

**Justyna HADAŚ**

Laboratory of Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, Faculty of Polish and Classical Philology, Adam Mickiewicz University

### **INTROSPECTION AS A KEY STRATEGY FOR LEARNING CULTURE IN A LANGUAGE CLASSROOM APPROACHING BYRAM'S SAVOIR COMPRENDRE FROM A TRANSCULTURAL PERSPECTIVE<sup>1</sup>**

***Abstract:** The aim of this article is to bring attention to the importance of raising awareness of one's own culture (CI) in foreign language education and its significance for developing intercultural skills and cultural awareness. Introspection will be presented as an act of self-examination, self-inquiry or reflecting oneself: a strategy necessary for developing an ability to understand the other and a technique that can be used within the language classroom context. The author will be looking at introspection as a metacognitive act, carried out by a learner and directed towards his/her own actions (ways of interacting and communicating) as well as his/her internal states, aimed at searching ethnocentric perspectives in the context of reflecting on intercultural communication, especially the comparing processes. Michael Byram's Intercultural Communicative Competence model will be used as theoretical framework and it will be related to the notion of transcultural awareness in order to present arguments in favor of introspection and draw some pedagogic recommendations for its use.*

***Key words:** transcultural awareness, cultural awareness, critical incidents, intercultural communicative competence, introspection, transcultural education, intercultural learning*

---

<sup>1</sup> This article originally appeared in: *Voces y caminos en la enseñanza de español/LE: desarrollo de las identidades en el aula*, ed. C. Tatoj, S.R. Balches Arenas, Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2018, and is reprinted after translation into English, with minor changes, with permission of the Publishing House of the University of Silesia (Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego).

*Know thyself, attributed to many authors (interpreted by even more)  
One is never at home, Gayathri Chakravorty Spivak*

## 1. Introduction

The aim of this article is to bring attention to the importance of raising awareness of one's own culture (C1) in foreign language education and its significance for developing intercultural skills and cultural awareness. Introspection will be presented as an act of self-examination, self-inquiry or reflecting on self: a skill necessary for developing an ability to understand the *other* and an ability that can be practiced within the language classroom context. We will be looking at introspection as a metacognitive act, carried out by a learner and directed towards his/her own actions (ways of interacting and communicating) as well as his/her internal states, aimed at searching ethnocentric perspectives in the context of reflecting on intercultural communication, especially the comparing processes. Michael Byram's Intercultural Communicative Competence model will be used as theoretical framework and it will be related to such concepts as transcultural awareness in order to present arguments in favor of introspection and draw pedagogic recommendations for its use.

From the philosophical viewpoint, introspection is an act of looking inward, as opposed to the observation of the external world<sup>2</sup>. According to Judycki, thinkers throughout centuries have pointed out, on one hand, the metaphysical limitations of self-examination and, on the other, the epistemological value of such a possibility of separating oneself from the «material and spiritual states and processes» in order to make a judgment on them and adjust actions to this judgment<sup>3</sup>. In the psychological field, introspection is a far-reaching concept referring to many ways of «examining the contents of one's own mind»<sup>4</sup>, with a special emphasis on bringing one's attention to the emotional states he/she is experiencing. Being a kind of self-observation, «introspection is often thought as a flashlight that illuminates thoughts and feelings that were not previously object of a person's conscious attention»<sup>5</sup>.

Both of these perspectives suppose the consideration of the inner world, the world of psyche, the world of thoughts and feelings: spheres that should be considered essential to the educational context. Learning cultures and languages requires a reflection on both cognitive and emotional states, because of the importance of internal experience for the real-life of interpersonal and intercultural communication. At the same time, in the framework of this study, classroom

---

<sup>2</sup> S. Judycki, „Introspekcja jako problem filozoficzny”, *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, nr 50, 2002, p. 263.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 294.

<sup>4</sup> T. Wilson, *Strangers to Ourselves: Discovering the Adaptive Unconscious*, Harvard University Press, 2004, p. 145.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 160. Among psychologists there has been a vivid debate over the extent to which introspection can be actually useful, a discussion involving a scientifically up-to-date question: is an individual really unravel the mysteries of his/her own mind?. Despite the skepticism, there is still much agreement on the usefulness of self-examination. Timothy Wilson, although known for criticizing introspection as a data collection technique and questioning the ability to accurately analyse own mental *content*, finds advantageous the very fact of bringing one's attention to their own thoughts, judgments, sensations and emotions.

introspection encompasses also a reflection not only on the mental structures but also one's own actions (the behavioral component), by bringing light to what is *automatic* and a reflection on the purposes and intentions of own actions, in order to enhance cultural awareness. This is why I consider noticing patterns in one's own behavior (communicative and cognitive included) as a first step for their further analysis (e.g. within the transcultural approach). The choice of the term *introspection* seems substantial, as it quite precisely represents a paradigm rearrangement that leads from concentrating on the target culture (C2) towards aiming attention at the learner's (trans)cultural identity and involving the re-discovery of the native, own, familiar contexts (C1's).

## 2. Culture in language education: communicative, sociocognitive and trans-cultural dimension

Foreign language pedagogy<sup>6</sup> requires a definition of culture, which is applicable for researching real-life human interactions involving the use of a language which is non-native for at least one participant. In this field, rooted in linguistics and communication sciences, culture is often seen as discourse, as a dynamic conglomerate of texts, and as a concept inseparable from language, meaning and communication. This is why researchers such as Risager use the term *languaculture*<sup>7</sup>. Culture manifests itself through *interaction* between participants of a communicative act and through the *interpretation* that they give to the interaction (meaning). In case of written communication the rule is the same, however the possibilities of interaction (and meaning negotiation) are limited by space and time separation. Additionally, in oral communication, not only the linguistic resources are significant, but any acts (non-verbal, para-verbal)<sup>8</sup> that carry a cultural meaning can cause different interpretations, and their development, presence or lack might lead to possible misunderstandings.

