 2* (Borobio 2002).

One would ask whether the selected coursebooks can provide a basis for insightful analysis? I would like to defend my choice with the following arguments:

* First, the two English language coursebooks chosen for analysis cover more than 25% of all adults learning general English (782 out of 3085) and nearly 59% (!) of all adults learning general English at level 1 (782 out of 1335). The two Russian language coursebooks cover almost 65% (!) of all adults learning general Russian (138 out of 214) and more than 84% (!) of all adults learning general Russian at level 1 (138 out of 164). And, the two Spanish language coursebooks cover nearly 48% of all adults learning general Spanish (275 out of 576) and almost 72% (!) of all adults learning general Spanish at level 1 (275 out of 384).

* Second, as experience and classroom observations show, at intermediate and higher levels, the proportion of time spent on work with the coursebook is decreasing in comparison with the lower levels; where more additional materials are brought into the classroom. That means, the influence of coursebooks on LLs progression with regard to both linguistic and intercultural (communicative) competence; can be prognosticated as more considerable at lower levels than at intermediate and higher levels. In other words, LLs at level 1 are more dependent in their progression from coursebooks than at any other level.

* Third, coursebooks for level 1 must be considered more important from the perspective of this research as a “good” start is always essential for further progress.

* Last, without narrowing the number of coursebooks to be analysed, this research would become physically impossible. Although I have collected data about other levels as well (for example, *New Headway* pre-intermediate, *New Headway* intermediate and so on), I decided not to include them in the analysis, and only occasionally bring examples from those tables of analysis. No doubt, that it would be very insightful to include all of the
levels in the analysis; or, for instance, to raise the amplitude of languages, or, maybe, to compare “national” coursebooks to “international” ones. But, taking into account that the instrument elaborated for coursebook analysis – a table – consists of 4 parts, more than 60 variables/parameters, and nearly 400 options, it becomes clear that it is impossible to undertake broader analysis within a PhD research and to keep the format (length) requirements.

Under the pressure of these arguments, and – by all means – recognising the limitations of this sample selection, I decided to make my choice on the above-mentioned 6 coursebooks. However, I would like to note, that while analysing these 6 coursebooks, examples from more than 30 will be given for comparison and for creating a broader view on the possibilities of including an intercultural component in FL coursebooks.

As to adults, the coursebooks used for this age group have been chosen for analysis because I consider it extremely useful to do research into lifelong learning and it is very timely nowadays. On the other hand, it is also more challenging to do an investigation into adults acquiring ICC, because at this age the people have already gone through different stages of socialization, and many have already acquired both – “first-hand” and “second-hand”- stereotypes, which are extremely difficult to be broken down.

As to the choice of foreign languages – English, Russian and Spanish – beyond personal reasons there were few others:

- First, the three above-mentioned languages are, without any doubt, important international languages. They are means of intercultural communication, so called “lingua francas” in quite big territories of the world.

- Second, they not only pertain to different language groups (Germanic, Slavonic, and Romance), but very differing cultures find their expression through these languages. Hence, speaking at least one language from each of these groups is useful not only to become a plurilingual person, but also to become an intercultural one.

- Last, but maybe the most important reason for such choice is the status of these languages in Hungary nowadays. Russian, which was for decades a compulsory language in Hungarian FL education, at the beginning of 1990s suddenly lost its positions. Although some positive tendencies show up in increasing interest in this language, it is still one of the less taught foreign languages in Hungary (according to Bakonyi [Bakonyi 2001], only 1% learn Russian). Since then, English (together with German) is dominating (Cs. Jónás & Fedoszov 1999, Statisztikai Tájékoztató), which undoubtedly reflects in Hungarian FL text- and coursebook market (Szépe 2001). And, Spanish (together with other less taught
languages in Hungary) is becoming more and more popular, but still a very small number of LLs study Spanish in Hungary (Győri 2001a, b; Jámbor 2001). It is not the purpose of this research to deepen into the questions of language policy or to study the coursebook market in Hungary. However, these two undoubtedly influence each other (and, of course, the influence of the first on the second is stronger than vice versa).

2.1.3. Planning the coursebook investigation

Before presenting the actual research design, I would like to note that in the process of planning my investigation I was influenced by such Hungarian scholars as Antal (1976), Falus (1996), Horváth (1972, 1998), and Orosz (1995).

The present research will be identified as descriptive and comparative; evaluative and applied; and as combining qualitative and quantitative methods of research. It is descriptive because its aim is to describe and examine the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of I(C)C. It is comparative because it compares the data collected in English, Russian and Spanish coursebooks. It is evaluative and applied, because the present research aims at assessing the potential of FL coursebooks and suggesting recommendations for its enhancing. And, the final tenet underlying the present research is the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods of research.

In my research I applied both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and analysis, which – though demanding – proved particularly insightful. Quantitative techniques of data collection and analysis allowed for gaining macro-overview insights in coursebook data. They also provided a statistical foundation for generalising research findings. Qualitative techniques, on the other hand, permitted refining the understanding of coursebook data. Therefore, in the following chapter (2.2) the data collected during the investigation will be presented in both forms: (1) statistically – in the form of tables and graphs; and (2) verbally – illustrated with extracts from coursebooks.

To answer the main research question I had to thoroughly analyse the intercultural component of the coursebooks under investigation. I decided to use the technique of content analysis, understanding it in a broader way as, “any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages” (Holsti 1969:14 quoted in Stemler 2001, from web). I chose Holsti’s definition because under this definition the technique of content analysis is not restricted to the domain of textual analysis, but may be applied to other areas (see Stemler 2001). Content analysis proved to be a useful technique for dealing with large volumes of data (like in case of the present research). The coursebooks were analysed using the scheme (table) of analysis (more about it in following
section). I have chosen the 'a priori' way of coding, i.e. the categories (variables) were established prior to the analysis based upon the theory framework discussed in the first part of my dissertation. During the process of analysis necessary revisions were made to tighten up the categories. To define coding units, I considered (1) the natural (physical) borders of material in FL coursebooks; and (2) the way teachers are planning the lessons. Taking into account these two aspects, I decided to choose 'a unit in a coursebook' as a coding unit.

2.1.4. Data collection

The methodology employed to find out the way culture is dealt with in English, Russian and Spanish coursebooks used for adults in Hungary and the evaluation of the potential of these books for promoting the acquisition of ICC consists in the use of a scheme (table) of intercultural analysis (see Appendix VIII). The use of a table in the case of content analysis is widely applied and is reasoned not only while collecting data, but also while analysing and comparing them (Antal 1976, Golnhofer & Nádasi 1982, Krippendorf 1980, Orosz 1995, Szabolcs 1996). The idea itself was adapted from Méndez García (2003:59-69), in whose table the variants were grouped around four main categories: objectives, contents, methodology and assessment. Most parameters for evaluation of intercultural component of FL coursebooks were borrowed from Méndez García (ibid.) and new ones we added basing on the works of such outstanding experts in the field as Byram, Esarte-Sarries, Gullestrup, Hall and Hall, Hofstede, Sercu, Stern, and Trompenaars, just to name but a few, whose theories and ideas were discussed in detail in the first part of this PhD dissertation.

The table consists of 63 variables (grouped around four main categories: objectives, contents, methodology and assessment, as I have already mentioned), and each of the variables having several options (totalling 385). In order to endow the table with the necessary objectivity, as well as to delimit the analysis somehow, to the right of each parameter, at the end of the list of a series of options, usually two heterogeneous categories were added, viz. "other" and "not applicable/not found" or alike. These categories help record the data that cannot be assigned to the previous ones on the list.

Block 1, (1.1 – 1.5) – Intercultural objectives – was included, first of all, because it seemed to be important to reveal whether the coursebook author(s) consciously include(s) intercultural component into his/her book (1.1) and what changes s/he (they) expect(s) from LLs with regard to intercultural (communicative) competence (1.3) (see Table 11/1 bellow; for the whole scheme for analysis of intercultural component in FL coursebooks see Appendix VIII). The objectives are to be investigated with regard to their character. The classification of (inter)cultural objectives was based on a proposal by Stern (1992), according
to whom the objectives can be divided on cognitive (1.2.a), behavioural (1.2.b), and affective (1.2.c). Under cognitive objectives acquisition of cultural knowledge, awareness about cultural differences, willingness to describe, analyse and generalise are understood. Under behavioural objectives the development of skills of behaving and interpreting others’ behaviour in a culturally appropriate way are understood. And, under affective objectives intellectual curiosity, interest, and empathy are understood.

| Table 11/1: Intercultural objectives – the first block of the scheme for analysis of intercultural component in FL coursebooks (adapted from Méndez García 2003:59-60) |
|---|---|
| **Variable** | **Options** |
| 1.1. Explicitly expressed | a) yes  
b) yes, but as cultural and not intercultural  
c) no |
| 1.2. By character | a) cognitive  
b) behavioural  
c) affective  
d) other  
e) not applicable |
| 1.3. Changes expected from learner | a) realistic  
b) not realistic  
c) there are not any expectations  
d) other  
e) not found |
| 1.4. Relation to linguistic | a) dominance of (inter)cultural objectives  
b) balance between (inter)cultural and linguistic objectives  
c) dominance of linguistic objectives  
d) exclusivity of linguistic objectives  
e) other  
f) absolute absence of objectives of any type |
| 1.5. General evaluation of intercultural objectives | a) appropriate  
b) limited  
c) other  
d) not found |

The second block (2.1 – 2.12.3) – Intercultural contents – was planned to be investigated more in detail. First, I decided to clear up whether the intercultural contents are present in the table/ or map of contents explicitly or not (2.1) (see 2.1 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

Second, it seemed interesting to reveal what topics are treated in coursebooks and in what proportion (2.2), and at which level: micro-, macro- or intercultural/ international one (2.3) (see 2.2-2.3 in Table 11, Appendix VIII). Here I would like to make a note that the list of topics was the result of preliminary study.

Third, under Intercultural (international) level of contents (2.4), I investigated several parameters: how many cultures are mentioned (2.4.1); whether there is comparison of the target culture(s) with other culture(s); whether stress is made on similarities or differences (2.4.2); and, whether the relations between or opinions about different cultures are shown
(2.4.3) (see 2.4 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

Four, I decided to find out which aspects of intercultural competence are addressed in coursebooks (2.5). I investigated whether such aspects as savoirs (2.5.1) and savoir être (2.5.2) are addressed in the coursebook or not (see 2.5 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

Five, I was curious what characters are statistically „dominating” the coursebook, therefore, I collected the data about characters’ age (2.6.1), gender (2.6.2), social class / group (2.6.3), race / ethnics (2.6.4), family type (2.6.5), types of characters (2.6.6) and their nationality (2.6.7). It is in close connection with the next parameter (2.7). As not only the characters themselves were of interest, but also the interaction between them, I decided to investigate: where a given interaction takes place (2.7.1 and 2.7.2), its atmosphere (2.7.3), what cultures are ‘interacting’ (2.7.4) (see 2.6-2.7 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

Six, I considered it extremely important to find out more about stereotypes in FL coursebooks, so I included the following questions in the table: about which culture – target, learners, or other – the stereotypes can be found in the coursebook (2.8.1); on what topic – gender, nationality, etc. (2.8.2); and whether they are treated or not (2.8.3). The importance of such analysis was reasoned in section (1.2.4), when I discussed the role of stereotyping in the process of culture learning (see 2.8 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

Seven, the author’s point of view / or position was also of my interest: whether it is inner or outer (2.9.1), positive, critical, neutral, etc. (2.9.2) (see 2.9 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

Eight, as I completely agree with those scholars who stress the role of visual elements in the process of learning (e.g. Horváth 1998, Tang 1994), I decided to include the analysis of illustrations in the table (2.10). I have not included the discussion of the role of illustrations in the theoretical part of my dissertation, because for analysis I have selected only those “visible” aspects of illustrations, which may be easily recognised by both language teachers and learners, and therefore may (1) influence the choice of the coursebook; (2) ease the understanding of the coursebook contents. These parameters are the type of illustrations (2.10.1); the colour (2.10.2), the connection between illustrations (2.10.3), whether they are appropriate or not (2.10.4) (see 2.10 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

Next, and probably one of the parts of the table which deserve the most attention, is Cultural information (2.11). Here, I decided to investigate the following parameters: the characteristics of the information (e.g. genuine, insightful, stereotyped, etc.) (2.11.1); its geographical amplitude (2.11.2); whether values, beliefs and attitudes are personal, universal, or cultural (2.11.4) and are expressed explicitly or not (2.11.3); the non-verbal communication (2.11.5); cultural dimensions (2.11.6), which were discussed in detail in section 1.1.2; and, how are they treated (2.11.7) (see 2.11 in Table 11 Appendix VIII).
Last part of the second block is dedicated to the evaluation of intercultural contents (2.12), which contains the evaluation of intercultural contents in relation to intercultural objectives (2.12.1), and in relation to language (2.12.2). The second block of the table ends by general evaluation of intercultural contents (2.12.3) (see 2.12 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

The third block (3.1 – 3.9.3) – Methodology of intercultural language learning – is of less volume to the previous one. It mirrors the lack of a sound theoretical basis for ILL. Despite this, I decided to investigate parameters which – in my view – are essential to intercultural language learning.

First, I decided to find out which aspects of intercultural competence are addressed at this level (3.1), i.e. which skills the exercises and activities in a given coursebook are developing: (3.1.1) Savoir comprendre; (3.1.2) Savoir apprendre / faire; (3.1.3) Savoir s’engager (see 3.1 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

Second, I wanted to reveal on what the intercultural learning is based (3.2): on (traditionally) linguistic activities; on activities for intercultural training or other. In case it is built on specific activities / techniques, what are they (3.3), and on which culture they focus (3.4) (see 3.2-3.4 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

Third, I was curious, what language skills are usually involved in the process of ILL (3.5); and, whether coursebook activities develop such skills necessary for developing IC as observing, identifying, recognising, comparing, contrasting, negotiating meaning, etc. (3.6) (see 3.5-3.6 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

Fourth, I was also willing to reveal whether a coursebook has potential to develop strategies needed for successful intercultural communication such as: problem-solving, coping, guessing (3.7) (see 3.7 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

Next, I analysed the tasks for intercultural language learning, with regard to the involvement of LLs (3.8.1), and whether these activities are cognitive, cognitive-attitudinal, exploration, production of materials, enactment or other (3.8.2) (see 3.8 in Table 11, Appendix VIII). Distinguishing between these types of tasks is useful for description of the intercultural component being more precise (see 1.3.5).

As in the previous block, I ended with evaluation: I tried to evaluate the intercultural methodology in relation to intercultural objectives (3.9.1), in relation to intercultural contents (3.9.2), and provide general evaluation of intercultural methodology (3.9.3) (see 3.9 in Table 11, Appendix VIII).

The fourth block (4.1 – 4.3.4) is dedicated to the inclusion of (inter)cultural elements into assessment (see 4. block in Table 11, Appendix VIII). As already discussed in section 1.2.5.2, the assessment of intercultural (communicative) competence is not developed yet. For
this reason, its inclusion in FL coursebook is also very problematic, and needs further elaboration. However, I tried to gain some insights into the matter, i.e. to investigate whether there are any guidelines for assessing intercultural component (4.1); and, to compare the assessment of intercultural component to the assessment of linguistic component (4.2). At the end I tried to evaluate the assessment of intercultural component in relation to intercultural objectives (4.3.1), in relation to intercultural contents (4.3.2); in relation to intercultural methodology (4.3.3); and to evaluate it in general (4.3.4).

Summarising, I would like to stress that all these parameters were chosen on the basis of theoretical findings discussed in part 1 of this dissertation (Theoretical framework). This scheme (table) of analysis aims at providing, on the one hand, an in-depth study of the (inter)cultural component in each coursebook while, on the other hand, it is an excellent means of comparing and contrasting the results obtained in each of them so as to draw general conclusions. The main limitation of this table is that it is too detailed. It would be naive to believe that FL teachers will use it for choosing the coursebook, not to mention the fact that this table was created exclusively for analysis of the intercultural component. Teachers making their choice have to pay attention to many other components such as grammar, vocabulary, etc. However, I believe, that this table may serve as a good starting point for those who are concerned with incorporating an intercultural component in FLT in general and in FL coursebooks and materials in particular.

2.1.5. Data analysis and presentation

For analysis only material found in FL coursebooks (Student’s books) was taken. As not all coursebooks have accompanying Workbooks, Video, etc. these materials were not analysed. Moreover, the fact that a given coursebook is used in a language classroom does not automatically mean that the teacher also uses the material that accompanies it. This is proved by the preliminary study I made in 2002 (not published). It aimed at showing to what extent the various teaching materials and tools are used in the FL classroom. 100% of FL teachers (N=30) responded that they regularly use textbooks in their lessons, some of whom (N=24) quite often use tapes (in 30% of lessons) but rarely Videos (in 5 % of lessons), and only an insignificant number of teachers (N=1) identified tools such as a CD-ROM, but it was also mentioned that this was used very rarely.

The combination of qualitative and quantiative modes of data collection required a similar combination of modes of analysis. For quantitative analysis, the data collected with the help of above-discussed scheme (table) will be presented in table 12 (separately for each analysed coursebook). (The table is included in the text in a shortened form, for the whole
table see Appendix IX).

Except for the block of objectives, each unit will be analysed with regard to each of the parameters, and options detected in the unit will be registered accordingly. In the last column the proportion of units, where a given option was detected, will be scored (in %). For example, score 100,0 will mean that the option was detected in each of the units.

Table 12: Table for gathering the data (adapted from Méndez García 2003:81-82).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of coursebook:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables

1. Intercultural objectives
   1.1
   ...

2. Intercultural contents
   2.1
   ...

3. Methodology of intercultural language learning
   3.1.1
   ...

4. Inclusion of intercultural elements into assessment
   4.1
   ...

For working with this (huge) data I will use statistical descriptive techniques. At the end, the proportions of each variable option will be counted (in %), and compared with the results of the analysis of other coursebooks. For qualitative analysis I will use extracts and illustrations from coursebooks. The data will be presented in the form of tables, graphs, diagrams as well as in the form of verbal evaluation. The tables with data collected about the coursebooks can be found in Appendix X. In the text, only parts of the tables will be presented.
2.2. Analysis of the intercultural component in selected FL coursebooks

2.2.1. Selected English language coursebooks

As discussed in section (2.1.2) which deals with sample selection, among coursebooks used for Hungarian adults learning general English the following books were chosen for analysis:

- *New Headway* beginner (Soars & Soars 2002)
- *New Headway* elementary (Soars & Soars 2000)

In school year 2004-2005, these coursebooks were used by 25.4% (782 out of 3085) of Hungarian adults learning general English: *New Headway* beginner – 4.3%, and *New Headway* elementary – 21.1%.

These coursebooks are the same series published by Oxford University Press.

The data collected on these two coursebooks can be found in Tables A and B of Appendix X (Table A – for *New Headway* beginner, and Table B – for *New Headway* elementary). In text, when analysing the coursebooks, I will use the abbreviations [NHB] for *New Headway* beginner, and [NHe] for *New Headway* elementary.

2.2.1.1. Intercultural objectives in selected English language coursebooks

As already discussed above, the first block of analysis represents the analysis of *Intercultural objectives*. This aims at revealing whether the coursebook authors *consciously* include an intercultural component in their books in order to promote LLs’ acquisition of intercultural communicative competence and what changes they expect from LLs with regard to ICC.

For both analysed English language coursebooks the situation is completely the same: the objectives are formulated as cultural (1.1.b=100,0%) and not intercultural; by character these objectives are behavioural (1.2.b=100,0%). The authors have some realistic expectations: they want LLs to be able to use everyday English in simple social situations, like shopping, classroom, airport, etc. (1.3.a=100,0%), but they do not have any expectations with regard to developing LLs’ intercultural communicative competence.

To sum up, in both English coursebooks linguistic objectives are dominant (1.4.c=100,0%), and cultural objectives can be considered as being very limited (1.5.b=100,0%) (for scores see Tables A and B in Appendix X).

2.2.1.2. Intercultural contents in selected English language coursebooks

In the analysis of intercultural contents, I started with an investigation of the maps of contents (2.1). In both – NHB and NHe – culture is included in the map of contents under the title *Everyday English*. It can be concluded from these objectives, that the users of the coursebooks
are expected to be able to use everyday English in simple social situations.

I felt it interesting to investigate what topics are treated in these coursebooks and in what proportion (2.2), i.e. what is the number of units in which these topics are treated (see Graph 3).

![Graph 3: Proportions of topics treated in NHb and NHe.](image)

Such topics as Economy... (g), Education ...(h), Social life & institutions...(o), Animal world (s), Politics (w), National symbols (x), Religion (z), Migrants (dd), Law & Crime (ee), Poverty...(ff), Intercultural contacts...(ii), and Culture shock (ji) are not dealt with in any of the two books. One may argue that these topics require a higher level of language skills than beginner or elementary. However, the analysis of New Headway pre-intermediate [NHp-i] (Soars & Soars 2000) and New Headway intermediate [NHi] (Soars & Soars 2003), shows that this cannot be considered as proof. For instance, topic (h) appears at pre-intermediate level, but does not appear at intermediate; or, topic (o) does not appear even at intermediate level (meanwhile, this is one of the topics for discussion in the Hungarian state language exam at intermediate level [2] – "középfok").
In both coursebooks – NHB and NHe – the most often treated topic turned out to be Geography/ countries/ places of residence (NHB 2.2.c=42,9% and NHe 2.2.c=64,3%). The second most often treated topic in NHB is Personal identity... (2.2.c=35,7%), and in NHe is – with the same score – Work professions... (2.2.i=35,7%). Another quite “popular” topic in both coursebooks is Free time... (NHB 2.2.a=21,4% and NHe 2.2.a=28,5%). At higher levels it is less often treated, for example, in NHp-i – 2.2.a=7,1% (only in one unit), in NHi – 2.2.a=16,7%.

Surprisingly, it turned out that such a “basic” topic as Family and Interpersonal Relations (2.2.aa) is not among the most “popular” topics: in NHB 2.2.aa=14,3% and in NHe 2.2.aa=21,4%. Further analysis showed that in these two coursebooks family is usually presented as nuclear (see 2.6.5. in Tables A and B, Appendix X). As a rule, it is a happy, “problem-free”, healthy and wealthy couple with two children – a boy and a girl (see Illustration 1).

![Sally's Family](image)

**Illustration 1:** New Headway beginner, p.24.

Another topic, capital “C”- Culture can be found in NHe and with quite a high score 2.2.b=28,6%, but not in NHB. Neither Culture comparison (kk), nor Stereotypes (II) were found at beginner’s level, but were found at elementary level (NHe 2.2.kk=7,1% and 2.2.ll=7,1%).

Summarising the discussion of topics found in these coursebooks, I would like to note that nobody expects that all kinds of topics are dealt with in language coursebooks; nobody
supposes that a FL coursebook is an Encyclopaedia. But, it would definitely be useful, if the author when planning the contents of his/her book, kept in his/her mind what cultural segments should be included in it. In section 1.1.2 of Theoretical part I have discussed the stratified model of Gullestrup (1992), according to whom there are eight cultural segments which understanding is important for the understanding of any given culture, viz. (1) Technology; (2) Economic institutions; (3) Social institutions; (4) Political institution; (5) Language and Communication; (6) Reproduction and Socialisation; (7) Ideology; (8) Religious institutions. This model can be used as a sort of checklist for coursebook authors. And, it is extremely interesting and useful to apply it to analysis of a series. For example, if we suppose that there are some Hungarian adults, who while preparing for elementary level Hungarian state language exam ("alapfok"), learn first from NHb and then from NHe, we can check whether they are provided with knowledge about all necessary aspects (segments) of culture just by using these coursebooks or not (see Table 13).

Table 13: Segments of culture treated in NHb and NHe (on base of Gullestrup’s model 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gullestrup’s segments</th>
<th>NHb</th>
<th>NHe</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social institutions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political institutions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction and Socialisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious institutions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, as the table shows, five of Gullestrup’s eight segments are touched in NHb and NHe (the depth of treatment is not under investigation). The authors do not discuss such topics as Socialisation, and, trying to write a “politically correct” coursebooks they avoid discussion of such topics as Politics and Religion. (Later, these topics appear, for example, at pre-intermediate or intermediate level of New Headway, but only in one unit in each of the books).

The next step in the analysis of intercultural component in coursebooks was to reveal at which level these topics are treated (2.3): micro-, macro- or intercultural/ international ones. In each unit of both English language coursebooks, the treatment of topics on micro-level was detected (2.3.a=100,0%). In NHb treatment of topics on a macro- level was detected in two units (2.2.b=14,3%), and on an intercultural/ international level – none (2.3.c=0,0%). In NHe treatment at macro- level was detected in four units (2.3.b=28,6%) and on intercultural/ international – in two (2.3.c=14,3%).
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Under *Intercultural (international) level of contents* (2.4), I investigated several parameters and it turned out that in both *NHb* and *NHe* in the majority of units five or more various cultures appear (in both books 2.4.1.c=71.4%). In *NHe* cultures are usually compared (2.4.2.a=85.7%), which is very important for raising intercultural awareness. In the case of *NHb* this score is much lower (2.4.2.a=21.4%). It was found that in *NHe* in seven units the emphasis was made on differences (2.4.2.f=50.0%), and only in two – on similarities (2.4.2.e=14.3%).

The next parameter to investigate was the relationship between cultures, and their opinions about each other, in case they are expressed. More often the relations between “target and other” or “learner’s and other” cultures were shown, and less often between different target cultures themselves. And in one unit of *NHe* the relations between other countries were shown (2.4.3.e=7.1%). (In one unit of *NHp-i* the opinion of a Hungarian about American culture was given (2.4.3.a=7.1%), see U.2, p. 19).

When trying to describe the potential of coursebooks under investigation for promoting the acquisition of ICC, it was important to find out whether such aspects of ICC as *savoirs* and *savoirs être* are addressed in the coursebooks. In both *NHb* and *NHe* culture general knowledge was found in one unit (2.5.1.b=7.1%). Opposite to it, culture specific knowledge appears in six units in *NHb* and in seven units in *NHe*. This totally contradicts today’s view on culture learning (Paige et al. 2003:176), according to which the shift from “culture-specific” to “culture-general” knowledge should be made, because only this way the intercultural competence may be acquired (it was discussed in Section 1.2.4).

Knowledge of self and other (Byram 1997), or – according to Paige and Stringer (1997) – learning about the self as a cultural being, is also very important. Though in *NHb* this aspect is not addressed, in *NHe* it is addressed in 57.1% of units (see 2.5.1.c in Table B, Appendix X). But, for example, such tasks as ex.3, p.55 in *NHe*, would be more interesting (and useful) to do in a multicultural classroom. Insights regarding the ways in which culture affects language and communication are not provided in *NHb* nor in *NHe* (2.5.1.d=0.0%).

In 42.9% of units in *NHe* the attempt to develop the attitude to relativise self and value others is made (e.g. ex. 6 p. 65: “Imagine you are one of the people…”). In *NHb* more stress is done on creating a positive disposition towards learning about other cultures (2.5.2.b=42.9%).

Regarding the characters depicted in *NHb* and *NHe*, some interesting observations were done. Both *NHb* and *NHe* depict quite a broad range of characters. The illustrations also help enormously to enlarge the gallery of social images. However, the quantitative analysis of these coursebooks showed that there are some types of characters that are dominating. For
instance, since Headway series was written for adults and young adults, the characters of children, teenagers and old people appear very rarely, while the adult characters are presented in each unit (see scores for 2.6.1 in Tables A & B, Appendix X).

The quantitative analysis of two books from a gender perspective resulted in identical scores for both males and females in NHb (2.6.2.a & b=100,0%). In NHe male characters were present in 100,0% of units and females only in 85,7%. But, of course, the formal numerical analysis of the coursebooks is not sufficient when dealing with identities in general and gender in particular. It was positive to notice that the authors of Headway tried to avoid stereotypes on gender roles (though I found one example of stereotyping gender roles in U.2 of NHp-i (Soars & Soars 2000), in NHb and NHe I have not found such). In both NHb and NHe, women are depicted as completely socially engaged. LLs see them situated not only in the family domain, but also being successful professionally, e.g. Bobbi Brown, who works for SKY TV in New York City (NHe, p.28), or Alison Hauser, works at the Institute of Molecular Biology in Geneva (see Illustration 2).

\[\text{Illustration 2: New Headway elementary, p.20.}\]

The qualitative analysis also showed that in both NHb and NHe the majority of characters are representatives of the middle class. Representatives of the working class are depicted less often and representatives of the upper class appear only in NHb (for scores see 2.6.3 in Tables A & B, Appendix X). Interestingly, in the highest proportion in both books the students are,
and very often LLs themselves are involved in the interactions.

Also, the authors of *Headway* tried to show that contemporary English societies are multi-ethnic. The scores for “White”, “Black” and “Asian” characters are the same in *NHb* and *NHe*: 100.0%, 64.3%, and 35.7% respectively. The illustrations play an important role in broadening the range of characters with regard to the races they belong to.

Curiously enough, a typical English or American family are depicted as nuclear, moreover, in the majority of cases having two children – a boy and a girl (see illustration 1 (*NHb*, p.24), and also *NHb* p.26). This does not really reflect the demographical processes going on in today’s English-speaking societies, for which divorces have become quite typical. Only in one unit of *NHb* does a divorced woman appear (2.6.5.b=7.1%). But even in this case, the divorced person is depicted as a happy, wealthy woman who managed to get married again (see Illustration 3).

![Illustration 3: New Headway beginner, p.49.](image)

With regard to the types of characters, it was observed that native speakers appear in each unit of both books (2.6.6.a=100.0%), also in a big proportion non-native residents are present (*NHb* 2.6.6.b=64.3% and *NHe* 2.6.6.b=57.1%). The proportion of tourists is lower (*NHb* 2.6.6.c=28.6% and *NHe* 2.6.6.c=14.3%). Famous personalities appear in the same proportion in the two books (*NHb* 2.6.6.f=14.3% and *NHe* 2.6.6.f=14.3%). Also I noticed that while in *NHb* some characters seem to be over-generalised, in *NHe* authors try to introduce simple everyday people.

More problematic seems the presentation of characters with regard to their nationalities. The English and the American characters are dominating. Other nationalities speaking English as a native language appear only in one or two units, if at all.

Besides the statistical analysis of characters, I felt it important to analyse the interactions presented in the coursebooks. It was observed that in the predominant majority of units the interactions are taking place in towns (*NHb* 2.7.1.b=85.7% and *NHe* 2.7.1.b=92.9%),
and in quite a high proportion of units the interactions take place in capitals (\(NHb\) 2.7.1.a=50,0% and \(NHe\) 2.7.1.a=64,3%). And only in less than one third of units the interactions are placed outside town in the country (\(NHb\) and \(NHe\) 2.7.1.c=28,6%).

Graph 4 shows, which are the places the interactions are situated in. In \(NHb\) the largest number of interactions are situated at home (2.7.2.a=78,6%), and a little bit less often – in a street, park, etc. (2.7.2.f=57,1%). In \(NHe\) most interactions are situated at home and in a shop, a restaurant, etc. (2.7.2.a=50,0% and 2.7.2.g=50,0%). Surprisingly, the interactions taking place in such places as hotels, airport, or by phone have quite a low score. And no mention of Internet was found.

Graph 4: Places interactions are situated in in \(NHb\) and \(NHe\).

Though the desire of authors to write a positive, pleasant book is understandable, we should not forget that the purpose of FLT is, first of all, to provide LLs with linguistic instruments they may use in various communicative situations, including conflicts and intercultural misunderstandings. Unfortunately, this cannot be said about these two books. The atmosphere of interactions is almost always friendly, and only in a few cases it is neutral or conflicting (see scores for 2.7.3 in Tables A & B, Appendix X). But, from these representations of conflicts LLs can learn hardly anything (see Illustration 4).
Illustration 4: New Headway elementary, p.103.

