Abstract

Second/international language (L2) education contexts are increasingly recognized as fertile ground for the learning about “otherness”, teaching a new linguistic code and another way of seeing the world. This study contrasts how culture teaching beliefs and visions develop among new secondary school international language teachers in curriculum/methodology classes in two distinct teacher preparation programs.

Using a comparative, multi-case study approach with a mixed methods design, this research uses complementary data sources including three repeated questionnaires, individual, focus group interviews and classroom observations to examine changes in culture teaching beliefs/visions. The research was informed by a sociocultural perspective in teacher education, a proposed model of teacher education impact and current thinking in culture and intercultural learning including Byram’s (1997) framework of intercultural communicative competence and post-modernist definitions of culture.

Comparisons between the teacher educators involved show that culture teaching practices are strongly situated in historically embedded paradigms, contextual constraints of learning environments and framed by practitioners’ culture teaching beliefs. Findings indicate that teacher candidates’ culture teaching beliefs and visions evolve on individual pathways, depend on reflection, and are firmly rooted in previous beliefs about culture and L2 learning. Teacher education practices in these programs prompted both a facilitative and tempering effect on teacher candidate culture teaching
beliefs and visions. Enthusiasm and curiosity about culture teaching increased and some teacher candidates saw culture teaching having perspective-changing benefits. Alternatively, many teacher candidates began to see increased complexity with culture teaching leading to insecurity about culture teaching knowledge and cultural credibility. Teacher candidates cited increased awareness of curricular and time constraints, concerns with stereotypes, the daunting breadth of culture and a lack of culture teaching models. Teachers with the most teaching and “living away” experience exhibited more culture teaching familiarity. Despite a brief appearance of some intercultural approaches, an instructivist approach working with the material dimension of the target culture dominated teachers’ culture teaching visions. Implications include rethinking the structure of L2 teacher preparation programs to provide more critical, ethnorelative reflection on culture, teacher identity, and to situate and operationalize culture teaching in teacher beliefs and experiences.
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Chapter 1
Changing Views of Culture

There is, perhaps, no more important topic in the social sciences than the study of intercultural communication. Understanding between members of different cultures was always important, but it has never been as important as it is now. ...it is a matter of survival of our species....while we are clearly more involved in each other’s lives than ever before, we appear no less deeply involved in brutal rejection of each other.

While more people from more cultures are communicating and co-operating across differences, as many, it seems, are killing and maiming each other in the name of cultural and religious identity. ... The dilemma of the global age is that ... we are profoundly divided by race, culture and belief and we have yet to find a tongue in which we can speak our humanity to each other.

Young (1996, p. 2)

Young’s quote illustrates an odd juxtaposition in modern societies, that we are increasingly interconnected yet distanced on many levels by communication, and intercultural awareness. The growing social and economic interdependence of our societies fueled by continual advances in telecommunications and increasing global interactions are reshaping communication contexts to be inherently intercultural. This is redefining the potential role of the second and international language (L2) classroom as a place of cultural intersection, a safe “third space” (Kramsch, 1995). Such classrooms can offer learners a chance to explore multiple cultural and linguistic perspectives, gaining new perspectives into their cultural selves and building knowledge about others, and a more open approach to difference.

There has been increasing awareness of the shared system of meanings that lie implicitly with language and its crucial role in making communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries effective. Language use is increasingly seen as a social practice (Johnson, 2009a), embedding cultural meanings and norms, which if ignored in the language teaching process, limit the communicative effectiveness of learners. This changing context and increased awareness of the interconnectedness of culture and language has prompted a rethinking of how culture is positioned in L2 language teaching and how teachers are prepared to approach culture-and-language learning.
Recognizing the Intercultural Dimension in L2 Teaching

L2 educational contexts are increasingly recognized as fertile ground for the promotion of global communication skills, intercultural learning and reflection and for the promotion of intercultural communicative competence – the ability to see oneself operating in a cultural context, to appreciate and adapt to cultural difference (Alptekin, 2002; Bennett, Bennett, & Allen, 2003; Byram & Morgan, 1994; Knutson, 2006; Kramsch, 1993; Mendes & Moreira, 2005; Paige, Jorstad, Siaya, Klein, & Colby, 2003; Troudi, 2003). The L2 classroom context can be constructed as a place of cultural intersection, a safe “third space” (Kramsch, 1995) where learners can explore multiple cultural and linguistic perspectives, gaining new perspective into their cultural selves, building knowledge about others and developing culture-and-language learning strategies.

Byram (1989) states that learning another language is learning “otherness”, which involves not only another linguistic code but another culture, another way of seeing the world. Through L2 language learning we have the potential to develop a lens through which the world can be seen differently, uniquely from the way we’ve seen it before. Language learning has the power to expand our linguistic and cultural filters that shape our thoughts, our perspectives and our world views. It has the potential to enable us to see, understand and accept other ways of being, other ways of seeing. Language and cultural learning that is “intercultural” has the potential to offer learners more than target language competence but communication skills for the 21st century, an ability to see difference as a benefit rather than a limitation.

This potential of language learning environments has spawned a recent flood of literature discussing the potential of enhancing the cultural and intercultural focus of language teaching (Alptekin, 2002; Bennett et al., 2003; Byram & Feng, 2004; Byram, Gribkova, & Starkey, 2002; Cates, 2006; Damen, 1987; Fantini, 1999; Kramsch, 1993, 1995, 1998; Lange, 1999, 2003; Lazarton, 2003; MacPherson et al., 2004; Nault, 2006; Paige et al., 2003; Sehlaoui, 2001; Willems, 2002; Zarate, 1991). It has also prompted the redefinition of language teaching standards around the world from the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages to the European Union’s Common European Framework of Reference for Languages to adopt a more intercultural-focused language teaching approach. In Canada, the cultural syllabus of Canada’s National Core French Study adopted a reflective intercultural approach that advocates reflection on student home culture with awareness of target cultural frameworks (Knutson, 2006, p.598). The province of Alberta has emphasized global citizenship as a core outcome of international
language learning programs, emphasizing the need to develop not just good language speakers but effective culture-and-language learners (Alberta Education, 2009). Such a goal of intercultural learning and reflection implies much more than a change in topic focus. The shift encourages a process-based pedagogy focused on culture-general learning, learning about categories of cultural difference (Klein, 2004).

The Context for this Research

In spite of this transformative shift in thinking, there seems to be a growing gap between these broadened goals and teaching practice (Klein, 2004; Paige et al., 2003). In Canadian language teacher education programs, explicit attention to intercultural learning and awareness seems rarely considered (Pauchulo, 2005). In many L2 programs, cultural learning is often marginalized as a neglected and often eclectically treated fifth skill (Klein, 2004; Kurogi, 1998; Paige et al., 2003). In language programs, teacher education programs and related curricula, cultural learning is often usurped by an overriding focus on teaching linguistic competence (Klein, 2004; Kramsch, 1993; Paige et al., 2003; Pauchulo, 2005).

Despite the implied focus on the sociocultural aspects of language through the prevalence of the communicative approach often touted in L2 language teacher preparation programs, culture often remains a neglected focus. When culture is taught, its treatment is often based on a monolithic perception of the “native” speaker’s language and culture (Alptekin, 2002). As L2 teachers, we often feel unable to specifically define culture and how it relates concretely to language teaching. Culture is an ambiguous topic that is often overlooked in curriculum planning. As a result, we are often left on our own to integrate cultural learning, to navigate cultural difference, to promote intercultural awareness, to deal with stereotypes and to teach beyond the target culture. As a result, we often avoid working with cultural difference in spite of the communicative, critical learning potential such engagement can offer.

This lack of attention to cultural and intercultural issues is unfortunate as L2 language teaching contexts in urban settings are increasingly populated by rich cultural diversity that can be used a valuable resource in addition to working with the target culture. Fostering intercultural awareness and dialogue among new teachers seems an important step in developing a reflective practice, deepening an understanding of the role of culture in language use and developing the ability to facilitate intercultural communication skills.
However, very little is known about the treatment and impact of culture learning in L2 teacher education programs or even the treatment of culture in L2 teaching programs. In a comprehensive review of the culture teaching field, Paige et al. (2003) found only 289 articles focusing on culture teaching in second language education, 65 of which reported on empirical research in this area. Culture teaching has been highly eclectic and largely dependent on the individual teacher’s conceptualization of culture (Paige et al., 2003). Very little, if any, research has been conducted on the treatment and impact of culture learning in L2 teacher education programs.

**Research Focus and Questions**

This study attempts to provide some initial insight into how the concept of culture is treated in Canadian L2 teacher preparation programs. As initial teacher education has been shown to have a unique impact on helping refine and reprioritize new teacher beliefs and practices (Borg, 2006), examining teacher educator (TE) beliefs about culture/culture teaching and how these beliefs impact teacher candidate (TC) conceptualizations about culture seems relevant as a first step in understanding the landscape of culture teaching in L2 teacher preparation.

This study uses a multi-staged, multiple case, comparative case study research approach to explore the interrelationship between the treatment of culture in international language teacher preparation programs and teacher candidate beliefs and visions towards culture and culture teaching. The overarching question that guided this study was: What is the treatment and impact of culture teaching in International Language Teacher Preparation Programs?

From this main focus, a number of more specific questions arose that appeared pivotal in informing such an exploration in the preparation of language-and-culture teachers. These included:

1. How do culture teaching beliefs, visions including perceptions of benefits and challenges differ and evolve among international language teacher candidates in two Ontario teacher preparation programs? How intercultural are these culture teaching beliefs and visions?

2. How do culture learning experiences in a curriculum and methodology class differ and influence teacher candidate beliefs and visions?
3. What demographic, experiential factors influence teachers’ culture teaching beliefs and visions?

4. How do these culture learning experiences prepare new teachers to work with culture in international language education?

As there has been criticism of only examining teacher beliefs from self-reported questionnaire data (Pajares, 1992), this study adopted a more purposeful and holistic approach at exploring a range of factors shaping teacher beliefs, belief change and intended practices toward culture teaching. Using multiple points and levels of data generation, and recognizing the powerful impact of life history on pre-service teacher beliefs (Richardson, 1996), this research looked at aspects of personal experience including demographic factors, exposure to cultural difference, previous teaching experience combined with the impact of teacher education practices on teaching visions. In addition, the study examined the intersection between teacher educator culture teaching beliefs and practices and their resulting impact on teacher candidates to better understand the impact of teacher education practices on new teacher beliefs and teaching visions. By using a comparative case study approach, exploring multiple data sources and focusing on a range of factors that influence and enact beliefs, I was able to explore and triangulate findings among the two distinct institutional contexts, deepening understanding of the teacher education on new teacher beliefs and visions.

**My Investment in Culture**

Having been a language learner of French and Spanish throughout elementary and secondary school, I had been exposed to select tidbits of target culture throughout my language learning experiences. I remember learning about Carnival in Québec, reading about bullfighting in Spain, baguettes and Gaston Gavroche et son gâteau au chocolat en France, racism against the first nations in Mexico, and one of my most memorable cultural experiences, a Paella night in my Grade 12 Spanish class. My Spanish teacher, Ms. Lee, gathered us together at school one night to eat paella, listen to Flamenco music, flip through books about Spain (she had studied there during the Franco years). This night was memorable for me as it fired up a curiosity about Spain and Spanish “otherness” that intrigued me.

However it has been as a teacher of English and English teachers that I began to cultivate a more profound interest and fascination with the complexity of culture. My
consciousness was heightened about culture in language teaching when I began teaching English to new immigrants in LINC (Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada) classes in the mid-1990s. The curriculum encouraged us to facilitate cultural adaptation skills (“assimilation” was the word used which then and now has always worried me) and teach how to apply for jobs, succeed in interviews, all very culturally-based topics. It was in these classes that I began recognizing the power and challenge of teaching a new cultural system of actions that embedded beliefs, values and expectations - much more than language. I was introduced to the concept and impact of culture shock that some of my students were experiencing to varying degrees and began seeing how it coloured their visions about Canada. Working with a colleague and friend in these classes, we naively decided to work with the topics of stereotypes and rid students once and for all of any of these generalizations. It was a great facilitator of oral competence but the stereotypes seemed to linger.

I think my greatest learning about culture and certainly of otherness has been my gay identity. Growing up gay in a seemingly very straight and at times very unaccepting world has made me feel othered in a profound way. I remember seeing Anita Bryant on the TV news in the 1970s fighting to rid the U.S. of gay people and perpetuate inequality based on sexual orientation. As a teenager, this suddenly made me conscious of the widespread hatred towards people like me and made me realize that I had to hide myself to be safe. Luckily I felt very loved, supported and secure in my family, so I was eventually able to share this side of my identity, albeit cautiously, with my parents and my immediate family. However there has always been a part of that social hatred and fear that I recognize I have internalized, increasing my reluctance to be open, to often mask that side of my identity unless I absolutely had to share it. This is the widespread collateral damage that many of us feel resulting from heterosexism, coercive power relations and ethnocentrism. As many gay, lesbian individuals, and members of sexual minority groups will know, this disdain toward the other is still fairly commonplace, even in countries as liberal as Canada. Just recently my partner and I were on an Air Canada flight returning from Europe and asked for just one customs form to complete (as only one form per “family” is required) and got such a look of shock with an unsettling vocalization from a middle aged female flight attendant that it again reminded me of my otherness. It reignited internalized homophobia and reminded me that while I feel fairly “normal”, others may see me as “weird”.
It has been this exposure to bias based on perception and ignorance combined with increasing awareness of language-and-culture teaching issues that has moved me into intercultural communication and learning. I spent two summers at the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication in Portland Oregon, exploring culture and intercultural teaching and learning. This experience prompted me to design a 12-hour unit in building an intercultural teaching practice within a TESL Ontario Certificate program. This focus on culture and intercultural learning has also enabled me to develop my own intercultural language teaching and teacher education practice to make culture and intercultural issues more conscious.

Through this experience I have explicitly been made aware of the complexity of culture, that we have many layers of cultural influence and identity like my often invisible gay identity that I can strategically conceal but that I feel strongly connected and committed to. I recognize the connection between culture, identity and language use and the fact that these often remain unaddressed in language teaching. I recoil when I hear a homophobic slur from someone who doesn’t see this cultural identity within me. I see the perceived threat of otherness and the ignorance that often cultivates this threat. And I increasingly recognize the power language education offers in facilitating intercultural awareness to break down this cycle of cultivated fear based on ignorance and ethnocentric worldviews. I hope that this study will be a small but useful step in building more awareness about the potentially transformative role of culture learning in L2 teacher education to enable teachers and teacher educators to start seeing culture and how they can work with it to build greater intercultural understanding.

The Need to “See” Culture

Throughout this dissertation I will occasionally refer to the metaphor of seeing culture as a way to describe consciousness around cultural issues. In his discussion of the complexity of culture, Michael Agar (2006) argues that culture becomes visible often only when differences appear with an outsider from that culture. In my English language teacher education, I often discuss the invisibility of culture, particularly when referring to the cultures of the dominant group(s) in a society. Dominant cultures are often invisible if we’re from that culture.

The classic iceberg metaphor for culture is based on visibility. One can “see” the visible surface layers of the culture (the iceberg) but it is the deeper layers, the values, beliefs, expectations that lie beneath the water’s surface that are harder to see. And it is
these deeper layers that often play a crucial role in meaning exchange. Culture in itself is such an ambiguous term and therefore very difficult to see or define, hence its inherent challenge in deciding how to integrate it into language teaching.

I have come to understand that the more we see our personal cultures, the more we are likely to see the cultures of others. The more we see the patterns in cultural interaction, the more we are able to contrast and see the way we can broaden or adapt our thinking and communication approach to meet the needs of different cultural contexts. Culture teaching seems a lot about learning and “seeing” culture first. If we don’t see culture, we likely have challenges teaching it.

**Dissertation Focus and Overview**

This research attempts to explore a broad area that delves into complex and rapidly emerging areas of teacher education, culture and intercultural learning. I recognize that there are many contested and evolving interpretations of culture, intercultural learning and valuable debates of identity, multicultural education and power relations that evolve from these areas. While I will touch upon issues of identity, teacher self-efficacy and the treatment of culture and cultural diversity that relate to power relations as they emerged in this research, more comprehensive debates of these issues are beyond the scope of this dissertation. This research is designed as a first stage in exploring the treatment of culture teaching and learning in L2 teacher preparation contexts from an intercultural perspective. After surveying the literature, I have selected theoretical frameworks that I feel represent current thinking in culture, intercultural language teaching and teacher development. Appendix A offers a brief, glossary of some of the terms and concepts referred to in this dissertation. I have defined these terms based on my understanding of related literature. The list is by no means comprehensive.

Chapter 2 situates the study within the literature on culture, language teaching and teacher education. Chapter 3 discusses several complementary theoretical frameworks that underpin the analysis of this research. In this chapter, I’ve also proposed a blended theoretical framework that will be used to analyze teacher belief systems towards culture teaching and learning in this research. Chapter 4 describes the research methodology and the participants who took part. Chapter 5 describes the culture learning landscape of this research and contrasts the teacher educators and their culture teaching practices. Chapters 6, 7 and 8 discuss the findings from this research in relation to each of the research topics investigated. Chapter 9 examines culture teaching
beliefs and vision changes through the eyes of 6 teacher candidates, 3 in each institutional context to explore culture teaching visions and belief change at the individual level. Chapter 10 summarizes and discusses the main findings and proposes some implications and recommendations for L2 teacher education emerging from this research.
Chapter 2
Emerging Visions of Culture and Culture Teaching

If second language education programs are going to flourish in the future, culture must be the core of assessment, curriculum, and instructional practices with language.

Dale L. Lange (2003, p.272)

Introduction

Lange’s citation emphasizes an emerging trend in second language education, a growing recognition of the relevance of the cultural and intercultural dimension in language teaching. This chapter will situate my study in the thought and research behind this emerging movement calling for the integration of intercultural learning in L2 teaching and learning and language teacher preparation.

I will begin by summarizing the changing landscape of L2 teaching and learning, the evolving needs of language learners and renewed visions of culture. This will be followed by a discussion of the evolving understanding of the relationship between language and culture and the limitations of current visions of culture teaching. The perceived challenges of culture teaching resulting in limited culture learning will then be outlined. A review of international standards established to guide an intercultural language teaching and teacher education approach will then be summarized. This will be followed with an examination of the language teacher’s role as cultural mediator within the context of a sociocultural approach to teacher preparation. The chapter will conclude with the call to reframe language teacher preparation outlining the benefits of adopting an intercultural approach.

The Changing Communication Needs of L2 Learners

The intensity of immigration and global communication technology is dramatically altering the cultural and linguistic landscape of second language classrooms in urban Canada and in many urban centres around the world. Increasing transmigration, economic, political and social interdependence in today’s tech-connected societies is changing our communication demands and the needs of learners in L2 language programs (Mendes & Moreira, 2005). Increasing mobility, information exchange and computer-mediated communication are creating rich intercultural communicative opportunities and challenges. Inevitable encounters with otherness and
the need to negotiate meaning across differences are calling for the need to reframe language education and language teacher preparation to enable intercultural communicative competence – the ability to see oneself operating in a cultural context, to appreciate and adapt to cultural difference (Alptekin, 2002; Bennett et al., 2003; Byram & Morgan, 1994; Knutson, 2006; Kramsch, 1993; Mendes & Moreira, 2005; Paige et al., 2003; Troudi, 2003).

Canada has the highest per capita immigration rate in the world. In 2006, visible minorities made up 16.2% of the population and nearly half of major urban centres such as Toronto (Statistics Canada, 2006). In Canada’s major cities (Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver), approximately 47% of the population speaks languages other than English or French at home. This trend is predicted to intensify and is reflected in L2 learner and L2 teacher student populations.

This demographic shift has significant implications on the nature of L2 language learning, teaching and teacher development. The role of culture in language teaching and learning is repositioning itself as a dominant focus in both the content and process of language learning (Lange, 2003). In addition, the role of the target culture as the solitary cultural focus seems ineffective when language learning needs, student populations are increasingly becoming intercultural (Alptekin, 2002; Dogancay-Aktuna, 2005). Recognizing this changing landscape, international standards for language teaching, as cited earlier, are calling for an intercultural dimension to culture and language learning, positioning culture at the core of language teaching and learning (Kelly, Grenfell, Allan, Kriza, & McEvoy, 2004; Phillips, 2003). This intercultural refocusing requires a reconceptualization of culture teaching in language teacher preparation, from the marginalized fifth skill to an integrated core of language teaching and learning processes (Kramsch, 1995; Lange, 2003, 2003; Paige et al., 2003), reflecting a new vision of culture.

**Changing Views towards Culture**

Embedded in this movement to reposition culture teaching in L2 teaching, is an evolution of thinking about the concept of culture. The traditional concept of culture as a closed, coherent system of meanings and actions in which an individual uniquely participates in is increasingly seen as irrelevant in today’s world of dynamic multicultural, multilayered interactions (Agar, 1994, 2006; Bennett, 1998; Ting-Toomey, 1999). Culture is increasingly being seen as partial and relational. Given the
interconnected layered cultural influences on one individual, it is often impossible to speak of one culture but a composite. As a result, culture is always partial. We’re all “a little of this and a little of that” as Michael Agar so aptly writes (2006, p. 7). Two people can share and identify with a “Canadian” culture and related embedded meanings but can be quite distinct through other cultural influences.

Culture is also seen as relational. Culture often only becomes visible when it is being construed from an outsider’s perspective (Agar, 2006). Culture is somewhat of an artificial construction built to enable translation of perceived areas of difference between the source and target cultures. “There is no culture of X, only a culture of X for Y” (Agar, 2006, p. 6). In this regard, the definition of culture takes on somewhat of a translation model. Agar advocates that culture is the property of no one and exists only as a translation enabler between the source and target culture.

The Dimensions of Culture

In recent decades, culture has been described as having many dimensions. There is the concept of surface or objective culture that all can see. This is what has been called the product-based layer of culture (Shaules, 2007), defined by products of a cultural group like clothing, food, festivals, literature. Less visible aspects of culture have been called deep or subjective culture (Shaules, 2007; Triandis, 1972). These are aspects of culture that often shape behaviour, language use and the development of cultural products. These meaning-focused layers are also the invisible factors that often cause cultural miscommunication through their influence on behaviour and communication (Ting-Toomey, 1999). In fact, it is conservatively estimated that between 25 and 50% of our basic values stem from cultural experience (Gannon, 2004). Components of these deeper layers of culture include value orientations and cognitive styles. Examples of value orientations include attitudes toward time, power distance or respect of hierarchy, attitudes toward nature and collectivism vs. individualism. Cognitive styles include consensus building vs. problem-solving vs. strategic analytical orientations or relational vs. inductive vs. deductive logic (Bennett, 2009a).

Language use tends to be influenced by deep cultural orientations and contributes greatly to the creation of cultural products and systems of communication. Non-verbal communication, communications styles are culturally-informed areas in language use that directly relate to L2 teaching. Communication styles have been defined as high context vs. low context, indirect vs. direct, linear vs. circular, restrained
vs. expressive and intellectually or relationally confrontational (Bennett, 2009a). In terms of L2 teaching, Kramsch (1998) identifies three layers of culture related to the sociocultural context of language study. The first, the social (synchronic) layer, represents the language people use to identify themselves as part of a community which is informed by shared beliefs and worldviews. The second layer, the historical (diachronic) dimension, constitutes everyday practices that are informed by the shared history and experience of a group. The third layer she discusses is the layer of the imagination, representing shared dreams and visions of a group displayed through art or language.

As illustrated, many of these frameworks of cultural dimensions overlap and define similar constructs. One breakdown of culture that I have found particularly clear, that I shall refer to in my analysis in this study is one outlined by Jaime Wurzel (2005), where, like others, he defines culture as shared patterns of often implicit knowledge and understanding. In his description of culture, Wurzel highlights three dimensions of shared cultural knowledge: the subjective dimensions (beliefs, attitudes and values), the interactive dimensions (verbal and nonverbal communication), and the material dimension (relevant objects, artifacts) (p. 23). These dimensions constitute the shared and learned patterns of information a group uses to generate rules and meaning among its members (Wurzel, 2005). They facilitate communication and a relatively high degree of coherent functioning among members of a culture. He emphasizes that this concept of culture as knowledge should not be considered a wholly cognitive process as he sees the integration of cognition and emotion as inseparable and elemental. Wurzel states that a "culture common to a group not only facilitates cohesion and communication, it also affects the identity, the sense of belonging, and the self-esteem of individuals within the group" (Wurzel, 2005, p. 23).

**The Interconnection Between Language and Culture**

Language and culture have often been described as inextricably connected (Byram et al., 2002; Kramsch, 1993; Paige et al., 2003). E.T. Hall (1959) described communication as culture and culture as communication. It is widely understood that language organizes and expresses cultural interpretations of concepts and ways of life that have evolved within a specific community of language users (Byram & Risager, 1999; Thomas & Wareing, 2002). Theories of linguistic relativity and determinism drafted by Sapir and Whorf highlighted the influence of culture on linguistic and cognitive processes (Carroll, 1956).
When two people talk to one another, they do not just exchange linguistic code, they negotiate and redefine identities, negotiate and socially construct understanding, often exploiting culturally defined paralinguistic and contextual cues and assumptions (Byram et al., 2002; Ting-Toomey, 1999). This notion of sociolinguistic competence and linguistic “appropriateness” has been promoted as a key part of the communicative language teaching method since the 1970s. More recently, Agar (1994) emphasized the interconnectedness of culture with language, coining the term “languaculture” to reunite the two concepts. Agar developed the term languaculture to reinforce that using a language involves all manner of background knowledge and local information in addition to grammar and vocabulary.

Johnson (2009) defines language as not a set of rules but a semiotic system that we use to communicate that incorporates shared understandings that are often culturally defined. In this vane, Johnson reflects the understanding of language as social practice, reflecting an emerging sociocultural perspective to language teaching (Johnson, 2006, 2009b). In her discussion of languaculture as a key concept in language teaching, Karen Risager (2005) argues that the connection between language and culture should be seen from a multicultural, ecological perspective. Rather than focus on target language spoken within a geographically bounded cultural region, Risager stresses the need to emphasize the variability of languaculture in discourse among different native users of the same language but also among people who use the language as a native, additional or international language. She notes that there are dimensions of culture that are bound to specific languacultures and dimensions that are not. As a result, awareness needs to be placed on the worldwide network of the target language and the cultural variation that influences these social networks of language use (Risager, 2005).

**Culture and Identity**

These systems of language and culture that intersect and create a social practice have lead to greater understanding of the relationship between cultural, linguistic membership and identity. Identity and one’s sense of belonging are increasingly seen as socioculturally constructed (Norton, 2006), mediated through linguistic and cultural systems within a social context. Researchers increasingly recognize that identity construction must be understood in terms of larger social processes, marked by relations of power that can be either coercive or collaborative (Cummins, 2001; Norton, 2006). For example, language has been described as a site of social and political struggle where identity is constructed (Weedon, 1987). A range of scholars have highlighted the power
relations connected to identity, language, culture and L2 learning where legitimacy, cultural capital and social inclusion are negotiated and often framed within unequal power relationships (Bourdieu, 1986; Cummins, 2001; Deters, 2009; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Norton, 1997). The widely cited insider vs. outsider phenomenon in cultural membership (Ting-Toomey, 1999) relates in some ways to Lave and Wenger’s (1991) concepts of legitimacy in communities of practice. This recognition of power dynamics and identity construction interconnected with issues of cultural and linguistic membership has strengthened the criticism of some language-and-culture teaching methodologies and added a call for more critical approaches to L2 teaching and teacher education (Canagarajah, 1999a; Norton, 2005). It is thought that L2 teacher education programs should more fully investigate the concept of culture as a dynamic, multifaceted, ideological construct and discuss how language, culture identity and power are relevant to language teaching and learning situations (Franson & Holliday, 2009). This ties into discussions that L2 teacher education programs should enable teachers to think critically about their how their daily practices contribute to broader social and political issues (Johnson, 2009b).

The Native Speaker Ideology and Teacher Credibility

This evolving recognition of the dynamic nature of culture and its relation to power has resulted in criticism of the native speaker focus in the communicative competence model that has informed communicative language teaching (Alptekin, 2002; Canagarajah, 1999b; Dogancay-Aktuna, 2005; Phillipson, 1992). The implicit goal in communicative language teaching has been to imitate a native speaker in linguistic competence, appropriateness and in knowledge about a country and its culture (Byram et al., 2002). This native speaker fallacy as coined by Phillipson (2002) has been critiqued as circumscribing learner and teacher autonomy, often portraying target language culture as static, stereotypical and utopian (Alptekin, 2002; Canagarajah, 1999b).

Byram (1997) cites two grounds for criticism of the native speaker model. First, he describes this target language speaking goal as an impossible target, set up for failure that assumes that learners have the same mastery over a language as a native speaker. This ignores the quite distinct conditions through which learners and native speakers acquire language (Byram, 1997, p. 11). He also states that promoting native-like communicative competence fuels a damaging, acculturation-focused competence. By inducing such “linguistic schizophrenia”, as Byram defines it (p. 11), language teaching
can result in the forced abandonment of one’s linguistic and cultural identity, promoting a new sociocultural identity, a far-fetched and potentially damaging goal.

The ideology that has arisen around this native speaker model has also taken its toll on the credibility of “non-native” speaking teachers. Contradicting research into teacher effectiveness, there is often a perception that second language speakers of the target language are less than ideal and have constrained L2 teaching abilities from their first language speaking peers (Canagarajah, 1999b; Faez, 2007; Thomas, 1999). Students can be critical, employers can openly discriminate and perhaps the most threatening impact is on these teachers’ perceptions of self-efficacy. “This lack of confidence, this uncertainty about one’s abilities, is damaging because it sometimes stands in the way of non-native speaking teachers being all that they possibly can be and of realizing their full potential” (Thomas, 1999, p. 10). The irony with this situation is that often such teachers, proficient in more than one language system, and having learned the target language, can act as inspirational role models, relating to their learners and the language learning process in ways first language speakers may not (Canagarajah, 1999b; Kamhi-Stein, 1999).

In her criticism of the native-speaker model of language teaching, Kramsch (1995) questions the notion of native speakership by birth, education or membership in a native speaker community and proposes a pedagogical framework focused on the competence of a bilingual non-native speaker operating on the “edge” between two languages. Communicating on the edge of identities, cultures and linguistic frameworks seems increasingly commonplace in our globalized world. This seems a particularly relevant phenomenon given the increasing use of technology-mediated communication across time, space and cultural/linguistic boundaries to negotiate relationships and build communities online.

**The Challenge with Culture Teaching and Learning**

In spite of these changing visions towards culture, culture teaching and culture’s recognized role in language teaching, culture remains somewhat of an enigma in second language teaching and in teacher development programs (Alptekin, 2002; Bennett et al., 2003; Lazarton, 2003; Murphy, 1988; Paige et al., 2003). There appear to be a number of reported barriers inhibiting culture teaching or at least framing culture as a static entity, consisting of classifiable, observable and therefore easily teachable and assessable facts (Paige et al., 2003).
Authors have cited the supremacy of linguistics, of student proficiency levels that has tended to limit the perceived relevance of culture teaching and learning (Kramsch, 1993; Lafayette, 2003; Paige et al., 2003; Pauchulo, 2005). There are concerns about the time needed to understand and teach culture, the need to know culture before teaching it and concerns over student reactions to culture learning (Hadley, 2001). There is a perceived inherent complexity in the concept of culture, and an overall lack of understanding of what exactly culture is and which aspects to teach, making the understanding of the intercultural dimension quite a challenge (Kurogi, 1998; Levy, 2007; Ting-Toomey, 1999). As discussed above, there is also the issue of credibility with culture and L2 teaching and perceptions of the need to be an authentic representative of the target culture (Canagarajah, 1999b; Faez, 2007; Kamhi-Stein, 1999).

These interconnected factors have often forced culture teaching and learning into the backseat of language curriculum and teacher education. Reflecting the marginalized role of culture in second language teaching, Paige et al. (2003) found very limited research guiding language teachers on culture teaching in second language classrooms in their comprehensive review of the field. Only a few ethnographic studies were found that shed light on how culture is actually treated in the language classroom. A similar lack of information and research on culture teaching has been cited by other authors recognizing the potential importance of the cultural dimension in language teaching (Byram & Morgan, 1994; Kramsch, 1993; Kurogi, 1998; Pauchulo, 2005; Seelye, 1993). Below I have summarized recent research that examines the interplay between teachers’ beliefs, culture teaching practices and some of the perceived challenges of culture, culture teaching and integrating an intercultural approach.

**Linguistic Supremacy**

In the research examining culture teaching and teacher’s prioritization of culture teaching, there is an underlying theme that teachers generally view linguistic goals in language education as far superior to culture learning goals (Murphy, 1988; Young, 2009). When culture is taught, it often focuses on target culture-specific objectives, dealt distinctly from language learning, where textbooks or personal anecdotes are a primary source of cultural information.

In research examining culture teaching in two Spanish language university classrooms, Pauchulo (2005) found that language teaching was prioritized over culture teaching. When culture teaching occurred it was often taught in isolation from language.
In Pauchulo’s study, a non-native Spanish speaking teacher taught culture explicitly using textbook portrayals of often stereotypical target language culture. In the case of a first language teacher, target language culture was presented implicitly through personal anecdotes eliciting little analysis from the students. Pauchulo concludes that culture teaching practices were influenced by the teachers’ beliefs about the role of culture teaching in language learning and by the teacher’s understanding of culture teaching objectives.

In their examination of Spanish foreign language teachers’ perceptions of culture teaching, Castro, Sercu and Garcia (2004) found that teachers overwhelmingly prioritized linguistic competence and practical language skills over cultural objectives. Teachers ranked target culture learning high above more interculturally focused goals such as promoting openness to unfamiliar cultures and assisting pupils in developing a better understanding of their own identity and culture (the latter of which ranked last in a list of eight priority options).

These authors emphasize that teachers’ culture teaching beliefs shape teaching practice. These beliefs are influenced by teacher experience as language students and the resulting prioritization of often linguistic goals in language teaching. These researchers found a strong correlation between prioritized goals in language teaching and time spent on teaching tasks. They also add that some teachers appear to experience conflicting beliefs toward culture teaching. On one hand, teachers have an interest in exploring and teaching culture but on the other hand they are restricted by institutional and curriculum constraints, and possibly a profound belief, reinforced by experience in and perceptions of language teaching, that teaching the language is more important than teaching cultural or intercultural competence. Sercu (2005) stressed the importance of contextual factors shaping teaching practice, noting that practices are often influenced by the “social, psychological and environmental realities of the school and classroom” (p. 174).

Klein (2004) examined 14 high school foreign language teachers’ beliefs on culture, perceptions over the role of culture in language teaching and their culture teaching practices. She found that while teachers generally shared a common understanding of culture, the importance of culture teaching and the goal of developing learners’ awareness of others, their culture teaching practices did not reflect these views. Like the researchers cited above, Klein found that culture teaching was usurped by the teaching of language.
Reliance on Textbook Culture

In a review of challenges that plague second language teaching, Tedick and Walter (1994) lament the continued failure to recognize the connection between culture and language in teacher development programs and language teaching practices. In an examination of L2 methodology texts, these authors, found alarmingly scarce mention of culture learning, multiculturalism or intercultural communication in teaching resources (p. 309). Culture in texts is often “boxed”, and presented as disconnected tips, observations and/or statistics. It is often labeled as “optional” content, which in reality means unnecessary to both learner and teacher (Lafayette, 2003). Language teaching, considered distinct from culture teaching, is prioritized in language classrooms and in teacher education.

Tedick and Walter (1994) cite the marginalization of the cultural dimension of language teaching and the sterile, surface level treatment of target language culture in student L2 resources. They offer the example of Spanish textbooks in the U.S. focusing on uncontroversial, culture-specific facts that present the cultural world in a stereotypical, sterilized form (p. 308) that fail to elicit any discussion on deeper cultural questions of beliefs, values and resulting contradictions. Despite citing the potential of L2 teaching as a vehicle for developing diverse cultural understanding, the authors deplore the evidence found in L2 resources, often promoting western European models of cultural representation instead of examples illustrating the hybrid, multi-layered and localized nature of culture. They cite the example of a text that outlines a visit to El Prado in Madrid instead of exploring the Mural Art of the Latino Barrio in St. Paul Minnesota (p. 309). Other scholars have confirmed this prevalence toward a didactic and transmission-oriented approach to culture teaching in L2 learning where static examples of dominant cultural facts are presented (Alptekin, 2002; Bennett et al., 2003; Byram, Esarte-Sarries, Taylor, & Allatt, 1991; Kramsch, 1993, 1995; Lazarton, 2003; Paige et al., 2003; Sercu, Garcia, & Prieto, 2005).

The Complexity of Culture

Part of the dilemma with culture teaching is its perceived complexity, making the teaching and assessment of objective culture (cultural artifacts, institutions, folklore) much easier for teachers to navigate than subjective culture teaching that involves cultural behaviour, beliefs and values. The concept of culture has been inherently difficult to define and complex to teach. More than 160 distinct definitions of the term
“culture” have been identified (Ting-Toomey, 1999). Stern (1992) equated the challenge of defining culture with its difficulty in designing high quality instruction.

Culture has traditionally been associated with objective culture and only recently has there been recognition of the value of subjective cultural elements in L2 learning due to its impact on shaping communicative behaviour. Research examining the treatment of culture in L2 teaching has found that objective culture predominates, likely due to its uncontentious nature and teachable/assessable ease (Leeman & Ledoux, 2005; Nault, 2006; Paige et al., 2003; Tedick & Walker, 1994). With increasing recognition of the diversity of culture and the range of target cultural backgrounds (i.e., so many “Spanish” cultures), there is often confusion about which culture to teach (Hadley, 2001). This further prompts the avoidance of culture or limits it to the sharing of personal “cultural” experiences or working with encapsulated textbook culture.

Perceptions of the complexity of culture also make some teachers think that it should only be integrated in classrooms focusing on higher proficiency levels (Hadley, 2001). Grammar and linguistic skills should be developed first and “they can learn culture later” (Hadley, 2001, p. 347). Unfortunately given the scarcity of culture teaching, that later never comes (Seelye, 1984, as cited in Hadley, 2001, p. 347).

Researchers and scholars also cite the issue of assessment as a barrier to culture teaching as assessing cultural facts and practices are much easier and more aligned to linguistic assessment than assessing cultural self-reflection, or on developmental learning that occurs around cultural beliefs and values (Lange, 2003). Assessing subjective culture is inherently more challenging than testing student knowledge on cultural facts and trivia. In addition, subjective culture can be highly value-laden and challenging for teachers, largely unprepared for the mediation of beliefs, values and potential intercultural conflict in L2 teaching. Unfortunately by focusing culture teaching on objective, culture-specific learning, such approaches can perpetuate stereotypical thinking and prevent the development of intercultural learning skills to undertake ongoing cultural learning and enhance personal and intellectual growth (Hadley, 2001; Nault, 2006). Limiting culture teaching to only target culture aspects can in many ways essentialize and exoticize the other if learners are not encouraged to reflect on their own cultural selves (Guest, 2000).
Consensus and Action-Driven Curricular Focus

In addition to its complexity, the cultural dimension of language teaching tends to be value laden (Byram & Feng, 2004). Delving into this uncharted territory for unprepared teachers can threaten the consensus-driven atmosphere of the communicative language classroom (Klein, 2004). Understanding the variability of cultural concepts involves challenging, relativistic insight that cultures differ in respect of the multiple worldviews through which reality is perceived. Hadley (2001) argues that students often approach new cultural phenomenon assuming that the new patterns of behaviour can be understood within the framework of their first culture. She relates this to the “naive lexical hypothesis” coined by Bland, Noblitt, Armington and Gay (1990 as cited in Hadley, 2001, p. 347) which assumes equivalence between linguistic systems of the first and target languages. As a result, there is a fear that when students encounter phenomena they do not expect, they will react negatively, labelling it as weird (Hadley, 2001, p. 347).

In her study cited on foreign language teacher beliefs and practices to culture teaching, Klein (2007) found that opportunities for deeper analysis of cultural learning were often missed due to the action orientation and consensus-drive communicative approaches of these teachers. Teachers often did not exploit teachable moments that could have expanded student knowledge on their own and other cultural frameworks. As Claire Kramsch (1993) noted, culture learning is often missed in the name of communicative language practice.

In international language teaching, teachers often see themselves as the cultural torchbearer which can result in some insecurity if one has not lived extensively in the target country or one does not identify as a first language speaker (Klein, 2007). Compounding this insecurity is the belief that teachers need to know all about culture before teaching it which requires substantial research time that teachers often do not have. This, in addition to the complexity of culture, the challenge in dealing with negative student reaction and stereotypical thinking, can dramatically inhibit work with culture in the language classroom (Hadley, 2001).

Lack of a Culture Teaching Vision

The complexity and unfamiliarity with culture teaching and learning often leaves teachers unprepared to teach culture or able to define culture learning objectives. In research examining beliefs about culture and intercultural learning among English
foreign language faculty at higher education institutes in Taiwan, Cheng (2007) found minimal integration of culture teaching and no focus on intercultural learning. She found that faculty had difficulty defining culture and intercultural competence and that the minimal culture teaching taught was largely framed around textbook-presented American English culture. Cheng hypothesizes that the absence of culture in these reported practices resulted from a lack of focus on the role of culture in foreign language teaching in these teachers’ professional development. Cheng emphasizes the need for language educators and teacher education programs to focus on intercultural learning in today’s language learning contexts.

The language profession’s history with quantifying language acquisition and building lessons from a linear, logical, sequential approach from learning outcomes has the potential to scare teachers away from focusing on a topic as dynamic and multilayered as culture learning. Kurogi (1998, p. 68) summarizes research conducted by Stodolsky and Grossman (1995) examining high school teacher perceptions of their subject areas along three dimensions: definable, sequential or static. These researchers found that foreign language teachers perceived foreign language teaching as well-defined and sequential and the body of knowledge static. Kurogi expresses concern that this may prevent foreign language teachers from recognizing the importance of focusing on dynamic areas of learning such as culture and intercultural learning. This observation reinforces related research that finds a small number of teachers who give culture any prioritization in language education (Cooper, 1985; Davis & Markham, 1991; Wolf & Riordan, 1991).

In an oft cited study on secondary school French teachers, Byram, Esarte-Sarries, and Taylor (1991) explored the relationship between culture teaching practices and teachers’ perceptions of culture. The results demonstrated that teaching approaches to culture were varied, often didactic and dependent on teachers’ perceptions of the role of culture in language teaching. Byram et al. hypothesized that limited exposure to culture teaching and experiences with intercultural learning may limit teachers’ roles as culture teachers.

In more recent research examining British and Danish foreign language teacher beliefs about culture teaching, Byram and Risager (1999) found teachers often recognized the significance of the cultural dimension in language education and had a sound understanding of what might be involved. However, these researchers found that teachers’ concepts of culture were often lacking in the depth and complexity required to
understand its potential for language teaching. Teachers expressed frustration with having an interest in culture teaching but feeling restricted by pressures to teach linguistic competence and produce measurable results.

**How Not to Teach Culture**

Resulting from these many challenges, research has found that culture teaching is extremely eclectic and often taught in isolation from language. In spite of these new intercultural teaching visions, research suggests that the “product-focus” to culture teaching in language classrooms remains strong and often focuses on teaching target culture practices and products (Bennett, 2009b; Byram et al., 1991; Byram & Risager, 1999; Castro, Sercu, & Garcia, 2004; Cheng, 2007; Kurogi, 1998; Lafayette, 2003; Paige et al., 2003; Pauchulo, 2005; Ryan, 1994; Tedick & Walker, 1994). In her review of the culture teaching literature, Hadley (2001) summarizes some common strategies on how not to teach culture that remain quite widespread. These include the Frankenstein approach, a taco from here, a bullfight from there; the 4 Fs approach that include folkdances, festivals, fairs and food; the tour-guide approach, identifying monuments, rivers and cities; and finally, the by-the-way approach, focusing on sporadic lectures or bits of behaviour illustrating sharp cultural differences (Galloway, 1985 cited in Hadley, 2001, p. 348). The danger of this type of culture-specific treatment of objective culture is that it can stereotype and trivialize culture, resulting in a “dangerous incompleteness” (Hadley, 2001, p. 347) of cultural awareness. It also prevents the development of culture-and-language learning strategies that can help students effectively communicate in new cultural and linguistic contexts.

**New Conceptualizations of Culture Teaching**

Paige et al. (2003) suggests an emerging shift in culture learning from one of memorization of cultural facts and sociolinguistic conventions to higher order learning outcomes that include learning about one’s cultural self, the impact of culture on human communication, behaviour and identity. A number of authors confirm similar calls for a reframing of culture teaching in L2 learning and L2 teacher education programs to become more intercultural (Alptekin, 2002; Bennett et al., 2003; Byram & Feng, 2004; Byram et al., 2002; Cates, 2006; Damen, 1987; Fantini, 1999; Kramsch, 1993, 1995, 1998; Lange, 1999, 2003; Lazarton, 2003; MacPherson et al., 2004; Nault, 2006; Paige et al., 2003; Sehlaoui, 2001; Willems, 2002; Zarate, 1991).
An increasingly accepted philosophy of language and culture learning is from Claire Kramsch (1995) that language study has the potential to create a “third space”, a privileged environment in which learners can question, reflect and gain insight into their own and other cultural and linguistic frameworks. Such an approach may seem challenging but it offers a dialogical approach to teaching and learning with the potential to incite student-teacher learning, classroom community and exploratory, reflective and highly communicative approaches that integrate language and culture learning.

**Relational, Critically Reflective, Ethnographic Approaches to Culture Teaching**

Paige et al. (2003) emphasize the importance of learning how to become an effective language-and-culture learner, a dimension they stress is often overlooked but highly needed in today’s communicative environments. They assert the need to put culture at the core of language education to prepare students to become culture learners. It is not enough, they argue, to accept someone else’s definition of a culture. As a result, such language-and-culture learners would know how to learn from a context when immersed in it. They would develop strategies ranging from reflective observation, exploring multiple interpretations and tuning in to verbal and non-verbal communication patterns so they can adapt to the sociocultural context and participate without negative repercussions.

Agar advises that cultural analysis depends on the “of whom/for whom boundary” (Agar, 2006., p. 5). He suggests analyzing “rich points”, which he describes as those departures from an outsider’s expectations that signal a difference between the source and target cultures. Some boundaries will generate greater rich points or cultural differences than others. For example there may be more subtle rich points between members of the same society that come from different subcultures. If the source and target cultures are already similar in meanings and contexts, it will take less “culture” to define the differences than if the source and target were far apart. In terms of cultural analysis, he recommends looking for patterns across certain kinds of persons and/or certain kinds of situations, ensuring that rich points are recurring and are neither universal, unique nor random.

Kramsch (1993, 1995) reinforces the centrality of context and relational learning in culture learning and teaching. She frames context along five aspects: linguistic, situational, interactional, cultural and intertextual and argues for working with learners
to discover the potential meanings examining contextual aspects of target language discourse. One example Kramsch (1998) offers to develop language-and-culture learning is having students post summaries of a reading, where students express in their own words what the reading is about. This is a dialogic approach to identify how interpretations have been constructed according to students’ life experiences, beliefs and sociocultural realities. Such an approach encourages learners to explore diverse perspectives and appreciate the interconnection between context and language, how linguistic production can be seen as cultural production. It can also frame culture learning through an ethnographic approach where teachers and learners collaboratively explore learning from each other’s cultural lenses. Such an approach can validate individual cultural and linguistic identity and can illustrate the power of seeing the world through multiple perspectives, creating an intercultural knowledge building approach.

This relational, reflective approach to culture-and-language learning enables learners to reflect on themselves as culturally constructed beings while simultaneously examining cultural aspects of dissimilar others. This relational focus encourages learners to see the familiar as unfamiliar and the unfamiliar as familiar. Such an approach has been advised for L2 language teacher education and reflects recent theoretical developments in sociocultural theory, growing recognition of the need for a reflective, relational approach in teacher development. Through critical self-awareness and an exploration of professional and personal identity, teachers can begin to recognize the socially and culturally situated nature of their beliefs, values, knowledge and assumptions (Johnson, 2006; Mann, 2005; Nieto, 2002). A relational, intercultural focus to culture-and-language learning may help deconstruct ethnocentric approaches to culture-and-language learning and can help teachers develop intercultural mediation skills.

Situating Intercultural Language Teaching

At this stage in this discussion, I feel it is important to briefly locate the concept of intercultural language teaching in the sociohistorical development of foreign-culture teaching, multicultural and intercultural education. While recognizing that these concepts and this chronology are often contentiously debated and geographically situated, I will offer a non-comprehensive summary from a linguistic and intercultural perspective that serves to locate this research focus in current thinking around L2 teacher education in a North American context.
As outlined above, the interest in the intercultural dimension in L2 teaching evolved from criticisms of a foreign-culture teaching approach that was based on the concept of a single culture, associated with a specific group of people speaking a similar language within a specific territory (Paige et al., 2003). Increased recognition of the dynamic, emergent nature of culture and its role in influencing language use, communication and perception helped fuel the field of intercultural communication. The study of intercultural communication evolved mainly from an anthropological perspective and has tried to answer the question, how do people understand one another when they do not share a common cultural experience (Bennett, 1998)? As a result, intercultural approaches explored an ethnorelative approach to interacting with difference, recognizing that cultural behaviour develops relative to the needs of a community. Interculturalism adopted the view that different cultures are structurally related to each other, using culture general and specific approaches to navigate cultural difference, and often examining otherness in relation to one’s own unique cultural identity.

The emergence of intercultural approaches to education and language education evolved against a backdrop of discussion around multicultural education, recognizing the often coercive power relations that exist based on culture, language and identity. In North America, multicultural education has adopted an advocacy role founded on principles of critical pedagogy to promote educational reform. In her discussion of a conceptual framework for multicultural education, Sonia Nieto (1992, p. 222) describes multicultural education as good pedagogy that takes students seriously, uses their experiences as a basis for learning and helps them develop into critical and empowered citizens.

In North America, both intercultural and multicultural education recognize the need to actively work with culture and linguistic diversity in an ethnorelative, equitable and student-centred manner. An intercultural educational approach views confronting otherness as inherently challenging, providing the possibility for personal enrichment and growth (Portera, 2008). The fundamental core of this approach in education is interaction, derived from the prefix inter in intercultural. This approach also has adopted a reflective dimension, recognizing that interacting with difference has the potential to influence one’s perception of self (Bennett & Bennet, 2001; Kramsch, 1998; Ting-Toomey, 1999). Portera, like others (Bennett et al., 2003; Ting-Toomey, 1999) claim that this approach needs to be based on dialogue, reflection and proactive interaction in an effort
to reach heightened awareness of similarities and differences that can increase empathy and understanding.

These constructs of multicultural and intercultural education are in constant development and conceptualized differently in a range of contexts. More recently there has been talk of a transcultural approach (Garcia, Prieto, & Sercu, 2003; Seidl, 1998) in language teaching recognizing the influences of highly interconnected and dynamic cultural interaction of global discourse communities. Such an approach requires the need to not only give learners an outsider’s perspective on their personal situation but also confidence as a “globalized” communicator enabled with strategies to navigate dynamic global cultural contexts.

While the theoretical discussion of these constructs falls beyond the focus of this research, it is important to note the impact of this thinking on L2 education and the demands of L2 teachers. In Canada, while intercultural language teaching is only just beginning to emerge, there is an increasing demand for L2 teachers and L2 teacher educators to more critically understand and attend to the role of culture and its impact on perceptions and educational effectiveness in L2 education. The vision of language-and-culture teaching is beginning to move well beyond the teaching of cultural facts and appropriate behaviour into a process that at a minimum encourages understanding and appreciating otherness.

**Intercultural Language Education Standards**

Recognizing this conceptual shift in culture teaching, many educational associations have revised language teaching and teacher education guidelines to adopt a more intercultural approach to language education. Given Canada’s increasingly multicultural, intercultural context, the cultural syllabus of Canada’s National Core French Study has adopted an approach that advocates student understanding of their home culture as distinct and relative. It encourages students to develop awareness of a range of French target cultures along with cultural frameworks, working to discover views and practices that are similar and distinct from their individual culture (Knutson, 2006, p. 598).

In the province of Alberta, intercultural learning outcomes have been integrated into all international language teaching guidelines. For example, the Italian secondary
school curriculum guidelines (Alberta Education, 2009) emphasize the importance of culture-general\(^1\) learning and intercultural understanding.

Intercultural competence is an essential element of any language-learning endeavour. Knowledge of the target culture must take into account that cultures evolve overtime and minority cultures exist within the dominant culture in any society. If students develop the skills to analyze, understand for themselves and relate to any culture they come in contact with, they will be prepared for encounters with cultural practices that have not been dealt with in class (p. 3).

Alberta’s educational guidelines build in the outcome of global citizenship as a parallel to the goal of linguistic competence in all of its international language curriculum guidelines. This outcome states that “students will acquire the knowledge, skills and attitudes to be effective global citizens through the exploration of cultures of the Italian-speaking world (reference, p. 230).” This intercultural focus contrasts quite dramatically from the Ontario International Language curriculum guidelines that promote three strands embedding much more of a target language focus: oral communication, reading and writing.

In the United States, recognition of the increasingly important role of culture and intercultural communication in language education has prompted the redefinition of a number of language education standards. Over the last decade, the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) revised its standards for foreign language education to reflect the need for language education to enable intercultural communicative competence (ACTFL, 2007). The five C’s of the standards advocate an emphasis on communication, cultures, connections, comparisons and communities. The standards are grounded in the phrase “knowing how, when, and why to say who to whom” (p. 3) that ACTFL describes as representing all linguistic and social knowledge required for effective interpersonal communication. Under the comparisons goal, the standards recommend that “as students expand their knowledge of cultures through language learning, they continually discover perspectives, practices, and products that are similar and different from their own culture, and they develop the ability to

---

\(^1\) Culture-general learning focuses on topics that discuss categories of cultural behaviour such as communication styles that can be defined as low context or high context for example; this type of culture learning implies that cultures share common types of behaviour that can be defined relative to the needs of its members.
hypothesize about cultural systems in general” (p. 6). Under the eleven national standards, four directly address culture:

Standard 2.1: Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the culture studied.

Standard 2.2: Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the products and perspectives of the culture studied.

Standard 3.2: Students acquire information and recognize the distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its cultures.

Standard 4.2: Students demonstrate understanding of the concept of culture through the comparisons of the cultures studied and their own. (Lafayette, 2003, p. 58)

This redefinition of standards placing culture at the core of language education represents a dramatic evolution integrating the intercultural dimension in this association’s maxim for language teaching, from one focusing primarily on linguistic proficiency in the 1980s that reportedly inhibited research in the cultural dimension. (Paige et al., 2003). Figure 1 outlines ACTFL’s concept of culture that evolved through discussion of these standards. Perspectives, which lay an intercultural foundation of analysis, were seen as the common foundation shaping practices and products. The model clearly is designed to be easily understood and complementary to curricular goals (Phillips, 2003).
Following ACTFL’s model, the American Association of Teachers of French (AATF) introduced an exhaustive treatment of culture in a document entitled Acquiring Cross-Cultural Competence. These proposed standards define in detail four stages of cultural competence for students of French: elementary, basic intercultural skills, social competence and socioprofessional ability (Lafayette, 2003). For each stage, the standards list indicators of competence in categories that include empathy toward other cultures, ability to observe and analyze a culture and knowledge of other French-speaking societies.

In Europe, there has been a similar recognition of the relevance of the intercultural dimension in language education. Increasing political, social and intercultural interaction and interdependence through the European Union has prompted the investigation and active promotion of the benefits of plurilingualism. With the recent accession of ten new countries to the Union and a linguistically and culturally diverse population of over 450 million, scholars, policy makers and educators recognize the potential of leveraging diversity through interculturally focused language education (Kelly, Grenfell, Allan, Kriza, & McEvoy, 2004).

Efforts have been undertaken by the Council of Europe to integrate an intercultural dimension in language teaching and teacher development to promote a culturally sensitive, responsive and aware citizenry (Willems, 2002). The Council of Europe’s Common European Framework of Reference for Languages heavily integrates
the intercultural dimension in its recommended approach to language teaching (Byram et al., 2002). In its guide for teachers, it describes the role of the intercultural dimension as follows.

Its essence is to help language learners to interact with speakers of other languages on equal terms, and to be aware of their own identities and those of their interlocutors. It is the hope that language learners who thus become ‘intercultural speakers’ will be successful not only in communicating information but also in developing a human relationship with people of other languages and cultures. (Byram et al., 2002, p. 7)

The 2004 reference guide for the European Profile for Language Teacher Education (Kelly et al., 2004) recommends a number of guidelines for teacher preparation programs that involve developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching. The profile suggests that language teachers:

- Gain teaching experience in an intercultural and multicultural environment;
- Spend a period of work or study in a country or countries where the trainee’s foreign language is spoken;
- Have the opportunity to observe or participate in teaching in more than one country;
- Receive training in social and cultural values;
- Receive training in the diversity of languages and cultures;
- Receive training in the importance of teaching and learning about foreign languages and cultures (pp. 4-6).

Policy makers, educators and scholars are increasingly recognizing the changing communication demands in today’s globalized nations – where daily communication is often intercultural in nature (Byram et al., 2002; Willems, 2002). This contextual shift has significant implications on the nature of ‘second’ language learning, teaching and teacher development.

In the following section, I will review the important role of the teacher as cultural mediator in L2 teaching followed by the call to make language teacher preparation more interculturally focused along with related research. This will be followed by a discussion of the recognized value of adopting a sociocultural approach to language teacher development.

---

2 Second language is cited as many learners in today’s urban environments are multicultural, learning ‘second’ languages in schools as third/fourth languages.
preparation. This chapter will conclude with a discussion of the located nature of L2 teacher education, an overview of L2 teachers’ knowledge base needs and the benefits of adopting an intercultural approach in L2 teacher preparation.