Second of all, culture possesses a sociocognitive dimension, as it has to do with a shared *knowledge* about what is appropriate and the awareness of what is presupposed by the participants. House, in her study of different definitions of culture, highlights two aspects of culture: its role in deciding what is acceptable in a certain community (the social aspect) and its role in guiding human perception and interpretation of phenomena (the cognitive aspect)<sup>9</sup>. This brings us to the van Dijk's concept of *epistemic community* as a key term for intercultural communication. This author defines knowledge «not as personal beliefs, but as social beliefs certified, shared and hence discursively presupposed by the members of epistemic

<sup>6</sup> The term *language pedagogy*, for a Polish reader might seem misleading, because of a traditional fixed distinction between the sphere called "didactics" (art of teaching) and pedagogy (art of upbringing, educating). Nevertheless, in the context of the Anglo-American educational research (in which the present study is theoretically embedded), such concepts as *second language pedagogy* and *foreign language pedagogy* are widespread.

<sup>7</sup> K. Risager, *Language and Culture Pedagogy: From a National to a Transnational Paradigm*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2007.

<sup>8</sup> In this article by speaking about participant's *actions* or *event* I will be referring to any behavior of a person in interaction with the interlocutor, which will include not only the actions that involve the use of language.

<sup>9</sup> J. House, "What is an Intercultural Speaker", [in:] *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, ed. E. Alcón Soler, Dordrecht: Springer, 2007, pp. 7-21.

communities»<sup>10</sup>. In intercultural communication participants represent different epistemic communities: what each of them believes about the world, their group and the self: their «knowledge, attitudes, ideologies, norms and values»<sup>11</sup>. This is how presuppositions and what they *do not know* about each other (and what they *think they know*) becomes crucial.

Finally, we need to consider culture as a dynamic and multidimensional construct. Its flexible and subjective character was once expressed by Spivak who, while describing her multi-sociocultural identity and experience, concluded stating that «one is never at home»<sup>12</sup>. In the case of a particular speaker (and her/his interlocutor), cultural identity acquires a transcultural character, as a combination of different group identities that interact within the individual idioculture<sup>13</sup> to create a specific (trans)culturally rooted vision of the world.

To understand the usefulness of the transcultural perspective, it is important to mention that the rise of interest in culture and communicative competence that took place in the nineties, led to a limiting paradigm of culture identified with a national reality and a focus on cultural schemata as quite static patterns of behavior and interpretation<sup>14</sup>. Only with years came an awareness of cultural diversity of national areas and language speaking areas (culture became *cultures*, plural), but still with concepts such as national identity and the target country as a main reference point. The transcultural approach introduces a paradigm shift, as we have to acknowledge the fact that culturally driven behaviors and thinking processes of a person cannot be reduced to patterns originating from her/his national culture. In this context, cross-cultural and nation-based models, from the field of intercultural psychology and/or communication (e.g. Hofstede or Raga Gimeno<sup>15</sup>), can be seen as a helpful starting point, but not as a key for understanding the world. And, more importantly, transcultural education is one that firstly acknowledges and focuses on the «cultural barriers that limit human interaction» and subsequently empowers the learners to overcome (transcend) those limitations<sup>16</sup>.

As a conclusion, in this paper, I adopt a semiotic approach to the study of culture<sup>17</sup>, which will be especially useful while studying the meaning attributed through interpretation of the acts of self and other. As we will see, the *critical incidents* – moments of communication breakdown and often damaging for the

<sup>10</sup> T. van Dijk, “Contextual knowledge management in discourse production. A CDA perspective”, [in:] *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis. Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity*, eds. R. Wodak, P. Chilton, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005, p. 87.

<sup>11</sup> Idem., p. 87.

<sup>12</sup> G. C. Spivak, *Strategie postkolonialne*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej, 2011.

<sup>13</sup> As defined by: T. Attridge, *Jednostkowość literatury*, Cracow: Universitas, 2007, p. 120.

<sup>14</sup> C. Kramersch, J. Aden, “ELT and Intercultural/Transcultural Learning. An Overview”, [in:] *Approche culturelle en didactique des langues*, eds. J. Aden, F. Harnboure, C. Hoybel, A-M Voise, Paris: Éditions le Manuscrit, coll. Recherche et Université, 2013, p. 40.

<sup>15</sup> G. Hofstede, *Culture's Consequences. International Differences in Work-related values*, New York: Sage, 1984; Culturas cara a cara. *Relatos y actividades para la comunicación intercultural*, ed. F. Raga Gimeno et al. (Grupo CRIT), Madrid: Edinumen, 2009.

<sup>16</sup> J. Aldridge, J. L. Kilgo, L. M. Christensen, “Turning Culture Upside Down: The Role of Transcultural Education”, *Social Studies Research and Practice*, vol. 9 (2), 2014, pp. 107–119.

<sup>17</sup> P. Boski, *Kulturowe ramy zachowań społecznych. Podręcznik psychologii międzykulturowej*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2009, p. 29.

relation being established between two people – come from the fact that both actors attribute a different meaning to a specific (communicative) event and the meanings should be analyzed from the point of view of norms and values of both C1 and C2<sup>18</sup>. A principle of focusing on meaning is also the one that should guide learning and teaching of how intercultural communicative crisis should be prevented.

Hence, a definition of culture that captures its dynamic, cognitively subjective and transcultural character is the one by Byram: «the complexity of beliefs, values and behaviors of a social group with which a person is identified *in a given interaction* [my italics]<sup>19</sup>. The cultural content (what I will be later calling *culture per se*) is situated in the minds of the speakers and is determined by the specific moment/space configuration, although can be expressed and observed (and what is more important, negotiated) through language.

### 3. Teaching and learning culture in a language classroom: components, competences and principles

I agree with Morawiec, that in order to use the notion of culture it is essential to specify its composing elements<sup>20</sup>, which is essential both for research and classroom practice. To study identities, the mentioned author suggests focusing on the cultural model of the world, as a complexity of categories (*basic assumptions about the world, values and norms, attitudes, behaviors, and finally symbols and artifacts* [my translation]), which are hierarchically positioned<sup>21</sup>. This conceptualization coincides in general terms with Hofstede's «cultural onion»<sup>22</sup>, which also represents culture in terms of layers, and is equally inspiring for this article.