Probably one of the most interesting variables about interactions is 2.7.4, which describes the cultures between whose representatives the interaction takes place. In my view, the proportions found in the coursebooks are justifiable. The fact that in the majority of the units the interactions take place between representatives of target cultures (NHb 2.7.4.d=92,9% and NHe 2.7.4.d=100,0%); or between representatives of target and other cultures (NHb 2.7.4.b=78,6% and NHe 2.7.4.b=28,6%); or between learners themselves (NHb 2.7.4.f=92,9% and NHe 2.7.4.f=100,0%), serves the general purposes of FL coursebooks: (1) to show the correct use of target language, (2) to depict the typical situations of interactions between natives and non-natives, and (3) to make LLs interact using target language.

As discussed in the Theoretical part of my dissertation, stereotypes may serve as a major hindrance to successful intercultural communication, and the acquisition of ICC can be seen as the process of combating them (see section 1.2.4). In light of this, I analysed whether there is any stereotyped information in the FL coursebooks under examination. The analysis showed that the authors of Headway considered it extremely important to avoid any stereotypes; hence neither stereotypical representation of cultures, nor stereotyped information on gender, nationality, age, class, etc. was found in these two books.

Above, the analysis of the coursebooks at micro-, macro- and intercultural/international levels was done. According to Risager (1991) and Byram and Esarte-Sarries (1991), who took the traditions of ‘literary realism’, the fourth dimension of coursebook analysis should be the analysis of the viewpoint taken by the author, (either explicitly or implicitly) (see section 1.3.4 in Theoretical framework). Trying to remain as objective as possible, I examined: first, whether the author’s position is inner or outer in representation of target culture (2.9.1); second, whether his/her description of target culture is positive, critical, fictional, or journalistic (2.9.2).

The analysis showed that in NHb and NHe authors occupy the inner position (2.9.1.a=100,0%), and only in rare cases the “outsider” point of view is given (NHb 2.9.1.b=7,1% and NHe 2.9.2.b=21,4%). For example, in NHb Dublin is seen through the eyes
of two Italian students, Doan and Sergio (p.53). In both books target culture is described positively, only in two cases in NHe some critical remarks were detected (2.9.2.b=14,3%). For example, how hard black people worked (16 hours a day) in the cotton fields in the USA. The authors have chosen “journalistic” style, and only in two units fiction was used (see Illustration 5).

Illustration 5: New Headway elementary, p.104.

In creating the “realistic” picture of target culture illustrations play an important role. From this point Headway should be highly praised. These coursebooks are not simply attractive and colourful, but contain a wide range of illustrations – from photos and caricatural drawings/comics to life-like drawings and maps (for scores see 2.10.1 in Tables A & B, Appendix X). The illustrations are appropriate and help to better understand the contents of the coursebooks (especially the sequenced illustrations accompanying the texts).

It was also very interesting to investigate the characteristics of cultural information given in the books. In general, it can be defined as positive (NHB 2.11.1.d=100,0% and NHe 2.11.1.d=85,7%). The proportions of insightful vs. superficial information are almost the same (NHB 2.11.1.b=57,1% vs 2.11.1.c=50,0%, and NHe 2.11.1.b=57,1% vs 2.11.1.c=57,1%). Negative information was found only in two units in NHe. And in the same book, in half of the units I found texts that are genuine or genuine-like (e.g. a text about Joanne Ussery, who lives on a jet plane, NHe p.41, Illustration 6).
The lady who lives on a plane

Joanne Usery, 54, from Mississippi is a big favourite with her two grandsons because she lives on a jet plane. Her home is a Boeing 727, so a visit to grandma is very special.

Illustration 6: New Headway elementary, p.41.

Analysis of geographical amplitude of information revealed that in NHb most often the information referring to England appear (2.11.2.a=71.4%), and in NHs – the USA (2.11.2.g=85.7%). GB as a whole is rarely referred to. Quite often in both books the information on non-English-speaking countries may be found (Hungary is mentioned once in NHb and twice in NHs). Information on such countries as Canada or Australia is rarely given, not to speak about Ireland, Scotland, etc. (see Graph 5). The geographical amplitude of Headway is very similar to that of other EFL coursebooks, which are England and the USA-centred.

When analysing values, beliefs and attitudes in these two coursebooks, I found out that in the majority of cases they are expressed explicitly, but it refers mainly to attitudes. And these are of a personal character. Universal values and beliefs can also be found (NHb 2.11.4.b=7,1% and NHs 2.11.4.b=35,7%). And in NHs cultural ones were found in great proportion (2.11.4.c=71,4%). For example, in U.4 a Canadian, a Brazilian and a Japanese talk about their favourite seasons, and what they like doing (pp.32-33).
Although non-verbal communication plays an enormous role in communication in general, one does not expect that foreign language coursebooks deal with non-verbal communication (though it is arguable whether the coursebooks should deal with it or not). However, I was curious whether non-verbal communication appears in FL coursebooks or not and in what form (explicit or implicit)?

The analysis showed that in an implicit form non-verbal communication appears in every unit of NHb and NHe (see Illustration 7). Explicitly in New Headway it appears later, e.g.: in intermediate level (see a text on A world guide to Good Manners in U. 4, p.35).

In the Theoretical part of my research, the detailed discussion of cultural dimensions was offered (see section 1.1.2). I was curious to know how English language coursebooks under examination treat these cultural dimensions. First of all, I should stress that in all cases when cultural dimensions find their reflection in these coursebooks, they are reflected implicitly.
As observed from Graph 6, in NHb most often such cultural dimensions are reflected as: achievement/ascription (in 42,9% of units); attitudes to time (monochronic/polychronic, etc.) (in 35,7% of units); and masculinity/femininity (in 21,4% of units). In NHe the range of cultural dimensions that are quite often reflected is wider: personal space (in 92,9% of units); achievement/ascription and masculinity/femininity (in 71,4% of units); attitudes to time (monochronic/polychronic, etc.) (in 42,9% of units); individualism/collectivism (in 28,6% of units); and universalism/particularism (in 21,4% of units).

In my view, the scores for these dimensions are emerging not by coincidence. Every coursebook is the product of its culture, and for English and American cultures (which most often appear in these two books), such dimensions as achievement/ascription, individualism/collectivism, universalism/particularism, masculinity/femininity, and attitudes to time (monochronic/polychronic, etc.) are important indeed (see section 1.1.2 in Theoretical Framework and also Appendix X).

The reflection of some of these dimensions is especially important for Hungarian LLs for better understanding of these target cultures because the difference in the scores is significant (e.g. see scores for individualism/collectivism (IND), masculinity/femininity (MAS), and uncertainty avoidance (UAI) in Graph 7).
The graph 7 shows the high *individualism* (IDV) ranking for United Kingdom and the United States, which indicates that the populace is more self-reliant and looks out for themselves and their close family members. Moreover, for the UK and USA, IDV is their highest-ranking dimension. The next highest Hofstede dimension is *masculinity* (MAS: UK=66, USA=62), which is higher than the world average of 50, but still much lower than for Hungary (88). This indicates that the UK and USA experience a higher degree of gender differentiation of roles. On the one hand – males dominate a significant portion of the society and power structure, and on the other – this situation generates a female population that becomes more assertive and competitive, with women shifting toward the male role model and away from their female role. And, the third dimension mentioned in graph 7 is *uncertainty avoidance* (UAI). For both the UK and USA the scores for UAI are lower than the world average of 64 (UAI UK=35, USA=46). This low ranking indicates that these societies have fewer rules and do not attempt to control all outcomes and results; they also have a greater level of tolerance for a variety of ideas, thoughts, and beliefs. On the other hand, Hungary has a low tolerance for ambiguity (UAI=82). This creates a highly rule-oriented society that institutes laws, rules and regulations in order to reduce the amount of uncertainty within the population. While the cultural dimension of MAS is reflected in both *NHb* and *NHe*, IND is reflected only in *NHe*, and UAI unfortunately is not reflected in either of the two books (2.11.6.d=0,0%). But, again this proves, that each language coursebook is the product of its culture (and for English-speaking cultures this dimension does not seem to be so important to be reflected in the coursebook).

Concluding, the intercultural contents can be evaluated as "limited", only in three units of *NHe* they can be evaluated as "appropriate" (2.12.3.a=21,4%). But, this does not mean that there is a tendency for increasing volume of intercultural contents with the level of the book getting higher. As I mentioned, I also analysed higher level coursebooks, and while at pre-intermediate level in *NHp-i* the proportion of "appropriate" intercultural contents is 50,0%, in *NHi* it is lower again – 33,3%. In general, in two *Headway* books there is no balance between
language and culture, language is more relevant (2.12.2.a=100,0%), and even in relation to objectives expressed by the authors themselves the intercultural contents have many deficiencies (NHb 2.12.1.b=100,0% and NHc 2.12.1.b=78,6%).

2.2.1.3. Methodology of intercultural language learning in selected English language coursebooks

In section 1.2.2 of Theoretical framework, I discussed the concepts of intercultural and intercultural communicative competence. As a basis for the discussion, Byram’s model of savoirs (1997) was taken (see Fig. 8). Also, following the well-known Bloom’s taxonomy (see section 1.2.2), these competences were discussed as a complex of cognitive, affective and behavioural factors.

On the basis of these assumptions, the methodology of ILL should be understood as a sum of methods, principles, activities and tasks, which promote the development of each of the savoirs, and take into account all factors – cognitive, affective or behavioural.

Illustration 8: New Headway elementary p.70-71.

The analysis showed that existing FL coursebooks (not only those that were chosen for investigation, but many others as well), on the level of methodology, are very poor. They are not promoting the development of intercultural competence as a whole, only some aspects of it. For instance, in NHb not only was any activity found that could promote the development of savoir comprendre (i.e. ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to
explain it and relate it to documents or events from one's own) (3.1.1.a=0.0%), but, in NHe in 7 of 14 units such activities were found (3.1.1.a=50.0%). For example, in Unit 9 (see Illustration 8), there is a Reading and Speaking activity, in which LLs, first, have to talk about their country: Which food and drink comes from your country? Which foreign food and drink is popular in your country? Then, they have to identify places and nationalities in the photographs, and read the text about Food around the world.

It was pleasant to find out that in both NHB and NHe the ability to interact is being developed (NHB 3.1.2.a=92.9% and NHe 3.1.2.a=100.0%). For example, in the same activity (see Illustration 8), LLs are asked to discuss in small groups these questions about their country (NHe, p.70): What is a typical breakfast? What does your family have for breakfast? Is lunch or dinner the main meal of the day? What is a typical main meal? But, the ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and operate it, is not being developed (3.1.2.b=0.0%). The ability to critically evaluate perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures (savoir s'engager) is being developed in one unit in NHB and in four units of NHe. For example, in U.10 NHe (pp.78-79) LLs have to read about such famous towns as New Orleans, Vienna, Liverpool, and then to answer the questions about their town, and write some similar information about it.

The analysis showed that IL in these coursebooks is based mainly on linguistic activities. In NHe only one activity which is often used in intercultural training (viz. culture capsule) and another which can be considered a combination of linguistic and intercultural activities (viz. quiz, see Illustration 9) were found. Both address culture-specific knowledge.

[Image of a GENERAL KNOWLEDGE QUIZ]

Graph 8 shows that in these tasks the focus is made mainly on target culture, or to a lesser degree on other cultures. The scores for learner's culture explains the fact that learners are invited to talk about their own culture and experiences. In two units of *NHb* the focus is also on universal values. And the focus on comparison of cultures, unfortunately, was found only in one unit of *NHb*.

Most often such language skills are involved as listening, reading and speaking, and more rarely writing (see scores for 3.5 in Tables A & B, Appendix X). Other skills involved are:

- observing, identifying and recognising (*NHb* 3.6.a=14,3% and *NHb* 3.6.a=57,1%);
- comparing and contrasting (*NHb* 3.6.b=14,3% and *NHb* 3.6.b=35,7%);
- effectively interpreting messages (*NHb* 3.6.e=7,1%);
- defending one's own point of view while acknowledging the legitimacy of others (*NHb* 3.6.e=14,3%);
- accepting difference (*NHb* 3.6.h=28,6%).

I also wanted to analyse whether the strategies for successful intercultural communication are developed by the coursebooks. Unfortunately, not much was found: in one unit of *NHb* and in two units of *NHb* the strategy of guessing has to be applied.

I also analysed the types of tasks in terms of involvement of LLs. In *NHb* more often than not these tasks are receptive (3.8.1.a=100,0%), and less often productive (3.8.1.b=92,9%) and co-operative (3.8.1.c=85,7%). In *NHb* the scores for these three types of tasks are the same (100,0%). And only in two units of *NHb* the tasks promoting autonomous learning were found.

In terms of the nature of the tasks, these turned out to be mainly enactment tasks (*NHb* 3.8.2.e=85,7% and *NHb* 3.8.2.e=100,0%). But also cognitive and cognitive-attitudinal tasks
were found. Production type tasks were found very rarely (NHb 3.8.2.d=7.1% and NHe 3.8.2.d=14.3%). For example, see in NHb "A postcard from Dublin" (p.53), and in NHe "Food around the world" (p.70).

Although some positive examples were found in both books, in general, the methodology can be evaluated as "limited". It has many deficiencies in relation to both objectives and contents of the coursebooks. But, this is understandable, since the authors have not put as the aim the development of intercultural communicative competence of LLs, users of these books.

2.2.1.4. Intercultural assessment in selected English language coursebooks

In none of these two coursebooks the guidelines for assessing intercultural component are given (see 4.1 in Table A & B, Appendix X). In the previous edition of Headway series (e.g. Headway Elementary (Soars & Soars 1993), Headway Pre-Intermediate (Soars & Soars 1994), Headway Intermediate (Soars & Soars 1986), Headway Upper-Intermediate (Soars & Soars 1997), etc.), Stop and Check units were included in the Student's Book. In the New Edition the assessment was taken out of the Student's Book. For this reason, for the rest of the parameters in this block (see 4.2. - 4.3.4 Table A & B, Appendix X), the option "not applicable" was identified.

2.2.1.5. Evaluation of analysed English language coursebooks from the point of view of their potential for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence

Neither of the analysed coursebooks fully reflects the diversity of contemporary English-speaking societies. The oversimplifications identified in the texts and dialogues represent lost opportunities for intercultural reflection, and may negatively affect the LLs and deprive them of important means of self-representation.

Unfortunately, these books cannot be considered unbiased. Although at the level of gender and races the authors could avoid stereotyped representations, at the level of social classes and life-style, these books are strongly representing Western middle-class values like consumerism, delayed gratification and social mobility. The representatives of the working-class rarely appear and usually are depicted not as plausible friends or acquaintances for non-natives, but as waiters, shop-assistants, and so on. And, migrants and refugees seem not to be a part of target societies to any degree. In the case of representing English-speaking families, the authors also do not observe the criteria of realism and representativeness. Families are depicted as nuclear, which does not reflect the demographic processes going in Western
societies, with an increasing number of divorces and children brought up in single-parent families. The families depicted in the coursebooks under analysis are always happy, problem-free, healthy and wealthy, having as a rule two children of opposite sex – a boy and a girl.

Not only the range of characters, but also the range of encounters between them cannot be defined as broad. In the majority of cases middle-class people are depicted taking part in problem-free interactions. The encounters take place mainly in the towns.

In English language coursebooks, in general, and in analysed coursebooks in particular, the focus is still mainly on English and American cultures. Rarely information on such countries as New Zealand can be found, but then it is presented as an ‘exotic’ option. And, even then these cultures are viewed through a predominantly British, or less often American, ‘lens’. Standard British or American English norms are taken for granted.

The positive feature of Headway books is the design: the scrupulous selection of illustrations allow – to great extent – to expand the range of characters. This, in turn, helps in presenting learners with a more varied picture of the target society’s life.

To sum up, I would not deny that the English coursebooks under examination do have some potential for promoting the acquisition of ICC, but this can (and should) be enhanced.

2.2.2. Selected Russian language coursebooks

As discussed in section (2.1.2) which deals with sample selection, among coursebooks used for Hungarian adults learning general Russian the following books were chosen for analysis:

- Šag za šagom ([Шаг за шагом] Székely & Székely 1999)
- Poehali ([Поехали!] Чернышов 2003)

In school year 2004-2005, these coursebooks were used by 64,5% (138 out of 214) of Hungarian adults learning general Russian: Šag za šagom – 51,4%; and Poehali – 13,1%.

Šag za šagom was published in Hungary by Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó. Poehali was published in Russia by Zlatoust.

The data collected on these two coursebooks can be found in Tables C and D of Appendix X (Table C – for Šag za šagom, and Table D – for Poehali).

2.2.2.1. Intercultural objectives in selected Russian language coursebooks

As in the case of English coursebooks, the evaluation of Russian language coursebooks started with the analysis of Intercultural objectives. This was aimed at revealing whether the coursebook authors consciously include intercultural component into their books in order to promote LLs’ acquisition of ICC and what changes they expect from LLs with regard to ICC.
For both analysed Russian language coursebooks the situation is completely the same. The objectives are formulated as cultural (1.1.b=100,0%) and not intercultural; by character these objectives are cognitive (1.2.a=100,0%); the authors do not have any expectations with regard to their intercultural development (1.3.c=100,0%).

To sum up, in both coursebooks linguistic objectives are dominant (1.4.c=100,0%), and cultural (without inter-) objectives can be considered as being very limited (1.5.b=100,0%) (for scores see Tables C and D in Appendix X).

2.2.2.2. Intercultural contents in selected Russian language coursebooks

The analysis of intercultural contents was started with investigation of maps of contents (2.1). Neither in Šag za šagom nor in Poehali explicitly, culture is not included in the map of contents. In Poehali, culture is mentioned in U. 16 as a topic for conversation. In the case of Šag za šagom, the map of contents consists of Topic, Conversation, Grammar, and Vocabulary. In the case of Poehali, the map of contents consists of Conversation, Constructions, and Grammar.

![Graph 9: Proportions of topics treated in Šag za šagom and Poehali.](image)
Then, I followed with analysis of topics: it was interesting to know what topics are more “popular” in these coursebooks (see Graph 9). It is notable that in both – Šag za šagom and Poehali – the most often treated is capital “C” – Culture (2.2.b) (46,7% and 35,5% respectively). This topic is traditionally treated as the most important in Russia, and not only in teaching Russian as a foreign language but in the teaching of any other foreign language. The second most often treated topic in Šag za šagom is Food... (2.2.k=33,3%) (see Illustration 10), and in Poehali is Geography, place of residence... (2.2.c=29,0%). Other quite “popular” topics turned out to be in Šag za šagom – Geography, place of residence... (2.2.c=26,7%), Body, health... (2.2.n=20,0%), House, home... (2.2.q=20,0%), Family, interpersonal relations... (2.2.aa=20,0%); in Poehali – Work, professions... (2.2.l=25,8%), Stereotypes (2.2.ll=25,8%), and History, famous people (2.2.j=19,4%) (the topic which is very close to topic (b) Culture). Such topics as Economy...(g), Religion (z), Science and Technology (cc), Migrants (dd), Poverty...(ff), Intercultural contacts...(ii), and Culture shock (jj) are not treated in any of the two books. Surprisingly enough, only in a small number of units such topics as Free time...(a), Shopping...(f), Biography...(p), Environment, nature, weather (r), Feasts, ceremonies...(v) are touched.

Illustration 10: Šag za šagom, p.149 &150.

As in the case of English language coursebooks, I decided to investigate on the basis of Gullestrup’s model (1992), what segments of culture are (not) treated in these two
coursebooks (see Table 14). As the table shows, such aspects of culture as Technology, Economy and Religion are avoided by authors of both coursebooks. In Šag za šagom Politics and Ideology are omitted, and in Poehali – Socialisation.

Table 14: Segments of culture treated in Šag za šagom and Poehali (on base of Gullestrup’s model 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gullestrup’s segments</th>
<th>Šag za šagom</th>
<th>Poehali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social institutions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political institutions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction and Socialisation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious institutions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next step in the analysis of intercultural component of coursebooks was to reveal on which level these topics are treated (2.3): micro-, macro- or intercultural/ international one. The data for both Russian language coursebooks were quite similar: in the case of Šag za šagom these scores are 2.3.a=100, 0% (micro-), 2.3.b=20,0% (macro-) and 2.3.c=13,3% (inter-); and in the case of Poehali – 100,0%; 22,6%, and 12,9% respectively.

On an intercultural level, the analysis showed that in Šag za šagom the proportion of units where wide range of cultures is presented is higher than in Poehali (in Šag... 2.4.1.c=33,3%, in Poehali 2.4.1.c=12,9%). Since Šag za šagom was written for Hungarian LLs, “learner’s culture” appears in quite a high proportion of units (2.4.1.d=40,0%). The proportion of units where comparison of cultures was found is approximately the same: in Šag za šagom 2.4.2.a=40,0%, in Poehali 2.4.2.a=38,7%. In Šag za šagom the emphasis is made mostly on Russian culture (2.4.2.b=33,3%), in Poehali only in 12,9% of units the stress is made on Russian culture, and the number of cases when the emphasis is made on other cultures is insignificant (see scores for 2.4.2.d in Table C & D, Appendix X). In Šag za šagom the emphasis is made on differences in 13,3% of units (see Illustration 11); while in Poehali in 6,5% of units the emphasis is made on similarities, in 25,8% of units – on differences (see scores for 2.4.2.e and f in Tables C & D, Appendix X).

Illustration 11: Šag za šagom, p. 103.
The next parameter to investigate was the relations between cultures, and their opinions about each other, in case they are expressed. In Šag za šagom only in 20,0% of units the relations between “target and other” cultures are pictured (2.4.3.b). In Poehali, in 45,2% of units the relations between “target and other” cultures are shown through the eyes of Sven (a Swedish, one of two main characters). In dominant majority of cases the target culture is viewed positively: Sven praises Russia (pp.95, 133, 159), Russian culture (pp.95, 159) and Russian people (p.95). Only once (in U.27) is there a hint that Sven would not really like to live in Russia forever (this will be discussed below, when analysing the data on 2.9.1).

Sven is also praised, for example, for his language skills (Poehali p.100), and for his interest in Russia, its history and capital “C” – culture (pp.139, 188). In the majority of cases Sven gets into contact with capital “C”-culture (Эрмитаж, «Лебединое озеро», p.95; Третьяковская галерея, Большой театр «Борис Годунов», p.159). But he is also presented when gaining experience of everyday life: for example, he goes shopping (Poehali, p.85, 86, 120), or goes out (Poehali p.95). Unfortunately, these situations are always problem and conflict-free.

Also the opinions about or relations between “target and learner’s”, “learner’s and other”, “target and target” and “other and other” cultures are mentioned in a few units of Poehali. For example, the opinion of a member of “other” culture about target culture can be found in the letters of Sven (p.95, 109, 159, etc). LLs are also invited to express their own opinion about target and other cultures (Poehali):

1. Чего вы думаете о России? (p.101)
2. Чего любят русские, немцы, итальянцы, американцы, японцы, французы? (p.123)
3. Какие блюда русской кухни вы знаете? Какие вы любите? (p.192)
4. Какой транспорт любят люди в России и почему? (p.196)

When trying to describe the potential of coursebooks under investigation for promoting the acquisition of ICC, it was important to find out whether such aspects of ICC as savoirs and savoirs être are addressed in the coursebooks.

In Poehali culture specific knowledge was addressed in 45,2% of units, while culture general – only in 19,4%. In Šag za šagom culture specific knowledge was addressed in all the units (2.5.1.a=100,0%), but culture general knowledge was not found at all. This totally contradicts today’s view on culture learning (Paige et al. 2003:176), according to which the shift from “culture-specific” to “culture-general” knowledge should be made, because only in this way the intercultural competence may be acquired (it was discussed in Section 1.2.4).

Knowledge of self and other (Byram 1997), or – according to Paige and Stringer (1997) – learning about the self as a cultural being, is also very important, but it was
promoted only in one unit in Šag za šagom. Insights regarding the ways in which culture affects language and communication were found in two units in Šag za šagom and in one unit in Poehali (see Illustration 12).

Illustration 12: Poehali, p.196.

Very low is the number of units where the attempt to develop the attitude to relativise self and value other is made (see scores for 2.5.2.a in Tables C and D, Appendix X).

It is interesting that in Šag za šagom the proportion of units that may promote positive disposition towards learning about another culture is twice as high as in Poehali (2.5.2.b=20,0% and 9,7% respectively).

Regarding the characters depicted in Šag za šagom and Poehali, some interesting observations were done. For example, Poehali is not sensitive to age. It may negatively affect LLs. One should not forget that in Russian culture age often appears to be the key aspects of social hierarchy. For example, in Russia, the youngsters generally comply, at least ostensibly, with the adults. And, in naming conventions whereby all young people regardless of their social status go by nicknames while the older people are addressed by full names that include patronyms. As a rule, in Russia adults have more rights and privileges than the youngsters. That is why, LLs should be aware of the social significance of the age factor and to monitor their linguistic behaviour carefully to comply with Russian rules, in particular with regard to politeness and forms of address. From this point of view Šag za šagom provides a wider range of characters regarding their age. This book, which was written for schoolchildren, represents all age groups: children (2.6.1.a=60,0%), teenagers (2.6.1.b=87,6%), adults (2.6.1.c=93,3%), and old people (2.6.1.d=40,0%).

The quantitative analysis showed that in Šag za šagom both males and females are
found in each unit. In Poehali this proportion differs: in 64.5% of units males were found, and only in 45.2% of units — females. In some cases it was not possible to identify the gender (e.g. a Martian (see Illustrations 13, 14), or a shop-assistant in a written dialogue 2.6.2.c=19.4%).


V. — Бабушка, познакомься!
А.П. — Господи, что это? Кто это?
В. — А как ты думашь?
А.П. — Новый пышкосё?
В. — Нет, что ты!
А.П. — Халаджанник?
В. — Нет.
А.П. — Неужели микроволновая печь?
В. — Нет, бабушка, это же марсианки!
А.П. — Господи!
Брык — Зарабатывайте, Анастасия Петровна!
А.П. — Зарабатывай... Зарабатывайте... Как тебя... Как Вас зовут?
В. — Бабушка, говоря с ним «на ты»!
Брык — Разрешите представиться. Меня зовут Брык.
А.П. — Очень прия́тно, Брык. А в каком городе ты живёшь, Брык?
В. — Бабушка, на Марсе городов нет, там только кратеры. Брык очень хочет есть и пить. Что у нас есть?
А.П. — Пода́м... Кашу у нас нет, супа нет, фруктов нет, рёбы тóже нет, у́далко консервёр... Есть сосиски, винегрёт... Ну и, конечно, хлеб, мёло, колбаса...
Брык — Просите, а я жела́ю у вас нет? Я очень люблю желе́зо.
А.П. — Боже мой! Желе́зо! Есть валька... Есть консервы́ная банка...
Брык — Ух, как вкусно!
А.П. — Хотите какао? Или чайку чай?
Брык — Я бы с удовольствием выпил бензина. Дайте мне, пожалуйста, ложку бензина, а ложку я съем, если можно.

Иллюстрация 14: Шаг за шагом, p.51.

In Poehali the inequality in gender presentation is determined by the choice of two main characters. The both are men (a Russian — Igor, and a Swedish — Sven). They are both White heterosexual middle-class educated young men. Their age is not identified, but it can be concluded from the context and the illustrations, that they should be in their thirties. Igor is
from a typical Russian intelligentsia family (according to Soviet Encyclopedic Dictionary [Советский Энциклопедический Словарь] (1983:495), this is a group of people professionally involved in intellectual and creative activity). He is married, his wife is an economist, and they have one child, a schoolboy. Igor himself is a biologist. Sven is an ecologist; he learns Russian and takes part in a conference for ecologists in St. Petersburg. Sven has a girlfriend in his home country to whom he writes letters throughout the coursebook (in Russian, surprisingly).

In spite of the fact that the majority of women in Russia work, usually the coursebooks do not provide occupational information on female characters. And, even when knowing that Olga (Igor’s wife) is an economist, throughout the book she is defined through her roles in the family and household. The reader does not know anything about her professional life. She is shown exclusively at home busy with housekeeping and shopping (p.120, 122), and talking about family matters (p.133, 140, 216). She is not accompanying her husband and his friend to the theatre, for instance. Igor and Sven buy only two tickets (p.138). Other (Russian) women appearing as secondary characters in the dialogues in Poehali are defined as a chambermaid in a hotel (p.179), secretary (p.203), or dancer in a Cabaret (p.206). And even, Sven’s girlfriend – Helga – is defined through her relationship with Sven. In Poehali there is a text about the role the age and the appearance of a woman play in her professional life (pp.205-207). However, women are never depicted in the office, wearing an elegant dress, but at home wearing her apron or doing shopping (see Illustration 15).

Illustration 15: Poehali, p.173.

In contrast, men of the same age are shown to have professional jobs, and it can be implicitly concluded that in the Russian context occupational status and professional engagement constitute an important part of a male – but not female – identity.

The qualitative analysis showed that in Poehali the representatives of the working class appear in less than a quarter of units (2.6.3.a=22,6%). For the upper class and students these scores are even lower (2.6.3.c & d=6,5%), and in the majority of units, representatives
of the middle class are portrayed (2.6.3.b=58.1%). In Šag za šagom the proportions differ enormously: the representatives of the working class appear in 40.0% of units (2.6.3.a), and representatives of the middle class – in 80.0% (2.6.3.b). But the most difference is observed in the proportion of units where students (in this case schoolchildren) are portrayed (2.6.3.d=93.3%). This high score can be explained by the fact that this book was written for being used at school. In both coursebooks only “white” characters are portrayed.

But, probably more surprising in these two coursebooks is the presentation of the Russian family. Whenever it appears in the books, it is shown as nuclear with at least one child (Poehali), or with two children, but then of opposite sex (Šag za šagom). No single parents are portrayed, which contradicts the statistics about Russian families (Архангельский 1997, Борисов & Синельников 1995, Гукова 1997, Иванова 1998, Михеева 2001, Демографический ежегодник России 2002), which show an increasing number of divorces.

It was also interesting to find out that the majority of characters portrayed in the two coursebooks are native residents and seem to be over-generalised or even idealised. In Šag za šagom in 46.7% of units the characters of tourists coming to Russia were depicted, and in Poehali in place of tourists non-native residents are portrayed (see scores for 2.6.6 in Tables C & D, Appendix X). In Poehali also famous personalities appear, and in Šag za šagom in one fifth of units a Martian, Bryk (Брых) appears (see Illustration 14). A Martian also appears in Poehali (see Illustration 13).

Interestingly, Bryk identifies him/herself (?) with Russian youngsters, which can be observed from the forms of address used when talking to Vitya’s grandmother (see Illustration 14). She uses the form “ты”, and Bryk uses the polite form “вы”. This fits Russian conventions, when all young people are addressed by nicknames and the forms of “ты”, and the adults – especially older people – are addressed by names with patronymics and the forms of “вы”. So, even a Martian is shown as being aware of the social significance of the age factor and is able to monitor his/her (?) linguistic behaviour to comply with Russian rules with regard to politeness.

The characters presented are mainly Russians or foreigners. Even in Šag za šagom, which is written for Hungarian LLs, Hungarian appears only in one unit (see scores for 2.6.7 in Tables C & D, Appendix X). But what is even more surprising, the ex-soviet people of other nationalities who still live in Russia and speak Russian as a second or third language are not presented at all. Only in one unit (U.13) in Poehali a fruit and vegetable vendor is pictured as if he were from the Caucasus. But this is not expressed explicitly, only the illustration makes one think so (see Illustration 16). For LLs who are beginners and do not know much about Russia (and have never been to Russian markets), this illustration remains un-decoded.
Besides the statistical analysis of characters, I felt it important to analyse the interactions presented in the coursebooks. It was observed that in the predominant majority of units the interactions are taking place in towns (Šag za šagom 2.7.1.b=93.3% and Poehali 2.7.1.b=54.8%), and only once in Poehali (in U.30) the interaction takes place in a village, but it is a folk-tale (2.7.1.c=3.2%). Graph 10 shows where the interactions are situated.