The Teacher as Cultural Mediator

L2 teachers are often culture carriers and mediators and they, along with the school curriculum, set the tone and approach through which the cultural dimension of language teaching is addressed. Teachers’ beliefs about culture and culture teaching, previous language-and-culture learning experiences and attitudes toward cultural difference shape their treatment of culture and the culture learning that occurs in the L2 classroom (Castro et al., 2004; Klein, 2004; Kurogi, 1998; Paige et al., 2003; Pauchulo, 2005). A common theme running through the literature is that culture teaching is largely dependent on the individual teacher’s definition of culture (Paige et al., 2003, p. 183) and a teacher’s experiences with culture learning, suggesting that barriers to culture teaching may exist in both language classrooms and in teacher education programs (Castro et al., 2004; Cheng, 2007; Klein, 2004; Kurogi, 1998; Paige et al., 2003; Pauchulo, 2005).

Research suggests that it is essential for teachers to adopt the role of cultural educator and explicitly facilitate the process of cultural analysis and reflection (Alptekin, 2002; Bennett et al., 2003; Byram et al., 2002; Paige et al., 2003). Although it is often presumed that learning another language results in cultural competence (Klein, 2004; Kramsch, 1998), studies have shown that exposure to a target language will not automatically promote positive attitudes toward the target culture (Berg, 2007; Byram et al., 1991; Paige et al., 2003). The same can be said about language teaching, that language learning does not imply cultural or intercultural competence.

Young’s study (2009) investigating the beliefs of EFL teachers towards intercultural competence in three countries found teachers in the U.S. and U.K. reported strong stereotypical representations of Swiss and Japanese learners, that for example the Swiss were “industrious, impatient” while the Japanese were “sincere but unapproachable”. He reported that these perceptions correlated significantly with contact, with how often teachers were teaching students from these backgrounds, and that such cultural perceptions were often negative.

Unfortunately, the evaluations of culturally different behaviour are likely to be ethnocentric (Bennett, 1998), whether this judgment comes from a student or a teacher. As human beings, we naturally process and filter information through our own
culturally conditioned lenses. We often judge others through our own cultural expectations and assumptions. This has allowed us to survive as a species but has limitations when building relationships across cultures.

Given the intercultural wealth in many L2 classrooms, teachers have a powerful opportunity and responsibility of mediating intercultural understanding and relationships. Unfortunately many opportunities for cultural and intercultural learning are left unexploited, often in the name of communicative language practice (Klein, 2004; Kramsch, 1993). If not debriefed and exploited as a learning opportunity, cross-cultural incidents or conflicts can often have a negative learning impact, reinforcing student and teacher stereotypes.

The Call for Intercultural Language Teacher Education

This call for an intercultural reflective approach to language teacher preparation has the potential to deepen language teaching practices and the potential of building teacher skills to mediate and leverage cultural differences within the classroom. There is an emerging call around the world for teacher education programs that are culturally responsive (Alptekin, 2002; Atay, 2005; Bennett, 1995; Bennett et al., 2003; Byram & Feng, 2004; Castro et al., 2004; Coville-Hall, MacDonald, & Smolen, 1995; Damen, 2003; Dogancay-Aktuna, 2005; Knutson, 2006; Liu, 2003; Pratt-Johnson, 2006). Language teacher preparation programs that encourage intercultural reflection and awareness can develop teachers who can use their students’ cultural backgrounds, communication styles, values, beliefs to target learning and to facilitate intercultural awareness and growth among their students and themselves.

This can be particularly useful for a non-native target language speaking teacher working with a group of target language speakers in her/his class. It can also simply be good preparation to teach diverse learners. In a call for culturally responsive teacher preparation programs, Bennett (1995) argues for the development of intercultural competence and cultural consciousness among teacher candidates in initial teacher education programs. She outlines how people sharing common linguistic systems and primary experiences often learn to see reality in similar ways; they develop similar styles of cognition, perception and share similar assumptions and processes of reasoning, communication and judging. As a result, teachers working with diverse student populations must become conscious of their cultural filters and biases. They must develop cultural consciousness increasing their awareness of their own worldview,
understanding how it has developed personally and socio-historically. Ultimately teachers need to understand that their view of reality, their assumptions, communication styles and values may be profoundly different from those of their students.

**Intercultural Language Teaching Research**

In this regard, Sercu (2005) examined the beliefs and practices of foreign language teachers around intercultural competence in seven European countries and found teachers fell into two categories: those who were favourably-disposed to integrating intercultural competence (IC) and those who were unfavourable. Her study found that unfavourable teachers believed that language and culture was difficult to integrate, that there was no positive effect of integrating intercultural competence and that it would tend to reinforce stereotypes (Sercu et al., 2005). Favourable teachers on the other hand, felt integrating culture and language was possible, and adopted a cross-curricular perspective believing all teachers, even outside of L2 teaching, should integrate intercultural competence.

Sercu’s (2005) study also found that while the vast majority of teachers expressed a willingness to integrate intercultural competence in their teaching, culture teaching practices tended to focus on teacher-centred approaches working with the target culture and not on an intercultural approach critically examining the target and home cultures from a cognitive, affective and skill-based approach. In addition, teachers did not tend to reflect on their students’ attitudes to the target culture when planning their teaching. Only a minority of teachers devoted time to preparing out-of-class target cultural activities for their students, feeling it was largely the school’s responsibility. As noted earlier in this discussion, some factors cited in this study that limited an intercultural approach included lack of time, curricular constraints, resource limitations, learner preference for language (vs. culture) learning and lack of training in this area (Sercu, 2005).

Like Sercu’s study Young (2009) found that while EFL teachers thought integrating intercultural communicative competence was a desirable aim, none actively did it (Young, 2009). Factors contributing to this included perceptions that L2 learners wanted a focus on linguistic vs. intercultural competence, that developing critical intercultural awareness may be challenging for learners to handle and that this topic was not supported by curricula, texts and assessment processes.
Sercu (2005) concludes that foreign language teachers need a shift in professionalism to build content and pedagogical content knowledge around levels of communication and the role of culture in target language communities. She argues that teachers need to be able to define learning objectives to enable linguistic and intercultural acquisition. Teachers need to be skilful creators of learning environments that promote the acquisition of not just target culture knowledge but the interpretation/discovery skills to facilitate intercultural competence and empathy among their learners.

In a multiple case study examining culture and intercultural teaching in Japanese language classrooms in two U.S. high schools, Kurogi (1998) found that teachers examined seldom taught culture and rarely ventured into intercultural teaching approaches. However, Kurogi did find one teacher who taught elements of both objective and subjective, more interculturally focused culture. Her methods were influenced by a professional development workshop she attended presenting a holistic definition of culture. From this new understanding, this teacher had redefined her practice and was having students work with a more comprehensive view of culture, teaching it through explicit and implicit methods.

Kurogi (1998) laments the lack of culture teaching in teacher development and writes, “When teachers realize the significance of teaching culture from this perspective [an intercultural perspective], they prioritize it, and include subjective culture and intercultural communication in their educational goals” (p. 213). He concludes that there are two possible obstacles preventing intercultural teaching in these Japanese language classes, that teachers are limited by their cultural knowledge, defined by the material dimension of culture and sociolinguistic practices. In addition, he argued that teachers have not been introduced to the larger meaning of culture, to its potential in learning about others and the self (p. 214).

In his call for an intercultural dimension in English language teaching, Dogancay-Aktuna (2005, p. 27) suggests that without a course that increases both students’ self-awareness and their awareness of other cultures, TESOL graduates are more likely to enter into intercultural teaching situations from an ethnocentric perspective, evaluating (often negatively) cultural differences in terms of their own culture.
Byram and Feng (2004) suggest that if teachers begin to reflect critically on their own culture, socialization processes in teaching will not be focused just on other cultures. The goal will then not just be to make learners into members of other cultures, but to make them part of a group who see themselves as mediators, able to compare, juxtapose and analyse cultural interaction (p. 164). Teachers learning from an intercultural perspective will no longer settle for just teaching the decontextualized functional aspects of language as found in texts where almost exclusive native speaker input is presented (Willems, 2002, p. 19). Sehlaoui (2001) argues that critical intercultural competence is necessary in L2 teacher education as it can be first step to enable teachers with critical reflective skills to see and question their own biases, biases inherent in instructional methodology, curricular and assessment frameworks and school structures. It can help move teachers from the expected role as language technician to facilitating target culture, language and intercultural knowledge building and communication skills that are tailored for life in the twenty-first century (Sehlaoui, 2001).

A Sociocultural Approach to Language Teacher Education

This awareness of the role of critical reflection in teacher development reflects a sociocultural approach to language teacher preparation that has been promoted in recent years (Johnson, 2009a; Johnson, 2006, 2009b; Nieto, 2002). There is an emerging call to move away from positivistic preparation approaches focusing on relaying content knowledge to more situated processes of teacher education that frame content knowledge in the sociocultural construction of teacher’s knowledge, assumptions and practices (Hedgcock, 2002; Johnson, 2006; Nieto, 2002; Troudi, 2003). Hedgcock (2002, p. 311) argues that a language teacher’s knowledge base must be embedded in social practices representing a teacher education model that connects internal schemata with external texts, practices and ways of being.

There is increasing awareness of the power of a teacher’s mental life that creates the hidden side of teaching, and the resulting effects these beliefs and experiences have on directing teaching practice (Freeman, 2002; Pajares, 1992). There is also increasing awareness of the socially negotiated processes involved in language teaching and learning and the teacher’s role in mediating relationships in the classroom community that can facilitate learning (Johnson, 2009b; Troudi, 2003).
“Located” Second Language Teacher Education

Johnson (2009) describes an emerging view of L2 teacher professional development as a “dynamic activity that is situated in physical and social contexts, distributed across persons, tools, and activities, and both influencing and influenced by both participation and context” (p.121). She calls into question the assumption that there can or should be any uniformity in what L2 teachers should know and be able to do. Johnson foregrounds this in the positivistic paradigms that many student teachers, teacher educators and programs exist, defining good teaching based on student performance, standardized tests and conceptualizations of learning as internal to the learner. She advises that L2 teacher education programs need to consider the social, political, economic, and cultural histories that are “located” in the contexts where L2 teachers learn and teach. She echoes an emerging call to adopt a more critical, reflexive inquiry that uses conceptual tools to reflect on beliefs, values and knowledge about language-and-culture learning along with the wider professional discourse to co-construct a more transformative and located teaching practice (Franson & Holliday, 2009; Johnson, 2009b; Troudi, 2003).

L2 Teachers’ Knowledge Base Needs

In a call to reconceptualize the knowledge base of language teacher education, Freeman and Johnson (1998) state that it is not only the content knowledge expertise that makes the teacher but how teachers apply and frame content knowledge within specific teaching contexts and within their own experiences that is crucial to teacher development. They argue that teacher preparation programs must recognize that teachers position and apply knowledge through their own experiential filters. Others add that this experience, along with a teacher’s framing of their practice, their communication styles, their assumptions about learners are together shaped by cultural filters and hence require critical cultural self-reflection and the development of intercultural competence (Bennett, 1995; Bennett et al., 2003; Coville-Hall et al., 1995; Nieto, 2002; Ryan, 1998; Troudi, 2003).

Richards (2009) states that teachers need to develop content knowledge that can be defined as disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. Disciplinary knowledge includes core knowledge related to the language teaching profession including theories of second language acquisition, learning styles and knowledge of what constitutes culture. Pedagogical content knowledge, on the other hand, includes knowledge about how to teach. In the area of culture teaching this would include
culture teaching strategies and being able to resolve culture teaching issues in class. Richards suggests that building this complementary knowledge base helps teachers to develop pedagogical reasoning skills, thinking skills that allow teachers to analyze a teaching and learning context and adapt the teaching accordingly. Johnson (2009) echoes this call, saying that teacher education needs to enable teachers to think in concepts. Teacher education needs to discuss concepts in concrete terms, clearly defining complex topics (like culture) to support such thinking.

In her discussion of the knowledge base for teachers of English, Troudi (2005) argues for critical and cultural content knowledge in language teacher preparation. Teachers need to become aware of modes of learning, cultural patterns of communication of their students that affect their approaches to language learning. Troudi emphasizes that teachers need to develop critical cultural knowledge of themselves and their teaching context to help them understand their students and their educational and language needs. Through such critical self-awareness and an exploration of professional and personal identity, teachers can begin to recognize the socially and culturally situated nature of their beliefs, values, knowledge and assumptions (Johnson, 2006; Mann, 2005; Nieto, 2002).

In terms of culture teaching, Bennett (1995) argues for the use of cultural therapy, a philosophy and approach developed to help teachers increase their awareness of the cultural assumptions they bring to the classroom that affect their behaviour and their interactions with students (p. 261). She cites Spindler and Spindler (as cited in Bennett, 1995) who developed the cultural therapy approach as a tool in teacher preparation.

Cultural therapy is a process of bringing one’s own culture – assumptions, goals, values, beliefs, and communication modes – to a level of awareness that permits one to see it as a potential bias in social interaction and in the acquisition or transmission of skills and knowledge. One’s own culture is perceived in relation to other cultures, so that potential conflicts, misunderstandings, and blind spots in the perception and interpretation of behaviour may be anticipated. (Bennett, 1995, p. 261)

There appears general agreement that new teachers require a foundational knowledge base in culture and language learning, teaching methodologies and assessment approaches, but that this knowledge needs to be contextualized in individual teacher experience, teacher beliefs and in relevant teaching contexts (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson, 2006). As discussed above there is a movement to expand the
often dominant linguistic focus of language teacher preparation to that of one integrating cultural and intercultural learning and critical reflection.

**The Benefits of the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teacher Development**

Integrating an intercultural dimension into language teacher development has a number of key cognitive and affective benefits. Integrating a supported approach to the study of culture-in-language can promote a deeper understanding of the impact of cultural systems on language use along with identifying aspects of culture that can be relevant for language learners. Modeling an ethnographic, reflective approach to culture-in-language learning can help teachers understand the relevance of culture-general learning and strategy development.

Given that many language teachers and language teacher educators do not come from target language and culture backgrounds, adopting an ethnographic approach to language and culture learning can reinforce the value of building upon the cultural and linguistic knowledge base of learners in the classroom (Cummins, 2001; Nieto, 2002; Swain & Lapkin, 2005; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). This validation and active engagement of students’ first language-and-culture experiences helps create an inclusive, empowering and collaborative learning environment. The use of ethnographic approaches that collectively explore and contrast students’ individual linguistic and cultural experiences with a variety of target language speech is reported as an ideal way to validate student identity, build curiosity, enhance student agency and help both teachers and students develop culture-and-language learning skills together (Kramsch, 1993, 2003). Such an intercultural approach has the potential of building empathy and intercultural citizenship (Byram, 2006).

In the area of teacher development, Dogancay-Aktuna (2005, p.100) outlines several benefits of adopting an intercultural dimension as it can help:

- Provide teachers with greater sociocultural variation in language teaching/learning;
- Probe and foreground teachers’ preconceived notions of various learner groups;
- Evaluate the appropriateness of proposed language teaching methodology for a specific target group;
- Raise teachers’ sociocultural awareness so they can mediate intercultural incidents;
Introduce teachers to the danger of preconceived assumptions – about student expectations, communication styles/preferences, and more.

In addition to heightening teacher’s sensitivity to student communicative needs, the nature of intercultural language teaching and teacher development also has the potential to develop critical cultural knowledge about one’s self, one’s biases, presumptions, practices and worldviews (Byram, 2006; Troudi, 2003). This critical, reflective learning seems crucial in the teaching profession and would be of great benefit to both learners and teachers. Intercultural learning is built upon intercultural reflection (Byram & Feng, 2004) and one of the benefits of following an intercultural approach is that it has the potential to make the familiar unfamiliar and build empathy and connection. By integrating an ethnographic, student-centred and intercultural approach into language teaching, teachers relieve themselves of the demand to have to know and transfer a codified body of knowledge to students. Teachers can truly adopt a facilitative role in the building of intercultural knowledge and communication skills that can be fulfilling and developmental.

This call to heighten new teachers’ sensitivity to the emerging role of culture in language teaching requires a dramatic shift in teacher preparation processes and an understanding of the role of cultural and intercultural learning. The following chapter will discuss a number of complementary theoretical frameworks used in this research that attempt to explain the multiple factors involved in intercultural communicative competence, culture teaching and learning and teacher preparation processes.
Chapter 3
Theoretical Frameworks

As outlined in the previous chapter, this movement to adopt a more intercultural approach to culture-and-language teaching and teacher preparation requires a fundamental shift in language teacher preparation processes and content. Such a shift demands an understanding of the interrelated factors shaping intercultural teaching and learning, the concept of intercultural communicative competence and knowledge about teacher beliefs and the impact of teacher preparation processes. This chapter outlines several complementary theoretical frameworks that breakdown and define concepts in these areas that are key to this research.

This chapter will begin with a brief orientation to a discussion on the emergence of intercultural education from other approaches to culture teaching. An overview of the concept of intercultural communicative competence will then be presented outlining Michael Byram’s (1997) widely cited model, defining the complementary objectives of developing intercultural awareness while building intercultural communication strategies. This will be followed by a discussion of interactionist competence (Paige et al., 2003), a concept defining similar intercultural goals to Byram’s model and emphasizing the need to build effective culture-and-language learning strategies. Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (1986) and Allen and Lange’s (1996) culture learning framework will then be presented to illustrate models of intercultural learning. This will be followed by a brief summary synthesizing the common objectives and strategies embedded in these models.

My model of teacher belief systems (Lawrence, 2000) will be outlined that identifies key factors influencing teacher beliefs followed by a discussion of some key concepts in teacher development. The chapter will conclude with a proposed teacher education impact cycle, a theoretical framework used in this research to help understand the processes involved in the impact of initial preparation programs on new teachers’ culture teaching beliefs and visions.

Four Models of Culture Teaching

Murphy (1988) outlines four approaches or theoretical orientations to teaching cultural content in the foreign language classroom: the audio-visual approach (based on audiolingualism), the communicative method, the civilisation method and the
intercultural approach. She describes them in terms of the envisioned connection between culture and language, the explicitness of cultural content, the learner competencies developed and the way culture is treated. These characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1
Four Approaches to Teaching Culture in Foreign Language Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Audio-visual</th>
<th>Communicative approach</th>
<th>Civilisation approach</th>
<th>Intercultural approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpenetration of language and culture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit cultural content</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner-centred approaches</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective before objective culture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Murphy (1988, p. 157).

Murphy (1988) describes all three approaches aside from the civilisation approach as treating language and culture in close dependence to each other. She describes the audio-visual approach as generally approaching culture within language, while the communicative approach treats culture through communication and the intercultural approach treats language within culture. In the intercultural approach language is seen as a “semiological system included in the wider sphere of culture” (p. 150). On the other hand, the civilisation approach juxtaposes language and culture, seeing language as a means to access cultural materials like literary texts.

She adds that the linguistically-focused audio-visual and communicative approaches do not deal explicitly with culture but come to culture through the learning of language. As a result, culture is often marginalized and treated implicitly. The audio-visual and civilisation approaches adopt a transmission-centred, more cognitive-focused pedagogy working with culture while the communicative and intercultural approaches recognize the need for a more psycho-social approach based on learner needs. Murphy argues that an intercultural approach is the only of the four approaches that emphasizes
the need for a learner’s subjective response to the other culture over its description in objective terms. In other words, the focus is on the non-observable, hidden features of culture that shape communicative interaction and on enriching learners’ identity by enlarging their understanding of other people and their communication through a relativistic pedagogy.

Through an intercultural approach, she concludes that learners can work on “interculture”, expanding their own cultural filters the same way we work with learner interlanguage and refine knowledge of the target language. She adds that we only understand what makes us singular by confronting differences and that the discovery of foreign cultures is a pretext to self-discovery where foreign cultures act as mirrors.

**Intercultural Communicative Competence and Intercultural Language Teaching Frameworks**

Emerging from this recognition of the value of intercultural education, the concept of intercultural communicative competence has arisen as a culture-and-language teaching goal, replacing the target language-focused notion of communicative competence. Byram et al. (2002) describes the goal in intercultural-focused language teaching to develop learners’ linguistic competence needed to communicate in correct and appropriate ways, and to develop learners’ intercultural communicative competence (ICC). This would develop learners’ ability to negotiate understanding with people of different social identities. It would develop learner’s ability to interact in changing contexts recognizing people as complex human beings with layered identities and unique individuality (p. 5).

Castro et al. (2004, p. 92, citing Meyer, 1991) add that intercultural communicative competence has the potential to stabilize the identity of oneself and that of the interlocutor in cross-cultural mediation. Citing Byram (1997, p. 42) they add that effective communication involves not only successful exchange of information, as was the goal with communicative language teaching, but affords the learner the ability to decentre and adopt the other’s perspective, anticipating, empathizing and proactively seeking to resolve dysfunctions in communication and behaviour.

As Sercu writes (2002, p. 62), ICC integrates a post-modernist view of society into the former model of communicative competence. This intercultural communicative framework sees all encounters as intercultural, that we are continually crossing cultural boundaries. It assumes that communication engages multilayered identities, perceptions
of identities, in multifaceted, continually evolving contexts. It presumes that the intercultural speaker is committed to turning intercultural encounters into intercultural relationships and that such communication involves a continual process of becoming as well as being (Hall, 1990, cited in Sercu, 2002, p. 63).

**Byram’s Framework of Intercultural Communicative Competence**

Byram’s (1997) widely cited model of intercultural communicative competence, represented in Figure 2, defines a portrayal of this ICC model by outlining relationships between cultural knowledge, cultural learning skills and attitudes and how these support aspects of intercultural communicative competence.
Figure 2. Byram’s model of intercultural communicative competence (adapted from Byram, 1997, p. 34).

A key dimension in Byram’s definition of intercultural competence is the development of intercultural attitudes (savoirêtre) (Byram, 1997). These attitudes represent curiosity, openness and a readiness to suspend judgment over other cultures. They encourage being critical and self-reflective over one’s own cultural framework and to decentre oneself, to see cultures from an ethnorelative rather than ethnocentric perspective. The second dimension is knowledge (savoirs), including culture-specific knowledge of products, practices, meanings, including one’s own, along with culture-general knowledge of patterns of cultural behaviour that can be transferred to a range of
contexts. The third and fourth dimensions of Byram’s model involve the acquisition of two types of culture learning skills that provide learners with the analytical toolkit to learn from experience in a relational manner to continually build their intercultural knowledge. These skills include the skills of interpreting and relating (savoir comprendre). This enables learners to develop the analytical skills of comparing, relating and interpreting knowledge and behaviour. This can include relating cultural artifacts to cultural values and beliefs. Using these interpreting skills, learners develop the ability to identify ethnocentric perspectives and explain their origins. Learners can identify misunderstandings in interaction and explain them in terms of their cultural systems. They develop the ability to mediate between conflicting interpretations. The second set of skills, discovery and interaction (savoir apprendre/FAIRE), provides learners with the ability to conduct ethnographic observation and inquiry, to know how to ask questions to elicit value systems to understand behaviour and to develop the strategies to discover new knowledge about a culture. As Klein (2004) states, this can be a challenging task, as individuals are often ignorant of their worldviews and their cultural selves.

Recognizing the deeply embedded nature of cultural beliefs, values and behaviours, and the potential volatility of cross-cultural interaction, Byram proposes a fifth and final dimension called critical cultural awareness. Such awareness involves the use of explicit criteria to critically evaluate perspectives, practices and products in one’s own and other cultures. This dimension is founded upon the proactive reflection on one’s culture and that of others – an awareness of cultural frameworks and their origins to facilitate common understanding and to define the need for further learning and action. Through this focus Byram (2002, p. 13) suggests that the goal of facilitating intercultural competence is not to “try to change learners values but to make them explicit and conscious in any evaluative response to others.” Byram reinforces his focus on critical pedagogy stating that “all language teaching should promote: a position which acknowledges respect for human dignity and equality of human rights as the democratic basis for social interaction” (emphasis in original)(Byram et al., 2002, p. 13). This critical, analytical focus can again be challenging for teachers who have not been educated with a comfort level to use such approaches (Klein, 2004).

**Interactionist Competence**

Byram’s conceptualization of cultural knowledge recognizes that culture is variable, contextual and dynamic and requires both culture-specific inquiry and culture-general learning. This newer perspective moves culture learning away from the
memorization of cultural facts to higher order learning outcomes such as interactionist competence, outlined by Paige et al. (2003, p. 185) that include:

- Learning about the self as a cultural being;
- Learning about culture and its impact on human communication, behavior and identity;
- Culture-general learning, learning about universal, cross-cultural phenomena such as cultural adjustment;
- Culture-specific learning, learning about a specific culture and its language; and,
- Learning how to learn to become an effective language and culture learner.

In their review of the literature on culture learning in language education, Paige et al. (2003) emphasize the importance of this last outcome, stating that it is often overlooked and yet crucial to navigate the ongoing inquiry necessary for culture learning that is a lifelong task.

**Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity**

The goal of many of these intercultural approaches to language teaching is to develop an ethnorelative orientation to cultural difference among learners. Milton Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (1986, 1993) is a useful model to illustrate how people respond to cultural difference and increase their competence as intercultural communicators. Using a grounded theoretical approach, examining individuals from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, Bennett found that individual orientations to cultural differences could be organized into six developmental stages of attitudes to cultural difference (see Figure 3).
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Figure 3. Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity.

The underlying assumption of the model is that as one’s experience of cultural difference becomes more complex, conscious and reflective, one’s competence increases in intercultural interactions. Each stage reflects a unique cognitive perspective that yields specific types of attitudes and behaviour related to cultural difference. Bennett proposes that the identification and understanding of an individual or a group’s orientation to cultural difference can result in patterns of behaviour and attitudes that can help tailor educational initiatives to facilitate intercultural development (Bennett & Hammer, 1998; Bennett, 1986, 1993).

The model illustrates six stages along a developmental continuum. The first three stages are characterized by ethnocentric perspectives, where an individual believes that her/his own culture is experienced as central to reality in some way. The second three stages are characterized by ethnorelative perspectives to cultural difference where one’s cultural framework is seen as only one equally complex interpretation of reality. Within the three ethnocentric stages, individuals can develop from a state of denial, where cultural difference is not seen, to defensiveness against cultural difference, an “us vs. them” reality, where one’s own culture is the only authentically good one. In this defensive orientation, Bennett (1986, 1993) has identified a phenomenon known as reverse defensiveness where an individual sees her/his own culture as the “bad” culture
and the target culture as the often exotic, idealized culture. This orientation to cultural difference has been reported among long-term sojourners who “go native” or among some human rights activists, particularly members of dominant cultural groups, who fight for minority rights (Bennett, 1986, 1993).

These two stages are followed by the ubiquitous minimization of cultural difference, a stage commonly found among individuals living in multicultural environments in the twenty-first century (personal communication, Bennett, 2006). This attitude to minimize cultural difference is particularly common among teachers in North America (Bennett, 2009a). My personal action research assessing ESL teachers in TESL programs using the Intercultural Developmental Inventory (an assessment tool based on the DMIS) has found that all five groups of teachers assessed, numbering approximately 60 individuals in total, have generally scored within the minimization range.

In this minimization stage, cultural differences are minimized, trivialized or romanticized, and spiritual, behavioural and/or physical similarities are expected. While this is a definite improvement from a defensive orientation to cultural difference, cultural differences are minimized and expected similarities are based on the cultural norms of the “minimizer”. Individuals at this stage tend to gloss over cultural difference, neglecting to see deeper cultural differences. They may become insistent on correcting other’s behaviour to match their expectations and their cultural norms – the “insistently nice” syndrome (Bennett, 2009).

The minimization stage is a common and relatively unstable stage and therefore challenging to evolve through. This can be a particularly fixed stage for members of a dominant cultural group, where culture becomes even more invisible and the normality of “my” culture seems commonsensical. If differences become too apparent or are seen negatively contrasted against my own culture, they can very well be seen as threatening, drawing the individual back into a defensiveness orientation.

The latter three stages of Bennett’s model illustrate an ethnorelative worldview to cultural difference. Individuals at the “acceptance of cultural difference” level are curious about and respectful of cultural difference. They may not agree with some differences but they have the ability to empathize with those differences. The adaptation stage describes people who are able to see the world through different lenses. Their worldview has expanded to include constructs from other perspectives and they may intentionally change their behaviour to communicate more effectively in another culture.
The final stage, integration, describes individuals who often experience a bi- or multilingual identity of sorts. Their experience of self is one of commonly moving in and out of different cultural worldviews. Individuals at this stage can be dealing with “cultural marginality” – where they may have an identity crisis – not feeling they fit into any culture. This stage is common among non-dominant minority groups, long-term expatriates and “global nomads” who have experienced living in many cultural environments and feel on the edge of cultures (Bennett and Hammer, 1998).

In the second language classroom context, movement beyond acceptance can be challenging to facilitate given the limitations of current classroom culture learning processes. Should classroom learning provide systematic opportunities for reflective, developmental cultural experience, adopting an ethnographic, collaborative approach, using ongoing intercultural telecollaborations as an example, orientations to cultural difference may expand into the adaptation stage. Below I’ve outlined approaches that have been proposed to guide culture teaching and learning to develop an ethnorelative approach to cultural difference.

*Allen and Lange's Culture Learning Framework*

Reflecting the ethnographic, reflective focus of Byram’s culture learning framework, Allen and Lange (1996) propose a cyclical culture learning framework (see Figure 4) that focuses on a relational, comparative approach to intercultural knowledge building.
Figure 4. Allen and Lange’s culture learning framework (adapted from Lange, 2003, p. 288).

The four elements of this model, observation, exploration, expansion and evaluation, are meant to be conducted first with the home culture and then with the target culture. Using this model, learners develop cultural hypotheses based on exploration, evaluation and knowledge refinement. Such a dialogic process reflects new thinking about culture learning from a developmental, reflective stance (Kramsch, 1993; Lange, 2003).

Defining an Intercultural Language Teaching Approach

Byram et al. (2002) state

the best teacher is...the person who can help learners see relationships between their own and other cultures, can help them acquire interest in and curiosity about ‘otherness’, and an awareness of themselves and their own cultures seen from other people’s perspectives (p. 10).

To realize such an intercultural vision in L2 teaching, it appears that teachers should come into the classroom with intercultural, ethnorelative attitudes and be ready to use interpreting and relating and intercultural discovery skills with their students to develop critical cultural and intercultural awareness. Such intercultural learning should
develop empathy to difference, an attitudinal shift that is characterized by curiosity and respect towards others.

While this is an ideal, it appears far from an easy task and the strategies to attain it need to be defined. In order to apply this to a teacher preparation context, knowledge about teacher belief systems and the processes involved in making an impact in teacher education must be understood. Below I will discuss the multiple factors contributing to teacher belief systems, current thought on teacher education processes and I will propose a model used to examine the impact of culture teacher preparation.

The Role of Beliefs in Teacher Preparation

In her discussion of the influence of teacher education on teacher beliefs about the purposes of education, Maria Tato (1998, p. 66) writes that “Reflecting and attempting to understand how [teacher] beliefs influence their teaching are critical to teachers’ development and change in conceptions and teaching practices”. She adds that positive change requires attention to teachers’ previous beliefs, attitudes and experiences and that meaningful change in instruction entails fundamental change in what teacher know and believe. In an exploration of the role of teacher beliefs in change processes, Richards et al. (2001) concludes that teacher beliefs play a central role in the process of teacher development and that change in teacher practice is the result of changes in teacher beliefs.

Yet if beliefs are so important what are they and how can we define them? Research suggests that the concept of beliefs are vaguely defined, that constructs like perceptions, attitudes, feelings and assumptions are used interchangeably and yet can represent unique concepts (Pajares, 1992; Turnbull & Lawrence, 2003). In her review of research examining teacher beliefs and attitudes, Richardson (1996) concludes that teachers’ existing understanding, beliefs and preconceptions work together to shape what student teachers learn, how they learn it and how they apply such knowledge into teaching practice.

In earlier work I conducted on defining teacher beliefs (Lawrence, 2000), I adapted a framework defining teacher belief systems from Azjen’s (1988) theory of planned behaviour into a framework that examines the interconnected factors shaping teacher beliefs toward educational change and innovation. This framework (see Figure 5), examines teacher beliefs as a series of interrelated, dynamic systems that reinforce beliefs to influence teacher action.
In this framework belief systems are defined most dramatically by a teacher’s attitudes and perceived effectiveness toward educational change. This perceived effectiveness represents a teacher’s cognitive understanding of that teaching practice, whereas attitudes represent a more emotional response to that practice. The perceived effectiveness construct is related to Larry Cuban’s (1986) argument that as teaching is a practical profession, teachers evaluate a teaching approach using a practicality ethic. If a new approach doesn’t make teaching and/or learning more efficient and effective, it is likely to be rejected. A teacher’s perceived effectiveness and attitudes towards an educational innovation are in turn influenced by personal experience and her/his perceived expectations of the profession’s or colleagues’ views over that teaching practice. These factors combined with a teacher’s perception of control over the innovation will together influence her/his intentions to adopt that teaching practice. The way in which intentions translate into actions is largely influenced by external constraints, out of the immediate control of the teacher, that may facilitate or inhibit this innovation’s use.
While this framework dealt specifically with teacher beliefs towards innovation, many of these interconnecting factors have been identified in related research examining factors that shape beliefs and thought processes (Borg, 2006; Richardson, 1996). Richardson’s analysis of research examining teacher beliefs identified three forms of experience that inform beliefs (Richardson, 1996). They include personal experience, aspects of life that inform a teacher’s worldview, experience with schooling and instruction, reflecting Lortie’s (1975) apprenticeship of observation hypothesis and experience with formal knowledge including content or disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. Most researchers agree that the experiential effects of personal life, previous schooling create a set of deep-seated beliefs about the nature of teaching and learning that are difficult to influence in preservice teacher education.

Mangubhai et al. (2004) used features of an oft-cited model of teacher beliefs and behaviour (see Joyce & Weil, 1992, as cited in Mangubhai, 2004, p. 295) to identify specific features of beliefs and teacher behaviour that informed one teacher’s practical theory of communicative language teaching. The goals of a lesson combined with a teacher’s beliefs, values and principles underlying the approach were seen as instrumental in shaping a teacher’s practical theory about teaching. In addition, a teacher’s reactions including responses to students, special resources and skills/knowledge used contribute to shaping a teacher’s practice and its impact on learners (Mangubhai, Marland, Dashwood, & Son, 2004).

Assessing the Impact of Teacher Preparation on Teacher Beliefs

While initial teacher education is seen as a unique opportunity that can help teachers develop teaching priorities and refine teaching practice, there has been criticism that teacher education programs have little impact on how teachers actually teach (Borg, 2003; Castro et al., 2004; Lortie, 1975). The role and effectiveness of initial teacher education in the development of teachers and teaching practices has often been questioned. In the 1990s, many theorists questioned the viability of teacher education in making a difference in teaching practices (Borg, 2009, 2006). Except for the student teaching element, preservice teacher education has been critiqued as a relatively weak intervention (Richardson, 1996). Recognizing the crucial role of human agency, beliefs and context in learning, Johnson (2009) critiques the causal relationship between what student teachers learn from what teacher educators teach.
Unlike many other professions, given the unique exposure many of us have to teaching practices throughout our lives, we often come into the teaching profession with a perceived understanding of what makes a good teacher and a good teaching practice. This apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) instils within us a belief system defining good and bad teaching practices that is often resistant to change. Johnson (2009) defines this as the “everyday concepts” that frame the way teachers think. These everyday concepts include teachers’ familiarity with teaching and learning approaches that are deeply ingrained and less open to conscious inspection and critique. They contribute to teachers’ conceptualizations of the teaching-learning process that shape teaching behaviour (Peacock, 2001).

Teacher education that engages active reflection on beliefs and conceptualizations of teaching is reported to have the most potential to refine beliefs and teaching practices (Borg, 2003; Freeman, 2002; Tatto, 1998). Freeman and Johnson (1998) emphasize the key role of initial teacher education in refining beliefs towards practice. When teachers’ beliefs are attended to in teacher preparation programs, there has been some evidence of changes in beliefs and personal theories of teaching and learning in preservice teacher education (Borg, 2006). Researchers have found that initial teacher education has varied impact on individual teachers and that while it may not completely change beliefs, it does have the potential to reprioritize beliefs (Borg, p. 90). Johnson (2009) describes the relationship between teacher education and teacher learning as one of influence rather than causality, emphasizing the differences in how different learners react to the same set of circumstances at different times. These findings support the need to locate teacher education programs in teacher beliefs, experiences and to enable teachers as reflective and critical thinkers (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson, 2009b; Sharpling, 2002). Johnson (2009) recommends that teacher preparation programs must facilitate a dialectal relationship between scientific and everyday concepts, scaffolding difficult concepts, connecting them with existing teacher beliefs and experiences around teaching and learning.

**The Teacher Educator Impact Cycle**

Given the complexity of teacher preparation processes, teacher beliefs, and intercultural language teaching approaches, there appears a need to synthesize this understanding into a framework within the context of culture-and-language teacher preparation. In Figure 6, I have proposed a model to illustrate the circular impact of teacher preparation processes on culture teaching beliefs and visions.
Figure 6. Teacher Education Impact Cycle.

As outlined in Figure 6, I have attempted to define and show the relationships between the three main constructs in teacher preparation as defined in the literature: teacher education practices and potential impact, teacher beliefs and teacher visions. While this framework could be applied to other teacher education processes, I will explain the relationships of these constructs as they relate to preparing new culture-and-language teachers in the context of my study.

In terms of learning how to teach culture, new teachers are exposed to teacher educator’s practices that can consist of various types of cultural content (surface or
The teacher educator’s approach at working with culture can include simply presenting cultural content or having teachers work with it using the interpreting/relating or discovery skills outlined in Byram’s model (1997). This teaching practice can potentially create an impact but I’m proposing that it’s the degree of “reflective” impact that has the potential to influence new teachers’ beliefs and attitudes about culture along with their culture teaching visions. This reflects literature and research on the impact of teacher education discussed above, finding that teacher development that engages active reflection on beliefs and visions of teaching has the most potential to refine beliefs and teaching practices (Borg, 2003; Freeman, 2002; Johnson, 2009a; Richards, 2009; Richards, 2003; Tatto, 1998).

Reflection on a topic can be prompted by several factors. It can be the type of cultural content and the way it is presented that elicits a reflective reaction from students. Reflection can be influenced by the rapport that exists in the class, the way the teacher educator (TE) interacts with and responds to her/his learners’ reactions to culture learning. Such reflective impact has the potential to reprioritize a teacher’s personal belief system toward culture teaching that includes beliefs and attitudes about culture and culture teaching. Beliefs include Richard’s concepts of disciplinary and pedagogical content knowledge related to culture teaching and learning, including culture’s role in L2 education. Attitudes reflect teachers’ emotional responses to culture learning and teaching and responses to engaging with otherness. These attitudes and beliefs are continually informed by teachers’ life and educational experiences related to culture. These can include culture and language learning experiences, cultural immersion, and experiences with otherness, feeling “othered” or feeling normal (where our culture seems invisible). As shown in this model, these aspects are continually refining and reinforcing each other.

This foundation of beliefs and attitudes forms the basis for our culture teaching visions. However, like others (Cuban, 1986; Kennedy & Kennedy, 1996), I am proposing that beliefs about culture teaching do not freely inform culture teaching visions but that they are influenced by what I’m calling a practicality filter, a teacher’s sense of relevance
and what practically can work in the classroom. This practicality filter is based on Larry Cuban’s (1986) notion of a teacher’s practicality ethic and research findings that teachers’ beliefs are often related to a practicality ethic about what is useful for learners in the classroom (Kennedy & Kennedy, 1996; Lawrence, 2000). This situated nature of teacher knowledge reflects Sercu’s (2005) findings that contextual factors shape teaching practice. This inherent attention to the practical reality of the classroom shapes culture teaching visions and equally informs culture teaching practice. The impact of teacher education practices have the potential to show the practical relevance of culture learning in language classrooms, thereby facilitating the development of culture teaching visions.

As a result, new teachers’ culture teaching visions are largely influenced by experiences, beliefs and attitudes around culture teaching but they can also be enhanced or constrained by the impact of teacher education processes. For example, new teachers can experience culture teaching and learning activities modeled by the teacher educator that can expand their visions of culture teaching. Teacher education programs can also reinforce the importance or relevance of culture teaching and learning in the language classroom, highlighting professional movements to deepen culture teaching in L2 education. On the other hand, teacher education practices can also reinforce constraints on culture teaching by focusing on linguistic goals in L2 teaching, by raising issues of stereotypes or highlighting the breadth of culture without showing strategies to prioritize areas. Culture teaching visions can also be inhibited by not discussing culture, or by not teaching how to work with it. Such teaching practices can also deepen pre-existing beliefs about the challenges of culture teaching.

It is important to note that while I have been applying this model to teacher candidates, it should also work for teacher educators, in that their culture teaching practices are shaped continuously by their foundation of beliefs, assumptions, attitudes and experiences toward culture and culture learning.

Applying Frameworks in this Research

This teacher education impact cycle was used as a primary framework in shaping areas in my research methodology and focusing the analysis and interpretation of teacher education practices. It is important to note however that all the frameworks and discussion presented on culture and culture teaching have informed this research within and beyond this framework. Teacher educator practices have been analyzed in terms of the cultural content presented which was interpreted based on current post-
positivist thinking of culture as layered, dynamic and relational as outlined at the beginning of this chapter and specifically using Wurzel’s (2005) three dimensions of culture as a guide. Byram’s model (1997) was used to examine the degree to which teacher educators and teacher candidates’ culture teaching beliefs and visions are intercultural.

To examine new teachers’ beliefs and experiences towards culture and to identify changes in these beliefs, this study has elicited teacher perceptions of the benefits and challenges of culture and its role in language teaching over time. It has also attempted to map out changes in teacher candidate culture teaching visions over this research period, examining changes in perceived affordances and constraints resulting from teacher education practices and experiences. This has been done to define changes in TC culture teaching beliefs, attitudes, visions that may result from teacher education practices and also from life experiences related to culture, and language and culture teaching/learning.

It is important to note however that research into teacher beliefs and the impact of teaching practice is highly complex as so many factors are interrelated and involved, many of which will be unrepresented in this research. For example, my study only focuses on examining the potential impact of one curriculum and methodology class in each location yet TC beliefs about culture could be influenced by experiences in the teacher preparation program outside of this classroom that I do not have access to. In his review of research examining the impact of preservice teacher education on teacher cognition, Borg (2006) concludes that variable outcomes and individual developmental pathways are central to an understanding of initial teacher education on language teacher cognition. He also states that much existing literature about the ineffectiveness of teacher preparation in changing teacher candidates’ cognitions focused on the content of these beliefs. In contrast, research examining the processes and structure of cognitive development suggests significant change in new teachers during teacher education. Borg laments the scarcity and variability of research in this area and recommends research that investigates new teachers’ beliefs along with belief changes that occur within the program and the identification of factors that stimulate such change.

My study, outlined in the following chapters, recognizes the need to attend to these complex layers of teacher beliefs and teacher preparation processes in order to understand the impact of teacher education practices on refining new teacher beliefs toward the treatment of culture and intercultural language teaching practices.
Chapter 4
Methodology

This chapter will summarize my research design and rationale. This will be followed by a description of my recruitment processes, the research sites, their teacher preparation programs, and an overview of demographic characteristics of my participants. An overview of research methods including data generation and analysis techniques will then be presented. I will conclude this chapter with a discussion of efforts to maintain validity, reliability and credibility in this study followed by a summary of my assumptions as a researcher and the perceived limitations of this research.

Research questions investigated in this study are listed below.

1. How do culture teaching beliefs, visions including perceptions of benefits and challenges differ and evolve among international language teacher candidates in two Ontario teacher preparation programs? How intercultural are these culture teaching beliefs and visions?

2. How do culture learning experiences in a curriculum and methodology class differ and influence teacher candidate beliefs and visions?

3. What demographic, experiential factors influence teachers’ culture teaching beliefs and visions?

4. How do these culture learning experiences prepare new teachers to work with culture in international language education?

Research Design and Rationale

Due to the complex nature of this research, I have chosen to use a mixed methods approach within a systematic, multi-stage, comparative case study research framework. Case studies are described as ideal mediums when the goal of a study is to seek an extensive and intensive understanding of a phenomenon, particularly when the phenomena may be highly context-bound (Stake, 1995) such as teacher beliefs. I have also chosen a case study research approach given the potential for extensive, real-life exposure to phenomena and the longitudinal nature of some case study research, providing the ability to trace changes over time (Yin, 2009). To increase the robustness of
this study’s design and analytical potential, I have used multiple research contexts and complementary cases within each context to enable cross-case analysis to result in more compelling findings (Stake, 1995; Yin, 1989; Yin, 2009). In addition, I have used embedded units of analysis from complementary qualitative and quantitative data sources to examine teacher belief changes over time. Given the focus of this program, studying participants in year-long post-undergraduate Bachelor of Education programs, data generation took place over eight months.

A systematic, multi-staged, developmental and mixed methods design was adopted for this research to identify changes in teacher beliefs and to identify enabling and constraining factors influencing these beliefs (see Figure 7).
Figure 7. Research design stages.

As this study explores and describes teacher beliefs towards culture and factors shaping those beliefs, an inductive theoretical drive guides the design, data generation, analysis and interpretation stages of this research. Data sources were combined with analytical strategies that included varied quantitative analyses complemented by analytic, inductive analytic strategies common to qualitative case study and mixed methods research (specifically discussed below). Recognizing that data making and analysis involves separating data from its context which may detach it from valuable links, I have made an effort to build in thick descriptions of selected participants to
allow readers to build their own understanding of my research. I have also purposefully adopted the term data *making or generation* to describe the traditionally coined term data collection, recognizing the relatively subjective, selective nature of generating (not collecting) data (Richards & Morse, 2007). These complementary mixed methods data generation and analytical approaches were used to confirm, cross-validate and corroborate findings within the study.

*Rationale for a Mixed Methods Approach*

I have chosen a mixed methods research design due to the benefit of examining phenomena from different research paradigms, with unique strengths and weaknesses (Greene & Caracelli, 1997). Adopting a mixed methods approach was seen as a strategy to help mitigate some of the disadvantages of individual methods and provide a richer depiction of the phenomena being studied, helping to seek congruent findings (Creswell, Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003). Mixed methods were used concurrently and developmentally, often with equal rigor in various stages of this research and analysis. They were used in a developmental role as specific methods were used to inform and deepen data generation, iterative analysis and to guide the selection of embedded cases (i.e., individual teacher candidates) within the larger teacher preparation site cases.

Qualitative methods were used to gain rich, contextual understanding of phenomena related to teacher education practices and teacher beliefs towards culture. Quantitative methods were embedded in the core of the repeated questionnaires to identify belief changes which were then cross-checked and better understood with qualitative data. In addition, quantitative approaches were sometimes used to transform qualitative data to gain different perspectives on measurements and degrees of change. Such complementary data generation and analysis approaches were used to confirm, cross-validate and corroborate findings within the study.

This systematic intermethod mixing approach has been adopted to help mitigate the reported limitations of teacher beliefs research that has primarily focused on examining phenomena through self-reported data (Pajares, 1992). Accordingly, I chose to use a complementary, rigorous range of data sources to examine belief system changes and phenomena through multiple lenses. Data sources included classroom observations, a series of pre and post interviews with teacher educators and candidates, year-end focus group interviews, artifact analysis in addition to the more typical belief-
eliciting questionnaires. The questionnaires were specifically designed to be administered before and immediately after explicit culture teaching lessons and at the end of the year to better understand the dynamics of belief change.

**Recruitment Processes**

Given the complex and multifaceted focus of this research, I used key strategic principles in selecting cases for this analysis (Kemper, Stringfield, & Teddlie, 2003). These strategies suggest that sampling is logically aligned with the conceptual framework and research questions of the study and that the sample should be able to generate a focused and thorough database for analysis. In addition, the sample needs to provide accessibility and be feasible and it should allow offer credibility through participant characteristics and representation. Given the comparative nature of this case study research, I wanted sites that were complementary in teacher preparation structure yet unique contextually and in the qualities of the participants. I wanted teacher educators who had substantial language-and-culture teaching and language teacher education experience, who were willing and interested to reflect on culture teaching and learning and provide me access to their teaching contexts. I also wanted sites that shared a common international language teacher preparation context (i.e., both preparing Ontario secondary school teachers) but that offered unique demographic, regional and cultural distinctiveness to broaden the range of participants in the study and to enable more powerful contrastive analyses.

As a result, I selected two very similar yet regionally and demographically unique sites, offering complementary and unique contexts within which I could situate this research. Both sites offered a one-year teacher preparation program preparing Ontario secondary school international language teachers in very unique regional and demographic contexts that are detailed below. I approached 2 teacher educators in teaching contexts that I thought may be suitable through an information letter and consent form (Appendix B). Once they agreed to participate in the research I sought approval from the university’s administration (Appendix C). Once both these degrees of consent were confirmed, I negotiated observation dates within each teacher preparation context. In my first observation in each site, I made an announcement to teacher candidates to elicit participation, outlining the goals and scope of the research and answer any questions. I distributed an information letter and consent form (Appendix D) which I then collected from participants interested in participating in this study. All
participants were asked to adopt a pseudonym to protect their confidentiality in this study.

Teacher Candidate Interviewee Recruitment and Selection

Once I had confirmed the two groups of participants, I also wanted to select at least 3 teacher candidate informants in each site to explore changes in culture teaching visions at an individual level to deepen my understanding of the culture learning in these two environments. In addition to selecting at least one teacher candidate with culture teaching beliefs and visions that reflected a reasonably typical view of participants, I also wanted to explore extreme cases, recognizing that studying the extreme may facilitate exploration of the phenomena being studied (Morse & Richards, 2002).

In other words I wanted to interview teacher candidates who had diverse life experience, cultural backgrounds and who exhibited a range of negative, typical or positive views towards culture teaching to examine the impact of the teacher preparation experience on their individual culture teaching visions. In order to recruit interviewees, I included a request at the end of the pre-culture teaching (pre) questionnaire (see Appendix E) eliciting interest. Of participants expressing interest, I used two categories of data to select participants: responses to culture teaching-related questions in the pre questionnaire and demographic information on participants. Demographic information including age, target language teachable, first language were analyzed directly along with experience in the target culture, living away from one’s country of origin (living away experience) and any experience teaching a second/additional language. In addition, participants’ comfort and confidence in teaching culture were assessed by a combination of two responses to the pre questionnaire. Their ranking of culture teaching comfort on a scale of 1 - 4 was combined with their response to question B 4.13 on the pre questionnaire (see Appendix E) asking agreement to the statement “I know how to effectively integrate culture into language teaching”. Responses to these two questions reflected the same level of comfort/confidence and were thus seen as reliable indicators of culture teaching confidence.

Participant responses to the culture teaching familiarity scale (see question B.1 in Appendix E) were averaged to get an overall familiarity ranking that was then compared against the mean ranking to yield a high, low or moderate (i.e., mean) score.
The prioritization of culture teaching over linguistic teaching was also assessed directly from responses to question B.4.4 (see Appendix E) eliciting agreement to the statement: “Given limited time, I would teach linguistic competence over cultural competence.” The final criteria used included what degree participants felt culture teaching should be at the core of international language teaching, statement 2 in the culture teaching beliefs scale B.4 of the PRE questionnaire.

Selected participants were given an information/consent form (Appendix F) and mutually convenient 60-minute initial and final interview times were confirmed as the study progressed. These interviewees from each research site and their ranking in terms of the selection criteria are outlined in detail in Chapter 9 where these individual teacher candidates’ beliefs toward culture and culture teaching are discussed.

Focus Group Interview Participants

Recognizing the unique ability of focus group interviews to explore and generate new issues around a research topic that may not easily be revealed through other data sources (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006), I integrated one focus group interview at the end of the school year with participants in each site. Focus group interviews offer a dynamic interaction between the researcher and participants to explore and deconstruct issues around culture teaching that I thought would be a useful addition to this research plan.

In the sixth classroom observation (near the end of the observation protocol), I made an announcement to participating teacher candidates in each research site to elicit participation in one 90-minute focus group interview. I distributed information/consent forms to interested participants (see Appendix G) outlining the scope and limitations of confidentiality among focus group participants. This recruitment process resulted in 9 TU participants and 7 MU participants. Semi-structured interview questions were prepared (Appendix H) along with a selection of some good culture-in-language teaching practices (Appendix I) for participants to review and offer feedback on. Findings from these focus group interviews were used to triangulate results.

Research Sites

As stated above, both research sites were selected as they shared similar teacher preparation goals, but they varied in geographical, institutional and cultural contexts. Both classes were involved in preparing secondary school teachers to teach international languages in Ontario using the Ontario Ministry of Education’s Classical and
International Languages Curriculum guidelines, making the goals of each class reasonably similar. Both sites were provincially regulated one-year, post-graduate programs that enable teachers to qualify to teach in Ontario secondary schools. However, while the curriculum covered and scheduling are common, the student population, intake processes, institutional cultures, teacher educators, and teaching contexts were quite distinct and offered varied perspectives on perceptions of culture teaching in L2 language education.

The first site, Turner University (TU), was selected as it was a medium-sized teacher preparation program set in a medium-sized urban setting surrounded by rural farmland and was populated by a largely white, Canadian-born student population. Turner University is located in medium-sized city populated by an 85% white, English speaking citizenry (Statistics Canada, 2006). The second site, Monfort University (MU), was located in a large urban centre, populated by a more multicultural, multilingual student population. 47% of this city’s population are visible minorities speaking a first language other than English or French (Statistics Canada, 2006). Full descriptions of each institution and teacher preparation program are contrasted in the following chapter as they present factors influencing the landscape of the research findings.

I chose the international language teacher context, as opposed to French or English second language classes, as these classes focus on a “foreign” culture that is geographically remote and somewhat abstract in its portrayal and discussion. Such teacher education contexts are representative of many language teacher preparation contexts around the world, preparing teachers to teach languages spoken outside of the home country. In addition, these international language teacher preparation classes often prepare teachers of more than one language group in the same class so there is the opportunity for cross-cultural discussion and comparative approaches.

Research Context

This research was limited to observing eight classes in one Curriculum/Methodology class in each site. This class was a required class preparing teacher candidates to teach one international language in secondary schools in Ontario. The class shared a similar goal and schedule being taught over approximately 72 hours, in twice weekly classes of 2 hour classes over a period of 18 weeks. Nevertheless, like any class, this course was named differently in each institution and although sharing
similar content, was approached somewhat differently by different teacher educators in each institution. Complete descriptions are outlined in Chapter 5.

Participants

Participants consisted of a total of 3 teacher educators and 30 teacher candidates in the two curriculum/methodology courses observed. All have been assigned pseudonyms that are used in this research. At Turner University, there was one teacher educator, Gabriela, who had taught the international language teacher curriculum class for 15 years. She had 15 students in her class, of which 14 volunteered to participate in this study. The class was preparing teachers of Spanish and German. Of the 14 participants, ranging from age 22 to 30, 12 were preparing to teach Spanish and 2 were learning to teach German. They included 2 men and 12 women. It is important to note that one teacher candidate at TU did not complete the final questionnaire so data analysis incorporating year-end data may only list 13 participants.

At Monfort University, there was one principle teacher educator, Savanna, accompanied by a Teaching Assistant, Sabrine, who coordinated the teaching of approximately 24 teacher candidates from which 16 participated in this research. This class was preparing teachers of Italian, Spanish and German. 9 of these participating teacher candidates were preparing to teach Italian while 7 were preparing to teach Spanish. They ranged from age 22 to 43 and included 2 men and 14 women. None of the 3 German teacher candidates from this group offered to participate in this research. An analysis contrasting specific details of participating teacher educators and teacher candidates is detailed in Chapter 4. Teacher candidates selected for one-on-one interviews are profiled in Chapter 9.

Instruments and Data Generation

Multiple, complementary data sources and methods were used in this study to gain a deeper understanding of culture teaching beliefs and issues from multiple perspectives. Data sources included three repeated questionnaires combined with two individual interviews with selected teacher candidates and teacher educators. To directly examine the treatment of culture teaching and its impact on TCs, I also conducted eight classroom observations in each location along with analyzing related accessible artifacts, and a final year-end focus group interview held with teacher candidates on each site. This section provides a detailed description of instruments and
methods to make data. Table 2 summarizes the data generation instruments, the schedule and the participants involved in this study.

**Table 2**

*Data Generation Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre questionnaire</td>
<td>30 teacher candidates</td>
<td>Oct - Nov., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post questionnaire</td>
<td>30 teacher candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end questionnaire</td>
<td>29 teacher candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE interview #1</td>
<td>3 teacher educators</td>
<td>Nov. - Dec., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE interview #2</td>
<td>3 teacher educators</td>
<td>Mar. - May, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU TC interviews #1</td>
<td>3 teacher candidates</td>
<td>Nov., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU TC interviews #2</td>
<td>3 teacher candidates</td>
<td>Jan., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU TC interviews #1</td>
<td>3 teacher candidates</td>
<td>Dec., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU TC interviews #2</td>
<td>3 teacher candidates</td>
<td>Apr., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU focus group interview</td>
<td>9 teacher candidates</td>
<td>Feb., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU focus group interview</td>
<td>7 teacher candidates</td>
<td>Apr., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 TU classroom observations</td>
<td>14 TCs and 1 TE</td>
<td>Oct./07 - Mar./08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and related artifacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 MU classroom observations</td>
<td>16 TCs and 2 TEs</td>
<td>Nov./07 - Apr./08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and related artifacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. TE = teacher educator; TC = teacher candidate; TU = Turner University; MU = Monfort University.*

**Questionnaires**

The questionnaire was based on one used in a study examining foreign language teachers’ attitudes across eight countries towards culture and the teaching of intercultural competence in language teaching (Sercu et al., 2005). Sercu et al.’s questionnaire had 11 sections, used both closed and open questions, and was targeted to international language teachers working in the field. I selected and adapted several relevant sections that I felt were appropriate for teachers in initial teacher education and used them as a foundation for a pilot questionnaire. The sections selected included
information about demographics, teaching experience and experiences living in target cultural environments. They also included perceptions of familiarity over aspects of culture teaching, specific culture teaching objectives, the anticipated frequency of culture teaching and beliefs over various approaches and benefits to culture and intercultural teaching.