Thus, based on various conceptualizations which present culture in terms of components or levels (the above mentioned and other employed in language/culture didactics<sup>23</sup>), here we will distinguish *three levels of cultural analysis*:

A) *Patterns of interaction and its interpretation*: the social practice, what is observable and manifested in a (communicative) event and directly influences the actors' communicative intentions. The inclusion of interpretation on this level is based on the idea that what we say, do or think acquires a meaning only through our interpretation of it. Furthermore, an interpretation can be also (and is often) expressed verbally, this is why – although it is not always *observed* – it is *observable*. According to semiology in communicative theory, also cognitive phenomena can work as signs. In this sense, our habits of interpretation also have a meaning, are subjective and culturally driven.

B) *Culture per se*. Norms, values, beliefs and attitudes, which constitute

<sup>18</sup> I will be using these abbreviations to designate the native culture of the interpreter (C1) and the foreign culture he or she is trying to understand (C2).

<sup>19</sup> M. Byram, *From Foreign Language Education to Education for Intercultural Citizenship*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2008, p. 254.

<sup>20</sup> N. Morawiec, “*Małe ojczyzny a transkulturowy, intertwingularny i transkluzyjny charakter historiografii*”, [in:] *Doświadczenie pokoleniowe a perspektywa osobista*, ed. B. Płonka-Syroka, M. Dąsał, K. Marchel, Warszawa-Bellerive-Allier: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2016, pp. 51–79.

<sup>21</sup> Idem, p. 64.

<sup>22</sup> G. Hofstede, op. cit.

<sup>23</sup> L. Miquel, N. Sans, “El componente cultural: un ingredientemás de las clases de lengua”, *Cable*, vol 9, (15-21), 1992; C. Kramsch, “Culture in foreign language teaching”, *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, vol. 1(1), 2013.

the worldview, on which the interaction and interpretation (level A) are based: the elements that in communication remain *invisible* and give meaning to the communicative patterns. This cultural level can be related to what used to be called *small-c culture* (*cultura con minúsculas*), defined by Miquel and Sans as norms that determine behavior and communication, shared and understood by a community<sup>24</sup>, but is also the closest to Byram's definition adopted above.

C) *Sociohistorical background*: the context in which the invisible and the observable are shaped and rooted—the level that is sometimes associated with Culture (*capital-C culture*) and includes: history, political systems, social structures and institutions, literature, art of a specific group, with a clear materialistic dimension; the relation between this level and the previous ones is the one emphasized by intercultural psychologists (and actually is the real point of including such content in the language programs: a point that is too often lost).

The bottom line is that the links between the three levels should be explored in classrooms as one of the crucial techniques for understanding other cultures. Furthermore, in transcultural education it is fundamental that the learner is strategically trained to ask questions that will lead him to establish at least a hypothetical relation between a specific behavior/practice, the semiotic/axiological background and the social context. After all, being aware of the links between *what I do, I think and I know* and the socio-political past of my region/community is to be closed to understanding one's self.

Now, to understand what learning culture is, we shall adopt a perspective focused on competences, a well-known model of intercultural communicative competence (ICC) as a reference point and Byram's and Fleming's definition of intercultural speaker. According to them «the intercultural speaker is someone with knowledge of one or more cultures and social identities, and who enjoys discovering and maintaining relationships with people from other cultural backgrounds, although s/he has not been formally trained for that purpose»<sup>25</sup>. House adds that such competent speakers should be able to counteract «any self-destructive 'reduction of their personality'»<sup>26</sup> (vide transcending barriers: a preferred gesture of the transcultural education). Byram's and Fleming's definition, despite the use of the *intercultural* nomenclature represents an obvious shift from the C1-C2 configuration (a focus on the target culture) and from the factual concept of knowledge (seen as a set of facts), to a more active participation of the learner in culture discovery, but also a more multidimensional and transcultural perception of identity.

The insistence on an active and exploring role of the learner is first of all linked to the very nature of competences (as distinguished from knowledge), which should be seen as a disposition, readiness to act appropriately in a new and *one of a kind* (as unrehearsed before) situation. But it is likewise related to the fact that the teacher who enters the pedagogical process is also marked by a worldview of her/his culture(s) and, further, by the one of the institution (s)he represents and the educational system that (s)he serves. As the teacher is not objective, (s)he does not

<sup>24</sup> L. Miquel, N. Sans, op. cit.; Compare this concept with Hofstede's "programming of mind".

<sup>25</sup> M. Byram, M. Fleming, *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, after: *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, eds. E. Alcón Soler, M. P. Safont Jordà, Dordrecht: Springer, 2007, p. 1.

<sup>26</sup> J. House, op. cit., 2007, p. 18.

*bring* pure cultural information to class but only his own selection and interpretation of it. Hence, the teacher is in fact unable to *teach culture* as such and, additionally, should not make such intents, as the transmissive approach to learning cultures (exactly as in the case of learning languages) is particularly pointless. We suggest, alongside the proponents of ICC, that the teacher becomes a participant and a facilitator of the process of discovering and negotiating cultures through and in communication. Moreover, a traditional perception of native-speakers as the ideal carriers of target cultures has solidified the reductionist vision of culture learning, and marginalized the reflective dimension of languaculture learning (as the fact of being native does not imply an intercultural communicative competence nor the ability to mediate between the own, the learner's and other cultural systems)<sup>27</sup>.

Similarly, the learner is supposed to avoid an unreflective imitation of C2 representatives' behavior, as this would reduce his/her acquisition of culture to the most superficial level of the *observable*.