Graph 10: Situation of interactions in Šag za šagom and Poehali.

As observed from graph 10, in Šag za šagom the largest number of interactions are situated at home (2.7.2.a=53.3%), but also quite often — outside (in a park, street, etc.) (2.7.2.f=40.0%). Poehali turned out to be quite poor with regard to the range of interactions presented: one third of units do not contain any interactions at all (2.7.2.i=29.0%). The scores for interactions taking place at home, by mail or phone, in a street or park, are the same and very low (12,9%). There is no mention on Internet in either of the books.
With regard to the atmosphere of interactions, in Šag za šagom the majority of units depict friendly interactions (2.7.3.a=80,0%), the score for conflicting situations is much lower (2.7.3.b=26,7%), and some that can be defined as neutral (2.7.3.c=13,3%). As mentioned, in Poehali one third of units do not represent interactions at all, in the rest of the units the majority of interactions are friendly (2.7.3.a=32,3%) or neutral (2.7.3.c=29,0%), and only in two units conflicting situations are depicted (2.7.3.b=6,5%) (see Poehali pp. 203, 236-239).

As previously discussed, the desire of authors to write a positive book is understandable, but one should not forget, that the purpose of FLT is, first of all, to provide LLs with linguistic instruments they may use in various communicative situations, including conflicts and intercultural misunderstandings. Such knowledge is especially important for beginners and elementary level LLs. Unfortunately, in their aim to provide a positive model of a competent foreign user of Russian (Sven — in Poehali, and Sean — in Šag za šagom), the books are devoid of any negotiation of miscommunication. Thus, the LLs hardly get any opportunity to master the skill of negotiating misunderstandings (including intercultural ones), crucial for all levels of proficiency, but particularly for beginners to elementary level LLs. In fact, Sven’s and Sean’s relatively high level of proficiency and the ease of establishing social connections cannot be easily reproduced by beginning and elementary learners for whom these books are intended.

The analysis of interactions from the point of view of the cultures the characters are belonging to (2.7.4), showed justifiable distribution of proportions. The fact that in the majority of the units the interactions take place between representatives of target cultures (Šag za šagom 2.7.4.d=100,0% and Poehali 2.7.4.d=58,1%); or between learners themselves (Šag za šagom 2.7.4.f=86,7% and Poehali 2.7.4.f=80,6%); or between representatives of target and other cultures (Šag za šagom 2.7.4.b=53,3% and Poehali 2.7.4.b =29,0%), serves the general purposes of FL coursebooks: (1) to show the correct use of target language, (2) to depict the typical situations of interactions between natives and non-natives, and (3) to make LLs interact using target language.

As previously discussed in the Theoretical part of my dissertation, stereotypes may serve as major hindrance to successful intercultural communication, and the acquisition of ICC can be seen as the process of combating them (see section 1.2.4). In light of this, I analysed whether there is any stereotyped information in FL coursebooks under examination. The analysis showed that in Šag za šagom some cases of stereotypical representation of other cultures can be detected (2.8.1.c=13,3%) (see Illustration 17).

In Poehali, stereotypical representation not only of other cultures (2.8.1.c=6,5%) (see Illustration 16), but also of target culture was found (2.8.1.a=3,2%) (see Illustration 15).
While in Šag za šagom only stereotypes on nationalities were found (2.8.2.c=13.3%), in Poehali besides stereotypes on nationalities (2.8.2.c=12.9%), I found some on gender (2.8.2.a=6.5%), occupation (2.8.2.b=3.2%), age (2.8.2.d=3.2%) and class or social group (2.8.2.e=6.5%). The stereotypes found in Poehali are not treated, but in Šag za šagom some positive examples of fighting against stereotypes were found (see Illustration 17).

Illustration 17: Šag za šagom. p.121.

Above, the analysis of the coursebooks at micro-, macro- and intercultural/ international levels was done. According to Risager (1991) and Byram and Esarte-Sarries (1991), who took the traditions of ‘literary realism’, the fourth dimension of coursebook analysis should be the analysis of the viewpoint taken by the author, (either explicitly or implicitly) (see section 1.3.4 in Theoretical framework). Trying to remain as much objective as possible, I examined: first, whether author’s position is inner or outer in representation of target culture (2.9.1); second, whether s/he describes target culture in a positive, critical, fictional, or journalistic way (2.9.2).

The analysis showed that in Šag za šagom authors occupied inner position (2.9.1.a=100,0%), and described the target culture in a positive way (2.9.2.a=100,0%). On the other hand, in Poehali the target culture was often showed from the “outer” point of view, through the eyes of Sven (a Swedish character). In the majority of cases the target culture is described positively: Sven praises Russia (pp.95, 133, 159), Russian culture (pp.95, 159) and Russian people (p.95). He also shows interest towards the country and its history (pp.139, 188). Interestingly, in spite of the fact that throughout the book, Sven praises Russia (its
culture and people), in U.27 (almost at the end of the coursebook), Sven is very worried, because he is afraid of not being able to leave the country. When leaving for Sweden, at the airport he realises that his passport has been left in Igor’s pocket. To find Igor, Sven phones Igor’s wife Olga, but Igor is already on his way to the airport. Later when Sven has got his passport and has left, Igor talks to his wife, who ironically notes that Sven was afraid that he would have to stay in Russia forever (in case he did not get his passport) (p.221). Igor agrees with her, he says that he found Sven very sad sitting on his suitcase at the airport (p.221).

Here, the question emerges, whether Sven was sincere while praising Russia, its people and culture, if he became so upset at the mere thought of living there? (see Illustration 18).

Illustration 18: Poehali, p.220.

Opposite to Šag za šagom, in Poehali the author also used fiction in a few cases to illustrate Russian culture.

In creating the “real” picture of target culture coursebooks illustrations may play an important role. But, from this point of view some deficiencies were detected in both Šag za šagom and in Poehali. I am not criticizing these books for having only black-and-white (like in Poehali) or monochrome illustrations (like in Šag za šagom, except for the flags, which are coloured), because this is a question of money invested in the production of a given book. But, what I think should be mentioned is that in these books I found illustrations which are not really appropriate (see Illustration 19 & 20).

Illustration 19: Šag za šagom, p.33.
It was also very interesting to investigate the characteristics of cultural information given in the books. In general, it can be defined as positive, and – unfortunately – superficial (see scores for 2.11.1 in Tables C & D, Appendix X). In Poehali only few examples of critical, genuine and insightful information were found, e.g.: an episode from a book written by famous Russian opera singer (Фёдор Шаляпин, «Страницы из моей жизни», p.247-249).

The analysis of geographical amplitude of information revealed that in Poehali and in Šag za šagom most often the information referring to Russia appear, and very rarely to any other country from the former Soviet Union (see 2.11.2 for scores in Tables C & D, Appendix X). Some information was found on other countries. In Poehali not any information was found on Hungary, while in Šag za šagom, being written for Hungarian language learners, in 40,0% of the units some remarks on Hungary were found.

When analysing values, beliefs and attitudes in these two coursebooks, I found out that in the majority of cases they are expressed explicitly (Šag za šagom 2.11.3.a=66,7% and Poehali 2.11.3.a=67,7%). While in Šag za šagom these are mainly of a personal character, in Poehali these are mainly of cultural character. Interestingly, in Poehali we can find episodes when the superiority of Sven’s values is stressed: e.g. he is “true ecologist”, and so he dislikes natural fur, and prefers an artificial one (Poehali p.85). This episode also serves for reflecting Russian cultural values and attitudes. Though in less proportion, universal values can also be found in both books (Šag za šagom 2.11.4.b=13,3% and Poehali 2.11.4.b=19,4%).

Although non-verbal communication plays an enormous role in communication in general, one does not expect that foreign language coursebooks deal with non-verbal communication (though it is arguable whether the coursebooks should deal with it or not). However, I was curious whether non-verbal communication appears in FL coursebooks or not, and if yes in what form (explicit or implicit)?
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The analysis showed that in Šag za šagom non-verbal communication appears in every unit, but only in implicit form. On the other hand, in Poehali it appears only in 58.1% of units and one of them explicitly. Igor tells a funny story that happened to Sven when he went to Bulgaria and had problems in interpreting the Bulgarians nodding (see Illustration 12). Igor stresses at the end of the story, “Since then Sven always studies the traditions of the country he travels to” (Poehali p.196).

In the Theoretical part of my research, the detailed discussion of cultural dimensions was offered (see section 1.1.2). I was curious to know how Russian language coursebooks under examination treat these cultural dimensions. First of all, I should stress that in all cases when cultural dimensions find their reflection in these coursebooks, they are reflected implicitly. But, as can be observed from graph 11, in both Russian language coursebooks even implicitly the cultural dimensions are reflected very rarely.

In Šag za šagom most often are reflected such dimensions as: masculinity/ femininity (in 26.7% of units) (see Illustration 21) and power distance (in 20.0% of units). In Poehali these are: individualism/ collectivism and attitude to the environment/ relation to nature (in 19.4% of units); masculinity/ femininity and achievement/ ascription (in 16.1% of units). The rest of the cultural dimensions are reflected even more rarely. For instance, power distance (Poehali 2.11.7.a=6.5%) is clearly shown in a dialogue of a boss with a poet who is substituting for the secretary (Poehali, p.203).
Although, the range of cultural dimensions is not wide and the proportion of units where these dimensions are reflected is low, I could find some positive examples. As Graph 12 shows, the main difference between Hungary and Russia are observed in scores for power distance and masculinity/femininity.

Graph 12: Comparison of Hungary and Russia with regard to PD and MAS. (Based on data from Hofstede 2003 and www.geerthofstede.com)

In light of this, Šag za Šagom and, to a lesser degree, Poehali does have some potential for developing intercultural competence, because they present the most problematic for Hungarian LLs dimensions of Russian culture (e.g. see Illustration 21, on masculinity / femininity in Russia).

Illustration 21: Šag za Šagom, p.38.

Concluding, the intercultural contents in these two books can be evaluated as “limited”, and only in 16,1% of units in Poehali they can be evaluated as “appropriate”. In Šag za Šagom language is more relevant then culture, and in Poehali this proportion is even more worrying, because in 41,9% of units not any intercultural contents were found.
2.2.2.3. Methodology of intercultural language learning in selected Russian language coursebooks

As discussed previously in section 2.2.1.3, the third block was included in the table (scheme) with the purpose of revealing whether any activities can be found in the books under investigation, which could promote the acquisition of ICC.

Regarding savoir comprendre, in Šag za šagom no activity was found which would promote its development (3.1.1.a=0%). On the other hand, in Poehali, in 35,5% of units such activities are found. For instance, LLs are asked to explain why tourists in Russia are always taken to the theatre to see “Swan Lake” (p.139).

It was pleasant to find out that in both Šag za šagom and in Poehali the ability to interact and the ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and operate it are being developed (Šag za šagom 3.1.2.a=46,7%, 3.1.2.b=46,7% and Poehali 3.1.2.a=3,2%, 3.1.2.b=32,3%).

The ability to critically evaluate perspectives, practices and products in one’s own and other cultures (savoir s’engager) is being developed only in Poehali (3.1.3.a=35,5%). For instance, in U.23 (p.190-192) there is a text on the History of Russian Cuisine. LLs have to read it, and to answer some questions on Russian cuisine and on their own country’s cuisine (see Illustration 22).

The analysis showed that intercultural learning in these coursebooks is based mainly on linguistic activities. In Poehali one activity that is usually used in intercultural training and three that can be considered a combination of the two, were found. These were ‘culture capsule’, ‘critical incidents’ and the list of pieces of advice for foreigners coming to Russia (U.27 p.222, see Illustration 23).
Советы иностранцам в России

1) Не оставляйте в доме русские считают, что если оставить, то в доме не будет денег.
2) Не меняйте деньги на улице: у вас не будет денег, и это уже не лестно!
3) Не покупайте на улице «антивирусные»!
4) Скользите в дождь обувь в доме!
5) Не говорите много о ночном: русские считают, что это глупо.
6) Не давайте кошке и платье, а если хотите подарить, то возьмите за них маленькую симпатичную пачку.
7) Если в доме подарите цветы, не давайте 2, 4, 6, ... штук, подарите лучше 1, 3, 5, ..., потому что 2, 4 и т.д. принесут на кладбище.
8) Если хотите сказать тост, то говорите «За здоровье!», а не «На здоровье!» — это не полезно.
9) Не пейте пиво после обеда: будет болеть голова.
10) Не оставляйте пустые бутылки на столе: стол будет пустой.
11) Не пейте воду на краю!
12) Не ешьте хот-доги, лучше попробуйте русскую кухню.
13) Не ешьте мороженое на улице зимой, вы не русские.
14) Не хмурьте в транспорте!
15) Не сплющивайте в туче: вас не пустят на лиши мест.
16) Не играйте в «русскую рулежку»!

А какие советы вы можете дать иностранцам в России и туристам в вашей стране (в других странах)?

Illustration 23: Poehali, p.222.

Graph 13: Focus of activities in Sag za bagom and Poehali

Graph 13 shows that in these tasks the focus is made mainly on target culture, or to a lesser degree on other cultures. The scores for learner's culture explains the fact that learners are
invited to talk about their own culture and experiences. Interestingly, despite the fact that Šag za šagom was written in Hungary for Hungarian LLs, there is no difference between the scores for focus on learner’s culture. Unfortunately, the focus on comparison of cultures was found only in one unit in Šag za šagom and in one unit in Poehali. In two units of Poehali the focus is also on universal values.

In Šag za šagom most often such language skills as reading and listening, and more rarely speaking and writing are involved. In Poehali most often the skills of reading and speaking, and less often of listening are involved. (See scores for 3.5 in Tables C & D, Appendix X). Other skills involved are:

- observing, identifying and recognising (Šag za šagom 3.6.a=53,3% and Poehali 3.6.a=12,9%);
- comparing and contrasting (Poehali 3.6.b=19,4%);
- negotiating meaning (Šag za šagom 3.6.c=6,7% and Poehali 3.6.c=3,2%);
- dealing with or tolerating ambiguity (Poehali 3.6.d=3,2%);
- effectively interpreting messages (Šag za šagom 3.6.e=6,7% and Poehali 3.6.e=3,2%);
- defending one’s own point of view while acknowledging the legitimacy of others (Poehali 3.6.g=3,2%);
- accepting difference (Poehali 3.6.h=3,2%).

I also wanted to analyse whether the strategies for successful intercultural communication are developed by the coursebooks. Unfortunately, not much was found: so in two units of Šag za šagom the strategy of guessing has to be applied (see Illustration 24).

Illustration 24: Šag za šagom, p.110.
I also analysed the types of tasks in terms of involvement of LLs. In Šag za šagom more often these tasks are receptive (3.8.1.a=100,0%), and less often productive (3.8.1.b=80,0%) and co-operative (3.8.1.c=73,3%). In Poehali the proportion of receptive and productive tasks is similar, and co-operative tasks were not found.

In terms of the nature of the tasks, these turned out to be mainly cognitive tasks (Šag za šagom 3.8.2.a=100,0% and Poehali 3.8.2.a=12,9%). But also some cognitive-attitudinal tasks were found in Poehali (3.8.2.b=35,5%) (e.g. see Illustration 38, or U. 26 pp. 216-217 about giving presents in different cultures).

Although some positive examples were found in both books, in general, the methodology can be evaluated as “limited”. It has many deficiencies in relation to both objectives and contents of the coursebooks. But, this is understandable, since the authors have not put as the aim the development of intercultural communicative competence of LLs, who are users of these books.

2.2.2.4. Intercultural assessment in selected Russian language coursebooks

In Šag za šagom, no guidelines for assessing intercultural component are given (see 4.1 in Table C, Appendix X). Moreover, assessment as such is not included in the coursebook. For this reason, for the rest of the parameters in this block (see 4.2. – 4.3.4 Table C, Appendix X), the option “not applicable” was identified.

It comparison to Šag za šagom, in Poehali the assessment is included in the coursebook (see Units 10, 17, 24, 31). No guidelines for assessing intercultural component are given (see 4.1 in Table D, Appendix X), and in these four units (10, 17, 24, 31) only linguistic elements are assessed (4.2.b=12,9%). In the rest, the option “not applicable” was identified.

2.2.2.5. Evaluation of analysed Russian language coursebooks from the point of view of their potential for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence

Probably, in comparison with the teaching of other target language cultures under examination in my research, teaching of Russian culture is more challenging. It can be explained with dramatic political, economic, and sociocultural transformations of the past 15 years that have completely reshaped Russian society, bringing changes in identity and values.

Neither of the analysed coursebooks fully reflects the diversity of contemporary Russian society. Being highly multietnic, in these books Russia is represented as an ethnically homogeneous society consisting of Russians exclusively. Although Poehali makes an attempt to introduce other ethnicities that reside in the former Soviet republics, it does not
reflect that "ethnic diversity not only continues to exist within Russia, but together with religion remains an important organising feature of Russian life" (Shardakova & Pavlenko 2004:39). The visual reference to ethnic minority in Poehali (a fruit and vegetable vendor who looks as if he were from the Caucasus, p. 122), without explicit explanation, remains a lost opportunity for introducing the LLs to ethnic diversity among Russian speakers and for exploring the nexus of language and ethnicity attitudes. To know more about these attitudes and linguistic varieties within the Russian society would be extremely useful for LLs who will have to negotiate meaning with a variety of Russian speakers. Some of these speakers will not be ethnically Russian, some may speak a non-standard variety of Russian, and some may speak Russian as a second or even third language.

The analysis also showed that these books are not biases- and stereotypes - free. The characters are mainly representatives of the middle-class. None of the books depicts "new Russians", a very special social group in today’s Russia. Women are often shown through their roles in families and household, or through their relationship with men. This portrayal obscures the fact that women are consistently found among the highest achieving scientists, physicians, political and business leaders in today’s Russia. Not to say, that with growing number of divorces, women in Russia often take up men’s duties when bringing up children and providing the material needs in the family. So, the nuclear families depicted in these coursebooks do not cover the Russian reality.

As the analysis of Poehali showed, the imaginary learner (Sven) is a heterosexual White middle-class male who goes to Russia to learn the language, to take part in a professional conference, and to know more about capital “C”- culture. Moreover, in one incident he tries to “educate the natives”, when expressing his attitude to wearing natural fur. He is depicted as a “true ecologist” who prefers the artificial fur coat of light blue colour to a natural one (p.85). The range of his interlocutors is rather limited – they are mostly his Russian friend Igor (a White middle-class man), Igor’s wife, shop assistants, cashiers, etc. Also he writes letters to a woman who constitutes romantic interests.

Since Šag za šagom was written for schoolchildren, in terms of identity options offered, it is even less adequate to adult LLs than Poehali.

The oversimplifications identified in the texts and dialogues represent lost opportunities for intercultural reflection. I agree with Shardakova and Pavlenko (2004), who in their article on Identity options in Russian textbooks note that such oversimplifications and biases may negatively affect the LLs and deprive them of important means of self-representation and at times even self-defence.

Moreover, the texts and dialogues in these two books are devoid of any negotiation of
miscommunication. The LLs – users of these books – hardly get any opportunity to master the skills of negotiating intercultural misunderstandings, crucial for all levels of proficiency, but particularly for beginners and elementary level learners.

To sum up, the analysis of the two Russian coursebooks, which are most widely used for beginners to elementary level learners in adult FL education in Hungary, demonstrated that their potential for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence is quite low. But, I cannot deny that positive examples were found in both – in Šag za šagom as well as in Poehali.

2.2.3. Selected Spanish language coursebooks

As discussed in section (2.1.2) dealing with sample selection, among coursebooks used for Hungarian adults learning general Spanish the following books were chosen for analysis:

- *Nuevo ELE inicial 1* (Borobio 2002)
- *Nuevo ELE inicial 2* (Borobio 2002)

These coursebooks belong to the same series published in Spain by Ediciones SM.

In school year 2004-2005, these coursebooks were used by 47,8% (275 out of 576) of Hungarian adults learning general Spanish: *Nuevo ELE inicial 1* – 30,4%; and *Nuevo ELE inicial 2* – 17,4%.

The data collected on these two coursebooks can be found in Tables E and F of Appendix X (Table E – for *Nuevo ELE inicial 1*, and Table F – for *Nuevo ELE inicial 2*). In text, when analysing the coursebooks, I will use the abbreviations [NEi1] for *Nuevo ELE inicial 1*, and [NEi2] for *Nuevo ELE inicial 2*.

2.2.3.1. Intercultural objectives in selected Spanish language coursebooks

As in the case of analyses of English and Russian language coursebooks, the investigation of intercultural component of Spanish coursebooks started with analysis of *Intercultural objectives*. This was aimed at revealing whether the coursebook authors *consciously* include an intercultural component into their books in order to promote LLs’ acquisition of ICC and what changes they expect from LLs with regard to ICC. For both analysed Spanish language coursebooks the situation is absolutely the same. The intercultural objectives are explicitly formulated (1.1.a=100,0%) (see Illustration 25).

By character these objectives can be defined as cognitive (1.2.a=100,0%) and affective (1.2.c=100,0%). The authors have some realistic expectations with regard to the development of LLs’ intercultural awareness (1.3.a=100,0%). In both coursebooks balance
between intercultural and linguistic objectives can be diagnosed (1.4.b=100,0%). To sum up, the intercultural objectives can be considered as appropriate (1.5.a=100,0%) (for scores see Tables E & F in Appendix X).

Illustration 25: Nuevo ELE inicial 2, p.5.

2.2.3.2. Intercultural contents in selected Spanish language coursebooks

The analysis of intercultural contents was started with investigation of the maps of contents (2.1). In both – Nei1 and Nei2 – culture is included in the map of contents under the title Descubre España y América Latina (in English, Discover Spain and Latin America). As the author notes, this section aims at broadening sociocultural knowledge about Spain and Latin America.

I followed with analysis of topics: it was interesting to know what topics are more “popular” in these coursebooks (see Graph 14). In Nei1 the most “popular” topics are Personal Identity… (2.2.e=38,9%), Geography, place of residence...(2.2.c=33,3%), and Capital “C” Culture… (2.2.b=27,8%). In Nei2 the most “popular” topics are Geography, place of residence... (2.2.c=50,0%), capital “C” Culture… (2.2.b=44,4%), and Free time… (2.2.a=27,8%). In both coursebooks Daily routine… is treated with the same frequency (2.2.bb=22,2%). Surprisingly enough, such a topic as Work… is treated only in Nei1 (2.2.i=22,2%), and Food… only in Nei2 (2.2.k=22,2%). There is quite a long list of topics not treated in any of the two coursebooks. These are Education and socialisation (h), Politics (w), National symbols (x), Religion (z), Migrants (dd), Law and crime (ee), Poverty... (ff), Intercultural contacts... (ii), Culture shock (jj), Culture comparison (kk), and Stereotypes (ll).
As in the case of English and Russian language coursebooks, I decided to check, applying the stratified model of Gullestrup (1992), what segments (aspects) of culture are (not) treated in these two coursebooks (see Table 15). Moreover, this checklist may help us when investigating a series. For example, it may help to reveal whether a LL, who learns general Spanish from beginner to elementary level and uses NEi1 and NEi2, is provided with knowledge about all necessary aspects (segments) of culture just by using these coursebooks or not (see Table 15).

Table 15: Segments of culture treated in NEi1 and NEi2 (on base of Gullestrup’s model 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gullestrup’s segments</th>
<th>NEi1</th>
<th>NEi2</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social institutions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political institutions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction and Socialisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious institutions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So, as the table shows, only two of Gullestrup’s eight segments are touched in both NEI and NEI2 (Language & Communication and Social institutions). The author tries to write “politically correct” coursebook and avoid discussion of such topics as Politics and Religion. He does not discuss such a topic as Socialisation.

The next step in the analysis of intercultural component of coursebooks was to reveal at which level these topics are treated (2.3): micro-, macro- or intercultural/ international one. For treatment of topics on micro-level the score is the same in both Spanish language coursebooks: 2.3.a=88,9%. For macro-level the scores are quite similar: NEI1 – 2.3.b=61,1% and NEI2 – 2.3.b=72,2%. Surprisingly enough, in NEI1 the score for treating topics on intercultural/international level (2.3.c=38,9%) is much higher than in NEI2 (2.3.c=11,1%). It drives me to the conclusion that the coursebook being interculturally-oriented, does not depend on the level of the book, i.e. a higher level coursebook may turn to be less “intercultural” than lower level like, for example, in the case of NH e 2.3.c=14,3% vs. NHp-i 2.3.c=0,0%. On an intercultural level, the analysis showed that in NEI1 the proportion of units where only target culture(s) were mentioned was higher (2.4.1.a=83,3%) than in NEI2 (2.4.1.a=66,6%). The proportion of units where five or more cultures were mentioned is the same (2.4.1.c=11,1%). And, in NEI2 there are also units where a few (less than 5) cultures are mentioned (2.4.1.b=22,2%). In NEI2 more often than in NEI1 the comparison of cultures can be found: NEI1 – 2.4.2.a=27,8% and NEI2 – 2.4.2.a=38,9%.

Illustration 26: Nuevo ELE inicial 2, p.147.
In *NEi1* emphasis is made on target culture, and in *NEi2* sometimes on other cultures as well (including learner’s culture): e.g. LLs are asked to compare the superstitions (Illustration 26).

The next parameter to investigate was the relationship between cultures, and their opinions about each other, in the case where they are expressed. In both *NEi1* and *NEi2* learners are stimulated to give their opinions about target culture (2.4.3.a=66.7% and 50.0%, respectively) (see Illustration 27). Opinions about or relationship between “target and other”, “learner’s and other”, “target and target” and “other and other” cultures also appear in a lower number of units (see scores for 2.4.3 in Tables E & F, Appendix X).

Illustration 27: *Nuevo ELE inicial 1*, p.74-75.

As I previously mentioned, when trying to describe the potential of coursebooks under investigation for promoting the acquisition of ICC, it was important to find out whether such aspects of ICC as *savoirs* and *savoirs être* are addressed in the coursebooks.

In both *NEi1* and *NEi2* culture specific knowledge was addressed in quite a high proportion of units (2.5.1.a=94.4% and 88.9%, respectively), but culture general knowledge was not found in any of them. As it was discussed in section 1.2.4 of *Theoretical Framework*,
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this totally contradicts today's view on culture learning (Paige et al. 2003:176), according to which the shift from "culture-specific" to "culture-general" knowledge should be made for IC being acquired. Knowledge of self and other is also very important (Byram 1997); but it was promoted only in three units in NEi2. In NEi1 the number of units where the attempt to develop the attitude to relativise self and value other is made is higher than in NEi2, and in NEi2 the proportion of units where positive disposition towards learning about other culture is promoted, is higher than in NEi1 (see scores for 2.5.2.a and b in Tables E & F, Appendix X).

Regarding the characters depicted in NEi1 and NEi2, some interesting observations were done. In both NEi1 and NEi2 the author, Virgilio Borobio, tries to depict quite a broad range of characters. The illustrations also help to enlarge the gallery of social images. However, the quantitative analysis of these coursebooks showed that there are some types of characters that are dominant. For instance, since Nuevo ELE series was written for adults and young adults, the characters of children, teenagers and old people appear very rarely if at all, while the adult characters can be found in the majority of units (see scores for 2.6.1 in Tables E & F, Appendix X).

The quantitative analysis of two books from a gender perspective resulted in almost identical scores for both males and females in NEi1 and in NEi2 (see scores for 2.6.2. a & b in Tables E & F, Appendix X). Of course, the formal numerical analysis is not sufficient when dealing with identities in general and gender in particular. For example, in NEi2 in two units I found stereotypes on gender roles (in U.2 and U.14).

The qualitative analysis also showed that in both NEi1 and NEi2 the majority of the characters are representatives of the middle class. Representatives of the working class are depicted less often and representatives of the upper class appear only in NEi1 (for scores see 2.6.3 in Tables E & F, Appendix X). Interestingly, most often in both books the LLs themselves are involved in the interactions.

In spite of the fact that Spanish and Latin American societies are multiethnic nowadays, in the majority of units we can find only "White" characters. In NEi2 only in two units "Black" and "Asian" characters appear (see Illustration 28).
Las las opiniones de estos cuatro estudiantes de español y decide dónde van las frases del recuadro.

A. Hay que hacer ejercicios de pronunciación y entonación en clase.

B. Es muy importante aprender bien la gramática.

C. No me importa cometer algunos errores.

D. No sé si estoy hablando bien o mal.

«Cuando estudio una lengua, quiero hablar, comunicarme con las personas que hablan esa lengua. Mi objetivo es comprender lo que oigo y que la gente comprenda lo que digo, 1... Por esa razón pienso que es necesario hablar mucho en clase».

Lucy

«Creo que es muy importante aprender a pronunciar y entonar frases correctamente. Muchas veces me siento muy frustrado porque quiero decir palabras que conozco, pero las pronuncio mal y la gente no me entiende. En mi opinión, 2... ».

Chris

«Si no estudias gramática, aprendes más lentamente y olvidas las cosas fácilmente, por eso 3... ¡Ahh! y fuera de clase, en la calle, puedes aprender vocabulario, pero normalmente no aprendes gramática».

Michael

«A veces, cuando hablamos, el profesor no nos corrige los errores, y eso no me gusta porque 4...».

Akira


Interestingly, the family is presented only in two units in NEI1 and in one in NEI2, and in all these cases it is depicted as nuclear (see Illustration 29). Though no mention can be found explicitly about present tendencies in Spanish society to marry at the age of cca. 30 and to have a baby, as a rule only one, between 30 and 35.

Illustration 29: Nuevo ELE inicial 1, p.112.

With regard to the types of characters it was observed that the majority are native speakers. In NEI1 also non-native residents are represented, but in a small proportion (2.6.6.b=16,7%), and in one unit in NEI2 – tourists (2.6.6.c=5,6%). The proportion of tourists is lower (NHb 2.6.6.c=28,6% and NH e 2.6.6.c=14,3%). In the majority of the cases the characters seem to be over-generalised rather than real everyday people.
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More problematic seems the presentation of characters with the regard to their nationalities. The Latin Americans are missing from these coursebooks. Or, better said, one could guess that the native speaker is Spanish and not Latin American.

Besides the statistical analysis of characters, I felt it important to analyse the interactions presented in the coursebooks. It was observed that all interactions are taking place in towns, which seems to be quite one-sided.

Also, I analysed the situations of interaction (see Graph 15). As can be observed from graph 15, in NEi1 and in NEi2 the largest number of interactions are situated at a (language) school (NEi1 2.7.2.b=61,1% and NEi1 2.7.2.b=94,4%). The proportion of other situations is much lower.

With regard to the atmosphere of interactions, in NEi1 in the majority of units the interactions that are depicted can be defined as neutral (2.7.3.c=50,0%), but in NEi2 in the majority of units the interactions can be defined as friendly are depicted (2.7.3.a=61,1%). Only in one unit of NEi2 the interaction can be defined as conflicting is found (2.7.3.b=5,6%) (see U.4 p. 41).

As discussed, in the case of English and Russian coursebooks under examination, the desire of authors to write a positive book is understandable. But one should not forget, that the purpose of FLT is, first of all, to provide LLs with linguistic instruments that they may use in various communicative situations, including conflicts and intercultural misunderstandings.
Such knowledge is especially important for beginners and elementary level LLs.

The analysis of interactions from the point of view of the cultures the characters are belonging to (2.7.4), showed justifiable distribution of proportions. The fact that in the majority of the units the interactions take place between representatives of target cultures (NEil 2.7.4.d=50,0% and NEi2 2.7.4.d=55,6%); or between learners themselves (NEil 2.7.4.f=94,4% and NEi2 2.7.4.f=100,0%), serves some general purposes of FL coursebooks: (1) to show the correct use of target language, and (2) to make LLs interact using target language. The interactions between the representatives of target and other cultures are less often (NEil 2.7.4.b=16,7% and NEi2 2.7.4.b=16,7%), which does not provide users of these coursebooks with a wide range of typical situations of interactions between natives and non-natives.