I based these adaptations on previous survey research I had conducted on teacher beliefs towards computer-assisted language learning (Lawrence, 2000; Turnbull & Lawrence, 2001) that was designed to elicit teacher attitudes, beliefs and teaching practices and/or visions using my teacher belief framework noted above (Lawrence, 2000, p. 83). Sercu et al.’s (2005) questionnaire was similarly focused on eliciting and comparing beliefs and teaching practices, using similar question types, and how they relate to intercultural communicative competence as conceptualized by Byram (1997). However, recognizing the access constraints of my research contexts, I realized the need to shorten her questionnaire and make these versions no longer than 15 minutes to respond to.

Using this foundation, I added some additional demographic questions that I thought were important to include. These included experience and time living in not just the target culture but in other new cultures. I thought it would be useful to ask TCs to identify their envisioned culture teaching strategies and their degree of comfort in integrating culture into international language teaching which I ended up integrating into all three surveys to gauge any changes over the year. I added open-ended questions asking for opinions on the benefits and challenges to culture teaching to again gauge any changes. I also added a general question asking teachers to share skills, strategies and knowledge they felt were needed about culture to facilitate effective culture teaching. Once drafted I then piloted this questionnaire to three groups of sample participants.

**Questionnaire piloting.**

I piloted a draft questionnaire to three consecutive groups of participants to provide critical feedback on the focus, format, questions and language used in the draft questionnaire. This questionnaire consisted of three parts: Part A eliciting demographic data, Part B eliciting culture teaching beliefs and Part C defining participant culture teaching visions. I asked each group of participants to complete the questionnaire as if they were a participant in my study and to note critical feedback on the above mentioned areas. I administered the first version of the questionnaire to two groups of
participants that included one group of 2 graduate students in second language education programs, followed by a second group of 3 teacher candidates learning to become French-second language teachers. These two groups recommended revisions to unclear wording in several sections of the questionnaire, a reorganization of two questions in Part A to keep questions related to demographic information together and a simplification of the scale I had drafted to elicit envisioned culture teaching frequency.

I then redrafted a second version of the questionnaire and piloted this with 2 graduate students in second language education programs and a professor in second language education who teaches research methodology. Again these participants recommended minor revisions to wording in several questions to clarify some Likert scale statements in the culture teaching belief scale I had drafted in Part B of the questionnaire. In addition, during this piloting session, 2 participants recommended omitting the “neither disagree, nor agree” option in the draft culture teaching belief Likert scale citing that it may reduce data quality and prevent participants from thinking about the issue. I decided to follow this advice after reviewing the literature on questionnaire design, seeing that there was an argument in survey design confirming that omitting the no opinion response option encouraged participants to think about the issue more deeply and express an opinion (Krosnick et al., 2002).

**Development of the post and year-end questionnaires.**

Using this revised questionnaire that would be used for the pre culture teaching questionnaire, I developed two versions of the questionnaire to be administered after the culture teaching lessons and at the end of the year. Being conscious of the time constraints of administering three questionnaires to two groups of very busy participants, I recognized the need to keep these additional surveys even more brief. As a result, these versions largely repeated the same scales eliciting culture teaching familiarity, beliefs and objectives and asked participants to define their culture teaching visions. I decided to only repeat the prompts asking about the benefits and challenges of culture teaching to just the pre and year-end questionnaires. I was also hoping that this delay in response time would also help illustrate any potential long-term impact on teacher beliefs about the benefits/challenges of culture teaching. To assess participant reactions on the value of the culture teaching lessons, I added open-ended prompts in both the post and year-end questionnaires (Appendices J and K) to assess participant reaction to the impact of the culture teaching lessons and their experience in this preparation program on shaping their culture teaching visions.
In addition, prompted by discussions with colleagues after the first questionnaire was administered, I thought it would be useful to elicit information about the perceived degree of multicultural exposure TCs had in various aspects of their personal life (family, educational, work and friendship experiences) which I integrated into the post culture teaching questionnaire (Appendix J). This would be used to see if this exposure/orientation had any impact on their views to culture teaching.

Given the preference expressed by Savanna at Monfort University, I adapted the paper-based questionnaires used in Gabriela’s classes to an online survey so Savanna’s students could respond outside of class. The questions used were identical in both questionnaire versions.

Assessing Changes in Culture Teaching Familiarity, Objectives and Confidence

In order to assess aspects of culture teaching beliefs and changes in these beliefs over time, three scales were developed and embedded in the pre, post and year-end questionnaires used in this study. These scales assessed perceptions of culture teaching familiarity, culture teaching objectives and culture teaching beliefs. The following section first summarizes internal reliability measures of the scales, determining whether the scales yield consistent scores across administrations and thereby can be used as valid measures of these defined constructs.

Questionnaire Scale Reliability

To assess the overall reliability and within-scale consistency of the questionnaire instruments, internal consistency estimates were computed for the Culture Teaching Familiarity (CTFam), Culture Teaching Objectives (CTObj) and on seven statements from the Culture Teaching Beliefs scales. Coefficient alphas for the various data sets are listed in Table 3 indicating satisfactory reliability for these three scales over the three time points.

Table 3

Alpha Reliability Measures on Questionnaire Scale Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Coefficient alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture Teaching Familiarity (CTFam)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTFam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>No. of items</td>
<td>Time period</td>
<td>Coefficient alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTFam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Teaching Objectives (CTObj)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTObj</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTObj</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Teaching Confidence (CTConf)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Conf</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Conf</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CTFaM = Culture teaching familiarity; CTObj = Culture teaching objectives; CTConf = Culture teaching confidence.

As illustrated, all items in both the CTFam and CTObj scales were satisfactory in the three administrations of the questionnaires. However the 14 items in the original CT Beliefs scale did not maintain internal reliability over the three questionnaires. In an attempt to define and analyze specific constructs within the broad area of teacher beliefs towards culture and culture teaching, a series of analyses were conducted on the 14 Likert scale items in the broadly defined culture teaching attitude scale. To ensure a common matrix (i.e., a pro-culture teaching bias) in responses, negatively worded items (statements 4, 5, 6 and 9 in Part B, question 4 of Appendix E) were recoded in all three datasets.

Reliability analyses conducted on the recoded 14 variables demonstrated insufficient internal reliability among the three sets of questionnaire responses. Coefficient alpha analysis on these variables in the pre questionnaire demonstrated a strong reliability of .84 whereas the alpha for the post questionnaire responses diminished to .70 and dropped even further to an unreliable .55 in the year-end questionnaire. As a result, this 14-item scale was deemed too unstable to be used in its entirety to assess changes in teacher beliefs towards culture/culture teaching over the three time points.

This instability over time may have been due to the fact that this scale was designed to elicit teacher beliefs on a range of issues surrounding culture and culture teaching in international language teaching. Therefore, items are likely eliciting more
than one construct, complicating the impact of alpha analyses on this third administration. However, as the internal reliability was strong on the first administration and then dropped over time, it may also be possible that teachers’ perceptions of the constructs measured in this scale are becoming more complex over the three timepoints. In other words, it may be possible that teachers are seeing culture and culture teaching in more complicated ways over these teacher preparation programs.

In order to explore variables that demonstrate internal consistency over the three timepoints in this culture teaching beliefs scale, item analyses were conducted on the 14 items on culture teaching attitude scale using alpha reliability analyses. Each item was correlated with the total score for the 14 item scale (with the item removed). Given that the dataset from the year-end questionnaire was more unreliable than the earlier data, it was used initially for analysis. Once a reasonably reliable scale was determined in this dataset the same scale was assessed for reliability across the other two datasets. Multiple analyses revealed one set of seven items (items 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14 in Part B, question 4 of Appendix E) that were reliable across the three datasets where alpha ≥ .70 (α = .71 in dataset 1, .70 in datasets 2 and 3). These variables largely focused on concepts related to culture teaching practice, its related benefits and perceptions of confidence around integrating culture teaching into international language teaching. Given the commonality of confidence in culture teaching that these statements expressed, this 7-variable scale was named the Culture Teaching Confidence scale and used to assess changes in teacher candidates’ culture teaching confidence over the three timepoints.

Pattern analyses using scatter and stem-and-leaf plots examining individual response changes on all 14 items in this culture teaching beliefs scale were conducted to see if there were any observable trends in response changes among participants on these individual items. In most cases individual responses among these items dropped or increased one degree of agreement/disagreement in each timepoint, reflecting general stability in beliefs over time. From these analyses, no patterns could be visually identified indicating trends in response change.

**Individual Interviews**

In order to develop a deeper understanding of teacher educator and teacher candidate beliefs towards the concept of culture and culture teaching, two 45-minute to one hour interviews were conducted with each selected participant early in the study.
and at the end of the school year. I integrated interviews into this research recognizing their potential to access individual’s ideas, thoughts and beliefs in their own words rather than in my words (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006). This seemed a crucial complement to the questionnaire base of this research which was largely based on pre-conceived culture teaching beliefs and issues. I also recognize the relevance of hearing individual voices and exploring how individual teacher candidates see culture and their teacher preparation experiences as a crucial factor in complementing my focus on group experience and better understanding the individualized impact of teacher education processes.

I adopted semi-structured interviews as these offered the comfort of framing some of the discussion in advance and eliciting similar topics among several participants while leaving the option open to explore unexpected themes raised by individual participants (Morse & Richards, 2002). The interviews held with both teacher educators and teacher candidates were conducted in a location and at a time that was mutually convenient. The interview questions for teacher educators in the first and final interviews are listed in Appendix L. The questions for teacher candidates in the first and final interviews are listed in Appendix M. At least a day before the interview, I emailed the list of interview questions to participants to orient them to the interview topics. Interviews were audiotaped and in most cases, when my schedule permitted, I made an effort to write some initial thoughts immediately following the interview to use as additional data.

Focus Group Interviews

Recognizing the potential of group interviews to explore participants’ thinking on a topic and to build collaborative thinking on an issue (Johnson & Turner, 2003), I decided to integrate a year-end focus group interview of teacher candidates in each research site to explore the impact of the culture learning in the methodology classes I observed. The focus groups were scheduled to be 90-minutes and were conducted at a mutually convenient time after class at a location on campus in each of the sites. Both focus group interviews were audiotaped.

Following discussion with one of my thesis committee members who suggested exploring teacher candidates’ perceptions of some models of culture-in-language teaching, I adopted an agenda that involved three stages of participant input (see Appendix N). Recognizing the likelihood of participants arriving late to the focus group,
I decided to begin the interview by giving each participant a handout (Appendix O) and asking them to write down their thoughts on what they feel they have learned about “culture” and “culture teaching” in their curriculum/methodology class. Once all participants had arrived and had some time to complete this form, I introduced the topic of the focus group, guidelines for respectful discussion and confidentiality, and began asking them to share points they had written on their handout, identifying culture learning from their methodology class. This was followed by a semi-structured discussion covering issues related to culture and culture teaching that emerged from my classroom observations and participant interviews. The focus group then concluded with a sharing of three cited approaches to culture-in-language teaching (Appendix I) that incorporate intercultural teaching foci. In this final stage of the focus group interview, small groups or pairs of participants were asked to review one approach as a group, discuss the question prompts following the approach, and then introduce the approach with their thoughts to the remaining participants. This was followed by a group discussion of these approaches and any additional comments on culture teaching and learning in teacher preparation.

**Classroom Observations**

Eight 2-hour non-participant classroom observations were conducted in curriculum/methodology classes in both locations over the school year. As noted above, these classroom observations were seen as fundamental in this research as they provided data on how the concept of culture and the role of culture teaching are treated in language teacher education programs. Observations have the potential to provide a window on how teacher beliefs translate into practice and guide understanding of the factors that possibly influence teacher action (Pajares, 1992). The observation schedule was negotiated with each lead teacher educator in each location as the school year progressed. Classroom observations began in both locations as each group of teacher candidates returned from their first practice teaching and as explicit lessons on culture teaching began. In addition to observing the approximate four classes in each location that were specifically scheduled to focus entirely or partly on culture teaching, I was able to observe classes devoted to other aspects of methodology and curriculum planning, including some classes where TCs presented their culminating projects addressing culture teaching.

As I spent a limited time inside the group and made explicit my role as observer in the class, I adopted the role of observer-as-participant (Johnson & Turner, 2003) in
these classroom observations. As my focus in these observations was to see how culture was treated by teacher educators and how it was taken up by teacher candidates, I used an integration of descriptive and analytic field notes. Using an adaptation of key features in a number of observation protocols (Faez, 2007; Richards, 2003), I logged time, activity focus, observable behaviour, noting some spoken comments among the teacher educator and teacher candidates in addition to analytic comments on potential teacher educator goals, belief systems, the treatment of culture and reactions and any evidence of teacher candidate uptake on cultural issues. Recognizing the time constraints of writing field notes on site, I attempted to reserve several hours after each observation to transfer handwritten field notes to a Word document, adding in analytic and reflective comments in addition to thick description of the research context and specific events.

Artifact and Document Selection

Selected artifacts and documents were collected when made available by teacher educators and teacher candidates. This data included: syllabi for both institution’s curriculum/methodology classes, teacher educator-produced handouts for teacher candidates outlining assignments and resources, and selected culminating projects that included culture bulletin boards at TU and culture unit planners at MU when made available by the teacher educators and candidates. These documents and artifacts were analyzed to document how culture teaching was being treated by teacher educators and to identify ways it was being taken up by teacher candidates.

Data Analysis

As stated above, complementary mixed methods were used for data making and analysis to triangulate and deepen findings within this single study. In addition to using a complementary mix of data sources from distinct paradigms, I also transformed and consolidated data, quantifying qualitative data for example, to examine the results from different perspectives to better understand the issues being examined. Following recommendations on analytical strategies (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2009), efforts have been made throughout this analysis to play with data to explore connections between datasets and phenomena related to culture/culture teaching. In the following sections I discuss how I approached the analysis of each specific data source followed by a discussion of the findings integration matrix I developed and used to corroborate and triangulate my findings.
Analysis of Questionnaire Data

Quantitative survey data was input and analyzed using the quantitative analysis software SPSS 16.0 complemented with the use of MS Excel. Descriptive statistical analyses were conducted first on demographic data to explore and understand the groupings of participants based on different demographic and experiential factors. Data made from question 8 a, c and d examining previous L2 teaching experience in Part A of the pre questionnaire (Appendix E) were not included in this analysis as the questions did not isolate time teaching a specific language or a specific language group of students. As a result, the data was deemed too difficult to contrast. For example, many teacher candidates noted experience teaching multiple languages and varying types of learners, recording learner backgrounds sometimes as “varied” vs. identifying specific learner nationalities. In addition, data produced from question 8c of this initial questionnaire asking “Did any of this teaching take place away from your country of origin?” may be interpreted as substantially different for TCs who were immigrants to Canada at a young age (as experienced by several participants) vs. Canadian-born L2 teachers, teaching their first language in another country. To maintain a reasonably common metric among my variables, I limited my analysis of this experiential data in Part A of this questionnaire to any previous second/international language teaching experience, the time of that experience (in months to make an easily comparable common measure), and whether they had lived outside of their country of origin (their “living away” experience) or had lived in their teachable L2 target culture (“immersion” experience) along with time in months for those experiences.

Responses from the three Likert scales repeated in the three questionnaires were converted to numerical codes from one to four, where four was the most positive and one was the most negative response (see the culture teaching familiarity and culture teaching beliefs scales in Part B and the culture teaching objectives in Part C of the pre questionnaire in Appendix E). Negatively worded statements in the culture teaching belief scale (statements 4, 5, 6 and 9 in question 4 of the culture teaching beliefs scale in Part B) were recoded to ensure that all items shared a common metric. Coefficient alpha reliability analyses were conducted to examine the internal reliability of the scales used in the questionnaires. This was followed by a series of parametric tests to examine correlations between participant responses on scale surveys and demographic groupings and changes over time. In addition, pattern matching techniques were used to explore participant responses on culture teaching beliefs, familiarity and visions to define
potential demographic or experiential factors that may be contributing to response patterns.

Open-ended questionnaire data was treated as qualitative data and coded using NVivo 8.0 and MS Excel to sometimes quantify repeated qualitative data that occurred in culture teaching visions to better understand participant changes over time. Such a mixed methods multi-step analysis process was used on open-ended questionnaire responses identifying culture teaching visions and perceptions of culture teaching benefits and challenges. A summary of this multi-step coding and data transformation process is outlined below.

**Coding and Generating Textual Data**

All of the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. I hired 2 local agencies to complete these transcriptions. When receiving the transcriptions, I listened to the interviews again, rechecking and reformatting the transcriptions to note repetitions in speech, unusual intonation, incomplete utterances, pauses or non-verbal sounds like laughter, sighs that may influence the interpretation of the written language.

I used this opportunity to listen again to each interview to spend time after each interview to record emerging themes that seemed to arise, to note questions and comments that I used in my analysis of each series of participant interviews (i.e., TU TC initial interviews). For example, I listened to each initial TU TC interview, edited the transcript, wrote analytic, reflective notes afterward, then began this process with the next initial TU TC interview. Following all TU TC interviews, I reviewed my analytic notes to identify any common themes that seem to emerge. Then I began coding each interview using this comparative meta-analysis as a guiding tool. I used these comparative meta-analysis tools to corroborate themes and triangulate findings in this analytical process.

This comparative analysis helped me become familiar with the transcribed texts and to develop a contextual understanding for the coding process and themes within the datasets. Throughout this study, coding was conducted using an inductive approach, developing, modifying and refining a coding scheme for each response dataset based on participant language use using a constant comparison method (Miles & Huberman, 1994). With interview data, I often used a series of organizational (i.e., topic), substantive and at times theoretical codes (Maxwell, 2009). I segmented text into meaning units that were assigned a code. Meaning units were any number of words that created coherent
and distinct meanings embedded in the text; these were concepts that were coherent and distinct from other ideas (Ratner, 2001 as cited in Deters, 2009).

I used a multi-phased approach to the coding of texts. In the initial phase I would often assign meaning units topic codes to organize the concepts being discussed. On subsequent reviews of the texts, using a process of constant comparison (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), I would then develop and use a mix of substantive and/or theoretical categories to code and categorize the meaning units. Substantive codes were largely descriptive, staying close to the data while theoretical codes framed the data in a more abstract, theoretical framework. I followed the premise that coding categories should reflect the purpose of the research, should remain exhaustive and mutually exclusive and that they clearly reflect what is in the data, remaining conceptually congruent (Merriam, 1998). A master list of codes is attached in Appendix P and an example of data segmentation and coding is attached in Appendix Q.

For classroom observations, I took handwritten notes in class and as stated earlier would immediately afterwards, convert these to electronic MS Word files by retyping the notes and integrating analytical comments and memos on emerging themes. When analyzing classroom observations I read through electronic field note summaries and analyses, reviewing and listing cultural topics discussed, teaching approaches used, student reactions, themes emerging and used this data to provide thick descriptions of participants and contexts and to corroborate findings related to teacher candidate beliefs and visions.

**A Multi-Step Data Transformation, Integration Analysis Approach**

In an effort to define changes in how participants think about culture teaching visions and the benefits and challenges of culture teaching, I used a multi-step analysis strategy. In this process I used a sequential mixed analysis approach (Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003) that first coded qualitative data using the procedures outlined above, then quantified this data and compared and integrated it into the analysis process. To analyze perception changes in participant responses to culture teaching benefits and challenges I first worked with open-ended qualitative data in the pre and year-end questionnaires. I coded these following the coding procedures outlined above using NVivo then placed each response in a Word table juxtaposing each pre and year-end response for each participant (see Appendix R for an excerpt of the table juxtaposing and coding culture teaching challenges). This allowed me to refine the codes and to develop a hierarchy of
themes emerging among participants. This pre and year-end juxtaposition also allowed me to examine any individual changes in responses over this time period and identify any emerging patterns among participant groups based on demographic or experiential factors.

This process of cyclical coding, reviewing the contrasted statements of individual participants with the themes/codes identified in the initial NVivo coding, helped refine the hierarchy of thematic categories and codes used in this analytical process. The final stage of this analysis consisted of quantifying the number of participants reporting the coded themes in each of these two time periods using an Excel table (see Appendix S for an excerpt of the table used to contrast changes in culture teaching challenges). The integration of this quantitative and qualitative data being worked with in different formats helped elicit a deeper understanding of the changes occurring at both an individual and group level. This integrated data was then correlated with focus group interview data to yield a more comprehensive picture of the perceptions of culture teaching.

A similar process was used to analyze the changes that took place in teacher candidate participants’ visions of teaching culture. In this case, each participant’s written response defining these visions in the pre, post and year-end questionnaires were juxtaposed in a Word table (Appendix T) along with their response outlining aspects of culture they felt important for students to learn. When reviewing these responses, some key areas contributing to these visions became evident: culture topics (e.g., music, literature, everyday culture, stereotypes, reflection on home culture), and a cultural focus or emphasis (i.e., an emphasis on authentic culture, hooking student interest or using personal experiences within the target culture). In some cases, participants noted or alluded to a culture teaching methodology that ranged from reflective, comparative to exploratory, or a teacher-focused presentation of cultural information. As a result, a spreadsheet was developed to isolate, quantify and analyze any changes in culture teaching visions over time. In addition, changes in the degree of detail and in the focus of these visions were noted, presuming that such changes may, in some cases, reflect a new vision or a more concrete view of working with culture in the language classroom. Findings from both these analyses are reported in Chapters 6 and 7 respectively.
**Individual Teacher Candidate Analysis**

Individual interviews were coded following the procedures outlined above identifying pre and post culture teaching beliefs and visions. Findings from this data were integrated with quantitative and qualitative questionnaire responses over the three time points to triangulate findings and identify institutional or individual patterns that may suggest factors that appear to influence culture teaching beliefs and/or visions.

**Artifact and Document Analysis**

Available documents and artifacts related to this research were analyzed to define the treatment and uptake of culture teaching and learning and to again corroborate findings. Teacher preparation course syllabi and teacher education handouts were analyzed to confirm the treatment of culture, culture teaching assignments and to identify the position of culture in relation to other topics. Available culminating assignments from both institutions were analyzed in terms of the type of culture treated and approach used to triangulate findings related to teacher candidate culture teacher visions. It is important note that access to these culminating projects was very limited thereby reducing the potential for analysis of these data sources.

**Data Log**

Throughout this research, I kept a data log to keep a record of data generation and analytic strategies to decipher and to clarify data generation/analysis processes throughout the various stages of the research. These notes were used to help triangulate findings and to make decision-making processes as transparent as possible for the research analysis and the reader of these findings.

**Findings Integration Matrix**

One of the challenges in mixed methods research is to clearly analyze data generated from multiple sources and paradigmatic lenses. In order to facilitate the meta-analysis of such data I have developed a tool I have called the Findings Integration Matrix that provides a visual tool to analyze themes and findings in various datasets. This visual tool is outlined in Chapter 10.

**Triangulation**

One of the advantages of using a mixed methods approach in this study is the ability to complement and correlate data from multiple sources. A cross-track analytical
approach was used so that findings from various methodological strands intertwine and inform each other throughout the research (Li, Marquart & Zercher, 2000). The use of data transformation, intermethod and intramethod mixing along with varied analytic strategies have been used to corroborate findings and to examine the impact of multiple factors and experiences on teacher beliefs toward culture teaching through complementary paradigmatic lenses. Such an approach supports Stake’s recommendation in case study research to reach new meanings through the “aggregation of instances” (p. 74), seeking patterns, corroborating and disconfirming instances.

My Role as a Researcher

Having some experience conducting case study research, I recognize the benefits and limitations of close personal contact and the subjective nature of interactions with case study participants and data (Turnbull & Lawrence, 2003). This is one of the reasons for integrating mixed methods to gain complementary data from multiple paradigmatic perspectives. However, I am increasingly skeptical of the claim that research can be objective. I recognize that my interest in intercultural learning, in language education, my cultural filters and biases have framed my research design and will frame what information I select from the observations, interviews and analyses. This is one reason I have consciously worked to seek alternative explanations, to document my thoughts and rationale for decisions, interpretations and analysis throughout the research process using my data analysis log. This is also the reason I have chosen a staged, mixed methods research approach in order to integrate complementary, yet paradigmatically distinct, research approaches that can synergistically inform each other throughout the study resulting in richer data making and analytical approaches.

I believe in maintaining a transparent research process to the best of my ability, describing my rationale related to research logic and processes. I also believe in the power of showing rather than telling, believing that it is important to embed rich description into research write-ups to allow the readers to come to their own conclusions and understanding of the research process. As a result, I have worked to integrate participant stories and words into this research account to deepen understanding of the complexity and personalized nature of the phenomena being studied. Good case study research (and research in general I would hypothesize) has been described as patient, reflective with a willingness to actively seek opposing views of the case (Stake, 1995). I have tried to follow this approach.
Validity and Credibility

To ensure the validity and credibility of my research design and claims, I have attempted to integrate and continually attend to a number of procedures and measures to maintain the trustworthiness of this research. Maxwell (2009) outlines key strategies to deal with validity threats in qualitative research that have all been purposefully integrated into this study. He cites (p. 244) intensive, long-term involvement, providing “rich” data, using respondent validation techniques to confirm and deepen participant voices, to continuously search for and work with disconfirming evidence, to support qualitative claims with quantitative support where possible, to use comparative methods and to triangulate data making and analysis.

I specifically chose a mixed methods design using competing paradigms and related approaches to look for areas of convergence in research findings. Mixed methods involve comparing, contrasting and integrating the findings of qualitative and quantitative strands of a study, thereby providing an integrated and systematic source of triangulation. Intramethod mixing integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in individual research methods such as questionnaires helps assess the degree and amount of evidence in the data. In addition, intermethod mixing, concurrently or sequentially mixing two or more methods in a single study ensures “the most accurate and complete depiction in the phenomenon under investigation” (Johnson & Turner, 2003, p. 299).

Limitations of the Study

As this research has examined issues around culture and beliefs in quite specific and selected contexts, I understand findings cannot be generalized beyond very similar environments. While this research approach integrated mixed methods to gather and analyze data through multiple, complementary lenses, it was still framed and interpreted by me, the sole researcher with an inherent interest and bias for the integration of intercultural learning into L2 and L2 teacher education. Being sole observer in these classroom situations may have made me miss valuable teaching and learning moments and seeing alternate interpretations of data.

In addition, given my responsibility as sole researcher on this project, I had to limit myself to making data from only one class in these wide-ranging teacher education programs, missing out on the treatment of culture and diversity in other courses or components of these teacher education programs. In hindsight, I also recognize the
limitations of my data making instruments, the risk of bias in selecting and framing content in questionnaire instruments and interview processes based on my understanding of culture and teaching-related issues. There has often been criticism of self-report questionnaires as yielding data that presents a somewhat biased view in the researcher’s perspective (Garcia et al., 2003; Miles & Huberman, 1994). I recognize the value in eliciting reactions from concrete teaching situations that may have yielded more specific, comparable visions than asking for these visions in abstract. Working on a topic as complex as culture teaching and learning and teacher beliefs would greatly benefit from multiple researchers and visions in providing a range of checks and interpretations to build deeper, more balanced understanding.

I also recognize the potential impact my presence as observer in these classes may have had in how culture was taught and how participants responded. A more complete understanding of the influence of the impact of these teacher preparation programs may have been gained from more widespread observations, and/or a longitudinal exploration of these same teacher candidates teaching in actual secondary school classes and exploring culture teaching among their students.
Chapter 5
The Culture Learning Landscape

Introduction

This chapter will serve to contextualize this research by illustrating the teacher preparation contexts, their teacher educators, culture teaching and learning approaches and critical moments in the teaching of culture and these new teachers’ experiences. Selected thick descriptions will be used to give readers a sense of these research contexts to highlight the complexity of factors shaping culture learning and teacher beliefs. The chapter will begin with a comparative contrast of the 2 teacher preparation sites and programs, followed by a contrastive discussion of the teacher candidate participants, the teacher educators and a description of each teacher educator’s approach to culture teaching and learning. The chapter will conclude with a contrastive analysis of the teacher educators’ treatment of culture teaching.

Turner University

Turner University is a large university located in a medium-sized urban centre in Ontario, surrounded by rural, mainly farming regions. While this city, like many urban centres in Canada, has witnessed more immigration in recent years, it remains largely populated by Canadian born residents. While student enrolment has generally been from Canadian-born upper middle-class backgrounds, the university has increasingly been attracting students from immigrant-rich neighbourhoods in urban centres across Southern Ontario (personal communication from M. McNay, July 22, 2007).

Turner University’s Teacher Education Program

The initial teacher education at TU prepares over 700 teachers every year to teach in Ontario schools. On average, applicants to TU have about a 25-35% chance of acceptance. Turner University’s 1 year undergraduate Bachelor Education program prepares candidates to teacher at one of the following levels: (a) Primary/Junior (Jr. Kindergarten to Grade 6); (b) Junior/Intermediate (Grades 4 to 10); and (c) Intermediate/Senior (Grades 7 to 12). The values underlying Turner University’s teacher preparation programs include equity, fairness, inclusion and respect for diversity, fostering an environment where scholarship thrives.
Turner University’s program of study requires six credits of which 4.0 consist of in-Faculty course credits and 2.0 represent the Practicum. The B.Ed. Program includes a common core course, Foundations in Education that consists of two components, Social Foundations of Education (.75 credit) and Psychological Foundations of Education (.25 credit). Combined with this, students must complete two teaching and learning theory courses related to the grade levels and teachable subjects of the candidate. This is accompanied with four specialized quarter-courses that must include one focusing on the education of exceptional students. The practicum consists of three components: a day per week of school or school-related activities; ten weeks of student teaching divided into three blocks (3 weeks + 3 weeks + 4 weeks); and a two-week transition to professional practice session at the end of the academic year.

Table 4 outlines the requirements for completing Turner University’s B.Ed. Program.

**Table 4**

*Turner University B.Ed. Program Requirements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course and Requirement</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Foundations of Education</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Critical exploration of Ontario’s education system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Foundations of Education</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>Theories of learning and human development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating Exceptional Students</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>Exploring diversity and inclusive educational practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Theory - Subject 1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Curriculum planning/methodology related to the candidate’s first teaching subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Theory - Subject 2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Curriculum planning/methodology related to the candidate’s second teaching subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Elective courses</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Wide-ranging course selections ranging from multicultural education, teaching in private schools to independent study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Requirement</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Three blocks of observations and practice teaching totaling 10 weeks, one day/week in school and a two-week transition to professional practice session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research focused on observing one Teaching and Learning Theory class that combined students preparing to teach Spanish or German (which are offered as separate courses but never offered as such given the small numbers of both student populations). This class lasted 72 hours, was offered twice weekly in 2-hour classes over a period of 18 weeks, 9 weeks per semester. These classes met once per week together as a multilingual group that was largely conducted in English and once each week in language groups where the course was conducted largely in the target language. To ensure adequate comprehension of the observations and equal treatment of both language groups and research sites, I decided to observe the weekly class taught in English only as I have no knowledge of German and limited proficiency in Spanish. I did make one exemption however to observe student presentations of their culminating culture project, the culture bulletin board which was only scheduled during a Spanish language class and ended up being taught in English and Spanish.

Topics covered in this Teaching and Learning Theory class included theories of second language learning and pedagogy applied to curriculum delivery and development. This was combined with a discussion of language teaching methods, motivation, classroom management, and working with diverse learners. See Appendix U for a summary of the complete syllabus for this course.

**Turner University teacher intake processes.**

Turner University requires teacher candidates applying to their pre-service teacher preparation program to have completed an undergraduate degree attaining a 70% average in their best 10 courses. For intermediate/senior teacher candidates in this research (teachers wanting to teach secondary school students), candidates must attain a 70% average on all of the courses of their teachable subjects. Applicants must submit an application that includes an experience profile. The experience profile asks candidates to outline three experiences (including referees) that were relevant to them as future
teachers. They are then asked to write a 250-word essay describing how these experiences are important to them as a future teacher.

Applicants are reviewed through a three-stage process. The first two stages focus entirely on academic background while the third involves analysis of the experience profile. In the first stage an applicant’s marks from her/his best 10 undergraduate courses are averaged and compared to all other applicants. The undergraduate averages of successful applicants are then compared to others within each program stream along with the total number of undergraduate courses taken and the number of courses taken in the applicant’s teachable areas. The final stage evaluates how successful applicants described their teaching-related experiences in their experience profiles. In the 2007-8 program, the year this research was conducted, almost 30% of applicants received offers to attend TU’s teacher preparation programs (personal correspondence from A. Suber, 2009).

Monfort University

Monfort University is a large research-based university located in an increasingly multilingual, multicultural large urban centre in Ontario. This city attracts many immigrant populations and as a result, there is increasing diversity in students in local schools and post-secondary institutions. In addition, teacher candidates enrolling in initial teacher education programs at MU are increasingly diverse.

Monfort University’s Teacher Education Program

The initial teacher education at MU prepares over 1400 teachers every year to teach in Ontario schools. On average, applicants to MU have about a 15 - 25% chance of acceptance. Consistent with Turner University’s program described above, the one-year post-graduate Bachelor of Education program prepares candidates to teach at one of the following levels: (a) Primary / Junior (Jr. Kindergarten to Grade 6); (b) Junior/Intermediate (Grades 4 to 10); and (c) Intermediate/Senior (Grades 7 to 12). The principles underlying MU’s initial teacher education program include: teaching excellence; research-based and research-driven; cohort-based learning communities; coherence; faculty collaboration; school/Field/University partnerships; and equity, diversity, and social justice.

Program requirements for teacher candidates entering the Secondary Initial Teacher Education Program consist of seven core components for a total of five full-
course equivalents. Successful applicants are organized into a cohort, a grouping of 25 - 35 TCs, where they together study their foundation courses: Teacher Education Seminar, Psychological Foundations of Education, School and Society. Each cohort has a coordinator who helps teach the group and organizes practice teaching in partnering schools. The seven core components for this program are summarized in Table 5 and consist of the three foundation courses mentioned above. In addition, teacher candidates must complete two curriculum and instruction courses, one in each of their teachable areas building teaching strategies for their selected subjects, along with a related studies course. This is complemented by a practicum, consisting of two four-week blocks of practice teaching in schools with a focus on classroom practice and an orientation to the broader school community. The program concludes with a five-week internship where TCs can build teaching-related skills in a non-evaluated field-based setting.

Similar to the TU context, this research focused on observing one curriculum/methodology class preparing teachers of Italian, Spanish and German to teach in secondary school programs. See Appendix V for a summary of the syllabus for this course.

Table 5

Monfort University B.Ed. Program Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course / Requirement</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education Seminar</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Six themes related to secondary education in Ontario including ethics, classroom management, diversity, equity and social justice among others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Foundations of Education</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Cognitive, emotional and physical development of children, adolescents and implications for teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Society</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Exploring the purpose of schooling in society and related themes including student diversity, democracy, conflict and resistance, teacher identity among others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Curriculum planning/methodology related to the candidate’s two teaching subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Studies</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Wide-ranging course selections ranging from anti-racist education studies, ESL across the curriculum to technology, curriculum and instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Course / Requirement | Credits | Emphasis
--- | --- | ---
Practicum | 0.5 | Orientation to schools and two blocks of four-week classroom observations and practice teaching
Internship | 0 | A non-evaluated, field-based, five-week teaching-related experience that acts as a bridge to practice

**Monfort University teacher intake processes.**

Monfort University lists three requirement areas for admission into its Initial Teacher Education program: English proficiency, academic standing and experience. Applicants must have a strong proficiency in English along with an undergraduate degree attaining a B average in their best 15 courses. In addition, applicants must submit an applicant profile, providing a written reflection on experiences that have helped prepare them for teaching. This applicant profile consists of three main parts focusing on experience, diversity, equity and social justice. Applicants are asked to reflect on three teaching-related experiences and a related interaction with learners. They are also asked to describe their social identity and how this will influence their work with diverse learners in a 250-word response. Finally, applicants are asked to write another 250-word response about a time they or someone they knew was advantaged or disadvantaged, what they learned from this experience and how this learning could be applied in their teaching. MU considers this experience profile in addition to academic standing in its assessment process.

MU emphasizes a strong commitment to social justice in its teacher intake process, noting that it admits teacher candidates with the potential of becoming educational leaders, who reflect the diversity of the student population and who show a commitment to working towards equity in diverse classrooms. In addition, MU has an Internationally Educated Teacher category on its applicant profile form, allowing teachers educated internationally to be eligible for consideration under this category that holds approximately 15 spaces for teachers with this experience. The noted goal of this program is to assist new Canadians with teaching experience to integrate into the teaching profession.
**Teacher Candidate Profiles**

As can be seen from Table 6, the teacher candidate participants were mostly female, learning to teach Spanish and also preparing to teach another language which was most often French.

**Table 6**

*Teacher Candidate Profiles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>TU Teacher Candidates (&lt;i&gt;n = 14&lt;/i&gt;)</th>
<th>MU Teacher Candidates (&lt;i&gt;n = 16&lt;/i&gt;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target language teachable:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic identities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First language Spanish speakers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First language Italian speakers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second teachable:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another L2 (FSL or ESL)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Teaching experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some teaching experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of months</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 immersion experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some C2 immersion experience</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of months</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living away experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some living away experience</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of months</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* C2 = target culture; L2 = second/additional language.

Ages among these participants ranged from 22 to 43, the average age being 27 of the whole group. Of the 30 teacher candidate participants, almost half (<i>n = 12</i>) defined
themselves as target language speakers. It is important to note that at least one Italian teacher candidate, while not identifying Italian as a first language, was raised in an Italian-speaking household with first language speaking parents so could be considered a second generation first language Italian speaker, recognizing a broader interpretation of linguistic identities (Faez, 2007). All but 4 reported bachelor degrees as their highest degree; 3 at Monfort U. and 1 TC at Turner U. noted having attained Masters degrees. Both groups had exactly 10 TCs preparing to teach another L2 with the remainder planning on teaching subjects ranging from music, history, English to politics and art.

The majority of participants had some L2 teaching experience, target culture/language immersion experience and have spent time living outside the country they were born in. By analyzing their responses to questions asking about living away and target culture immersion experience, I could determine that approximately one third of participants (n = 10) were immigrants to Canada while 6 of those (20%) were immigrants from target language speaking countries. These included 3 Spanish teacher candidates from both TU and MU from various Spanish-speaking countries in Latin/Central America. When asked to define their ethno-cultural identity, two-thirds of all participants self-identified as being from a bi- or multicultural background.

**Contrasting Turner and Monfort U. Teacher Candidate Participants**

As can be seen from Table 6, MU participants tended to be older and have more experience in language teaching, living away and spending time in the target culture environment. The vast majority (75%) of MU participants had some experience teaching a second/additional language which ranged from six months to ten years. This was substantially more teaching experience than the TU participants who ranged from 3 months to 3 years. 7 of the 8 teacher candidates with the most teaching experience of all TC participants, above the median of 24 months, were from the MU group.

Of this L2 teaching experience, MU participants also reported the most target language teaching experience in the language they were studying to teach in secondary schools. Of the 12 TCs reporting previous L2 teaching experience, 9 (75%) reported target language teaching experience. This contrasted with the 7 TU participants, of whom four (57%) reported target language teaching experience.

It seems apparent that the demographic and experiential differences in these two population samples are greatly influenced by the institutional intake processes, the demographics of the host communities and the institutional cultures including factors
prioritized in teacher intake such as attitudes towards diversity, equity and social justice among MU teacher candidates. In terms of immersion in new cultures, MU participants again reported more living away and target culture immersion experience. Experience living outside one’s home country ranged from four months to 30 years among MU participants while target culture immersion experience ranged from one month to 21 years. This contrasted with TU participants who reported between one month and 17.5 years of living away experience and one month and ten years of target culture immersion. Much of this living away experience was the result of immigrants’ living experiences in their home countries, often in a target language speaking country. Of the dominant Italian TC group at MU, there were some TCs who reported significant time in Italy, ranging from 2 to 19 years. Both institutional groups had similar percentages of TCs that reported all their living away experience to be target culture immersion experience (TU = 3, MU = 4), appearing to reflect the experience of a non-native speaking teacher candidate who majored in Spanish wanting to spend some time in a Spanish speaking culture.

The Teacher Educators

As stated in Chapter 4, a total of 3 teacher educators participated in this study. There was one principle teacher educator in each location. In addition, a teaching assistant, Sabrine, a doctoral graduate student, worked with Savanna, the head teacher at MU. Based on my two interviews with each of these teacher educators, descriptions outlining demographic characteristics, language and cultural learning experiences are outlined in three sections, one devoted to each teacher educator.

The next sections will present and contrast the 3 teacher educators in this study, their beliefs and attitudes towards culture, their goals in culture teaching and their culture teaching practices. I will begin by sharing formative influencing factors or experiences that appear to have shaped each teacher educator’s culture teaching beliefs and approaches. This will be followed by descriptions outlining demographic characteristics including language and culture learning experiences. I will then discuss each teacher educator’s conceptualization of culture, their goals for culture teaching in the teacher preparation context including perceived benefits and challenges of culture teaching followed by their culture teaching approach. This will be followed by a more detailed discussion of each site’s teaching approach to culture teaching and learning in the classes I observed. A summary contrasting the beliefs and practices of each teacher educator will conclude this chapter.
I will spend most of the next three sections focusing on the 2 principle teacher educators in my study but will summarize, after my description of Savanna, some thoughts about Sabrine, Savanna’s teaching assistant. Sabrine did participate in some of the culture teaching classes and had a significant role in designing and delivering the introductory lesson on culture teaching in Savanna’s class. However, in spite of this contribution, it is important to note that through my observations, Sabrine was present only in alternate classes and often remained quiet when Savanna was teaching. As a result, it appeared that while Sabrine did have some impact on the teaching of culture, particularly in class 2, it was Savanna who appeared to be the major teacher educator voice in the Monfort University classroom. Nevertheless, to recognize Sabrine’s contribution, some of which I was unable to see, I have decided to refer to Savanna and Sabrine’s culture teaching classes as the MU classes in my discussions.

**Gabriela: On Being Carefully Taught**

You’ve got to be taught
To hate and fear,
You’ve got to be taught
From year to year,
It’s got to be drummed
In your dear little ear
You’ve got to be carefully taught.

You’ve got to be taught to be afraid
Of people whose eyes are oddly made,
And people whose skin is a diff’rent shade,
You’ve got to be carefully taught.

You’ve got to be taught before it’s too late,
Before you are six or seven or eight,
To hate all the people your relatives hate,
You’ve got to be carefully taught!

Oscar Hammerstein II, 1949 from *South Pacific* (Rogers, 1949)

In one interview and at least twice in the classes I observed, Gabriela cited lyrics from a song from the musical *South Pacific* saying “you’ve got to be carefully taught”. She referenced this phrase to describe the subconscious conditioning that can build stereotypes and barriers between people. Gabriela said that she saw this musical with
her family as a young girl and she remembers this song making quite an impression on her parents. She remembers them discussing the idea of being carefully taught in a reflective manner. In class, Gabriela referred to this song title to support her call for the need to integrate culture teaching “to build empathy for others” in secondary school international language programs. She also used it to describe the naive and conditioned prejudice she saw around her in her hometown.

My whole village was raised on one set of prejudice based on a next set....you are judged by your grandparents, by your name, where you go to school, what your parents do....heavily mixed with how Irish you are and how Irish you aren’t.

In her discussions on culture, on a number of occasions, Gabriela brought up her upbringing in a small southwest Ontario town that was steeped in religious and ethnic prejudice. She stated that this upbringing likely influenced her sensitivity towards culture. The town Gabriela was raised in was settled originally by Blacks fleeing slavery from the United States, using the underground railway to Canada, but as Gabriela emphasized it wasn’t an issue of racism in the town, “it was the religion that was the problem”. This town was settled by Irish catholic immigrants and had a “Roman line” dividing the protestant from the catholic areas of town. Gabriela said townsfolk would say, “Don’t get smart with me. I know what your grandmother’s name was. In other words, I know whether you’re Catholic or Protestant...We grew up with things like ... that person dresses like a Catholic.”

Gabriela shared this aspect of her background with her teacher candidates when discussing culture and the issue of prejudice, using it to highlight the need to learn about “otherness”. She said there was no inter-religious marriage in her town and if someone did dare marry across religions, people would use the expression, so and so “has turned” to describe the situation. Gabriela added how she never really felt accepted in this small town as her parents had moved there from the big city. In spite of being born there, her brother, born back in the city, “married a girl that was related to half of [the town], and he’s an insider”. So he was accepted while she was not.

Gabriela described the prejudice expressed by some of the townsfolk towards her Mexican girlfriends that she befriended at the Catholic girl school where she went to school. These girlfriends were from “very well-to-do...very protected Catholic families in Mexico”. “One girl, her uncle was the president of Mexico”. Gabriela explained to me how her Mexican girlfriends would spend some weekends with her family and how her
parents took these girls under their care. Gabriela cited an incident when she threw a t-towel at one of these girls after making her help her do the dishes at her house and the girl began to cry, saying “I don’t know how.” Gabriela recounted her feelings at the moment, “Oh, yeah. So she gets out of the dishes if she cries.” She admitted feeling embarrassed later on, realizing that these girls simply didn’t have experience doing dishes, or household chores, assuming they shared similar experiences. In summarizing her learning from this experience, Gabriela said “I was so embarrassed....they never criticized me...They always spoke highly and they loved my parents. So they embraced us for who we were. And that was the best lesson I ever had.”

Gabriela emphasized in class and in our interviews how “we had to protect them from people saying things like....Do you have television sets....or where’s your sombrero?....you know, all those ridiculous stereotypes.” She even told her students in the second class I observed how when she was thinking about visiting Mexico at age 15 with her Mexican girlfriends. Gabriela admitted that both her parents had a very open-minded mindset and thought little of the biases of these local townsfolk. Her mother particularly worried about the influence of this small town mentality on Gabriela, encouraging her to spend her teenage summers in Mexico with her girlfriends. She remembered her mother saying “it would be good for you to experience how the other half lives”. Gabriela added, “I soon realized that I was the other half”, highlighting that although her parents were broad thinkers, they were still susceptible, like all of us, to our own unconscious judgments. Recognizing the ignorance at the root of the interreligious prejudice in her home town, Gabriela added “they didn’t mean to hurt, many really believed these girls rode donkeys, lived in adobe huts, and had sombreros.” She stressed they weren’t bad people in [my town], they just were carefully taught.”

Gabriela: “A Heinz 57”

Gabriela was in her early fifties, from Canadian hybrid stock (she often defined herself among her teacher candidates as a “Heinz 57”, referring to the 57 varieties of Heinz food products). Gabriela came from an extensive language learning background, having studied languages in high school that included French, Spanish and German. She studied Latin and due to her studies in music, learned to sing in Italian. She got her undergraduate degree and teaching certification at Turner University teaching all levels from Primary to Senior levels. She had extensive language teaching experiences in Ontario that includes having taught in elementary French immersion classes, along with
Spanish and core French in secondary school programs. She had taught teacher preparation classes at Turner University for the past fifteen years.

In addition to her teacher preparation responsibilities at Turner University, Gabriela had a wide ranging background in educational research, exploring immersion programs in Mexico and Canada and examining the application of the Common European Framework of language learning descriptors in Canadian language learning programs. She had also conducted work with the Oneida Language Revitalization Project to help the first nations’ Oneida nation develop a language training program for K - 12 students.

**Culture Is the “Soul” of the Language**

When asked to define culture in our first interview, Gabriela initially refused, saying it was too big to define, that “it’s everything”. As our discussion continued, she admitted that culture was the “heart” and “soul” of language. “It isn’t the language that should come first, it’s the culture”, she said as “language is culture”. She noted that one of the common dangers of language teaching is focusing only on the language. She reinforced this point with her students in the second observation I conducted, saying “When we don’t teach the culture of a language we’re ripping the soul, heart and lungs out of those languages....we’re sanitizing them.”

In both her classes and in our interviews, Gabriela reinforced the layered, dynamic nature of culture. She used the analogy of a hippo in the water, saying initially you only see the eyes, but the more you experience, the more cultural experiences you encounter, the more you see. “You do not encounter another culture without thinking about your own culture”, she told her students, illustrating Agar’s (2006) intrapersonal focus on culture. According to Gabriela, culture is a very personalized concept, representing not only my identity but my experiences that continually evolve with new cultural encounters.

**A Dialogue for Peace**

The teaching of a language constructs a dialogue for peace....a lifetime dialogue...[if taught] in a non-judgmental way.

Early on in our first interview, Gabriela explicitly stated this belief of a core value in language-and-culture education. She expressed concern that people make judgments and think they know all there is to know about a culture, without having been immersed
or having had personal experiences in that culture. She added that these positive or negative perceptions will influence whether individuals will seek more exposure to that culture and the people within it. “It’s all about communication and dialogue” she said, emphasizing the goal of peacemaking through language and culture learning. In our final interview, she refined her views, adding this belief in the ability of L2 learning to build critical cultural awareness.

Language acquisition fosters that whole exploration into the philosophical questions about myself, and what I value...I think each time [students] encounter a new cultural experience, it causes them to think a little beyond themselves. And to me, that is the greater payoff than actually being able to speak the language.

When asked what she hopes her teachers will learn from her classes on culture, Gabriela quipped “heightened sensitivity”. She expressed concern about “the tendency to think from one stereotype to another” and wants her student teachers “to teach the target language in a holistic way”. She added that she wanted her teachers to admit what they know (about the target culture), and to be curious and willing to explore what they don’t. She wanted them “to reflect on their biases” and to be willing “to go out and explore”.

In her teacher preparation classes, she emphasized the unique culture learning potential of adolescent-age groups, the “age of non-believers” as she described them in the second class I observed. She told her teachers that they’ll be “teaching a very important group of people”. Teenagers, she stated, have a natural tendency to “think everything sucks....they’re naturally criticizing everything around them”. In addition, they’re questioning who they are, what group they belong to, so “it’s a perfect time to teach culture” that can add perspective and help “build a perception of self”. “If we can get them in school before they [become adults], we will change the world one student at a time”, she added.

However, in spite of these potential benefits of culture teaching, Gabriela also seemed very much aware of the many challenges of culture teaching. She used the expression, “the road paved to hell with good intentions” to describe the ever-present pitfalls of culture teaching. She cited the challenge and scariness of culture teaching, saying to her students, “students will ask you questions that you don’t want to answer” she told her group, asking them to not make up an answer to shut students up and advising them “to explore and learn together”. She stressed that culture teaching is scary
because as a teacher “you choose what is important”. She warned of the biases we all have and the need for teachers to reflect and work with those. She also expressed the worry that her teachers will simplify and reify culture. Citing “a classic example of bad culture teaching”, Gabriela described the ubiquitous French Carnival as a culture lesson topic in the typical core French class, leaving students thinking that this event defines French culture, neglecting the depth of cultural learning and the culture of the remaining French-speaking populations in Canada.

**Gabriela’s Culture Teaching Approach**

According to her students, Gabriela discussed culture and integrated culture and language learning in many of her classes, outside of her culture-specific lessons. I observed eight international language curriculum classes taught by Gabriela that addressed culture and a number of other topics. The schedule of classes with lesson topics and aspects of culture that were taught in each are listed in Table 7. Classroom observation 6 was a Spanish language curriculum preparation class, taught in both Spanish and English. The remaining classes observed were the International Language Curriculum classes preparing both German and Spanish teacher candidates taught in English. It is important to note that I did not observe Wednesday classes, where TCs were divided and taught in target language groups, often focused on applying the learning from the Monday class in teaching situations. Following this Table is a discussion describing the cultural content presented by Gabriela followed by descriptions of Gabriela’s culture teaching approaches.

**Table 7**

**Gabriela’s Culture Teaching Lessons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Lesson focus</th>
<th>Culture topics and activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Practicum debrief; Introduction to culture and culture teaching</td>
<td>Introduction to culture/culture teaching; how NOT to teach culture; culture teaching strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Culture and perception</td>
<td>Perception, bias and culture teaching; depiction of culture in teaching materials; Picture Walk activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bias and culture teaching/learning; Conceptual Fluency Theory</td>
<td>Picture Walk debriefing; bias and culture teaching; introduction to conceptual fluency theory, culture in language; Culture bulletin board assignment overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enabling culture learning strategies</td>
<td>Using Think Literacy: Cross-curricular approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In each of the eight classes I observed, the topic of culture was brought up in various ways, throughout all eight classes. The first four Monday classes focused on the theory of culture teaching and learning while the following Wednesday classes focused on generally applying the learning in Monday and earlier classes to high school teaching and learning contexts. Although it is important to note that the German teacher candidates had a different teacher working with them in this Wednesday class through distance education in the first semester and in a classroom setting in the second.

Gabriela began in the first class by sharing her experiences working with a language revitalization project with a first nation’s community in Southern Ontario. She then elicited her TC’s views on the concept of culture, discussed the complexity of culture and focused more specifically on commonly used culture teaching strategies that were examples of how NOT to teach culture. These examples included the four Fs, the Frankenstein, Tour Guide and “By the Way” approaches as outlined in students’ assigned reading for this class, and in Chapter 2 of this dissertation (Hadley, 2001).

Class 2 began with anecdotes about the interconnection between language, culture and perception, citing examples from the religious prejudice and biased perception in Gabriela’s upbringing. This was followed by a review of what students remembered about the problematic culture teaching strategies reviewed in Class 1. Gabriela elicited the challenges working with culture which erupted in a discussion
where Anja, a German TC shared her observation of a poster put up by students in an ethics class that she felt linked Nazism and white privilege. This was followed by several students critically discussing the cultural bias of things like bandaids (that were designed for those with “white” skin). Gabriela then presented the power and personal bias around images, sharing with the class cultural biases found in L2 learning materials, like the French book “Un Merveilleux Petit Rien” where the character on the cover was a rather stereotypical Jewish tailor. She ended this class with an activity called the picture walk, where student teachers negotiated a collaborative response to a picture, outlined in more detail below.

Class 3 began with an announcement of a Spanish movie night and a discussion of cultural differences in birthday celebrations, prompted by a TC announcing their colleague, Penelope’s, birthday. Gabriela then debriefed the picture walk activity from last class including a discussion of feelings during the activity and strategies to use this activity with various groups of L2 learners. This was followed by a discussion and exploration of conceptual fluency theory and culturally informed metaphors common in language use, also known as metaphorical competence. After explaining the theory with some examples, Gabriela had students brainstorm some metaphors about time (e.g., time is money), love and other topics in English then in their target language groups. This discussion prompted one teacher candidate to mumble “that’s weird” when hearing a Salvadorian expression presented. Gabriela jumped on this comment and used it as a teachable moment, describing it as a typical reaction to cultural difference. This moment is outlined below in more detail.

Class 4, the final class scheduled for culture teaching, began with a review of an activity conducted in the previous Wednesday’s Spanish teacher preparation class on Freda Callo, the Mexican painter who picked symbols to represent her Mexicanism in her art. Gabriela reviewed the activity for students who had been absent and repeated the question at the centre of the activity, “how would you portray your Canadianism?” This was followed by an introduction to the text “Think Literacy: Cross-curricular Approaches, Grades 7 – 12” (Ontario Ministry of Education) that Gabriela presented as a template to infuse culture learning strategies into L2 teaching. Discussion and collaborative work on how to use the framework for infusing culture in curriculum followed.

Class 5 involved unit planning and included a student culture bulletin board presentation on La Musica Cubana. Conducted in English and Spanish, Class 6 featured
a number of culture bulletin board presentations combined with a video and debriefing of Linda Ronstadt singing and dancing to Mexican folk songs depicting political, historical and cultural topics of Mexican society. Near the end of the class term before the final practicum, in Classes 7 and 8, Gabriela presented a range of professional organizations, the Ontario Ministry of Education’s site, differentiated instruction guidelines and strategies on organizing field trips. Gabriela spent some time during these two classes getting her TCs involved in helping organize Spanish Day, a day coordinated through Turner University to celebrate the learning of Spanish language and culture with high school students and Spanish teachers from regional schools. In the final class, Class 8, I spent about 45-minutes conducting the final questionnaire in this research and sharing some culture learning resources, giving language teaching resources as gifts to participants, and conducting an experiential culture learning exercise called Nacirema that illustrates the emotional and intellectual challenges of experiencing a new cultural/linguistic system.

**Gabriela’s relational treatment of cultural content.**

Gabriela often approached culture from a relational, intercultural perspective, emphasizing the impact of cultural experience on perception, communication and interpretation, reinforcing the need to develop intercultural attitudes, facilitating Byram’s (1997) “savoir être” or critical engagement with the target and first cultures. In her first two classes, she reinforced how important it is to “hear” the untold stories of cultures, citing her experience working with Aboriginal cultures and how cultural information can often be represented in a biased manner, illustrating a critical approach to culture teaching. Throughout the first four classes specifically devoted to culture teaching, Gabriela explicitly reinforced the complexity of culture, its impact on perception, communication and identity. In her first class, she introduced the subjective, interactive and material dimensions of culture. She highlighted differences between “Big C” and “small c” culture, highlighting the fluidity between the two. In response to a student asking for clarification on this difference, she offered the painting of the Virgin Mary, explaining how this could be Big C culture if it’s viewed as an object of art and religion but an example of small c culture if children were praying nearby.

As part of her Powerpoint presentation introducing culture in this first class, she described some features and impacts of culture that included connection, connotation, conditioning and comprehension. Illustrating these interconnections over the next four culture-focused classes, she cited and prompted some student sharing of personal
experiences and examples that illustrated the impact of cultural conditioning on greetings, birthday celebrations, protests and reacting to punishment. Through her numerous anecdotes of culturally-informed behaviour through these classes, she expressed the relativity of culture, emphasizing the impact of culture and language on perception, behaviour and misunderstanding. She particularly emphasized numerous times how cultural experience influences our worldview, our understanding of the world and noting how our views continued to change.

Throughout her classes, she also warned of and gave numerous examples of the dangers of stereotypes, of cultural misrepresentation and cultural miscommunication. For example in her second class when sharing the inherent cultural biases in L2 teaching materials, Gabriela asked her TCs “How do we get students beyond this one-sided view of the world?” In this activity, she cited the example of her father who fought in the war and argued, saying that he argued there were no good/bad guys, only kids shooting themselves. She rhetorically asked who is the bad guy, explaining how we all have good/bad elements in us, that life and culture is not one-sided. In the picture walk activity that concluded this same class, Gabriela cautioned that when teaching culture, teachers were teaching a snapshot of their cultural group, that every interpretation was entirely personal.