#### 4. *Savoir comprendre* and the importance of comparing for intercultural competence development

Byram characterizes *savoir comprendre* as one of the components of the ICC, among other *savoirs* (knowledge, skills and attitudes). Translated into «being able to understand», it is a set of «skills of interpreting and relating», defined as «an ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents or events from one's own»<sup>28</sup>. While the idea of *savoir comprendre*, refers to understanding the cultural code, *savoir faire* («skills of discovery and interaction»), for instance, concerns the ability of «active» participation in communicative acts, being able to interact with other people in the intercultural context (establish and carry out communication), and also negotiate. The two are linked, as, logically one needs to be able to *understand* in order to build the capacity to produce meaningful and understandable messages, both in language and culture acquisition. Also *savoir* and *savoir comprendre* are inseparable in prac-

<sup>27</sup> Teacher's cultural *identification* is of lesser significance than his/her level of trans- inter- cultural competences. A coinciding view is expressed by Morawiec, although in the context of history classroom, where the culture learned by the pupils is by principle – and in contrast with language learning – the native culture (C1). For more, see: N. Morawiec, O. Zabolotna, “Historia, mała ojczyzna a edukacja wielo-, między-, transkulturowa”, [in:] *Historia na źródłach oparta. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Tadeuszowi Srogoszowi w 65 rocznicę urodzin*, ed. A. Stroynowski, Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo im. Stanisława Podobińskiego Akademii im. Jana Długosza w Częstochowie, 2017, pp. 867–878.

<sup>28</sup> M. Byram, op. cit., p. 182. There is no doubt that both events and documents should be treated in a language classroom (as well as in transcultural education), as objects of analysis. The author of the present study finds, however that the distinction between event and text needs to be nuanced. Firstly, according to communication studies a written text is a communicative event. Text lies undoubtedly in the heart of every communication, but a non-textual act is equally crucial for intercultural interaction, even though the linguistic code is not being used. To demonstrate that events can be seen as a specific kind of text, because they carry a meaning and *communicate* cultural content, we can use the example of taking of shoes (or not) by the guest while entering a house, which may be a sign (as in *signifié*) of modesty and respect, while in other it does not. Note that in some cultures when entering a house as a guest, it is common to ask if one should take off shoes and subsequently the inviting person usually opposes and politely expresses no such need, as a sign of hospitality, which is the case of some parts of Poland. For this reason I treat the communicative events as a tipe of events in general, obviously, a type that is the most crucial for language learning.

tice.<sup>29</sup>

Skills of interpreting and relating are important, since by «seeing how each might look from the other perspective, intercultural speakers/mediators can see how people might misunderstand what is said or written or done by someone with a different social identity»<sup>30</sup>. Understanding culture(s), basically means being able to interpret them and *compare* with the native cultural reality<sup>31</sup>. As Majewska states about intercultural comparisons in her research dedicated to CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), by virtue of comparing, contrast is construed and the aspects/features of the described phenomenon are highlighted, which brings a possibility of a deeper understanding<sup>32</sup>.

According to Byram, the fundamental activities proper to an intercultural competent understanding are «to identify ethnocentric perspectives in a document or event and explain their origins; identify areas of misunderstanding and dysfunction in an interaction and explain them in terms of each of the cultural systems present; mediate between conflicting interpretations of phenomena»<sup>33</sup>. Such a three step analysis needs to involve a reflection on the three levels of culture proposed in the previous section, which means that the ethnocentric perspectives might be detected among: A) ways of interacting and interpreting, B) the values and norms that they are rooted in, but also C) the ideologies that underlie the social structures and historical events. A learner may apply such a detective-like activity equally to foreign and native culture documents and events, so that (s)he can establish relations (differences and similarities), as we cannot compare our culture with the other, if we do not work on a deeper understanding of ourselves.

If we perceive comparing, from a cognitive position, as a basis for building the learner's conceptual apparatus<sup>34</sup>, we come to a conclusion that comparing two situations in two different cultural systems, could bring her/him to a better general understanding of what culture basically is and in which areas of human activity culture can be manifested and how. This is why the ability to compare is not just a result of an intercultural competence, but actually the way of competence formation. The more differences a learner discovers, analyses and discusses - building up a habit of noticing new elements and significant details which could be carried out through strategy training - the smaller is the risk that (s)he will

<sup>29</sup> It has been discussed in: M. Byram, B. Gribkova, H. Starkey, *Developing the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching: a practical introduction for teachers*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2002, p. 7. Also see: J. Hadaś, "El uso de monólogos argumentativos orales y el desarrollo de la competencia intercultural. Una reflexión acerca de los temas socioculturales en didáctica de ELE", [in:] *Tendencias en la enseñanza del español LE. Perspectivas gloto didácticas y metodológicas contemporáneas*, eds. E. Stala, S. Balches Arenas, C. Tatoj, Cracow: Wydawnictwo UJ, 2015, pp. 136-137.

<sup>30</sup> M. Byram, B. Gribkova, H. Starkey, *Developing the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching: a practical introduction for teachers*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2002, p. 12.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 8.

<sup>32</sup> R. Majewska, *Zintegrowane kształcenie przedmiotowo-językowe. Dydaktyka zadaniowa a rozwój osobistej kompetencji komunikacyjnej w warunkach półautonomii, Nieopublikowana praca doktorska*, UAM Poznań, 2013, p. 350.

<sup>33</sup> M. Byram, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

<sup>34</sup> Majewska, *op. cit.*, p. 348.

attribute a C1 meaning to a C2 act and take it for granted<sup>35</sup>. This is why, as it will be discussed later, transcultural awareness is at the same time needed in classroom comparing activities, as it will be developed in them.

### 5. How to practice comparing: recommendations for lesson designers

From a neurobiological point of view, comparing (as a cognitive activity) is a rather primary brain function, a common and quite primitive mental process, and as such can lead to stereotypical judgments, when the higher level thinking is not involved. On the other hand, comparing can be a very complicated psychological process, implicating multiple operations like synthesis, analysis and assessment<sup>36</sup>. This guides us to a conclusion that not every kind of comparing is beneficial. In the pedagogical process emphasis should be laid on deepening the comparative process and on its links with transcultural awareness.