As previously discussed in the Theoretical part of my dissertation, stereotypes may serve as a major hindrance to successful intercultural communication, and the acquisition of ICC can be seen as the process of combating them (see section 1.2.4). In light of this, I analysed whether there is any stereotyped information in FL coursebooks under examination. The analysis showed that in Nuevo ELE stereotypical representation of cultures can be detected in a higher proportion than in other coursebooks under examination. In both NEil and NEi2 I found stereotypical representation of target culture (2.8.1.a=16,75% and 22,2%, respectively) (see Illustrations 27, 29).

In NEi2 I also found the attempt to stereotypically represent the learner’s and other cultures (2.8.1.b=5,6% and 2.8.1.c=11,1%) (e.g. the discussion on superstitions in NEi2, p.147).

In NEil the stereotypes were on nationalities and social class (see Illustration 27), in NEi2 – on occupation, action, and gender (see Illustration 30). While in NEil the stereotypes were mainly not treated, in NEi2 they were reinforced. For example, in Unit 14 (p.141) LLs are asked to think on women giving presents to men.

Image: En grupos de tres. Pensad en la actitud de las mujeres cuando hacen regalos y escribid algunas frases describiendo diferentes grupos en los que pueden ser incluidas.

Illustration 30: Nuevo ELE inicial 2, p.141.
Above, the analysis of the coursebooks at micro-, macro- and intercultural/ international levels was done. According to Risager (1991) and Byram and Esarte-Sarries (1991), who took the traditions of ‘literary realism’, the fourth dimension of coursebook analysis should be the analysis of the viewpoint taken by the author, (either explicitly or implicitly) (see section 1.3.4 in Theoretical framework). Trying to remain as objective as possible, I examined: first, whether the author’s position is inner or outer in representation of target culture (2.9.1); second, whether his/her description of target culture is positive, critical, fictional, or journalistic (2.9.2).

The analysis showed that in NEi1 and NEi2 author occupies not only inner but “outer” position, and promotes LLs discussion about the target culture and its comparison with learners’ culture, which is very effective for developing intercultural awareness. In both books target culture is described positively, only in one case in NEi2 (see Repaso 1) the author offers a critical view on the target culture.

While in NEi1 the author tried to represent the target culture(s) in “journalistic” style, in NEi2 fiction was also used.

In creating the “realistic” picture of target culture coursebooks illustrations may play important role. The illustrations found in both NEi1 and NEi2 are colourful, good-quality photos or caricatural drawings/comics. And, even when black-and-white illustrations are put in the coursebook this is to reflect the times when the photos were taken (see Illustration 31).

Illustration 31: Nuevo ELE inicial 2, p.86.

Another positive feature of illustrations found in these coursebooks is that they are not only appropriate but in the majority of cases essential to complete that task (see Illustration 32).
It was also very interesting to investigate the characteristics of cultural information given in the books. In general, it can be defined as positive, and in much lower proportion – neutral, but rarely critical. Also the information can be defined as insightful and genuine rather than superficial (see scores for 2.11.1 in Tables E & F, Appendix X). For example, in NEiI LLs have to listen to the fragments of Latin-American music and have to connect them to the photos (p. 92-93).

The analysis of geographical amplitude of information revealed that in NEiI most often the information referring to Spain appear (2.11.2.a=72,2%), and in NEi2 – the Latin America (2.11.2.b=61,1%). In NEi2 the proportion of information about LA countries (2.11.2.b=61,1%) is a little bit higher than about Spain (2.11.2.a=55,6%). But, if I would count a proportion for each country separately, the score would be much lower than for Spain, e.g. Mexico (22,2%), Peru (16,7%), Argentina (5,6%), etc. Moreover, often Latin American countries are listed when talking about LA in general. So, this is the reason why in the table of analysis I mentioned Latin America, and not its countries separately.

When analysing values, beliefs and attitudes in these two coursebooks, I found out that in NEiI the proportion of explicitly and implicitly expressed ones is the same (2.11.3.a and b=22,2%). In NEi2 the proportion of implicitly expressed values, beliefs and attitudes is higher (2.11.3.a=27,8% vs. 2.11.3.b=44,4%). In both books they are mainly cultural (see illustration 33), in lower proportions – universal, and in the lowest proportion – personal values, beliefs, or attitudes.
Although non-verbal communication plays an enormous role in communication in general, one does not expect that foreign language coursebooks deal with non-verbal communication (though it is arguable whether the coursebooks should deal with it or not). However, I was curious whether non-verbal communication appears in FL coursebooks or not and, if yes, in what form (explicit or implicit)?

The analysis showed that in both *NEi1* and *NEi2* non-verbal communication appears in the predominant majority of units, but only implicitly (*NEi1* 2.11.5.b=88.9% and *NEi2* 2.11.5.b=94.4%) (see non-verbal reaction of a boy on a man hitchhiking, Illustration 34).

Explicitly non-verbal communication appears later, at intermediate level in *Nuevo ELE intermedio* (Borobio & Palencia 2002) (see Illustration 35). But as we see such explanation – for the simplicity of language used – can be easily included at a lower level, too (see *NEi2*).
In the *Theoretical* part of my research, the detailed discussion of cultural dimensions was offered (see section 1.1.2). I was curious to know how Spanish coursebooks under examination treat these cultural dimensions. First of all, I should stress that in all cases – when cultural dimensions find their reflection in these coursebooks – they are reflected implicitly. As it observed from Graph 16, in *NEi1* most often such cultural dimensions are reflected as: *attitudes to time (monochronic/polychronic, etc.*) (but only in 11,1% of units). In *NEi2* the range of cultural dimensions that are reflected is wider, but the scores are still very low: *masculinity/femininity and past/present/future orientation* (in 16,7% of units); *individualism/collectivism, short-term/long-term orientation, attitude to the environment/relation to nature, neutral/emotional, achievement/ ascription and universalism/particularism* (in 11,1% of units). For example, the text on pp.132-133 (*NEi2*) clearly shows that Inca’s was ascription culture (e.g. “los ancianos … recibían ayuda especial”).
Graph 16: Cultural dimensions reflected in NEi1 and in NEi2

Although these dimensions are reflected in a very low number of units, it seems to be positive that one of the dimensions — viz. masculinity/femininity — in terms of which Hungary differs enormously from any Spanish-language culture (see Graph 17), is reflected in both coursebooks (e.g. see NEi2, p.140). For Hungarian LLs it should be useful to know that in Spanish as well as in the majority of Latin American cultures gender roles often overlap, and females are less controlled by male domination.

Graph 17: Comparison of indexes for Hungary, Spain and average index for the Latin America with regard to MAS. (Based on data from Hofstede 2003 and www.geerthofstede.com)

Here, I would like to repeat what I wrote when discussing cultural dimensions in other coursebooks, viz. that each language coursebook is the product of its culture (and it is proved by proportions of cultural dimensions reflected in the coursebooks).

Concluding, in both — NEi1 and NEi2 — there is no balance between language and culture, language is more relevant, and even in relation to objectives expressed by the author
himself the intercultural contents have many deficiencies (see scores for 2.12.1-2.12.3 in Tables E & F, Appendix X). Although some very good examples were found in both coursebooks, the intercultural contents can be evaluated only as “limited”.

2.2.3.3. Methodology of intercultural language learning in selected Spanish language coursebooks

As I already mentioned in section 2.2.2.3, the block 3. was included in the table (scheme) with the purpose of revealing whether any activities can be found in the books under investigation which could promote the development of ICC.

Regarding savoir comprendre, in both – NEi1 and NEi2 – the same number of units were found which contain activities to promote its development (3.1.1.a=44.4%) (see Illustration 36).

The positive is that both books contain the examples on developing savoir apprendre/ faire. In both NEi1 and NEi2 the ability to discover and interact is being developed (NEi1 3.1.2.a=50.0% and NEi2 3.1.2.a=66.7%), and – to a lesser degree – the ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and operate it (NEi1 3.1.2.b=50.0% and NEi2 3.1.2.b=44.4%) (see Illustration 37).
The ability to critically evaluate perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures (savoir s'engager) is being developed in four units in NEil1 and in two units of NEil2. For example, in NEil2 (U.7, pp.74-75) there is a text on how the Day of Dead is celebrated in Mexico, and that it is a merry day rather than a sad one. LLs are invited to discuss it and to compare to the Day of Dead in their country.

The analysis showed that intercultural learning in these coursebooks is based exclusively on linguistic activities (see scores for 3.2 and 3.3 in tables E & F, Appendix X). Graph 18 shows that in these tasks the focus is made mainly on target culture (NEil1 3.4.a=94,4% and NEil2 3.4.a=83,3%). In NEil1 the focus on learner's culture is made in 38,9% of units, and on other cultures only in one unit. On the other hand, in NEil2 the focus on other cultures is made in 44,4% of units, and on learner's culture only in 22, 2% of units. The scores for learner's culture explains the fact that learners are invited to talk about their own culture and experiences. In two units of NEil2 the focus is also on universal values. And the focus on comparison of cultures was found in NEil1 in 22,2% of units and in NEil2 in 11,1% (e.g. see the above-discussed exercise from U.7).
Most often such language skills are involved as reading and speaking, and much less often – listening and writing (see scores for 3.5 in Tables A & B, Appendix X). Other skills involved are:

- observing, identifying and recognising ($NEi1$ 3.6.a=50,0% and $NEi2$ 3.6.a=27,8%);
- comparing and contrasting ($NEi1$ 3.6.b=27,8% and $NEi2$ 3.6.b=33,3%);
- negotiating meaning ($NEi1$ 3.6.c=11,1% and $NEi2$ 3.6.c=16,7%);
- effectively interpreting messages ($NEi1$ 3.6.e=11,1%);
- accepting difference ($NEi1$ 3.6.h=11,1% and $NEi2$ 3.6.h=11,1%).

I also wanted to analyse whether the strategies for successful intercultural communication are developed by the coursebooks. The results of analysis of $NEi1$ and $NEi2$ were much more positive than in the case of the other four books. The strategy of problem-solving has to be applied in two units of $NEi2$; the strategy of guessing has to be applied in one unit of $NEi1$ and in 27,8% of units in $NEi2$, and in one, one unit of both $NEi1$ and $NEi2$, LLs were invited to manage their learning process.

I analysed the types of tasks in terms of involvement of LLs. The proportion of receptive and productive tasks in both books is the same (94,4%). In $NEi1$ the proportion of co-operative tasks is much lower in comparison with $NEi2$ (5,6% vs. 55,6%). It is found only in one unit in $NEi1$ (Repasso 6-10). LLs in pairs have to write a text about the town they are in. In the process of writing they have to consult the tourist booklets, and to include the list of places of interest in their text. Then, LLs change the texts with other pair and check grammar. After that LLs have to comment on mistakes, correct them, and at the end put some photos or maps of the town on the wall of the classroom ($NEi1$, p.97). In one unit of each of the books
the task promoting autonomous learning was found (in NEi1 – p.97, Repaso 6-10, in NEi2 – ex.5, U.15). In terms of the nature of the tasks, these turned out to be mainly cognitive-attitudinal tasks (NEi1 3.8.2.b=88,9%; NEi2 3.8.2.b=88,9%). In NEi2 also cognitive (27,8%) and exploration tasks (5,6%) were found (e.g. ex.10 p.28 can be adapted as exploration task, see Illustration 38). Production type tasks were found very rarely in one unit of NEi1 and in five units of NEi2.

![Illustration 38: Nuevo ELE inicial 2, p.28.](image)

Although some positive examples were found in both books, in general, the methodology can be evaluated as “limited”. It has many deficiencies in relation to both objectives and contents of the coursebooks. However, the fact that the author consciously included the development of intercultural awareness among the objectives of these books, resulted in a higher potential for promoting the acquisition of ICC.

2.2.3.4. Intercultural assessment in selected Spanish language coursebooks

Both coursebooks – NEi1 and NEi2 – are divided into three blocks: (1) Units 1-5, (2) Units 6-10, and (3) Units 11-15. After each block the Review section (in Spanish, Repaso) is found. Although no guidelines for assessing intercultural component are provided (see 4.1 in Table E & F, Appendix X), it would be unjust to say that intercultural elements are “not found” in the assessment. For example, in NEi1 (pp. 96-97) LLs are asked to read the text about Sevilla, to answer whether the statements about Sevilla are true or false, and after it, to write a text about the town they are in. They are asked to include information on places of interest, and if able to do so, they are advised to use additional materials (tourist leaflets, for instance). Another example can be found in NEi2 (see Illustration 39).
La dieta española, como la de otros muchos países, está cambiando. Los alimentos tradicionales están siendo sustituidos por otros, normalmente de origen norteamericano, que son perjudiciales para la salud porque contienen mucha grasa animal. Actualmente tomamos menos legumbres, verduras, ensaladas, arroz y aceite de oliva que antes. Por el contrario, el consumo de hamburguesas, perritos calientes, sándwiches y patatas fritas es ahora mayor. También cocinamos menos que antes y comemos más fuera de casa, a menudo alimentos con mucha grasa. Las consecuencias de estos nuevos hábitos alimenticios son claramente negativas: el número de enfermedades relacionadas con la mala alimentación es cada vez mayor.

**El Mundo del Siglo Veintiuno.**  (Adaptado).

---

**b) Busca dos alimentos tradicionales de España que aparecen en el texto.**

- ¿Los has tomado alguna vez?
- ¿Te gustan?

---

**c) Comenta ahora el artículo con tus compañeros.**

- ¿En tu país pasa lo mismo que en España?
  - Creo que sí... porque...
  - Pues yo creo que...

---

**Illustration 39: Nuevo Español Inicial 2, p.56.**

In this task LLs are asked to read a text that can be defined as genuine and adapted (following Newby’s (2000) definition of genuine text in section 1.3.4, Theoretical framework). LLs have not only to find the traditional Spanish dishes in the text, but also to express their attitude to them, and compare the situation with that in his/her own country. Although this task provides excellent opportunity to develop skills necessary for successful intercultural communication, the unit (as well as other review units) is designed first of all for review and assessment of language skills, and the intercultural element is just something additional. For this reason, in both coursebooks option (a) was identified for these review units in (4.2.a=16.7%), for the rest the option “not applicable” was chosen (Tab. E, F in Appendix X).
2.2.3.5. Evaluation of analysed Spanish language coursebooks from the point of view of their potential for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence

Here, instead of repeating my observations made during the analysis of Spanish language coursebooks under examination (which I will, in any case, summarise in chapter 2.3), I will focus on those aspects that I consider essential for promoting the acquisition of ICC.

The analysis showed that neither of the analysed coursebooks fully reflects the diversity of contemporary Spanish-speaking societies. The social life is often depicted in oversimplified and superficial form, which deprives LLs of chances for intercultural reflection. These books, for example, can be criticized for not discussing refugees and migrants, which represent an integral part of today’s Spanish society. In general, the range of characters and interactions between them can be considered narrow and one-sided.

Among the positive features of these books I would mention the range of countries represented. Although I did not mention in the table of analysis each Latin American country separately, the score for Latin America in general was quite high.

Another positive feature is that in NEiI the proportion of units where topics are treated on intercultural level is quite high (2.3.c-38.9%), which is much higher than in other books under examination (with scores varying from 0.0% to 14.3%). This found its reflection in the scores for 3.4 (in the block of Methodology), where NEiI has the highest proportion of units with the focus on “comparison of cultures” (3.4.d=22.2%), compared to the proportions detected in other books ranking from 0.0% to 11.1%.

As discussed in the case of English and Russian coursebooks under examination, the desire of authors to write a positive book is understandable, but one should not forget, that the purpose of FLT is, first of all, to provide LLs with linguistic instruments they may use in various communicative situations, including conflicts and intercultural misunderstandings. Such knowledge is especially important for beginners and elementary level LLs.

In my view, one of the main deficiencies of both books is that they are devoid of any negotiation of miscommunication. The LLs – users of these books – hardly get any opportunity to master the skills of negotiating intercultural misunderstandings, crucial for all levels of proficiency, but particularly for beginners and elementary level learners.

To sum up, the analysis of two Spanish coursebooks, which are most widely used for beginners to elementary level learners in adult FL education in Hungary, demonstrated that their potential for promoting the acquisition of ICC is “limited”. However, it would be unjust not to mention that the fact that the author of the coursebooks included the raising of intercultural awareness in the list of objectives resulted in more “conscious” incorporation of cultural material, which may promote the acquisition of ICC.
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2.3. Comparison of the potential of the analysed English, Russian and Spanish language coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence

All of the above-analysed coursebooks were published by well-known publishers: Oxford University Press (New Headway series), Ediciones SM (Nuevo ELE series), Nemzetii Tankönyvkiadó (Sag za šagom), and Zlatoust (Poehali). All these publishers pay special attention to the quality of the books and to make them fit the requirements of the modern world. Therefore, there can be noted the growing concern and care about including culture in FL coursebooks. But, only in the case of Nuevo ELE inicial 1 and inicial 2, it was found out that the author (Virgilio Borohio) consciously includes the intercultural component in his books, and has realistic expectations for LLs (users of his book) with regard to developing their intercultural awareness.

![Table 16: Comparison of data collected in English, Russian and Spanish coursebooks concerning Intercultural Objectives (adapted from Méndez García 2003:81-82)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercultural Objectives</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>NHb</th>
<th>NHe</th>
<th>Sag...</th>
<th>Poehali</th>
<th>NE11</th>
<th>NE12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Explicitly expressed</td>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) yes, but as cultural and not intercultural</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) no</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. By character</td>
<td>a) cognitive</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) behavioural</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) affective</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) other</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) not applicable</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Changes expected from learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) realistic</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) not realistic</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) there are not any expectations</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) other</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) not found</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Relation to linguistic objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) dominance of (inter)cultural objectives</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) balance between (inter)cultural and linguistic objectives</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) dominance of linguistic objectives</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) exclusivity of linguistic objectives</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) other</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) absolute absence of objectives of any type</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. General evaluation of intercultural objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) appropriate</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) limited</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) other</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) not found</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the balance between linguistic and intercultural objectives can be noted in these two Spanish language coursebooks. Opposite to this, in English and Russian language coursebooks analysed above, only cultural (not intercultural) objectives are mentioned, and in
quite a limited form. In Russian language coursebooks, in comparison to English and Spanish, no expectations are mentioned in connection with LLs acquisition of either cultural knowledge or ICC. The data collected concerning Intercultural Objectives in these 6 coursebooks are compared in Table 16.

In general, the analysis of intercultural objectives, completed with the analysis of the maps of contents, showed that the inclusion of culture in FL coursebooks is – if not totally spontaneous – then not really well-thought-out. On the one hand, it is understandable, since the main purpose of coursebook authors is to write a book for teaching language; on the other hand, it is disappointing, since the inseparability of language and culture is widely accepted by profession.

The analysis of topics treated in these coursebooks showed which of them (topics) are the most “popular”, which are less, and which of them are not treated at all (see Table 17). As the table illustrates, among the most often treated topics are (c) Geography/Countries/Place of residence, (b) capital “C” - Culture, (e) Personal identity/Personal features and (i) Work/.../Career/Unemployment. These topics were ranked according to the mean value of a given topic over the six books. But, for some coursebooks these conclusions are not relevant: for example, topic (b) does not appear in NHB; topic (e) does not appear in Poehali and is treated only in one unit in Šag za šagom and in one unit in NEi2. Or, for example, such a topic as Work/.../Career/Unemployment in Šag za šagom appears only in one unit. It was surprising to find out that such topics as Family/Interpersonal relations/Friendship (aa) or House/home (q) are not as popular as one would suppose. Such topics as Economy... (g), Education/Socialisation (h), Social life... (o), Animal world (s), Politics (w), Cultural norms and values (hh), Culture comparison (kk), Stereotypes (ll) are treated extremely rare in analysed coursebooks or not appear at all. Curiously enough, the list of not treated topics is quite similar. None of analysed coursebooks treats Religion (z), Migrants (dd), Poverty/The third world (ff), Intercultural contacts/International relations (ii), Culture shock (jj), the topics knowing of which is very important for successful intercultural communication. I feel it necessary to mention, that there are FL coursebooks, in which these topics are addressed, e.g.:

- the topic of Cultural norms and values (hh) appears in New Success at First Certificate (O’Neill, Duckworth & Gude 1997), Живём и учимся в России (Капитонова, Барanova, Городецкая, Никитина, Плоткина & Жукова 2003); Es español (Alcoba, Gómez Asencio & Borrego Nieto 2001);
- Intercultural contacts/International relations (ii) are discussed in Живём и учимся в России (Капитонова, Барanova, Городецкая, Никитина, Плоткина & Жукова 2003);
- Culture shock (jj) is discussed in Перспективы (Костина, Александрова, Васянина &
Culture comparison (kk) appears in Language in Use Intermediate level (Doff & Jones 1994), New Success at First Certificate (O’Neill, Duckworth & Gude 1997), Живём и учимся в России (Капитонова et al. 2003);

Stereotypes (II) are addressed in Перспективы (Костина, Александрова, Васишина & Костина 1998), Живём и учимся в России (Капитонова et al. 2003).

Table 17: Comparison of proportions of topics treated in FL coursebooks under analysis
(adapted from Sercu 2000:275)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>NHb</th>
<th>NHe</th>
<th>Šag za šgoman</th>
<th>Poehall</th>
<th>NEi1</th>
<th>NEi2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Geography/ Countries/.../</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Capital “C” Culture</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Personal identity/... features</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Work/ Professions/...</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Free time/Hobbies/...</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Food and drinks/Restaurant...</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bb) Daily routine/Life style...</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa) Family/Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) History/Famous people</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Travelling/Transportation</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) House/Home</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t) Target language</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p) Biography/Life/Life cycle</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gg) Likes/dislikes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Body/.../Sport/Health</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r) Environment/Nature/...</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Shopping</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Fashion/Cloths and other</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ll) Stereotypes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hh) Cultural norms and values</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Feasts/Ceremonies/...</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y) Mentality/Ideology</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Media...</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u) Language/body language...</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc) Science/Technology</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) Social life/Institutions/Society</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kk) Culture comparison</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s) Animal world</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Education/Socialisation</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm) Other topics</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) National symbols</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Economy/Money</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w) Politics</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee) Law/Crime</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z) Religion</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dd) Migrants</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff) Poverty/...The third world</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Intercultural contacts...</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jj) Culture shock</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39 topics</th>
<th>13 topics</th>
<th>25 topics</th>
<th>27 topics</th>
<th>24 topics</th>
<th>20 topics</th>
<th>20 topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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However, in spite of the fact that these topics can be found in some of the FL coursebooks, their appearance is sporadic and quite arbitrary, the 'relative weight' of these topics is quite low.

In the case of the coursebooks under investigation, I decided not only to reveal and compare the 'relative weight' of the topics, but, with the help of simple counts, to reveal how many topics from the list are addressed in each coursebook. It was revealed that in NHb only 13 topics from the list were treated, in NHc – 25, in Šag za šagom – 27, in Pohali – 24, and in both NEi1 and NEi2 – 20 (see Table 17). However, these numbers were not enough to get the idea about how diversified is the picture of culture(s) presented in these coursebooks. So, in order not to draw wrongful conclusions from the numbers, I decided to apply Gullestrup's model of segments of culture, and thus, to reveal the number of different aspects of culture addressed in each coursebook (the results of analysis can be observed in Table 18).

Table 18: Segments of culture treated in English, Russian and Spanish coursebooks under analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gullestrup's segments</th>
<th>NHb</th>
<th>NHc</th>
<th>Šag ...</th>
<th>Pohali</th>
<th>NEi1</th>
<th>NEi2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social institutions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political institutions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction and Socialisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious institutions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 5 5 3 4 3 4

The application of this "checklist" showed that the general tendency of avoiding such topics (segments) as Politics and Religion (see Table 18), which can be explained that (together with Sex) these aspects are traditionally considered as taboos in the FL classroom. On the one hand, the concerns of practice, which avoid discussing these taboo topics in the classrooms, are understandable. On the other hand, Gullestrup (1992) is right when suggesting that knowledge about these aspects (segments) of culture is essential for successful intercultural communication.

As the next step in the analysis of intercultural component of coursebooks, it was investigated to which extent the treatment of cultural information is distributed over the micro-, macro- and intercultural/ international levels (2.3). The results of this analysis can be observed in graph 19:
Since every topic can be presented at any of three levels, I decided not to investigate how cultural information regarding individual topics is distributed over these levels; rather I decided to gain an overview picture. The comparison of the coursebooks shows a general preference to represent cultural information mainly on the micro-level, less often on the macro-level, and only in a low number of lessons on the intercultural/international level. As can be observed from Graph 19, the English and the Russian language coursebooks under examination are quite similar from this point of view; while the Spanish coursebooks – in comparison with English and Russian coursebooks – have a lower proportion of units where the cultural information is treated on the micro-level, and higher proportion of units in which the cultural information is treated on the macro- and the intercultural/international levels. The highest proportion of units, where topics are treated at intercultural level, was detected in NEi1 (2.3.c=38.9%).

Summarising the data collected about topics that are addressed in coursebooks under examination, it seems justifiable to say at this stage that, from the point of view of diversification of topics and levels at which these are presented, these coursebooks are rather weak than strong in picturing cultures realistically. This, in its turn, may negatively condition their potential for promoting the acquisition of ICC.

As can be observed from Table 19, the proportion of units where only target culture is mentioned is quite high in both NEi1 and NEi2; in NHb and NHe in the majority of units at least five different cultures are mentioned. In Šag za šagom the proportion of units where the
learner’s (Hungarian) culture is mentioned is quite high (2.4.1.d=40%), which is due to the fact that this coursebook was written for Hungarian LLs, while the other five books are produced for the international market. And, while comparing cultures, in Šag za šagom more often than in other books under examination the emphasis is made on learner’s culture (see scores for 2.4.2.c). Except for NHe, the proportion of units where comparison of cultures is found is quite similar. In NHe this score is quite high (2.4.2.a=85,7%). In general, in all books under examination the emphasis is more often made on differences than on similarities.

Table 19: Presentation and comparison of cultures in FL coursebooks under examination (2.4.1. and 2.4.2) (adapted from Mendoza García 2003:81-82).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>NHb</th>
<th>NHe</th>
<th>Šag...</th>
<th>Pechali</th>
<th>NEi1</th>
<th>NEi2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2.4.1)</td>
<td>Amplitude of cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) only target culture(s) is(are) mentioned</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>26,7</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>83,3</td>
<td>66,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) only a few cultures are mentioned (&lt;5)</td>
<td>28,6</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>29,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>22,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) many cultures are mentioned (≥5)</td>
<td>71,4</td>
<td>71,4</td>
<td>33,3</td>
<td>12,9</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) other</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) not found</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>54,8</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.4.2)</td>
<td>Comparison of target culture(s) with other cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) there is comparison</td>
<td>21,4</td>
<td>85,7</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>38,7</td>
<td>27,8</td>
<td>38,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) emphasis is made on target culture(s)</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>33,3</td>
<td>12,9</td>
<td>27,8</td>
<td>22,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) emphasis is made on LL’s culture</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>9,7</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) emphasis is made on other culture(s)</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) emphasis is made on similarities</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) emphasis is made on differences</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>13,3</td>
<td>25,8</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) other</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) not found</td>
<td>78,6</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>61,3</td>
<td>72,2</td>
<td>61,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When investigating opinions about, or relationships between different cultures, it was observed that in both NEi1 and NEi2 – in comparison to other coursebooks under examination – are highly stimulating with LLs giving their opinions about target culture.

For description of the potential of coursebooks under investigation for promoting the acquisition of ICC, it was important to find out whether such aspects of ICC as savoirs and savoirs être are addressed in the coursebooks. The analysis demonstrated that in general the books do not fit today’s view on culture learning (Paige et al. 2003:176), according to which the shift from “culture-specific” to “culture-general” knowledge should be made for intercultural competence being acquired, because the proportion of culture specific information is much higher than of culture general. In such books as Šag za šagom, NEi1 and NEi2 culture general information was not found at all.

Such aspects of ICC as knowledge of self and other, insights regarding the ways in which culture affects language and communication, attitude to relativise self and value other, and positive disposition towards learning about other cultures are addressed only in some of the books under examination (see scores for 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 in Tables A-F, Appendix X).

The quantitative analysis of the coursebooks showed many deficiencies in presentation of characters. In analysed books the lack of sensitivity to age can be observed (except for Šag
za šagom where some positive examples were detected). On the one hand, I agree that as a rule adult LLs get into contact with adult natives or adults speaking the target language. On the other hand, LLs should be aware of the social significance of the age factor and should be provided examples of how to monitor their linguistic behaviour with regard to the forms of address depending on the age of the interlocutor.

Although the quantitative analysis did not show much difference in presentation of male and female characters, in some cases examples on stereotyping of gender roles were detected. Especially, in Poehali women were depicted through their roles in families or their relations with men.

Similarly, the one-sidedness was observed in presentation of different social classes. Though, in the analysed books some representatives of the working-class (mainly waiters, shop-assistants or cashiers) appear, they are never depicted as friends for non-native residents or students. Usually, the interactions take place when these representatives of the working-class provide services to non-natives, and these encounters are almost always conflict-free, without any misunderstandings. Hence, LLs are not provided linguistic instruments for managing such situations in real life situations.

Also, as the results of the analysis show, the majority of FL coursebooks do not discuss race, and thus is irrelevant for the adult LLs own experiences gained abroad (in the USA, the UK, Latin America, etc). The fact that the authors do not to observe the criteria of accuracy, realism and representativeness when presenting target culture and native characters, results in the sterilized and idealised image of the target culture(s).

Neither the range of characters, nor encounters between them can be defined as broad. In the majority of cases middle-class people are depicted taking part in problem-free interactions. The encounters take place mainly in the towns. The situations are placed at home or at (language) school, which is not really relevant in the case of Hungarian LLs, who with most probability will use FLs in their work or while travelling abroad. The atmosphere of interactions is rarely conflicting or neutral; in the majority of cases it is friendly. The desire of authors to write a positive book is understandable, but one should not forget, that the purpose of FLT is, first of all, to provide LLs with linguistic instruments they may use in various communicative situations, including conflicts and intercultural misunderstandings. Such knowledge is especially important for beginners and elementary level LLs.

The analysis of interactions from the point of view of the cultures the characters are belonging to (2.7.4), showed quite justifiable distribution of proportions. The fact that in the majority of the units the interactions take place between representatives of target cultures, or between representatives of target and other cultures, or between learners themselves serves
the general purposes of FL coursebooks: (1) to show the correct use of target language, (2) to depict the typical situations of interactions between natives and non-natives, and (3) to make LLs interact using target language.

Summarising the results of analysis of characters and interactions between them, I should conclude that the life of target language societies is presented in an over-simplified form, which later may lead to misunderstandings between LLs and native speakers.

As previously discussed in the Theoretical part of my dissertation, stereotypes may serve as a major hindrance to successful intercultural communication, and the acquisition of ICC can be seen as the process of combating them (see section 1.2.4). In light of this, I analysed whether there is any stereotyped information in the FL coursebooks under examination. The analysis showed that the authors of Headway had paid great attention in order to eliminate all kind of stereotypes. The other four coursebooks contain some stereotypes (mainly on gender roles, occupation and nationalities). But probably the more warning is that in some of the cases these stereotypes are reinforced (e.g. in Nuevo ELE). However, there are positive examples of fighting against stereotypes (see Šag za šagom).

The analysis of the author’s viewpoint was done in order to complete the picture of how ‘realistic’ is the representation of culture in the coursebooks. As you may remember, in section 1.3.4 of Theoretical framework, I discussed the four dimensions of coursebook analysis offered by Risager (1991) and Byram and Esarte-Sarries (1991). Three of these dimensions – micro-, macro- and intercultural/ international levels – were analysed at the beginning and the author’s viewpoint is the fourth. Trying to be objective as much as possible, I examined: first, whether the author's position is inner or outer in representation of target culture (2.9.1); second, whether his/her description of target culture is positive, critical, fictional, or journalistic (2.9.2).