When working with target cultural content, she shared many examples from her experiences with Mexican culture, which sometimes prompted other students to share their cultural experiences. At times, she elicited cultural experiences from native Spanish speaking students in the class to contrast with her examples from Mexican cultures. Examples of target cultural content that were discussed included aspects from the material dimension of culture including artifacts, dance and paintings/pictures. The focus on the material dimension in classes was often critically discussed, like the time in Class 2 when Gabriela lamented the ongoing use of Le Carnival to teach about Quebecois culture. Examples of culture often included the interactive dimension that included metaphors in language use, greetings, celebrating birthdays, and some aspects of the subjective dimension that included values, expressing shame, attitudes to family, relationships.

In addition, TCs’ culture bulletin board assignment had students work in pairs to investigate and present how they would teach an aspect of Spanish-speaking target culture of interest. Gabriela also regularly worked relationally with target culture, eliciting and encouraging students to make connections to their first cultures. In her first
lesson, after warning of the dangers of stereotypes, she asked the class “What is typically Canadian”, reinforcing how problematic it was to generalize, citing the phenomena of ceilidhs from southwest Ontario through to Newfoundland and reinforcing the need to analyze differences.

She emphasized the interconnectedness between language and culture in several lessons, and quite explicitly in her lesson on conceptual fluency theory. Gabriela used a teacher candidate’s ethnocentric reaction to a Salvadorian idiom as a teachable moment, highlighting the natural ethnocentric gut reactions to cultural difference that will be typical among high school students. Gabriela’s treatment of this teachable moment is outlined in detail below.

_That’s weird!_

An aspect that stood out in Gabriela’s work with culture was the emphasis on the interrelationship between personal experience, culture, language and perception. For example, in the class debriefing on a discussion of conceptual fluency theory, Kitty, a native Salvadorian, Spanish first language teacher candidate shared an expression, “viejo rama verde”, which translates literally into “old man, green branch” an idiom roughly equivalent to the English expression “dirty old man”. When sharing this Salvadorian expression, a fellow English L1 speaking Spanish teacher candidate mumbled “that’s weird”, illustrating a defensive orientation to cultural difference (Bennett, 1986).

This prompted Gabriela to immediately stop the discussion, turn around and face this student and say “Now, wait a minute, that’s exactly what I’m trying to point out.” The student making the comment immediately apologized sheepishly and Gabriela reassured her that her reaction was completely OK and a “natural knee-jerk reaction” to expect from teenagers when presenting culture. She explained that they will think aspects of the target culture are weird “from their own point of view....but they’ll do things that others consider weird”. Gabriela thanked the student for commenting this way and emphasized that teenagers will be thinking a lot of things are weird including parents and people “outside my group”. She added that the whole point of teaching culture is understanding that we will naturally judge other people and situations from our own perspectives. She summarized by saying “the challenge for everybody here including me is to know that it’s not weird, it’s not better, not worse”.
Gabriela’s relativistic culture teaching strategies.

Gabriela used a range of didactic and interactive teaching strategies to have her students work with culture. Activities included analyzing how not to teach culture, the picture walk activity, understanding culturally-informed metaphorical competence in language use and developing approaches to teach culture learning strategies with international language students. Her Spanish teacher candidates’ culminating project, preparing a collaborative culture teaching bulletin board, involved exploring and presenting an aspect of Spanish culture to colleagues and culture teaching and learning strategies. This assignment encouraged an ethnographic, exploratory approach to culture learning.

Her first lesson presenting how NOT to teach culture outlined many common approaches that students agreed have been used to teach culture in language classrooms. Gabriela emphasized that such haphazard, information-based, superficial treatments of culture essentialized culture into static entities. She gave the example of the piñata that many kids make in Spanish class but have little understanding of what it was used for and what values it represented.

In the second class I observed, Gabriela had her TCs participate in a “picture walk” experiential activity, illustrating the power of perception. In this activity, TCs were asked to remain silent and move to a picture posted on the classroom wall that resonated with them. They were then asked to write words, emotions, phrases that came to them when looking at this picture. After about five minutes, teachers were asked to collaborate with colleagues looking at the same picture and compose a joint piece (poetry, story, sentences) that shares a group impression of that picture. In the class following this activity Gabriela debriefed the class’ emotions to the pictures, to the activity, which prompted a discussion of how this activity could be used in an international language teaching context. She told her teachers that “you bring your own personal bias and experiences to it [the picture] and your students will as well”. Gabriela noted the power of the visual to evoke personal perception and emphasized her rationale for using this activity, showing that “when you teach culture, you teach just a snapshot of your culture and language group…that your reaction is entirely personal”, reinforcing awareness of perception/bias in culture teaching.

Her lessons on conceptual fluency theory explicitly explained the cultural influence on metaphorical competence in language use. By conducting group work contrasting common metaphors in English with Spanish and/or German, Gabriela
occasionally touched on some of subjective dimensions of language use, like the value on action and haste (vs. being) that was brought up in English cultures expressed by the proverb, “strike while the iron is hot”. Examples of this type of metaphorical language use was raised in both Spanish and German but were rarely deconstructed to highlight the subjective cultural dimension informing the metaphor or the culture-general patterns that could be used to deepen understanding.

In Class 4, Gabriela distributed the *Think Literacy: Cross-curricular Approaches, Grades 7 – 12* texts (Ontario Government, 2005) and introduced them as templates to teach culture learning strategies vs. cultural content. Before presenting these resources, she discussed culture-general concepts she had written on the board that included: beauty, symbolism, values, authority, order, ceremony, love, humour, honour, spirit. Focusing on a few examples, she highlighted some of the different ways they can be expressed in English and other cultures. For example, when discussing honour, she explained that honour can be expressed by symbols, gestures and practices. She gave the example of clapping or rhetorically asked the class what action would be taken to celebrate a football team’s win.

Following this discussion, Gabriela explained the approach of the *Think Literacy* texts, which are designed to integrate reading strategy development in different curricula. She emphasized that these texts helped teachers focus on skill development vs. teaching facts, encouraging teachers to teach a key element of intercultural learning, following Byram’s savoir apprendre/faire (1997). These texts offered an approach to respond to reading, explicitly outlining what teachers do, what students, all summarized on one page. After introducing these texts and their approach, Gabriela encouraged her TCs to work in groups and use this template to help students develop strategies to learn about cultural difference, and to simultaneously think about their own culture.

Students worked together for about 15 minutes and then shared their strategies. One group said they would select a reading passage in Spanish on ceremonies and have students contrast what is done in ceremonial practices between the target and home cultures. Other examples given included strategies to emphasize similarities (instead of differences), to analyze the perception of gender differences, or to work with stereotypes. Gabriela later explained to me that she felt this type of approach provides a tool for self empowerment for the international language learner. She added that many of these teacher candidates were highly successful students and need to “nurture their students’ abilities to communicate ideas and understand text and various voices that are
met in an authentic text”. By using this approach to work with cultural facts and authentic sources, she hoped that her TCs would learn how to provide strategies for students to encounter the “Other”.

**A narrative approach and conviction that culture teaching is crucial.**

Gabriela’s culture learning activities were often interspersed with personal anecdotes offering examples of intercultural miscommunication, the often detrimental impact of cultural bias and the interconnection between language/culture teaching. In class, Gabriela admitted being from a family of story-tellers, explaining her rationale for using a narrative approach in her first interview with me. She said that by using stories to highlight points, she hoped that her overworked teacher candidates would remember these contextualized culture teaching moments when teaching years later.

Gabriela demonstrated a strong conviction that culture teaching and learning should be at the core of the international language classroom. She encouraged her teachers to work with culture in a thoughtful, reflective, intercultural manner so learners reflect on their home cultures while learning about otherness. She professed to me that she wanted her teachers to work with culture so they could move beyond the “better than” or “less than” descriptors. She wanted her teachers to move beyond a judgment mentality and have the mental checks that help them avoid “the road to Hell paved with good intentions”.

In addition to the lessons I witnessed on culture, some of Gabriela’s students told me that Gabriela integrated culture in many other lessons throughout their classes. One student gave the example of Gabriela teaching her students to work with Spanish numbers using the Mayan number system, introducing aspects of the Mayan culture.

**Savanna: Finding the Passion in Language Teaching**

In our first interview, Savanna told me that she “always [had] this desire to escape to a faraway land.” She told me about the first trip to Italy she took for three weeks when she was in Grade 3 because her grandfather was ill. She said she remembered everything about that trip, going to the small town, meeting her relatives and La Befana³. She remembered missing three weeks of school but was still able to

---

³ La Befana is a character in Italian folklore who delivers presents to children in Italy similar to St. Nicholas or Santa Claus.
catch up thinking to herself “that’s an education in itself”, emphasizing that this experience “stayed with me”.

This formative childhood experience appeared to fuel Savanna’s fascination for immersion experiences which included a high school weekend trip to Québec City and while in university, one summer in Laval, Québec on the Summer Language Bursary Program. She admitted having resistance from her parents for these faraway excursions. “My parents were sort of old fashioned” and “raised me as if living in a small town in Italy”. Nevertheless, escaping to France remained an ongoing goal throughout her undergraduate degree and then finally, under the guise of education, she was able to convince her parents to let her go to France while completing her M.A. in French. She said she chose this program over a similar one in Italian once she heard that it could include a year in France.

Fuelling her interest in immersion experiences, Savanna cited a complaint common to many classroom language learners, a profound lack of confidence speaking French after so many years of study. She wanted to “teach French but then how can I do that if I don’t know the culture from the inside....I don’t know what the French think, I don’t know how the French live, what they eat for breakfast...”, highlighting Savanna’s holistic conceptualization of “lived culture”. So Savanna got her M.A. in French and planned to go to France for one year but ended up staying two. She taught English at the University of Nice, having a “phenomenal” and “amazing” time. The Nice experience just changed my life on a personal and professional level...I ended up coming back and really feeling that I was ready to be a French teacher because I had lived it.”

This need to authentically “live” the language and culture in an authentic first culture and language environment emerged as a recurring mantra in Savanna’s discussions with her teacher candidates. She stressed that language teachers need to be passionate about the language and culture they are teaching. For Savanna, this often meant living the language, living the culture, having had immersion experience in the target language. On several occasions during my observations, I heard Savanna advise students to “bring your passions into the classroom”. She told me that this passion about culture and language had the potential to “hook students” into the language learning process.

When introducing the culture unit assignment to her teacher candidates in this study, Savanna suggested they “need to be passionate about the culture topic”, to find a
topic they really want to share. When describing her transition from secondary school teaching to teacher education, Savanna said an overriding thought was “how can I bring my passion for these immersion experiences that I organized for high school students here for pre-service teachers”.

A “Cultural Orphan”

When describing her cultural identity, Savanna admitted feeling “lost” between Italian, French and English backgrounds. “...like what am I, where do I belong and where do I feel most comfortable” she asked rhetorically in our first interview. She described herself as a cultural orphan, feeling lost between cultures. Savanna was in her late forties and grew up in a bicultural, Italian-Canadian family. Born of immigrant Italian parents, Savanna grew up speaking English and Neapolitan, a dialect of Italian. She learned standard Italian at school, studied French and Italian through school, majoring in French and Psychology in her undergraduate degree. Then she spent 2 years in France, completing a Masters in French and teaching English.

Savanna taught French and Italian in a secondary school context for 14 years, acting as Department Head for 11 years, before transitioning to teacher education at Monfort U. where she had been for the past eight years. Savanna has also been active on a number of language teaching organizations including an Italian teachers’ association along with an organization supporting language travel and immersion programs abroad. In her capacity as a teacher educator, Savanna also coordinated international immersion opportunities in MU’s internship program that allows teacher candidates to get practical teaching-related experience to conclude their teacher preparation program.

Culture and Language Are Identity

In her personal case, Savanna’s experiences with immersion had ignited passion about the language and culture and reflected Savanna’s conceptualization of culture as “...the intangible... it’s what you feel, what you, you know, what you think, eat, drink, live, laugh about, get angry at, what comes from the gut.” In this way, Savanna seems to describe culture as holistic, all-encompassing and identity. In a similar way, she described language as identity, describing Neopolitan⁴, her first language, as the “language of my gut...the language that is musical and playful for me...the language of my parents and who I am.” Savannah saw culture as synonymous with language, and

⁴ Neapolitan is the language of the city and region of Naples, Italy.
culture learning synonymous with language learning. “Culture equals language learning. It is.” Discussing the goals of the L2 classroom, she noted “we tell kids to think in French, think in Italian, that’s what it is. [Culture]’s embodying.” Based on this fundamental belief, the best way to understand and to be able to share these subtle, deep qualities of a culture is by “living it”.

**Savanna’s Goals in Culture Teaching**

Through her attention to immersion and approaching language learning from a holistic, developmental stance, it became clear that Savanna recognized the multilayered nature of culture and the need for teachers to work with it in their IL classes. She described culture as “sticky” and “messy” but important, saying we have to convey to teachers that this is “important stuff”. She identified the ability of culture learning to “hook [high school] kids” into language learning by talking about the self and the other when kids are often going through an “identity crisis”. However, in spite of these benefits, Savanna expressed a concern that she didn’t do enough on culture, citing an inherent lack of time. “We’re always rushing” she said, adding that “you need time for continuity, you need time to reflect”. When discussing the idea of integrating an intercultural focus in the language classroom, Savanna cited the challenge that “we’re presuming that the language teacher has explored [his/her cultural self] as a language student”.

She also admitted that she “could do [culture teaching] better”, that “it’s really difficult” and doesn’t “know how”. She also said that when the international language teacher preparation course used to be taught in separate language sections (i.e., the Spanish teacher candidates would be in a separate class from the Italian teacher candidates), they had more time to work with culture. Savanna said that the cultural component in that course was 2 or 3 weeks. In this respect, she expressed the need for a related studies course focusing on culture teaching.

When describing how she planned for culture teaching, she stated that she made sure she talked about it and included at least one major assignment focusing on culture teaching. She added that she tried to ensure teachers integrated it into their lesson plans and she made an effort to place her teachers with mentors who infused culture teaching regularly into their teaching.

She also said that she often assumed that IL teacher candidates had a good knowledge base around the target language and culture. Unlike French teachers who
recognized the employability of French as a teachable, IL teachers Savanna said often pursued it as a passion and were inherently curious about their language and culture. Reflecting her beliefs of the interconnectedness between culture and language, Savanna described her goals related to culture learning as follows:

I want them to be hopefully as passionate about being a language teacher as they were filling out their application. I want them not to forget that and to convey to their students, and to keep having those types of experiences, to keep traveling, keep reading, keep being immersed, even [locally].

The Transformative Benefits of Cultural Immersion

In her discussions, it appeared that immersion experiences had transformative, developmental benefits that reinforced Savanna’s deep belief that teaching holds a unique benefit of self-discovery or learning about “personhood” as she called it. She stated that “teaching a language is about sharing”. When asked what is needed to help international language teachers understand how to work with culture she replied immediately an “immersion experience”. “You have to go and see what it’s like to be a minority, to be discriminated against, to be marginalized. People come back and will not forget,” she added.

She also emphasized a perceived benefit of the perspective-changing potential of immersion experiences for teachers and students. “I think the immersion experience really prepares you to be a teacher because it forces you to be adaptable, to be flexible, to be able to deal with a lot of things, and that’s what teaching is about.” She suggested such immersions help teachers move beyond a stereotypical, monolithic view of culture by increasing the range of cultural behaviour and experiences they’re exposed to.

If you’re looking at [culture] without going there, you think of the negative a little bit too much, the stereotypes, and when you’re living it, you can get rid of the stereotypes. You can say “Well, sure the French are like that, but I’ve also met people that aren’t like that.”

Highlighting this developmental potential of culture-and-language learning among language learners, in our first interview, Savanna shared some examples of the transformative change that happened to some of her students in a 17-day French immersion she organized and lead while teaching French in secondary school. She cited a young student who told her, “You know Miss, I realized as I was sitting on the beach that the sun that I stare in Toronto is the same sun that the French students look at”. She
cited Beata, a student of Polish origin who said, “I really want to continue learning Polish...I had forgotten about my Polish side, but going back to Europe, I really valued who I am as a Polish Canadian.” Savanna said that this transformative impact on the “self” reflected what she had experienced in her immersion in France, having helped her find her own “Italian-ness”.

In our interviews and with her teacher candidates in my observations, Savanna often shared her experiences and the benefits leading her French students on an overseas immersion. In the sixth class I observed, Savanna conducted an artifact sharing activity with her students, distributing excerpts of personal journal entries written by these students in her immersion. She told the class these excerpts were part of her doctoral thesis work that has remained incomplete, but was “a topic close to her heart”. She told her teacher candidates that this immersion was a passion of hers and took 10 years to get off the ground involving a load of advocacy and organization. And then she added that while it did take a long time and a lot of work, it was worth it because remember, “you’re not just teachers of the language but of the whole child”.

**Sabrine’s Conceptualization of Culture Teaching**

Sabrines’s teaching assistant, Sabrine, was an Arabic speaker who had studied French, English and Italian at school, in Tunisia. During the period of this study, she was pursuing a doctorate in second language education at Monfort U. She majored in English in her undergraduate program from Tunisia and has experience teaching English as a foreign language in secondary schools in Tunisia.

She completed her undergraduate degree in English language and literature, where British culture was presented as tidbits of the material dimension of culture (e.g., Big Ben) and through an exploration of history. She defined culture as “a way of being, a way of interacting and a way of perceiving things, approaching life.” She recognized the ability of culture to motivate language learning, recounting the deconstruction of a mini-lesson she demonstrated near the beginning of term, where she designed a lesson teaching integrated skills around a theme, Tunisia. She integrated artefacts from Tunisia representing aspects of Tunisian culture. She remembers saying “how we use the culture or aspects of culture to have the students work on their language”.

Sabrine admitted that it wasn’t until after conducting the presentation introducing culture teaching in the second class I observed when she began to think about the role of culture in language teaching. To prepare for this presentation, she read
the Hadley (2001, p. 345) chapter critically reviewing culture teaching approaches. She admitted that reading this chapter prompted reflection on her priorities as a language teacher, “Is it just about the language or is it culture”. She admitted wondering whether culture had a bigger role to play, adding that integration of the two seemed a challenge. “How do you fit [culture] into your language curriculum is the main question I’m still struggling with”.

She felt that the way teachers work with culture depends greatly on “our own beliefs about teaching and culture....like how we see our role as teachers....do you see yourself as primarily a language teacher and then how do you define language, how do you define culture...if you define it”. This was one of the reasons she asked students a lot about their own personal experiences learning culture and teaching it in their practicum, discussing the challenges and successes. Her teaching approach was that she was “not there to give them answers but just to have them think back to those experiences and maybe see them in a different light”. She admitted not wanting to focus at all on the target culture but focus more on critically analyzing culture learning experiences and exploring approaches.

Sabrine adopted an intercultural, reflective approach at culture teaching believing that “you have to face your own [biases] and do the same with your students because it is not very easy”. She thought it was crucial that teachers deconstruct their own cultures but also that we teach strategies that enable teachers to do this with their students. In her introductory lesson on culture teaching, Sabrine said she wanted to highlight a couple of points for these new teachers. She wanted to express that one can’t understand a target culture through one’s own culture, that such an approach results in bias and stereotypes. She wanted teachers to “get the idea of how you actually reconstruct your own culture so you can appreciate the other culture and see it as a different way of doing things and approaching life in general.” Sabrine said that it is how we approach other cultures, how we make sense of other cultures, preferably with an open-mind that shapes how we can appreciate the other culture. She affirmed that is the individual teacher’s “beliefs in teaching and culture that will shape how culture is presented in class.”

*The MU Culture Teaching Approach*

Similar to my observations at Turner University, I observed eight curriculum classes taught by Savanna and supported by Sabrine that addressed culture and a
number of other topics. The schedule of classes with applicable lesson topics and aspects of culture that were taught in each are listed in Table 8. Classroom observation 8 was a class that I lead in a computer lab as a give-back to Savanna and her students where I shared my knowledge of computer-assisted language learning, demonstrating some approaches that built linguistic and cultural and intercultural competence.

**Table 8**

**MU’s Culture Teaching Lessons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Lesson focus</th>
<th>Culture topics and activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intro to research; Practicum debrief; Mini-presentation overview; L2 learner/teacher</td>
<td>Research introduction/consent; Give and get practicum sharing activity; Overview of mini-presentation activities; Brief discussion of good L2 teacher qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introduction to culture teaching; Cultura Project</td>
<td>Powerpoint: “Teaching for cultural understanding”; Discussion of good/bad culture teaching strategies; Intro to the cross-cultural Cultura Project; critiquing video clip, Lost in Francelation: On the trail of French culture; International language teaching quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mini-presentation: using cartoons in L2 teaching; Interpreting culture from ads; exploring use of C2 video clips; When Oprah Winfrey came to my Italian class</td>
<td>Critical incident discussing stereotypes in L2 teaching; Using ads and the 60 Minutes episode “Mammoni” (mama boys) videoclip to teach about culture in IL classes; sharing of personal thesis excerpt discussing her experience inviting family members of her Italian female high school students to discuss gender differences/issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>L2 teaching web-site resource sharing</td>
<td>Students summarized websites, a few of which summarized language/cultural immersion opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stern’s (1992) culture teaching approaches; Interpreting cultural metaphors</td>
<td>Discussion of Stern’s eight culture teaching approaches; Examining the use of cultural metaphors in L2/culture teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Modeling of an interactive classroom activity; Introduction to Culture unit assignment; Sharing of L2 immersion experience in TE thesis work; Christmas gift sharing ceremony</td>
<td>Modeling of an interactive classroom activity that TCs completed; Discussion of group culture unit assignments including group discussions of potential topics; Savanna sharing the transformative potential of L2 immersion experiences as documented in her thesis work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Lesson focus</td>
<td>Culture topics and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Review of culture unit assignments; mini-presentations</td>
<td>Groups summarized culture unit assignments and thoughts; Nandita presented strategies on using a guest immigrant speaker to come share C2 insider experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Computer-assisted language learning give-back</td>
<td>In computer lab, Geoff facilitated an exploration of tandem learning, webquests and blogs that could involve some cultural exchange/learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* TC = teacher candidate; C2 = target culture.

While various aspects of culture teaching and learning were brought up in some degree in all eight classes I observed, three classes specifically focused on culture teaching in Savanna’s course, classes 2, 3 and 5. The culture teaching in Class 2 began the culture teaching lessons with Sabrine’s Powerpoint presentation entitled “Teaching for Cultural Understanding”, critically discussing common forms of culture teaching and debriefing some culture teaching strategies. This presentation accompanied by some concrete culture teaching examples and elicitation/discussion took the entire 2 hour class.

Class 3 began with a mini-presentation from a German teacher candidate highlighting strategies on how to use cartoons in L2 teaching. This presentation erupted in a heated critical discussion on the issue of stereotypes in culture teaching and learning that is outlined below. This was followed by an activity where Savanna shared target language magazine ads and had student groups share first impressions, the type of language used and associations implied. Following this, Savanna showing a clip from a 60-Minutes episode discussing Mammoni - the mama boys of Italy - asking students whether they would use such a videoclip to teach culture. After expressing to me her concern that she hadn’t done enough on culture, Savanna added one more class on culture after the holiday break. This class debriefed Stern’s (1992) eight approaches for culture teaching, followed by an analysis of the relevance of cultural metaphors in L2 teaching.

These classes were followed by two discussions of the culture unit planning activity, respectively in Classes 6 and 7 that students did in target language groups. Specific details and a critical analysis on MU’s treatment of culture including the cultural content and teaching strategies used are outlined below. This is followed by a
Summary of the critical discussion that arose on stereotypes in Class 3, a brief analysis of MU’s culture treatment strategies and perceptions of learner impact, ending with a contrastive analysis of Gabriela and Savanna’s culture teaching treatments.

**MU’s treatment of cultural content.**

Over the weeks I observed, Savanna and Sabrine’s treatment introduced a rich, comprehensive overview to the complexity and multiple dimensions of culture. Multiple dimensions of culture were presented explicitly in Class 2, where subjective layers (values, beliefs, attitudes) were juxtaposed with interactive communicative dimensions and material dimensions (literature, music, monuments). Over the lessons on culture in Classes 2, 3 and 5, there was much elicitation and discussion of examples of the various dimensions of mostly Italian and Spanish target cultures, focusing on mostly the material and occasionally the interactive and subjective dimensions. For example, in Class 2 Sabrine elicited culture teaching experiences from individual students who shared cultural topics experienced in their practica and in their own language and culture learning. These topics largely tended to be from the material dimensions of culture, largely around Hadley’s 4 Fs (folkdances, festivals, folklore and food). For example, cited cultural topics included the Day of the Dead in Mexico, salsa dancing, the bolero tradition in Mexico, and famous people in Latin America.

Over my observations, discussions did touch on the dynamic and subjective dimensions of culture. For example in Class 3, the Mammoni videoclip did present family values present in Italian culture. However, these values were somewhat sensationalized in this 60-minutes episode, portraying professional Italian men as having “unusual” ties to their mothers that included living at home (while having their own apartments and girlfriends), having mom do their laundry, even in their older years. The video framed this “unusual” cultural behaviour from an American ethnocentric, defensive perspective which was not explicitly addressed, missing out on potential intercultural learning, discussing how one’s sense of “normality” is often shaped through culturally conditioned assumptions.

In addition, the activity comparing ads from multiple target language media where students discussed their impressions may have been an ideal forum to move deeper and discuss more explicitly the cultural values shaping the design of such ads. In addition, the cultural metaphor readings assigned for and discussed in Class 5 presented patterns of behaviour and values among Spanish, Italian and German cultural groups.
The introductory chapter of this book (Gannon, 2004), entitled “Understanding Cultural Metaphors” outlines several culture-general frameworks, intercultural reflective approaches and some strategies on how to work with stereotypes. However discussions of these readings were largely occupied with critiques of such patterning as American-centric and unrepresentative stereotyping that some TCs perceived in these readings. The culminating project for culture learning in this course, the culture unit planning assignment, allowed students to work in target language groups and select topics of interest that seemed relevant for high school language-and-culture learners. Topic choices and how teacher candidates were taking up culture will be discussed in Chapter 8 which focuses on teacher candidate’s culture teaching visions.

**MU’s culture teaching strategies.**

A significant component of the culture teaching classes included open-ended discussions where students and Savanna and Sabrine discussed/shared mostly target culture and some intercultural teaching strategies. In Class 2 Sabrine advocated an intercultural approach, suggesting the need for teachers to examine their cultural biases, the dangers of cultural misrepresentation, recommending a principled, systematic approach to culture teaching and learning. Sabrine summarized a number of culture teaching strategies that included linking cultural topics to linguistic themes, use probing questions to elicit critical understanding of photos/realia and avoiding a facts-only approach by encouraging experiential or process learning. In addition, a large part of this class was spent critically discussing Hadley’s common approaches to culture teaching: The 4-F Approach, the Tour Guide Approach, the By-the-Way Approach, and the Frankenstein Approach. She warned of the often dangerous incompleteness of culture teaching in language classes. During this discussion, students were encouraged to share their own culture learning experiences characterized by these methods and highlight the potential limitations of culture teaching using these common approaches.

In addition, Sabrine showed a concrete example of a comparative cultural analysis used in the Cultura Project, a project initiated by MIT and Ecole Polytechnique in France using an ethnographic approach to explore and contrast American and French behaviour and values among university students. She also mentioned e-pals, the benefits of using cultural informants to get an “insider” perspective on culture, and showed a youtube video called “On the trail of French culture” eliciting how this could be used to work with culture in the L2 classroom. While Sabrine’s treatment of these
cultural teaching strategies was comprehensive, there was little discussion, aside from the Cultura example on individual teachers’ perceptions of culture teaching.

Savanna and Sabrine’s teacher education practices were characterized by elicitation, open, often unstructured discussion that resulted in the widespread sharing of experiences, ideas on a range of cultural topics. Savanna often remained quiet in discussions, letting the students discuss and debate. “I think we should let students talk. I think we should let them try and figure it out,” she said in her first interview with me.

In Classes 3 and 5, after debriefing initial reactions, Savanna explicitly asked students whether TCs would use the cultural materials such as the Mammoni videoclip, cultural metaphors in an international language class. Instead of discussing concrete approaches to working with this material to build cultural and intercultural knowledge, discussions in both these instances raised concerns around the shock value of the Mammoni video and the stereotypes perceived in the cultural metaphor readings. In Class 5, Savanna shared and elicited culture teaching and learning experiences from students highlighting each of Stern’s (1992) eight culture teaching approaches. For example, Savanna asked Lila to describe her Spanish language practicum classroom that was rich with Spanish and Latin American artifacts, momentos, posters and souvenirs from the associate teacher’s travels. Following Lila’s description, Savanna shared her experience as a learner of French seeing a poster of a castle in her classroom, making her want to visit France.

In several classes, Savanna shared personal cultural experiences and elicited such from her students as points of cultural discussion. In the discussion of Stern’s (1992) culture teaching approaches focusing on behavioural and affective aspects, Savanna shared a story of traveling in Italy when the bus driver stopped the bus, stood up and literally screamed at everyone to move back on the bus, asking students to imagine if a Toronto bus driver did that. In Class 3 responding to student concerns about stereotypes, Savanna shared how a student in one of her Grade 10 Italian classes came up to her and questioned her Italian background by saying “you’re not Italian because you’re not fat.” She explicitly stated she would leave that for the class to reflect on rather than debriefing it further. The challenge with such cultural points of discussion is that they can, if not deconstructed more fully, perpetuate stereotypes in a cultural group (Ting-Toomey, 1999).
Savanna’s sharing of the transformative, developmental potential.

In many of the classes I observed, Savanna would share her personal experiences with culture learning and immersion, highlighting the transformative, developmental potential of target language and culture learning. For example, in Class 3 she read an excerpt from her thesis draft that she called “When Oprah Winfrey Came to My Italian Class”. This story was about dealing with the gender issues and differences among young women in her high school Italian class. Savanna explained in her reading that in her fourth year of teaching, she felt bombarded by complaints from some of the young Italian-Canadian women in her class about the “double standards” towards gender in their families. These issues particularly revolved around these girls’ brothers who these girls accused of managing who they went out with, forced them to make dinner, and bring them coffee, among other examples.

In an effort to ease the perceived tension between young women in her class and their brothers, Savanna coordinated a group meeting of 6 brothers of these young women in her class to discuss different perceptions towards gender roles, strategically inviting the Italian-Canadian Vice-Principal of her school to the event. Her story highlighted the uniqueness and variation of brother-sister relationships that all participants suddenly saw, helping them see the potential for growth and improvement in their own relationships. Savanna described it as a professional and personal challenge but one that had great benefits of personal growth and family peace, citing testimonials from some of the participating girls. At the end of this story, she asked her TCs what type of teacher are you going to be? Marco, the Spanish TC from El Salvador replied, “a risk taker”.

Another example of Savanna’s emphasis on personal development through culture and language learning arose in her response to TCs debating the misperceptions that can be caused by cultural assumptions and stereotypes around the cultural metaphors discussed in Class 5. In her response, Savanna stressed the benefit of having such discussions with students on issues that “bring out emotions”. She said that students should be encouraged to critically think about and discuss these issues related to culture and identity. She stated that students are capable of “these mental gymnastics”, that they’ll think about this after class, bring it to the dinner table, that it will be transformative.

In Class 4, which was structured as a language teaching website sharing discussion, she integrated approximately seven sites (of roughly 20) that provided
cultural and linguistic exchanges, educational travel or English teaching opportunities in Spain, Italy or Germany. In this class she also shared her role on the Board of Directors of a provincial association responsible for providing information on cultural and linguistic immersions, again reinforcing her convictions in cultural and linguistic immersion experiences.

In Class 6, Savanna facilitated an activity where groups of students read and debriefed personal journal entries from students in her French immersion experience that she orchestrated while teaching in secondary school. She shared these as “topics close to my heart…my [doctoral] thesis work”. In this activity she highlighted some of the challenges organizing this immersion trip, and shared the transformative personal impact of this French cultural immersion on several of her students. For example, one journal entry discussed shared the story of Martha who was forced to speak French which helped her overcome her lack of confidence. She prefaced the activity with an overhead image of a globe encircled by children’s hands and a quote from her draft thesis:

There is a flickering spark in all of us, which, if struck at just the right age, I think can light the rest of our lives, elevating our ideas, deepening our tolerance and sharpening our appetite for knowledge about the rest of the world.

She concluded this activity and discussion summarizing the goals of cultural exchanges to increase target culture and language proficiency, to increase contact and familiarization with the target culture and to increase “personal lived experience and self-growth”. Savanna told me in a passing comment in this class that she saw cultural exchanges fitting nicely into multidimensional and holistic educational frameworks. I then remembered that she had mentioned holistic education in an earlier class, peaking my attention to this connection with her vision of language and culture learning.

These examples highlight the passion Savanna has for language teaching and teacher education. Her teaching demonstrated the strength of Savanna’s beliefs about the transformative potential of authentic linguistic and cultural immersion experiences and of language learning in general for teacher candidates and language learners. They illustrate Savanna’s belief of the relevance of personal development, identity and reflection in language teaching and learning. They show her attempt to encourage her teachers to become “risk-takers” responsible for the teaching of the “whole child” as she stated in her classes and in our interviews.
A critical moment: Confronting stereotypes.

Class 3 began with what was supposed to be a 20-minute mini-presentation by a German teacher candidate on culture teaching using caricatures or cartoons. The teacher candidate passed around a handout with five black and white images of caricature-like characters interacting in a range of situations. The images ranged from five family members sitting together and watching a washing machine, former President George B. Bush and former German Chancellor Gerhard Schroder smiling and drinking beer together, to a young buxom woman smoking in a halter top and talking to 3 young female friends in summer dresses on a beach. The German teacher candidate then asked her colleagues to work in small groups and discuss their reactions to the cartoons, defining where the image was from, who the characters were, what they were doing etc. After some time, the teacher candidates offered their opinions. Referring to the image of the women on the beach, Eva, a Spanish teacher candidate said, “this one looks Spanish”, the girls in bikinis talking, “I might have seen it on the beach in Spain“, referring to her 2 year immersion in Spain. Another colleague then added I thought it might have been in Italy. The TC presenter then clarified that it was actually an Italian cartoon where one girl is crying and the other girl is telling her to not think about men, think about your career. Eva quickly retorted “I can think of a career she’d be good at”, prompting laughter from the class.

The opinions continued to be shared with TCs offering comments like “redneck typical American”, “I think this one [cartoon] is French because of the bare bum and smoking. After about five minutes of these sorts of responses, Jennifer, a Spanish teacher candidate interjected quite emotionally and said “I’m having an issue with this class…so quickly making stereotypes based on appearances…it’s bothering me”. She added any of these except the George Bush image could be from anywhere, so why do they have to be from one place?

Jennifer’s interjection prompted a brief somewhat uncomfortable silence then Natasha, an Italian TC, responded how it’s important to note how people saw the images differently based on their different backgrounds and exposures. She offered the example that the dress one woman was wearing in the washing machine cartoon looked “like my grandmother’s dress”. Another TC added how ironic and ridiculous stereotypes are.

At this point Savanna asked the presenting TC to wrap up and asked the class “How would you respond to a high school class with the same reaction?” One TC said
he would reveal personal experience, highlighting the diversity among the individuals. There was an awkward silence as no one else responded. Savanna thanked the TC for her presentation and pointed out the need to explain more about how to teach culture in the classroom using these types of images. The German TC then interjected, sharing a site where users can create their own cartoons. She offered the example of creating a Jewish person with a long nose. Immediately following this comment, Jennifer again exclaimed “I have issues with that … getting into religious stereotypes, then colour… it’s dangerous.”

This prompted a cacophony of comments and concerns about stereotypes in culture teaching. One TC asked “why is it OK to make fun of some aspects of culture but then religion or others are problematic?” She added the example of blacks being able to call each other niggers while whites can’t. Savanna commented that this is the whole insider vs. outsider perspective. Another TC added, it’s using language as an empowering tool, reclaiming cultural identity. Savanna then called for a final comment. Then a Spanish TC stressed that cultural and religious stereotypes exist in society and should be addressed in a forum like this where appreciation for difference can be cultivated. She added that ignoring them is not going to make them go away.

This discussion that erupted lasted only about 15-minutes but the energy created by these concerns and this discussion felt strong. Jennifer was visibly flushed during most of the discussion. In an email exchange with me afterwards, she added that she felt the activity perpetuated stereotypes, making her feel “shocked, offended and angry” at the way her colleagues were stereotyping these images based on minimal information. She was frustrated at the use of these cartoons that reinforced stereotypes rather than demystify and break them down. She admitted feeling the odd-woman out expressing this concern and felt everyone jumped on her case for commenting on this issue. She felt that her classmates “were perpetuating cultural differences as opposed to rejoicing in our similarities”. She felt she had to say what she did as stereotypes can lead to an incorrect perception of a group and can result in lasting, damaging perceptions.

Olivia, an Italian TC I spoke with after this incident, offered a slightly different perspective on the discussion. She was upset by thinking that the discussion was blown out of proportion. She could understand how Eva perceived the image of the girls on the beach to be from Spain, given her experiences (having lived in Spain for 2 years) and laughed when she found out the images were of Italian girls like her. She thought it was important to be able to laugh at oneself but could see the potential for offending some
individuals. In that respect she stressed the importance of discussing stereotypes and analyzing where they come from and why they exist. Olivia didn’t see presenting them as condoning them as possibly Jennifer did.

In spite of these two varied opinions it appeared that this heated discussion heightened sensitivity towards the issue of stereotypes and prompted thinking of how to work with them in an international language class. In our final interview, Savanna said she purposely let students talk and work out their emotions and feelings in such situations. However, after this incident, I was left wondering whether an ideal intercultural teachable moment was missed. Was this a potentially rich segue into building culture and intercultural L2 teaching strategies? Nevertheless, the discussion ended after the poignant comment by the Spanish TC who suggested that stereotypes should not be ignored and should actively be deconstructed.

**Contrastive Analysis of Gabriela and Savanna**

Table 9 contrasts demographic/experiential data between Gabriela and Savanna. This is followed by Table 10 that compares their thoughts on culture, its benefits/goals and constraints, along with the cultural content and the way they worked with this content. A discussion comparing the culture teaching content and approaches in the two institutions follows.

**Table 9**

*Gabriela and Savanna: Demographic and Experiential Contrasts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Gabriela</th>
<th>Savanna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 background</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Bilingual Neopolitan and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 teaching experience</td>
<td>12 years mostly FSL immersion, some Spanish</td>
<td>14 years, secondary school teaching, FSL and Standard Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living away experience</td>
<td>Just over two years and extensive extended travel</td>
<td>2 years in France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 living experience</td>
<td>Just over 2 years (4 summers in Mexico, 5 summers in St. Pierre/Miquelon)</td>
<td>2 - 3 months (time in Italy while living in France)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. C2 = target culture.*
Table 10

*Gabriela and Savanna: A Culture Treatment Contrastive Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Gabriela</th>
<th>Savanna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>The heart and soul of language</td>
<td>The intangible, the gut; it’s messy and needs to be lived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Benefits and Goals</td>
<td>Peacemaking potential, heightened sensitivity</td>
<td>Hook into L2 learning; builds passion for L2/C2 teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Content</td>
<td>Culture-specific, some culture-general; material, interactive and subjective dimensions; conceptual fluency; culture teaching strategies and challenges</td>
<td>Culture-specific; material, interactive and subjective dimensions; culture teaching strategies, stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Approach</td>
<td>Personalized, reflective, critical, intercultural and L2 specific</td>
<td>Personalized, reflective, mostly L2 specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Approach</td>
<td>Teacher-dominated discussion; some interactive, experiential activities</td>
<td>Teacher-facilitated discussion with elicitation, student-lead discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating Project</td>
<td>Culture bulletin board presentations</td>
<td>Culture unit plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints</td>
<td>Lack of culture teaching clarity from curriculum</td>
<td>Time, curricular constraints and culture teaching knowledge/strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. C2 = target culture.

*Discussion and Summary*

While there were quite a few similarities between Gabriela and Savanna’s culture teaching beliefs, content and approaches, there were some important differences. Both struggled with defining culture, and presented multiple dimensions of it. However, Gabriela’s work with interactive and subjective dimensions of culture tended to be more explicit than Savanna in terms of Murphy’s (1988) categorizations. While both felt it was very important in the language classroom, Gabriela consistently emphasized its centrality to language teaching as “the heart and soul” of the language teaching and learning process. Savanna on the other hand emphasized that culture must be lived and often emphasized the transformative potential and need for lived target cultural experiences.
When discussing cultural content, both teacher educators emphasized the target cultures, reinforcing the need for authentic immersion experiences and thereby reinforcing native speaker ideologies. While Gabriela regularly referred to the need to work with first cultures and explicitly addressed first culture bias in the picture walk activity, Savanna was particularly focused on emphasizing the need to build target culture fluency through immersion and living the culture and language. Some of Gabriela’s students critiqued her in the year-end focus group for eliciting cultural experiences from often only Spanish first language speakers, alienating “non-native” speaker experience. From my limited observations, neither teacher made explicit mention of the value of second language learner teacher experience in the teaching of a target culture or language.

Gabriela seemed to frame culture as the filter, the bias, as very individualized and dynamic and worked with it from this focus. Alternatively, Savanna seemed to project a more “feeling” response to culture, that it embodied us, that it’s created through experience and approached it from this more reflective, intrapersonal stance. Both teacher educators made an effort to regularly share personal anecdotes about culture, Gabriela about her hometown experiences and with Mexican cultures and Savanna about her cultural experiences in Italy and France and her personal efforts to initiate and manage a student group’s cultural immersion in France.

Gabriela often emphasized exploration with her students on Byram’s savoirs by eliciting experiences in target and home cultures. Through her work exploring conceptual fluency theory in English, German and Spanish, and her culture learning strategy teaching using the Think Literacy texts, Gabriela also worked with Byram’s (1997) interpreting/relating skills and introducing how to discover cultural information. In this manner, she emphasized the need for both teachers and learners to become interactionally competent and to learn culture learning skills (Paige et al., 2003). In addition, she occasionally challenged students and encouraged critical cultural awareness among her students, having them make explicit links from the target culture to their first culture. Gabriela’s attempt to highlight her student’s “that’s weird” comment illustrated an explicit attempt to make teachers aware of the “naive lexical hypothesis” (Hadley, 2001) where linguistic equivalence is incorrectly assumed between languages. No students brought up this event in this research, and it seemed like a very rich teachable moment, suggesting that teaching on this subject may have required additional time and support.
In general, Gabriela’s teaching tended to be more teacher-centred while Savanna’s teaching tended to be more student-centred. Savanna adopted more of an intrapersonal, reflective approach at working with culture. She did not engage with explicit cultural analysis as much as Gabriela, but created a learning environment where exploration and some target cultural analysis occurred, prompted by student experience, facilitating knowledge of Byram’s savoirs or culture-specific skills. Savanna often adopted a facilitative approach with her students, introducing a topic, eliciting reactions, feelings and sharing personal experiences with target cultures. In an interview with me she said “I think we should let students talk...let them figure it out”.

Both teachers felt constrained by institutional contexts in teaching culture. Gabriela thought culture remained unclearly defined in Ontario’s curriculum guidelines while Savanna viewed time as a major constraint on culture as she felt it required reflection. Both teacher educators recognized the wide range of topics they needed to cover in their limited 72-hour classes, restricting the amount of time they could spend on culture. Savanna also felt constrained by the conflicting needs of the multiple language groups in her classroom, noting that historically, when the course was language group-specific (i.e., Spanish teacher candidates were in a separate methodology class from Italian teacher candidates), the teacher educator devoted 2 to 3 weeks on culture teaching and learning. Savanna also admitted wanting to know more about how to best work with culture in the international language classroom, calling for more content and pedagogical content knowledge to facilitate deeper understanding of how to work with this challenging topic. I suspect that more knowledge around intercultural communicative competence would have enabled Savanna to work with the rich intercultural moments in her classes facilitating deeper awareness of how to work with culture among her teachers.

An important finding with these 2 teacher educators is the dramatic influence of beliefs, target language learning and life experience on framing teaching practice. Gabriela, sensitized to ”otherness” in her upbringing saw the role of culture teaching and learning in building dialogue, intercultural awareness and peace. Alternatively, Savanna experiencing identity issues and the transformative power of cultural immersion, recognized the need to share such potential and encourage passionate curiosity about the self and other. Both culture teaching practices were highly located in the experiences and beliefs of these teacher educators.
The objective of this chapter was to contrast and provide insight into the two teacher preparation contexts, teacher candidate profiles, highlighting the similarities and differences in the culture teaching and learning landscape of these teacher candidates. Contrastive descriptions of the 3 teacher educators involved in this research were provided to illustrate the belief systems influencing the treatment of cultural content and treatment in these teacher education programs. The next three chapters will expand on findings in this study exploring the impact of this treatment of culture on teacher candidate beliefs and visions of culture teaching in international language programs.
Chapter 6
Culture Teaching Needs and Evolving Beliefs

This chapter will begin by summarizing the culture teaching needs identified by teacher candidates at the beginning of this research. Perceived benefits and challenges of culture teaching will then be discussed and changes in these perceptions from the first to the year-end questionnaire will be outlined. I will then discuss the three questionnaire scales used to assess changes in teacher candidate beliefs about culture teaching over time and will summarize internal reliability results on these scales. Changes in teacher candidate perceptions within these three scales will then be summarized. Significant changes in culture teaching familiarity among all participants over the research period and within institutional groups will be discussed. This will be followed by an exploration of demographic and experiential factors including L2 teaching and “living away” experience which were found to influence culture teaching familiarity. This will be followed by a discussion of significant increases in culture teaching confidence among both institutional groups. The chapter will conclude with a summary of teacher candidates’ year-end definitions of culture and a discussion of these results.

Culture Teaching Knowledge Base Needs

I believe that there is one essential basis that is needed for effective culture teaching, and that is being intimately acquainted with it. One has to have lived and breathed this culture, in order to genuinely transmit it to the students.

...Nina, Italian teacher candidate from MU

As Nina’s quote illustrates, when asked in the pre questionnaire to define the skills, strategies and knowledge needed about culture to teach international language classes effectively in Ontario, cultural knowledge was the second most commonly cited topic in this pre-culture teaching questionnaire. As shown in Figure 8, responses were dominated by needs around target culture knowledge and teaching strategies.
A large number of teacher candidates felt that knowledge of the target culture(s) is needed to teach culture effectively. Donatella from TU wrote, “I need to know the culture of the language I am teaching (e.g., history, daily routines etc.).” Penelope brought up the need for knowledge of cultural diversity noting the need for knowledge about “the ranges of cultural diversity, youth/pop cultures”. This was reiterated by one other Italian TC at MU. 6 participants including Nina, all having some target culture immersion experience, emphasized that cultural immersion experience was needed to effectively teach culture. Nandita from MU expressed the need for teachers to “have authentic experience with people who speak the language as their first language.” Jennifer from MU expressed the need for teachers to have “time and dedication to investigate” the target culture.

This perceived need for target culture knowledge was only surpassed slightly by the need for culture teaching strategies, cited by almost half of all participants. Rita from MU wrote “I feel like I need to learn more about how to teach culture if I am going to maximize my potential as an effective international language teacher.” Some participants also noted an explicit need not just for culture teaching strategies but for
strategies to integrate culture into the language curriculum. Clark from TU asked, “How to teach it and incorporate it into the regular curriculum”. His colleague Janine expressed a concern that “textbooks are mostly focused on grammar”.

This request for culture teaching strategies was sometimes framed in the desire to make culture learning interesting for students. Jennifer from MU expressed the need for teachers to “make culture learning fun and interesting--through interactive means i.e mind maps, debates, designing food menus, cultural presentations, cultural investigations, through film, music, and even food.” Complementing this need to make culture learning fun was the need for teachers to “be passionate” as Nandita from MU said, in their culture teaching. This perceived need for affective engagement in culture teaching was mentioned by 3 participants overall. An interesting contrast to this need for culture teaching strategies was a comment by Eva from MU who wrote “As long as you are familiar and comfortable with the cultural element you are introducing, I don't think there are any special skills required.”

The Need to Be Culturally Sensitive

The most significant difference in perceived knowledge base needs around culture teaching between these two groups was in the area of cultural sensitivity that was expressed almost uniquely by TU participants. 5 TU participants vs. only one MU participant expressed the need to learn about making culture teaching culturally sensitive and the need for teachers to be culturally aware. Chantal from TU expressed the need to know engaging culture teaching strategies and, “to be aware that I am not setting up stereotypes either”. This ability to interpret and relate cultural awareness was present in her colleague Janine’s response desiring “not to pass judgment and be able to identify the stereotypes in order to avoid transmitting them to your students”. This need reflects the third dimension of Byram’s 1997 framework of intercultural communicative competence, the savoir comprendre dimension, where individuals have the ability to develop the analytical skills of comparing, relating and interpreting cultural knowledge and behaviour and the ability to identify ethnocentric perspectives, explaining their origins.

Complementing this focus on cultural interpretive strategies, a number of participants expressed the need for this intercultural awareness among language teachers, the key dimension in Byram’s model, savoir être, or the development of intercultural attitudes. Petra, the only participant from MU expressing this intercultural
approach, wrote that teachers should know “how to teach culture from a social justice point of view and in a safe, diverse and equitable context; how to view ‘Canadian’ culture in the same way.” From TU, Chyo added the need for teachers who are “sensitive to other cultures and their beliefs”. Her colleague, Katelynn expressed the need for teachers “to know the cultural dynamics that exist in your school, classroom, city”.

This angle on the knowledge base needed by the language teacher, more widely expressed among TU participants, reflects more of an intercultural, rather than a target culture-specific, approach to language teaching. This type of knowledge base reflects Byram’s tenants of curiosity, openness and a readiness to undertake a critical, self-reflective approach to culture teaching that may help in suspending judgment over other cultures. It is interesting to note that this intercultural knowledge base focus was expressed almost exclusively among a third of TU participants, suggesting perhaps an influencing force in the TU teacher preparation context. This expressed need to be culturally sensitive contrasted with over half of the MU participants (9/16) expressing a need for culture teaching strategies vs. just under a third (4/14) of TU participants.

**Beliefs about the Benefits of Culture Teaching**

When grouped into categories, TC’s perceived culture teaching benefits fell into four categories: (a) enhancing culture and/or language teaching, (b) motivating learners, (c) changing perspectives or (d) other varied reasons including preparing learners for travel or employment. Figure 9 illustrates the number of participants who raised each of these specific benefits in the pre and year-end questionnaires within each institutional group. Note that many times one individual participant expressed more than one perceived benefit, so the number of participants in total do not equal the number of benefits expressed.
When institutional groups were merged, the most commonly cited benefits were often related to the role of culture teaching to enhance language learning. Within this theme, a number of TCs cited the inherent interconnection with language and culture, the fact that culture teaching allows for “a deeper understanding of the language and its origin” (Janine, from TU). Petra from MU wrote that culture teaching “makes the language more meaningful and provides a context in which to use the language”. This sense of making the language more authentic was a theme that emerged in discussed benefits among MU participants in the year-end focus group. For example, Maria said:

It is important to include culture teaching to effectively engage students and in order to make language classes authentic. I feel that the cultural element gives students a means of involving themselves in an aspect of the language outside of the classroom.

In this case Maria noted the relationship between authenticity and engagement of culture teaching and its potential to help learners transfer their language learning outside of the class. This sense of culture as a motivating force was the dominant benefit cited during the focus group interviews at both institutions. The majority of TCs reporting motivation as a culture teaching benefit cited the ability of culture to engage learners, to complement the dryness of grammar and to “nurture a love for the culture”
(Ross, from MU). John, a Spanish TC at Turner University reiterated this thought in the focus group saying “Teaching culture breaks up the monotony of teaching grammar and vocabulary.” Janine, a Spanish TC at TU noted that “I learned that culture teaching can be a great hook to have students continue studying the language.”

In addition to motivation, a number of TCs cited the perspective changing nature of learning about another culture as a benefit. Comments included culture teaching “gets rid of stereotypes that may exist” (Katelyn, from TU) and “one sees the world from another perspective....one becomes a better informed citizen of the world” (Nandita, from MU).

**Emerging perspective changing benefits.**

In terms of how participant views of culture teaching benefits changed over their preparation program, there are a few interesting observations to note from Figure 9. The number of participants viewing culture teaching as motivational remained relatively consistent through the two time periods (TU: 3/13 to 4/13; MU: 7/16 to 6/16). However, in both institutions, by the end of the teacher preparation program, the number of teacher candidates seeing culture teaching as perspective changing more than doubled as illustrated in Figure 9.

This doubling of perspective changing benefits was mirrored in both institutions (TU: 3/13 to 7/13; MU: 4/16 to 8/16). The emergence of perspective changing benefits corresponded to a reduction in the number of TCs who saw culture teaching as a means to enhance language teaching (TU: 10/13 to 6/14; MU: 12/16 to 9/16).

5 TCs in TU and 6 TCs in MU reported new perspective changing benefits of culture teaching in the year-end questionnaire. These participants had focused on language enhancing or motivational benefits or the ability of cultural learning to prepare students for international travel in the pre-culture teaching questionnaire. Examples illustrating this perspective broadening awareness include Anja, a German teacher candidate at TU, who initially reported culture teaching benefits as motivational and tied to linguistics: “Have more students interested in learning the target language. I am a firm believer that language and culture are intrinsically linked.” In the year-end survey, Anja’s perceptions of the benefits of culture teaching were noted as: “Benefits of culture teaching: Giving students a broader perspective on not only their lives but the lives of others in different cultures; keeping students open-minded.”
In a similar fashion, Jennifer at MU initially reported the inherent connection between culture and language teaching as the benefit of culture teaching. “You learn culture through language and vice versa. They are integral, it doesn’t happen in a vacuum.” In the year-end questionnaire, Jennifer’s views had broadened considerably.

It [culture] is a way of trying to understand a way of life, or why people behave a certain way. It explains the commonalities amongst people. The benefits of teaching culture in international languages: it can motivate students, it can engage students, it creates empathy and understanding.

It is important to note that not all TCs ended up seeing more of the perspective changing benefits of culture at the end of their program. There were at least 2 teacher candidates (one in both location) that moved from seeing culture as perspective changing to seeing culture as a tool to enhance motivation and/or language learning. Nevertheless, the trend that over one third of TCs in both locations (TU: 5/13; MU: 6/16) began seeing culture teaching as perspective changing as opposed to simply language-enhancing appears to suggest a somewhat transformative impact of their pre-service experience among some of the teacher candidates.

**The Perceived Challenges of Culture Teaching**

Participant responses expressing concerns about culture teaching fell largely into two broad categories: issues related to culture teaching output (how culture is presented or worked with by the teacher), and issues related to student reaction. Concerns related to culture teaching output included concerns about portraying culture accurately, being an authentic representative of the target culture, how to effectively teach culture and integrate it into language teaching and concerns over not being adequately prepared to teach culture. Issues related to student reaction included the challenge of encouraging learners to accept cultural differences, concerns about offending students, working with controversial cultural histories (i.e., Nazism in German culture teaching) and issues related to the creation or perpetuation of stereotypes.

Figures 10 contrasts concerns around culture teaching output around student reaction expressed by teacher candidates in both institutional groups in the pre and year-end questionnaires.
As illustrated, issues related to culture teaching output dominated participant responses in both the pre and year-end questionnaires, particularly among MU participants where all participants included at least one related comment in the pre questionnaire. These output-related concerns expressed among all participants were often based on concern over effective culture teaching methods and being able to accurately portray the breadth of culture. For example, in the year-end questionnaire, Natasha from MU wrote “What’s the most effective way of teaching culture?” In the same questionnaire, her colleague, Maria expressed concern about integrating culture into language curriculum, “Being able to fit in a variety of culture teaching in the lesson without having it interfere with ministry expectations”. Interconnected with this worry about effective culture teaching methods, was the concern expressed by several participants about finding adequate culture teaching resources. Janine from TU in the year-end questionnaire wrote “finding resources that I will need in order to properly teach culture is a large concern”.

Participants from all language backgrounds from both institutions expressed a concern about the daunting breadth of culture, and representing it accurately and authentically as a non-native culture teacher. Jennifer, a Spanish TC from MU stated in the year-end questionnaire that “there are 21 cultural histories out there (in terms of Spanish and cultural backgrounds) each country’s culture is uniquely different and
special”. Clark, a Spanish TC from TU echoed this concern in the pre questionnaire: “not teaching it broad enough (i.e. representing most Spanish speaking cultures)”.

Layered onto this issue was a concern about staying updated with the continually changing nature of culture and being an authentic representative of the target culture. Eva from MU, stated her concern about “not being seen as an authentic source since I am not a native speaker of neither French nor Spanish”. Ross, another MU non-native Italian TC expanded on this, writing: “since ... the target cultures are not my native culture, I have occasional uncertainties about the depth of my knowledge of certain cultural elements as well as the possible ignorance of other cultural elements entirely”. Anita, a German TC from TU consistently expressed across both questionnaires a unique concern about not being German, “I’m born and raised Canadian and NOT 100% German, although I’ve lived there for 3 years”.

Adding to these teaching-related concerns was worry about not being adequately familiar with the target culture. Many respondents felt they needed to know the culture before teaching it. Marco from MU wrote in the year-end questionnaire, “I feel as if I do not know enough about the culture to teach it.” Petra from MU expressed a year-end concern about her “lack of experience, lack of knowledge, lack of cultural sensitivity” and her colleague Jordan added “I am not exposed enough to the culture of the target language. I would need to better prepare myself through reading and researching.”

This concern about culture teaching familiarity tied into worries about the necessary time required to learn about cultural content and the lack of resources available for culture teaching in L2 classes. In a written comment in her focus group interview, Jordan wrote “teachers need to educate or inform themselves on culture, this would require a lot of time, making the job very demanding.” Donatella noted “the books are so old and you have to put a lot of effort into research.”

The second category of concerns related to student reaction to culture teaching. Figures 11 contrasts teacher candidates’ perceptions of these concerns.
Figure 11. Concerns over student reactions including acceptance of differences and stereotypes.

As illustrated, concerns over student reaction were far less dominant in MU participant responses and was marked by less dramatic changes over time among both groups. These concerns included worry over student ability to accept cultural difference and concerns about the creation and perpetuation of cultural stereotypes. Chyo, a Salvadorian-Canadian TU Spanish teaching participant remarked on her concern about student inability to accept cultural difference.