First of all, the comparison criteria have to be made explicit, since comparing documents from two cultural systems, based on values coming from C1 and without a metareflection on such an approach, will result in biased conclusions. In addition, all the three levels of cultural understanding have to be involved in the analysis and interpretation process and stress should be put on establishing causality links between them<sup>37</sup> (e.g. moving from «what is different» to «why is it different»). While handling comparisons we should bear in mind that comparing behaviors is relatively easy, while dealing with interpretations, or the level of worldviews (values and norms) demands a more profound investigation. Thirdly, a metareflection on the comparative strategies and anti-strategies should be practiced, for the sake of developing an awareness of how human beings tend to engage in *othering*, through such actions as: assimilationism, exoticization and essentialism<sup>38</sup>. Finally, it is recommended to involve as much of learners experience and emotions as possible, to make them taste «the uncomfortable» feeling that awaits them in real-life situations: this is why analysis and discussion should be linked to role-play activities.

The comparing activities have traditionally been based on: critical analysis on the text level and the ethnographic method on the level of cultural manifestations, as verbal and non-verbal behavior<sup>39</sup>. A learner can be confronted with texts and events that give an opportunity for detecting and discussing ethnocentric perspectives. Discussion can induce a better understanding of how those biases are acquired by any social being in the process of socialization. From the perspective of program design, in order to achieve development of skills of comprehending («reading signs» interculturally), the following elements should be taken into ac-

<sup>35</sup> Compare with: I. Maya Jariego, “Estrategias de entrenamiento de las habilidades de comunicación intercultural”, *Portularia. Revista de Trabajo Social*, vol. 2, 2002, pp. 91-108.

<sup>36</sup> Majewska, op. cit., 347.

<sup>37</sup> Compare with J. Iluk, *Nauczanie bilingwalne. Modele, koncepcje, zalozenia metodyczne*, Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ, 2000, p. 58, after: Majewska, op. cit., p. 347.

<sup>38</sup> See more in J. Hadaś, “Developing transcultural awareness as a basis for intercultural dialogue: between theory and pedagogical reflection”, [in:] *World in Dialogue. Intercultural Problems in the Religious, Economic, Communication and Educational Contexts*, eds. A.W. Mikołajczak, R. Dymczyk, Poznań, 2016.

<sup>39</sup> M. Byram, B. Gribkova, H. Starkey, op. cit. p. 21.

count<sup>40</sup>:

- ordering the texts/events gradually from the point of view of «visibility» of biases/ ethnocentric perspectives (from the most explicit to most hidden meanings);
- differentiating the tasks from the point of view of their difficulty (depth of intercultural analysis);
- dedicating time to analyze different aspects of texts and events (e.g. special pedagogical units orientated towards semantic, discourse or content structures);
- treating separately different aspects of interaction/interpretation areas in which misunderstanding can take place (e.g. saving each other's face, structuring the discourse, non-verbal and para-verbal behavior)<sup>41</sup>;
- insisting on the observation of communicative acts, as a threshold for authentic real-life negotiation.

Critical language pedagogy has advocated towards a dual (a two-step) purpose of analyzing intercultural interactions: «(...) of revealing the codes under which speakers in cross-cultural encounters operate, and of constructing something different and hybrid from these cross-cultural encounters»<sup>42</sup>. As Kramersch argues bridging differences is no longer the purpose, giving space to maintaining and appreciating the dialogue itself, which «ensures a mutual base to explore the sometimes irreducible differences between people's values and attitude»<sup>43</sup>.

#### Comparing as celebrating differences

As it has been already stated, the objective of (trans)cultural education is not (and cannot be) providing the learner with a full package of information. For Corbett, the logical consequence for teachers is to make learners *aware* of a possibility of difference in other cultures<sup>44</sup> instead of teaching all those differences. Assimilationism (the contrary position) is a comparative anti-strategy, which ignores cultural differences, interpreting and relating behaviors from the biased standpoint of only one culture. This anti-strategy is symptomatic for transcultural awareness deficit<sup>45</sup> and rejecting the differences is one of the ethnocentric stages of cultural adaptation<sup>46</sup>. An example taken from Polish-Spanish intercultural reality is that interrupting the speaker in the Polish culture is rather associated with lack of manners while in the mentality of many Spanish and Latin American natives, finishing a sentences for somebody, using interjections or even speaking simultaneously to the interlocutor is a sign of interest, encouragement and will to maintain the con-

---

<sup>40</sup> Compare with Raga Gimeno's et al. pedagogical proposal of exploiting critical incidents with videos and texts: F. Raga Gimeno et al. (Grupo CRIT), op. cit.

<sup>41</sup> For these and more facets of human interactions in intercultural encounters, see C. Kramersch, "Intercultural communication", [in:] *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*, eds. R. Carter, D. Nunan, Cambridge 2001, pp. 202.

<sup>42</sup> C. Kramersch, "The Cultural Component of Language Teaching", *Zeitschrift für Interkulturell en Fremd sprache nunterricht* [Online], 1(2),13, [[http://www.spz.tudarmstadt.de/projekt\\_ejournal/jg\\_01\\_2/beitrag/kramersch2.htm](http://www.spz.tudarmstadt.de/projekt_ejournal/jg_01_2/beitrag/kramersch2.htm)], 1996.

<sup>43</sup> Ibidem. Compare with M. Guilherme, "Critical language and intercultural communication pedagogy", [in:] *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*, ed. J. Jackson, Routledge, 2012, p. 367.

<sup>44</sup> J. Corbett, *An intercultural approach to English language teaching*, Clevedon 2003, pp. 20–30.

<sup>45</sup> J. Hadaś, op. cit., 2016, pp. 128–133.

<sup>46</sup> M. J. Bennett, "Towards a Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity", [in:] *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, ed. R. M. Paige, ME: Intercultural Press, Yarmouth, 1993.

versation. Yet, Polish speakers often feel uncomfortable and disorientated when the Spanish counterpart employs this pattern, which may lead to a communication breakdown: an interrupted speaker, not used to a different paraverbal model that allows interruptions, may not know how to react, get lost in his own discourse and/or make a minorizing judgment. A possible interpretation that would involve assimilation anti-strategy would come to work here, if the Polish speaker applied his own values on the others action (in his/her eyes: *not letting him/her finish the sentence*)

Dealing with assimilationism in class is challenging because, basically, talking about diversity is complicated. Ignoring the differences might be an effect of a naïve conception of political correctness, and of an ingenuous belief that everybody is *the same* (as in being *equal*). The assimilationism and the above mentioned ignorance can be also an effect of not having enough experience in a deepened contact with other cultures<sup>47</sup>.