The analysis showed that in NHb, NHe and in Šag za šagom, authors occupy predominantly the “inner” position. The “outer” point of view was detected in quite a high proportion in Poehali, NE11 and NE12. In all six books the target cultures are represented from positive perspective. However, some critical remarks were found in NHe, Poehali and NE12. Moreover, in NE12 the author promotes LLs to (critically) discuss the target culture and to compare it with the learners’ own culture, which is very effective for developing intercultural awareness.

In creating the “realistic” picture of target culture coursebooks illustrations may play an important role, and that is the reason why I decided to analyse them. It is not easy to make a comparison of illustrations in these six books due to the difference in the financial background of the production. In the case of Headway and Nuevo ELE, these are big
publishing houses producing books for a wide international market (Oxford University Press and SM). In the case of Šag za šagom and Poehali the publishing houses (Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó and Zlatoust) could not spend much money for production of these two Russian language coursebooks for quite a limited consumer market. However, this cannot serve as an explanation for including not really appropriate illustrations. Moreover, in Poehali the proportion of illustrations, essential for understanding the contents or for completing tasks, turned out to be quite low, which also cannot be explained by the lack of financial resources.

It was interesting to analyse the characteristics of cultural information. In the majority of cases it can be defined as positive, and rarely neutral or critical. The proportion of superficial information is higher in Šag za šagom and Poehali. In some books genuine or genuine-like texts were found in quite a high proportion (e.g. NH e, NEi1, NEi2). But a genuine text does not mean automatically insightful cultural information.

The geographical amplitude also does not contribute to providing more insight into the target language “world”. In the case of the EFL coursebooks the cultural information regarding England and the USA were found; in the case of the Russian language coursebooks – regarding Russia, and in the case of the Spanish language coursebooks – Spain and LA as a whole.

When analysing values, beliefs and attitudes, I revealed that the books differ a lot in expressing them. For instance, in the English and Russian language books under examination these are mainly expressed in an explicit way. In NEi1 the proportion of explicitly and implicitly expressed values, beliefs and attitudes is the same, and in NEi2 the proportion of implicitly expressed ones is higher. Or, for example, in two Headway books and in Šag za šagom the proportion of personal values, beliefs and attitudes is higher, and in Nuevo ELE and Poehali the proportion of cultural values is higher.

Although non-verbal communication plays an enormous role in communication in general, one does not expect that foreign language coursebooks deal with non-verbal communication (though it is arguable whether the coursebooks should deal with it or not). However, I was curious whether non-verbal communication appears in FL coursebooks or not, and if yes, in what form (explicit or implicit)?

The analysis showed that in the coursebooks under investigation, predominantly in the majority of units, non-verbal communication appears in implicit form. Explicitly it is treated only in one unit in Poehali. This shows that the low level of language knowledge should not be considered as the obstacle for discussing non-verbal communication.

Also implicitly, the cultural dimensions are reflected in these coursebooks, in some of
them to a wider range, in the others – less. But, what can be observed on the basis of analysis of cultural dimensions is that all of the coursebooks under examination are products of their cultures, and therefore reflect the most typical for their culture dimensions.

In general, the intercultural contents in these coursebooks can be evaluated as “limited”, and only a few units were evaluated as “appropriate”. There is no balance between language and culture, language is more relevant, and even in relation to objectives expressed by the authors themselves the intercultural contents have many deficiencies.

The analysis of parameters in block 3. – Methodology, included in the table (scheme) with the purpose of revealing whether any activities and tasks included in the coursebooks can promote the development of ICC, showed that on the level of methodology, these coursebooks are rather poor. However, some good examples were found. For instance, the tasks that develop savoir comprendre – ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents or events from one’s own – were found in four of six books.

Much difference was found with regard to savoir apprendre/faire: e.g. tasks developing the ability to discover and/or interact were found in each coursebook under examination, but with scores differing from 3,2% (Poehali) to 100,0% (NHè). The tasks developing the ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and to operate it under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction were found in four of six books. And, the task for developing metacognitive strategies to direct own learning was found only in one book.

The ability to critically evaluate perspectives, practices and products in one’s own and other cultures (savoir s’engager) is being developed in five of six books with scores varying from 7,1% (NHb) to 35,5% (Poehali).

Also, the analysis showed that ILL in these coursebooks is based almost exclusively on linguistic activities, and in only two books I found activities that are usually used in intercultural training and the activities that can be considered a combination of two (linguistic and intercultural). But, the range of such activities is very poor: a culture capsule, critical incident, and a quiz.
Diagram 4 shows that in these tasks the focus is made mainly on target culture, and to a lesser degree on other cultures and learner’s culture. The scores for learner’s culture explains the fact that learners are invited to talk about their own culture and experiences. Very rarely focus is made on other aspects of culture, as for example – universal values. The proportion of units in which the focus was made on comparison of cultures, unfortunately, is very low. The highest proportion of units with focus on “comparison of cultures” was detected in NEiI (with the score 3.4.d=22.2%, compared to the proportions detected in other books ranking from 0.0% to 11.1%).

The analysis of skills involved in interculturally oriented language learning showed that most often such language skills are involved as reading and speaking, and less often – listening and writing. I also analysed what other skills, which may be important for developing ICC, are involved. These turned out to be: (a) observing, identifying and recognising; (b) comparing and contrasting; (c) negotiating meaning; (d) dealing with or toleration ambiguity; (e) effectively interpreting messages; (g) defending one’s own point of view while acknowledging the legitimacy of others; and (h) accepting difference. Table 20 shows the proportions of units in which these skills were involved for each of the coursebooks under examination.
Table 20: The proportions of units in which other than language skills were involved (adapted from Ménendez García 2003:81-82).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>NHb</th>
<th>NHe</th>
<th>Šag</th>
<th>Poehali</th>
<th>NEI1</th>
<th>NEI2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) observing, identifying and recognising</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>57,1</td>
<td>53,3</td>
<td>12,9</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>27,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) comparing and contrasting</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>35,7</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>19,4</td>
<td>27,8</td>
<td>33,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) negotiating meaning</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) dealing with or toleration ambiguity</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) effectively interpreting messages</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) limiting the possibility of misinterpretation</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) defending one’s own point of view while acknowledging the legitimacy of others</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) accepting difference</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>28,6</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) other</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j) not found</td>
<td>71,4</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>33,3</td>
<td>58,1</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>16,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also analysed whether the strategies for successful intercultural communication are developed by the coursebooks. The wider range of such strategies was detected in NEI2, where LLs have to apply such strategies as problem-solving, guessing, learning management.

The analysis of tasks in terms of involvement of LLs revealed that in the majority these are receptive and less often – productive tasks (this is true in the case of all six coursebooks under examination). A very high proportion of co-operative tasks was found in NHb (85,9%) and NHe (100,0%); it was also high in Šag za šagom (73,3%) and NEI2 (55,6%); very low in NEI1 (5,6%), and not one co-operative task was found in Poehali (0,0%). In the Theoretical part of my research (in section 1.2.5.1.2), I discussed the importance of autonomous learning in the process of acquiring ICC. Regrettably, only in three books I found tasks that promote autonomous learning and in a very low proportion (NHe 3.8.1d=14,3%; NEI1 3.8.1d=5,6%; NEI2 3.8.1d=5,6%).

It was interesting to find out that in terms of the nature of the tasks, these mainly fit the objectives put by the authors of the books. For example, the authors of Headway aimed at practicing “functional language” in various social situations. Thus, the high proportions of enactment tasks are logical. But, the authors of Šag za šagom formulated the objectives, which are cognitive by character. So, the tasks for culture learning in this book are cognitive. The author of Nuevo ELE, in his turn, aimed at raising LLs curiosity and interest toward target cultures. His main objective is to raise LLs intercultural awareness and improve their understanding, acceptance and respect of values of differing cultures. Consequently, the majority of tasks turned out to be cognitive-attitudinal.

Although from the point of view of methodology these coursebooks were evaluated as “limited”, some positive examples of tasks that can promote the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence were found.
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The last step in the analysis of the coursebooks was the analysis of the inclusion of intercultural elements into the assessment. It was revealed that the situation is similarly poor in all analysed coursebooks (see Table 21).

Table 21: Comparison of data collected in English, Russian and Spanish coursebooks concerning Intercultural Objectives (adapted from Mendoza García 2003: 81-82).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>NHb</th>
<th>NHc</th>
<th>Šag...</th>
<th>Poehl</th>
<th>NE11</th>
<th>NE12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Guidelines for assessing intercultural component</td>
<td>a) explicit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) implicit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) not found</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Assessment of intercultural component compared to assessment of linguistic component</td>
<td>a) language is more important</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) only language</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) culture is more important</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) balance between them</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) not applicable</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1. In relation to intercultural objectives</td>
<td>a) appropriate</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) with many deficiencies</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) not applicable</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2. In relation to intercultural contents</td>
<td>a) appropriate</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) with many deficiencies</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) not applicable</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3. In relation to intercultural methodology</td>
<td>a) appropriate</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) with many deficiencies</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) not applicable</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.4. General evaluation of assessment of intercultural component</td>
<td>a) appropriate</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) with many deficiencies</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) not applicable</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 summarises the data collected on the inclusion of intercultural elements into assessment, and it observes that in the majority of cases the options "not found" and "not applicable" were identified. There may be two explanations:

1) as discussed in section 1.2.5.2 of Theoretical framework, assessment of intercultural communicative competence is the least well-developed dimension of intercultural language teaching, and, even on a theoretical level it has not crystallized yet, how to include the assessment of intercultural communicative competence in FLT in general, and in FL coursebooks in particular;

2) the developing of ICC is still not taken seriously by FLT practice, nor are FL coursebook writers concerned about the inclusion of intercultural component in the books.

Summarising, the analysis of intercultural component showed – to a smaller or greater extent
in all of coursebooks under investigation heavy deficiencies on the level of objectives, methodology and assessment. On the level of contents, the situation can be evaluated as something better. But, in general, the inclusion of intercultural component into FL coursebooks can still be described as being occasional and not really well-thought-out.

However, if – when defining the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC – we take as a basis the description of 3 levels of intercultural competence offered by INCA (see Table 5 in section 1.2.5.2), then we should accept that the most-widely used by Hungarian adult LLs FL coursebooks at level 1, do have some potential for promoting the acquisition of ICC. By this I mean, that the coursebooks analysed above – to a lesser or to a greater degree – do correspond with the expectations put to LLs at Level 1 (see Table 5 in section 1.2.5.2 and INCA website), according to which,

- LL is already willing to interact successfully with people of other cultures;
- LL tends to pick things up and learn from them as s/he goes along, but s/he hasn’t yet the experience to work out any system of dealing with intercultural situations in general;
- LL responds to events, rather than planning for them;
- LL is reasonably tolerant of other values, customs and practices although s/he may find them odd or surprising and approve or disapprove. (Based on INCA – Intercultural Competence Assessment Project – Assesssee Manual INCA 2004, 5-6)

Therefore, I advocate for a positive attitude when evaluating the intercultural component of a FL coursebook. Being aware of the fact that the scheme used for analysis in present research would be quite hard to handle in every-day practice, I also offer a shortened version of it (see Table 22 in Appendix XI). This table can be used as a kind of checklist: it does not contain options at all, and only those variables are included which proved to be most essential in the analysis of FL coursebook corpus. This makes this scheme of analysis more ‘user-friendly’; and, at the same time, allows teachers, coursebook writers, etc. to turn to the original scheme (table) of analysis at any time if a more detailed insight is necessary. Following this checklist, the user (including decision-makers) may not only evaluate the intercultural component of a given FL book, but also compare the coursebooks on the subject matter, and make on the basis of it, an informed choice. Coursebook writers may use this checklist as guidelines for enhancing the intercultural potential of their books.

The recommendations for enhancing the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC will be discussed in the following chapter (2.3.).
2.4. Cross-cultural recommendations for enhancing the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence

As I have argued earlier, foreign language coursebooks play a unique role in the process of potential ‘empowerment’ or ‘dismemberpowerment’ of language learners. Coursebooks are not a neutral repository of grammatical forms and lexical choices; rather they are an important source of knowledge about alternative cultural and linguistic worlds. In fact, probably they are the main source on the basis of which LLs are imagining these alternative worlds. Misrepresentation, stereotyping, and oversimplification of these imaginary worlds may lead to intercultural miscommunication, frustration, offence, and conflict, as well as to resistance from LLs in cases where their own linguistic and cultural values come into conflict with those imposed on them by the coursebooks. Therefore, the occasional inclusion of culture is not enough; for FL learning to become really learning for communication, more attention should be paid to developing the intercultural component of FL coursebooks.

But, before giving recommendations for enhancing the potential of coursebooks for promoting LLs’ acquisition of ICC, I would like to make clear the real situation and to show some obstacles on the way of incorporating the intercultural component in FL coursebooks. These are:

1. the theory of intercultural language learning is still at the very beginning stage of its development and yet cannot provide us with answers to an endless list of questions;
2. the coursebook authors have to pay attention to several components of the book (and intercultural component is not among those that enjoy the priority);
3. even the authors are concerned with including culture in the coursebook and so promoting language learners acquisition of intercultural communicative competence, they lack special preparation of how to do it;
4. the publisher first of all aims at producing a book which is easy to sell and is “politically correct”.

Taking into account these facts, I still argue that it is possible to make some steps towards enhancing the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting learners’ acquisition of ICC. These recommendations will be discussed in this chapter.

The data collected and analysed in this research, as well as the comparison of English, Russian and Spanish language coursebooks done in the previous chapter, may serve as a basis for giving some cross-cultural recommendations, which might work at least in Western FLT tradition.

The first deficiencies of FL coursebooks regarding their potential for promoting the
acquisition of ICC were revealed on the level of objectives (except for NEi1 and NEi2). The shift from communicative language teaching towards an intercultural one should be reinforced by expressing it explicitly on the level of objectives in FL coursebooks. Mentioning the intercultural objectives in documents like National Curriculum (NAT), or programs for adult courses, seems not to be enough, because it remains too abstract for every-day teaching practice. Teachers need clear instructions, for this, intercultural objectives in FL coursebooks should be expressed in terms of concrete expectations towards changes in LLs – users of a given book. For example, the learners maybe supposed to use cultural information actively, or the learners may be supposed just to be aware of it for a better understanding of the target culture, etc.

Another recommendation, coursebooks designed for adults should be adult in topics. The proportion of cultural information treated on the intercultural/ international level should be increased for a realistic portrayal of different aspects of culture. It should be elaborated on how to deal with topics that are considered taboos in FL classroom (Politics, Religion, and Sex). Of course, one should not expect that coursebook authors, who have to take into account more aspects than just an intercultural one, would include all existing topics in their books. However, I would recommend the authors of FL coursebooks to keep in mind a kind of checklist (like Gullestrup’s, for instance), not to forget to address these ‘segments’ of culture, while selecting the topics.

And, even in the case, where the inclusion of the topics in FL coursebooks remains arbitrary as it has been till now, there is still a way how to enhance the books’ potential for promoting the acquisition of ICC. For example, the situation may be improved by changes in treatment of topics addressed in the coursebooks. Byram and others (Byram, Grikova & Starkey 2002), for example, do not consider it so important which topic is touched in the coursebook, but they stress the importance of how it is treated. They claim, “The key principle is to get learners to compare the theme in a familiar situation with examples from an unfamiliar context” (Byram et al. 2002:16). For instance they offer to examine the theme of sport from such perspectives as:

- Gender – are there sports that are, in the familiar context or in the unfamiliar context, predominantly played by men or by women? Are things changing?
- Age – are there sports for younger people and older people?
- Region – are there local sports? Do people, including the learners, identify with local teams? Do some teams have a particular cultural tradition?
- Religion – are there religious objections to playing sport, or days when some people
choose not to do sport because of religious observance?

- Racism – is this found in spectator sports? Are the players of foreign teams, or foreign players in local teams always treated with respect? Are there incidents of racist chants or insults? (Byram et al. 2002:16)


The results of analysis of intercultural level of contents showed that the number of cultures mentioned is very limited. Even the range of target cultures is very narrow (e.g., in EFL coursebooks mostly English and American cultures are mentioned. I feel it extremely important not only to widen the range of cultures presented in FL coursebooks (especially target cultures), but also include the activities that would stimulate the constant comparison of cultures, and concentrate as much on similarities as on differences between them.

I consider it extremely important to stimulate LLs’ discussion on different cultures. Moreover, I think that providing LLs with opinions of members of other cultures about target culture(s) is also very useful. In my research I analysed FL coursebooks, which are most widely used by Hungarian adult language learners from beginner to elementary levels. Hungarian society – as the majority of countries in the world today – is becoming more and more multicultural. For this reason, these FL coursebooks – which exhibit Western middle-class values – may not fit the new (i.e. not exclusively Western any more) Hungarian society. Hence more attention should be paid to relationships between cultures and opinions about cultures should be discussed.

Such aspects of ICC as knowledge of self and other, insights regarding the ways in which culture affects language and communication, attitude to relativise self and value others, and positive disposition towards learning about other culture should be addressed in FL coursebooks. More emphasis should be made on culture general knowledge.

With regard to characters depicted in FL coursebooks and encounters between them, I consider it extremely important to widen the range of the both. More attention needs to be paid to such aspects of identity as age, gender, social classes, races, nationalities, and so on. The gallery of social images can easily be enlarged through the coursebook illustrations. Everyday interactions should be depicted not as problem- and conflict-free, but being of multiple facets. This would help to present LLs with a more complex and varied picture of social life, and let LLs better understand target (and other) cultures. It is not true to believe, that representation of conflicting situations and non-normative characters (like disabled people or sexual minorities), will make adult LLs feel uncomfortable. But, this will make
them feel *adult*.

Moreover, the representation of conflicting situations is also extremely important for beginner and elementary learners, because it provides them with linguistic instruments that they may use to manage conflicts and intercultural misunderstandings. We should not forget that they are the ones with the fewest linguistic resources and are thus least able to improvise on the spot.

There is always the risk that FL coursebooks through inaccurate representation of target culture convey auto-stereotypes. But, even then there should not be a fear of them. If the stereotypes appear in the book, and are not treated by the authors of the coursebooks, then the teacher should overtake this task. Otherwise, LLs will acquire these stereotypes, which though being second-hand are tenacious anyway.

Clearly, the styles and viewpoints of authors may differ. It is also understandable that the authors choose the positive perspective in representing target cultures. But, what I find important for being included in FL coursebooks is constant promotion of LLs (critically) discussion of the target cultures and their comparison to the learners’ own culture. Providing the ‘outer’ view on the target culture(s) would be very useful.

The quality of illustrations, of course, depends first of all on the financial background of coursebook production. However, more attention should be paid to the didactical role the illustration have in FL coursebooks. They should help to create a “realistic” picture of target language society, be appropriate, and be included when they are essential for better understanding of contents or for completing the task.

Analysing the characteristics of cultural information, I came to the conclusion that at beginner to elementary levels it is extremely difficult to provide deep insight into a culture. Moreover, including genuine or genuine-like text does not provide automatically insightful cultural information. Since beginners and elementary level LLs’ language proficiency level is quite low, the implicit ways of transferring cultural information should be applied.

In my view, it would be useful and fresh to include more information on “exotic” parts of the world where the given target language is spoken. By “exotic” I mean those countries where the target language is spoken, but these rarely appear in FL coursebooks. (I remember when I learnt Portuguese at University, the target country where one could go as an interpreter, was not Portugal, and not even Brazil, but Mozambique. However, all coursebooks of those times contained information only on Portugal and more rarely on Brazil).

I think that LLs should be curious about cultural values, beliefs and attitudes of the target language “world”. When possible, I suggest these should be expressed not only
implicitly but also explicitly in FL coursebooks. The same refers to cultural dimensions. Cultural dimensions are always there, implicitly reflected in FL coursebooks (in some of them to a wider range, in the others – less). But, what is advised to the teachers is that these cultural dimensions should be discussed in the classroom.

Disappointingly, even when FL coursebooks give information on cultural aspects, they provide very little practice in dealing with them. They focus on the cognitive aspect of ICC, mainly offering reading tasks on cultural issues with subsequent discussions. FL coursebooks to become ‘adult’ not only on the level of contents, but also on the level of methodology should offer tasks that promote autonomous intercultural language learning.

I am convinced that, even in the case of lower-level coursebooks, effective changes in methodology can be made. For instance, for developing savoir comprendre (ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents or events from one’s own) I would suggest some very simple tasks. For example, almost each coursebook at beginner and elementary levels contains a task in which LLs have to fill in an application form. For adaptation of this kind of tasks for intercultural language learning, LLs may be asked to bring in the classroom similar forms, which are used in their country, or the teacher can provide with it. They are asked to compare the two, to observe the differences, and to interpret them. This shows that we not necessarily have to wait till out students achieve higher levels of language proficiency to start with intercultural issues. The incorporation of intercultural elements in FLT does not involve unmanageable levels of complexity.

There should be included more tasks that could develop savoir apprendre/faire. Also it is not easy, but as examples of Šag za šagom, Poehali, NEi1 and NEi2 show, it is possible.

More focus should be done on developing savoir s’engager – the ability to critically evaluate perspectives, practices and products in one’s own and other cultures, or as Byram calls it “critical cultural awareness” (Golubeva 2006). I see it as a key for the process of acquiring ICC. This ability can be developed through traditional linguistic tasks. So, FL coursebooks should not necessarily become “a booklet for intercultural training”. However, some tasks that are usually used in intercultural trainings can be easily incorporated in FLT (e.g. culture capsule, critical incident, simulation game, etc.)

Actually, some role-plays appear in FL coursebooks, but they are usually ‘neutral’, i.e. without any cultural context, with attention being paid specifically to the proper use of grammar and vocabulary and to developing communicative skills. Additional activities should be used if we want to develop not only the cognitive, but also the affective, behavioural and strategic aspects of the intercultural communicative competence of LLs.

For instance, a list of intercultural questions can be put in the coursebook. Not only do
they provide a good starting point for discussion, but they may especially be a very effective tool for developing ICC through comparing other cultures (including target) with the LL’s own one. An example is extracted from a list of 22 questions for Swedish students <http://www.fba.uu.se/portfolio/portfolio_en/ pf7.htm>:

- How do people address someone they don’t know? What sort of politeness phrases do people use when talking to casual acquaintances or strangers?

- What is the attitude to private cars? Positive / negative? Do cars tend to be small / large / new / old / well-cared for / wrecks?

- Are there issues which people feel strongly about – e.g. hospitals and health-care, the environment, animal rights etc?

The inclusion of intercultural questions in FL coursebooks is probably one of the easiest solutions because the degree of linguistic complexity can always be changed in order to fit the level of language proficiency of LLs, be that beginners or advanced level.

Questions can also be used for self-assessment of one’s ICC. I think that one of the reasons of not taking seriously the developing of intercultural communicative competence in FLT is that its assessment is not developed yet. It is especially true in the case of Hungarian adult language learners, who learn FLs mainly for pragmatic purposes. As discussed in section 1.2.5.2 (see Theoretical part), unfortunately, yet the assessment of ICC is the least well-developed dimension of intercultural language learning. No provision is made in the European Language Portfolio for self-assessment that focuses on non-linguistic socio-cultural practices. Yet, some ideas discussed in the Theoretical part (can be brought in adult FL classroom (e.g. see Tables 5 & 6, section 1.2.5.2). It can be included in FL coursebooks in various forms: checklist, questions, etc.

To sum up, it would be unjust to claim that FL coursebooks do not promote the LLs’ acquisition of ICC. They develop some skills necessary for successful intercultural communication (although not in a high degree). They also promote a positive attitude towards learning about target culture. Some of them promote the comparison between target culture(s) and other cultures, including the learner’s own culture. But, with regard to their potential to promote LLs’ acquisition of a dynamic concept of culture and intercultural communicative skills that learners can later independently apply to hitherto unknown intercultural contact situations, they (coursebooks) result in being powerless.
3. Summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations

3.0. Introduction

To look is one thing  
To see what you look at is another  
To understand what you see is a third  
To learn from what you understand is something else  
To act on what you learn is all that matters.  
Taoist saying

The final part (Summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations) intends to synthesize the most outstanding aspects of the previous ones, as well as to illuminate the limitations of this study and to give recommendations for further research.

FL coursebooks have the central role in adult language education in Hungary, that is why the study was to investigate – on the example of English, Russian and Spanish language coursebooks currently in use in Hungary for adult LLs – whether and (if yes) to what extent FL coursebooks have the potential for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence.

Thus, the purpose of my research was not just to investigate coursebooks in terms of the amount of cultural information they offer on the target culture(s) or of how that information is distributed over topics (as has been the object of numerous previous investigations of FL coursebooks); rather its purpose was to find those elements in coursebooks that may serve for promoting the acquisition of ICC with their users (in the case of this study – with Hungarian adults learning general English, Russian or Spanish languages). And then – after having determined the relative potential of the analysed coursebooks for promoting LLs’ acquisition of ICC – to formulate workable recommendations regarding the way in which the intercultural component may be enhanced.

My humble contribution to foreign language teaching here is that I tried to give a proposal how to make teaching culture in a foreign language classroom more structured. I strongly believe that teaching culture is not only extremely motivating for FL learners but also gives a more meaningful status to this subject, not to mention that without knowledge of cultural background and intercultural competence, any knowledge (be that grammar, vocabulary or pronunciation) loses its sense.

3.1. Evaluation of the theoretical framework

In the first part of my PhD dissertation I tried to build the theoretical framework for my research. It brought me into contact, however briefly, with several disciplines. Since as yet no single comprehensive theory of ILL is available, insights from Applied Linguistics, Anthropology, Educational Psychology, Sociology, Stereotyping theory, the theoretical field
of Intercultural Communication, and Textbook Research were combined for this research. Having to keep to the limits of physical volume (i.e. length) of a PhD dissertation – on the one hand, and having to combine insights from so numerous fields – on the other hand, I ran the risk of appearing not just brief but superficial. Being aware of it, I tried to do my best, to overview the main findings of these disciplines relevant to my research.

It seemed essential to me to start with an overview of various definitions of culture (section 1.1.1) and the best-known models and discussions of culture (section 1.1.2).

In section 1.1.3 an overview of treating culture by the main methods and approaches of FLT was given, demonstrating that culture – implicitly or explicitly, in one or another form – was always present in FLT since ancient times. But even the widely accepted and applied Communicative Language Teaching Approach can be criticized for limitedness of its cultural dimension. The main purpose of this overview was to underline the idea expressed in chapter 1.2 about the need to shift to a new approach of FLT, viz. Intercultural Language Learning.

I felt it very important, when discussing the Intercultural Language Approach, to start with a brief overview of the field of intercultural communication (section 1.2.1), and to follow with clarifying such concepts as ‘communicative competence’, ‘intercultural competence’ and ‘intercultural communicative competence’ (section 1.2.2).

CLT is strongly criticized for viewing the language learner as an “incomplete native speaker” (see section 1.1.3). The main difference between CLT and ILL is that the last views as its aim that the LL should become rather more intercultural than a native speaker. So, the next step in building a theoretical framework was to define the concept of intercultural speaker (section 1.2.3).

The discussion of the process of becoming an intercultural speaker would be incomplete without touching such phenomena as culture shock and stereotypes (section 1.2.4).

The purpose of my research was to investigate the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC. Although neither the handling of coursebook material by teachers nor the processes the LL goes through while using FL coursebooks were the purpose of my research, I decided to touch these issues in the theoretical part of my dissertation (section 1.2.5.1). I did this to make it clear that a foreign language coursebook (however good it is) can be seen only as a tool of the process (although a powerful one), and besides the coursebook there are many other variables of the process of ILL (see section 1.2.5).

While describing the process and models of intercultural learning in section 1.2.4, I could not omit the discussion of such phenomenon as changes in learner’s identity during FL learning (especially in section 1.2.5.1.2). It seemed to be extremely important, because to
become an intercultural speaker one has to create a special personal linguistic and cultural identity.

Through discussing the above-mentioned issues, I arrived at the matter issue of my study, viz. the role of coursebooks in developing intercultural communicative competence (chapter 1.3). First, I started with overviewing the role of the coursebook in FL teaching and learning in general (section 1.3.1). Second, I discussed the methods of evaluation of FL coursebooks (section 1.3.2). Next, I would consider it unjust not to have mentioned the previous studies on culture in FL coursebooks (section 1.3.3). Other issues, which deserved separate discussion, were the importance of authenticity in interculturally-oriented language coursebooks (section 1.3.4) and the intercultural language learning tasks and activities (section 1.3.5).

Giving the rationale of research (chapter 1.4) ended the theoretical part. Since in Hungary the number of interactions with people from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds is constantly growing, there is a need to re-evaluate foreign language teaching with a view to promoting the LLs' acquisition of ICC. However, in adult education still other objectives have priority. In Hungary, for the majority of adult LLs the reason why they learn FL(s) is to get a better job or university degree (since the intermediate level of language knowledge is a compulsory prerequisite to get a diploma). This means that in the case of adult Hungarian LLs instrumental motivation is more typical. Only few adult language learners learn FL(s) for fun, or because they are interested in target language culture or want to assimilate in a culture and society where the target language is spoken. For the majority, culture remains something additional, or secondary to acquiring linguistic skills. Since FL course-/textbooks still have a central role in the language teaching process and since culture learning plays only a secondary role in this process, it seems logical that the cultural content of a coursebook influences, to great extent, the degree in which culture is present (or absent) in the language classroom. Therefore, in Hungary there is an urgent need to investigate FL coursebooks currently in use in adult language classrooms, and thus provide an empirical basis for reviewing them so as to clarify the way forward.

3.2. Evaluation of the research design

The rationale for this study, as previously discussed, originated from a deep gap between the need for changes within the field of FLT to fit the requirements of a modern world by educating interculturally competent speakers, and the typical for Hungary practice of FLT, where usually taking a successful exam is the final (if not the only) aim of adults learning a FL language. Since the FL coursebook is the most widely used tool for
teaching and learning language, I decided to investigate whether and to what extent FL coursebooks have the potential for promoting the acquisition of ICC with adults in a classroom context. (Certainly, FL coursebooks themselves cannot be sufficient for acquiring ICC, and they definitely should be complemented with learning from other materials and out-of-classroom experiential intercultural learning.)

Focusing on the case of teaching English, Russian and Spanish to adults, the research aimed at suggesting theoretically well-founded and workable ways for reorienting FLT in Hungary, where the FL coursebook is seen as a means for change.

The strength of my research is that the corpus of coursebooks for analysis was selected with scrupulous care. I collected data regarding 5709 adults learning English, Russian or Spanish languages throughout Hungary. I obtained the information about which coursebooks were used in the school year 2004-2005 to teach them. These lists contained 70 titles for English language coursebooks, 22 for Russian, and 14 for Spanish. After that, I selected those coursebooks that are designed to teach general language skills. This way the lists of coursebooks were reduced to 31 for English, 9 for Russian and 9 for Spanish. The final selection was made on the basis of analysis of levels Hungarian adult LLs learnt at in the school year 2004-2005. As the majority of adults learn FLs to pass the state exam, the Hungarian 3-level system (of [1] “alap-”, [2] “közép-”, and [3] “felsőfok”) was taken as a basis for dividing them into groups according to levels. IMPORTANT NOTE: Since then the language examination system in Hungary has changed.

After data analysis on these levels of adult LLs, it turned out that in the case of the three languages the situation is similar, i.e. the majority of adults were at level 1 (beginner to elementary). Moreover, at levels 2 and 3 the proportion of time spent on work with a coursebook is decreasing, while increasing the number of additional materials brought in the classroom and time spent on it. That means, the influence of the FL coursebook on learners' progression with regard to both linguistic and intercultural (communicative) competence may be prognosticated as less significant at levels 2 and 3 than at level 1.