The biggest concerns I have about cultural teaching is the reaction that one might get when introducing a culture. The information being presented [may] have more of a shock value than an educational aspect. The teaching of a culture might turn some people away because of the difference to their own culture.

Nina, an Italian TC from MU stated similar concerns “Some students' culture and value systems may be drastically different from those of Italian culture.” In the TU focus group interview, Anja and Donatella expressed concern about working with controversial issues in the history of target cultures in both German and Hispanic contexts. Anja, a German teacher candidate, expressing a concern about Germany’s Nazi past asked “how do you work with that because for a lot of people it’s still ... there’s still
that stigma associated with it.” Interconnected with this concern about student reaction to culture teaching was a gradually increasing concern over the creation and/or perpetuation of cultural stereotypes. Janine, a Spanish TC from TU in the pre questionnaire expressed a concern of “providing students with a stereotypical image of the culture”. An Italian teacher at MU stated a similar concern about “making generalizations or reasserting stereotypes”.

Contrasting perceptions of culture teaching challenges.

The concern about cultural unfamiliarity and the time required to “know culture” increased dramatically among MU participants over the time period of this research from one to 7 participants. While TU participants showed a relatively consistent division of concerns across time points between issues related to culture teaching presentation and student reaction, MU participant concerns exhibited more dramatic changes. These changing perceptions among MU participants are illustrated in Figure 12.

![Figure 12. Changes in Monfort University participants' culture teaching concerns.](image-url)
Almost half of MU TCs (7/16) included the concern about target culture unfamiliarity in their year-end questionnaire responses versus only one participant at the beginning of the year. In terms of other changes in these culture teaching related concerns over the year, MU participants demonstrated a dramatic decrease in concern over culture teaching methods that dominated their responses in the pre-culture teaching questionnaire (10/16 to 1/16). This corresponded to a slight increase in concern over stereotypes reflected in the questionnaire responses (1/16 to 4/16). Olivia, an Italian TC at MU changed her focus from a concern about effective culture teaching methods in the pre questionnaire to a concern about stereotypes but adopting a proactive recognition of the need to work with them in language classes.

My concerns have always been the stereotypes that exist in each culture ... although I do not condone promoting these stereotypes, I do believe in making others aware of them. Why? Because knowing their origins may perhaps allow students to develop a better understanding of the reason behind [them] and how they were formed!

While this increasing concern over stereotypes was noted in the questionnaire data it was more widely apparent in the MU focus group interview, where the issue was raised by 5 out of the 7 participants. For example, Jennifer, a Spanish TC at Monfort U stated how her concerns about culture teaching unfamiliarity were linked to perpetuating bias or “giving the wrong impression” among her students.

I know maybe the culture of two or 3 countries but if I’m going to be teaching right I have to know and learn about those countries right so it involves a lot of study by speaking to a lot of people from those countries to learn like ‘cause you don’t want to give the wrong impression or stereotype or bias.

In the focus group interview, Eva, the Spanish TC who made one of the cultural statements criticized by Jennifer in the heated stereotype classroom discussion outlined in Chapter 5, said, “

One thing that I learned that I wasn’t expecting was that it is a huge responsibility involved in teaching culture because it can be very risky and you really have to know what you’re talking about because that whole...that whole class we had about stereotypes.

In terms of concern about student reactions to culture teaching, TU participants showed much more consistent concerns over this research period (9/13 to 8/13). One
notable change among TU participants was the slight increase in concern over culture teaching methods from one individual in the pre-culture teaching questionnaire to four in the year-end questionnaire.

Changes in Culture Teaching Familiarity, Objectives and Confidence

In order to assess changes in teacher candidate culture teaching beliefs over these programs, a repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted on TC participants’ responses on each of the 3 repeated scales in the questionnaires. The within-subjects factors were the dependent variables being the mean of each scale response and time with three levels (the three questionnaire timepoints). The time main effect and the scale means X time interaction effect were tested using the multivariate criterion of Wilks lambda (Λ). If significant results were found pairwise comparison tests were conducted to define specific points of significant change. When examining the entire teacher candidate population, significant time effects (i.e., significant changes over time with mean responses to variables within a scale) were found on the responses to the culture teaching familiarity scale and the culture teaching confidence scale.

No significant time effects were found with responses to how teachers prioritized culture teaching objectives which are discussed in Chapter 7 as they relate more to culture teaching visions. A number of influencing factors including institutional affiliation, previous teaching and living away experience were found to significantly influence teacher responses on some of these scales. Results from each scale are discussed below.

Changes in Culture Teaching Familiarity

In terms of changes in culture teaching familiarity, the results for the repeated measures ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks’ Λ = .74, F(2,26) = 4.64, p < .05, multivariate $\eta^2 = .26$ as illustrated in Figure 13, indicating that a significant drop is happening over time with teacher candidate responses. On this scale, four is very familiar while one represents not familiar at all.
Institutional changes in perceived culture teaching familiarity

Follow-up paired t-tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means and to define any significant differences among the institutional group perceptions. The results indicated no significant changes among the Monfort University group’s reported familiarity in culture teaching across the three time points. Results did however show a significant drop in means from the TU participants’ pre-culture teaching questionnaire responses ($M = 3.15$, $SD = .44$) to their post-culture teaching responses ($M = 3.00$, $SD = .48$), $t(13), p < .05$.

When asked about this drop in culture teaching familiarity in her individual questionnaire responses, Anja at TU, quite poignantly summed up this phenomenon by saying, “It’s sort of like that progression when you become a teacher, you’re all excited and then it’s like ....the downer”. An important observation here is that teacher candidates’ familiarity towards culture teaching decreased in both groups once explicit lessons began, and dropped more dramatically among the Turner University group.

Figure 13. Institutional changes in perceived culture teaching familiarity.
Relationships Between Demographic Factors, Culture Teaching Familiarity and Other Scale Responses

To explore relationships between participant life experience, culture teaching familiarity and other scale responses, I conducted a series of correlation analyses to highlight any significant relationships. Given that my dataset was relatively small, that response variables were often the means of ordinal not continuous data, and that normality assumptions were sometimes not met, I decided to use both parametric and non-parametric analyses to explore this data. Decisions on which results to include were based on the magnitude and significance of the result, on whether both parametric and nonparametric analyses supported the same finding and whether complementary quantitative or qualitative data could be found to support such findings.

Correlation coefficients were computed among participant predictor variables including data defining institutional, target language, target culture affiliations, age, gender, target language teachable, educational level along with variables quantifying experience in L2 teaching, overseas living, target culture living and cultural exposure (calculated by the means of responses in the post questionnaire assessing exposure to cultural difference in various life situations - See question 1 in Appendix J). These predictor variables were correlated with repeated response variables including culture teaching familiarity, culture teaching objectives, culture teaching beliefs, reported comfort in culture teaching and envisioned frequency of culture teaching. Once a significant correlation coefficient was found, data was explored visually using scatterplots and descriptive statistical analysis to define the specific relationship between the related variables. Further analyses were conducted to define the relationships between potential predictor and response variables.

Relationships Between Teacher Experience and Culture Teaching Familiarity

Among the correlation coefficients computed among participant demographic, experiential and response variable data, the strongest and most consistent correlation coefficients were found among participant previous L2 teaching experience, “living away” experience (away from their country of origin) and perceptions of culture teaching familiarity. Pearson correlation coefficients are presented in Table 11, showing that three of the six correlations were statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level. It is interesting to note that time spent in the target culture did not show a significant correlation with aspects of culture teaching familiarity.
Table 11

*Correlations Among Teacher Candidate Life Experiences and Culture Teaching Familiarity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT Familiarity scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Teaching time</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time living outside one’s country of origin</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target culture living experience</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.** *p < .01, * *p < .05.*

An exploration of these significant correlations suggested an understandable trend toward increasing culture teaching familiarity with increased language teaching experience and experience living away from one’s home country that in many cases included time in the target cultures. To determine whether teaching experience or time living in other countries played a factor in culture teaching familiarity response rates, participants were divided into three groups in each of these demographic categories. For example, in terms of previous teaching experience, participants were divided into three groups: those with no experience (n = 11), those with some teaching experience but less than or equal to the median of 24 months (n = 10) and those with more than 24 months (n = 8).

**L2 Teaching Experience and Culture Teaching Familiarity**

In order to examine the impact of L2 teaching experience on culture teaching familiarity, a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with the factor being the three surveyed time points and the dependent variable being the culture teaching familiarity response means. The results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks’ Λ = .75, \( F(2,25) = 4.22, p < .05 \), multivariate \( \eta^2 = .25 \), with a strong effect size. The difference in culture teaching familiarity between the three groups with varying teaching experience is illustrated in Figure 14.
No significant difference was found in degree of change over time in culture teaching familiarity responses based on previous L2 teaching experience. However, a significant between-subjects effect was found, \( F(2,25) = 4.08, \ p < .05 \), multivariate \( \eta^2 = .24 \), indicating a difference between means among the teaching experience groups, regardless of time.

Follow-up analyses of variances on the dependent variables were then conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means. To control for Type 1 error, a Bonferroni method was adopted, indicating a significant difference in the means \( (p < .05) \) between participants with more than 24 months L2 teaching experience and those with no teaching experience in both the pre and delayed post questionnaires (see Table 12). The lower means represents less perceived culture teaching familiarity. It seems no surprise that participants with the greatest teaching experience demonstrated more culture teaching familiarity than those with no teaching experience.

*Figure 14. Culture teaching familiarity and L2 teaching experience.*
Table 12

Teaching Experience and Culture Teaching Familiarity Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Teaching experience group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>No experience</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 24 mos.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>No experience</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 24 mos.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Living Away Experience and Culture Teaching Familiarity

Similar differences were found with those teacher candidates with most living away experience and higher degrees of culture teaching familiarity as illustrated in Figure 15.
Participants were divided again into three groups: those with no experience living elsewhere, those with some experience living away for up to and including the median of 48 months and those living elsewhere for more than 48 months. Again results from an ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks’ $\Lambda = .75$, $F(2,25) = 4.22$, $p < .05$ multivariate $\eta^2 = .25$ with a strong effect size. Follow up tests also indicated a significant difference in mean responses between groups, indicating a significance using a Bonferroni method of $p < .01$ between those with no living away experience and those over 48 months between the pre and post questionnaire responses.

**Changes in Culture Teaching Confidence**

In order to determine any significant changes in participants’ confidence towards culture teaching over the research period, a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted on participant responses to variables in the culture teaching confidence scale repeated in the three questionnaires. This repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with the factor being time and the dependent variables being the means of responses to the seven...
variables in the culture teaching confidence scale. The results for the ANOVA indicated a significant time effect, Wilks’ Λ = .76, F(2,26) = 4.09, p < .05, multivariate η² = .24, with a strong effect size. As seen in Figure 16, both institutional groups demonstrated increased confidence in culture teaching over the program period. On this scale, four signifies the greatest confidence.

![Graph showing changes in culture teaching confidence over time for three groups (Turner University, Monfort University, Average).](image)

**Figure 16. Changes in culture teaching confidence.**

Follow up tests did not reveal any significant differences between the two institutional groups. There were no significant correlational analyses between culture teaching confidence responses and demographic factors analyzed.

*Year-End Definitions of Culture*

In the year-end questionnaire, all but 1 of the 29 responses described culture as multifaceted, consisting of multiple, interrelated concepts. Many noted the multifaceted nature of culture, describing it as “a cocktail of”, “ensemble of”, how culture “permeates all aspects of life” and “encompasses many things”. Individual responses were often characterized by lists of what culture is. These lists consisted of between one and eleven connected constructs or things, an average of almost five items per participant. For
example Jennifer from MU, exemplified this multifaceted understanding of culture writing: “Culture is: history, traditions, music, food, customs, a way of viewing the world, a way of thinking, a way of explaining behaviour.” Indicating the inherent complexity of culture, many participants noted the breadth of culture and the challenge to define it. For example Olivia begins her response with “Huge question. Tough.” Eva wrote “culture is almost too broad to define”.

In order to understand how participants see culture and would potentially frame culture in their language classes, concepts in each definition were labelled either product (the material dimension of culture), meaning (the subjective or values that shape the interactive dimensions of culture), or both product-meaning focused. Based on participant’s emphasis in the definition, definitions were then defined as having a product, meaning or mixed product-meaning orientation. For example, some participants defined culture by listing the products it was associated with. For example, Anita at TU defined culture as “music, architecture, art, dialects, food, literature, films, psychology, transportation, language.” These elements consist primarily of the visible or material dimension of culture that represents the creative accomplishments of a society, things that largely can be seen and therefore readily explained and understood. Alternatively some participants focused on the deeper, more hidden aspects of culture that influence society’s thinking and interactions that reflect both Wurzel’s (2005) subjective and interactive dimensions. Lila from MU defines culture as “…an abstract concept that is based on realities and approaches.” Her colleague, Petra, defined culture as “the common lived experience of a group of people at a particular time in a particular place.” There were several definitions that I labeled both product and meaning focused as no dominant focus could be identified. For example, Anja’s definition of culture, “Culture is a way of life and includes everything from music and literature to buying tomatoes in a market or taking public transportation”, initially focuses on culture as a system of meaning and then shifts to a strong product-focus.

As can be seen in Table 13, definitions of culture took on somewhat more of product orientation among the Turner University group with almost 40% of participants defining culture by its observable products. Monfort University students on the other hand, tended to focus slightly more on defining culture as a way of life and influencing force. It is important to note that the majority of participants in both groups included the hidden, more pervasive, yet less easily taught aspects of culture in their definitions.
Table 13

Definitions of Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Product-focused</th>
<th>Meaning-focused</th>
<th>Mixed focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turner University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monfort University</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aside from the deeper vs. surface levels of culture, there were a number of themes that surfaced in participant definitions. 5 respondents emphasized identity in their definition of culture, making the link between culture and group membership. Gisele from TU wrote, “Culture is a person’s identity.” Nandita from MU added culture is “the values that we call identity.” Only 2 MU students mentioned culture as difference. Olivia from MU wrote, “Culture to me represents the differences in society, business, religion and nationality.” Again only 2 participants, one from each university, mentioned the dynamic nature of culture. John from TU defined culture as “a dynamic identity composed of people’s language, customs, traditions.”

One interesting observation was the juxtaposition of language and culture in participants’ definitions. 9 out of the 13 TU participants explicitly mentioned language and often the role of culture shaping it in their definition. 5 TU participants mentioned the influencing role of culture on language. For example, Penelope wrote “Culture is the backdrop to a language...it enriches the language and supports it. Without putting the culture of a language into perspective, one will never see the whole picture.” Her colleague, Chantal wrote that culture “deepens the breadth of language learning.” This focus on the role of culture on language was contrasted with a relative absence of discussion of language among MU participants in their culture definitions. Only 3 out of the 16 participants mentioned language, 2 of whom noted literature as a cultural product. When holistically comparing the two group’s responses, the TU group focused much more on the role of culture in language along with values and artifacts. The MU group alternatively tended to focus on culture as a broader force shaping a group’s way of life rather than the language.
Discussion and Summary

It seems clear that in both institutional contexts, teacher candidate beliefs about culture became refined and often more complex and were located in individual beliefs and experiences with culture. The declines in culture teaching familiarity and the results from the reliability tests on the culture teaching belief scale indicate that as teachers learned more about culture, it became more complex and there was more insecurity around teachers’ cultural knowledge base and ways to work with culture. In part, this reflects the truism the more we know, the less we know and may also reflect the inherent complexity in culture and the lack of clarity of how to work with it in L2 classes (Klein, 2004; Kurogi, 1998; Levy, 2007; Ting-Toomey, 1999).

The fact that previous L2 teaching and living away experience enabled some teachers with greater culture teaching familiarity and confidence is logical. Given the fact that 12 of the 29 year-end participants were raised to some degree and for some time in a target culture they will be teaching, it is not surprising that living away experience increases familiarity with the target cultures. It was surprising however that target culture immersion experience as assessed did not significantly correlate with culture teaching familiarity. This may be due to the small sample size and the bias of individual responses, like Nandita from MU who felt very familiar with all aspects of Spanish target culture and who reported 204 months of living away experience, none of which was immersion-related.

Nevertheless it is interesting to contrast the overall decreased familiarity with culture knowledge and the overall increase in culture teaching confidence that occurred in both institutions in spite of different teaching approaches and teacher educator backgrounds. It is important to note as discussed in Chapter 9, that there are substantial individual differences in both changes in teacher candidate culture teaching confidence and familiarity that do not reflect the group average. The fact that overall confidence increased and overall familiarity decreased may suggest that you can feel more confident working with culture and yet simultaneously recognize its challenging breadth.

In both institutional contexts, it seemed clear the teacher candidates were calling out throughout this study for more content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge (Richards, 2009) to increase culture teaching confidence and broaden their approach. This desire to get more culture knowledge before facing an L2 class reflects an instructivist orientation in these teachers’ pedagogical approaches, feeling they need to
know culture before teaching it. This likely arises from teaching and learning experiences in positivistic learning environments, reinforced somewhat by both Savanna but particularly Gabriela’s teacher-dominated classes using a pre-determined curriculum framed within a positivistic orientation.

While both institutional groups shared this desire for content and pedagogical content knowledge, it was interesting to see that TU participants explicitly asked for more guidance on teaching in a culturally sensitive manner. This could suggest an influence from Gabriela’s emphasis on culture and bias, but it could also result from a more inexperienced teaching group that is newer to the daunting thought of working with topics like culture and language with teenage learners. Such reported associations between changes in teacher’s beliefs and teacher educators or associates have been reported in similar teacher education research (Faez, 2007; Nettle, 1998).

Among both groups, the primary benefit of culture teaching was largely seen as its ability to enhance language teaching and to motivate learners. However the doubling of participants in both institutions seeing culture teaching as perspective changing was remarkable, given that teacher educators in both institutions worked with culture quite distinctly, framing it through their individual lenses of experience. This finding was mirrored in teacher candidates’ year-end definitions where the majority defined culture referring to its subjective layers. As a result, it appears that such limited culture teaching programs have the ability to demonstrate the power of culture learning and teaching to enable intercultural attitudes, knowledge, and some critical reflection reflecting these dimensions of Byram’s (1997) framework.

Though there was more divergence among institutional groups on perceived culture teaching challenges, teachers’ common concerns were clearly connected to their culture knowledge, and how to work with it in the L2 class. MU participants expressed more consistent concerns over culture teaching methods and then by the program’s end, these had changed or been subsumed under increased concern about their lack of cultural knowledge and about working with stereotypes. This dramatic seven-fold increase in MU teacher candidates concerns about their culture teaching unfamiliarity and a three-fold increase in concerns about cultural authenticity in the year-end questionnaire suggests a somewhat disempowering outcome in teacher preparation, where the need to feel authentically representative is reinforced.
It is likely that the stereotype discussion outlined in Chapter 5 had an impact in this, unsettling teacher candidates about their knowledge base, concerns about authenticity, which appeared as a theme in individual teacher candidate interviews reported in Chapter 9. Nevertheless, MU participants demonstrated significantly higher perceptions of culture teaching familiarity, again likely reflective of their increased L2 teaching and living away experience. MU participants’ year-end definitions of culture included deeper dimensions of culture than their counterparts at TU, again possibly due to their life experiences and MU’s teacher intake processes which prioritize sensitivity to issues around diversity and social equity in education.

The objective of this chapter was to report on changes in teacher candidate beliefs about culture, including their perceptions of culture teaching benefits and challenges. It also reported on changes in culture teaching familiarity and confidence, factors shaping these beliefs and year-end definitions of culture. The next chapter will explore findings related to teacher candidate culture teaching visions. This will be followed by Chapter 8 discussing the perceived impact of these culture teaching lessons in the curriculum/methodology teacher preparation classes of both institutions. In an effort to contrast and inform these findings based on group data, Chapter 9 will summarize the individual visions of three teacher candidates from each institution, outlining the impact of these teacher preparation programs on their beliefs and visions of culture teaching. Chapter 10 will conclude this research summarizing key findings and discussing implications from this study.
Chapter 7
Changes in Culture Teaching Visions

This chapter will summarize the changes in teacher candidate culture teaching visions. It begins by summarizing changes in participant perceptions of culture teaching objectives, elicited in each of the three timepoints. This is followed by changes in culture teaching visions defined by culture teaching topics, student learning outcomes and approaches to culture teaching. I then discuss the intercultural nature of these culture teaching visions and whether the teacher preparation course appears to facilitate intercultural integration in culture teaching visions. Changes in perceived culture teaching frequency are then discussed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the results suggesting that some culture learning opportunities may have been lost.

Culture Teaching Objectives

As stated in Chapter 6, changes were not statistically significant in how teachers rated the degree of importance of ten culture teaching objectives over the three time points in this research. These objectives covered both target culture objectives (e.g., socio-historical perspectives, communication patterns) and intercultural teaching objectives (e.g., encouraging reflection on cultural differences). Figure 17 highlights institutional and overall averages of the degree of importance perceived towards culture teaching objectives where four equals extremely important, three is very important and two somewhat important.
While these changes were not deemed statistically significant there are still some interesting observations worth noting. As can be seen by the average high degree of importance, the vast majority of teachers prioritized culture teaching objectives high in their envisioned practices. While these objectives rated by MU teacher candidates remained fairly static across timepoints, TU teacher candidates’ degree of importance waned slightly by year-end. In her year-end interview, Kitty, who demonstrated an almost full point drop in her perceived rating of importance of these culture teaching objectives, noted “I don’t want to create such a harsh effect on them...such a harsh culture shock”. While this very gradual institutional drop may be caused by a number of factors among specific teacher candidates, it may suggest a tempering effect of the teacher education program, particularly among teachers with less experience and increased caution around the delicate nature of culture. In her interview, Kitty also admitted being disillusioned by the linguistic focus of the Ontario curriculum, recognizing that she would have to focus on language or culture.

*Figure 17. Changes in culture teaching objectives.*
Factors Shaping Culture Teaching

In the pre questionnaire, teacher candidates were asked to define the degrees of influence various factors could have on shaping their culture teaching practices (see Question 4 in Part C of Appendix E). Factors proposed included curriculum, time, my target cultural experience/knowledge, student interest, student language levels and the availability of materials. TCs were asked to rate these on a scale of between 1 and 5 where 1 is no influence and 5 a strong influence. Based on responses of 4 or 5 on these scales, the most strongly influencing factors were defined in order of most influential: a teacher’s target cultural experience/knowledge (25/30 participants), student interest (23/30), time (19/30), curriculum (15/30), followed by materials (13/30) and student L2 proficiency (10/30). The dominant factors defined by teacher candidates seem to be their knowledge and experience with the target culture followed by student interest. MU participants felt stronger about both these influencing factors whereas cultural experience/knowledge was rated a strong influence in culture teaching practices by 15/16 participants vs. 10/14 of TU participants. In addition student interest was ranked an important influence by 14/16 MU participants vs. 9/14 TU participants.

Culture Teaching Topics

As can be seen from Table 14, the most commonly cited and recurring cultural topics in these culture teaching visions were music and film, occurring at least once in half of all participant visions (15/30) and often occurring together. Across all three timeframes, music was almost equally distributed among TU and MU respondents (7/13 vs. 8/16 respectively). Film on the other hand was more commonly cited among MU participants where 11 respondents included it in at least one of their culture teaching visions compared to only 4 TU participants.

Table 14
Most Commonly Cited Culture Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture topic</th>
<th>TU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE Music</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST First culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next most commonly cited topics for culture teaching were in descending order of frequency: food, literature, art, first culture, current events, ways of life, and stereotypes which was raised by 6 participants. Music, film were often paired with art and/or events in participant responses. Less common topics mentioned by 5 or fewer participants included language-related cultural topics (idioms, proverbs), history, beliefs, holidays, travel and traditions.

The vast majority of teacher candidates’ culture teaching topics in all time periods were those representing the material dimension of culture including products and artifacts. Far less common were interactive dimensions of culture, aspects directly related to L2 teaching, and cultural topics from the subjective, deeper dimension of culture that often influence communicative expression, such as beliefs and values. Aspects of subjective culture such as beliefs and values only emerged in the post and year-end questionnaires.

In the post-questionnaire, only 1 participant, Janine from TU, mentioned beliefs in her vision of culture teaching.

I would focus on the deeper issues of culture and not just on the various celebrations. I would look more at beliefs and values of the cultures and explore these aspects through the use of the target language.

In the year-end questionnaire, a total of 4 participants included beliefs and/or values as topics in their culture teaching visions. 2 were from TU and 2 were from MU indicating some minimal realization of the relevance of these deeper layers of cultural learning. Among these participants, there were no trends in terms of teaching or living away experience, as they represented both those with no teaching/living away experience and those with the most.
In this discussion of culture teaching visions, there was a relatively minor but interesting shift in culture vision topics discussed within the three time periods, the most noticeable being the emergence of the need to address cultural stereotypes and bias that emerged in the post-culture teaching questionnaire. It was in this set of responses where the topic of cultural stereotypes emerged among 2 TU participants and most dramatically among MU participants where one quarter of participants brought it up (4/16). For instance, when defining her culture teaching vision, Petra from MU wrote:

Frame cultural discussions with discussions about stereotypes, prejudice, and cultural differences. Ask the students to speak about their experiences with these things. Create an environment in which everyone is able to express their opinions and attitudes, even if they are not culturally sensitive, and speak about them as a class. Even if the students are not aware of their own preconceptions, they should feel safe to voice them so we can learn as a class that we all have bias and prejudice, and the first thing to do is become aware of it.

It is interesting to note that the 2 sole TU participants who brought up stereotypes in their post-questionnaire, both referring to it as bias, were future teachers of German. As discussed in the perceptions of culture teaching challenges in Chapter 6, Anja expressed worry that Germany’s Nazi past would negatively bias students towards the learning of German language and culture.

Another change in culture teaching topics was the emergence of a focus on students’ first cultures that was raised by 9 female participants in their culture teaching visions through the three time periods. Although the topic of home culture was brought up by 3 participants in the pre-questionnaire, the number doubled to 6 in the post-questionnaire then decreased to 2 in the year-end questionnaire. This increase was most dramatic among MU participants where the number of participants including first culture as a culture teaching topic tripled from 1 to 3 from the pre to the post-questionnaire. When analyzing the demographic backgrounds of these TCs, it appears that the majority had L2 teaching experience (6/9 or 67%), and a bigger majority, 7 out of the 9 participants (7/9 or 78%) had living away and target culture immersion experience. 4 of these 9 had more than 48 months living away experience. An interesting aside is the fact that the 2 participants not having this living away experience have similar backgrounds from MU. Jordan and Olivia are both Italian TCs with bicultural, bilingual backgrounds.
Important Aspects of Culture for Student Learning

It is interesting to compare the culture teaching topics discussed above with the most commonly cited aspects of culture that participants see as important for student learning defined in the year-end questionnaire that are listed in Table 15. From this list, again, it is evident that the material cultural dimension represented by daily life, customs and history were foremost in participants’ minds, but overlapping somewhat with interactive and deeper cultural dimensions. It is quite apparent that aspects of deep culture including beliefs/values emerged as quite important, particularly among TU participants, where almost half referred to these factors as important for student cultural learning.

Table 15
Most Commonly Cited Cultural Topics for Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture topic</th>
<th>TU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily life / customs</td>
<td>9 (69%)</td>
<td>7 (44%)</td>
<td>16 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
<td>11 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs / values</td>
<td>6 (46%)</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When contrasting the culture teaching topics, approaches or demographic background of participants indicating the above listed topics there were few correlations that I could define. The majority of participants (8/10) including beliefs in their priorities for student cultural learning also included cultural customs. In addition, 4 of these 10 participants indicated the need to teach home culture in their culture teaching vision. There were no strong correlations between participants identifying a focus on stereotypes and those listing beliefs/values in their culture teaching visions across the three questionnaires.
There was however an interesting observation on the recurrence of beliefs to note. Both TU participants mentioning beliefs or values in their year-end culture teaching visions also repeated it in student learning topics. Conversely, there was no reiteration of beliefs/values in student learning topics among the 2 MU participants who included these in their culture teaching visions. Similarly, the 4 MU participants identifying these deeper cultural topics as important student learning did not mention it in their repeated visions. While the same number of 6 participants in each institution eventually mentioned beliefs/values in either their culture teaching vision or as an important learning topic, the increased depth and explicitness of occurrence of beliefs/values in TU participant responses may suggest that an increased awareness was raised of the relevance of these deeper layers of culture in the TU teacher preparation program.

Other less commonly cited topics listed by 5 or fewer participant responses outlining important cultural topics for student learning included youth/pop culture, family, religion and language-related culture such as idioms and the evolution of the target language. When including youth-related culture in their important cultural topics, a few participants noted the motivational aspect of culture related to youth. Jordan from MU, wrote “Students would be interested in knowing what students of the same age in a different country are like.” Donatella from TU reiterated this view noting, “Once the students know more about children their own age and their way of life, then they will have the opportunity to better relate to the specific language.”

Topics that were brought up in culture teaching visions but not as important cultural topics for students included students’ home culture and stereotypes that may promote a more critical, comparative and reflective approach toward the teaching of culture. While language-related topics were brought up by 4 individuals, 2 in each institution, they focused on teaching idiomatic expressions, or the history of the language, not communication style differences. Nandita from MU was the only participant noting the relevance of nonverbal communication and Penelope from TU mentioned the impact of culture on language which could refer to communication styles and beyond.

Culture Teaching Input and Approaches

In addition to culture teaching topics, participants sometimes mentioned a cultural teaching approach in their culture teaching visions that included at times,
sources of cultural input and less often a methodology. Figure 18 illustrates the most commonly cited culture teaching approaches among all teacher candidate participants which was lead by presenting varied target culture input.

![Bar chart showing the most commonly cited culture teaching approaches.](image)

**Figure 18. Most commonly cited culture teaching approaches.**

These approaches ranged from providing students with varied, often authentic cultural input or personalized examples of culture, as presented by guest speakers. At times, they also included methodologies that encouraged reflection on notions of bias, project-based work or local and international cultural immersion. The most commonly cited approaches were to offer a variety of cultural input. Participants often included a range of cultural input in their visions that included newspapers, film, visuals, literature and Internet resources among others. Nina from MU for example wrote, “I would use film, art, literature and media, ads and popular shows to teach culture.” 5 MU participants emphasized the need to offer authentic varied cultural input. For example, Marco wrote in the year-end questionnaire: “I feel I would incorporate authentic materials in language learning; using things like grocery store flyers, menus, bus schedules and small newspaper articles to show how the target language can be used for everyday situations.”
Table 16 provides a more thorough breakdown of institutional differences over the research period in teachers’ perceptions of culture teaching approaches.

### Table 16

**Most Commonly Cited Culture Teaching Approaches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture teaching approach</th>
<th>Turner U.</th>
<th>Monfort U.</th>
<th>Total parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>YE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied cultural input</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective approaches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based approaches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural immersion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of approaches given</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Parts = participants; YE = year-end.*

As shown in Table 16, the focus on varied cultural input was greatest among MU participants of whom 14 out of 16 (88%) included this at some point in their culture teaching visions. This is contrasted with only 5 of the 14 (36%) of TU participants expressing varied cultural input in their visions. The inclusion of varied input remained fairly consistent among both institutional groups in the pre and year-end questionnaires but declined in the post-questionnaire. It is also interesting to see the number of approaches increase in both institutional groups over time. TU participants showed an almost doubling in approaches offered at year-end while the MU group showed some increase in defining approaches in the post and year-end vision responses. While the approaches were often vaguely defined, this finding may suggest that these teacher preparation programs helped fuel thinking about culture teaching approaches.

Among MU participants, the post-questionnaire culture teaching visions were dominated by a focus that emerged on reflective culture teaching, likely prompted by the discussion on stereotypes that emerged in the culture teaching lessons. This reflective teaching focus prevalent in half of the MU post-questionnaire culture teaching visions, often included working with stereotypes, bias. These visions often encouraged comparative approaches incorporating student reflection on the commonalities and differences between the target and home cultures. For example, Nandita outlined her
comparative, reflective approach in the post-questionnaire that reflected an exploratory and observational approach.

Schools are a part of communities and community members are also educators. I would bring people into my class. I think it is important to offer people and their experiences to students, allowing them to arrive at their own conclusions through exploration and observation instead of imposing your ideas on them. Of course, you will also speak to them about your experiences and have each of them share their experiences as well. Demonstrating and teaching empathy, sensitivity and interest is an effective way to encourage critical thinking.

In her year-end survey, at the end of her culture teaching vision citing cultural immersion opportunities, Lila emphasized a reflective, intercultural approach “More important I will help the students to discover and to explore their own culture.” Bianca reiterated this reflective approach, emphasizing the need to actively engage stereotypes. “Being open about all stereotypes and acknowledging them - because ignoring is promoting. The students need to know that everyone is different even though we seem the same.” Addressing the in-class stereotypes discussion more dogmatically, Rita wrote, “I would use the stereotyping activity to model what NOT to say about other cultures (example of what a typical Frenchman is like).”

A number of other approaches in participant culture teaching visions may have been influenced by experiences in their teacher preparation programs. By the year-end questionnaire, TU participants seemed to favour project-based approaches, potentially reflecting their exposure to collaborative project-based research on cultural topics in their program. In her year-end culture teaching vision, Chyo stated “Students would spend 1-2 weeks researching a Spanish speaking country and presenting as much info as possible to the class.” In her vision, Anja included independent study projects “allowing the students to pick a topic they choose - they will likely get more out of it!”

By the year-end questionnaire, a significant number of MU participants (6/16 or 38%) also demonstrated a preference to include target culture immersion opportunities in their culture teaching visions. These ranged from field trips to local restaurants or movies or international exchange trips. Lila wrote “I would organize field trips to community centres, restaurants, associations, cultural newspapers etc.” In her year-end vision, Lisa D. added “doing student exchanges/trips to a country in which the target language is spoken”. Again, there didn’t seem to be any apparent correlation between participant backgrounds experiencing cultural immersion and the inclusion of this
approach in their visions. Of the 6 MU participants including immersion approaches in their vision, 4 had experienced target culture immersion while 2 had not. Both TU participants including immersion in their visions had not reported experience any target cultural immersion of living away experiences. The occurrence of this approach in the year-end questionnaires among MU participants may reflect a general awareness of the benefits of cultural immersion in language/culture learning or the broader language-and-culture learning experiences of this group, but given its predominance among MU participants (and relative absence among TU responses) and its dominance in the year-end responses, it may reflect an influence of Savanna’s emphasis on immersion experiences in the MU teacher preparation program.

Lost Opportunities?

An interesting phenomenon arose when analyzing the changes in teacher candidate topics and approaches towards culture teaching. As illustrated in Figure 19, immediately after the culture teaching lessons in both institutional settings but most notably among Monfort U teacher candidates, a dramatic change in culture teaching topics and approaches appeared. There was a dramatic spike in interest about adopting reflective culture teaching approaches, discussing both the first and target cultures, and working with stereotypes, likely prompted by classroom discussion. For example in the post questionnaire, 4 MU participants reported an interest in discussing stereotypes vs. 2 at TU and 8 MU TCs reported an interest in using reflective approaches vs. 2 at TU.
Unfortunately, this new interest dropped off almost as dramatically as it arose as culture teaching topics and approaches in year-end questionnaire responses returned to almost what they were before the culture teaching lessons began. For example, the most widely cited culture teaching topics among evolved from music and film in the pre questionnaire to working with first cultures and stereotypes in the post questionnaire and then returned back to music and film in the year-end questionnaire. In terms of culture teaching approaches, the most widely cited approach evolved from offering varied cultural input in the pre questionnaire to reflective approaches in the post questionnaire back to varied cultural input in the year-end questionnaire. It appears that this change in thinking did not stick among teacher candidates.

**Culture Teaching Frequency**

As can be seen in Figure 20, TU participants demonstrated the most changes in envisioned culture teaching frequency. Among the TU participants, all 5 originally predicting the occasional teaching of culture ultimately envisioned teaching culture “often” in the year-end questionnaire. Of these 5 participants, 4 had no previous
teaching experience. No similar correlations could be found with first language background, experience living away or immersion time in the target culture. It is important to note that 1 TU participant declined in her envisioned culture teaching frequency, dropping from often to occasionally in the final survey.

![Figure 20. Changes in envisioned culture teaching frequency.](image)

While seeming quite stagnant, Monfort University teacher candidates also showed some interesting changes. Of the 6 participants indicating that they would teach culture in every class in the pre-questionnaire, 5 were from the group of 7 MU participants indicating the most L2 teaching experience. Of these 5 experienced teachers indicating a regular culture teaching frequency, 2 did report a decline in the year-end questionnaire, indicating that they would only teach it often. Contributing to this possible connection with teaching experience and envisioned culture teaching frequency, the MU participant predicting the occasional teaching of culture, the lowest among MU participants, also reported the lowest amount of teaching experience among those with experience in the MU group. As was the case with the TU participants, there
were no other observable correlations between MU participant’s predicted culture teaching frequency and L1 or experience living away or in the target culture.

*Culminating Visions*

As stated in Chapter 4, I had limited access to teacher candidates’ culminating projects so can only present a limited and partial analysis of these projects. In order to present a relatively equitable comparison between both institutional groups, I have listed the topics focused on in these culminating projects and highlighted more details on one project that I had the most access to from each institution.

For their final assignment, TU teacher candidates prepared culture bulletin boards which were designed to present a cultural topic and a few lessons/activities designed for international language learning students to learn about this topic. Topics of these culture bulletin boards included La Música Cubana, Las Posadas Celebration, La Festival de San Fermín, El 5 de Mayo, Antoni Gaudí, respectively focusing on Cuban music, the trials and tribulations of Mary and Joseph celebrated around Christmas in Spanish-speaking regions of the Americas, the running of the bulls in Pamplona Mexico, the Mexican celebration of the May 5th victory over the French invaders in Puebla, Mexico and the well-known Catalan architect. Two examples of these culture bulletin boards are shown in Figure 21.

The presentation that I attended on Música Cubana in Class 5 began with an overview of the geography, demographic information on Cuba, its history, politics and Cuban life, noting social security, healthcare, religion and July 26th, Independence Day. This evolved into a discussion of Cuban music, including a suggestion of how teachers could work with students on having them name and discuss Cuban musical instruments. They then presented the emergence of salsa, referring to films “La Buena Vista Social Club” and “The Cantante”, the story of Hector Lavoe, the Puerto Rican salsa singer who popularized salsa and summarized ways this topic could be discussed in a Spanish class investigating this topic (i.e., student presentations on salsa music and singers).
Among participating MU teacher candidates, the MU Culture Teaching Units included La Moda Italiana (Italian Fashion), La Musica - Passione Tutta Italiana (Italian Music - An Italian Passion), Pasta and Italian Culture, Salsa in Iberoamerican Culture, and Las Lenguas Desconocidas (The Unknown Languages). The assignment I managed to review most thoroughly of these culture included La Musica Italiana unit, designed for a Grade 12 Italian class. It included six lessons on music, having students in the first three lessons describe music they listen to and enjoy, using subjunctive grammatical features and highlighting a musical event or singer they like. The next three lessons presented different types of Italian music and have the students work with the lyrics, act out a lip-sync and write a biography of a famous singer or TV personality. In the passage introducing this culture unit, the TC group writes that they have chosen to highlight culture explicitly in these lessons understanding that linguistic mastery “can only occur when that student is both culturally and linguistically aware”. They add that they chose music as it would engage high school learners and feel it is a very important cultural topic, one that would help motivate learners to learn the language.
Reactions to Culture Teaching Visions

If second language education programs are going to flourish in the future, culture must be the core of assessment, curriculum, and instructional practices with language.

This section will share teacher candidate responses to the quote cited above by Lange (2003, p. 272) and three cited approaches at teaching culture, often framed through an intercultural approach. As outlined in Chapter 4, these approaches were shared in the final stages of the 2 focus group interviews with participants from both institutions.

When asked what they thought of the Dale Lange’s statement asserting that culture should be at the core of L2 teaching, TU participants often expressed that teachers should not go overboard with culture. Penelope said teachers should “strike a balance, 50% to 50%”. Clark stressed the limited time in the curriculum and Anja suggested “you’ll lose a lot of people”, emphasizing that if students come to learn a language, then that language should be the focus.

MU focus group participants were somewhat more favourable to this statement. Eva and Petra agreed with it and Petra shared her own experience learning Spanish, saying “it was like getting to know another person”. She shared the experience of learning about Spanish history, and learning about fascism that helped her develop more compassion for what was going on in the country. She added that when asked by friends why she liked learning languages, she replied because “it was getting to know how other people think...when I speak Spanish I can somehow get closer to that psychology”.

Reactions to the three culture teaching approaches outlined in the focus group interviews (see Appendix 1) were limited in both groups given the scheduling of these interviews at the end of an assignment-packed year and given the discussion of these approaches at the end of these interviews. Reactions to approach #1, Owning a Cultural Identity, were generally favourable among the MU group and 3 participants admitted they would use this activity. Maria, an Italian TC said, “it says a lot about who we are...about students...I think that’s an important part of culture.” She added the reflective value of comparisons in culture saying that we have to compare things in order to understand them. Eva noted the engagement potential, saying “people love to talk about themselves”. Natasha was the only one who expressed a concern, saying
“what if someone doesn’t want to reveal a part of themselves”. TU responses to this approach were more varied. Janine liked this approach and said “maybe you’d get a deeper understanding of your own culture but also of a new culture as well”. Anja said it may be challenging to come up with a “class” culture if we are working with multicultural learners. Donatella said that this type of activity seemed more geared towards university students than high school students, given its focus and Penelope said it may perpetuate stereotypes of student cultural identities.

MU teacher candidates had mixed reactions to culture teaching approach #2, Tandem Learning using computer-mediated approaches, saying they thought it was motivating, self-directed, “way better than textbooks”. Limitations included the potential lack of response from email partners, that it may not be ideal for introverted learners. TU teacher candidates reiterated the challenge of ensuring responsive partners, and expressed concerns about the suitability of this type of activity for high school learners and the risk of sharing personal information on the Net. 3 TU teacher candidates cited tandem learning experiences they had experienced in their L2 learning. Kitty said that it made Spanish learning authentic, connecting with her Mexican e-pal who helped her increase her linguistic proficiency and cultural knowledge about life in Mexico.

Reactions to Claire Kramsch’s Comparative Text Interpretation approach #3 were far more mixed in both groups. Nandita and Eva from MU liked the activity and said they would use it but would choose more student-centred reading topics like dating. Petra cited a concern about the weight of culture teaching, saying “yes, culture can be fun and interesting, but ... it’s what racism is all about”. She added that you need to talk about this darker side with students. Katelynn from TU said she would likely not use the activity citing the need to explain the context of the reading to the students. Clark said it shows how pervasive culture is, how “auslander” can mean different things to different people.

Discussion and Summary

The most prominent finding of this analysis of culture teaching visions is the prevalence and recurrence of the material dimension of culture in teacher candidates’ culture teaching visions. In spite of the lessons both groups received on the limitations of the 4Fs (Hadley, 2001), and approaches that risk essentializing cultures, these visions of culture teaching seem to remain strong. These findings reflect the literature examining
culture teaching in L2 practices confirming that the material dimension to working with the target culture remains dominant in L2 teaching (Bennett, 2009b; Byram et al., 1991; Byram & Risager, 1999; Castro et al., 2004; Cheng, 2007; Kurogi, 1998; Lafayette, 2003; Paige et al., 2003; Pauchulo, 2005; Ryan, 1994; Tedick & Walker, 1994). Such approaches also likely reflect the culture learning experiences of these teacher candidates as some noted directly when deconstructing how not to teach culture in both classes.

The perpetuation of this “dangerous incompleteness” of culture teaching (Hadley, 2001, p. 347) may very well result from the fact that working with cultural materials can be seen as safer and less controversial than value-laden culture (Byram & Feng, 2004; Klein, 2007; Klein, 2004; Kurogi, 1998; Lange, 1999). Such topics can be treated more linearly, more explicitly, and they can more easily be assessed and fit into the action orientated and consensus-driven communicative approaches of curricula and teaching practice (Klein, 2004; Paige et al., 2003). It is also the way that many of us L2 learners have learned about culture so it is much more familiar and potentially comfortable than an intercultural approach at culture teaching (Castro et al., 2004; Lortie, 1975; Sercu et al., 2005).

Results also found that the dominant culture teaching approach when mentioned tended to be presenting a variety of cultural input, often from the material dimension. There appeared to be a focus on authentic cultural input, seeing culture as a way to bring the language to life in communicative language classes, potentially highlighting the multilayered nature of culture but reinforcing the linguistic supremacy of L2 communicative teaching practices (Pauchulo, 2005; Castro et al., 2004). Given participants’ high ranking of target culture knowledge and experience shaping culture teaching practice, these new teachers’ visions of culture teaching appear to be predisposed to target culture teaching using a more instructivist approach, likely reflecting the positivistic paradigms they’ve experienced in their own language-and-culture learning. The challenges with such focus on objective, culture-specific learning, include the potential for perpetuating stereotypes and preventing the development of intercultural learning skills to enhance personal and intellectual growth (Hadley, 2001; Nault, 2006). In addition, limiting culture teaching to only target culture aspects can in many ways essentialize and exoticize the other if learners are not encouraged to reflect on their own cultural selves (Guest, 2000). It also perpetuates an idealized version of the native speaker, not attending to and validating hybrid cultural identities.
Nevertheless, these findings are multidimensional. There is some movement away from uniquely material layers of culture-specific content and teacher-centred approaches. There were scatterings of teaching approaches that included inviting guest lecturers from target culture communities, encouraging students to compare aspects of the target culture to their home cultures, discussing ways of life, and sharing experiences with the target culture. In addition it is important to note that the number of culture teaching approaches increased in participants at both institutions over time. This suggests that teachers may have been prompted in their thinking about culture teaching approaches through discussion and reflection in these programs. Interestingly, MU participants’ discussion of approaches increased in the post and year-end responses while TU approaches increased quite dramatically in the year-end response.

Previous L2 teaching experience again seemed to predispose teacher candidates to more holistic, reflective culture teaching beliefs and visions that worked with the first culture and worked with culture more frequently. The spike in more intercultural, reflective approaches and attention to stereotypes by some MU teacher candidates in the post questionnaire suggested a potential impact of experiences in their teacher preparation program. This would have been an ideal time to work with teachers on strategies to teach stereotypes and intercultural approaches. Unfortunately MU teacher candidates’ focus on these value-laden aspects of culture seemed to wane by year-end, as teachers seemed to fall back on their earlier visions of culture teaching. This reflects findings recognizing the powerful influence of teachers’ previous beliefs and visions on practice. It also illustrates that while the intercultural dimension is appealing for teachers, concerns over how to operationalize such a practice remain inhibiting unless explicitly addressed (Bennett, 2009a; Byram & Risager, 1999; Sercu et al., 2005).

The objective of this chapter was to identify changes in teacher candidate culture teaching visions including their envisioned cultural content and approaches. Changes in culture teaching frequency were discussed along with visions represented by culminating projects. The next chapter discusses the impact of these teacher preparation programs on teacher candidate culture teaching beliefs and visions. Chapter 9 examines belief and vision change from the experiences of 6 individual teacher candidates. Chapter 10 will conclude this dissertation summarizing main findings and discussing implications.
Chapter 8
The Impact of Culture Learning

This chapter will explore the perceived impact of culture teaching and learning experiences on teacher candidates’ culture teaching beliefs and visions in the curriculum and methodology courses in these two teacher preparation programs. These findings paint a picture of varying degrees of impact on individuals and groups, where the teacher preparation experience can impact culture teaching beliefs and consequently inhibit and/or constrain culture teaching visions. In this chapter, I will begin by exploring the perceived impact of the first practicum experience on teacher candidate beliefs and visions around culture teaching. This will be followed by the perceived impact of the culture teaching lessons on TC visions from the post questionnaire including perceptions of culture teaching lessons needed. The year-end perceptions of impact on beliefs around culture, culture teaching benefits and culture teaching approaches will then be outlined. This will be followed by a description of TC perceptions of the most useful culture learning from analyses conducted in the post and year-end questionnaires and focus group interviews. The chapter will conclude with teacher candidates’ views on insufficient learning in culture teaching, followed by a discussion and summary of the findings.

The Impact of the First Practicum on Culture Teaching Visions

As this study began in both institutions as TCs returned from their first practicum, TCs were asked in the pre questionnaire whether their recent practicum changed their views on culture teaching in language education. Responses are illustrated in Figure 22.
Figure 22. Impact of the practicum on culture teaching visions.

At the time of the pre questionnaire, 5 participants indicated that they hadn’t received an international language placement. Of the 25 participants experiencing an international language practicum, 8 respondents (32%) reported that the teaching experience hadn’t changed their culture teaching views, while 12 (48%) replied somewhat and 5 (20%) indicated that it had. Given that the majority (68%) of respondents indicated some influence on their culture teaching visions, qualitative responses were analyzed to define any patterns of change.

Breakdowns of responses at an institutional level from these practicum-experienced participants are outlined in Table 17. From an institutional perspective, MU participants reported a somewhat more positive impact of the practicum on their culture teaching visions (approximately 74% of participants vs. 60% at TU). The number of MU participants reporting a definitive change in views from their initial placement teaching experience was four times that of their TU counterparts.
Table 17

_Institutional Impact of the First Practicum on Culture Teaching Visions_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported change in culture teaching vision</th>
<th>TU</th>
<th>MU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>4 (26.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some change</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>7 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>4 (26.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 6 teacher candidates indicating that the practicum experience had not changed their culture teaching visions, the majority (n=4) reported that their placement had not changed their positive views towards the role of culture in language teaching. Of these 4, 1 indicated she failed to see any culture teaching, 2 mentioned nothing they saw changed their positive views, while one indicated that her associate teacher simply confirmed her positive beliefs through demonstrating “a wealth of cultural knowledge that the students clearly enjoyed”. Chyo, a Spanish TU teacher candidate, shared a discouraging culture teaching experience which appeared to indicate that her attempts to teach aspects of her home culture prompted only mediocre interest.

The last day of my teaching experience I had to do a presentation on El Salvador. I did the usual topics such as: food, tourist attractions, the people, transportation, home life, rural vs. city life in El Salvador. I got to the response I expected…some interest but no “WOW” reactions, nothing changed…Chyo from TU

Among TCs who indicated somewhat of a change in their culture teaching views, the overarching theme was recognition of the need to work with culture. The most widely cited factor igniting this recognition was experiencing student interest in culture (5 out of 1 responses). Natasha from MU wrote, “I noticed that my students were very interested in the culture, more than I expected.” Coming from a placement outside international language teaching in history, Katelynn from TU commented on the important role of culture among a diverse student population.

My experience was in history- BUT I was in a school that has 45% Muslim population- this made me learn quickly how culture affects students in all areas of their lives and especially in the school environment.
Rachel from TU remarked on the need to deconstruct stereotypical cultural views that she witnessed when working with textbook “culture boxes” having students compare Spanish cafe culture with their own. 3 participants noting some change, including Maria from MU in the quote, remarked on the absence of culture teaching.

My associate teacher taught a minimal amount of culture and this forced me to question her methods. I have come to the realization that in my own classes, culture teaching should be the main focus, although I will still need to teach language in order for the students to understand texts in the target language.

John from TU cited a “gap in teacher training” and disillusionment with his practicum experience where he assisted the teacher, showing students where Spanish was spoken in South America and then asking students to memorize those countries and capital cities. “There was nothing about the differences in cultures, languages spoken, expressions”, he noted.

The 5 participants noting a definitive change in culture teaching vision resulting from their practicum cited seeing the motivational role of culture in language teaching or learning from the experience of teaching or seeing it effectively taught. Jennifer from MU cited the challenge of working with a film in her Spanish class and the need to culturally contextualize the viewing for students in history, politics and religion. Her colleague Petra, contrasted the effective culture teaching she witnessed in her practicum with her previous culture learning experiences.

I had previously thought/experienced a "Mickey Mouse" approach to culture, that is, food, music, stereotypes, and my recent experience showed me how to integrate culture into teaching in a more authentic and relevant way.

Penelope from TU, cited the benefit of actively working with culture in her practicum.

Teaching in the practicum helped because you learn new strategies and what works with students from other teachers....I probably learned a lot more about culture because you’re learning from your associate and you’re actually doing it in front of the kids, playing off what they say and what they actually absorb.
The Impact of Culture Teaching Lessons

This section begins by discussing the perceived impact from teacher candidates of the lessons on teaching culture as assessed in the post questionnaire (see Appendix J). This is followed by a description of what participants felt were lessons still needed in culture teaching. A discussion of year-end perceptions of the impact of culture learning in this curriculum/methodology class on TC beliefs about culture, perceptions of culture teaching benefits and culture teaching approaches will then be outlined. This will be followed by a description of perceptions of the most useful learning and lessons still needed on culture teaching.

The Impact of Culture Learning

Following the culture lessons in both teacher preparation programs, participants were asked whether the recent lessons changed how they would teach culture. As illustrated in Figure 23, most participants in both institutions felt that the culture teaching lessons “somewhat” changed how they will teach culture.

![Figure 23. The impact of culture learning on culture teaching visions.](image-url)
Given the dominance of yes respondents in the TU group, it appeared that these participants had an increased perception that their culture teaching lessons changed their culture teaching visions. The MU group appeared more hesitant about the impact of the culture teaching lessons on changing their prevailing culture teaching vision. Only several participants reported no impact from these lessons.

In addition to answering whether the lessons had any impact on their culture teaching visions, participants were asked to explain why their vision changed or did not. In the order of most frequently occurring, the themes in these responses fell into five general areas: increased awareness of the challenges in culture teaching; awareness of culture teaching strategies; changes in the perceived role of culture in language teaching; reflection on teacher development needs; and reasons for no change.

The most commonly cited impact in these culture teaching lessons was an increased perception of the inherent challenges in culture teaching, often focusing around the topic of stereotypes. 11 participants (4 from TU and 7 from MU) commented on these challenges and most expressed concern about the need to avoid reinforcing stereotypes when teaching culture. For example, Janine from TU commented how “it made me more aware of the potential dangers of teaching culture but also the huge benefit it can have”. Reflecting concerns of the other 6 MU participants, Eva added “I learned a lot about how culture teaching can incite a lot of stereotypes about different cultures and how important it is to teach culture carefully.”

The second most frequent topic in participant responses focused on an increased awareness of culture teaching strategies and related issues. Referring to the culture learning activities Gabriela offered her TU students, Chantal from TU wrote “We were put into the role of the students (learning things that were new to us) and dealing or learning how to deal and accept this info with out judging the Spanish culture or being [Spanish] either”. This topic was dominated by TU participants where four commented positively how these lessons had helped show them how not to teach culture, how to integrate culture into activities and how it helped them gain confidence. The sole MU participant who commented in this area brought up an interesting point, how these lessons prompted her to reframe her role as a culture teacher, becoming a collaborative learner with her students. Olivia wrote “Again, they have made me fully realize that I really was not taught in this manner and that I too need to learn the culture alongside the students. It provides a more ‘whole’ teaching of the language....because language does not stand on its own without the accompanying culture!”
In addition to these changes in culture teaching views, some teachers reflected on further needs they had become aware of in culture learning. Jordan from MU suggested the culture learning increased her awareness of culture knowledge she lacked and the time needed to prepare to teach it. She wrote “The recent lessons confirmed my lack of knowledge on the culture of the target language and how much prep work it would take to inform myself and then be able to teach it.” This reflected Kitty’s comment from TU that “time keeps being an obstacle” in culture teaching. Marco from MU admitted an enduring lack of confidence and Lisa from TU stressed the need for culture teaching resources “that give context and history.” 2 MU participants expressed their increased awareness of the importance of culture but the need for more culture teaching strategies. Natasha said “I see everyday how important it is but I don’t know where to start.” Lila added “I think I am more aware of the importance of culture teaching. However, I still have some questions about how to put it in practice.”

This perceived lack of impact on culture teaching strategies dominated the responses of the 3 participants who explicitly stated that the culture teaching lessons did not change their visions. Katelynn from TU wrote that “I felt that it was very general and broad. Although I was able to come up with some ways that I would change, I was often given the impression that there is no effective way to teach culture.” Her colleague Anja referred to one of the logistical constraints of the TU program that divided the TCs into separate language groups on the second day of each week of their program. She noted “...it is difficult to only receive half the culture lesson. As a German student I was not able to see the practicality of the theories presented.” Ross from MU added that he “didn’t see very much in the lessons that I haven’t already done in my past teaching experiences. Nothing really revelational sticks out.”

One of Ross’ colleagues, Nandita acknowledged that while these lessons did not change her views on culture and culture teaching, they prompted reflection on her culture teaching vision.

My views on culture and culture teaching did not change. However, I took the time to consciously think about what I believe and hence have a more tangible idea of what my vision actually is. I am also left with many more questions as to how to prepare my students for the world. In the end people should be judged for who they are but to understand who they are you need to know about what shaped them and you also need to have a strong understanding of who you are and why you are that way.
Based on participant responses to this question, it appears that these lessons prompted substantial reflection about culture and culture teaching among these teacher candidates. Almost a third of respondents acknowledged an increased recognition of the importance and relevance of culture in language teaching. Clark from TU wrote “I will try harder to incorporate it because I am realizing how important it is and how much it affects us.” Donatella put it more practically noting “I’ve realised that teaching culture is just as important as teaching grammar.”

**Culture Teaching Lessons Needed**

To better understand this culture learning impact, in the post questionnaire, participants were asked to define what they still needed to learn about culture teaching after these culture teaching lessons. Responses again were dominated by a request for more specific culture teaching strategies, activities and ways to integrate culture into language curriculum, expressed by 18 or 60% of participants. The remaining responses largely consisted of a request for more learning about the target culture(s).

TU participants were equally split over those expressing a desire for more culture teaching strategies vs. more culture learning. Among the half desiring more specific culture teaching strategies, many expressed a desire for more specific culture teaching activities and strategies. Anja stated “I need to know more examples overall, so I can compare and contrast cultural concepts for my students.” Chantal expressed the need for knowledge on how to methodically integrate culture teaching into language curriculum asking how do we “specifically integrate this into our classroom smoothly (instead of simply just having a culture lesson that day)....to incorporate it into the linguistic and grammatical teachings as well.” Kitty reinforced this and raised another issue mentioned by a small number of participants overall - the need for strategies to locate culture teaching resources, writing “More examples and strategies, ideas and activity exercises, also more resources (books magazines etc.).”