## 5. 2. Comparing as a deepened analysis

Another anti-strategy that should be highlighted and deconstructed in a class is essentialization which is associated to a culturalist approach in anthropology in a sense that it reaches for cultural elements to interpret all aspects of identity and performance of a person<sup>48</sup>. Comparing should lead the learner to take the cultural interpretation as a possibility, not the final solution; invite him/her to observe, make hypotheses, and investigate and, if the possibility exists, to negotiate. In a specific classroom analysis, no teacher can guarantee that the intentions/roots of a specific act in a studied event are representative for the national/regional culture that the speaker is identified with. Still, we should ask ourselves «cultural questions» if we want to understand better what happened in the communicative event. A classroom example – personal for the author – happened while analyzing cross-cultural models of Hofstede and Raga Gimeno through conversational analysis, role-play and (self) observation activities in an international group of exchange students. What some of the participants noticed was that the para-verbal language employed by their two Lebanese classmates differed in some aspects, which drew a conclusion that either one of them is not *a real representative* of such a cultural model or that the model itself *is wrong*. The challenge consisted in discussing the fact that human personality is multidimensional, and the cultural dimension should actually be rather perceived as transcultural. Indeed, one of the strongest advantages of transculturality as perspective is that it prevents us from formulating definite or hasty answers (that would pretend to serve to satisfy complex questions). The transcultural approach insists on that no one can be easily identified with only one isolated social reality. This assumption reinforces the necessity of working on differences and savoring them, instead of trying to deny them or create them, with

<sup>47</sup> Such a superficial contact is often experienced by tourists and exchange students. See E. Murphy-Lejeune, *Student Mobility and Narrative in Europe: The New Strangers*, London: Routledge, 2002, for a distinction between migrants and visiting students who are seen more like travelers, from a point of view of the depth of their integration into host society. This phenomenon has been also observed in another study led by the author (described here: J. Hadaś, *op. cit.* 2016).

<sup>48</sup> F. Dervin, “Cultural identity, representation and othering”, [in:] *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*, ed. J. Jackson, New York: Routledge, 2012, p. 182.

negotiation/dialogue (and not agreement) as the final aims.

## 6. Practicing introspection as a starting point for *savoir comprendre*

One of the pedagogical challenges that transcultural education meets, in order to implement the principles described in the previous section, is strategy training design. One of the core strategies – a transversal one, as it can be used at various levels and within numerous activities, both in a language and non-language classroom – is introspection, seen as self-analysis, self-inquiry or reflecting on self (own acts, words and thoughts). In language education research on learning strategies, self-observation has been long presented as an important element of fostering learner's autonomy, for instance by means of learner diaries.

In this research the author has adopted Paige's et al. proposal to divide culture learning into five areas, from which the first one is «learning about the self as a cultural being»<sup>49</sup>, which clearly coincides with the need of moving away from the C2-centered educational paradigm, giving space to reflection on the own cultural condition and its impact on our understanding of the world in the first place. In worlds of Bennett, we would describe the goal of such learning as an ability to see «that all your beliefs, behaviours, and values are at least influenced by the particular context in which you were socialized»<sup>50</sup>, a skill necessary for exploring other cultures.

The first reason for using introspection in teaching practice is that the transcultural approach, as it has been already mentioned, opens the way to meaning negotiation, seen as the key for comprehending messages. In such a setting, comprehension is not possible without looking at oneself, without the «the relativization of self and other», as Kramsch and Aden put it<sup>51</sup>.

Another advantage of using introspection is the invaluable opportunity to observe own thinking processes, interpretations, the stereotypes applied, which in the process of self-inquiry become the object of reflection for the communicating subject. Only in the case of introspection the subject and the object become one and the *programming of mind* (to use the term by Hofstede), suddenly moves from the *invisible* to the *observable*.

As a consequence – and thirdly – self-analysis is the most powerful tool that can bring a learner to realize the complexity and (trans)culturality of his/her own world-view, which can help to look in such a way at the *other*. If cultural awareness consists of being aware of the conventionality of culture, then it must be based on the awareness of a conventionality of C1. In this sense introspection may contribute to preventing learners from exotising (while noticing specific patterns

---

<sup>49</sup> R. M. Paige et. al., "Culture learning in language education: A review of the literature", [in:] *Culture as the core: Integrating culture into the language curriculum*, eds. R. M. Paige, D. L. Lange, Y. A. Yershova, Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, 2000, pp. 47–113. Analyzing elements coming from your own cultural context and relating them to other cultural systems need to be pedagogically linked to other four elements within the Paige's framework and may contribute to their development. They are: "2. learning about culture and its impact on human communication, behavior, and identity, 3. learning about universal, cross-cultural phenomena such as cultural adjustment, 4. culture-specific learning; i.e. learning about a particular culture, including its language, and, 5. learning how to learn; i.e. becoming an effective language and culture learner".

<sup>50</sup> M. J. Bennett, 2004, op. cit., p. 68; Compare with J. Hadaś, op. cit., 2015, pp. 134–135.

<sup>51</sup> C. Kramsch, J. Aden, op. cit., 2013, p. 56.

not only in C2, but also C1 cultural texts)<sup>52</sup>.

Introspection is furthermore a meta-strategy that raises awareness of possible *othering* processes, used by self. The learner may discover his/her own cultural bias, the way s(he) uses othering or minorizing. The teacher should not expect that learners will stop othering, but rather encourage them to be aware of how these processes are carried out. Such a deconstruction is a step forward in transcultural understanding and a component of TA.

To summarize, introspection as a strategy leads to a better understanding of self and the native culture(s) and shapes the ability of its constant re-discovering, a skill that can be used in encounters with people, representing different cultural contexts. Introspection also opens the way to other intercultural processes such as decentering/ relativizing self in an intent of looking at own actions and thoughts from the other's perspective<sup>53</sup>. Via self-examination, a student gets an opportunity to *zoom out* while looking at him/herself, own culture and self as a cultural being. In such a way the learner tries to see self as a part of a group/s – identifying the cultural bias in his/her thinking and behavior.