For the above-mentioned reasons, and for viewing the inclusion of intercultural component at beginner and elementary levels as most problematic (due to the limits of language skills), I decided, finally, to reduce the corpus of analysed coursebooks to those for level 1. I chose the most widely used coursebooks for beginner and elementary levels for each of the languages – six altogether.

In spite of the fact that only two coursebooks for each language were analysed, this sample is quite insightful:

- The two English language coursebooks chosen for analysis (Headway beginner and New
Headway elementary) were used by nearly 59% (!) of all adults learning general English at level 1 (782 out of 1335).

- The two Russian language coursebooks chosen for analysis (Шаг за шагом and Полевой!) were used by more than 84% (!) of all adults learning general Russian at level 1 (138 out of 164).

- And, the two Spanish language coursebooks (Nuevo ELE inicial 1 and Nuevo ELE inicial 2) were used by almost 72% (!) of all adults learning general Spanish at level 1 (275 out of 384).

After having selected the corpus of coursebooks to be analysed, I started elaborating the instrument of analysis. As I already mentioned, I took the idea of a table consisting of four blocks – objectives, contents, methodology, and assessment – from Méndez García (2003:59-69). It was adapted and new parameters (variables) were added. As yet not one theory of ILL is available, findings of various disciplines had to be summarised for the elaboration of criteria for coursebook evaluation. The theoretical findings of such researchers as Byram, Esarte-Sarries, Gullestrup, Hall and Hall, Hofstede, Méndez García, Sercu, Stern, Trompenaars and others were taken into account while choosing the parameters for coursebook analysis. In sum, the table of analysis consists of 63 variables and 385 options. Its main difference from that of Méndez García is its purpose: it not just serves to investigate coursebooks in terms of the amount of cultural information they offer and how that information is distributed over topics; rather it serves to find the elements of coursebooks that may promote the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence with their users.

Being that the table is so detailed – on the one hand – made it possible to thoroughly analyse the selected FL coursebooks on the subject matter, and – on the other hand – made it quite difficult for use in every-day practice. This will explain why I offered a shortened version of this table (see Table 22 in Appendix XI). This table can be used as a kind of checklist, and helps its users to evaluate and compare FL coursebooks on the subject matter. It does not contain options at all. Only those variables are included which proved to be most essential in the analysis of FL coursebook corpus. As a result, the table contains 46 variables, which makes this scheme more ‘user-friendly’; and, at the same time, allows teachers and coursebook writers to turn to the original scheme (table) of analysis at any time if a more detailed insight is necessary.

The implementation of this table of intercultural analysis resulted in the discovery of the way in which the intercultural component is incorporated in FL coursebooks under examination. Most of these findings are certainly surprising.
3.3. Evaluation of the main findings of research

The analyses of intercultural objectives revealed that the inclusion of culture in FL coursebooks is – if not totally spontaneous – then not really well-thought-out. Since the inseparability of language and culture is widely accepted by the profession and the importance of ICC for successful intercultural communication is theoretically proved, it seems to be alarming that in practice (and coursebook writing is such), the developing of intercultural communicative competence is neglected in the majority of cases.

Though the analysis showed that the choice of topics for FL coursebooks is quite sporadic and arbitrary, in general, the list of the most often treated topics and the topics not treated at all is quite similar in the case of English, Russian and Spanish language coursebooks. The number of topics addressed in the coursebooks under investigation varies from 13 to 27 (the total number of topics on the list is 38 plus one option for “other” topics as mentioned in the list, the topics mentioned in the list were chosen on the basis of preliminary research). The topics that are traditionally considered taboos in FL classrooms (e.g. Politics, Religion, Sex, etc.) are also avoided in FL coursebooks. The analysis showed that out of 8 ‘segments’ of culture defined in Gullestrup’s (1992) model, in FL coursebooks under investigation only from 3 to 5 ‘segments’ were addressed. Also it was observed that in FL coursebooks under investigation cultural information was treated mainly on the ‘micro-’ level; in much less proportion – on ‘macro-’ level; and in an insignificant number of cases (if at all) on the ‘intercultural/-national’ level.

The analysis of intercultural level showed that usually the range of cultures presented in FL coursebooks is very narrow. Even in the case of target language cultures the amplitude is quite limited. Moreover, the cultures are rarely compared and, when they are, the emphasis is made on differences as a rule, not on similarities. As a rule, FL coursebooks focus on culture-specific and not culture-general aspects of knowledge. Though, it is understandable because they focus on target language and culture.

It was observed that in general the opinions about different cultures or relationships between them are rarely discussed. The characters depicted are usually over-generalised and idealised; and, the encounters between them – as a rule – are problem and conflict-free. The analysed coursebooks in general do not provide LLs with the linguistic instruments to be able to manage conflicting situations and situations of intercultural misunderstandings. However, getting the skills of negotiating intercultural misunderstandings is especially crucial for the LLs at beginner and elementary levels, who – due to the level of their language proficiency – seem to be least able to improvise on the spot. The qualitative analysis of stereotypes showed that the majority of them are on gender and nationalities, and less on occupation and social
classes. Also it was revealed that it is possible to avoid stereotyped information in FL coursebooks (see *New Headway beginner* and *elementary*). Warning was to find out that in some cases the stereotypes are not only not treated in FL coursebooks, but also rather reinforced.

As it was observed, the styles and the viewpoints of authors differ. However, the common factor for the coursebooks under analysis was the positive perspective chosen by the authors in representing target cultures. Good examples of promoting the development of intercultural awareness were found in *NEi2*, where after each representation of target culture(s), the author invites LLs to (critically) discuss what they have learnt and to compare this to their own culture.

In the case of *Headway* and *Nuevo ELE* it can be claimed that illustrations broaden the gallery of social images and help to create a "realistic" picture of target cultures. In the case of *Šag za šagom* it is true only partly, where together with *Poehali* many deficiencies were detected. Probably, the main criticism should be directed at the inappropriate use of illustrations, and the lack of illustrations that are essential for better understanding of the contents, or for completing the tasks.

In the majority of coursebooks under examination the illustrations also play an important role in implicit treating of non-verbal communication. However, this does not mean that at lower levels non-verbal communication can be treated only implicitly. Some good examples discussed in Part 2, show that even at the beginner level non-verbal communication can be treated explicitly, and the low level of language proficiency cannot be considered as an obstacle.

Analysing the characteristics of cultural information, I came to the conclusion that at beginner to elementary levels it is difficult to provide a deep insight into a culture. Moreover, including genuine or genuine-like text does not provide automatically insightful cultural information.

The information on target language culture(s) is also one-sided with regard to its geographical amplitude. In the case of English language coursebooks usually England (or Great Britain in general) and the USA are mentioned. In the case of Russian language coursebooks – only Russia, as if in the ex-Soviet territories nobody speaks Russian any more. And, in the case of Spanish language coursebooks – mainly Spain and Latin America as a whole. Of Latin American countries the most often mentioned are Mexico, Peru and Argentina.

It also observes that values, which are expressed explicitly and implicitly, are predominantly personal in *NHb, NHe and Šag za šagom*, and cultural in *Poehali, NEi1,* and
Cultural dimensions are expressed implicitly. But even then, they reflect the most typical aspects of target language culture. This finding is very important, since it serves as a proof of language and culture inseparability.

In sum, the analyses of intercultural contents showed not only deficiencies, but detected some good examples which can be taken into consideration in the future when writing a FL coursebook.

On the level of intercultural methodology, the analysis showed that, in general, the coursebooks are rather poor. Though, some good examples were found. For instance, the tasks that develop savoir comprendre — ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents or events from one's own — were found in four of six books.

Much difference was revealed with regard to savoir apprendre/faire — the ability to discover and/or interact: the scores differ from 3.2% (Poehali) to 100.0% (NH). The tasks developing the ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and to operate it under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction were found in four of six books. And, the task for developing metacognitive strategies to direct one's own learning was found only in one book.

The ability to critically evaluate perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures (savoir s'engager) — which is seen to be crucial in the process of developing ICC — is being developed in five of six books, but the scores are quite low.

Also, the analysis showed that ILL in these coursebooks is based almost exclusively on linguistic activities, and in only two books I found activities that are usually used in intercultural training and the activities that can be considered a combination of two (linguistic and intercultural). But, the range of such activities is very poor: culture capsule, critical incident and a quiz.

Although the tasks predominantly focus on target culture(s), the scores for focus on learner's culture, as a rule, are quite high. The scores for learner's culture explains the fact that in these tasks learners are invited to talk about their own culture and experiences. Unfortunately, the proportion of units in which the focus was made on comparison of cultures is very low.

The analysis of skills involved in intercultural language learning showed that most often such language skills as reading and speaking, and less often — listening and writing are involved. I also analysed what other skills, which may be important for developing ICC, are involved. These turned out to be: (1) observing, identifying and recognising; (2) comparing
and contrasting; (3) negotiating meaning; (4) dealing with or toleration ambiguity; (5) effectively interpreting messages; (6) defending one's own point of view while acknowledging the legitimacy of others; and (7) accepting difference. The analysis of strategies showed that books mainly addressed such of them as problem-solving; guessing; and to a lesser degree learning management.

The analysis of tasks in terms of involvement of LLs revealed that in the majority these are receptive and less often - productive tasks (this is true in the case of all six coursebooks under examination). A high proportion of co-operative tasks was found in NHb and in NHc. In the Theoretical part of my research (in section 1.2.5.1.2), I discussed the importance of autonomous learning in the process of acquiring ICC. Regrettably, only in three books (NHc, NE1l and NE12), and in a very low proportion.

It was interesting to find out that in terms of the nature of the tasks, these mainly fit the objectives put by the authors of the books. For example, the authors of Headway aimed at practicing “functional language” in various social situations. Thus, the high proportions of enactment tasks are logical; on the other hand, the authors of Šag za šagom formulated the objectives, which are cognitive by character, so, the tasks for culture learning in this book are cognitive, etc.

Although from the point of view of methodology these coursebooks were evaluated as "limited", some positive examples of tasks that can promote the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence were found.

The analysis on the level of assessment revealed that ICC is not considered to be so important to be assessed. The absence of any intercultural elements in the assessment in FL coursebooks under examination is the consequence of two facts: (1) on the level of theory, the assessment of ICC is the least well-developed dimension of intercultural language teaching; and (2) in FLT practice, the developing of ICC is not taken seriously, therefore the assessment of ICC is out of focus.

Summarising, the analysis of intercultural component showed smaller or greater deficiencies on the level of objectives, methodology and assessment in all coursebooks under investigation. On the level of contents the situation can be evaluated as being something better. But, in general, the inclusion of intercultural component into FL coursebooks can still be described as being occasional and not really well thought out.

However, I would like to consider these findings in a positive way. That means, I never had as the final aim of my research to reveal the deficiencies of the coursebooks on an intercultural level, and therefore to conclude that they do not have any potential for adult Hungarian LLs with regard to promote their acquisition of ICC. Rather, I wanted to be more
positive and to show the possible and achievable ways to enhance the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC.

3.4. Recommendations for enhancing the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence

[...] the foreign language teacher should understand how cultural background and attitudes towards foreign cultures may affect language learning. Awareness of these differences is a prerequisite for the development of materials and strategies completely tuned in to and taking into account the needs of specific groups.

De Wachter & Decavele, 2004:157

Given the primacy of FL coursebooks in Hungarian adult classrooms in comparison with other tools and materials (which are considered by teachers to be more time consuming, less efficient, and more difficult to use), makes it even more urgent to revise the coursebooks in order to make them effective tools for promoting the acquisition of ICC.

The research findings made it clear that the current coursebooks are shallow and sometimes superficial with respect to their treatment of culture. They approach culture learning as the learning of target culture facts, thus emphasising the culture-specific aspect of culture learning. These coursebooks are therefore inadequate for the task of teaching culture specifics in the deeper sense, i.e. values, beliefs, etc., or culture-general skills. The cultural information that is provided is rather basic (e.g. topics like holidays, food, shopping; snippets of information about the history, geography, and demography of the target language society or about local exotica, etc.). This shallow presentation of culture can reinforce inaccurate stereotypes (both negative and positive in nature).

But, if we assume that beginner and elementary level LLs should not necessarily become perfect “intercultural speakers”, but rather to start their way towards becoming so, then this aim turns out to be achievable. On this research I took the description of ICC levels offered by INCA project as a basis. I assumed the first of three levels as a realistic aim for beginner to elementary LLs. According to the description of this level (see Table 8 in section 1.2.5.2 and also INCA website), a LL has to fit the following requirements: (1) s/he tends to pick things up and learn from them as s/he goes along, but s/he hasn’t yet the experience to work out any system of dealing with intercultural situations in general; (2) s/he responds to events, rather than planning for them; and (3) s/he is reasonably tolerant of other values, customs and practices although s/he may find them odd or surprising and approve or disapprove.

I argue that following recommendations which were formulated on the basis of the analysis of the coursebooks, the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of
ICC can be considerably enhanced. The recommendations for revising FL coursebooks are as follows:

**On the level of objectives:**
- *Conscious inclusion of intercultural component in the FL coursebook:* There should be made the shift from spontaneously including cultural elements into the FL coursebook to consciously build a theoretically well thought out intercultural component of the FL coursebook.
- *Explicitly defined objectives and expectations towards language learners regarding the development of ICC:* The developing of ICC should be included explicitly in the objectives and the changes expected in the users of given books should be made clear.

**On the level of contents:**
- *Appropriateness of topics with regard to the age of LLs:* Coursebooks designed for adults should be adult in topics; they should be elaborated in the way to deal with topics that are considered taboos in the FL classroom (e.g. politics, religion, sex).
- *Main topics:* Taking in account that it is impossible (and also not necessary), while choosing the topics to be treated, to include all existing topics in a FL coursebook, I would recommend to use as a checklist the eight ‘segments’ from Gullestrup’s model (1992), viz. technology, economics, social institutions, political institutions, language and communication, reproduction and socialisation, ideology, and religious institutions.
- *Cultural information:* More attention should be paid to treating cultural information not only on the micro- or macro- levels, but also on the intercultural/ international level in order to create a realistic portrayal of different aspects of culture.
- *The amplitude of cultures:* The amplitude of cultures presented in FL coursebooks should be broadened, and special attention should be paid to the target cultures, their range should not be limited to English and American cultures as, for example, in the case of teaching EFL. Such representation of cultures is not only one-sided, it is out of date.
- *Comparison of cultures:* The constant comparison of cultures should be stimulated, and stress should be done not only on differences, but also on similarities between them.
- *Discussions about cultures:* LLs should be invited to discuss different cultures, and be provided with opinions of the members of other cultures about the target culture(s).
- *Culture general knowledge:* Such aspects of ICC as knowledge of self and other, insights regarding the ways in which culture affects language and communication, attitude to relativise self and value other, and positive disposition towards learning about other
cultures should be addressed in FL coursebooks. More emphasis should be made on culture general knowledge.

- **The range of characters and encounters between them**: The range of characters and encounters between them should be broadened. Everyday interactions should be depicted not as problem- and conflict-free, but being of multiple facets. This would help to present LLs with a more complex and varied picture of social life, and provide LLs with linguistic instruments for coping with conflict situations.

- **Treatment of stereotypes**: The biased and stereotypical representations of cultures and such aspects of identity as gender, nationality, occupation, etc. should be avoided when possible, or at least treated. Otherwise LLs will acquire so-called second-hand stereotypes through FL coursebooks.

- **Discussion of target culture in comparison to one’s own culture**: After each representation of target culture, LLs should be invited to discuss it and to compare it to the similar aspects of their own culture.

- **Illustrations**: Only appropriate illustrations should be included in FL coursebooks, they should complete their didactical role: to broaden the gallery of social images, to create a “realistic” picture of target culture, and to help better understand the contents or complete the tasks.

- **Genuine texts selection**: Genuine texts to be included in FL coursebooks should be carefully selected under the criterion of insightfulness in representing target culture.

- **Presentation of values, beliefs and attitudes**: Cultural values, beliefs and attitudes should be expressed explicitly in FL coursebooks.

- **Explicit presentation of non-verbal communication**: Even at beginner and elementary level non-verbal communication should be treated explicitly.

- **Discussion of the most typical dimensions of the target culture**: The authors should include in the FL coursebook that material which is most typical for given target culture dimensions. However, this is the task of the FL teacher to call LLs attention to those dimensions, because – as a rule – they appear implicitly in the coursebook.

**On the level of methodology:**

- **Promotion of autonomous intercultural language learning**: The books should be made ‘adult’ not only on the level of contents, but on the level of methodology. FL coursebooks should promote autonomous intercultural language learning.

- **Inclusion of tasks for promoting the acquisition of ICC**: I suggest including in FL coursebooks the tasks for developing savoir comprendre, savoir apprendre/faire and
savoir s'engager. The last – the ability to critically evaluate perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures – is viewed by me as crucial in the process of acquiring intercultural communicative competence.

- **Adhering intercultural perspective to traditionally linguistic tasks**: The traditionally linguistic tasks should receive intercultural perspective. With the help of intercultural questions any topic can receive an intercultural perspective.

- **The range of tasks for intercultural language learning**: The range of tasks for intercultural language learning should be broadened both in terms of LLS' involvement and in terms of their nature.

**On the level of assessment:**

- **Inclusion of tasks for ICC assessment and evaluation**: Although, the assessment of ICC is the least well-developed dimension of intercultural language teaching, and, even on a theoretical level it has not crystallized yet. I consider it extremely important to work on ways of including it in FLT in general, and in FL coursebooks in particular (especially in Hungary). This will "force" both teachers and learners to take it (developing of intercultural communicative competence) seriously. I suggest to start with including simple checklists or questions for self-assessment.

Summarising, I would like to refer to the research questions that were put up at the beginning:

*What potential do English, Russian and Spanish language coursebooks (which are currently in use in Hungary for teaching adult language learners) have for promoting acquisition of ICC at the beginner to elementary levels?*

*What cross-cultural recommendations can be suggested for enhancing the potential of FL coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC?*

In my dissertation the answers to both research questions were provided. Applying both methods of content analysis – qualitative and quantitative – made it possible to describe the potential of coursebooks for promoting the acquisition of ICC. For analysis I chose those English, Russian and Spanish language coursebooks that turned out to be the most widely used by adult Hungarian language learners in school year 2004-2005. On the basis of deficiencies revealed in the process of analysis of these books, I formulated the recommendations. I hope that following these recommendations may significantly improve the present situation in Hungarian adult language education regarding its intercultural aspect.
3.5. Recommendations for further research

It is our conviction that in the multicultural international world in which we live foreign-language competence will gain in importance. Therefore, the teaching of communicative competence must be continued at the same high level as at present. It is, however, high time that language educators also realise that speaking a foreign language always means entering a cultural world that may to a lesser or a larger extent be different from one’s own. Therefore, all language education should always also be intercultural education.

Serçu, 2002:72

As mentioned before, even the most insightful materials may be easily misrepresented and oversimplified in careless teaching, while biased and stereotyped representations may turn into great subjects for intercultural reflection. Consequently, the most promising research direction in my view is not a numerical increase in the kinds of coursebooks examined, but a study of how various FL coursebooks are used in the classroom.

The other direction can be the examination of inter-relations of raising the learners’ critical language awareness and developing their ICC. Without proper discursive means LLs (especially adults) are unable to express their emotions and desires, construct their identities, and, hence, participate in meaningful interactions (with native as well as non-native speakers) as valid and legitimate interlocutors.

And the third, and probably the most challenging direction for further research, is the research on intercultural teachers’ training – both pre-service and in-service. FL teachers should understand that intercultural language learning is more than just teaching communicative competence and, in addition, increasing the volume of information about the target culture(s). Undoubtedly, the acquisition of ICC requires the increase of LL’s familiarity with target culture(s). But, attention should also be paid to the LL’s own culture and other cultures as well. Moreover, the knowledge about different cultures should be acquired through constant comparison and critical reflection. In FL teachers’ trainings the focus should be done on showing teachers how instead of traditional teacher-led FLT to move to a learner-centred autonomous intercultural language learning approach.

3.6. Conclusion

Yet, FLT practice is not ready for such change. Therefore, carefully planned FL coursebooks with an enhanced potential for promoting the acquisition of ICC (i.e. clear objectives, scrupulously selected contents, well-thought-out methodology, and motivating assessment tasks) could play a great role as a means for change.

In conclusion, I confirm that doing this research was a valuable experience for me and I hope it will serve as my humble contribution to the field of foreign language teaching.
Thank you for your attention to my work.
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MAGYAR NYELVŰ ÖSSZEFoglaló

A kezdő és alapszintű idegen nyelvi kurzuskönyvekben rejlő lehetőségek az interkulturális kommunikatív kompetencia fejlesztésére

(A felnőtt nyelvtanulók által jelenleg Magyarországon használt angol, orosz és spanyol tankönyvek elemzése alapján)

Bevezetés

Mivel a kurzuskönyveknek Magyarországon központi szerepük van a felnőttkori nyelvoktatásban, a kutatás célja – a jelenleg Magyarországon, a felnőttoktatásban használt angol, orosz és spanyol nyelvű kurzuskönyvek példáján keresztül – annak feltárása volt, hogy a kurzuskönyvekben milyen lehetőségek rejlénak az interkulturális kommunikatív kompetencia (IKK) fejlesztésére.

Tehát a kutatás célja – több, korábban megjelent idegen nye. /vi kurzuskönyvel kapcsolatos kutatás témájától eltérően – nem csupán a kurzuskönyvekben megtalálható célerszági civilizációra jellemző kulturális információ mennyiségének a feltérképezése és témákra bontásának a vizsgálata volt, hanem azoknak az elemeknek az összegyűjtésére is irányult, amelyek hozzájárulhatnak az interkulturális kommunikatív kompetencia elsajátításához a felhasználók – jelen kutatás esetében magyar anyanyelvű általános nyelvet tanuló, angol, orosz vagy spanyol kurzuskönyvet használó felnőtt nyelvtanulók – körében. Az elemzett kurzuskönyvek által nyújtott ezen lehetőségek számbavétele után további célom az volt, hogy könnyen adaptálható, használható javaslatokat tegyen az interkulturális komponens további fejlesztésére.

Emléleti háttér

Disszertációim első részében megpróbáltam felépíteni a kutatásiomhoz szükséges emléleti háttért. Eközben több tudományterülettel kerültem kapcsolatba. Mivel nem létezik egyetlen átfogó elmélete sem az interkulturális nyelvterületen, az alkalmazott nyelvészeti antropológiai, pedagógiai-pszichológiai, szociológiai, sztereotípia-elméleti területeken kívül, kutatásomban az interkulturális kommunikáció emléleti háttért összekapcsolatban a kurzuskönyvek elemzésével. A disszertáció terjedelmének a korlátait szem előtt tartva, valamint annak okán, hogy számos tudományterület eredményeit kellett egységbe foglalni, felmerülhet a feltületesség kockázata. Ennek tudatában, a tőlem telhető módon igyekeztem ezen tudományágaknak a kutatásiomhoz kapcsolódó legfőbb Elsődlegesnek tartottam a kultúra
különböző meghatározásainak a számbavételét (1.1.1 alfajezet), és a kultúra legismertebb modelljeinek az ismertetését (1.1.2 alfajezet).

Az 1.1.3 alfajezetben általánosan bemutatom a kultúra szerepét az idegennyelv-tanítás különböző történeti módszereiben, bizonyítva, hogy a kultúra – implicit vagy explicit módon, valamilyen formában – mindig jelen volt az idegennyelv-tanításban. De valójában még a széles körben elfogadott és alkalmazott kommunikatív nyelvoktatást is írhatjuk a kulturális dimenzió korlátai miatt. Az általános bemutatás fő célja az 1.2 fejezetben kiemelt gondolat alátámasztása volt, mely szerint az idegennyelv-tanításban egy új irányzat – (nevezetesen) az **interkulturális nyelvtanítás** – felé szükséges elmozdulni.

Fontosnak tartottam, hogy az interkulturális nyelvtanítási irányzat megvitatása során röviden áttekintsem az interkulturális kommunikáció tudományterületét (1.2.1 alfajezet), majd pedig – lehetőség szerint – pontos magyarázatát adjam a kommunikatív kompetencia, az interkulturális kompetencia és az interkulturális kommunikatív kompetencia fogalmának (1.2.2 alfajezet).

A kommunikatív nyelvoktatás legtöbb bírálója azzal a kritikával fordult az irányzat ellen, hogy az „tökéletlen anyanyelvi beszélő”-nek tekintette a nyelv tanulótól (ld. 1.1.3. alfajezet). A legfőbb különbség a kommunikatív nyelvoktatás és az interkulturális nyelvtanítási irányzat között abban rejlik, hogy az utóbbi a nyelvoktatás legfőbb célkitűzésének a nyelv tanuló “interkulturális” (nem pedig „anyanyelvi”) beszélővé formálását tartja. Emiatt az elméleti hátter felépítésében a következő lépés az interkulturális beszélő fogalmának definiálása volt (1.2.3 alfajezet).

Az interkulturális beszélővé válás folyamatának ismertetése nem lenne teljes a *kultúrosok* és a *sztereotípizálás* jelenségeinek érintése nélkül (1.2.4 alfajezet).

Kutatáson célja volt, hogy megvizsgáljam az idegen nyelvi kurzuskönyvekben rejlő lehetőségeket az IKK sikeres elsajátításának lehetősége szemszögéből. Bár sem a kurzuskönyvi tananyagok tanári alkalmazása, sem az idegennyelv-tanulási folyamatok elemzése nem képezte szűkebb kutatáson tárgyát, mindkét terület jelenségeire kitértem disszertációm elméleti részében (1.2.5.1 szakasz). Szándékom az vezérelte, hogy rámutassak arra a tényre, hogy bármennyire is jó minőségű legyen egy idegen nyelvi tankönyv, csupán (adott esetben persze nagyon is hatásos) eszközei tekintetéő az interkulturális nyelv tanulás folyamata során – számos egyéb tényező figyelembe vétele mellett (ld. 1.2.5. alfajezet).

Az interkulturális nyelv tanulás folyamatainak és modelljeinek ismertetése során nem tekinthettem el az idegennyelv-tanuló identitástudatában bekövetkező változások bemutatásától sem (1.2.5.1.2 alszakasz). A jelenség megvitatásának fontosságát jelentősen
alátámasztja az a megfigyelés, amely szerint az interkulturális beszélői kompetencia formálódása közben jellegzetes változások következnek be a nyelvtanuló személyes, nyelvi, és kulturális azonosságudatában.

A fenti jelenségek bemutatása átvezet disszertációim fő kutatási területére, nevezetesen a kurzuskönyvek szerepére az IKK fejlesztésében (1.3 fejezet). Első lépésként általánosságban áttekintem a tankönyvek idegennyelv-oktatásban és tanulásban betöltött szerepét (1.3.1 alfjezet), majd az idegennyelvi tananyagelemzés kérdéseit vizsgálok meg közelebből (1.3.2 alfjezet). Ez után következik az idegen nyelvi kurzuskönyvek kulturális tartalmát elemző korábbi tanulmányok és kutatások ismertetése (1.3.3 alfjezet), mivel mellőzésüket súlyos hiányossággént minősítem. Egyéb, az általam külön fejezetrezekben taglalt problémák és jelenségek körébe tartoznak a hitelesség („authenticity”) fontossága az interkulturális orientációjú idegen nyelvi tankönyvekben (1.3.4 alfjezet), valamint az interkulturális beállítottság tanulási feladatok és tevékenységek bemutatása (1.3.5 alfjezet).

Az elméleti részt a saját kutatáson céljait és megalapozottságát indokló fejezetet résza (1.4 fejezet). Mivel a magyar lakosság körében is folyamatosan növekszik az olyan interakciók száma, amelyekben a másik fél eltérő nyelvi és kulturális háttérrel rendelkezik, következésképpen szükségessé válik az idegennyelv-tanítás létező gyakorlatának felülvizsgálata a nyelvtanulók interkulturális kommunikatív kompetenciájának fejlesztése személyzetéből. Ennek ellenére a felnőttoktatásban továbbra is ettől eltérő szempontok dominálnak. Magyarországon a legtöbb felnőtt nyelvtanuló azért szánja rá magát az idegennyelv-tanulásra, mert jobb álláshoz szeretne jutni, vagy egyetemi diplomát akar szerezni (mivel a középfokú nyelvtudás kötelező feltétele a diploma megszerzésének). Így nem csoda, ha az átlag magyar felnőtt nyelvtanuló motivációs háttére tipikusan instrumentális jellegű. Kevés felnőtt tanul nyelvetek kizárólag a nyelvtanulás örömeért, vagy azért, mert érdeklődik a célnyelvi kultúra iránt, illetve asszimilálódni szeretne a célnyelvi kultúrába vagy társadalombra. A többség számára a kultúra legfeljebb járulékos jellegű adalék, mindenféle másodlagos jelentőségű a nyelvi készségek elsajátításához képest. Mivel az idegen nyelvi tankönyvek továbbra is központi szereppel bírnak a nyelvtanítás során, és a kultúra csupán másodlagos cél a folyamatban, logikusnak tűnik az a megállapítás, hogy a tankönyvek kulturális tartalma nagymértékben meghatározza a nyelvoktatás ilyen irányultságát (vagy ennek hiányát). Az elmondottakból következik, hogy Magyarországon stírgős szükség van a felnőtt idegennyelv-oktatásban jelenleg használatos tankönyvek elemzésére és az ehhez szükséges empirikus tapasztalatok összegyűjtésére a jövőbeli feladatok meghatározása és megoldása céljából.
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Kutatási terv

Jelen kutatás szükségességéért – ahogy fentebb már kifejtettem – a két terület között tapasztalható feszültség indokolja: egyrészt az idegennyelv-oktatás egészén belül felmerülő igény arra, hogy – a modern világ kihívásainak megfelelve – interkulturális kompetenciával is felvértezett beszélők hagyják el a nyelvi kurzusokat a tanfolyamok végén, másrészt a magyarországi idegennyelv-oktatással szemben támasztott jellegzetes helyi elvárások, amelyek leginkább a nyelvvizsga sikeres megszerzését tűzik ki a felnőtt nyelvoktatás végső céljául. Mivel a nyelvkönyv a legszélesebb körben alkalmazott nyelvoktatási és tanulási eszköz, kutatásaim során azt vizsgáltam, hogy formális felnőtt nyelvoktatási környezetben az idegennyelvi tankönyvek megfelelőképpen alkalmazhatóak-e (és ha igen, milyen mértékben) az IKK elsajátításának elősegítése céljából. Mivel a tankönyvek önmagukban nem elősegítenek az interkulturális kommunikatív kompetencia fejlesztésére, mindenképpen kiegészítő anyagok alkalmazására és tanórán kívüli interkulturális tapasztalatok megszerzésére is szükség van.

Kutatásom célja – mely a felnőttkori angol, orosz, és spanyol nyelvoktatás tapasztalatain alapul –, hogy elméletileg alátámasztott és gyakorlatban kivitelezhető módszerek ajánlásának segítségével változtatásokat javasoljon a magyarországi idegennyelv-oktatás jelenlegi tendenciáinak módosítása érdekében, mely folyamat során a kurzuskönyvet a változás eszközének tekintem.


A tanulókra vonatkozó adatok összegzése után kiderült, hogy a hallgatók többsége mindhárom nyelv esetén kezdő és alapszint között mozogt. Két másik ok is indokolta azt a döntésemet, hogy az imént említett célcsoport által használt könyvekre szüksésem le vizsgálatom fő irányát. Az egyik az volt, hogy közép- és felsőfokú nyelvtudás közelében – egyre csökken a tisztaan kurzuskönyvre fordított figyelem, és ezzel egyidejűleg nő a kiegészítő
anyagok mennyisége és a rájuk szánt idő. Így a tankönyv szerepe prognosztizálhatóan kisebb jelentőségű a közép- és felsőfokra való felkészülés során mind a nyelvi, mind pedig az IKK fejlesztése szempontjából. A másik oka annak, hogy a kezdő és alapszintet helyeztem előtérbe az a gyakran hangoztatott vélemény, mely szerint ezekben a színteken lehetetlen az IKK fejlesztése a meglévő nyelvtudás alacsony foka miatt.