2 TU participants also expressed the need for strategies to determine which cultures to focus on. In this vane, Katelynn writes “I think we need to learn about how we should choose the culture we teach. Spanish is used in so many countries it is hard to decide which to use.” Alluding to the diversity of culture, Clark expressed the need for “effective ways of incorporating various cultures in one lesson.”

The remaining 7 TU participants all expressed a desire for more cultural learning. These participants wanted more information on aspects of the target culture(s)
like “heritage”, “politics and famous people”. 2 participants expressly asked for more information on target cultures outside of Mexico, stating that Mexican cultures had been overly emphasized in the course.

This interest in more culture learning among half of TU participants was dramatically contrasted with only 2 MU participants interested in more culture learning. In this group, the vast majority (11/16 or 69%) of participants specifically requested more learning on culture teaching strategies that was often framed as culturally inclusive teaching strategies. Eva asked “How to teach it as openly as possible and not fall into the risk of reinforcing stereotypes but at the same time make students aware of why these stereotypes exist.” Rita reinforced this by asking “how not to perpetuate stereotypes or allowing my own bias (we all have them) enter the equation.” Jennifer, 1 of 2 MU participants who stressed the need to become more culturally familiar with a diverse range of Spanish cultures also expressed the need for culturally sensitive teaching strategies recognizing the teacher’s position as a cultural mediator.

I need to learn more and read more and be more current on the various (approx. 21) Spanish cultures that are out there. I also need to be aware of negative cultural bias, be more sensitive towards it and not reinforce it. How I respond to it will ultimately guide the behaviour of my students and their sensitivity towards other cultures.

In addition to this increasingly common request for culturally sensitive teaching strategies there was a common request for strategies to integrate culture into language classes, recognizing that culture teaching and learning deserves a regular place. Petra asked for “More strategies for tying it into an ‘everyday’ language lesson”. Bambi built on this asking for cultural knowledge assessment strategies, “how to implement it more often indirectly into the curriculum and how to assess student knowledge of culture.” In a reflective mode, Nandita implied the need for student-centred culture teaching strategies, noting “I need to learn what works for my students; I need to know who my students are before I decide how to teach them. Communication, observation, travel, art, interest and sensitivity have worked for me.”

**Year-End Perceptions of Culture Teaching Impact**

The Figures 24, 25 and 26 illustrate year-end perceptions of changes in understanding of culture, culture teaching benefits and approaches teachers can use to teach culture. There was an additional question on culture teaching integration that
largely mirrored data on culture teaching approaches so it was left out of this presentation.
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**Figure 24.** Changes in understanding of culture.

As highlighted in Figure 24, most participants indicated some change in their understanding of culture, often citing an increased understanding of the important role of culture in L2 teaching. TU participants demonstrated a slightly more powerful change in understanding culture with 3 TCs (23%) identifying a complete change and only 2 (15%) no change. This contrasts with 6 in the MU group (38%) who reported no change vs. the majority (10 or 63%) reporting some change.

Gisele from TU wrote “I first thought culture was about food, celebrations and music, but after doing our culture bulletin boards and culture unit, I realized there’s a lot more to it.” Donatella from TU wrote “I have realized how important it is to include culture learning in my language learning courses”. Jennifer noted “I knew culture teaching was important, I just didn’t realize how crucial it is”. Nandita added a thought on how the teacher education process helped her reflect on culture. “Just the concept of reflecting on, talking about (hearing other people’s views and concerns and articulating my own thoughts) has led to deeper awareness”.

Figures 25 and 26 identify changes in perceptions of the benefits of culture teaching and culture teaching approaches among TC participants. As highlighted in Figure 25, perceptions of changes in culture teaching benefits were more muted among participants, showing more who generally reported no change. TU participants again exhibited several participants who experienced complete changes in their understanding of culture teaching benefits through Gabriela’s classes.

*Figure 25. Changes in understanding of culture teaching benefits.*
As shown in Figure 26, changes in culture teaching approaches were generally viewed as partial by the majority of TC participants in both institutions. In spite of the quantitative results demonstrating this moderate impact on culture teaching visions, qualitative descriptions of culture learning impact often focused on describing the learning about culture teaching. For example, Lisa from TU wrote “We experimented with several examples of culture teaching in class that I may repeat in my own classes, i.e., the painting walk, culture bulletin boards.” Penelope wrote “Gabriela’s lecture on how to effectively teach culture really impacted my views on how to teach culture, and which aspects of culture are important to teach”.

Petra from MU wrote

I also came to appreciate even more what a difficult thing it is to teach, but that there are ways to expose students to the tools they can use -- internet, pen pals, exchanges -- that will let them explore it on their own. The experiences that prompted these changes were the instructor’s experiences with exchanges and the readings we did in class that showed
how we as teacher candidates are still challenged by our own cultures and those of our target languages.

Rita from MU, who worked on the salsa culture unit, added “Before this course I didn’t know how to take a theme like dance and spread it over an entire unit incorporating different language skills that also serve to teach the Ontario Curriculum”. There were a number of participants from both institutions that again brought up the impact of reflecting on stereotypes and culture teaching. Eva from MU who brought up this issue in the post and year-end questionnaires, wrote “In-class talks about stereotyping caused me to change some of my views on and/or approaches to culture teaching.” Chyo from TU added “Some ideas I had about teaching culture were stereotypes, I will try to stay away from stereotypes and be more authentic”.

In addition to these comments about positive change there was at least one comment in each institution about insufficient learning. Maria from MU wrote “I feel that the education program does not prepare teachers for culture teaching in a significant way”. Katelynn at TU noted “The teacher prep program didn’t do much of anything to change my views.”

**The Most Useful Learning**

In both data made from the post questionnaire results and the focus group interviews indicated that teacher candidates favoured learning about culture teaching strategies. In the post questionnaire, the vast majority of responses (21/30 or 70%) citing useful learning focused on culture teaching strategies. This learning included choosing aspects of culture to teach, how to integrate culture into curriculum and how to make culture teaching culturally sensitive. For example, Clark stated “Showing us the biases of teaching culture and how to avoid them; showing us the important aspects of cultures and how to implement them.” A principle focus among participant responses was an increased awareness in the need to frame culture teaching in a non-biased manner.

The lessons on how not to teach culture were commented on a lot among TU participants and less so by MU TCs. In the focus group interview, Clark from TU said

I think I would have been one of those teachers who would have done the food, the festivals without even thinking about it...I would have never thought twice about doing that so putting that out there for me was a really good thing.
Penelope added “the 4F thing that she taught us was probably the thing that stuck with me the most out of all of the culture lessons we had.” Petra added “I think it was good because I recognized when I had been taught with those different styles...when I was learning French and we did St. Jean Baptiste”.

In addition, the culminating assignments seemed perceived as very valuable in operationalizing culture teaching among participants in both groups. Maria from MU said how doing her unit planner on Italian fashion was “super useful” and she described putting into action in her second practicum placement. “Students were very motivated by it...and thanked me for having introduced such an exciting project”. Several TU teacher candidates commented on how much they learned on the target cultures and how to teach culture from researching their culture bulletin boards. Anja commented “she did motivate us to go out and research the culture because I don’t think it’s possible in however many weeks we have to actually learn really what culture teaching is”. Despite these positive comments, among the 4 MU culture unit planning groups represented in the year-end focus group interview, the two Spanish groups expressed challenges in figuring out how to integrate cultural topics into the curriculum.

In terms of institutional differences, the majority of TU participants in the focus group interview noted how Gabriela had helped them better understand culture teaching approaches and integration strategies. Janine said “she taught us how to incorporate culture into every unit”. 6 of the TU participants noted the need to be culturally sensitive and to avoid bias. Chantal remarked on the need for a comparative, relativistic approach, “relating their culture to ours; looking at a wide range of culture aspects”. Anja echoed this impact of Gabriela’s teaching saying in the focus group interview that she had been introduced to an intercultural approach to culture teaching.

A point that she did raise that was really good was that you always relate it back to your own culture as well to make them reflect on their culture and I think that’s something that I never would have thought to do before...

Janine referred to a new, more exploratory, student-centred and ethnographic approach to culture teaching.

The most useful aspect of the lessons was learning how to have a different perspective on teaching culture one that is objective, where you ask questions and present information on the culture guiding students in their exploration instead of imposing your perspective on them.
Janine also added that she learned the importance of integrating it through projects and not just on one day. 4 of the TU participants referred to specific activities experienced in Gabriela’s class including how not to teach culture, how to avoid shock value and the “drive-by shooting” approach along with the culture learning benefits of the culture bulletin board presentations.

Among the MU participants, a very common theme raised among the 12 participants noting culture teaching strategies as useful learning, was the challenge of avoiding stereotypes in culture teaching, again likely prompted by the critical stereotype discussion arising in Savanna’s class. Half of the responses noted the need to either avoid or work with stereotypes directly. Eva noted increased cultural sensitivity writing “Everyone is affected differently by culture teaching. Some people are more sensitive than others-it was an eye-opener to see how certain people reacted to some of the things we did in class.” Like a number of his colleagues, Ross exhibited a proactive stance towards this learning about stereotypes, writing “The only thing that really sticks out is that stereotypes will come out while teaching culture, and rather than beat them down immediately, they should be allowed to be a platform for thought-provoking class discussion.” Bianca echoed this very succinctly stating “Ignoring is promoting”. In the focus group interview, Petra, citing Savanna’s use of the Mammoni video concluded “It is possible to use the same materials in different ways, i.e., using the TV clip to make fun of Italian culture, or as a way to open up a discussion about cultural differences.”

While these references to the challenge of working with stereotypes did dominate the MU and to a lesser extent the TU responses, there were a few other useful learning topics mentioned that are important to discuss. There were a number of participants from both institutions mentioning a change in perception of the role of culture in language education, from that of periphery to more of a central focus. For example, Rita from MU wrote “That it [culture] can be incorporated in so many different ways. In some instances I was teaching it as a side note but there are so many more opportunities that I could use.” Marco commented on the motivational and valuable role of culture in the language classroom writing “I have learned that culture is what makes a language classroom most appealing to students. It makes their learning seem valuable and useful.” His colleague Jennifer added “It solidified my opinion that culture teaching is essential for language teaching. That they do indeed go hand and in hand.”
**Further Learning Needed**

My feeling is that culture teaching is a new approach to teaching Spanish because I was not taught that way in either my high school or university programs. Since I wasn’t taught Spanish in this way but am expected to teach this way now in the classroom, I wanted to get that kind of background knowledge from my teaching course. In the end, I felt I learned some teaching strategies and very general theoretical background but really no content on what I can teach to students.

In the year-end focus group, Lisa from TU equated her insecurity about culture teaching with her lack of culture learning experience in the above quote. She felt enthusiastic about culture teaching but was concerned about her lack of cultural content knowledge and how to treat and integrate culture into her Spanish classes. This theme of wanting more information on how to work with culture in L2 classes, how to concretely integrate it, and the need to “know” cultures more appeared as dominant learning needs in both groups. Specific areas of learning needs will be summarized and discussed below.

**More culture teaching strategies.**

TCs in both institutions expressed the desire for more culture learning and integration strategies in these teacher education programs. 7 out of 9 TU focus group participants wanted more guidance around culture teaching. While Janine praised the learning she had from Gabriela, saying “she taught us how to incorporate the culture into each unit”, she added that she would have liked to have seen “how to incorporate culture into a grammar lesson or into a language lesson”. Citing a perceived limitation of the treatment of Gabriela’s conceptual fluency activity, Anja added “it would have been helpful to see how it could have been taught and incorporate into an L2 classroom”. Both Lila and Jordan from MU in their final interviews noted that they wanted more culture teaching strategy work. Lila said that she “really would like to have more solutions” in terms of culture and language teaching, expressing frustration with the “I’ll leave that to you guys” attitude asking for more “ideas”. Citing Savanna’s Mammoni video activity, Petra stated “we watched the movie on the Mammoni which was interesting but how would you put that in a lesson?” She added that she would have liked to learn how to integrate “actual history and art and everything else”. She added “what are the theories about culture teaching and what is the current practice about integrating culture into the classroom?”
The need for credibility and "knowing" culture.

Throughout this research there were recurring themes around self-efficacy expressed by some teachers, worrying about being an authentic representative of the target culture interconnected with needing to "know" the target culture before teaching it. This need to "know" culture was more prevalent among TU than MU participants. Referring to the challenges of being a German minority in a class dominated by Spanish TCs and a teacher well acquainted with Mexican culture, Anja stated that “Gabriela has a wealth of knowledge but a limited cultural knowledge of the language I’m studying”. Compounding this Anja added the limitations of culture teaching resources in classrooms that she said mainly focused on cities/towns and travel, adding “we have textbooks from 2 years after I was born, from 1986”, citing the resource limitations recognized in culture teaching (Tedick & Walker, 1994).

Anja added concern about her authenticity stating

I myself am not German but I’ve been involved in German since Grade 10 so sure I’m probably not one of the better authorities on the German culture than [students] may have if they have grandparents or family members from a German background...I could be teaching them the wrong thing or teaching them the stereotype of that culture which we want to avoid.

While TU teacher candidates voiced this concern about needing to know more about culture, this was also expressed by some MU TCs, often embedded in concerns about being perceived as an “authentic” cultural representative. For example, Petra expressed the concern “I haven’t been to Mexico, I haven’t been to any other countries [besides Spain], so I wouldn’t be able to answer those lived experience questions”. Jordan cited this concern a number of times in her questionnaires and interviews, writing that it’s a “challenge for teachers to remain current with everyday life where the target language is spoken, unless teachers immerse themselves from time to time in the country”. These concerns reflect an instructivist orientation to culture teaching emphasizing traditional models of planning, knowledge transfer and more teacher-centered learning environments (Roblyer, Edwards, & Havriluk, 1997) that risk the perpetuation of stereotypes and culture as static and uniform. They also represent the embedded native speaker model embedded in communicative language teaching, which can alienate learners’ linguistic and cultural identities, promoting an unrealistic,
idealistic and potentially detrimental goal (Alptekin, 2002; Byram, 1997; Dogancay-Aktuna, 2005; Kramsch, 1995).

However there were some interesting participant-centred reactions to this. Eva said “Kids won’t expect you to know everything and if they ask a specific question you just say I have no idea. You go and you look it up and you come back and you tell them,” still reinforcing an instructivist pedagogical approach but opening the door to further exploration. When discussing the issue of staying current with Italian culture in the MU focus group, Jordan lamented the need to be immersed in Italy to stay current and be perceived as authentic. Responding to this, Nandita argued

I think it’s important to deal with culture as it is here...I mean we’re living in Toronto and there are communities and kids are growing up here so I don’t see why we can’t focus on Spanish, Italian culture as it is here...I don’t think we need to go back to Europe.

In this case, Nandita brought up the hybrid nature of culture and cultural identity, certainly among many students in urban North American settings (Jimenez, 2007), suggesting that presenting a messy view of the target culture may be more relevant for learners. This may also facilitate more culture-general vs. culture-specific learning, enabling intercultural attitudes and greater intercultural awareness (Bennett et al., 2003; Byram et al., 2002). It was interesting to observe Jordan, coming from an Italian-speaking upbringing, feeling the need to return to Italy to share current culture, when her Italian cultural experiences seem as relevant as any others.

**Strategies on working with the complexity of culture.**

This concern about wanting to know culture intersects with growing concerns highlighted by some TCs about the complexity of culture. There is a perceived inherent complexity in the concept of culture, and an overall lack of understanding of what exactly culture is and which aspects to teach (Kurogi, 1998; Levy, 2007; Ting-Toomey, 1999). Particularly among Spanish TCs, there seemed increasing awareness of the challenge of how to work with the breadth of Spanish cultures. Jennifer noted “I still believe that there is a lot more that I have to learn about culture. I will never know enough.” Citing her culture unit on Lenguas Desconocidas, Eva cited the challenge of teaching about cultures that exist in Spanish countries that speak different languages that aren’t Spanish, saying “How do you do that?” Anja again in the focus group raised the challenge of working with Germany’s Nazi spectre that she felt was left unresolved.
Such concerns about socio-historical cultural issues were reiterated by Spanish teacher candidates citing that they would also have to work with controversial histories of some Spanish-speaking countries.

Concerns about working with stereotypes arose again among both groups and particularly among the MU participants. Jennifer said she recognized the need to be very conscious of deconstructing bias and stereotypes and still wondered how best to do this. Eva wrote she had “learned the great responsibility involved in teaching culture and the risks that are involved” suggesting that more learning around working with bias may have been useful.

3 MU participants noted a negative impact of this experience learning about stereotypes. Nina, seeing stereotypes as distinct from her perception of “teachable” aspects of culture wrote “I have learned that stereotypes can get in the way of learning about the real aspects of culture”. Maria added “that it can be quite explosive, stereotypical and controversial.” This frustrated reaction to the challenging nature of stereotypes was reiterated only by 1 TU participant, Anja who stated quite poignantly that “I have learned that is like walking a tight rope and how if you are not completely solid in your information/presentation of material the harm you can do is immense.”

**Discussion and Summary**

As highlighted in this research, these teacher education programs seemed to make some difference in orienting teachers to thinking about culture, culture’s role in L2 teaching and culture teaching approaches. The vast majority of participants reported some impact on their understanding and approach to working with culture throughout these programs. The impact of the first practicum on culture teaching visions appeared to be individualized, depending greatly on the associate teacher’s approach to culture teaching. This reflects research findings that teaching approaches to culture were varied, often didactic and dependent on teachers’ perceptions to culture (Byram et al., 1991; Castro et al., 2004; Klein, 2004; Kurogi, 1998; Paige et al., 2003; Pauchulo, 2005). There were only a few teachers who reported great learning from this experience, seeing culture operationalized in the L2 classroom.

Overall, the impact of these culture learning experiences seemed to be felt in several ways. The majority of teacher candidates reported some impact on helping them refine their visions of culture in the L2 class, to put culture in a language teaching context. A number of teachers developed a more profound sense of the importance of
culture in culture teaching and a refinement of its role in the L2 class. These experiences also seemed to refine and deepen many teachers’ visions of working with culture, highlighting new challenges with its complexity and perceived impact, and often prompting more thought on further learning needed. As Nandita said, consciously thinking about culture helped refine her understanding of culture’s role and her approaches to working with it.

While culture teaching strategies were reported to be the most useful learning, many TCs felt this learning was insufficient. This phenomenon may reflect new teachers’ craving for practical solutions to complex problems (Johnston & Goettsch, 2000). It indicates that more culture teaching practice is needed. There was a recurring call among some teachers, often those with less L2 teaching experience and those distanced from the target cultures, for more content knowledge on the target cultures. These findings confirm new teachers’ concerns over credibility, and their need for disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge (Johnson, 2009a; Johnston & Goettsch, 2000). This also likely reflects an instructivist orientation to teaching and learning, gained partly through personal learning histories that encourages new teachers to know all of a subject before teaching it, particularly one as complex as culture (Johnson, 2009b). While this is understandable it likely prefaces a larger issue of socialization into positivistic orientations to language-and-culture learning which if left unexplored in teacher education programs may relegate culture to exotified constructs that reinforce stereotypes and unconscious bias (Franson & Holliday, 2009; Hadley, 2001; Paige et al., 2003). Such orientations may prompt a dismissal of culture as too complex and reinforce the linguistic focus of L2 programs, neglecting the potential that culture and intercultural learning has for L2 learners.

These findings reinforce that the influence of teacher preparation programs is contextualized in the beliefs and experiences of individual teacher candidates. Eva who was a key player in the Savanna’s stereotype reiterated her concerns about stereotypes in culture teaching in her post questionnaire and in our year-end focus group. Eva, who was personally attacked in this discussion, deeply internalized this issue. For several in Savanna’s class, this incident appeared to have deepened reflection on the controversy and complexity around culture that was left largely unaddressed. Given the fear this seemed to instil in some teacher candidates, this lack of closure runs the risk of perpetuating the treatment of material, static dimensions of culture due to their
uncontroversial nature and teachable ease (Leeman & Ledoux, 2005; Nault, 2006; Paige et al., 2003; Tedick & Walker, 1994).

This chapter summarized the impact of culture teaching in the curriculum and methodology classes on teacher candidates. It reviewed the impact of these lessons on perceptions of culture, culture teaching benefits, and culture teaching approaches and summarized the most useful learning along with lessons still needed. The next chapter outlines individual culture teaching belief and vision changes among 6 teacher candidates. Chapter 10 which follows summarizes the main findings of this study and outlines implications.
Chapter 9
Culture Learning through the Individual Lens

This chapter will examine culture teaching belief changes through the eyes and voices of individual teacher candidate participants. As discussed in the Chapter 4, I felt it important to explore changes in visions and beliefs to culture at both a group and individual participant level. At the individual level of analysis, I wanted to explore participants with somewhat negative, typical and positive beliefs toward culture teaching. I also looked for diversity in terms of gender, age, target language teachables, cultural/linguistic background (i.e., those from the target language/culture and those not), previous teaching and previous “living away” experience.

The teacher candidates selected for these two one-on-one interviews are profiled and contrasted below in institutional groupings. Findings result from an integrated analysis of questionnaire and interview data. A profile contrasting 3 participants from each institution begins each section, followed by a brief synopsis of each individual participant. Individual summaries begin with a unique comment from each participant about culture/culture teaching, followed by a brief profile of their life experience and second language/culture learning background. Their culture teaching beliefs and visions are then outlined at their initial and year-end interviews. In addition, any changes in beliefs and visions are discussed along with any observed impact of this curriculum/methodology course on each individual teacher’s culture teaching beliefs and visions. This chapter will conclude with a comparative analysis of the 6 teacher candidates, contrasting changes in their culture teaching beliefs and visions.

*Turner University Teacher Candidate Interviewees*

The Turner University teacher candidates who were selected are listed in Table 18 with the ranking of their selection criteria.

Table 18

*Turner University Interviewee Profiles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>Anja</th>
<th>Kitty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target language teachable</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachable</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Anja</td>
<td>Kitty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target language background</td>
<td>EL1</td>
<td>EL1</td>
<td>SL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 immersion experience</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>9 mos.</td>
<td>78 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living away experience</td>
<td>36 mos.</td>
<td>9 mos.</td>
<td>204 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 teaching experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture teaching comfort/confidence</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture teaching familiarity</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture teaching prioritization</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture teaching should be the core</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. EL1 = English first language speaker; SL1 = Spanish first language speaker; C2 = target culture; L2 = second/additional language; mos. = months; Mod. = moderate.

As described in Chapter 4, interviewees were selected from those willing to participate to represent somewhat extreme and typical cases. In the case of TU teacher candidates, Anja, 1 of only 2 German teacher candidates in this research, represented a fairly typical level of comfort and enthusiasm towards culture teaching that was typical of the group. She had spent 2 immersion periods studying in Germany, had no other living away experience and was one of the minority of TU teacher candidates with some teaching experience. She somewhat disagreed with the pre questionnaire statement (Appendix E, Part C question 4 (4)): “Given limited time I would teach linguistic competence over cultural competence”.

John was selected as he was the oldest TU teacher candidate, was male, a non-native Spanish speaking teacher and he had spent one year in Spain. His responses indicated very low level of confidence and comfort with teaching Spanish and he prioritized language over culture teaching. Interestingly he indicated an initial high degree of familiarity with Spanish cultures. John’s experience contrasted quite dramatically from Kitty’s (the final interviewee profiled), who was born in El Salvador, expressed high level of confidence and familiarity with culture teaching and was an immigrant to Canada as a child, therefore offering substantial living away experience. She strongly agreed that culture should be at the core of Spanish teaching but she also prioritized the teaching of language over the teaching of culture.
Profiling Anja

Culture’s like walking a tightrope because you don’t want to give people false ideas especially if they’ve never been exposed to those cultures….grammar’s so boom boom boom. It’s right or wrong…but there’s no right way to teach culture.

Anja was brought up in a bilingual family with an Italian-speaking mother who worked as a French teacher and an English-speaking father. Anja took French and German in high school and Italian in university. She admitted being motivated in second language teaching by her second language teachers. “I had an amazing German teacher and she was also my Grade 9 French teacher with enthusiasm for whatever she was teaching.” Anja said she excelled in university Italian and was approached by her professor to work as teaching assistant in the class.

In terms of culture learning in these second language classrooms, Anja said “it was all stereotypes”. She said her high school German/French teacher “did the Oktoberfest, did the Christmas, did the Carnival”. When describing culture Anja said it was “the onion, layers of society…layers of people maybe?” She added that this understanding came from a Grade 8 Geography class introducing a unit of World Cultures.

Our teacher put a big onion on the board and all the different layers…in the middle was language and everything else stemmed off that. But together it makes the one culture…so I’ve never forgotten that lesson.

Anja participated in 2 four-month immersion experiences in Germany, one in high school and one in university. “I went on an exchange to Germany in high school which solidified my passion for wanting to teach”. She continued describing her motivation to teach as directly related to culture.

A lot of it [wanting to teach L2s] has to do with culture too…I love learning new things and I love learning about new experiences and being involved in that and … there’s this innate sense to want to do new things and learn about new things and open your mind to different concepts and different lifestyles in certain situations.”

Discussing her German immersion experiences, Anja cited a number of cultural faux pas she made including a profoundly embarrassing moment in Germany when she misinterpreted the tipping rules basing them on Canadian standards. She explained to
me that rather than paying the bill first and leaving a separate tip, a typical tipping practice in Germany is to add the tip automatically when paying the bill. “So I gave [the German waitress] the money expecting the change back and she just stood there for a good ten minutes and I was like, what?…and my friends were all laughing at me.”

*Anja’s first thoughts on culture and culture teaching.*

Anja expressed the benefits of culture both in her pre-questionnaire and in her interview as being principally a motivational factor for “getting people to come to your class”, citing the elective nature of German language classes and the need to make German teaching fun and appealing. She reiterated this thought a couple of times saying a key priority was “getting them back”. Anja added that culture also allows for “a deeper appreciation for the language”.

In spite of these benefits, Anja expressed strong concern for the “scariness” of culture, and the potential challenge of presenting it effectively.

Culture’s like walking a tightrope because you don’t want to give people false ideas especially if they’ve never been exposed to those cultures…grammar’s so boom boom boom. It’s right or wrong…but there’s no right way to teach culture.

In addition, she expressed concern about how to work with Germany’s historical cultural past in her classes.

Some worries I have are just if history teachers present World War II, for example, and then the students come into my German class and I do a little shtick on World War II and it’s not 100% the same … I could see students themselves being confused.

When discussing culture teaching strategies, Anja added that “…my feeling is you can’t understand other cultures unless you know your own and how your own functions”.

You always need to have a framework to base your opinions and your thoughts on. So it’s like learning…it would be like learning a new math concept. You wouldn’t be able to do subtraction without having learned some form of addition, right?

In this vane, Anja added her desire to have a definition of culture in this interview that was repeated in her pre questionnaire.
I think it’s useful because as a new teacher there’s already so much that we need to worry about and from the new teacher’s perspective having some sort of reference point of culture would be helpful for my lesson planning and things like that.

Her initial visions of culture teaching combined both her teachables: music and German. She envisioned teaching German culture through having students exploring German music through radio and websites. She said she would have students pick a music type, research it and do a presentation for the class. Chuckling, she added that she thought having the students do a project on yodeling would be awesome, citing its well known but misunderstood phenomenon. She recognized the need to present the diversity of German cultures giving the example of German-speaking Mennonites in Pennsylvania. She said “you have these islands of speakers in different regions”, and that it “depends how you choose to present the [cultural] material”.

Anja’s year-end thoughts on culture and culture teaching.

In our year-end interview, Anja admitted to having a deeper understanding of culture, its layers and “the obscene amount of stuff you could teach”. She noted the different aspects that you can get at through the language, beyond the grammar and “stereotypical culture teaching”. Anja expressed feeling more informed about the layers of culture and the potential of culture teaching to help open students’ minds.

However she expressed concern about the “hidden backgrounds” of culture and how to teach these “correctly”. She said it feels overwhelming, cited never having “thought of doing grocery shopping and learning about daily activities”. In speaking about how much culture to teach she added that “I think I’ve gained a greater understanding of my own perspective as to what I would consider too much”. She also expressed concern about her perceived credibility as a German teacher saying “I feel overwhelmingly responsible now that some of these students will gain their cultural knowledge about say Germans for example solely from me.”

In terms of culture teaching visions, Anja admitted having a new recognition of the role of festivals in the course, the 4 Fs, as aspects of German to “keep students in her class”. She spoke favourably of Gabriela’s tangents as helping her remember and better understand cultural differences. She also saw the transferability of Gabriela’s picture walk activity and how she could use that in her German classes. In spite of these gains, Anja reiterated her concern brought up in the first interview, raised again in the focus
group interview, about still not being sure of how to navigate the controversial aspects of Germany’s historical past. She admitted wanting more work on stereotypes, how to work with preconceived notions and more culture teaching strategies.

Profiling John

If there are any students in the class with a first-hand knowledge of certain cultures I’m talking about then I’d like to use them as the resource.

John defined himself as Canadian-British in the first questionnaire, defining himself as the black sheep of the family as he went into teaching and his parents, sister were in science-related occupations. “I’ve always liked language, I’ve always had an affinity for it, I’ve always been good at it”, he said.

He began learning Spanish in university and admitted, “I liked my language teacher in university and really liked my language teacher in high school, so was inspired to follow.” He added that he believed it was really important to be engaged by his teachers. He spent 1 mandatory year in Spain as part of his program, living in a relatively isolated part of northwest Spain where he was immersed with Spanish speakers for an academic year. He said he “really enjoyed the feeling I got from being able to communicate with others in the language.” He spoke of the differences he saw in daily interactions/activities and a different emphasis on family in his immersion experience, cultural differences that were highlighted in his study-abroad experience.

John’s first thoughts on culture and culture teaching.

Having marketing and business as a second teachable, John emphasized the strategic relevance of cultural knowledge in building effective communication skills and opening doors allowing you to connect with people in a more meaningful way. “You need to know the cultural nuances of the language to effectively communicate”, he said emphasizing the relevance of cultural communication skills. In terms of teaching culture, John said he’d like to see his students “have a passion for it by being able to use it sometime down the road in their lives when they’re on vacation somewhere.” He felt that “understanding a new culture could be facilitated by knowing your own culture better”. While demonstrating intercultural leanings, John adopted a somewhat instructivist orientation at culture teaching, feeling that teachers “must know about culture to teach the language which is embedded in the culture”. He admitted that this concerned him as Spanish cultures were so vast and he only had experience in Spain.
His initial visions of culture teaching emphasized traditions, festivals, news and behaviour. In his first questionnaire, he added inviting guest speakers in to share experiences from their cultures. He imagined treating culture thematically, by doing role plays going to the doctor or engaging in small talk with friends. He also added working with “unexplainable expressions” like idioms or culturally-informed phrases and integrating non-verbal behaviour like gestures.

**John’s year-end thoughts on culture and culture teaching.**

John described his learning in Gabriela’s course as “somewhat of a revelation”. “I didn’t realize the importance that cultural aspects could play in teaching language.” He admitted learning fun ways to integrate cultural topics like festivals into teaching using games, the picture walk, keeping students engaged. He said “the most interesting thing I’ve learned about culture is its dynamic nature”, the importance of viewing culture as something that is not stagnant. He added recognition of the need for lifelong culture learning.

John noted an increased appreciation for recognizing the stereotypes and biases that exist. It’s important to “appreciate and realize that stereotypes exist and that we can perpetuate them….sometimes unknowingly through acceptance of what we perceive as fact.” He cited Gabriela’s approach emphasizing the diversity in target cultures, saying that a tradition may be just one particular tradition among many. John said he know realized that “no two people from the same country had the same cultural experiences and that he’d “always emphasize that as well”.

He cited more comfort with teaching culture after Gabriela’s classes though he “didn’t realize….how diverse some of these Latin American or Spanish speaking countries are”. He added that a lot of this awareness was built through the sharing and Gabriela’s elicitation of cultural experiences from the first language Spanish speaking teachers in the class. He admitted being “more reticent” to teach culture and wary of his ability as a non-native speaker to effectively teach culture. In his year-end questionnaire, he expressed concern about accidentally using stereotypes and insulting students unintentionally and using out of date cultural information. In response to this concern, John said he would use students as resources, citing Gabriela’s elicitation of L1 Spanish speakers cultural experiences in the class.

If there are any students in the class with a first-hand knowledge of certain cultures I’m talking about then I’d like to use them as the
resource….and [sharing] the information I’ve discovered as a teacher as long as I mention that my research is not the be all and end all.

In this regard John admitted a new understanding of the need to be wary of generalizing cultural characteristics. He added that he recognized the need to make culture learning fun and interactive, using it as a tool to keep students interested and enrolled. He also adopted an intercultural approach at culture teaching, adding that he now felt that “if one understands their culture more it can bring more peace with themselves”. He added that teachers have a responsibility to look out for the well-being of their students and “understanding of student cultures ties in with that”. John cited the need to be “sensitive, culturally aware, treating people with dignity and freeing the mind from stereotypes”, that teachers “need to learn from students given our need to interact with diversity and to prevent ignorance”. “I see the importance of language on a personal level [getting] to understand people a lot better if you understand not only the culture but speak their language.”

Profiling Kitty

[Culture] expands kids’ knowledge and it destroys biases, stereotypes…[but]...it’s a harsh reality for me. The curriculum gives you borders unfortunately.

Kitty immigrated to Canada from El Salvador when she was 7 as a refugee. When the war situation in El Salvador escalated Kitty’s parents sent her and her older brother to Canada where they had relatives. Kitty’s father was killed in an accident and her mother, a social worker in the government, tried twice to get smuggled to the U.S. after being threatened with death by the revolutionary militia. Finally Kitty’s uncle, acting as a “coyote” helped smuggle Kitty’s Mom across the Mexican border in a horrific voyage, where she saw others die of dehydration and heat. She finally reunited with her children in Canada but Kitty says her mother’s never been the same. “She came from a wealthy family, had to start again and learn a new language. She’s sad all the time,” Kitty said.

Kitty admitted struggling in her youth, facing extreme culture shock, feeling like she had no culture, no language. She grew up speaking Spanish at home without knowing how to read or write it. She said “I felt like I was losing my roots so my parents suggested I take Spanish and ever since I fell in love with my culture and my language”. Citing an inherent identity crisis in her teenage years, Kitty spoke fondly of her Spanish
high school class and teacher, finding it an empowering escape from the racism that she experienced in high school. “I was in a very multicultural school but there was a lot of racism, racial gangs, ghettos…and Spanish class was where racism stopped...once the door was locked, no more racism. Racism stopped.” She told me how her teacher made time to talk to her multicultural class about their cultural identities, making time to listen to their concerns, culture shock and fears. Kitty said, “at the end of our discussions, we would always end up with a positive perspective of what it meant to be Salvadorian Canadian or French Canadian...we wouldn’t feel so strange how the other students would see us...you almost didn’t feel ashamed.”

Kitty took French through high school and took University French and Italian and “passed with flying colours”. Kitty felt a calling to share her knowledge of her home culture and language with others, citing “I’m part of that culture so I know everything about it”.

*Kitty’s first thoughts on culture and culture teaching.*

Kitty saw culture and language as totally interconnected saying, “I just can’t imagine language being separate [from culture]”. “I think culture is what makes a race be…it’s embedded in civilisation”, she added. Kitty “Everything has to do with culture....also the pros and cons of our culture” she noted, emphasizing the need to discuss the government and corruption that occurs in some countries, the poverty, class structure and difference between the rural and urban populations. Kitty believed that one primary benefit from culture teaching was helping students to know what to expect in these countries should they travel there. The biggest challenge she perceived was curricular priorities and time needed for grammar, linguistics versus time for culture teaching.

Kitty cited the “romantic nature” of the Spanish language, explaining how the language paints a picture. In speaking of Spanish literature, she said it’s important to explain to students “why did they [Spanish classical authors] write in such fantastic ways?...you’ve got to understand...to look at the Spanish people.” She noted “how happy we are as people...we’re very happy so we portray that in our culture through festivities, through our celebrations, through ancient customs, family values. It’s very fulfilling for a teacher I think to give out this knowledge.”

In this vane, Kitty’s vision of teaching Spanish culture focused on family, festivals, religion and traditions. “Family, traditions, customs, that pretty much covers it
all.” Kitty had great confidence and enthusiasm about teaching culture saying “I’m part of that culture, so I know everything about it”. She spoke of getting dressed in a Salvadorian festival outfit to get students’ attention, playing some music and “helping the students feel as if they’re there”.

**Kitty’s year-end thoughts on culture and culture teaching.**

In our post-culture teaching discussions, Kitty emphasized her disappointment recognizing the linguistic limitations over culture teaching as prescribed in the international language curriculum. “It’s a harsh reality for me”, she said, that the “curriculum gives you borders unfortunately”. When speaking of her beliefs about culture teaching, Kitty demonstrated a new understanding of how teaching a second language and culture can broaden horizons. “It expands kids’ knowledge and it destroys biases, stereotypes”. She cited her personal reluctance as a teenager to speak to colleagues of other cultures and said it was based on “misconception and fear”. She admitted “I feel less scared now [of culture teaching]”, although she did mention increased concerns about targeting culture teaching to students with differing cultural and socio-economic backgrounds. “Now I’m just more like being cautious...because I don’t want my kids to be hurt”. She said “I always wondered why we didn’t do that much on culture [in high school], but now I’m understanding”.

Kitty spoke highly of a number of Gabriela’s culture teaching approaches learning about Mayan culture and relating it to modern day Mexican culture, saying she could see herself using that with kids. She liked Gabriela’s stories sharing personal experiences with Mexican culture, said she “didn’t notice the time and it made culture learning interesting”. She cited the recognition to keep Spanish language and culture teaching motivating, fun and interactive. Kitty recognized the need to use a range of strategies, “more than presentations and different resources, not just books to keep learners interested”. Kitty said “what I’ve learned from Gabriela’s course is to let the kids explore...it’s really good for them because it increases their knowledge....it lets them see who they are”.

**Monfort University Teacher Candidate Interviewees**

As outlined in the Turner University teacher candidate interviewees section above, the MU teacher candidates selected for individual interviews are listed in Table 19 with the ranking of their selection criteria.
Table 19

Monfort University Interviewee Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
<th>Lila</th>
<th>Nandita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target language teachable</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachable</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target language background</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 immersion experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living away experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 teaching experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture teaching comfort/confidence</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture teaching familiarity</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture teaching prioritization</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture teaching should be the core</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SL1 = Spanish first language speaker; EL1 = English first language speaker; C2 = target culture; L2 = second/additional language; mos. = months; Mod. = moderate.

MU teacher candidate interviewees were selected in the same manner as the TU participants outlined above. Jordan was selected as the teacher candidate reporting the least comfort and familiarity with culture teaching among the total participant sample. Although she reported English as her only first language, my initial interview with her indicated that she had been brought up by Italian-speaking parents and therefore had a solid understanding of spoken Italian from childhood. As a result, I have classified her as bilingual though she was clearly a second generation Italian speaker, following Faez’s (2007) dichotomies of linguistic identities, having been brought up by her parents in spoken Italian but being dominant in English. Jordan was the oldest participant in the teacher candidate sample and had no reported teaching, minimal living away or target culture immersion experience (although one could argue that her Italian upbringing may constitute some target culture immersion experience). She exhibited an interesting mix of priorities towards culture, seeing it as the core of language teaching but prioritizing linguistics over culture in her teaching vision.
Jordan’s profile contrasted dramatically with Nandita, a young South Asian, non-native Spanish teacher candidate who immigrated to Canada as a child and demonstrated a very high enthusiasm, familiarity and confidence in culture teaching. Nandita reported four years of L2 teaching experience with only a minimal month of target culture immersion experience. Lila, a Cuban-born immigrant to Canada, rounded out these participants with more typical moderate views and perceptions towards culture teaching in spite of substantial experience growing up in a target culture environment and being a native Spanish speaker.

**Profiling Jordan**

She just knows the country from top to bottom and everything about it. And she shares that with her students in every class and the kids...they just listen.

Defining her ethno-cultural background as Italian-Canadian, Jordan was born in Canada of Italian immigrant parents. She was brought up understanding Italian as her parents spoke it to her and her siblings but they would most often respond in English. She was inspired by secondary school language teachers that motivated her to become a language teacher. Jordan said she “excelled in languages” and because of her high marks in French, she was selected as the only student in her school to participate in a France-Canada exchange for three months. She attests to this immersion experience as an unbelievable experience and the key in motivating her to “stick with languages”. “It was an amazing experience to live in another culture, to live with a family in France for three months.” She noted not getting any culture teaching when in high school but rather focusing on grammar and linguistics which she excelled at. In university, she double majored in French and Italian and after having kids, used her language learning background to help out in school and tutor French. “I felt I had a way of helping students learn the language.”

Being the oldest TC participant Jordan cited her age as an advantage and disadvantage. She said her age allowed her to become an authority figure in her first practicum but her age also made her worried about getting teaching right. Referring to her younger colleagues, Jordan said, “they’re not afraid whereas at my age, now I’m thinking, you’ve got to do it right....it’s not like you have another chance”.
**Jordan’s first thoughts on culture and culture teaching.**

In our initial discussion on culture teaching, Jordan spoke of the motivating role of culture making language teaching fun. She also spoke of her need to “know” Italian culture, to remain current with it and feeling deeply concerned about her lack of cultural knowledge. She spoke highly of the culture teaching work she saw facilitated by her Italian associate teacher (AT) in her first practicum. She described how her AT returned to Italy every year with students, working as part of a language teaching program. “She brings that into the classroom and unfortunately we can’t all do that. I mean I haven’t traveled.”

Jordan noted a number of challenges of culture teaching: lack of preparation time, how to integrate culture, and the ideal frequency of teaching it. Her initial visions of culture teaching emphasized the need to connect culture to her students’ interests. She envisioned discussing the day in the life of a 15-year old in Italy. “

You know, what they do for entertainment...do they read a lot more, perhaps go to live theatre more, or perhaps sitting out in a cafe for an hour, like I did when I was in France and I was 16.

She suggested surveying her students to get to know their interests. Jordan suggested presenting Italian culture through artifacts, “visually, you know through films, through photographs, through magazines and music.” Jordan suggested that it may be worthwhile “letting students do the work, figuring out what culture is...what food they eat, do a paper on it and present it to the class”.

Jordan added that she felt the teenage years were a perfect time to work with culture. She said that this time seemed ideal, especially at age 14 or 15 “when they’re just starting to find themselves, to think what’s important to me, what do I value, what do I think....”

**Jordan’s year-end thoughts on culture and culture teaching.**

In our year-end interview, Jordan said she felt she had learned a lot over the year but it made her “realize how little she knew about teaching”. She reiterated the role of culture in making class interesting, but she lamented her lack of current knowledge about Italian culture. Citing a comical example where her Italian AT talked of giving and getting directions in Italy, Jordan said “she hooked the students right away ... but I can’t
do that”. She added, “she’s convinced them that she knows the culture, that she knows the way of life there.”

Jordan admitted, “I have to work on building my knowledge not just of my subject Italian or French but building a global knowledge of global issues…being able to share that in a classroom.” “I want to offer [students] hope and knowledge and so I have lots to learn.” She did not feel that an intercultural focus in the classroom was practical. “I just can’t see how to fit that into a language class”.

Jordan felt the culminating project she and her group prepared on “Pasta in Everyday Life” helped her think about working with culture and integrating it into her language teaching. Her year-end culture teaching visions were somewhat refined from her earlier approaches. She adopted a comparative approach, having students compare what they did on a typical day. However, Jordan added subjective dimensions of culture teaching into her visions, saying she would have students compare “what are your interests, what do you value, what’s important to you…what do students the same age as you value”. This was followed by differences in hobbies, eating, life with friends.

**Profiling Lila**

I realize that culture is very complex…it requires a lot of preparation time and resources from the teacher.

From a Cuban upbringing, Lila had immigrated to Canada nine years ago. While in Canada, she completed an undergraduate degree in Spanish part-time and taught Spanish for 2 years in a private French secondary school while completing her degree. She taught multilevel classes that were mainly grammar-focused. She told me she went into teaching as she “really enjoys working with students”, citing the creative, playful aspect of teaching. She indicated that she spent some limited time on culture in her classes, including one time comparing different orientations to time whereas Latin Americans tend to have a polychronic orientation to time (i.e., a more fluid approach at scheduling time) vs. the monochronic tendency among North Americans. She said her students “really liked this and I enjoyed myself”.

Citing her history teachable, Lila noted the relevance of culture in her history teaching, citing differences in orientations towards family values and history when she was learning about and planning to teach Chinese history. She cited a perceived advantage being a Spanish first language speaker and having that deep understanding
of the language she was teaching, and getting student buy-in to her teaching. Lila did however express a challenge understanding the “machinery” of the school system here, finding the teacher’s role considerably different from Cuba’s more centralized system.

**Lila’s first thoughts on culture and culture teaching.**

Lila described culture as a huge umbrella over a diverse range of topics that she felt somewhat unfamiliar with. She admitted being comfortable with Cuban culture but she expressed concern about the breadth of Hispanic cultures and her ignorance of them. “It might require more reading, more work for me to be able to transmit this to my students, since my knowledge is kind of restrained”. She also worried about the lack of culture teaching resources and time, saying that “the teacher has to do that extra work to bring culture to our classrooms”.

Nevertheless, she saw culture teaching as much more fun and motivating than grammar teaching and recognized the need to work with stereotypes and to understand their rationale. Approaching culture from an intercultural perspective, she noted the need to help students discover their culture, to “maybe compare and think about why we are different? Why do we react in a socially different way”? Her initial culture teaching visions were based, she said, on what she had done with her Spanish learners before. These included role plays, constructing Hispanic characters and taking students out for salsa dancing and to Hispanic restaurants so they could experience the culture and language. She also emphasized the importance of working with target culture topics that were of interest to her students citing the Colombian singer, Shakira, different types of music and food.

**Lila’s year-end thoughts on culture and culture teaching.**

In our year-end discussions, Lila said “I realize that culture is very complex…it requires a lot of preparation time and resources from the teacher.” She cited her culminating project focused on salsa dancing, saying “it was way harder than working on grammar”. However she added that it would be more appealing for the students. She remained concerned about the challenge of knowing about the diversity of Spanish-speaking cultures and therefore admitted less confidence, “I’ve never been to Spain and what I know about Spain is through books”.

She felt the need to do a lot of student-centred projects, given the elective nature of Spanish. She liked the idea of using film in class as art and gave the example of the
film “Maria, Full of Grace”, depicting a Colombian teenager’s odyssey to the U.S. as a drug trafficker. Lila also commented on her willingness to learn with her students as she will have her “Latin” point of view but others will come from different backgrounds.

When discussing the impact of Savanna’s class, Lila admitted seeing cultural traits in her fellow teacher candidates, seeing how her Italian-speaking colleagues seemed proud of their heritage, the arts and fashion. She noted “how they [Italian teacher candidates] grew up in Italian communities so have a strong sense of belonging compared to the Spanish teacher candidates” who she described as from multiple backgrounds. She emphasized a number of times that she “would have liked more solutions,” specifically citing the stereotype discussion and wondering how to deal with the consequences of such a discussion in her classroom.

**Profiling Nandita**

The benefits of culture teaching are seeing the world from another perspective...one learns about one’s own culture and language, one becomes a better citizen of the world.

Nandita was born in India and moved to Canada when she was six. She was raised speaking English, though she said her parents were multilingual, speaking three Indian languages. She described her upbringing as very open-minded, identifying herself as a blend of Indian, Hispanic and Canadian. Nandita loved Spanish and French. She studied professional singing and loved singing in different languages. She began learning French and Spanish in school and in her second year of high school, a wave of Latin American students entered her Spanish class, motivating her to learn.

I had to learn fast because they all became my friends...I felt like I was the outsider in another country and the person who didn’t speak the language so I’d be 16 years old, they’d be laughing, they’d be enjoying, having fun and I wanted to laugh too, I wanted to understand too...

She admitted feeling a connection with her Hispanic friends, “they were interested in knowing who I was...they wouldn’t ask the [more typical Canadian cultural] questions like what do you do...they’re passionate people and so am I”. An admitted hispanophile, Nandita searched for a Latin American student organization when entering university and the following year became president. She was reflective in her identity, admitting its multiplicity.
I do feel in some ways very Hispanic but no I’m not Hispanic right, there’s a difference. Indian people will say yeah, you are Indian…they can feel it, see it and I am in many ways very Indian in terms of my lifestyle, yes, more Canadian, more Indian but I guess my spirit, my heart is more Latin American.

With plans to become a doctor, Nandita chose to become a teacher. She gained experience teaching ESL at a private language school to students from multicultural backgrounds. With an effervescent personality, Nandita described herself as learning very well by talking to people. “I’m going to be a teacher because when you’re a teacher, you get to help people.”

**Nandita’s first thoughts on culture and culture teaching.**

Nandita defined culture as multilayered and personal, “what people experience every single day which isn’t one thing”. She felt it impossible to teach language without culture and suggested that lack of culture teaching is a reason “why kids drop”. “It’s like you’re taking out the life part of the language.” She expressed the benefits of culture teaching as “seeing the world from another perspective...one learns about one’s own culture and language, one becomes a better citizen of the world”. The only challenge she cited was “to do it justice”.

Nandita believed it was crucial to be passionate about what you’re teaching and “to love what you’re doing and convey that energy and love”. She felt teachers needed to be risk-takers and lifelong learners to meet the challenges of culture teaching. “If you’re not into it, then don’t be a teacher…if that means that you have to leave your comfort zone, well do it…it’s your responsibility.”

Nandita described a critical, intercultural, comparative culture teaching vision in her first interview with me. “The best way to understand something is to put it into direct reference with what you’re familiar with and what you know and then compare”. She said “you can’t say well, let’s learn about other people but it has nothing to do with you”. She spoke of the need to bring in engaging topics for students and working with cultural diversity rather than simply focusing on a dominant target culture. She cited Soca music from Martinique that she brought up in her French practicum, surprising some students that there were black countries that spoke French. Commenting on Sabrine’s first culture lesson discussing the negative portrayal of teaching culture using the 4 Fs or the material dimension of culture, Nandita felt these aspects of culture had a purpose.
I know people say well, yeah music and dance and literature, art are not culture. No, they’re representations of our lives...they are culture in a sense but then they’re not...they’re reflections of life, they’re not life itself but that’s the only way to learn so I think you should incorporate those.

Building on this, she added the importance of integrating the voices of people from a target culture. “I think it’s important to bring Hispanic people in....we can bring them in and they’ll do it for you...they can teach about their country”. She described this guest lecturer approach as “other ways of traveling”, recommending “let other people teach what you can’t teach”. Nandita envisioned bringing in a lot of target culture voices, “see lots of views and students can observe by themselves, coming to their own conclusion and then you have the inside understanding.” She added the need for students to arrive at their own conclusions and the importance of teaching people “to think independently....don’t be scared to ask questions”.

_Nandita’s year-end thoughts on culture teaching._

When defining culture in her year-end questionnaire, Nandita reiterated her view of it as “aspects that make up people’s daily life” and added “values that we call identity...a way of life that evolves with the people it is tied to”. She again emphasized the integral link between language and culture seeing “culture as an authentic resource that we can use when we’re teaching language”. She again cited the Soca lesson in her French practicum, saying it “brought the language to life”. Her only concern about culture teaching was some worry about student interpretation of lessons, of learning, with the recognition that “learning will be based on their own experiences and personalities”.

Her culture teaching visions remained critical, comparative and intercultural. She cited the need for students to learn ethnographic skills, “they should be taught to observe people and learn from that”. She defined her year-end culture teaching approach as follows.

I will try my best to teach my students to subjectively become one with the language and people but also maintain the ability to step back and objectively observe cultural/linguistic norms and compare them to their own values.

Citing her culture unit planner on “Lenguas Desconocidas” (Unknown Languages), she added the importance of understanding the linguistic/cultural
diversity in Hispanic cultures, recognizing that Spanish is not the unique language. She felt it was important for students to understand the socio-historical context of Spanish and histories of oppression. She noted that people should be aware of the trends [in cultures] but they should also be aware that trends don’t define every person”.

When discussing the impact of Savanna’s classes on her culture learning, she noted the difficulty in separating her learning in this one course from the range of courses she took in her B.Ed. program. A number of times in this interview, she cited a social justice conference that seemed to fuel Nandita’s thinking. She said it was this event that prompted her to think of the possibility of using English language learning newcomers to Canada to share their experiences from their Hispanic homelands with her Spanish secondary school students as a mutually empowering experience.

Nandita said that Savanna’s class

was a starting point and made me actually reflect on the practice of teaching culture which is something that I don’t know I would have done”. “I was actually conscious of what I was doing which made me change what I was doing or think of more ways [of teaching culture].

She cited the stereotype discussion in Savanna’s class, seeing how “everyone saw the cartoons through their own biases/experiences” and recognizing the need to help learners see where people are coming from and build empathy.

To be sensitive enough to think okay, in any situation or at any given time, why is this person saying what they’re saying? What are their experiences? What are their thoughts? How did they arrive at this area in their life...When you try to understand, then any resentfulness or any misunderstanding you’re going to stop and maybe you’re going to judge them differently...I think you can teach that kind of stuff in class, especially here where we have people from different experiences.

Contrasting the MU and TU Experiences

To further deepen understanding of the evolution of these 6 teacher candidates’ culture teaching beliefs and visions, I have listed two figures that contrast these qualitative reports with quantitative measures. Figure 27 illustrates changes in perceived culture teaching familiarity in each of the teacher candidates’ responses over the three timepoints. Figure 28 presents a quantitative measure of each of these teacher candidates’ perceptions of culture teaching confidence over the research period. In both of these figures, individual changes are juxtaposed with institutional and overall
participant averages. A discussion of these changes will follow highlighting commonalities and contrasts.

*Figure 27.* Individual participant changes in culture teaching familiarity.
An important finding from these individual case studies is the degree of individual difference from the depiction of institutional changes listed earlier. For example while Figure 16 in Chapter 6 showed a gradual overall increase in culture teaching confidence, these individual depictions show a different and richer picture. As Borg (2006) writes, teacher education often results in variable outcomes and individual developmental pathways rather than collective learning. These individual portraits also demonstrate the located influence of teacher education in the individual beliefs and experiences of these teacher candidates. For example, John feeling insecure about his target culture knowledge picked up on Gabriela’s use of student cultural experience in her class as a strategy to strengthen his practice. Feeling very strongly about culture teaching, Nandita used experiences outside her curriculum and methodology class to refine her culture teaching techniques. Anja had her multilayered understanding of culture reinforced in Gabriela’s class and her experiences with cultural faux-in her immersion experiences highlight the need to attend to deeper dimensions of culture. These culture teaching visions and beliefs did not seem to dramatically change over time, but get more expanded and sometimes more refined through this teacher preparation process. In this regard it was interesting to see that all 3 Turner University
participants cited strategies used by Gabriela to fuel their thinking about culture and culture teaching practice, implying some direct impact on teaching visions from teacher education practice.

Reflecting their cohorts, culture was perceived as a motivating aspect of L2 teaching and often became more complex through these teacher education programs. The breadth and dynamic nature of culture, the potential stereotypes that can occur, and contextual constraints of the classroom sometimes tempered enthusiasm and influence about culture teaching visions. Again, reflecting their colleagues, the material dimensions remained relatively strong in these culture teaching visions but as Nandita expressed because it was accessible, engaging and could lead to reflective, deeper awareness. Again, the positivistic paradigm appeared strong, prompting this need to “know” culture beforehand, to treat it from an instructivist pedagogical approach, though all of these participants mentioned varying degrees of exploratory strategies. 4 of these participants across institutions, Anja, John, Lila and Nandita adopted an intercultural approach, encouraging students to reflect on their first culture while learning about the other.

One disheartening observation in these individual portraits was the insecurity exhibited by Jordan, Anja and John about their credibility as a second culture teacher. Even with a completely bicultural background, Jordan illustrated the powerful socialization into the native speaker ideal of L2 teaching that seemed unaddressed in her teacher preparation experiences (Canagarajah, 1999b; Johnson, 2009b). She failed to see the value in using her hybrid cultural self as a role model in the L2 classroom, drawing upon her bicultural upbringing as an authentic source of cultural input. Similarly Anja and John saw their non-native speaker selves as inherently limiting in the L2 classroom, highlighting the dominance of the native speaker ideology in these teacher preparation programs.

To illustrate the impact of teacher preparation programs on individual teacher candidates, this chapter examined culture teaching belief and vision changes among 6 teacher candidates in this research. Chapter 10 summarizes key findings and themes in this research and discusses implications and recommendations for L2 teacher preparation programs.
Chapter 10
Summary, Implications and Conclusion

This chapter summarizes key findings and themes that emerged in this study. A model of teacher education influence is then outlined followed by several pedagogical implications for L2 teacher education programs. The chapter concludes with some final thoughts on this research. An epilogue of participant feedback on participation in this study follows this chapter.

Summary of Key Findings

This study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. How do culture teaching beliefs, visions including perceptions of benefits and challenges differ and evolve among international language teacher candidates in two Ontario teacher preparation programs? How intercultural are these culture teaching beliefs and visions?

2. How do culture learning experiences in a curriculum and methodology class differ and influence teacher candidate beliefs and visions?

3. What demographic, experiential factors influence teachers’ culture teaching beliefs and visions?

4. How do these culture learning experiences prepare new teachers to work with culture in international language education?