## 7. Introspection as an element of transcultural awareness development

I have elsewhere defined transcultural awareness (TA) as recognizing the influence of culture on the sphere of human behaviour, communication and cognition, as referred to representatives of other cultures (C2's) and one's own (transcultural self-awareness), as well as acknowledging the complex and transcultural character of these processes<sup>54</sup>. Transcultural awareness is basically understanding what (trans)culture is for communication. It resides in knowing that human activity is influenced by cultures (plural) of origin, but also by other cultures: their values and norms. The lack of TA causes minorization of individuals and a stereotyped vision of the world. It is manifested in such anti-strategies as exotization, essentialization and assimilationism.

As we have already stated on another occasion:

«Awareness is undoubtedly a state of mind and as such it corresponds with the general notion of knowledge. However, it is not identical with intercultural knowledge, nor knowledge about C2, both pertaining to intercultural competence, because it goes beyond being familiar with (as possessing information about) just one or two specific cultural worldviews»<sup>55</sup> and also because it is rather a state of readiness for finding cultural explanations and using them, then the actual knowledge of them.

In an act of communication each participant represents a multiplicity of cultural and linguistic identities. The analysis of communicative events needs to be transcultural, because one needs to acknowledge the possibility that a communicative act might be an expression of patterns belonging to different cultures, of

<sup>52</sup> This may happen through detecting such ideological elements as sexism, nationalism, etc. and seeing them as universal socially-constructed phenomena and not features of specific cultures (as in *the Mexicans are very sexist exotization example*).

<sup>53</sup> See M. Byram, op. cit., 2008 for a discussion on decentering with the use of *entrare* and *fantasia*: terms proposed by I. Berlin.

<sup>54</sup> J. Hadaś, op.cit. 2016, p. 124.

<sup>55</sup> Idem., p. 125.

hybridization and also that the way of interacting depends on levels of awareness of the *other*. In this sense TA is an ability of metareflection over communication as such (and the trans-cultural character of communication). Awareness is not necessarily situated at the level of knowledge (*savoir*) in Byram's model, as it accompanies the intercultural speaker in the development of all sorts of ICC skills, influencing the comprehension and discovering processes, attitude formation or critical thinking, and also shaping the feelings that correspond to all the above mentioned. This is why the very concept of TA emphasizes the role of transcultural self-awareness, which can be seen as a metacognitive strategy that helps the learner to monitor her/his own transcultural progress.

Looking at TA as an ability to use a repertoire of relevant questions, a readiness to negotiate meanings and to reflect on culture and communication, brings us to see such a mental operation as par excellence *critical*. Critical theory of communication has been traditionally identified with reflection over text and communication. As Craig states, the contribution of critical theory consists of promoting «a deeper appreciation of discursive reflection as a practical possibility intrinsic to all communication»<sup>56</sup>. Craig presents such a reflection as a value in itself (independent from the utility and the results). This non-utilitarian approach to communication needs further implementation in learning, as its value lies in focusing on the process rather than results, on experience rather than facts, on the task itself, rather than conclusions and solutions. What the opponents of CDA and of deconstructionism, use as a disadvantage – *the questioning of everything* – I see, as an educationalist, as a major advantage: a habit of asking questions is the only basic way of approaching text.

As a consequence, the endeavor of operationalizing TA, would include identifying the questions that lead an individual to a better understanding of the act of communication that (s)he is currently engaged with and should definitely include the introspective dimension. The following is a preliminary sketch of a possible conceptualization of TA, the left column representing the self-inquiry.

Learner's (communicative act participant) awareness:	
Who am I as a transcultural being - how do I act and why?	Who is the other as a transcultural being - how does (s)he act and why?
How do I see the other and her/his culture?	How might (s)he see me and my culture?
... in a particular act of interaction and interpretation.	

According to Van Dijk, the need for using mental models for theorizing interpretation of communicative acts with elements such as «speech acts, politeness phenomena, style, rhetoric, deictic expressions», comes from the fact that «there is no direct link between social context and text, and hence we need a cognitive interface in the form of subjective mental models ongoingly constructed by the

<sup>56</sup> R. T. Craig, "Communication theory as a field", *Communication Theory*, vol. 9 (2), 1999, p. 151.

participants of the current communicative events»<sup>57</sup>.

An inspiring term, which could be adapted to language education, for raising the awareness both of the other and self is the one proposed by Morawiec. His *matrix* is «a subjective repertoire of categories determining a community of thoughts, behaviors and symbols» [my translation]<sup>58</sup>. If we consider *matrix* as a tool for researching the transcultural character of identity, it can be applied by researchers (e.g. a historiographer studying the identity of a writer/historian or an educator examining the cognition of a learner-reader/learner-speaker). Moreover, the components of *matrix* may be adapted to the classroom practice to be used by (language) teachers and learners: the aim would be to enable the learner to apply the tool for studying specific categories of identity. Therefore, for the sake of didactics, there is a need to elaborate a detailed set of strategies/ questions that will allow the learner to analyze his/her own transcultural matrix and make hypotheses about the people (s)he is interacting with. Transcultural awareness may be a framework for establishing such questions in research, pedagogical practice, as well as everyday communication. This is because acknowledging the multidimensionality of both self and the other is a doorstep for further intercultural learning.

### **8. Practicing introspection in a transcultural (language) classroom: the example of critical incidents**

A critical incident is based on a story depicting an example of an intercultural miscommunication, embedded in a specific kind of social situation (e.g. inviting or welcoming guests, a small talk in a park, a job interview or buying at a shop), that may be presented in form of a written story or dialogue, video, but also as a personal experience narrated by the learner or the teacher. It happens when two cultural systems are put together and manifested in the behavior and words of the actors. When one of them interprets the actions of the other through the lens of own culture, minorization may take place. Minorization is understood by authors such as Raga Gimeno, as a negative judgment that arises as a result of miscommunication<sup>59</sup> and usually it includes an emotional element (people feeling frustrated, uncomfortable, disrespected, misunderstood). Students, with help of comprehension questions, followed by analysis and interpretation activities (from *what* to *how* and *why*), discuss the characters' actions. The key moment is the interpretation: the learner-observer is asked to choose the best explanation of the characters' behavior based on what the learner knows (or presupposes) about their cultures. The reflection should involve: brainstorming, role-play or modifying the story and participants' behaviors in order to amend the communication breakdown<sup>60</sup>.