Ezen indokokból kifolyólag határoztam el, hogy az elemzéndő könyvek csoportját a kezdő és az alapszintű felnőtt nyelvtanulók által használt kötetekre szűkítem le, kiválasztva a legszélesebb körben alkalmazott kezdő („beginner”) és alapszintű („elementary”) kurzuskönyveket a három nyelvre lebontva, amely így 6 kategóriát eredményezett. Annak ellenére, hogy végül mindegyik nyelv esetében csak két tankönyvet elemeztem, a minta kiválasztásának módja lehetővé teszi megalapozott következtetések levonását.


A két orosz nyelvkönyv (Šag za šagom [Шаг за шагом], Székely & Székely 1999 és Poehali [Поезия!], Чернышов 2003) az orosz alapfokú felnőtt tanfolyamok résztvevőinek közel 84%-ánál (!) számított kurzuskönyvnek (138 főnél a 164-ből).

A két spanyol nyelvkönyvet (Nuevo ELE inicial 1, Borobio 2002 and Nuevo ELE inicial 2, Borobio 2002) pedig a felnőtt tanulók csaknem 72%-a használta az alapfokú, általános spanyol nyelvet oktató kurzusok alapkönyveként (275 fő a 384-ből).


A végző táblázat 63 változót és 385 opciót tartalmaz, és győkereisen eltér Méndez García eredeti javaslattól abban a tekintetben, hogy nem csupán a kurzuskönyvek kulturális információtartalmának (valamint ezen információk témák szerinti eloszlásának) meghatározására használható, hanem alkalmazható a tankönyvek olyan tartalmi elemeinek kiszűrésére is, amelyek elősegíthetik a tanulók interkulturális kommunikatív kompetenciájának fejlődését.
Az elemzéshez kidolgozott táblázat részletessége az előnyök mellet hátrányokkal is jár. Az előnyök közé tartozik, hogy a részletes táblázat lehetővé teszi a kiválasztott idegen nyelvi tankönyvek alapos tartalmi vizsgálatát, azonban a napi gyakorlati alkalmazást ugyanaz a részletesség hátráltathatja, nehézkessé teheti a tankönyvek nem tudományos, hanem gyakorlati célú értékelését. Ez volt az oka annak, hogy a gyakorlati alkalmazás céljaira egy rövidített táblázatot is készítettem (ld. 22. táblázat, XI. függelék). A rövidített változat egyfajta „ellenőrző listaként” használható, és lehetőséget nyújt két vagy több tankönyv ezirányú összehasonlítására. Ez a táblázat nem tartalmaz opciókat. Csak azokat a változókat építtettem be, amelyek kritikusabbaknak bizonyultak a tankönyvelemzés során. Így a táblázatban összesen 46 változó található. Ezzel a megoldással remélhetőleg sikerült a lehetséges felhasználók (tanárok és tankönyvszerzők) számára a gyakorlatban is könnyebben alkalmazható munkaeszközt biztosítani, egyúttal annak a lehetőségét is megőrizve, hogy a felhasználó részletesebb elemzés céljából bármikor visszatérhessen az eredeti táblázathoz, ha ennek szükségét érzi.

Ugyanakkor az interkulturális elemzési táblázat alkalmazásának segítségével rámutathatam az interkulturális komponens megjelenési és tartalmi integrációs formáira a vizsgált idegen nyelvi tankönyvekben. A megállapítások legtöbbje kétséggívül meglepő.

A kutatás legfontosabb eredményei

Az interkulturális célok elemzése rávilágított arra a tényre, hogy a célnyelv kultúra megjelenési formái a vizsgált nyelvkönyvekben ad hoc jellegűek, de legalábbis átgondolatlanok. Mivel a nyev és a kultúra elválaszthatatlanága széles körben elfogadott szakmai tétele, ráadásul az interkulturális kommunikatív kompetencia fontossága a kultúraközi kommunikációban is elméletileg bizonyított tény, aggódalomra adhat okot az a jelenség, hogy az idegennyelv-tanítás szakmai gyakorlata (beleértve a tankönyvírást is) jórészt nem vesz tudomást az IKK fejlesztésének szükségességéről.

Bár az elemzés kimutatta, hogy a nyelvkönyvekben található témák kiválasztásának módja előtté önkényes és szórványos, általánosságban kijelenthető, hogy a leggyakrabban felmértő (és leggyakrabban melőzőtő) témák meglehetős hasonlóságot mutatnak az angol, orosz, és spanyol nyelvkönyvekben egyaránt. A vizsgált kurzuskönyvekben felbukkanó témák száma 13 és 27 között változik, a teljes listán található témák száma 38 (plusz 1 „egyéb”, az előzőekbe nem sorolható téma). A témák ilyen jellegű összeállítása előzetes kutatáson alapult. A hagyományosan tabutémaként kezelt területek (pl. politika, vallás, szex) a nyelvkönyvekben is nemkívánatos elemeknek minősülnek. A vizsgálat kimutatta, hogy a Gullestrup (1992) által meghatározott 8 „kultúraszegmens” közül a nyelvkönyvekben csak
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mintegy 3-5 bukkan fel. Ráadásul a kulturális információk megjelenése jórészt a mikroszintre korlátozódik, makroszinten alig jellemző, interkulturális/nemzetközi szinten pedig gyakorlatilag elhanyagolható.

Az interkulturális szintű elemzés rámutatott arra a tényre, hogy a nyelvkönyvekben általában a kultúrát érintő témák meglehetősen szűk spektrumot fognak át, ez alól a célnyelvi kultúra sem kivétel. Ráadásul ritkán találhatók kultúraközi összehasonlításra irányuló törekvések, vagy ha mégis, akkor a különbségek kapnak hangsúlyt a hasonlóságok helyett. Az idegen nyelvi kurzuskönyvek inkább a kultúraspecifikus tudásaspektusokat emelik ki az általános mozzanatok helyett (bár ez érthető, tekintve, hogy a célnyelv és a célnyelvi kultúra bemutatása a fő cél).

Megfigyeléseim szerint a különböző kultúrákról alkotott vélemények illetve a kultúrák közötti kapcsolatok ritkán szerepelnek a nyelvkönyvekben. A jellembrázolást az idealizált túláltalanosítások jelzik, a karakterek találkozásai és kapcsolatai mindig probléma- és konfliktusmentesek. Aggasztó hiányosság, hogy így a vizsgált nyelvkönyvek általában nem vétezik fel a belőlük tanulókat a megfelelő nyelvi/diszkurzív eszközökkel a konfliktushelyzetek és a kulturális eltérésekből fakadó félreértések tisztázására. Valójában épp a kezdő („beginner”) és alapszintű („elementary”) nyelvtanulók kerülhetnek olyan helyzetekbe – alacsonyabb fokú nyelvtudásuk okán – amelyek sikeres kezeléséhez égetően szükség lenne az IKK fejlettebb szintjére.


Az egyes tankönyvek szerzőiinek stílusa és nézőpontja is nagyban eltér a többiekétől. Közös vonás azonban a célnyelvi kultúra kedvező színben történő feltüntetése. A kultúraközi szemlélet erősítésére irányuló, dicséretes törekvések figyelhetők meg a NEi2-ben, mivel a szerző minden egyes, a célnyelvi kultúra valamely aspektusára utaló fejezet részét után kritikus gondolkodásra, a frissen tanultak megvitatására és az anyanyelvi kultúrával történő összevetésére invitálja a nyelvtanulót.

A Headway és a Nuevo ELE esetében biztonsággal kijelenthető, hogy az illusztrációk nagyban hozzájárulnak a könyvek által képviselt társadalmi kép kibővítéséhez és realizmusos árnyalásához. A Šag za šagom-ra e megállapítás csak részben igaz, mert a Poehali-val egyetebben számos hiányosságot tartalmaz. A legtöbb kritikát talán a nem helyén való
illusztrációk „érdemlik ki”.

A vizsgált kurzuskönyvek többségében az illusztrációk szerepének fontossága kiterjed a nonverbális kommunikáció implicit bemutatására is. Bár ez nem jelenti azt, hogy kezdő szinten a nonverbális kommunikáció jellegzetességei csupán implicit utalások formájában kerülhetnek elő. Néhány (a disszertáció második részében tárgyalt) követésre érdemes példa jól bizonyítja, hogy még alacsonyabb fokú nyelvtudás esetén sem jelent akadályt a nonverbális kommunikáció sajátosságainak implicit bemutatása.

A kulturális tartalmú információk jellegzetességeinek elemzése során levont következtetéseim szerint kezdő („beginner”) és alapszinten („elementary”) meglehetősen nehéz kellő mélységgel bemutatni a célnyelvi kultúrát. Ráadásul az eredeti (autentikus) vagy autentikusnak-tűnő szövegek sem hordoznak automatikusan gazdag kultúrinformációkat.

A célnyelvi kultúrá(k)ra vonatkozó földrajzi információk egyoldalúsága megfigyelhető az angol nyelvkönyvekben, amelyek mindössze Anglia (esetleg Nagy-Britannia) és az USA említésére szorítkoznak; az orosz nyelvkönyvek esetében Oroszország van a figyelem középpontjában, mintha a volt Szovjetunió egykori tagállamaiban már senki sem beszélné az orosz nyelvet; a spanyol nyelvkönyvek pedig főleg Spanyolország-központúak illetve Latin-Amerikáról mint földrajzi egységről szólnak, és sokkal ritkábban ragadnak ki külön egy-egy latin-amerikai országot. A latin-amerikai országok közül legyakrabban Mexikó, Peru, és Argentine szerepel.

Szintén megfigyelhető az a tendencia, hogy az explicit és implicit módon kifejezett értékek főleg személyes jellegűek a NHb, NHe, és a Šág za šagom című könyvekben, de inkább kulturális vonatkozásúak a Poehali, NEil és a NEi2-ben.

A kulturális dimenziók implicit módon jelennek meg, de még így is tükrözik a célnyelvi kultúra legjellemzőbb aspektusait. Ez a fontos megállapítás alátámasztja a nyelv és a kultúra elválaszthatatlanságáról vallott nézeteket.

Mindent összevetve, az interkulturális tartalmak elemzése nem csupán a hiányosságokra világító rá, de feltárt néhány olyan, követésre méltó példát is, melyek iránymutatóak lehetnek a jövőbeli idegennyelvi tankönyvírók számára.

Az interkulturális módszertanra irányuló elemzés meglehetősen síralmas általános eredményes zártult, de akadt néhány pozitív ellenpélda. Ezek egyike a 6 könyvből 4-ben szerepel, és a savoir comprendre képességének fejlesztését célozta meg (azaz a célnyelvi kultúra területéről származó dokumentum vagy esemény értelmezését és elemzését az anyanyelvi kultúra perspektíváján keresztül).

A savoir apprendre/FAIRE (zelfedezésre és/vagy interakcióra való képesség) fejlesztése terén már jóval nagyobb különbségek mutatkoztak: az eredmények egészen 3,2%-tól
(Poehlau) 100%-ig terjedtek (a NHe esetében). A négy könnyvben fordultak elő olyan feladatok, amelyek azt hivatottak elősegíteni, hogy a nyelvtanuló könnyebben szerezzen ismereteket egy adott kultúráról, és ezen ismereteket a valós idejű kommunikáció kötöttségei között is alkalmazni tudja. A nyelvtanuló önálló tanulását könnyítő metakognitív stratégiák fejlesztésének szándéka mindössze egy nyelvkönyvben volt kimutatható. A kulturális nézőpontok, mindennapi gyakorlatok és produktumok kritikus értékelésének képessége az anyanyelvi és a célnyelvi kultúra szűrőjén át (savoir’s engagement) – mely tevékenységek az IKK kialakításának alapvető fontosságú összetevői – őt könnyvben képeztek a fejlesztendő képességek részét, de meglehetősen alacsony szinten.

A kutatás arra is rávilágított, hogy az interkulturális nyelvtanulás a vizsgált könyvekben szinte kizárólagosan a nyelvi készségeket fejlesztő gyakorlatok részeként valósul meg – mindössze két könnyvben találtam példát olyan nyelvi és interkulturális elemeket ötvöző feladatokra, amelyeket gyakran alkalmaznak az interkulturális tréningeken is. De az ilyen jellegű feladatoknak rendszerint csak kevés típusa fordul elő, mint például a kultúrakapszula, a kulturális alapú felereértés, valamint a kvíz.

Annak ellenére, hogy a nyelvkönyvi feladatok főként a célnyelvi kultúra (vagy kultúrák) bemutatását célozzák, az anyanyelvi kultúrára történő hivatkozás is gyakran megfigyelhető. Az ilyen gyakorlatok nagyrészt arra próbálják rábírni a tanulót, hogy saját kulturális tapasztalatairól beszéljen. Sajnos azonban az olyan leckék aránya, amelyek inkább a kultúrák összehasonlítására irányulnának, nagyon alacsony.

Az interkulturális nyelvtanulás során használt fő készségek elemzése kimutatja, hogy leggyakrabban az olvasás és a beszéd jut ilyen jellegű szerephez, a hallás utáni értés és az írás inkább a háttérben marad ebben a szempontból. Az egyéb készségek közül az IKK fejlesztése szempontjából jelentősnek találta a következőket: (1) megfigyelés, beazonosítás, felismerés; (2) összehasonlítás és összevetés; (3) a jelentés közös tisztázása („negotiating meaning”); (4) a tolerancia és a kétértelműség kezelése; (5) az üzenetek effektív értelmezése; (6) a saját álláspont megvédelmezése az ellenéremények tiszteletben tartása mellett; (7) a különbözőség elfogadása. A vizsgált nyelvkönyvek főként a (heurisztikus) problémamegoldási képesség („guessing”) erősítését tartják fontosnak, kevésbé a tanulási stratégiák („learning management”) fejlesztését.

A feladatok elemzése a tanulók bevonásának szándéka szempontjából azt az eredményt hozta, hogy az esetek többségében ezek a gyakorlatok receptív, nem pedig produktív jellegűek. (A megállapítás mind a hat könnyvre igaz.) Az NHė és az NHe esetében megfigyelhető az együttműködésre ösztönző feladatok jelentős aránya. Disszertációelméleti részében (1.2.5.1.2 alszakasz) tárgyalom az autonóm tanulás fontosságát az IKK elsajátítása
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vonatkozásában. Sajnálatos, hogy az ilyen irányú törekvések csupán 3 könyvben találhatóak meg (NHe, Nei1 és Nei2), itt is csak kis mértékben.

Ami a feladatok jellegét illeti, azok jórészt megfelelnek a szerzők által megfogalmazott célkitűzéseknek: a Headway a funkcionális nyelvhasználat gyakorlását tartja fontosnak változatos szituációkban, ezért logikus, hogy a könyvben aránylag sok az eljátszandó feladat, a Šag za šagom főként a kognitív jellegű gyakorlatokat hangsúlyozza, így a kulturális tartalmú feladatoknál is ezé a típusé a főszerep.

Annak ellenére, hogy módszertani szempontból az elemzett kurzuskönyvek meglehetősen behatároltnak minősíthatók, néhány feladattípus felhasználható bennük az IKK fejlesztésére.

Az értékelési szempontból történő elemzés megmutatta, hogy az interkulturális kompetencia nem számít eléggé fontosnak ebben a tekintetben. A kulturálközi elemek hiánya az értékelés folyamatában két tényezőre vezethető vissza: (1) elméleti síkon az IKK értékelése az interkulturális szempontú nyelvtanítás legkevésbé kidolgozott dimenziójának tekinthető; (2) az idegennyelv-tanítás gyakorlatában az IKK fejlesztését rendszerint komolytalanul kezelik, emiatt az IKK értékelésére sem fordíthatak figyelmet.

Összegezve: az interkulturális komponens elemzése során mindegyik vizsgált nyelvkönyvben kisebb-nagyobb hiányosságokra derült fény a célok, a módszertan, és az értékelés terén. A tartalom szintjén a helyzet kissé kedvezőbb. Ennek ellenére az idegen nyelvi kurzuskönyvekben az interkulturális komponens beiktatása meglehetősen átgondolatlannak és alkalomszerűnek minősíthető.

Mindazonáltal a megállapítások pozitív oldalát szeretném kiemelni. Kutatásaim során soha nem az motivált, hogy kizárólagosan a nyelvkönyvek interkulturális szemszögéből tekintett hiányosságaira mutassak rá, és következtetésként az IKK fejlesztésére történő alkalmatlanságukat hangsúlyozzam a felnőtt magyar nyelvtanulók körében. Sokkal inkább a lehetséges előnyöket próbáltam kiemelni, rámutatva azokra a lehetséges és gyakorlatban kivitelezhető módokra, amelyekkel minőségileg lehet javítani a nyelvkönyvekben rejlő lehetőségeket az IKK elsajátításának elősegítése érdekében.

Ajánlások az idegen nyelvi kurzuskönyvek interkulturális komponensének fejlesztésére

Figyelembe véve a kurzuskönyvek központi szerepét a magyar felnőtt nyelvoktatás terén, és a tanári hozzáállást az egyéb kiegészítő anyagok alkalmazásához (melyeket sokszor időrablónak, kevésbé hatékonynak, valamint nehézkesen alkalmazhatónak bélyegeznek), a nyelvkönyvek átírása, módosítása, javítása az IKK elsajátítatásának elősegítése érdekében sürűsödő feladatnak tűnik.
Kutatási eredményeim világossá tették, hogy a jelenleg alkalmazott nyelvkönyvek sekélyesen és felszínén valóban vannak a kultúrához. Megkönnyebbítségképpen tény- és adatorientált, ezáltal elégtelenek a kultúra specifikus elemeinek mélyebb elsaajátítatására; például az értékekrend, a hiedelmek vagy a kultúrára általánosan jellemző jártasságok megismertetésére. A kurzuskönyvek által a cénnyelvi kultúráról és társadalomról felvillantott információk egyszerű témákra korlátozódnak, mint például az utazás, ételek, vásárlás, valamint történelmi, földrajzi, demográfiai adatmarzások, esetleg helyi „egzotikumok”. A kultúra ilyen sekélyes bemutatása valószínűleg megerősíti a már meglévő, pontatlan (pozitív és negatív) sztereotípiákat.

De ha elfogadjuk azt a feltéve, hogy a kezdő („beginner”) és alapszintű („elementary”) nyelvtanulóknak nem szükségszerűen kell tökéletes „interkulturális beszélő”-vé válniuk, hanem pusztán el kell kezdeniük azzá formálódni, akkor ez a szükebb cél máris megvalósíthatóbbnak tűnik. Jelen kutatáson során az IKK-szintek leírására az INCA-projekt által javasolt háromszintű módszert alkalmaztam. A kezdő („beginner”) és az alapszintű („elementary”) nyelvtanulók számára az első szint elérését tartom reális célnak. Ezen a szinten a nyelvtanuló az alábbi követelményeknek kell, hogy megfeleljen (ld. 5. táblázat 1.2.5.2 szakasz, valamint www.incaproject.org): (1) önállóan azonosítja a releváns információkat és beépíti azokat saját ismeretrendszérébe, de még nem rendelkezik elég tapasztalattal ahhoz, hogy ezen ismeretrendszert az interkulturális helyzetek kezelésének szolgálatába állítsa; (2) a tanuló reagál az eseményekre, de előre nem látja azok valószínű bekövetkezését; és (3) meglehetősen toleráns az övétől eltérő értékekkel, szokásokkal szemben, de néha különösnek, meglepőnek, vagy helytelenítőnek találja azokat.

Meglátásom szerint az idegen nyelvi kurzuskönyvek IKK-fejlesztésre történő felhasználhatóságát nagyban javíthatják az alábbi ajánlások:

A célok szintjén:

- Az interkulturális komponens tudatos beillesztése a kurzuskönyvekbe: A kultúraelemek spontán, átgondolatlan alkalmazása helyett elméletileg megalapozott és tudatos módon kell az interkulturális komponens beiktatására törekedni.
- Explicit módon kifejett célok és a tanulóval szemben támasztott elvárások az IKK fejlesztéséit illetően: Az IKK fejlesztését nyilvánvaló célként kell megfogalmazni, csakúgy mint a tanulóval szemben támasztott ilyen irányú elvárásokat.

A tartalom szintjén:

- A nyelvtanulók korosztályának megfelelő témaválasztás: A felnőtt nyelvtanulók számára szükséges a korosztályuknak megfelelő témaválasztás, amely magában foglalja a
rendszerint tabuként kezelt területeket is, mint a politika, vallás, vagy a szex.

- **A legfontosabb témakörök:** Figyelembe véve azt, hogy kivitelezhetetlen (és szüksége van is) a teljeségre törekedni a nyelvkönyvekben tárgyal témák esetében, javaslatom szerint Gullestrup (1992) modelljének 8 szegmensét kellene figyelembe venni, mint alapvető iránymutatást. E témák közé tartozik a „technológia, technika”, „gazdasági élet”, „társadalmi intézmények”, „a politikai intézményrendszerek”, „nyelv és kommunikáció”, „reprodukció és szocializáció”, „ideológia”, és a „vallás”.

- **Kulturális információk:** Alaposabb figyelmet kellene szentelni – nem csak mikro- és makroszinten, hanem interkulturális/nemzetközi szinten is – a kulturális információk szerepetetésének abból a célból, hogy reálisabb képét mutathassuk a kultúra különböző aspektusairól.

- **A kulturák többretős ábrázolása:** A nyelvkönyvekben megjelenő cénnyelvi kulturák többretős ábrázolására van szükség – ez nem korlátozódhat például az angol, mint idegen nyelv oktatása során kizárólag a brit és az amerikai kultúrára.

- **Kulturák összehasonlítása:** A tanulókat bátorítani kell a különböző kulturák folyamatos összevetésére, de nem csak az eltéréseket ajánlatos hangsúlyozni, hanem a hasonlóságokat is.

- **Kultúrákról való véleményalkotás:** A nyelvtanulókat ösztönözni kell a különsége kulturák sajátosságainak megvitatására, valamint tanácsos megismertetni őket a cénnyelvi kulturák(k)ról más nemzetiségek által alkotott véleményekkel.

- **Általános kulturális ismeretek:** Az idegen nyelvi kurzuskönyvek nem tekintethetnek el az IKK olyan aspektusaira vonatkozó utalásoktól és gyakorlatoktól, mint például az önismert és mások ismerete; a kultúra hatása a nyelvre és a kommunikációra; az énkép relativizációja és mások pozitív értékelése; továbbá a nyitott hozzáállás a másfajta kulturákról történő ismeretszerzésre. Nagyobb hangsúlyt érdemelnek az általános kulturális ismeretek is.

- **A karakterek és interakcióik sokszínűsege:** Szükséges árnyalni a nyelvkönyvekben szereplő karaktereket és az interakcióik jellegét: a mindennapok egysíkú, probléma- és konfliktusmentes ábrázolása helyett a többnézőpontú, realizmusabb megjelenítés életszerűbb lehet. Az ilyen megkölzeltlésmod segít a nyelvtanulóknak abban, hogy komplexebb és változatosabb képet kapjon a társadalmi érintkezés jellegzetességeiről, és hogy jobban felkészítse a konfliktushelyzetek kezeléséhez szükséges nyelvi eszközök alkalmazására.

- **A sztereotípiák kezelése:** Amikor csak lehetséges, kerülendő az elfogult, sztereotípizáló kultúraábrázolás, valamint az identitás bizonyos összetevőinek (pl. nem, foglalkozás,
nemzetiség) hasonlóan részrehajló bemutatása. Ha ez nem történik meg, a tanulók úgynevezett „másodkézből való” sztereotípiákkal találják szemben magukat a nyelvkönyv közvetítésével.

- **A célnyelvi kultúra tárgyalása a saját kultúrával való összehasonlításon keresztül:** A célnyelvi kultúrára történő utalásokat követően hasznos a tanulókkal megvitatni az anyanyelvi kultúrával fennálló hasonlóságokat.

- **Illusztrációk:** A nyelvkönyvekben csakis helyénvaló és a didaktikai céloknak megfelelő illusztrációk alkalmazandók. A lehetséges célok közé tartozik a társadalomról alkotott kép színesítése és életszerűvé tétele, valamint a feladatok megértésének, megoldásának elősegítése.

- **Az eredeti szövegek kiválasztása:** Az eredeti célnyelvi szövegek választásánál szem előtt tartandó, hogy a kultúra lényegébe bepillantást engedő cikkeket alkalmazzanak a kurzuskönyvek szerzői.

- **Értékek, hiedelmek, attitűdök közvetítése:** A célnyelvi kultúrára jellemző értékek, hiedelmek, és attitűdök explicit módon jelenjenek meg a tankönyvekben.

- **Non-verbális kommunikáció megjelenítése:** A nonverbális kommunikáció jellegzetességeit már kezdő („beginner”) és alapszinten („elementary”) is be kell mutatni a hallgatóknak.

- **A célékutura legjellemzőbb dimenzióinak tárgyalása:** A nyelvkönyvírók olyan anyagokat próbáljanak beilleszteni a kurzuskönyvekbe, amelyek tükrözik az adott célnyelvi kultúra dimenzióinak legjellemzőbb aspektusait – bár a rendszerint implicit módon megjelenő kultúradimenziókról az idegennyelv-tanárnak kell felhívnia a hallgatók figyelmét.

**A módszertan szintjén megfogalmazott ajánlások:**

- **Az autonóm interkulturális nyelvtanulás előmozdítása:** A nyelvkönyveket szükséges „nagykorústani” a felnőtt felhasználók igényeinek megfelelően; nemcsak tartalmi szempontból, hanem az alkalmazott tanítási módszerek tekintetében is. Ez utóbbinak fontos aspektusa az autonóm interkulturális nyelvtanulás előmozdítása.

- **Az IKK elsajátítását segítő feladatok beépítése:** Meglátásom szerint fontos lenne belevenni a nyelvkönyvekbe olyan feladatokat, amelyek a „savoir comprendre”, „savoir apprendre/faire” és a „savoir s’engager” fejlesztését tűzi ki célul. Ez utóbbi – a kulturális nézőpontok, mindennapi gyakorlatok és produktumok kritikus értékelésének képessége az anyanyelvi és a célnyelvi kultúra szűrőjén át – az IKK kialakításának, elsajátításának alapvető fontosságú összefüggője.

- **A hagyományos nyelvtanulási feladatok interkulturális perspektívába való helyezése:** A hagyományosan a nyelvi fejlesztés témakörébe tartozó gyakorlatokat interkulturális
perspektívába kell helyezni, ami – néhány releváns kérdés beiktatása segítségével – viszonylag könnyen megoldható feladat.

- Az *interkulturális nyelvtanulást segítő feladatok választéka*: Az interkulturális nyelvtanulást elősegítő tevékenységek jellegét ki kell bővíteni annak érdekében is, hogy a nyelvtanulókat jobban be lehessen vonni ezekbe a feladatokba.

**Ajánlások az értékelés szintjén:**

- Az IKK fejlettségét tesztelő és mérő feladatok beépítése: Bár az IKK fejlettségének tesztelése és mérése az interkulturális nyelvtanítás legkevésbé kimunkált területénak számít (elméleti alapjai sem kristályosodtak még ki teljesen), véleményem szerint rendkívül fontos lenne kidolgozni annak a módját, hogy azt integrálni lehessen az idegennyelv-tanítás általános gyakorlatába, illetve (főleg Magyarországon) megjeleníteni magukban a kurzuskönyvekben is. Ezáltal mind a tanárok, mind pedig a diákok komolyabban vennék az IKK fejlesztésének szükségsességét. Kezdeti lépésként javaslom az egyszerűbb önellenőrző listák és kérdések beiktatását a kurzuskönyvekbe.

**Összefoglalás**

Befejezésképpen visszatérek a kiinduláskor megfogalmazott kutatási kérdésekhez, nevezetesen:

*Milyen lehetőségek rejlenek a jelenleg Magyarországon felnőtt nyelvtanulók esetében használatos angol, orosz, és spanyol nyelvkönyvekben, amelyek felhasználhatóak az interkulturális kommunikatív kompetencia fejlesztésére?*

valamint

*Milyen kultúraközi vonatkozású ajánlások megfogalmazásával lehet a nyelvkönyvekben meglévő lehetőségeket minél hatásosabban az interkulturális kommunikatív kompetencia fejlesztésének szolgálatába állítani?*

Az idegennyelv-tanítás eme területéhez történt szerény hozzájárulásommal arra törekedtem, hogy javaslatokat tegyek a kultúra tanításának szervesebb és szervezetesebb beillesztésére a napi tanítási gyakorlatba. Meggyőződésem, hogy a kultúra tanítása rendkívüli mértékben segít a hallgatók motivációs szintjének fenntartásában, továbbá hozzájárul a tantárgy és a szakma presztízének erősítéséhez. Nem is beszélete arról, hogy a kulturális háttér ismerete és az interkulturális kompetencia elsajátítása nélkül mindenféle nyelvi „tudás” (akár nyelvtani, akár szókincset érintő, akár kiejtéssel kapcsolatos ismeretekről legyen szó) értelmét veszíti.

Ajánlások a jövőbeli kutatási irányokat illetően

Még a legcélerányosabban megválasztott és kellően informatív tananyag is könnyen a félerértelmezések és tőlegyszerűsítések áldozatául eshet a hanyagul kivitelezett tanítás következtében. Ellenkező esetben viszont az elfogult és sztereotípiáktól hemzsegő anyagokat is kitűnően fel lehet használni (kellően rámutatva hiányosságaiukra) az interkulturális ismeretek oktatásában. Ebből következően nem azt a kutatási irányt tartom célra vezetőnek, amely minél több kurzuskönyv elemzését tűzi ki céljául, hanem sokkal inkább az idegennyelvi tankönyvek gyakorlatban történő, osztálytermi alkalmazásának módozatait kell alaposabb vizsgálat tárgyává tenni.

Egy másik kutatási irány lehet a tanulói kritikus nyelvi tudatosság erősítése és az interkulturális kommunikatív kompetencia fejlesztése között meglévő kölcsönhatás vizsgálata. Megfelelő diskurzív eszközök hiányában (különösen a felnőttkorú) nyelvtanulók képtelenek kifejezni érzelmeket és megfogalmazni vágyaikat, felépíteni identitásukat, és ezek híján értelmes interakciók résztvevőivel váltnak, teljes értéki kommunikációs partnerrekként elfogadatlan magukat akár a célnyelvet anyanyelvként beszélő, akár azt idegen nyelvként náluk magasabb szinten használó társalgási partnernek szemben.

A harmadik, és minden valószínűség szerint a legigazgatásabb jövőbeli kutatási irány lehet az interkulturális tanítási módszerek célzatosan alkalmazó tanárok képzésének és továbbképzésének területe. Az idegennyelv-tanárok számára tudatosítani kell, hogy az interkulturális nyelvtanulás többet jelent, mint a kommunikatív kompetencia fejlesztésének szándéka, és a célnyelvi kultúrával (kultúrákkal) kapcsolatos plusz információk nyújtása. Az interkulturális kommunikatív kompetencia fejlesztésének irányába tett lépések kétségkívül szerves része a célnyelvi kultúrával kapcsolatos műveltség elmélyítése. De nem hagyható figyelmen kívül a nyelvtanuló saját kulturális háttere és az egyéb kultúrák sem. Újraadásul a különböző kultúrákkal kapcsolatos tudás megszerzésének kívánatos módja a folyamatos összevetés és a kritikus reflexió. Az idegen nyelvi tanárképzésben súlyponttoltolódásra van
szükség a hagyományos, tanár által irányított nyelvtanulás és kulturális tudásátadás helyett a tanulóközpontú, autonóm interkulturális tanulási módszereket előnyben részesítő megközelítésmódok felé.