In order to synthesize the breadth of the findings in this mixed methods research, I have organized the key findings in a Findings Integration Matrix. Table 20 outlines some key interpretive findings related to participant groups and the area of research focus. Data sources have been included along with the research methodology used in analysis. If one research methodology was dominant over another, it is capitalized. A discussion of findings and key themes follows.
Table 20

Findings Integration Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants and research focus</th>
<th>Data and methods</th>
<th>Turner University</th>
<th>Monfort University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Interviews;</td>
<td>More TE experience; strong FSL immersion focus; strong Mexican connection; otherness- sensitized</td>
<td>FSL and Italian secondary focus; transformative French immersion experience; identity-sensitized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Goals</td>
<td>Observations,</td>
<td>Peacemaking, sensitivity and empathy</td>
<td>Passion for the L2 and C2; C2 immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Practices</td>
<td>interviews, focus groups; QUAL</td>
<td>Teacher-dominated; integrated CT; CT strategy focus; emphasis on culture, language, bias</td>
<td>Elicitation-focused; CT overview; stereotype focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher candidates</td>
<td>Questionnaires, interviews; QUAN</td>
<td>Younger, dominant Spanish focus; less L2 teaching and living away experience</td>
<td>Older, strong Italian and Spanish focus; more L2 teaching and living away experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Needs</td>
<td>Questionnaire; QUAL / quan</td>
<td>Stronger concerns over cultural sensitivity</td>
<td>CT strategies and C2 knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Beliefs</td>
<td>Questionnaires, interviews, focus groups; QUAL /QUAN</td>
<td>Culture seen as more complex over lessons; CT helps L2 and C2 learning was most commonly perceived benefit; increased beliefs of perspective-changing CT benefits; increased CT confidence and enthusiasm; increased concern over stereotypes and insecurity related to target culture knowledge; CT confidence/knowledge higher with experienced TCs</td>
<td>Increased awareness of influence of culture on language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Visions</td>
<td>Questionnaires, interviews, focus groups; QUAL /QUAN</td>
<td>Persistence of material cultural dimension although CT goals reflect some deeper dimensions; some awareness of how not to teach culture; more moderated visions; spike in attention to stereotypes after culture teaching lessons</td>
<td>Drop in concern over CT methods and increased insecurity over cultural knowledge/stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased envisioned CT frequency; some TE CT practices adopted</td>
<td>Temporary strong focus on stereotypes and reflective approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants and research focus</td>
<td>Data and methods</td>
<td>Turner University</td>
<td>Monfort University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Impact</td>
<td>Questionnaires interviews, focus groups; QUAL/QUAN</td>
<td>Some variable impact from practice teaching; some changes perceived in understanding of culture, CT benefits and approaches; impact largely influenced by previous beliefs/experiences; TCs wanted more CT methods and C2 knowledge</td>
<td>Stronger perceived impact from CT lessons; more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* QUAL = qualitative research methodology; TE = teacher education; FSL = French-as-a-second language; L2 = second language; C2 = second culture; CT = Culture teaching; QUAN = quantitative research methodology; TC = teacher candidate.

### Changes in Culture Teaching Beliefs and Visions

This next section will discuss some of the key findings in this research related to the research questions.

**Increased Understanding of Culture and its Complexity**

As long as you are familiar and comfortable with the cultural element you are introducing, I don't think there are any special skills required.

> Eva at the beginning of her MU program.

One thing that I learned that I wasn’t expecting was that it is a huge responsibility involved in teaching culture...

> Eva at the end of her program.

As Eva’s quotes above testify, there seems no doubt that both these L2 teacher education courses had some impact on teacher candidate culture teaching beliefs and visions. In both institutional contexts, teachers’ beliefs about culture became more complex and more refined. With this complexity came increasing awareness of the daunting breadth and challenge of culture teaching that made many teachers feel more insecure about their knowledge base and about how to teach it. Nevertheless, this was coupled with increasing awareness of the importance and perspective changing potential of culture in L2 learning and increased enthusiasm about working with it. Culture teaching confidence increased with some teachers but depended on previous beliefs, experiences and the impact of culture lessons.
Needing to “Know” Culture and the Instructivist Paradigm

It’s sort of like that progression when you become a teacher, you’re all excited and then it’s like ....the downer.

*Anja in her year-end interview.*

As Anja’s quote illustrates, this awareness of culture’s increased complexity and potential controversy increased some teachers’ insecurities around their lack of cultural knowledge. In some cases, the more teachers learned about culture and its complexity, the less they felt they knew, the more insecure they felt about teaching it and the more they wanted to learn about the target cultures. This precipitated some teacher candidates to call for more knowledge about the target culture. Some complained overtly at year’s end about the lack of “culture” they were taught. This desire to get more culture teaching knowledge before introducing it into a class likely reflects the instructivist learning environments dominant in many teacher candidates’ experiences (Johnson, 2009b) and even in these teacher education contexts.

While there was some indication of student-centered, collaborative culture teaching approaches scattered in this research, there remained an underlying orientation to teacher-dominated pedagogy present in many visions of culture teaching including the final culture teaching assignments. It is rather surprising that with today’s focus on collaborative, communicative language teaching, that teachers would not easily transfer or adopt more interactive, student-centred culture teaching strategies. Again, this may be the result of teacher-dominated culture and language learning experiences. In addition, it may support the understanding that new teachers rely on more traditional teaching methods in early visions of teaching (Watzke, 2007).

Unless these teaching beliefs and approaches are consciously critiqued, some of these teachers are likely left with the understanding that they are largely responsible for providing cultural input for their L2 learners. In order to enable change, models of collaborative, student-centred culture teaching approaches need to be presented. As Lisa from TU said, culture teaching is quite new to some teacher candidates and has not been modeled extensively like grammar or language teaching. Consequently, teachers need to see examples of culture and intercultural teaching embedded into L2 teaching practices and actively experiment with culture teaching in these preparation programs.
Music, film and the material dimension of culture dominated new teachers’ culture teaching visions. In spite of explicit discussions on the dangerous incompleteness of only working with this dimension of culture, it prevailed likely due to its familiarity, safety and less controversial nature than more value-laden cultural dimensions (Byram & Feng, 2004; Klein, 2007; Lange, 1999; Sercu, 2002). As discussed above, this surface vision of culture may also have been perpetuated by the increasing insecurity some teachers exhibited in their perceived culture teaching knowledge base, limiting them to easily learned, easily taught aspects of the target culture.

Year-end culture teaching approaches were often vaguely defined, often dominated by an information-transfer pedagogy, prioritizing teacher’s knowledge and engaging minimally with student experience, knowledge and first cultures. Interestingly, the adoption of more intercultural approaches working with stereotypes and with students’ first culture, arose briefly among some teacher candidates after explicit discussions of culture teaching. However, by year-end this intercultural approach was subsumed under the dominant and familiar ease of the teacher-centred approach to working with the material dimension of culture.

**The Intercultural Dimension?**

I couldn’t really say that I have a specific culture…I feel fairly average, Canadian…assimilated.

*Katelynn at the end of her TU program.*

In spite of Gabriela’s intercultural teacher education approaches, Katelynn remains unable to “see” her culture, highlighting the invisibility of culture to those from the dominant cultural group (Ting-Toomey, 1999). This illustrates the challenge of working with the intercultural dimension in L2 teaching without more explicit attention to this focus. As a result, Katelynn and many of her colleagues expressed culture teaching beliefs and visions that largely focused on culture-specific content. While teacher candidates generally agreed with the potential of the intercultural dimension in language teaching, its realization seemed abstract and more problematic. Already feeling insecure about their target culture knowledge base, constrained by Ontario’s linguistic curricular focus and being socialized in primarily linguistic focused L2
learning experiences, many teachers felt the intercultural dimension was an abstract ideal.

Nevertheless, there were some teachers in both institutions expressing an intercultural orientation to their L2 teaching practice. These teachers tended to have previous L2 teaching and living away experience or sensitivity to cultural difference and complexity. In Gabriela’s class, Anja who had experienced otherness in her German immersion experiences and had some orientation to the multilayered nature of culture expressed an intercultural approach by year-end, adopting some of Gabriela’s intercultural techniques. Coming from a very multicultural, multilingual background, Nandita who initially exhibited strong intercultural attitudes towards L2 teaching, used the teacher education experience to refine her intercultural beliefs and visions. MU participants were generally less critical of the intercultural teaching visions presented in the focus group interviews, whereas TU participants expressed more insecurity about student reactions and the suitability of these activities for high school learners. This supports findings that the more extensively teachers deal with culture in the foreign language classroom, the more willing they are to interculturalise their practice (Sercu, 2002).

Unfortunately, the temporary interest in working with stereotypes and culturally reflective intercultural practices that emerged after the culture teaching lessons among several MU teacher candidates largely evaporated as these discussions were left unaddressed in the classroom. Again, this learning experience was located in Savanna’s perception of time constraints, the consensus-driven atmosphere of the L2 teacher education classroom, and potentially by her lack of knowledge about working with stereotypes and intercultural issues.

**The Located Nature of Beliefs, Visions and Teacher Education Impact**

A key finding emerging in this research was the located, individualized nature of teachers’ culture teaching beliefs, visions and the impact of teacher educator’s culture teaching practices. While group measures of confidence with culture teaching increased, along with increased insecurity around inadequate culture knowledge and the perceived complexity of culture, individual teacher candidates told a different story. Previous L2 teaching and living away experience that often included target culture immersion predisposed some teachers to higher degrees of culture teaching familiarity and culture teaching confidence, reflecting similar research in this area (Sercu, 2002; Garcia, Prieto &
Sercu, 2003). The 5 out of 6 MU teacher candidates indicating they would integrate culture into every L2 class were from the most experienced L2 teaching group. On the other hand, TU teacher candidates who had less L2 teaching and living away experience expressed more consistent insecurity over their culture teaching knowledge base. Culture teaching confidence seemed quite individualized among teacher candidates rising with some who adopted models from the teacher education experience. However, confidence diminished with others who felt insecure about their culture teaching credibility, culture teaching methods and the daunting breadth of culture.

Findings in this research clearly defined L2 teacher education as “a dynamic activity that is situated in physical and social contexts, distributed across persons, tools and activities, and both influencing and influenced by both participation and context” (Johnson, 2009, p.121). Both teacher educators framed their culture teaching practices within their beliefs about culture, its role in L2 teaching and their experiences with it. In an email to me, discussing her experience with culture in her upbringing, Gabriela commented on how interesting it was “how one’s own emotional filters enter into our understanding and teaching practice”. Both teacher educators also framed their practices within the demands and expectations of their institutional and regional contexts. Their practices were constrained by curricular breadth, institutional demands, limited time and the “politics of accountability” as Johnson (2009, p.121) states. Gabriela lamented the fact that she had to “assess” students expressing that teacher education was much more than that. Savanna complained about the lack of time she had and the breadth of topics to cover in her 72-hour program. While discussing an ideal teacher preparation approach, Savanna suggested beginning her L2 teacher education program with culture, positioning it at the core, but feeling that in her current context, this was not easily realizable.

Teacher candidate culture learning was equally mediated by context and beliefs. Anja’s position as 1 of only 2 German teacher candidates in a large group of Spanish teacher candidates, felt dominated by discussions over Hispanic cultures. As a result, she felt limited in her learning about German-specific culture and strategies to work with Germany’s Nazi past, topics she raised continually through this research. Kitty, originally very enthusiastic about sharing her first culture with students in her classes, became increasingly disillusioned with the curricular and time constraints on culture teaching, positioning herself as a manager of the curriculum rather than as a facilitator of the learning process (Johnson, 1999).
The pervasive and potentially disempowering “native” culture ideology.

As illustrated by the comments of several participants, the prevalence of a historically embedded native speaker ideology in teachers’ beliefs, practices and visions emerged throughout this study. This native culture ideology glorified the target culture, target culture identity and ignored, thereby diminishing the value of blended or learner cultural identity and experience (Canagarajah, 1999; Kramsch, 1993, 1998). Several teacher candidates expressed concern about their credibility as cultural representatives in their envisioned L2 classes. Jordan, Eva, Anja, John and several others in both classes expressed feelings of inadequacy and incompetence in their ability to teach culture in their classes. These 4 teacher candidates had target culture immersion experiences and often spoke more than two languages. Anja at TU expressed continual concern over her ability to credibly represent the German culture with her students, assuming that she needed a German background or extensive German immersion to be credible. Jordan at MU had been brought up in an Italian-Canadian bicultural home, speaking Italian as one of her first languages, yet felt insecure about her ability to teach and represent “Italian” culture in L2 classes. This unfortunately highlights the pervasiveness of the native speaker ideology in L2 teacher education environments which marginalizes non-native cultural identities of both teachers and learners, essentializing culture and failing to better orient teachers and their future learners with 21st century post-colonial language-and-culture learning skills (Canagarajah, 1999).

This negative impact of culture learning occurred despite teacher educators’ best intentions to highlight the dynamic nature of culture. Both teacher educators explicitly valued target language-and-culture immersion sharing their own experiences in the target cultures and eliciting “target” culture experience, most often from target language speakers. Some of Gabriela’s students in our year-end focus group overtly complained about her focus on target culture vs. learner culture experience. On the other hand, Gabriela made a conscious effort to emphasize the need for her teachers to situate target culture teaching in learners’ first cultures, thereby validating the multiplicity of cultural experience and promoting intercultural attitudes and critical cultural awareness (Byram, 1997). At Monfort University, Savanna emphasized the value and transformative potential of target culture immersion reinforcing, unconsciously I would argue, the ideology and power around native speakership in her classes. While she also explicitly validated the identities, language-and-culture learning experiences of her students through activities in her class that included language learning biographies, such activities were subsumed under the more deeply embedded historical practices of
idealizing native speakership (and “native” cultural authenticity) in L2 learning. This may explain why some teachers, particularly target culture learners, began to feel more insecure about their cultural credibility when learning about the complexity and breadth of culture teaching.

This reinforces the politically and historically situated nature of L2 teacher education as teacher educators and teacher candidates have been socialized into these ideological models of L2 teaching and learning (Johnson, 1999). This potentially has a disempowering influence on second language learning teachers, neglecting the value of critically examining culture from multiple, equally valid lenses and empowering teacher identity rather than diminishing it. Such uncritiqued, unconscious native speaker and culture ideology fails to value the complex language-and-culture awareness that target language learner teachers and students bring to the L2 classroom. It also fails to encourage new teachers to reflect on the pedagogical value of helping their learners to expand upon rather than neglect their cultural and linguistic identities in the L2 classroom (Kramsch, 1998).

The Impact of Initial Teacher Education

In order to explain the relationships between some of the contextual factors that shape teacher candidate culture learning in these teacher education environments, I have refined and proposed a model of what I am calling the Initial Teacher Education Impact Cycle (see Figure 29) that was initially discussed in Chapter 3. This model is proposed only as a starting point to help better understand the relationships between teacher education practices and teacher candidate learning. Like all theoretical frameworks it is limited in its ability to capture the dynamic, chaotic nature of beliefs, impact and teaching practice that seem deeply interconnected. Nevertheless a key finding from this research appears to be the located nature of teacher education processes, and the continued need to attend to teacher beliefs in teacher education.

Below, I explain this model and refer to findings in this research to illustrate the relationships between the various factors.
As illustrated in this research and reflected in teacher education literature, initial teacher education processes are strongly located in physical and social contexts of teacher preparation activities (Freeman & Johnson, 2005; Johnson, 1999; Borg, 2006). This model like the framework proposed in Chapter 3 illustrates the relationship between the three main constructs in teacher preparation as defined in the literature: teacher beliefs
and experiences, teacher education practices and their impact on teacher visions (Borg, 2003, 2006; Johnson, 2009; Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Tatto, 1998). Unlike my earlier model, I have refined this version to emphasize findings emerging in this research. This includes the strong influence of contextual factors limiting teacher educators’ enacted practices and the synergistic relationship between teacher education, reflection and beliefs that highlight factors that in turn mediate culture teaching visions among new teachers.

This model begins with the teacher educator’s culture teaching visions that are situated in experiences and beliefs about culture and then framed by the teaching context. For example TU culture teaching appeared shaped by Gabriela’s sensitivity to bias and her perceived role of culture in shaping beliefs, communication patterns and values. Though her teacher education practice was preparing teachers for work in less culturally diverse, smaller and medium-sized towns in Southern Ontario, where she was largely socialized into her teaching practice, Gabriela’s intercultural orientation and sensitivity to otherness strongly framed her culture teaching approach that promoted the intercultural dimension. This approach was nevertheless constrained by Ministry of Education guidelines, curricular breadth, assessment processes and time, as Gabriela would often have to stop rich culture learning experiences abruptly due to the class bell.

In this model I’m proposing it is the degree of “reflection” prompted by teacher education activities that seems to influence new teachers’ beliefs and attitudes about culture along with their culture teaching visions. No matter how intercultural Gabriela’s teaching approach is, its influence on teacher candidates greatly depends on whether that approach engages with individual teacher candidate experiences, interests or concerns. This reflects related research findings that teacher development that engages active reflection on teachers’ beliefs and experiences has the most potential to refine beliefs and teaching practices (Borg, 2003; Freeman, 2002; Johnson, 2009a; Richards, 2009; Richards, 2003; Tatto, 1998). In this model, I am proposing that there is a synergistic relationship between beliefs, attitudes, life experience related to culture that prompts reflection and consciousness about culture teaching issues that in turn refine beliefs and visions. From this research it appears that reflection can be prompted by several factors: emotions, insecurities, questions, experience or sensitivities. When reflection is activated, teacher candidates attend to the issues, and this in turn can refine beliefs and visions. It is important to note, that as seen in this study, teacher education activity can prompt reflection that can result in negative and/or positive impact on
teacher beliefs/visions. And as illustrated, one incident alone can result in significant reflective impact.

The core of this model is teacher beliefs and experiences. As documented in the literature, teacher beliefs towards teaching and learning are fundamental in shaping how teachers approach teaching practice (Faez, 2007; Lawrence, 2000; Pajares, 1992; Richards, Gallo, & Renandya, 2001; Tatto, 1998; Turnbull & Lawrence, 2003). Beliefs seem a combination of cognitive understanding and attitudes built on personal experience, aspects of life that inform a teacher’s worldview and experience with schooling and instruction (Richards, 1996), reflecting Lortie’s (1975) apprenticeship of observation hypothesis. In this model, beliefs are shown as multilayered and somewhat permeable recognizing that beliefs can be refined and even altered, but the more deeply engrained the belief, the harder it is to influence (Pajares, 1992; Cuban, 1986).

This foundation of beliefs, attitudes and previous experiences form the basis of new teachers’ visions of culture teaching. Beliefs are often very personal and are informed by identity. This is indicated by the capitalized “MY” emphasizing the intersection with identity and teacher educator visions and teacher candidate beliefs. However, beliefs do not freely inform visions. As Cuban (1986) discussed, teachers’ visions are influenced by a practicality ethic that recognizes the contextual constraints that can include perceptions of learner needs, administrative or curricular goals, time constraints, the teaching and learning context, all of which dramatically mediate visions. These are the meditational factors indicated in the model that can be activated by teacher education practices, reflection and beliefs.

For example, an L2 teacher candidate may have grand beliefs about the benefits of intercultural language teaching but her vision is constrained by perceptions of learners’ linguistic-focused learning goals, the lack of intercultural teaching resources, time constraints and a curriculum that is L2 focused. As a result, visions are mediated by the context and beliefs. Sercu’s (2005) research found that similarly, teachers may have favourable beliefs towards intercultural language teaching but they are rarely enacted due to perceived contextual constraints.

**Examples of Teacher Education Impact**

From this research, we have a number of examples that may clarify this model. The most dramatic example of reflective impact in this study appeared to be the stereotype discussion occurring in Savanna’s third class. This single incident seemed to
have a dramatic effect refining some MU teacher candidates’ understanding of culture, its complexity and risks in addition to broadening, at least in the short-term, their interest in more intercultural approaches. It could be argued that the emotional intensity, the threatened identities and beliefs in this debate enhanced the affective dimension, igniting fears but also interest about culture and its complexity in the L2 class. This reflective impact focused teachers’ attention on the issues of stereotypes, encouraging them to reflect more deeply on both the potential and challenges with culture teaching further shaping their culture teaching beliefs and visions.

In spite of the impact of this event on teachers’ beliefs, prompting intercultural visions, this influence was short-lived as most teachers returned to their earlier more dominant target culture-specific visions by year’s end. The challenge of stereotypes may have dramatically reinforced some teachers’ practicality filters, keeping culture teaching visions constrained in the more “practical”, more familiar material dimension of culture despite desires to work with a more reflective, intercultural approach. This confirms the resilience of ingrained beliefs built on what Johnson (2009) describes as “everyday concepts” that frame the way teachers think. These everyday concepts are built on teachers’ familiarity with teaching and learning experiences that they have experienced and see as realizable. As a result, these concepts are less open to conscious inspection and critique. I would argue that for more transformative learning to occur, teachers would have needed to clearly see and explore classroom-based reflective, intercultural approaches responding to stereotype discussions that teachers could see transferring into their L2 class.

As a result, there seems to be the need to frame teacher education activities with a very practical orientation, tapping into teachers’ beliefs, concerns and questions and then exploring practical solutions. John illustrates an example of this type of learning that he gained from Gabriela’s class. In his initial interview, John, as an English-speaking Spanish teacher candidate, expressed concern to me over the breadth of culture and insecurity about his limited knowledge base of Spanish-speaking cultures. In our final interview, he said that he had adopted Gabriela’s techniques of eliciting experience with the target culture from Spanish first language speakers in the class. He then proposed to work with student experience as a solution to his cultural knowledge base insecurities.

In addition to John’s example, many TU participants and some MU participants cited the power of the lesson on how not to teach culture, which tapped into their personal experiences learning culture using these methods. Some admitted that being
sensitized to these approaches had made them rethink their approach to culture. These discussions made teachers consciously critique their beliefs or previous experiences. Several TU participants cited Gabriela’s picture walk activity as a powerful, practical exercise and wanted to integrate this into their culture teaching visions after having experienced it personally. It seems that teacher education activities that connect to teacher candidates’ concerns, questions or beliefs, supporting their practicality ethic, are likely to promote learning along with belief and vision change.

**How Prepared Are These Culture Teachers?**

Despite an increased understanding of culture, its role in L2 teaching/learning, some awareness of intercultural learning and culture teaching approaches, this research suggests that many teacher candidates were left with a somewhat vague understanding of how to teach and integrate culture into their L2 practices. In the year-end focus groups, a number of teachers in both institutions called for more concrete teaching approaches on how to integrate culture into a grammar or language lesson. At year-end, some of the Spanish teacher candidates were still concerned about how to work with the breadth of Hispanic cultures. Others wanted more information on where to get culture teaching resources and how to use computer-assisted tools to work with culture. A number of teachers remained concerned about stereotypes, how to actively work with them and how to present a holistic, fair representation of culture. It seemed apparent that more work on culture teaching approaches is needed, particularly ones that engage learners actively as co-collaborators in the culture learning process.

**Implications**

Based on the findings and participant voices from this research, I have briefly outlined some implications and recommendations on relevant areas of language-and-culture teacher preparation below.

**Educate L2 Teacher Educators About Culture**

It appears the key to developing successful second/additional language and culture teachers appears in many ways to be the knowledge base and practice of their teacher educators. While both of the teacher educators highlighted in this study attended to culture teaching quite explicitly, and introduced intercultural dimensions, it became clear that teacher candidates wanted more content and pedagogical content knowledge around culture teaching. Several critical moments were left untapped that
may have positively reinforced teacher candidates’ culture teaching visions and beliefs, instilling them with more confidence and strategies. As shown in this research it only seems to take one moment to dramatically affect teachers’ beliefs and visions about culture and culture teaching.

As a result, L2 teacher educators should be well oriented in the roles culture teaching and learning can play in L2 classroom, understanding its impact and the intercultural dimension of L2 education. Teacher educators also should be encouraged to critically reflect on issues around their own beliefs, identity, culture, socio-political factors in L2 teaching, native speaker ideology and the crucial role of teacher beliefs in teacher learning. Teacher educators should be well versed in classroom-centred research on the topic of non-native speaker issues in L2 teaching. They should be encouraged to promote collaboration between native and non-native speaking teacher candidates to explore the benefits each has to bring into the L2 classroom (Kamhi-Stein, 1999). Teacher educators need to know how to work with the complexity of culture, with cultural identity and how to facilitate a safe space to explore teacher identity and language-and-culture learning.

**A Larger, Explicit Focus on Culture and its Role in Teacher Preparation**

As detailed in this dissertation, culture teaching was constrained by time and conflicting curricular content in the two methodology classes observed. In these classes of approximately 72 hours, these teacher educators worked to give culture between 6 and 8 hours of explicit focus in these programs of roughly 350 hours of coursework and 10-14 weeks of field experience. Given these teacher educators’ strong personal investment in culture and my research focus which likely heightened their attention to culture, I suspect that this time on culture was likely higher than in an average curriculum and methodology class. Such restricted work with culture seems very limiting given the crucial role of culture, cultural and linguistic identity in education and particularly in second language education (Cummins, 2001; Nieto, 2002). Given the 600-hour length of these teacher preparation programs, the allotment of only 72 hours to prepare teachers to teach the breadth of topics involved in facilitating language-and-culture learning seems inadequate.

In our discussions, Savanna suggested that culture teaching and learning should be a separate course or more thoroughly integrated into the wider teacher preparation program. It appears that an explicit focus on culture and culture teaching in these L2
curriculum and methodology courses helped these new L2 teachers refine their understanding of culture and how to work with it in the classroom. Given the increasingly diverse student populations in many urban Canadian classrooms, a more explicit, reflective and integrated focus on intercultural learning, exploring culture, its role in student and teacher identity, in power relations, and in teaching practice seems a very relevant focus for not just L2 teachers but all future teachers. Work on such culture-related topics could be threaded through foundation courses in teacher education programs focusing on the social context of schooling, and on equity and diversity issues. If such work on culture occurred in foundation courses, L2 curriculum and methodology courses could more explicitly focus on how to operationalize culture in the L2 classroom. Such a holistic focus on culture in overall teacher preparation would help highlight the connection between the cultural dimension in international language education and learner autonomy (Sercu, Garcia & Prieto, 2005).

The Need to Operationalize Culture and Intercultural Learning

Freeman and Johnson (1998) state that it is not only the content knowledge expertise that makes teachers but how teachers apply and frame content knowledge within specific teaching contexts and within their own experiences that is crucial to teacher development. If cultural content knowledge could be addressed in the larger teacher education program context, curriculum and methodology courses could work specifically at operationalizing pedagogical content knowledge related to culture and intercultural learning.

A huge challenge highlighted in this research is the complexity of culture which in itself needs to be operationalized. Particularly for new teachers, these challenges can seem daunting and ultimately inhibiting. Anja suggested “you always need to have a framework to base your opinions and your thoughts on”. This reflects Johnson’s (2009) argument that teachers must be encouraged to think in concepts to refine beliefs and visions about teaching and learning. As culture is such a nebulous topic, it can be challenging for teachers, new and experienced, to know what to prioritize and focus on. In his discussion of integrating culture in L2 teaching, Bennett (2009) suggested working with culture general areas like culturally informed language use like rituals (i.e., greetings, leave-taking, complimenting), communication styles, value orientations (i.e., attitudes to time, hierarchy) to focus culture learning in L2 teaching.
While ideally some of these deeper understandings of culture should be addressed in teacher education foundation courses, they should also be explicitly revisited in L2 teacher education curriculum and methodology given the intersection of language and culture. The caution I would add to avoid stereotypes is to work with these areas as continua acknowledging that individual variation is important to recognize within cultural norms and expectations. As Gabriela said, try to work with the cultural other and the cultural self simultaneously. Focusing on individual differences and the complexity of the cultural self is a good way to deconstruct stereotypes and a good way to build a more complex view of the “other”. Stella Ting-Toomey (1999) advises a first best guess strategy when working with stereotypes in her mindful approach to intercultural learning. Debriefing such strategies offers teachers a way to deconstruct the fears of working with culture and develop concrete strategies to work with these challenges. Such discussions in teacher education as well as L2 education should be scaffolded and situated in students’ beliefs and experiences around culture teaching and learning (Johnson, 2009).

As discussed in this study, the actual process of culture integration can be complex and daunting as it often represents a new approach to language teaching and learning for many teachers who have experienced largely linguistic-focused language learning experiences. For such teachers the introduction of the intercultural dimension into L2 education can be even more overwhelming. Lange (2003, 1999) emphasizes the need to develop a systematic plan to integrate culture and language learning, linking curriculum, assessment and instruction. Explicit work on integrating culture methodically into L2 lesson plans may be one way of refining this sense of integration. Teachers participating in the focus group interviews were happy to discuss and explore concrete models of culture teaching in the L2 classroom. The lessons on how not to teach culture in this study prompted reflective feedback from teachers having experienced culture teaching in that way.

Encouraging new teachers to explicitly explore student-centred, collaborative culture teaching and learning strategies can help teachers see how they can concretely work with culture. Examples from this research included Gabriela’s use of the Think Literacy texts to promote culture learning strategies in L2 classes. Savanna’s Mammoni video or defining culture in ads activity could easily be used to deconstruct cultural perceptions from values and beliefs. Gabriela’s picture walk was an experiential activity
that encouraged teachers to become conscious of their own perception and bias that they bring into the classroom and how to negotiate perception with others.

The culminating projects in these classes required cultural research and helped teachers explore how they could systematically explore and practically integrate culture into L2 classes. In the majority of these activities, teacher candidates chose and researched areas of the target culture they had little knowledge about. Modeling such systematic ethnographic approaches in culture-and-language learning can encourage collaboration, identity investment and autonomy (Byram & Feng, 2004; Damen, 1987; Knutson, 2006; Kramsch, 1993). It also encourages more constructivist teaching approaches engaging lifelong language-and-culture learning strategies. Such activities orient teachers to the knowledge (savoir), skills (savoir apprendre, savoir comprendre) and dispositional dimensions (savoir être, savoir s’engager) of Byram’s (1997) model of intercultural communicative competence. Explicitly discussing this model of intercultural communicative competence and debriefing ways it can be integrated into L2 teaching would help illustrate the intercultural dimension and its relevance in L2 teaching.

Nevertheless, the key to operationalizing culture teaching is for teachers to actively work with culture in their microteaching and practica during their teacher preparation programs. At a minimum, new teachers should be encouraged to integrate culture and intercultural learning into their L2 practices and critically reflect on teaching outcomes. Alternatively, providing a seminar or course on culture and intercultural teaching may allow not just language teachers but all student teachers to actively work with culture, identity and language in their classes. Given current diversity in many Canadian educational contexts, a course working with culture, intercultural communication, and second/additional language learners seems a vital part of teacher education as teaching is largely a communicative craft.

**The Need for a Critical Intercultural Reflective Practice**

The infusion of intercultural teaching and learning into language teacher education practice offers great potential to develop a critical reflective orientation into L2 teacher education. Given the located nature of culture, language and identity in sociocultural communities in which there is often unequal access to power and possibility (Norton, 2005), and where there is an often unconscious perpetuation of these inequities, the development of critical reflective practices in culture-and-language
teaching is crucial. L2 teachers both embody and mediate cultural and linguistic identities through educational processes that can create coercive or collaborative power relations (Canagarajah, 1999). In his discussion of linguistic imperialism and World Englishes, Canagarajah (1999, p. 186) suggests that English teachers need to critically reflect on their hidden assumptions about language, power and knowledge.

Learners should be encouraged to become reflexive about their classroom relations since knowledge is socially constructed. Eventually, learners must be encouraged to become reflexive about themselves, i.e., how their values, community membership, historical background, and subject-positions motivate them to negotiate language and knowledge in particular ways.

I would argue that such an approach adopting a critical, reflective intercultural orientation is a strong step in deconstructing such hidden assumptions. As shown in this research, teacher candidates sometimes displayed feelings of inadequacy in terms of their legitimacy as target language-and-culture teachers. This illegitimacy was perpetuated in many instances by a focus on the need for native speaker cultural and linguistic credibility, for immersion opportunities often idealized in a “native” speaker community, devaluing often commonplace hybrid and fused cultural and linguistic identities and communities which are prevalent among many Ontario secondary students. Norton (2005) calls for L2 teacher education programs to move from a focus on simply content and methods to a more critical approach asking why we teach what we teach and why we teach the way we teach? She suggests that teacher educators situate their practices within their students’ communities of practice and provide a wider range of identity options for pre-service teachers. Adopting a critical, intercultural reflective approach in language teacher education can offer teachers insight into much more than enabling learners with culture-and-language learning strategies. Such a critical, reflective approach can give teachers and their learners greater sense of legitimacy in the language classroom, deconstructing linguistic and cultural imperialism and exploring the relevance of cultural and linguistic hybridity which is timely in today’s language classrooms.

_Call for More Research_

While this research has shown some insights into L2 teacher education processes in a Canadian context, there are many more questions left unanswered and in need of exploration. There is much unknown about the impact of culture and intercultural
learning in L2 teacher education programs and particularly in the Canadian L2 teacher education context. The role of intercultural learning in Ontario L2 classrooms seems abstract to many. And yet I would argue that the Canadian L2 and particularly English language teacher preparation contexts can offer unique very multicultural, multilingual contexts for exploring the treatment of culture and intercultural learning in L2 and second language teacher education programs.

Issues around native speaker ideology, identity and related power dimensions in L2 teacher education that emerged in this research are crucial areas that require more comprehensive examination, particularly given the hybrid nature of cultural identity and communicative demands among current populations. Given my own experience as a gay L2 teacher and teacher educator, I would personally like to see more research examining the treatment and impact of cultural identity issues including sexual identity in L2 teacher preparation programs to develop strategies to empower often marginalized sexual identities in the L2 classroom.

One of the significant limitations of this study was not examining how these newly educated teachers actually practiced culture teaching once in their own international language classrooms. As Pajares (1992) indicated, there is substantial difference between how teachers say they will teach and what they actually do in a classroom. Such a longitudinal study may yield a more complete picture of culture teaching visions and the impact of teacher education processes. Given that the teacher educators in this study were generally in favour of culture teaching, it would be useful to survey a broader range of L2 teacher educators in varied contexts to explore their culture teaching beliefs, visions and factors shaping their practices. This would help build a greater picture of culture’s current role and treatment in L2 teacher education programs and further inform L2 teacher education activities.

Concluding Comments

At the 2007 CARLA Conference, Dr. Timothy Reagan, gave a keynote closing lecture entitled The future of foreign language educators: Are we on our way to becoming dodos? linking the extinct bird from Mauritius to declining enrolment in international language classrooms across the U.S. This seems a tragedy as second/international language teaching contexts have the unique ability to offer a safe environment where teachers and learners can ‘decentre’ themselves culturally and linguistically, exploring new ways of being and seeing. We thereby have an opportunity to explore cultural
differences, our cultural self and develop strategies to build bridges and shift cultural and linguistic perspectives. In today’s increasingly globally interdependent societies, critical awareness of one’s cultural identity, the power it brings or lacks, and strategies to communicate and empathize with dissimilar others are important for learners and critical for L2 teachers. As cultural and linguistic mediators, L2 teachers hold significant responsibility, increasingly so in today’s multicultural contexts.

As Gabriela stated, this field offers the potential to build “a dialogue of peace” for the 21st century. I would argue that a key to this vision of language teaching seems to be in the preparation of our L2 teachers. Anja, a German language teacher candidate in this study, clearly began to see this potential.

I mean you can learn a language but you learn a lot more about not only yourself but about other ways of life and other people…and that just creates better students and better citizens of the world.
Epilogue

In order to examine any impact of this research, a question was sent out 18 months after this research asking any interested research participants to share any impact they had from participating in this research. Those who responded are outlined below along with some reflections from me as researcher.

Comments from Teacher Candidate Participants

Teacher candidates were asked the following question: Did participating in my research have any impact on your thinking about culture/culture teaching in international language teaching? If so, please describe. Only 2 teachers responded.

Yes, your research reminded me that teaching a language is also about teaching a culture or aspects of a culture.

Personally, I am very passionate about culture teaching in the classroom, so I believe that a big part of me wasn't directly impacted about culture/culture teaching in an international language classroom. However, the study really did impact how I interpreted the lessons that I was involved in, and helped me to figure out what NOT to do in a culture lesson. Your research study really helped to strengthen my personal convictions about culture teaching, and helped me to realize the importance of history with culture, and giving context/significance to all cultural aspects that I bring to my classroom.

Comments from Teacher Educators

Teacher educators were asked how participating in this research influenced their culture teaching beliefs and practices. I spoke to Savanna directly on this so her thoughts are paraphrased from our discussion.

Gabriela’s Comments

First of all, having you attend the class as frequently as you did, provided me with a constant visual reminder that the teaching of culture is present in everything we discussed in class throughout the two semesters. I firmly believe that one cannot teach a language without teaching the culture of some family traditions, regional practices or the cultural nuances tied to the semantics of a language. I am MOST fearful of sharing these aspects of culture in a bad way (stereotypes, judgmental drive by shooting comments). So, while there was some tension in me to
get this right, I welcomed the heightened awareness it brought to my teacher practice.

I also think that it heightened our whole class awareness of our own stories and personal experiences with various cultures that were not exclusively Spanish. Your presence and interaction with my students, who saw you as a sort of “equity-culture observer-coach” gave us permission to share stories in the class much more freely. Some of those moments were very unforgettable and most touching.

Savanna’s Comments

When asking Savanna if participating in this research had any impact, Savanna said yes, she increasingly recognized the huge responsibility culture teaching was. She said it prompted her to rethink the ways she organized culture teaching, giving it more time and allowing students to share their experiences with culture learning/teaching.

In the two classes she’d been teaching since the research she admitted not using the culture teaching unit culminating task citing its complexity and the complex size and L2 breakdowns of her classes since. She commented on the depth, breadth of the IL research group in 2007-8 saying it was the ideal group to give this assignment to. Savanna complained that the international language teacher preparation classes often vary widely in numbers and target language teaching backgrounds and depth of experience among students. For example, she said that in 2004 she had a group of 28 vs. 9 this year. The challenge with the culture teaching unit assignment was that it is designed to be worked on in groups and in her past classes she has had one student alone from one language background, making this task unfeasible.

As an alternate assignment, Savanna has put more emphasis on having students integrate culture learning into their lesson plan assignments. In addition, with this year’s group, she had them critically assess culture teaching as presented in L2 textbooks as part of a critical text analysis assignment.

Geoff’s Thoughts

Reflecting on the process and outcomes of this research has inspired me in my exploration of culture and L2 teaching/teacher education and the crucial role that intercultural learning can play in L2 and overall teacher education. It has also reinforced the potential that teacher education can have on shaping future teachers’ beliefs and teaching visions. As shown in this research, one teaching moment can make a big impact.
It has also reinforced my beliefs in the importance of working with teacher candidate beliefs, identity and perceptions of culture in teacher education. I am further convinced that the key to teaching is connecting with learners, their interests, their questions and concerns, whether they are new teachers or L2 students. Having developed a 12-hour program on intercultural communication for ESL teacher candidates, I've used an activity called “Who I am” that helps new teachers examine aspects of their identity, some of which is culturally informed. Like participants in this study, I remain convinced that the more we can work to “see” our culture, the more it helps to see and better understand others.

This research also highlighted the situated nature of teacher education processes and the need we have as teachers to strategically navigate our complex teaching contexts. Participants’ voices and my thesis committee’s guidance made me much more conscious of the often unconscious paradigms that shape teaching/learning processes, sometimes to the detriment of learning and learner identity. I increasingly believe that raising critical consciousness about our beliefs, and being conscious of our “situatedness” seems a key to building more effective teaching practices. As Stella Ting-Toomey (1999) wrote in terms of building intercultural competence, it’s a question of mindfulness.
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Appendix A
Glossary

**Culture**: the learned and shared values, beliefs and behaviours of a group of interacting people.

**Intercultural communication**: Communication among members of different cultural communities that has a reflective impact on the cultural self.

**Intercultural awareness**: Awareness of one’s cultural self and other cultural identities as relative to cultural groups.

**Cross-cultural communication**: Communication between members of two different cultural communities.

**Intercultural communicative competence**: The ability to see oneself operating in a cultural communicative context, to appreciate and adapt to cultural difference.

**Value orientations**: Complex but patterned principles that give order and direction to human acts and thoughts (e.g., individualism vs. collectivism).

**Communication style**: A learned and often implicit communication pattern.

**L2**: Second and/or international language

**C2**: Target culture

**Teacher candidate (TC)**: A teacher enrolled and actively engaged in an initial teacher education program.

**Teacher educator (TE)**: A teacher engaged in preparing teachers to effectively teach in schools.

**DMIS (The Developmental Model for Intercultural Sensitivity)**: A developmental model showing the stages attitudes to cultural difference.
Appendix B
Teacher Educator Consent

Dear Teacher Educator,

As you know, my name is Geoff Lawrence and I am a doctoral candidate from the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at OISE/UT. I am conducting a mixed methods research doctoral study on culture teaching in international language teacher preparation programs in Ontario. This study is entitled *Learning about Otherness: The Treatment and Impact of Culture Learning in International Language Teacher Preparation* and is being funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). I hope this study will lead to greater understanding of how culture and culture teaching is approached in language teacher education in Canada. One of the principal goals of this research is to examine the impact of culture teaching beliefs and practices in a language teacher preparation program on teacher candidate and teacher educator conceptualizations of culture teaching in language education. This is of particular importance at a time when new language teaching standards are being developed around the world to reposition culture teaching at the core of language education and language teacher preparation.

Due to the culture teaching focus of this research, this study will involve two case studies that will include two complementary international language teacher preparation methods/curriculum classes located in culturally and institutionally distinct settings in Southern Ontario. Approximately 12 – 20 teacher candidates and one teacher educator will be involved in each case study environment. Your international language teacher preparation methods/curriculum class has been chosen due to its focus preparing teachers of two or more international languages that may entail a rich negotiation of culture teaching visions and practices. Within these case study environments, a range of research activities will be employed with consenting participants to examine how teacher educator and teacher candidate beliefs about culture, culture teaching in language education change over a teacher preparation program. I am writing to ask your permission to conduct case study research in your international language teacher preparation methods/curriculum class over the 2007-8.

**Research scope**

Specifically, this study would include the following recruitment and data collection activities:

- A maximum of eight 2-hour non-participant observations conducted over the academic year with four taking place in the fall semester and four in the winter semester, scheduled at a mutually convenient time with you, the teacher educator;
- Two one-hour interviews conducted with you, the teacher educator, one at the beginning and at the end of the academic year along with one possible 30 minute mid-session interview following a culture teaching lesson, scheduled at a convenient time for you;
- A 30-minute pre-culture teaching questionnaire for consenting teacher candidates followed by one 20-minute post-culture teaching questionnaire and one 20-minute year-end questionnaire; the pre-culture teaching survey will be provided after the teacher candidates’ first practice teaching experience and ideally before the culture teaching work begins in the class; the year-end questionnaire will take place near the end of the program in March or April, 2008; times to complete these surveys will be negotiated with you;
• Two pre and post-program one-hour interviews will be conducted outside of class with three consenting teacher candidates who will be selected to represent the cross-section of teacher candidates in the class;
• One 90-minute focus group interview will be conducted with consenting teacher candidates outside of class near the end of the academic year.

Individual interviews

As part of this research, I am also writing to ask your permission and consent to participate in up to three one-on-one interviews over the year discussing your beliefs about culture/culture teaching and your culture teaching practices. This would include two one-hour interviews, one held near the beginning of the course in 2007 and one near the end of the course in 2008. These interviews will be audiotaped with your consent. Or if you’d prefer I can take notes as you talk. In these two one-hour interviews I would ask about your beliefs and practices toward teaching culture in teacher preparation and how these beliefs/practices evolve over the year. The third interview would be to follow up on a specific culture teaching lesson that you conduct sometime in the course. This interview would be no more than 30 minutes and would be to explore your rationale behind culture teaching, your thoughts on the lesson and your perceptions of its impact on teacher candidates. Should you agree to participate in these interviews, times for these interviews would be negotiated with you understanding that your time is very limited.

Processes to protect your option to participate and your confidentiality

Please understand you are under no obligation to participate in this research or any specific parts of it. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any point without any negative consequences. In the individual interviews you are under no obligation to answer questions and may withdraw at any point without any negative consequences. All data generated during this study will remain confidential. You and consenting teacher candidates in your class will be asked to choose a pseudonym that will ensure your anonymity. Information from the study will remain completely confidential and will not be shared with anyone outside of my committee. To help protect your anonymity, you will be asked to read and revise all written materials that contain information generated by your participation in the study and in your interviews. The same approach will be conducted with the consenting teacher candidates participating in the study. This will allow you and your teacher candidates the opportunity to edit out any information that you feel is too sensitive or that you feel would serve to identify you.

The institutions involved in this research will be described using generics (e.g., an urban university in Southern Ontario). To ensure anonymity, individual participants will be described in all research using self-selected pseudonyms. Please note that due to the collaborative nature of the focus group research, the privacy and confidentiality of focus group participants cannot be completely guaranteed. All participants will be volunteers who responded to the invitation information/consent letters. The invitation letter will explain the focus of the research, the schedule of the focus group and the way it will be conducted. Participants will be made aware of the risks of their participation and will be requested to sign a consent form confirming their willingness to participate in the project.

All data will be stored in either a password-protected area of a restricted-access computer or in a locked cabinet, both housed in the researcher’s home. Only the researcher and the thesis committee members will
have access to the data. All data, documents, audiotaped interviews and transcripts etc. will be destroyed three years after the completion of all data collection.

The privacy and confidentiality of all participants will also be protected by the guarantee that all presentations or publications of the research findings will be made after the end of the 2007-2008 academic year and will only be made using pseudonyms and generics for the institutions involved. No materials will be shared before this date in order to ensure that teacher candidates, you as teacher educator, and/or potential employers are not influenced by the findings.

**Potential benefits**

It is hoped that this research may promote reflective growth among teacher candidates and the teacher educator in the area of culture/language teaching. Summaries of the research findings will be offered to interested participants.

In recognition of the time commitment made by you, the teacher educator in this research, an online gift certificate for a bookstore will be provided in addition to several hours in-kind teaching/teaching assistantship support at a mutually convenient time outside of the classroom observations. In an effort to thank teacher candidates in your class, language teaching resources determined in consultation with you (i.e. a book on language teaching), and a list of culture teaching reference sites will be provided to all teacher candidates in the classroom being observed along with an end-of-the-year catered lunch.

Teacher candidates consenting to two individual interviews over the year will be given a $50 gift certificate for an online bookstore. Teacher candidate participants in the focus group will be provided with food and drinks and a $30 gift certificate for an online bookstore. In addition, all interested participants at each case study site will be provided with a summary of the research findings upon completion of this thesis research.

In closing, allow me to reiterate that you are under no obligation to agree to participate in this research. However, if you choose to do so, you will be free to raise questions or concerns with me at any time throughout the study and you may withdraw at any time if you choose.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me at xxx-xxx-xxxx or by email: xxxxx@xxx.xx with any concerns you may have. Alternatively you can contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. Antoinette Gagné, at OISE/UT at xxxxx@xxx.xx or at xxx-xxx-xxxx. A consent form is attached for your review.

Sincerely,

Geoff Lawrence

**TEACHER EDUCATOR CONSENT FORM**

I, __________________________, give permission for the conduct of the SSHRC-funded doctoral research study entitled, *Learning about Otherness: The Treatment and Impact of Culture Learning in International Language Teacher Preparation*, examining the cultural dimension in my pre-service international language teacher preparation program at your university.
I understand that giving permission for the conduct of this study would include the recruitment and data collection activities listed above. I understand that the researcher will make every effort to ensure the confidentiality of participants in this study as outlined above. I understand the researcher’s limitations in ensuring complete confidentiality of focus group participation.

I understand that my participation would involve up to three individual interviews at the following times:

First interview: October – November, 2007

Second interview: March – April, 2008

Third possible interview: October, 2007 through April, 2008

I understand that the first and second interviews will take about 60 minutes, will be audiotaped, and will occur at a time and place that is convenient for me. I understand that my third possible interview will again be audiotaped and will occur at a time and place that is convenient for me. I understand that if I prefer, I can ask that the interviews are not audiotaped and that the researcher will take notes instead.

I understand that I am under no obligation to agree to participate in any of these interviews. I understand that I may refuse to answer any questions, to stop the interview at any time, to withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences. I understand that my specific answers and comments will be kept confidential. I understand that my name will not be identified in any report or presentation that may arise from the study. I understand that I will be asked to read and revise all written materials generated by my individual participation in these interviews. This will allow me the opportunity to edit out any information that I feel is too sensitive or that I feel would serve to identify me. I understand that only the principal investigator and his thesis committee will have access to the information collected during the study. I understand that the findings of this study may be presented at conferences and published using pseudonyms without any personal or institutionally identifiable information.

I understand what this study involves and agree to participate. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature_________________________

Date________

I wish to use the following pseudonym in this research __________________________________________

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator Geoff Lawrence at xxx-xxx-xxxx or by email: xxxx@xxx.xx

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator Geoff Lawrence at xxx-xxx-xxxx or email: xxxx@xxx.xx. You may also contact the Ethics Review Office at xxxx@xxx.xx, or at xxx-xxx-xxxx if you have any questions about your rights as a participant.
Appendix C

University Administration Consent

Dear University Administrator,

My name is Geoff Lawrence and I am a doctoral candidate from the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at OISE/UT. I am conducting a mixed methods research doctoral study on culture teaching in international language teacher preparation programs in Ontario. This study is entitled *Learning about Otherness: The Treatment and Impact of Culture Learning in International Language Teacher Preparation* and is being funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). I hope this study will lead to greater understanding of how culture and culture teaching is approached in language teacher education in Canada. One of the principal goals of this research is to examine the impact of culture teaching beliefs and practices in a language teacher preparation program on teacher candidate and teacher educator conceptualizations of culture teaching in language education. This is of particular importance at a time when new language teaching standards are being developed around the world to reposition culture teaching at the core of language education and language teacher preparation.

Due to the culture teaching focus of this research, this study will involve two case studies that will include two complementary international language teacher preparation methods/curriculum classes located in culturally and institutionally distinct settings in Southern Ontario. Approximately 12 – 20 teacher candidates and one teacher educator will be involved in each case study environment. One of your university’s international language teacher preparation methods/curriculum classes has been chosen due to its focus preparing teachers of two or more international languages that may entail a rich negotiation of culture teaching visions and practices. I have met and spoken with one of your faculty teaching international language teacher preparation, Ms. XXX XXXXX, who has agreed to participate in this study.

Within these case study environments, a range of research activities will be employed with consenting participants to examine how teacher educator and teacher candidate beliefs about culture, culture teaching in language education change over a teacher preparation program. I am writing to ask your permission to conduct case study research in Ms. XXXXX’s international language teacher preparation methods/curriculum classes over the 2007-8 academic year.

Specifically, this study would include the following recruitment and data collection activities:

- A maximum of eight 2-hour non-participant observations conducted over the academic year with no more than four taking place in the fall semester and four in the winter semester, scheduled at a mutually convenient time with the consenting teacher educator;
- Two one-hour interviews conducted with the teacher educator, one at the beginning and at the end of the academic year along with one possible 30 minute mid-session interview following a culture teaching lesson, scheduled at a convenient time with the consenting teacher educator;
- A pre and post-program 30-minute questionnaire for consenting teacher candidates; the pre-program survey will be provided near the beginning of the academic year, the post-program survey at the end; times to complete these surveys will be negotiated with the consenting teacher educator;
- Two pre and post-program one-hour interviews will be conducted outside of class with three consenting teacher candidates who will be selected to represent the cross-section of teacher candidates in the class;
• One 90-minute focus group interview will be conducted with consenting teacher candidates outside of class near the end of the academic year.

**Processes to protect participants’ options to participate and their confidentiality**

Should you consent to this research, information letters and consent forms will be distributed to all potential participants in this case study classroom outlining that participation is completely voluntary and that the research is independent of the teacher preparation program. As the researcher, I will emphasize that participants have the ability to withdraw at any time and that non-participation will not carry any negative consequences.

All data generated during this study will remain confidential and all consenting participants in classroom observations and interviews will be asked to choose a pseudonym as well as to read and revise all written materials generated by the project that contain personal information, background and academic practices at your university. This will allow participants the opportunity to edit out any information that they feel is too sensitive or that they feel would serve to identify them. The institutions involved in this research will be described using generics (e.g., an urban university in Southern Ontario). To ensure anonymity, individual participants will be described in all research using self-selected pseudonyms. Please note that due to the collaborative nature of the focus group research, the privacy and confidentiality of focus group participants cannot be completely guaranteed. All participants will be volunteers who responded to the invitation information/consent letters. The invitation letter will explain the focus of the research, the schedule of the focus group and the way it will be conducted. Participants will be made aware of the risks of their participation and will be requested to sign a consent form confirming their willingness to participate in the project.

All project data will be stored in either a password-protected area of a restricted-access computer or in a locked cabinet, both housed in my home. Only my thesis committee members and I will have access to the data. All data, documents, audiotaped interviews and transcripts etc. will be destroyed three years after the completion of all data collection.

The privacy and confidentiality of all participants will also be protected by the guarantee that all presentations or publications of the research findings will be made after the end of the 2007-2008 academic year and will only be made using pseudonyms and generics for the institutions involved. No materials will be shared before this date in order to ensure that teacher candidates, teacher educators, and/or potential employers are not influenced by the findings.

**Potential benefits**

It is hoped that this research may promote reflective growth among teacher candidates and the teacher educator in the area of culture/language teaching. Summaries of the research findings will be offered to interested participants and to your office if interested.

In recognition of the time commitment made by the teacher educator to this research, an online gift certificate for a book store will be provided in addition to several hours in-kind teaching/teaching assistantship support at a mutually convenient time outside of the classroom observations. In consultation with the teacher educator, language teaching resources and a list of culture teaching reference sites will be
provided to all teacher candidates in the classroom being observed along with an end-of-the-year catered lunch.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me at xxx-xxx-xxxx or by email: xxxxx@xxx.xx with any concerns you may have. Alternatively you can contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. Antoinette Gagné, at OISE/UT at xxxxx@xxx.xx or at xxx-xxx-xxxx. A consent form is attached for your review.

Sincerely,

Geoff Lawrence

The Cultural Dimension in International Language Teacher Preparation: An Analysis of Teacher Beliefs and Experience

ADMINISTRATIVE CONSENT FORM

I, _________________________, give permission for the conduct of the SSHRC-funded doctoral research study entitled, Learning about Otherness: The Treatment and Impact of Culture Learning in International Language Teacher Preparation, examining the cultural dimension in the pre-service international language teacher preparation program, at XXXXXXX.

I understand that giving permission for the conduct of this study would include the recruitment and data collection activities listed above. I understand that the researcher will make every effort to ensure the confidentiality of participants in this study as outlined above. I understand the researcher’s limitations in ensuring complete confidentiality of focus group participation.

I understand that I may withdraw my consent from this study at any time without any negative consequences. I understand that only the principal investigator and his thesis committee will have access to the information collected during the study. I understand that the findings of this study may be presented at conferences and published using pseudonyms without any personal or institutionally identifiable information.

I understand what this study involves and give permission for its conduct. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature________________________

Date____________________________

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator Geoff Lawrence at xxx-xxx-xxxx or email: xxxxx@xxx.xx. If you have any questions about the rights of participants in research, please contact the Ethics Review Office at xxxxx@xxx.xx or xxx-xxx-xxxx.
Appendix D
Teacher Candidate Consent

Dear Teacher Candidate,

As announced in class, my name is Geoff Lawrence and I am a doctoral candidate from the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at the OISE/UT conducting a mixed methods research doctoral study on culture teaching in international language teacher preparation programs in Ontario. This study is entitled Learning about Otherness: The Treatment and Impact of Culture Learning in International Language Teacher Preparation and is being funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). I hope this study will lead to greater understanding of how culture and culture teaching is approached in language teacher education in Canada. As mentioned, one of the main goals of this research is to examine the impact of culture teaching beliefs and practices in a language teacher preparation program on teacher candidate and teacher educator conceptualizations of culture teaching in language education. This is of particular importance at a time when new language teaching standards are being developed around the world to reposition culture teaching at the core of language education and language teacher preparation.

This study will involve two case studies that will include two complementary international language teacher preparation methods/curriculum classes located in culturally and institutionally distinct settings in Southern Ontario. Approximately 12 – 20 teacher candidates and one teacher educator will be involved in each case study environment. Your international language teacher preparation methods/curriculum class has been chosen due to its focus preparing teachers of two or more international languages that may involve a rich negotiation of culture teaching visions and practices. Within these case study environments, a range of data collection activities (outlined below) will be used with consenting participants in your class to examine how teacher educator and teacher candidate beliefs about culture, culture teaching in language education change over a teacher preparation program. These research/data collection activities will be conducted in two phases. I am writing now to ask you whether you would consider being a participant in Phase 1 data collection activities, outlined below:

Phase 1 Data Collection Activities

- Classroom observations will involve me, as researcher, observing no more than eight 2-hour class periods over the academic year (a maximum of four of your classes in the fall and four in the winter semester). During these observations, I will not be participating in class and will simply be observing what happens, taking notes on events/interaction involving culture and/or culture teaching. If you decide to consent, I would ask you to choose a pseudonym (different name) that I would use to ensure your anonymity in this research (see below for a full description of the processes used to maintain your anonymity/confidentiality in this research). Please note if you do not consent to be observed in these classroom observations that your participation will not be recorded in any of my observation notes.

- Pre and post-teacher preparation program questionnaires will ask personal information, background information on your teaching and target language/culture-related experiences. These questionnaires would also ask for your views on culture, visions of culture teaching in language education and to share any thoughts you have on how you best see culture teaching in language education. If you agree to participate, the 30-minute pre-culture teaching questionnaire would be distributed at a time agreed on with your teacher educator after your first practicum and before you
focus on culture teaching. The second 20-minute questionnaire will take place after your culture teaching work and the final 20-minute questionnaire will be distributed at a convenient time late in the school year (March or April, 2008) during or at the end of class.

Phase 2 Data Collection Activities (to be recruited for at a later date)

- **One-on-one interviews** – two 1-hour interviews will be conducted outside of class with three consenting teacher candidates who will be recruited to represent the cross-section of teacher candidates in the class; one interview will be conducted in the fall semester, one in the winter, near the end of the course.
- **One 90-minute focus group interview** - conducted with 5 – 10 consenting teacher candidates outside of class near the end of the academic year.

These interviews will be used to find out more in-depth information about teacher beliefs and practices around culture teaching in language education. I will be recruiting for participants in this phase of research activities at a later date, from those teacher candidates completing the questionnaires.