Az idegennyelv-tanítás jelenlegi gyakorlata azonban nem készült fel az ilyen jellegű váltrasra. Ennélfogva a kellő gondossággal megtervezett, az interkulturális kommunikatív kompetencia fejlesztését hatékonyan elősegíteni hivatott, világos célokat megfogalmazó, tartalmilag gondosan összeválogatott, módszertanilag átgondolt, és az értékelésre kellő hangsúlyt fektető nyelvkönyvekre jelentős szerep hárul a változás elősegítésében.
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Appendix I

Modifications of the Iceberg Model of culture

Figure 1: The Iceberg model of culture. (Gibson’s idea, http://www.uni-saarland.de)

Figure 2: The Iceberg concept of culture. (AFS Orientation Handbook 1984:14, as reproduced in Martinelli & Taylor 2000, www.youth-knowledge.net/INTEGRATION/TY/Publications/tkit4/tkit4.pdf)
Appendix II

Hall's theory of proxemics


Note:
Strangers waiting for a train in Oklahoma try to maintain at least 18" of personal space. Edward Hall's theory of proxemics suggests that people will maintain differing degrees of personal distance depending on the social setting and their cultural backgrounds.)
Appendix III

Gullestrup's model of culture

Figure 1: The Static Cultural Model

Figure 3: The Static Cultural Model (Source Kuada & Gullestrup 1997:19)
Figure 2: The Dynamic Cultural Model

Figure 4: The Dynamic Cultural Model (Source: Kuada & Gullestrup 1997:20)
Appendix IV

The main methods and approaches of FLT

Figure 5: The 20th century 'waves' of the development of FLT methods. (Source: Bárdos 2005:218, 15. ábra: A módszerek fejlődésének 20. századi hallómai)
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
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<td>2010</td>
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</table>

_Figure 6: The occurrence and intensity of the main FLT methods_ (Source: Bárdos 2005:220, 17. ábra: Tömegesen elterjedt nyelvtanítási módok előfordulása és intenzitása)
Figure 7: The progress of FLT methods in the 20th century (Source Bárdos 2000:26, 4. ábra: A módszerek huszadik századi fejlődése).

Note:

T - thesis
AT - antithesis
SZ - synthesis
## Appendix V

**Major events in the life of Edward T. Hall**

*Table 2: Major events in the life of Edward T. Hall (adapted from Rogers et al. 2002:4,14; sources: Hall 1992, 1994, Hart 1996)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1933-1937</td>
<td>Worked on the Navajo and Hopi reservations in the U.S. Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942-1945</td>
<td>Served in WWII, commanding an African American regiment in Europe and the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Post-Doctoral study in Sociology / Cultural Anthropology at Colombia University; conducted research on the U.S. Army government administration of Turk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1948</td>
<td>Studied race relations at the University of Denver where he was the Chairman of the Department of Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Publication of “Race prejudice and Negro-White Relations in the Army” in the <em>American Journal of Sociology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1955</td>
<td>Director of the Point IV Training Program at the Foreign Service Institute, Washington, D.C.: Development of the original paradigm of intercultural communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>First publication on intercultural communication by Hall (&quot;The Anthropology of Manners&quot; in the <em>Scientific American</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Publication of <em>The Silent Language</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-1977</td>
<td>Conducted NIMH-funded research on proxemics and interethnic encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Publication of <em>The Hidden Dimension</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Publication of “Proxemics” in the <em>Current Anthropology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Participated in the Conference on Intercultural Communication, International Christian University, Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Publication of <em>Beyond Culture</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lectures at SIETAR conferences and the Summer Institute of Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI

Data collected from 25 institutions regarding the number of adult LLs learning English, Russian, and/or Spanish languages

Table 7: Data collected from 25 institutions\(^1\) regarding the number of adult LLs learning English, Russian, and/or Spanish languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Place (town)</th>
<th>N of adult LLs of English</th>
<th>N of adult LLs of Russian</th>
<th>N of adult LLs of Spanish</th>
<th>Total N of adult LLs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kecskemét</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Veszprém</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Debrecen</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kecskemét</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Veszprém</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Veszprém</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Székeszárd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nagykanizsa</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tatabánya</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Győr</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Veszprém</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Győr</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Szeged</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Győr</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Szombathely</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Institutions | 11 towns | 4660 | 382 | 667 | 5709

Note: * - data not provided

\(^1\) As some of the institutions asked to keep their anonymity for reasons of commercial competence, it was decided to treat all of them confidentially, and code their names by using numbers.
# Appendix VII

## Coursebooks currently in use for teaching English, Russian and Spanish languages to adult language learners in Hungary

| N | Coursebooks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Σ | % | Series (%) |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|
| 1 | New Headway b | 0 | 13 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 4.3 |
| 2 | New Headway e | 82 | 0 | 97 | 64 | 196 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 16 | * | * | * | 48 | 16 | * | 0 | 0 | 650 | 21.1 |
| 3 | New Headway p/i | 68 | 0 | 89 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 3 | * | 0 | 0 | 374 | 12.1 |
| 4 | New Headway i | 17 | 11 | 0 | 21 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 9 | * | * | * | * | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 4.4 |
| 5 | New Headway u/i | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 1.7 |
| 6 | New Headway a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0.1 |
| 7 | English File 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | * | * | * | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 1 | 1 | 113 | 3.7 |
| 8 | English File 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 4.6 |
| 9 | English File e | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | * | * | * | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 1.4 |

2 * - data not provided; b – beginner; s – starter; e – elementary; p/i – pre-intermediate; i – intermediate; u/i – upper-intermediate; a – advanced.
|   | English File i | English File u/i | Cutting Edge s | Cutting Edge p/i | Cutting Edge i | Cutting Edge a | Lifelines c | Lifelines p/i | Lifelines i | Inside Out p/i | Inside Out i | Inside Out u/i | Inside Out a | Express English | Reward c | Reward p/i | Language to go c | Language to go p/i | Language to go i | Matters p/i |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|=============|-------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| 10| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 18             | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 11| 0              | 10               | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 10           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 12| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 13| 0              | 23               | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 14| 0              | 25               | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 15| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 16| 0              | 45               | 12             | 0                | 0              | 0              | 6           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 17| 0              | 23               | 5              | 0                | 0              | 12             | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 18| 0              | 25               | 6              | 0                | 0              | 12             | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 19| 10             | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 16          | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 20| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 4             | 0            |
| 21| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 22| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 23| 0              | 60               | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 32             | 0           | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 24| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 60          | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 25| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 7           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 26| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 27| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 28| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0           | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |
| 29| 0              | 0                | 0              | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0              | 0            | 0              | 0           | 0              | 0            | 30          | 0              | 0              | 0             | 0            |

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|   |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 267| 8.7%      | 204| 6.6%      | 24| 0.8%      | 134| 4.3%      | 26| 0.8%      | 108| 3.5%      | 63| 2.0%      | 206| 6.7%      | 72| 2.3%      | 71| 2.3%      | 41| 1.3%      | 34| 1.1%      | 8| 0.3%      | 120| 3.9%      | 100| 3.2%      | 60| 1.9%      | 7| 0.2%      | 8| 0.3%      | 12| 0.4%      | 15| 0.5%      | 30| 1.0%      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Streamline Destinations</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 18 0 0 18 0,6 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 18 0 0 18 0,6 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>177 284 282 96 321 49 19 60 82 241 16 0 0 192 70 0 0 648 556 0 2 3085 100 3085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9**: Coursebooks currently in use for teaching Russian to adult ILs in Hungary.

| N  | Course books | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Σ | % | Series |
|----|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1  | Шаг за шагом | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 39 | 110 | 51,4 | --- |
| 2  | Поездка!     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 13,1 | --- |
| 3  | Перспек- тива | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 11,7 | --- |
| 4  | Эстетика    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5,1  | --- |
| 5  | Русский? Да! | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4,7  | --- |
| 6  | Три недели в Москве | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4,7  | --- |
| 7  | Погово- рим? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3,3  | --- |
| 8  | Россия сегодня | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3,3  | --- |
| 9  | Русский язык для начинающих | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2,8  | --- |
| SUM|               | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 51 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 71 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 39 | 214 | 100 | --- |

---

3 ** - not applicable (there are not any series of Russian language coursebooks currently in use in Hungary).
### Table 10: Coursebooks currently in use for teaching Spanish to adult LLs in Hungary

| N  | Coursebooks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Σ   | %   | Series |
|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|    |      |
| 1  | Nuevo ELE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 175 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 175 | 30,4 | 380 |
| 2  | Nuevo ELE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 100 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 100 | 17,4 | 380 |
| 3  | Nuevo ELE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75  | 13,1 | 380 |
| 4  | Nuevo ELE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30  | 5,2  | 380 |
| 5  | Spanyol nyelvkönyv | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90  | 16,5 | 164 |
| 6  | Spanyol nyelvkönyv | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 40  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 40  | 7,6  | 164 |
| 7  | Spanyol nyelvkönyv | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25  | 4,3  | 164 |
| 8  | Puesta a Punto | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18  | 3,1  | 18  |
| 9  | Cumbre     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14  | 2,4  | 14  |
| SUM|             | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 0  | 0  | 398 | 0  | 155 | 1  | 576 | 100 |

* - data not provided; i1 (for Spanish 'inicial 1') – beginner 1; i2 (for Spanish 'inicial 2') – beginner 2; i (for Spanish 'intermedio') – intermediate; a (for Spanish 'avanzado') – advanced.
Appendix VIII

Scheme for analysis of intercultural component in FL coursebooks

(idea taken from Méndez García 2003:59-69)

Table 11: Scheme for analysis of intercultural component in FL coursebooks (adapted from Méndez García 2003:59-69)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Intercultural objectives</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Explicitly expressed</td>
<td>a) yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) yes, but as cultural and not intercultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. By character</td>
<td>a) cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) behavioural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Changes expected from learner</td>
<td>a) realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) not realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) there are not any expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Relation to linguistic objectives</td>
<td>a) dominance of (inter)cultural objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) balance between (inter)cultural and linguistic objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) dominance of linguistic objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) exclusivity of linguistic objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) absolute absence of objectives of any type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. General evaluation of intercultural objectives</td>
<td>a) appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) not found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Intercultural contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Explicitly expressed in table/map of contents</td>
<td>a) yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2. Topics

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Free time/ Hobbies/ (Summer) holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Capital “C” - Culture (Literature/ Arts/ Theatre/ Cinema/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerts/ Music, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Geography/ Countries/ Place of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Travelling/ Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Personal identity/ Personal features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Economy/ Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Education/ Socialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Work/ Professions/ Job interview/ Career/ Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>History/ Famous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>Food and drinks/ Cuisine/ Alimentation/ Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td>Media/ Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m)</td>
<td>Fashion (Cloths and other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n)</td>
<td>Body/ Body culture/ Sport/ Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o)</td>
<td>Social life/ Institutions/ Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p)</td>
<td>Biography/ Life/ Life cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q)</td>
<td>House/ Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r)</td>
<td>Environment/ Nature/ Weather/ Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s)</td>
<td>Animal world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t)</td>
<td>Target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u)</td>
<td>Language, body language and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v)</td>
<td>Feasts/ Ceremonies/ Special occasions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w)</td>
<td>Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x)</td>
<td>National symbols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y)</td>
<td>Mentality/ Ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z)</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa)</td>
<td>Family/ Interpersonal relations/ Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bb)</td>
<td>Daily routine/ Life style/ Personal schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc)</td>
<td>Science/ Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dd)</td>
<td>Migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee)</td>
<td>Law/ Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff)</td>
<td>Poverty/ The third world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gg)</td>
<td>Likes/ dislikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hh)</td>
<td>Cultural norms and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Intercultural contacts/ International relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jj)</td>
<td>Culture shock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kk)</td>
<td>Culture comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ll)</td>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3. Topic treated on

- a) micro- level
- b) macro- level
- c) intercultural/ -national level

### 2.4. Intercultural (international) level of contents

#### 2.4.1. Amplitude of cultures presented

- a) only target culture(s) is(are) mentioned
- b) only a few cultures are mentioned (<5)
- c) many cultures are mentioned (≥5)
- d) other
- e) not found

#### 2.4.2. Comparison of target culture(s) with other culture(s)

- a) there is comparison of cultures
- b) emphasis is made on target culture(s)
- c) emphasis is made on learner’s culture
- d) emphasis is made on other culture(s)
- e) emphasis is made on similarities
- f) emphasis is made on differences
- g) other
- h) not found
2.4.3. Relations / opinions

| a) target culture(s) - learner's culture |
| b) target culture(s) - other culture(s) |
| c) learner's culture - other culture(s) |
| d) target culture - target culture |
| e) between other culture(s) |
| f) other |
| g) not found |

2.5. Aspects of intercultural competence addressed in coursebooks

2.5.1. Savoirs

| a) culture specific knowledge |
| b) culture general knowledge |
| c) knowledge of self and other |
| d) insight regarding the ways in which culture affects language and communication |
| e) not found |

2.5.2. Savoir être

| a) attitude to relativise self and value other |
| b) positive disposition towards learning about other culture |
| c) not found |

2.6. Definition of characters

2.6.1. Age

| a) child |
| b) teenager |
| c) adult |
| d) old person |
| e) other |
| f) not identified |

2.6.2. Gender

| a) female |
| b) male |
| c) not identified (e.g. Martian, or a shop-assistant) |
| d) not appear |

2.6.3. Social classes and groups

| a) working class |
| b) middle class |
| c) upper class |
| d) students / or LLs themselves |
| e) other |
| f) not found |

2.6.4. Races / Ethnics

| a) White |
| b) Black |
| c) Asian |
| d) other |
| e) not appear |

2.6.5. Family type

| a) nuclear |
| b) single-parent |
| c) other |
| d) not appear |

2.6.6. Types of characters

| a) native residents |
| b) non-natives |
| c) tourists |
| d) bona-fide everyday persons |
| e) over-generalized or idealized |
| f) famous personalities |
| g) other |
| h) not appear |
### 2.6.7. Nationality/ by origin
- a) English
- b) Welsh
- c) Scottish
- d) Irish
- e) British
- f) American
- g) Canadian
- h) Australian
- i) New Zealanders
- j) Hungarian
- k) other
- l) can not be identified

### 2.7. Interactions
#### 2.7.1. Interaction takes place in
- a) capital
- b) other town
- c) country / village
- d) other
- e) not identified

#### 2.7.2. The situation of interaction
- a) home
- b) school / language school / university
- c) workplace / office, etc.
- d) Internet / phone, etc.
- e) travel agency / hotel / bank / airport / post-office etc.
- f) street / park / open air / transport, etc.
- g) shop / market / restaurant, etc.
- h) other
- i) not identified

#### 2.7.3. Atmosphere of interaction
- a) friendly
- b) conflicting
- c) neutral
- d) other
- e) not identified

#### 2.7.4. Interaction between members of
- a) target culture(s) and learner’s culture
- b) target culture(s) and other culture(s)
- c) learner’s culture and other culture(s)
- d) target culture(s)
- e) other culture(s)
- f) learner’s culture
- g) not found

### 2.8. Stereotypes
#### 2.8.1. Stereotypical representation of
- a) target culture(s)
- b) learner’s culture
- c) other culture(s)
- d) other
- e) not found

#### 2.8.2. Stereotyped information on
- a) gender
- b) occupation
- c) nationality
- d) age
- e) class
- f) race
- g) religion
- h) relationships
- i) actions
- j) other
- k) not found
| 2.8.3. Treating of stereotypes | a) the found stereotypes are not treated  
b) they are treated  
c) stereotypes are reinforced  
d) stereotypes are fought against  
e) other  
f) not found |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 2.9. The author's point of view | a) inner (author's position)  
b) outer (author's position)  
c) not found |
| 2.9.2. The description of target culture(s) | a) positive  
b) critical or negative  
c) fictional  
d) journalistic  
e) other  
f) not found |
| 2.10. Illustrations | a) photos  
b) life-like drawings  
c) caricatural drawings / comics  
d) maps  
e) figures / graphics/ technical drawings  
f) other  
g) not found |
| 2.10.2. Colour of illustrations | a) black-and-white, or monochrome  
b) colourful  
c) not applicable |
| 2.10.3. Relation / connection between illustrations | a) isolated  
b) sequenced  
c) other  
d) not found |
| 2.10.4. Relation / connection to contents | a) appropriate illustration(s)  
b) not really appropriate  
c) additional information is necessary to explain illustrations  
d) illustration is essential to understand the text/ or to complete the task  
e) no connection  
f) other  
g) not found |
| 2.11. Cultural information | a) genuine / or genuine-like  
b) insightful  
c) superficial and / or anecdotal  
d) positive  
e) negative / or critical  
f) neutral  
g) other  
h) not found |
| 2.11.2. Geographical amplitude of information | a) England  
b) Wells  
c) Scotland  
d) Northern Ireland  
e) GB  
f) Ireland  
g) USA  
h) Canada  
i) Australia  
j) New Zealand  
k) other English-  
a) Russian Federation  
b) territory of former Soviet Union  
c) Spain  
d) Latin America  
e) the Philippines |
<p>| 2.11.1. Characteristics of cultural information |--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Speaking Countries</th>
<th>Inter-Cultural Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.11.3. Values, beliefs, attitudes expressed</td>
<td>l) Hungary</td>
<td>l) Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m) other</td>
<td>m) other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n) not found</td>
<td>n) not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) explicitly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) implicitly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.4. Characteristic of values, beliefs, attitudes</td>
<td>a) personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) universal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) cultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.5. Non-verbal communication treated</td>
<td>a) explicitly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) implicitly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.6. Cultural dimensions / cultural behavioural components explicitly or implicitly addressed in the coursebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) power distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) individualism / collectivism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) masculinity / femininity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) uncertainty avoidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) short-term/long-term orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) past/present/future orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) attitudes to time (monochronic/polychronic, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) territoriality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) personal space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j) attitude to the environment (or relation to nature)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k) high-context/low-context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l) specific/diffuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m) neutral/emotional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n) achievement/ascription</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o) universalism/particularism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p) other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q) not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.7. Way of treating cultural dimensions / cultural behavioural components</td>
<td>a) explicitly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) implicitly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12. Evaluation of intercultural contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.1. In relation to (inter)cultural objectives</td>
<td>a) appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) with many deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.2. In relation to language</td>
<td>a) language is more relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) culture is more important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) balance between them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) only language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.3. General evaluation of (inter)cultural contents</td>
<td>a) appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Methodology (techniques and activities) of intercultural language learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Aspects of intercultural competence addressed in coursebooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1. Savoir comprendre</td>
<td>a) ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents or events from one's own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) not found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.1.2. Savoir apprendre / faire
- a) ability to discover and/or interact
- b) ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and the ability to operate knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction
- c) metacognitive strategies to direct own learning
- d) not found

### 3.1.3. Savoir s'engager
- a) ability to critically evaluate perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures
- b) not found

### 3.2. Intercultural learning based on
- a) (traditionally) linguistic activities
- b) activities for intercultural training
- c) combination of two
- d) other
- e) not applicable

### 3.3. Specific activities / techniques for intercultural learning
- a) culture capsule
- b) critical incident
- c) simulation game
- d) quiz
- e) diary/portfolio/essay
- f) project (collecting information)
- g) ethnographic interview
- h) cultural minidrama
- i) culture assimilator
- j) other
- k) not found

### 3.4. Activities focused on
- a) target culture(s)
- b) learner's culture
- c) other culture(s)
- d) comparison of cultures
- e) other
- f) not found

### 3.5. Language skills involved
- a) listening
- b) reading
- c) speaking
- d) writing
- e) integrated skills
- f) not applicable

### 3.6. Other skills involved
- a) observing, identifying and recognising
- b) comparing and contrasting
- c) negotiating meaning
- d) dealing with or tolerating ambiguity
- e) effectively interpreting messages
- f) limiting the possibility of misinterpretation
- g) defending one's own point of view while acknowledging the legitimacy of others
- h) accepting difference
- i) other
- j) not found

### 3.7. Coursebook as a tool to develop the strategies for successful intercultural communication
- a) problem-solving
- b) coping
- c) guessing
- d) learning management
- e) other
- f) not found

### 3.8. Type of tasks for intercultural language learning
| 3.8.1. Type of tasks for intercultural learning (in terms of involvement of language learners) | a) receptive  
b) productive  
c) co-operative  
d) autonomous learning  
e) other  
f) not found |
|---|---|
| 3.8.2. Type of tasks for intercultural language learning (in terms of nature of activity) | a) cognitive tasks  
b) cognitive-attitudinal  
c) exploration  
d) production  
e) enactment  
f) other  
g) not applicable |
| 3.9. Evaluation of intercultural methodology |  |
| 3.9.1. In relation to intercultural objectives | a) appropriate  
b) with many deficiencies  
c) other  
d) not applicable |
| 3.9.2. In relation to intercultural contents | a) appropriate  
b) with many deficiencies  
c) other  
d) not applicable |
| 3.9.3. General evaluation of intercultural methodology | a) appropriate  
b) limited  
c) other  
d) not found |
| 4. Inclusion of intercultural elements into assessment |  |
| Variable | Options |
| 4.1. Guidelines for assessing intercultural component | a) explicit  
b) implicit  
c) not found |
| 4.2. Assessment of intercultural component compared to assessment of linguistic component | a) language is more important  
b) only language  
c) culture is more important  
d) balance between them  
e) other  
f) not applicable |
| 4.3. Evaluation of assessment of (inter)cultural component |  |
| 4.3.1. In relation to intercultural objectives | a) appropriate  
b) with many deficiencies  
c) other  
d) not applicable |
| 4.3.2. In relation to intercultural contents | a) appropriate  
b) with many deficiencies  
c) other  
d) not applicable |
| 4.3.3. In relation to intercultural methodology | a) appropriate  
b) with many deficiencies  
c) other  
d) not applicable |
| 4.3.4. General evaluation of assessment of intercultural component | a) appropriate  
b) with many deficiencies  
c) other  
d) not applicable |
Appendix IX

Table for the gathering of data
(idea taken from Méndez García 2003:81-82)

Table 12: Table for the gathering of data (adapted from Méndez García 2003:81-82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Intercultural objectives

1.1

1.2

1.3

1.4

1.5

2. Intercultural contents

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4.1

2.4.2

2.4.3

2.5.1

2.5.2

2.6.1

2.6.2

2.6.3

2.6.4

2.6.5

2.6.6

2.6.7

2.7.1

2.7.2

2.7.3

2.7.4

2.8.1

2.8.2

2.8.3

2.9.1
### 3. Methodology of intercultural language learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Inclusion of intercultural elements into assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix X

### Tables of analysis of intercultural component in FL coursebooks

(adapted from Méndez García 2003:81-82)

**Table A: Analysis of intercultural component in NEW HEADWAY beginner** (English language coursebook) (adapted from Méndez García 2003:81-82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>Stop &amp; Check 4</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taken out of SB in new ed.</td>
<td>taken out of SB in new ed</td>
<td>taken out of SB in new ed</td>
<td>taken out of SB in new ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variables

#### 1. Intercultural objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>b=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>b=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>a=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>c=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>b=100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Intercultural contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>a=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.1</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.2</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.3</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 LLs themselves
12 LLs themselves
13 LLs themselves
14 LLs themselves
15 LLs themselves
16 LLs themselves
17 LLs themselves
18 LLs themselves
19 LLs themselves
20 LLs themselves
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B: Analysis of intercultural component in NEW HEADWAY elementary (English language coursebook) (adapted from Méndez García 2003:81-82)

Title of coursebook: NEW HEADWAY
Author(s): Soars L. & Soars J.
Year: 2004 thirteenth impression (first published 2000)
Publisher: Oxford University Press
Place: Oxford, New York
Level: elementary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>Stop &amp; Check 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taken out of SB in new ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taken out of SB in new ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variables**

1. Intercultural objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a=100  b=100  c=100

2. Intercultural contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a a a a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=100

|   | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l | m | n | o | p | q | r | s | t | u | v | w | x | y | z |
| 3.5 | a | b | c | d | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c |
| 3.6 | a | a | a | h | a | b | a | h | b | a | h | b | a | h | b | a | h | b | a | h | b | a | h | b | a | h | b | a | h |
| 3.7 | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | c | c | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f |
| 3.8.1 | a | b | c | c | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c | a | b | c |
| 3.8.2 | c | e | e | c | d | e | c | e | d | c | e | d | c | e | d | c | e | d | c | e | d | c | e | d | c | e | d | c | e |
| 3.9.1 | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |
| 3.9.2 | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |
| 3.9.3 | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |

4. Inclusion of intercultural elements into assessment

|   | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| 4.1 | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c |
| 4.2 | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f |
| 4.3.1 | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d |
| 4.3.2 | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d |
| 4.3.3 | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d |
| 4.3.4 | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d |
Table C: Analysis of intercultural component in *Sag za SAGOM* (Russian language coursebook) (adapted from Méndez García 2003:81-82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of coursebook: <em>SAG za SAGOM</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author(s): Székely A. – Székely Ny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year: 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place: Budapest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level: beginner – elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Units**

**Variables**

1. Intercultural objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>b=100,0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>c=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>c=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b=100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Intercultural contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b=100,0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 3. Methodology (techniques and activities) of intercultural language learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1.1</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>a=100,0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4. Inclusion of Intercultural elements into assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>=100,0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>=100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table D: Analysis of intercultural component in POEHALI (Russian language coursebook) (adapted from Méndez Garcia 2003:81-82)**

Title of coursebook: **POEHALI**  
Author(s): Chernyshov, S.  
Year: 2003  
Publisher: Zlatoust  
Place: St.Petersburg, RUSSIA  
Level: beginner

| Nr | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | % |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Note | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Variables**

1. Intercultural objectives

| 1.1 | b |
| 1.2 | a |
| 1.3 | c |
| 1.4 | c |
| 1.5 | b |

b=100  
a=100  
c=100  
b=100

2. Intercultural contents

| 2.1 | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |
| b | b | b | b | b | a | b | b | b | b | b |
| b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |
| b | b | b | b | b | b | g | b | b | b | b |
| b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |
| b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | a | b |
| b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |
| b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |
| b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |
| b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |

a=3.2  
b=96.8
### 4. Inclusion of intercultural elements into assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3.6</th>
<th>3.7</th>
<th>3.8.1</th>
<th>3.8.2</th>
<th>3.9.1</th>
<th>3.9.2</th>
<th>3.9.3</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>4.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Inclusion of intercultural elements into assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>4.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Inclusion of intercultural elements into assessment
Table F: Analysis of intercultural component in NUEVO ELE inicial I (Spanish language coursebook) (adapted from Méndez García 2003:81 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Units**

**Variables**

1. Intercultural objectives

1.1 | A | a=100,0
1.2 | a | b=100,0
1.3 | c | c=100,0
1.4 | A | a=100,0
1.5 | B | b=100,0

2. Intercultural contents

2.1 | A | a=100,0

Title of coursebook: NUEVO ELE

Author(s): Borobia V.

Year: 2002 (corrected edition)

Publisher: Ediciones SM

Place: Madrid

Level: beginner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 2.11.2 | a | b | c | m | a | b | b | b | b | b | a | a | b | a | a | a | m | n | a | b | a | a | a=72,2 | b=55,6 | c=5,6 | m=11,1 | n=5,6 |
| 2.11.3 | c | b | c | c | a | a | b | b | b | b | a | a | b | b | a | b | c | c | a | b | c | a | a=22,2 | b=22,2 | c=35,6 | d=55,6 |
| 2.11.4 | d | b | d | d | a | d | c | c | c | c | d | c | c | c | c | a | b | c | d | d | d | a | a=5,6 | b=11,1 | c=33,3 | d=55,6 |
| 2.11.5 | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | a=88,9 | b=11,1 |
| 2.11.6 | q | k | q | q | q | q | q | q | n | q | m | g | b | g | c | q | q | q | q | q | q | q | q | q | a=5,6 | b=5,6 | c=5,6 | d=5,6 |
| 2.11.7 | c | b | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | b | c | b | c | b | b | b | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | c | a=65,7 | b=33,3 | c=66,7 | d=33,3 |
| 2.12.1 | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b=94,4 | d=5,6 |
| 2.12.2 | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a=94,4 | d=5,6 |
| 2.12.3 | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b=94,4 | d=5,6 |

<p>| 3.1.1 | b | a | a | b | a | b | a | a | a | b | a | b | a | a | a | b | a | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | a=44,4 | b=55,6 |
| 3.1.2 | b | b | b | b | a | d | a | d | a | a | c | d | a | a | c | d | a | d | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a=50,0 | b=50,0 | c=5,6 | d=22,2 |
| 3.1.3 | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | a | b | a | a | b | a | b | b | b | a | b | b | b | a | b | a | a | a=22,2 | b=77,8 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4. Inclusion of intercultural elements into assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | c=100,0
<p>|   | f | f | f | f | a | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | f | e | a=16.7 |
| 4.2 | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d |
| 4.3.1 | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d |
| 4.3.2 | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d |
| 4.3.3 | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d |
| 4.3.4 | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d | d |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variables**

1. Intercultural objectives

| 1.1 | a |
| 1.2 | a | c |
| 1.3 | a |
| 1.4 | b |
| 1.5 | a |

2. Intercultural contents

| 2.1 | a |

 multicultural component in NUEVO ELE Inicial 2 (Spanish language coursebook) (adapted from Méndez García 2003:81-82)

Title of coursebook: NUEVO ELE
Author(s): Borobio V.
Year: 2002 (corrected edition)
Publisher: Ediciones SM
Place: Madrid
Level: elementary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>q</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>w</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.3</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 4. Inclusion of intercultural elements into assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>a=100,0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>a=83,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d=100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d=100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix XI

User version of the scheme for analysis of intercultural component in FL coursebooks

Table 22: User version of the scheme for analysis of intercultural component in FL coursebooks (adapted from Méndez García 2003:59-69)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Found appropriate</th>
<th>Not found appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intercultural objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Explicitly expressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Changes on intercultural level expected from learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. General evaluation of intercultural objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intercultural contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Treatment of topics various levels, including intercultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. Intercultural (international) level of contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1. Amplitude of cultures presented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2. Comparison of target culture(s) with other culture(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3. Relations between / Opinions about cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Aspects of intercultural competence addressed in coursebooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1. Savoirs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.2. Savoir être</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. Equality in representation of characters with regard to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.1. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.2. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.3. Social classes and groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.4. Races / Ethnics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.7. Nationality / origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7. Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.1. Variety of places where interactions takes place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.2. Variety of situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.3. Variety of interactions with regard to atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4. Interactions between members of various cultures demonstrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8. Stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.3. Treating of stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9. The author’s point of view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.2. The description of target culture(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10. Illustrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10. Variety of illustration types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11. Cultural information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.1. Characteristics of cultural information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.2. Geographical amplitude of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.3. Values, beliefs, attitudes expressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.4. Characteristic of values, beliefs, attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.5. Non-verbal communication treated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.6. Cultural dimensions / cultural behavioural components explicitly or implicitly addressed in the coursebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12. Evaluation of intercultural contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.1. In relation to (inter)cultural objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.3. General evaluation of (inter)cultural contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Methodology (techniques and activities) of intercultural language learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1. Aspects of intercultural competence addressed in coursebooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1. <em>Savoir comprendre</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2. <em>Savoir apprendre / faire</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3. <em>Savoir s'engager</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Specific activities / techniques for intercultural learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. Activities focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6. Other (than language) skills, which are necessary for becoming intercultural are involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7. Coursebook as a tool to develop the strategies for successful intercultural communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8. Type of tasks for intercultural language learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.1. Variety of tasks for intercultural language learning (in terms of involvement of language learners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.2. Variety of tasks for intercultural language learning (in terms of nature of activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9. Evaluation of intercultural methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.1. In relation to intercultural objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.2. In relation to intercultural contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.3. General evaluation of intercultural methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Inclusion of intercultural elements into assessment

| 4.1. Guidelines for assessing intercultural component          |
| 4.3. Evaluation of assessment of (inter)cultural component     |
| 4.3.1. In relation to intercultural objectives               |
| 4.3.2. In relation to intercultural contents                 |
| 4.3.3. In relation to intercultural methodology              |
| 4.3.4. General evaluation of assessment of intercultural component |