Processes to protect your option to participate and your confidentiality

*As noted above, if you are willing to agree to participation in Phase 1 data collection activities, you would be asked to choose a pseudonym to ensure your confidentiality. To ensure anonymity, all consenting participants will be described in all research notes and documentation using only pseudonyms. In order to compare your responses on your pre- vs. post-questionnaires and to ensure your confidentiality in this process, each questionnaire would be given a code that would be matched with your pseudonym on a list of teacher candidates consenting to participate in this research. This process identifying your pre- and post-program questionnaires is necessary to compare any changes in your views on culture teaching over the teacher preparation program.*

Please understand you are under no obligation to participate in this research and that this research is completely independent of your teacher preparation program. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any point without any negative consequences. In the questionnaire responses you may decline to answer any question or prompt and may withdraw at any point without any negative consequences. At any point in this research you may withdraw at any time without any negative consequences. All data generated during this study will remain confidential. Information from the study will remain completely confidential and will not be shared with anyone outside of my committee. To help protect your anonymity, you will be asked to read and revise all written materials that contain direct quotes or any information generated by your individual participation in the classroom observations. This will allow you the opportunity to edit out any information that you feel is too sensitive or that you feel would serve to identify you.

The institutions involved in this research will be described using generics (e.g., an urban university in Southern Ontario). All data will be stored in either a password-protected area of a restricted-access computer or in a locked cabinet, both housed in the researcher’s home. Only the researcher and the thesis committee members will have access to the data. All data, documents, observation notes, questionnaires, etc. will be destroyed three years after the completion of all data collection.
The privacy and confidentiality of all participants will also be protected by the guarantee that all presentations or publications of the research findings will be made after the end of the 2007-2008 academic year and will only be made using pseudonyms and generics for the institutions involved. No materials will be shared before this date in order to ensure that you as a teacher candidate, the teacher educator, and/or potential employers are not influenced by the findings.

Potential Benefits

It is hoped that this research may promote reflective growth among you, the other teacher candidates and the teacher educator in the area of culture/language teaching. Summaries of the research findings will be offered to you if you are interested.

In an effort to thank you and other teacher candidates in your class, language teaching resources determined in consultation with your teacher educator, and a list of culture teaching websites will be provided to all of your class (whether they consent to participate or not) along with an end-of-the-year catered lunch.

In closing, allow me to reiterate that you are under no obligation to agree to participate in this research. However, if you choose to do so, you will be free to raise questions or concerns with me at any time throughout the study and you may withdraw at any time if you choose.

Thank you for your consideration. **If you decide to participate in this study please read through and sign the attached consent form and let me know if you have any questions.** Please contact me at xxx-xxx-xxxx or by email: xxxxx@xxx.xx with any concerns/questions you may have. Alternatively you can contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. Antoinette Gagné, at OISE/UT at xxxxx@xxx.xx or at xxx-xxx-xxxx.

Sincerely,

Geoff Lawrence

**TEACHER CANDIDATE CONSENT FORM**

I, ________________________, agree to take part in the SSHRC-funded doctoral research study entitled, *Learning about Otherness: The Treatment and Impact of Culture Learning in International Language Teacher Preparation*, examining the cultural dimension in the pre-service international language teacher preparation program at XXXXX.

*I understand that giving permission for the conduct of this study would include participating in classroom observations and the pre and post questionnaire outlined above in Phase 1 activities of this research.*

I understand that I am under no obligation to agree to participate in this research. I understand that participation or non-participation will not have any consequences for my academic standing at my university and that this research is completely independent of my teacher preparation program. I understand that I will be asked to choose a pseudonym to ensure my confidentiality in this research and that my participation, if and when described in all research notes and documentation will use my self-selected pseudonym. To help protect my anonymity and confidentiality, I will be asked to read and revise all written materials that contain
direct quotes or any information generated by my individual participation in the classroom observations. This will allow me the opportunity to edit out any information that I feel is too sensitive or that I feel would serve to identify me.

I understand that I may refuse to answer any questions on the questionnaire, to stop answering the questionnaire at any time, and/or withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that my specific answers and comments will be kept confidential. I understand that my name will not be identified in any report or presentation that may arise from the study. I understand that my specific answers and comments will be kept confidential. I understand that only the principal investigator and the researcher’s thesis committee will have access to the information collected during the study. I understand that the findings of this study may be presented at conferences and published in a range of publications using pseudonyms without any personal or institutionally identifiable information.

I understand that participation in this research may promote reflective growth about language and culture teaching and that I will be provided with a language teaching resource at the end of the year along with a reference list of culture teaching websites. I understand that a summary of the findings of the study will be given to me.

I understand what this study involves and agree to participate. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature_________________________
Date_________

I wish to use the following pseudonym in this research
____________________________________________

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator Geoff Lawrence at xxx-xxx-xxxx or xxxxx@xxx.xx

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator Geoff Lawrence at xxx-xxx-xxxx or email:gpjlawrence@gmail.com. You may also contact the Ethics Review Office at xxxxx@xxx.xx, or at xxx-xxx-xxxx if you have any questions about your rights as a participant.
Appendix E
Pre Culture Teaching Questionnaire

Please write your Pseudonym here:

Please note: This survey will be used to examine your beliefs toward culture, culture teaching and your visions of culture teaching in international language education. Please respond as completely as you can and as you are willing. Your responses will be kept completely confidential and anonymous.

Part A: Your Personal Background & Teaching Experience

Please complete the following questions that describe your background and experience. This information will be used to compare participant responses.

1. What is/are your first language(s)? ____________________________________________
2. What is your ethno-cultural background (e.g. Pakistani-Canadian)? ______________
3. I am ________ years old.
4. I am: □ Female □ Male
5. I have completed a:
   □ Bachelor’s degree in (please describe): ________________________________________
   □ Master’s degree in (please describe): ________________________________________
   □ Doctoral degree in (please describe): ________________________________________
   □ Other, please describe: ____________________________________________________
6. What international language (i.e. target language) are you preparing to teach?
   □ Spanish □ Italian □ German □ Other: _________________________________________
7. In addition to this language, please list any other subjects you are preparing to teach at the secondary level (e.g., math, English, ESL, French)?
   ________________________________________________________________________
8. Have you taught a second/additional or international language before?
   □ Yes (if you answered YES, please answer Questions a – d below)
   □ No (if you answered NO, please proceed to Question # 9 on the next page)
   a. Which language(s) have you taught? _______________________________________
   b. How long have you spent teaching this/these language(s)? _______ years and/or _____ months
   c. Did any of this teaching take place away from your country of origin (i.e. where you were born)?
      □ No □ Yes
   d. When teaching this/these language(s), describe the range of students you taught in terms of:
      i. Language backgrounds ______________________________________________________
      ii. Ethno-cultural backgrounds ________________________________________________
      iii. Range of language levels taught (e.g., beginner….advanced levels?) _________
9. Have you ever lived away from your country of origin (i.e. where you were born)?
   □ No
   □ Yes, I have lived ______ years and/or _____ months in a different country.
10. Have you ever lived in a country where the target language you plan on teaching is widely spoken?
    □ No
    □ Yes, I have lived ______ years and/or _____ months in a country where the target language I am preparing to teach is widely spoken.
Part B: Your views on culture teaching

This section asks for your familiarity with and views on culture teaching in international language teaching/learning. Please respond as completely as you can.

1. Please rank how familiar you currently feel with the areas listed below as they relate to the target language and culture you’re planning to teach. Your level of familiarity should reflect how extensively you could discuss/teach the topic in your language classroom (i.e., “Very familiar” means it would be very easy for you to talk about the topic extensively; “Not familiar at all” means you don’t really know anything about this particular cultural aspect of the target language you’re going to teach).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
<th>Sufficiently familiar</th>
<th>Not sufficiently familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-historical background on the target culture (e.g., history, political systems, religions, traditions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms of cultural expression (literature, music, art)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily life, routines, living conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication patterns in the target language (e.g., indirect vs. direct communication patterns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/pop culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The range of cultural diversity in the target language (e.g., many diverse cultural groups in many different countries speak Spanish)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value systems and beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between the target language and culture (e.g., how culture influences language use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In your opinion, what are the greatest potential benefits of culture teaching in international language teaching/learning?

3. What are the biggest concerns you have about culture teaching?
4. Please indicate your agreement with each statement by checking the box that most closely matches your current feeling toward the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Culture and language are interconnected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Culture teaching should be at the core of international language teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning about other cultures can help language learners become more empathetic toward people from other cultures and backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Given limited time, I would teach linguistic competence over cultural competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel unsure of which aspects of culture to teach in an international language class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Given the varied people/cultural groups speaking the same language (e.g., Spanish spoken in many different countries), I feel unsure of which culture to teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The target culture should be taught in a way that helps language learners develop cultural self-awareness (helps them think about their own cultural assumptions/practices).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Knowledge about the target culture will help students' target language skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I worry about culture teaching reinforcing stereotypes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To teach international languages effectively, teachers need to be aware of cultural differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Online approaches (e.g., e-pal exchanges, webquests) offer rich opportunities for culture teaching/learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers and learners should explore culture learning together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I know how to effectively integrate culture into language teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel excited about teaching about culture in my international language classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please share any comments or thoughts you have on any of the above statements.
Part C: Your vision of culture teaching

This final section asks for your thoughts on how you see yourself teaching culture in your language classes. Please respond to these questions and use the back of the questionnaire if you need more space.

1. Did your recent practice teaching experience change your views on culture teaching in language education?
   - [ ] No  [ ] Somewhat  [ ] Yes

   Please explain your response (e.g. why your views didn’t change or what factors/experiences changed your views).

2. Below are some potential objectives of culture teaching in language teaching/learning. Please check the degree of importance you feel each objective should have in a Canadian international language teaching classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential culture teaching objectives</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing awareness of the relationship between the target language and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about socio-historical perspectives of the target culture (e.g., history, religion, politics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about daily life/routines and living conditions in the target culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about communication patterns in the target culture (e.g., indirect vs. direct communication patterns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about cultural expression in the target culture (e.g., literature, music, art)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about the shared values and beliefs within the target culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing attitudes of openness and tolerance of other people/cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging reflection on cultural differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the ability to empathize with other cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing increased understanding of students’ own culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. As a future language teacher, how often do you see yourself teaching culture in your language classroom?

- ☐ In every class
- ☐ Often
- ☐ Occasionally
- ☐ Never
- ☐ Other (please describe):

4. As a future language teacher how do you feel the following factors will influence how you teach culture in your language classroom? On a scale from 1 – 5 (where 1 = no influence vs. 5 = strong influence), please check the degree of influence each factor will have on your culture teaching approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My target cultural experience/knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student target language level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. On the following scale mark to what degree you feel comfortable teaching culture in your international language classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Completely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain what would make you more comfortable.

6. As a future language teacher, what specific strategies do you think you will use to teach culture in your international language classroom?

7. As a future language teacher working in Ontario schools, what skills, strategies and knowledge do you need to know about culture to teach international language classes effectively?

Thank you for sharing your thoughts!

P.S. Would you consider doing two 1-hour individual interviews with me over the school year on your thoughts on culture teaching? (Don’t worry - you’d get full details before having to agree.)

☐ Yes, possibly ☐ Not interested
Appendix F
Teacher Candidate Interview Consent

Dear Teacher Candidate,

As you know I’ve been conducting research with your group examining the cultural dimension in language teacher preparation in the SSHRC-funded study, Learning about Otherness: The Treatment and Impact of Culture Learning in International Language Teacher Preparation.

As discussed earlier, a key component of this research involves two one-on-one interviews with up to three teacher candidates from your class to explore thoughts on culture teaching in language education and how these thoughts and envisioned approaches to culture teaching change over the teacher preparation program.

Individual interviews

I am writing to ask your permission to participate in two one-on-one interviews, outside of class, over the year discussing your beliefs about culture/culture teaching and your culture teaching practices. This would include two 1-hour interviews, one within the next three weeks (by November 19) and one near the end of the course in 2008. These interviews will be audiotaped and transcribed with your consent. In these two one-hour interviews I would ask about your beliefs and practices toward teaching culture in teacher preparation and how these beliefs/practices evolve over the year. Should you agree to participate in these interviews, mutually convenient times for these interviews would be negotiated with you understanding that your time is very limited. If you like, I would be happy to email you some draft questions that I will be asking you ahead of time.

Processes to protect your option to participate and your confidentiality

Please understand you are under no obligation to participate in this research and that this research is completely independent of your teacher preparation program. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any point without any negative consequences. In the interview you have the right to not answer questions and to withdraw at any point without any negative consequences. All data generated during this study will remain confidential and you will be asked to use a pseudonym. No one will be told of your involvement in this part of the study. To help protect your anonymity, you will be asked to read and revise all written materials generated by the research that contain information generated by your interview. This will allow you the opportunity to edit out any information that you feel is too sensitive or that you feel would serve to identify you. All data will be stored in either a password-protected area of a restricted-access computer or in a locked cabinet, both in my home. Only my thesis committee members and I will have access to the data. All data, audiotapes, transcriptions and notes will be destroyed three years after the completion of all data collection.

Potential Benefits

It is hoped that this interview process may promote reflective growth among you in the area of culture/language teaching. In an effort to thank you for your contribution and time to this phase of this research, at the end of this research process you will receive a $50 gift certificate for an online bookstore
(Amazon.ca or Indigo.ca) in addition to a summary of the research findings upon completion of this thesis research.

In closing, allow me to reiterate that you are under no obligation to agree to participate in this research. However, if you choose to do so, you will be free to raise questions or concerns with me at any time throughout the study and you may withdraw at any time if you choose.

Thank you for your consideration. If you decide to participate in this study please read through and sign/return to me the attached consent form. Please contact me at xxx-xxx-xxxx or by email: xxxxx@xxx.xx with any concerns/questions you may have. Alternatively you can contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. Antoinette Gagné, at OISE/UT at xxxxx@xxx.xx or at xxx-xxx-xxxx.

Sincerely,
Geoff Lawrence

*Learning about Otherness: The Treatment and Impact of Culture Learning in International Language Teacher Preparation*

**TEACHER CANDIDATE CONSENT FORM** for individual interviews

I, ____________________________, agree to take part in the SSHRC-funded doctoral research study entitled, *The Cultural Dimension in International Language Teacher Preparation: An Analysis of Teacher Beliefs and Experience*, examining the cultural dimension in the pre-service international language teacher preparation program at XXXX.

I understand that my participation would two 1-hour interviews at the following times:

First interview: November, 2007

Final interview: March – April, 2008

I understand that both interviews will take about 60 minutes, will be audiotaped, and will occur at a time and place that is convenient for me.

I understand that I am under no obligation to agree to participate in any of these interviews. I understand that I may refuse to answer any questions, to stop the interview at any time, to withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences. I understand that my specific answers and comments will be kept confidential. I understand that my name will not be identified in any report or presentation that may arise from the study. I understand that I will be asked to read and revise all written materials generated by my individual participation in these interviews. This will allow me the opportunity to edit out any information that I feel is too sensitive or that I feel would serve to identify me. I understand that only the principal investigator and his thesis committee will have access to the information collected during the study. I understand that the findings of this study may be presented at conferences and published using pseudonyms without any personal or institutionally identifiable information.
I understand what this study involves and agree to participate. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature_________________________  Date________________________

Email (to arrange a convenient time to meet for an interview – Please PRINT):

______________________________________________________________

I will use the following pseudonym in this research

______________________________________________

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator Geoff Lawrence at xxx-xxx-xxxx or xxxx@xxx.xx. You may also contact the Ethics Review Office at xxxx@xxx.xx, or at xxx-xxx-xxxx if you have any questions about your rights as a participant.
Appendix G
Focus Group Consent

Dear Teacher Candidate,

As you know I’ve been conducting research with your group examining the cultural dimension in language teacher preparation in the SSHRC-funded study, Learning about Otherness: The Treatment and Impact of Culture Learning in International Language Teacher Preparation.

A key component of this research involves one 60 to 90-minute focus group with up to 5 - 8 teacher candidates from your class to explore your thoughts on culture teaching in language education and how your thoughts and envisioned approaches to culture teaching have changed over your international language teacher preparation program.

Focus group interviews

I am writing to ask your permission and consent to participate in one 60 to 90-minute focus group interview discussing your beliefs about culture/culture teaching, your visions of culture teaching practices and how these have evolved over your teacher preparation program. This focus group interview would take place outside of class and in your University’s Education building. This focus group interview will be audiotaped and transcribed with your consent. This focus group interview would involve between 5 and 8 consenting teacher candidates from your teacher preparation class. If more than eight participants consent to participate, participants will be selected to represent the diversity of the class in terms of demographic information, language teaching focus and experience. In this focus group interview I would ask about your beliefs and practices toward teaching culture in teacher preparation and how these beliefs/practices have evolved over your language teacher preparation program. I will also be exploring with you some ideas of best practices in culture teaching and getting your feedback on these approaches. Should you agree to participate in these interviews, a mutually convenient time and location for this interview will be determined and proposed to you.

Processes to protect your option to participate and your confidentiality

Please understand you are under no obligation to participate in this research and that this research is completely independent of your teacher preparation program. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any point without any negative consequences. In the interview you have the right to not answer questions and to withdraw at any point without any negative consequences. Please note that due to the collaborative nature of the focus group research, the privacy and confidentiality of focus group participants cannot be completely guaranteed. All participants will be volunteers who responded to this invitation information/consent letter explaining the focus of the research, the schedule of the focus group and the way it will be conducted. Before the focus group begins, I will emphasize to all participants the need to maintain privacy and confidentiality of participants and their contributions. However, it is important to note that this privacy and confidentiality is dependent on individual participants involved in this interview, outside of my control.

All data generated during this study will remain confidential and you will be asked to choose/use a pseudonym. To help protect your anonymity, you will be asked to read and revise all written materials...
generated by your individual participation in this interview. This will allow you the opportunity to edit out any information that you feel is too sensitive or that you feel would serve to identify you. All data will be stored in either a password-protected area of a restricted-access computer or in a locked cabinet, both in the researcher’s home. Only myself as the researcher and my thesis committee members will have access to the data. All data, audiotapes, transcriptions and notes will be destroyed three years after the completion of all data collection.

**Potential Benefits**

It is hoped that this interview process may promote reflective growth among you and your colleagues in the area of culture/language teaching. In an effort to thank you for your contribution and time to this phase of this research, at the end of the interview you will receive a $40 Chapters-Indigo gift certificate along with food and drinks provided during the focus group interview. In addition, you will receive a summary of the research findings upon completion of this thesis research.

In closing, allow me to reiterate that you are under no obligation to agree to participate in this research. However, if you choose to do so, you will be free to raise questions or concerns with me at any time throughout the study and you may withdraw at any time if you choose.

Thank you for your consideration. **If you decide to participate in this study please read through and sign/return to me the attached consent form along with your email address and proposed times/dates that would work best to help me schedule this group interview.** Please contact me at xxx-xxx-xxxx or by email: xxxxx@xxx.x with any concerns/questions you may have. Alternatively you can contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. Antoinette Gagné, at OISE/UT at xxxxx@xxx.x or at xxx-xxx-xxxx.

Sincerely,

Geoff Lawrence

---

**TEACHER CANDIDATE CONSENT FORM for focus group interviews**

, _________________________, agree to take part in the SSHRC-funded doctoral research study entitled, *Learning about Otherness: The Treatment and Impact of Culture Learning in International Language Teacher Preparation*, examining the cultural dimension in the pre-service international language teacher preparation program at OISE/UT.

I understand that my participation would involve one 60 to 90-minute focus group interview scheduled someday in March – April, 2008 and that the date/time and location will be negotiated among consenting participants.

I understand that the interview will not take longer than 90 minutes, will be audiotaped, and will occur at a time and place that is convenient for me.

I understand that I am under no obligation to agree to participate in any of this interview. I understand that I may refuse to answer any questions, to stop the interview at any time, to withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences. I understand that given the collaborative nature of a focus group...
interview, the privacy and confidentiality of focus group participants cannot be completely guaranteed. I understand that before the focus group begins, the researcher will emphasize to all participants the need to maintain privacy and confidentiality of participants and their contributions but that this privacy and confidentiality is dependent on individual participants involved in this interview, outside of the researcher’s control.

I understand that my name will not be identified in any report or presentation that may arise from the study. I understand that I will be asked to read and revise all written materials generated by my individual participation in this interview. This will allow me the opportunity to edit out any information that I feel is too sensitive or that I feel would serve to identify me. I understand that only the principal investigator and his thesis committee will have access to the information collected during the study. I understand that the findings of this study may be presented at conferences and published using pseudonyms without any personal or institutionally identifiable information.

I understand what this study involves and agree to participate. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature_______________________________ Date________________________

I wish to use the following pseudonym in this research:________________________________________

My email address is (PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY):

___________________________________________________

Over the next four weeks, please list the days and times of the week that are BEST for you to meet for 60-90-minutes (e.g., Mondays after 5pm or Wednesdays 3 – 5pm):

What days/times of the week are impossible to meet (e.g., Tuesday Feb. 12 am, Wednesday Feb.20 pm):

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator Geoff Lawrence at xxx-xxx-xxxx or xxxx@xxx.xx

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator Geoff Lawrence at xxx-xxx-xxxx or email:gpjlawrence@gmail.com. You may also contact the Ethics Review Office at xxxx@xxx.xx, or at xxx-xxx-xxxx if you have any questions about your rights as a participant.
Appendix H
Focus Group Interview Questions

12:45 - Explanation of process;
   • Respect for other views/opinions....unable to maintain confidentiality of responses among each of you....
   • but what I hear is confidential, won’t share with XXX and will write up relevant details tactfully to ensure your anonymity in thesis/anything public....
   • answer honestly; ask questions if unclear, add thoughts in
   • for tape – try to speak clearly and if you can, say pseudonym before you speak

12:50 – 1:15pm Teacher preparation:
   • What do you feel you have learned about teaching culture in your teacher’s class?
     o Most valuable things/moments?
     o Has it changed:
       ▪ Your perceptions of culture?
       ▪ Role of culture in language teaching?
       ▪ Beliefs/limitations of culture teaching?
       ▪ Vision of how you will teach culture?
   • What aspects of culture do you feel are important for students to learn in SS language classes?
   • Value of: Culture teaching activities?
   • Have you learned anything about culture teaching in other aspects of your B.Ed. program?
   • Do you think my presence has had an impact on how you see culture in language teaching?
   • Have any other experiences/courses in this teacher ed program affected your vision of culture teaching? View of culture?
   • Your practice teaching? Observations? Any experiences teaching culture in your practicum? Impact?

1:15 - Readiness for culture teaching:
   • Do you feel ready to teach Spanish/German culture in a public school? Why/why not?
   • Ready to integrate culture into language? Why/why not?
   • What concerns do you have about teaching culture?
   • Impact of these concerns? Skip/minimize CT?
   • How will you work with stereotypes in your classes? Students bringing up stereotypical examples/making stereotypical comments?

1:30 - Intercultural aspect of culture teaching:
   • Recent discussions - language education is an ideal space for more than target language/culture teaching/learning; ideal for learning about cultural identity, how to relate to others, to different communication styles, to build empathy with others who are different. Thoughts?
   • Should language teacher preparation for teacher candidates encourage teachers to:
     a. reflect on their own culture
     b. be language-and-cultural mediators?
   • Please describe your reactions/thoughts to this statement: “If second language programs are going to flourish in the future, culture must be the core of assessment, curriculum and instructional practices WITH language.”
   • Are you excited about culture teaching? Some downward movement in survey responses among some of you....I feel excited about culture teaching – from strongly agree to somewhat and lower even....thoughts on why this would change? Seeing the challenge?

1:45 - CT approaches – assign pairs/small groups to review one CT approach and reporting back answers to questions
   • Do you have any other comments/questions about this research?
Appendix I
Focus Group Culture Teaching Activity Examples

1. **Owning a cultural identity** (adapted from Galloway, 1999; Knutson, 2004):

The approach:

- The teacher writes “Yo” (or “I” in the L2) on the board and gives students one minute to create a list of things that make up their identity (the time limit is imposed to capture a sense of individual priorities).
- To create a class-based, culture-representative sampling, the teacher and students share and merge results into a class composite calculating the frequency of similar responses.
- The teacher facilitates a class analysis of the group responses, analyzing the differences/similarities in identity perceptions and how these relate to individual and group cultural identities in the class and differences of cultural experience (paying attention to any differences that may emerge among students from different linguistic/cultural backgrounds).
- The list would be used throughout the course to help learners understand their cultural identity and how it may contrast, evolve and relate to others as they explore the target culture and language.

*An example of class responses from this task conducted with a university-level literature Spanish class in the U.S. (Galloway, 1999), listed in order of highest frequency:*

1. education (courses, school, clubs, organizations)
2. goals (goals, plans, dreams)
3. work and work-related aspects (job, position, desired profession)
4. abilities and preferred activities (sports listed most frequently)
5. material goods (house, clothing, money, car, etc.)
6. genetic factors (race, sex, age, appearance)
7. personality traits (honesty, humour, etc.)
8. friends, fraternities, sororities
9. family (parents, siblings, pets)
10. religion

*Notes:*

- in this class, the teacher and students observed that notions of identity among the large American majority of learners in the class began with the notion of the independent “self” (self-development through education) and future orientation in personal goals/aspirations
- the status of work as defining ourselves and the emphasis on “doing” and “action”
- the relatively high ranking of material goods, signifiers of personal achievement
- these aspects of identity among the majority American students were contrasted with nationality, culture, ancestry, language and politics as primary components ranked high on the lists of four international students in the class (two from France, two from India) who had been in the U.S. for three years

*An alternate approach: have students identify themselves as cultural subjects by naming various aspects of their identity (e.g. only child, city-dweller, athlete) in a series of 7-8 different circles that develops their personal culture diagram; they then choose one or two identities that seem more important at this moment
and write down values associated with each of these circles; students can explore how these aspects of their identity have changed in the past and may change in the future...

Questions for discussion:

1. Reactions?
2. What are the benefits of this type of activity?
3. What are its limitations?
4. Could you see yourself using it in a high school context? How?
5. How could you see using this approach to teach about culture and the target culture?

2. Tandem culture-and-language learning (adapted from a range of online resources including the European POOLS – Producing Open Online Learning Systems site)

What is tandem learning?

Learning in tandem can be defined as a form of open learning, whereby two people with different native languages (in the same class/community or via email/blogs/computer-mediated communication) work together in pairs in order to:

- learn more about one another’s culture and language;
- help one another improve their language skills;
- exchange knowledge – for example, about their personal, professional life;
- this can be done while working on a project together.

Teachers set up a network of tandem learners for their class and assign goals/responsibilities/timeline to this interaction (for setting up a tandem learning project see: http://www.languages.dk/methods/tandem/eTandem_syllabus_en.pdf or google tandem learning). Partners interact over a period of time and communicate in each interaction using their L1 for half the time and their L2 for the other half. Partners follow guidelines provided by the teachers to guide feedback, focus the objectives of the tandem learning experience and to promote language-and-culture learning.

Some possible culture teaching options with tandem learning:

- Have students work on their language skills while exploring culturally related topics (e.g. the range of cultural similarities and differences in a specific area such as communication patterns/styles; exploring/deconstructing stereotypes and cultural perceptions using media, personal inquiry and discussion; exploring value systems, etc.)
- Have students work on their language skills while conducting a collaborative project exploring some aspect of both partners’ cultures
- Encourage student self-reflection on their cultural self/attitude to ‘otherness’ during their tandem learning experience by having students keep a journal where they write about their language and culture learning along with reflecting on changes in their understanding of and attitudes towards their own cultural identity and the target culture and language expressed by their partner
Questions for discussion:

1. Reactions?
2. What are the benefits of this type of activity?
3. What are its limitations?
4. Could you see yourself using it in a high school context? How?
5. How could you see using this approach to teach about culture and the target culture?

3. Comparative Text Interpretation (Adapted from Kramsch, 2002)

The approach:

The teacher or students select an accessible, authentic, level-appropriate and engaging L2 reading for this activity. The reading should consist of a story discussing a theme or cultural reality in some aspect of the target culture that students would be interested in exploring (e.g., a story that explores a cultural reality such as perceptions towards immigrants, the role of the family, dating etc.)

After pre-reading activities eliciting student knowledge about the vocabulary and themes discussed in the reading, ask students to read the story. Then ask each student to write one sentence describing their impression from the story. This should be followed by a brief (e.g. 5-6 sentence) summary of the story in the target language, summarizing what the story is about. The summaries should then be shared and posted around the room – or shared online in a blog for example. Ask students to circulate and read the varying interpretations of the story, paying attention to the differences and similarities in: student impressions, story interpretations, points highlighted and the way language is used to make an impression.

As a class, debrief:

- The range of impressions as readers of the same story
- The commonalities and differences in impressions and interpretations of the story, comparing the perceived differences in summarizing the story
- Which points were left out and which were highlighted and how each student used language to make a difference in “framing” these points
- Possible explanations for leaving these points out
- Possible explanations for the reasons behind these different impressions and interpretations
- What details the author did not include in the story vs. details she/he did and possible reasons explaining this (if you can, summarize the background/life experiences of the author for students to see if students can relate the author’s presentation of this story to her/his life/cultural experience)

An example (below) of this activity conducted with a third semester university German class in the U.S. (17 – 20 years old) using a short story written by Yüksel Pazarkaya, entitled: Deutsche Kastanien.

The story is about a 6-year old boy, Ender, born and raised in Germany of Turkish parents. Ender is snubbed one day in the schoolyard by his best friend Stefan, who doesn’t want to play with him anymore because he says Ender “is not German but an Ausländer (a foreigner)”. Ender runs back home and asks his mother, “Who am I, Turkish or German?” The mother doesn’t dare tell him the truth. The father answers:
“You are Turkish my son, but you were born in Germany” and tries to comfort him with the promise that he will speak to Stefan.

Notes:

- This activity of comparing students’ written summaries was prompted by differences in student reactions and perceptions to the word “Ausländer (a foreigner) in this story.
- The teacher was struck by how students’ impressions of Ausländer differed from her impression as a teacher (from a German background) and how these students of German were working to construct an understanding of Ausländer from a German perspective through their own cultural filters/perspectives.
- The teacher focused on analyzing these differences in interpretations among students to hear their individual voices, to examine how their cultural lives/experiences shaped their interpretations of the stories.
- Claire Kramsch, this German teacher, then proceeded to replicate this activity with three classes of American students learning German, two classes of high school students in Germany and one high school German class in France.
- She did this to examine how American, French and German youngsters from different social classes and regions, construct themselves and their stories.
- She found very different conceptions of summary writing, differences in stylistic approaches, different degrees of evaluation/opinions integrated into the summaries and different interpretations of the word Ausländer.

Questions for discussion:

1. Reactions?
2. What are the benefits of this type of activity?
3. What are its limitations?
4. Could you see yourself using it in a high school context? How?
5. How could you see using this approach to teach about culture and the target language and culture?

Culture Teaching Approaches: References


Appendix J
Post Culture Teaching Questionnaire

Please write your Pseudonym here:

Please note: This brief survey will be used to further examine your cultural identity/experiences and to examine your beliefs toward culture/culture teaching in language teaching after some lessons on teaching culture. Please respond as completely as you can and as you want to. Your responses will be kept completely confidential and anonymous.

1. Please check the box that best describes your experiences in each of these areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mainly from/within one cultural background</th>
<th>Mainly bicultural – from/within two cultural backgrounds</th>
<th>Mainly multicultural – from/within multiple cultural backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My family background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friendships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. On the following scale mark to what degree you now feel comfortable teaching culture in your international language classroom?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not at all     Somewhat  Completely

Please explain what would make you more comfortable.
3. Please rank how familiar you currently feel with the areas listed below as they relate to the target language and culture you’re planning to teach. Your level of familiarity should reflect how extensively you could discuss/teach the topic in your language classroom (i.e., “Very familiar” means it would be very easy for you to talk about the topic extensively; “Not familiar at all” means you don’t really know anything about this particular cultural aspect of the target language you’re going to teach).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
<th>Sufficiently familiar</th>
<th>Not sufficiently familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-historical background on the target culture (e.g., history, political systems, religions, traditions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms of cultural expression (literature, music, art)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily life, routines, living conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication patterns in the target language (e.g., indirect vs. direct communication patterns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/pop culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The range of cultural diversity in the target language (e.g., many diverse cultural groups in many different countries speak Spanish)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value systems and beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between the target language and culture (e.g., how culture influences language use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please indicate your agreement with each statement by checking the box that most closely matches your current feeling toward the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Culture and language are interconnected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Culture teaching should be at the core of international language teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning about other cultures can help language learners become more empathetic toward people from other cultures and backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Given limited time, I would teach linguistic competence over cultural competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel unsure of which aspects of culture to teach in an international language class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Given the varied people/cultural groups speaking the same language (e.g., Spanish spoken in many different countries), I feel unsure of which culture to teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Below are some potential objectives of culture teaching in language teaching/learning. Please check the degree of importance you feel each objective should have in a Canadian international language teaching classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential culture teaching objectives</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing awareness of the relationship between the target language and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about socio-historical perspectives of the target culture (e.g., history, religion, politics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about daily life/routines and living conditions in the target culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about communication patterns in the target culture (e.g., indirect vs. direct communication patterns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about cultural expression in the target culture (e.g., literature, music, art)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about the shared values and beliefs within the target culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential culture teaching objectives</td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing attitudes of openness and tolerance of other people/cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging reflection on cultural differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the ability to empathize with other cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing increased understanding of students’ own culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What specific strategies would you now use to teach culture in your international language classroom?

11. Have the recent lessons on culture teaching changed how you will teach culture in your international language classes?
   ☐ No ☐ Somewhat ☐ Yes
   
   Please explain your response (e.g. why your vision of culture teaching didn’t change or why it did).

12. In the recent lessons on culture teaching, what have been the most useful things you have learned about culture teaching in international language education?

13. What do you feel you still need to learn about culture teaching to teach international languages effectively?

Thanks again for sharing your thoughts!
Appendix K
Year-End Culture Teaching Questionnaire

Please write your Pseudonym here:

Please note: This final survey will be used to examine your views on culture/culture teaching near the end of your teacher preparation program. Please respond as completely as you can and as you want to. Your responses will be kept completely confidential and anonymous.

1. In your opinion, what is culture?

2. In your opinion, what are the benefits of culture teaching in international language teaching?

3. What aspects of culture do you feel are important for students to learn in a secondary school international language program?

4. How do you see yourself teaching culture in your language classroom? Please list specific approaches that you would use.

5. On the following scale mark to what degree you now feel comfortable teaching culture in your international language classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Completely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What concerns do you have about teaching culture?

7. Has this teacher preparation program changed your views about the following aspects of culture/culture teaching in international language teaching? Please check the boxes that most closely represent the degree of change you’ve felt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My understanding of culture</th>
<th>No change in my views</th>
<th>Some change in my views</th>
<th>Complete change in my views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The potential benefits of culture teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches I can use to teach culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches I can use to integrate culture into language teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please describe how your views changed and what events/experiences prompted these changes.
9. As a future language teacher, how often do you see yourself teaching culture in your language classroom?

- ☐ In every class
- ☐ Often
- ☐ Occasionally
- ☐ Never
- ☐ Other (please describe):

10. Please rank how familiar you currently feel with the areas listed below as they relate to the target language and culture you’re planning to teach. Your level of familiarity should reflect how extensively you could discuss/teach the topic in your language classroom (i.e., “Very familiar” means it would be very easy for you to talk about the topic extensively; “Not familiar at all” means you don’t really know anything about this particular cultural aspect of the target language you’re going to teach).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
<th>Sufficiently familiar</th>
<th>Not sufficiently familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-historical background on the target culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., history, political systems, religions, traditions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms of cultural expression (literature, music, art)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily life, routines, living conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication patterns in the target language (e.g., indirect vs. direct communication patterns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/pop culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The range of cultural diversity in the target language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., many diverse cultural groups in many different countries speak Spanish)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value systems and beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between the target language and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., how culture influences language use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Please indicate your agreement with each statement by checking the box that most closely matches your current feeling toward the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Culture and language are interconnected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Culture teaching should be at the core of international language teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning about other cultures can help language learners become more empathetic toward people from other cultures and backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Given limited time, I would teach linguistic competence over cultural competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel unsure of which aspects of culture to teach in an international language class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Given the varied people/cultural groups speaking the same language (e.g., Spanish spoken in many different countries), I feel unsure of which culture to teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The target culture should be taught in a way that helps language learners develop cultural self-awareness (helps them think about their own cultural assumptions/practices).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Knowledge about the target culture will help students’ target language skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I worry about culture teaching reinforcing stereotypes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To teach international languages effectively, teachers need to be aware of cultural differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Online approaches (e.g., e-pal exchanges, webquests) offer rich opportunities for culture teaching/learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers and learners should explore culture learning together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I know how to effectively integrate culture into language teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel excited about teaching about culture in my international language classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Please share any comments or thoughts you have on any of the above statements.
13. Below are some potential objectives of culture teaching in language teaching/learning. Please check the degree of importance you feel each objective should have in a Canadian international language teaching classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential culture teaching objectives</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing awareness of the relationship between the target language and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about socio-historical perspectives of the target culture (e.g., history, religion, politics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about daily life/routines and living conditions in the target culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about communication patterns in the target culture (e.g., indirect vs. direct communication patterns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about cultural expression in the target culture (e.g., literature, music, art)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about the shared values and beliefs within the target culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing attitudes of openness and tolerance of other people/cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging reflection on cultural differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the ability to empathize with other cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing increased understanding of students’ own culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Please share any other thoughts you have or questions related to this research.

Thanks again for sharing your thoughts!

If you'd be willing to allow me to email you with any questions I have about your responses on the questionnaires you’ve completed for this research please print your email below....Thanks!

My email address is: _________________________________________________________________
Appendix L
Teacher Educator Initial and Year-End Interview Questions

Initial Interview Questions:

Teaching background info:

- Thanks for participating!
- Where did you learn to speak [target language(s)]?
- How did you get into teaching? Into second language teaching?
- How long have you been teaching language teacher education classes? Where have you taught? Range of contexts? Students?
- You told me you have spent regular time in [target language-speaking] countries, Why? What were the benefits/challenges? Do you think this experience helped you as a language teacher/teacher educator? How?

Priorities in language teacher preparation:

- What are your priorities for teacher candidates when you teach this language teacher preparation course? What do you hope students will leave with?
- What factors shape how you teach culture in these language teacher education classes?
- Do you think teacher candidates need to know about teaching culture? Why? What do you hope they’ll learn about culture teaching?
- What are some of the issues you have faced teaching TCs culture?

Culture teaching practices:

- You told me last week that you teach culture throughout the course – could you give me some examples of how you work with culture outside of teaching it explicitly? What have you done so far
- How have you taught culture in this course? Can you give me some examples of what aspects of culture you’ve focused on and why?
- If you could, is there any way you would change how you have taught culture in the past? Please explain why and how.
- How much time do you spend teaching culture vs. language teaching?

Beliefs about culture teaching:

- How would you define culture?
- What is the role of culture/culture teaching in language teaching? In language teacher preparation?
- Do you think there is a relationship between language, culture and communication?
- What is the benefit of culture teaching in language teaching/learning? What are the challenges?
Relevance of intercultural competence in language teaching:

- Recent discussions - language education is an ideal space for more than target language/culture teaching/learning; ideal for learning about cultural identity, how to relate to others, to different communication styles, to build empathy with others who are different. Thoughts?
- Is it important in language teacher preparation for teacher candidates to reflect on their own culture while learning about culture teaching? Thoughts?
- Should language teacher preparation programs teach teachers to become interculturalists/ intercultural communicators (to be curious and aware of cultural differences, to be language-and-cultural mediators)? How important/feasible do you think this is in language teacher preparation?
- What are some of the barriers to this intercultural vision of language teaching? What would facilitate it?
- Please describe your reactions/thoughts to this statement: “If second language programs are going to flourish in the future, culture must be the core of assessment, curriculum and instructional practices WITH language.”
- Do you have any other comments/questions about this research? Any comments you’d like to share about how you see culture teaching/learning in language teacher preparation?

Year-End Interview Questions:

CT Practices:

- Thoughts on this group of TCs compared to your previous groups? How would you describe this class?
- How did you think this teacher preparation course has gone?
- What were your priorities in teaching this course?
- Are you happy with how it’s progressed? Why/why not?
- Reactions on culture learning among TCs in this class? What do you feel/hope they have learned about culture/culture teaching?
- What do you think were some of the successes in culture teaching in the course? Explain.
- Do you think they need to learn more about culture? If so, what?
- Did you feel you learned anything about culture/culture teaching from teaching this group?
- Any culture/culture teaching issues with this group?
- Any impact of my influence on your teaching?

- Culminating assignments – what were assignment details/requirements for students? Evaluation scheme?
- Reactions to the way students did these assignments? Culture learning?
- Other CT practices – picture walk, conceptual fluency activities – learning perceived?
- Reactions to learning in these activities?
- Anything you would do differently next time to work with culture/culture teaching?

TE beliefs on TE CT practices:

- What should TCs know about culture/culture teaching before they begin to teach international languages in Ontario schools?
- Anything missing in today’s teacher preparation curriculum? Details?
- What should TErs do to help TCs learn about culture/culture teaching?
- What factors shape how you and other TErs teach culture to preservice teachers?
- Anything unique about XXX’s system?
- Do you think language teachers need to be interculturally competent to effectively teach IL programs?
- Should TCs be encouraged to reflect on their own culture/cultural framework in these L2 teacher education classes? Is L2 teacher education the place for this?
- Barriers to this intercultural vision of language teacher preparation?
Appendix M
Teacher Candidate Initial and Year-End Interview Questions

Initial Interview Questions

Teaching background information:

- What made you want to become a language teacher?
- Where did you learn to speak [target language(s)]?
- sDo you have experience teaching this/these language(s)? Please explain in what contexts/for how long.
- Have you spent time in [target language(s)]-speaking countries? If so, what were the benefits/challenges? Do you think this experience helped you as a language teacher? How?

Priorities in language teaching:

- What specific things do you hope to learn about language teaching in this teacher education program? Why?
- Once you’re in a classroom teaching, what do you think you will want your students to learn in your language class? (i.e., in your opinion, what knowledge/skills/abilities are important for them to learn?) Can you prioritize these things – from what you think is most important for them to learn to least?

Culture teaching beliefs:

- Do you think language teachers need to know about culture? Please explain.
- How would you define culture?
- Do you think there is a relationship between language, culture and communication? Please explain. What role does culture play in language teaching?
- What aspects of culture do you think are important for language students to learn? (i.e., holidays, foods, national history, politics or values, behaviour, beliefs, cultural differences)? Why are these aspects important?
- Do you think it’s important for students to learn how to communicate across cultures, to have respect for and understand cultural differences? If so, should they learn this in a language class? Why?

Vision of culture teaching practices:

- How do you see yourself teaching culture to your students? Can you give me some examples?
- Why would you teach culture this way? What factors shape how you would teach culture?
- If you could learn three things about culture in this course, what would you like to learn and why?
- What are the benefits of culture teaching in language education? What are its limitations?

The relevance of intercultural competence in language teaching/teacher preparation:

- Do you think it’s useful for students in language classrooms to reflect on their home culture when learning about another culture? Please explain.
- Is it important for teacher candidates to reflect on their own culture while learning about language teaching? Please explain how you feel about this idea.
- There have been recent discussions that language education is an ideal space for more than target language/culture teaching/learning; that it is an ideal space for learning about cultural identity, about how to relate to different communication styles, about how to build empathy/understanding of people from other cultures. What are your thoughts on this?
- Should language teacher preparation programs teach teachers to become interculturalists/intercultural communicators (to be curious and aware of cultural differences, to be language-and-cultural mediators)? How important/feasible do you think this is in language teacher preparation?
- What are some of the barriers to this intercultural vision of language teaching? What would facilitate it?
• Do you have any other comments/questions about this research? Any comments you’d like to share about how you see culture teaching/learning in language education

Year-End Interview Questions:

Background thoughts on course progress:
• What do you feel you have gained from this teacher preparation course?
• What was the most interesting thing you learned about culture and culture teaching in this course?
• What do you feel you still need to learn about culture or culture teaching to teach language students effectively?

Culture teaching debriefing:
• Have your ideas changed about the definition of culture? If so, what events/experiences prompted this change?
• What role does culture play in language teaching? Have your ideas changed on this over this course? If so, what events/experiences prompted this change?
• What do you feel is important as a language teacher to know about culture? Please explain.
• Did the teacher educator’s views about culture affect how you see culture? How you’ll teach culture? Please explain.

Visions of culture teaching:
• Did the teacher educator’s culture teaching practices affect how you will teach culture?
• What have you learned about culture teaching? Have your ideas about culture teaching changed over this preparation course? If so, what events/experiences prompted this change?
• What are the benefits of culture teaching in language education? What are its limitations? Did this teacher preparation course change your beliefs about the benefits/limitations of culture teaching? If so, what events/experiences prompted this change?
• What aspects of culture do you think are important for language students to learn? (i.e. holidays, foods, national history, politics or values, behaviour, beliefs, cultural differences)? Why are these aspects important? Please explain.
• How do you see yourself teaching culture in your future language classes? Can you outline some examples? Why would you teach culture this way?
• What factors shape how you will teach culture in your language classes?
• In an ideal world how would language teachers teach culture?

The relevance of intercultural competence in language teacher preparation/language teaching:
• Do you think it’s important for language teachers to be interculturally competent?
• Do you feel you know enough about cultural differences to teach students effectively?
• Do you think it’s important for students in language classes to learn how to communicate across cultures, to have respect for and understand cultural differences? Should they learn this in a language class? Please explain.
• Please describe your reactions/thoughts to this statement: “If second language programs are going to flourish in the future, culture must be the core of assessment, curriculum and instructional practices WITH language.”
• Do you have any other comments/questions about this research? Any comments you’d like to share about how you see culture teaching/learning in language education?
Appendix N
Focus Group Agenda

Distribute NAME TAGS

1. Explanation of process
2. Exploration of culture learning from written comments
3. Questions on teacher prep program and impact on your views about culture/culture teaching
4. Analysis/discussion of culture teaching approaches
5. Wrap-up and thanks
Appendix O
Focus Group Handout

Please write your pseudonym: ________________________________________

My email address is: _______________________________________________

Is it alright if I contact you by email to confirm understanding of what you said in this focus group interview?

   Yes   No

Please take a few minutes to answer the following question alone then we’ll discuss.

What do you feel you have learned about culture and culture teaching in XXXX’s class?
Appendix P
Master List of Codes

The following codes were used for the data set. Codes were developed based on participant responses and have been categorized based on analytical focus. Codes were used in an integrated manner when needed.

Participant Background

- Schooling
- L2 learning
- Teaching experience
- Living away experience
- Target language immersion experience
- Identity
- Defining culture
- Culture learning experiences
- Personal
- Other

Benefits of culture teaching

- Enhance target culture learning
- Enhance target language teaching/learning
- Motivating
- Change perceptions
- Helps future employment
- Prep for travel
- Other

Challenges of culture teaching

- Student reactions
  - Accepting differences
  - Stereotypes
  - Offending students
- Culture teaching output-related
  - Culture’s complexity
  - Accurate presentation of culture
  - Unfamiliarity and necessary preparation
  - Teacher authenticity
  - Teaching methods
  - Constraints
- Other

Defining Culture

- Product-focused
- Meaning-focuses
- Material dimension
- Interactive dimension
- Subjective dimension
• Too complex
• Other

CT knowledge base needs

• Target culture knowledge
• Culture teaching strategies
• Cultural sensitivity
• Affective qualities
• General cultural knowledge
• Other

Culture teaching impact

• Negative reaction
• Lack of understanding
• Positive reaction
• Greater understanding of teaching
• Greater understanding of culture
• Culture’s role in L2 teaching
• Greater understanding of culture teaching strategies
• Awareness of challenges
• Awareness of benefits
• Increased reflection
• Lack of culture knowledge
• Lack of confidence
• Need for strategies
• Need for models
• Other

Most useful learning

• Teaching-related strategies
• Target culture learning
• Cultural sensitivity
• Working with stereotypes
• Reflection
• Other

Classroom observations

• Teacher talk
• Student talk
• Student question
• Activity
• Culture and language
• Culture’s importance in society
• Culture teaching
• Sharing personal experiences
• Defining culture
• Bias and culture
• Perception and culture
• Culture and identity
• Target culture learning
• Thoughts on class

Culture teaching visions

• Culture topics
  o Culture topics (refer to culture definitions)
  o Other
• Focus of teaching
  o Presenting content
  o Sharing experiences
  o Maintaining student interest
  o Guest speakers
  o Other
• Methodology:
  o Presentation
  o Comparative
  o Reflective
  o Projects
  o Experiential
  o Other
### Appendix Q

**Example of Data Segmentation and Coding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1: Interview transcript – Initial interview with Anja [segments indicated by brackets, and bolded text]</th>
<th>Codes [in brackets]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geoff Lawrence:</strong> What do you feel you have been getting out of this class in terms of learning about culture?</td>
<td>One meaning unit that was double coded: [Lack of confidence &amp; Culture's complexity]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anja:</strong> There’s a lot of good theories of teaching. I’m not sure if it was…she presented it through culture but [I'm not sure I 100% feel confident in teaching.] I mean I can understand the relevance and I’m glad that she gave some examples of how to go through it but I mean culture can be such a personalized thing versus a non-personalized thing and it’s sort of finding the gray area where it’s okay and confidence-wise it’s just sort of like you’re still nervous because she gave you so much information and a lot of it is useful and some of it is not useful and again, missing that practicality component of it.]</td>
<td>[Need for models]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geoff Lawrence:</strong> So you feel you are missing that practicality component?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anja:</strong> Exactly. It didn’t even have to be in Spanish or German. [If I just saw someone presenting material of culture of whichever it would be and if it was something on biases, if it was something on beauty within different cultures or something like that and seeing how it would be presented I find that I myself would have a greater understanding of the process and sort of how to think about your presentation as a material.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Lawrence: Right right, yeah. So more concrete examples?</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lack of understanding" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anja: Yes. Because [when she gave us, she gave us the books today with the outlines and I had the hardest time. I was sitting there and I was like, “I don’t understand what we’re supposed to do.” And I was just getting frustrated because she was teaching, oh this is how we should do lesson plans and then I’m looking at this think and I’m, “What is this? I don’t understand.”]</td>
<td><a href="image">Culture’s complexity</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Lawrence: Right, right.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anja: And again, [the big issue is there’s no right or wrong way to teach culture. And that’s a scary thought. ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix R

### Qualitative Comparison Chart of CT Challenges

Changes in Perceptions of CT Challenges: Noting changes from pre to year-end data timepoints....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turner University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chantal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making it creative for the students to accept the differences of their culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making sure it is not presented in a stereotypical manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chyo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The biggest concerns I have about cultural teaching is the reaction that one might get when introducing a culture. The information being presented have more of a shock value than an educational aspect. The teaching a culture might turn some people away because of the difference to their own culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My main concern about teaching culture is that I tend to have favorites when it comes to teaching about Spanish speaking areas/countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clark</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not teaching it broad enough (i.e. representing most Spanish speaking cultures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglecting some Hispanic countries (there’s quiet a few); stereotyping a culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donatella</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The only thing that I would be concerned about is the stereotyping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gisele</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t want o offend anyone of that culture background, (that I am teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not covering it all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Themes and related codes:

Presentation-related concerns:
- Accurate portrayal of the target culture (incl: scope, aspects, timely info) AP
- teaching methods (integration into LT/ MOE curric, resources, strategies, time, student engagement) TM
- Unfamiliarity/preparation UNPR
- teacher authenticity TA

Student reaction:
- accepting differences (not offending C1 students; controversial topics) AD
- Creating/perpetuating stereotypes (and the need to break existing ones) ST
Appendix S
Quantitative Comparison of CT Challenges

Quantitative Comparison of Perceived Culture Teaching Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>POST</th>
<th># topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>TM</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chantal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chyo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donatella</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisele</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katelynn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penelope</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU totals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU cat totals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix T

### Culture Teaching Vision Comparison Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turner University</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chantal</strong></td>
<td>Implementing creative activities, i.e. food or music days, games, to incorporate their living styles, comparisons b/w western life &amp; Spanish life - Occasionally</td>
<td>surface-level; C2 &amp; C1</td>
<td>creative (hooking sts), comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wouldn’t simply present material of a culture – but rather elaborate on the explanation and reasoning of these b/c I don’t want to create a shock value to the students, who will judge the other culture; making specific connection/similarities to our own culture as well as even other cultures – since don’t simply want to <strong>EXPLAIN</strong> the difference in Spanish - culture</td>
<td>below surface - exploring rationale of behaviour to reduce difference shock</td>
<td>Freq - UP - effort to move below surface to make connections with C1 and cultures in general thru a comparative, relational, reflective approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide many resources to the students (ex: books or a an actual craft or costume for them to see as well); play music in the classroom, perhaps while they are independently working - Often</td>
<td>music</td>
<td>multiple cultural resources/experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I think music and food are important (especially since the students will be interested in this and can made their own connections). I think the history of traditions and customs is also important in order to fully understand various culture aspects</strong></td>
<td>student-centred: music/food/traditions - not deeper</td>
<td>student-centred touching on deeper cultural levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix U
Turner University Syllabus Excerpt

*International Languages: Spanish and German*

**Course Description:** Methods of teaching Spanish and German in the secondary school. Students are introduced to modern language teaching and learning pedagogy applied to curriculum delivery and development. Motivation, classroom management, assessment and student delivery in the modern language classroom will be addressed.

**Course objectives:**

Upon completion of this course, students will demonstrate knowledge of:

- the varied theories of second/foreign language acquisition that have informed foreign language teaching methods, e.g. grammar-translation, direct method, audio-lingual, cognitive code, communicative competence, proficiency-based learning;
- analysis of the current texts used in the teaching of foreign languages in Ontario secondary schools and how to adapt them to meet the varied learning styles represented in the classroom;
- the teaching strategies, skills, instructional concepts, memory organizers, and integration of the second language pedagogy of a foreign language curriculum through lesson design, reading and literature passages, and culture based activities.
- strategies to plan lessons that will incorporate a variety of topics, effective questioning techniques designed to assist secondary school students to participate actively in learning the language, concept attainment and communicative activities in order to ensure a balanced lesson that meets the needs of the different learning styles of their students;
- the effective use of technological equipment such as video and multi-media technologies, the Internet and CD Rom resources to enhance the learning environment in the second/foreign language classroom;
- strategies for teaching the culture of German/Spanish-speaking areas of the world through authentic cultural media including newspapers, magazines, literature, cinema and theatre, visual and plastic arts, dance, and national cuisine, as well as through visits by native speakers, exchanges, travel, language clubs;
- the current evaluation practices and rubric designs that measure foreign language skills through the categories of knowledge, understanding, communication and analysis across the four language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing.
- their own linguistic strengths in their knowledge of German/Spanish by reviewing the language structures and developing an appropriate, practical vocabulary of teaching and conversational terms in order to permit them to teach all aspects of the language in the target language;
- the factors to consider while analysing and evaluating pedagogical resources including TVO and computer-assisted instruction materials for second/foreign language classes;
- student achievement expectations in current Ministry guidelines and how to apply these to the course activities and assignments;
- the professional literature, and organizations concerned with the teaching of International Languages and strategies to help promote the global value of foreign language acquisition.

**REQUIRED TEXTS:**


Ministry Documents:
Classical and International Languages, grades 9 and 10; grades 11 and 12, Ontario Ministry of Education. 1999 and 2000. (Available from the instructor).
Think Literacy; cross curricular strategies for grades 7 to 12. Ontario Ministry of Education. 2003. (Available from the instructor)

ASSESSMENT:

Inductive Detailed Grammar Lesson 15%
Think Literacy Adaptation 15%
Spanish/German Cultural component 20%
Literature Based Unit including Assessment/Evaluation 35%
Linguistic Competency Test Design/Evaluation and Test 15%
COURSE RATIONALE
Our view of language learning, teaching and planning is based on the premise that the world in which we teach and learn is unpredictable. Students’ language learning needs are as diverse as the students themselves and are certain to change over time. While theory, curriculum, guidelines and ready-made materials have their place in language teaching and learning, they do not take the place of skills that are crucial in a dynamic and unpredictable learning and teaching environment. In addition to skills in reflection, advocacy, inquiry and facilitation, language teachers are also concerned with intercultural communication, anti-racism, relationship development and conflict resolution. We will work together to develop these skills. We will also focus on how computer technologies can be integrated into language classrooms.

Course Content
This course will focus on the teaching of second (as well as first and third) languages in the intermediate and senior grades. It will integrate three components:

1. An experiential component in which you will learn about language processes through your experience as meaning makers. You will spend much of the course engaging in learning activities.

2. A theoretical component in which you will explore current theory and research related to the teaching of languages.

3. A pragmatic component in which the focus will be on developing specific teaching and learning strategies that are consistent with current knowledge about language processes and language instruction.

Course GOALS
In this course you will have the opportunity to:

- learn to understand yourself as a language user and instructor using reflective techniques;
- experience the effects of engagement in learning;
- find out about the needs and interests of I/S students;
- become familiar with recent theory with particular emphasis on the applicability of theory to instruction in German, Italian and Spanish;
- examine Ministry of Education documents and regulations pertaining to German, Italian and Spanish;
- explore ways to create a positive and equitable classroom environment;
- learn about techniques and procedures for long-term and short-term planning;
- learn about the procedures involved in the selection and evaluation of materials and resources for language teaching/learning;
- develop an understanding of the reading, writing and oracy processes as well as learn about methods and techniques to facilitate the teaching/learning of listening, speaking, reading and writing in language classrooms;
- learn about the development of listening, speaking, reading and writing as interrelated processes;
- find out about methods and techniques to facilitate the teaching/learning of grammar and vocabulary;
- become familiar with literary works that can be integrated into the language curriculum as well as learn about methods and techniques to facilitate the teaching/learning of literature;
- explore methods and techniques to facilitate the teaching/learning of media and other technologies;
- find out about methods and techniques to facilitate the teaching/learning of culture;

Another objective of this course is to have you review the grammar and structures of German, Italian or Spanish, as applicable. This will mainly be done through the creation of a language portfolio.

An information package for the development of your language portfolio will be shared in class.

**COURSE READINGS**

**COURSE EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Language Project (individual or in pairs)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Portfolio</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Language Autobiography (individual)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mini-presentations (20 minutes) (individual)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical/Thematic Lesson Plan (individual)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Unit (in pairs)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>