Critical incidents are undoubtedly an example of bringing differences into classroom. Analyzing these communicative events should include an element of introspection, to ensure that the learner him/herself will be experiencing the differ-

<sup>57</sup> T. van Dijk, "Contextual knowledge management in discourse production. A CDA perspective", [in:] *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis. Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity*, eds. R. Wodak, P. Chilton, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005, p. 95.

<sup>58</sup> N. Morawiec, op. cit., 2016, p. 65.

<sup>59</sup> F. Raga Gimeno et al. (Grupo CRIT), op. cit.

<sup>60</sup> More on classroom methodology: *ibidem*.

ences. We said that introspection is a kind of self-questioning, self-examination, that should be based on asking questions. As the span of this article does not include the general methodology of teaching through critical incidents, what can be suggested at this stage are some examples of possible introspective questions – mostly how and why type- that should be asked in order to analyze self as a participant and interpreter of an intercultural communicative act:

Thus the big transversal questions are on the first level How would I behave in a similar situation? How would I communicate? What would I think? and on the second, How is it influenced by my cultural bias (mental constructs: values, beliefs, attitudes)? Would my behavior be related to any specific values, norms or beliefs rooted within a particular social group? All that might lead to an investigation on the sociohistorical antecedences: the origins of the discussed constructs. On the other hand, some metacognitive questions that help the learner to explore his/her own skills of interpreting and relating: Which element of the characters' actions did I find strange or disturbing? Do I qualify any of the analyzed behaviors as morally correct or incorrect? Why? Are there any other interpretations possible?

The proposed list needs to be further completed and developed, but at the same time, should remain open to specific ideas coming from teacher and learner in a classroom environment. The application of these proposals should depend on the learners' level of ICC and TA.

## 9. Conclusions and recommendations

Transcultural education is not an easy way, because it is a sort of pedagogy of real-life experience that comes with difficult emotions, deals with differences and is all about asking questions that never come with clear answers. This article's purpose was to present transcultural awareness as a cognitive capacity of asking questions – and not necessarily giving answers<sup>61</sup> – with the goal of keeping the dialogue open (as opposed to communication breakdown typical for critical incidents).

Dealing with differences and learning to compare is so essential, because a simple assumption that everyone is different (cultural relativism) is an intellectual trap that does not really enhance dialogue. By *everyone* we mean the whole spectrum of sociocultural groups that frequently remain in conflicting relations. Therefore, accepting that for example: specific radical political groups, criminal or terrorist organizations or elites of non-democratic regimes are simply different and have a right to be different does not lead to constructive solutions, through a confusion between the *awareness* of values and the *acceptance* of values<sup>62</sup>. This is another reason why we are in search of a profound way of comparing (relating and interpreting) cultures that will be productive and lead to negotiation of meanings.

Although transcultural awareness is a concept based mainly on the theoretic-

---

<sup>61</sup> The analogy with the maieutic method or the Socratic questioning, one of the techniques used to foster critical thinking in education comes into mind. As Arends and Kilcher observed: "Socratic dialogue: Engages students in discussions to explore ideas, values, and issues and relies on questioning rather than telling", R.I. Arends, A. Kilcher, *Teaching for Student Learning. Becoming an Accomplished Teacher*, Routledge: New York, 2009, p. 389.

<sup>62</sup> Compare with: I. Berlin, *The Crooked Timber of Humanity*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.

cal fundamentals of language education (because of its consideration of ICC as the point of reference) it should be considered as a research model for general transcultural education. This is because culture is always linked to language and communication but also because *savoir comprendre* values equally a reflection over the use of language as on thoughts and non-communicative acts (going along with the idea of holistic learning). Transcultural awareness can be operationalized by a competent learner whatever foreign person (s)he meets. A person, who does not speak a foreign language, can reveal a certain level of C2 awareness and of transcultural awareness. This is why Byram's distinction between IC and ICC<sup>63</sup> should be useful but not limiting for us.

Introspection has been presented here as a common denominator for the pedagogical development of both ICC and transcultural awareness, this is why we propose the concept as a transversal tool that can be used effectively for learning own native cultures (history, literature classroom), specific target cultures (as in the language classroom), global and regional cultural processes and, generally for understanding what *culture* actually is. Only through realizing the role of our own cultural bias, can we pass to analyzing the other's behavior and trying to imagine the other's worldview but also make hypotheses on their interpretation of our own behavior. It needs to be reminded that the purpose of such an observation is not to change how we act, but to become aware of our actions in the sense of being able to *de-automatize* them. Reflecting on the real-life conflicting situations, such as critical incidents, for many learners is a first opportunity to notice culture(s) in their actions, although in fact including critical incidents in language textbooks and programs is, unfortunately far from being a common practice.

Finally, introspection is a metacognitive strategy that serves to reflect on both interaction and on the interpretation that we make of it. What is probably the most important here for the transcultural approach is that through self-analysis, a learner her/himself experiences the difficulty of finding one right interpretation, of getting *the* exact answer. When we look at ourselves we tend to nuance, while looking at the *other* we fall for the temptation of generalizing (essentializing). For learners, analyzing own cultural behavior not as a homogeneous set of patterns, but as a result of different cultural backgrounds (national, regional cultures, social group/class, gender, age, etc.) can make them realize their own transculturality, opening the way to acknowledging the transculturality of... culture in general.

## References

1. Aldridge J., Kilgo J.L., Christensen L.M., "Turning Culture Upside Down: The Role of Transcultural Education", *Social Studies Research and Practice*, vol. 9 (2), 2014.
2. Arends R.I., Kilcher A., *Teaching for Student Learning. Becoming an Accomplished Teacher*, Routledge: New York, 2009.
3. Attridge T., *Jednostkowość literatury*, Cracow: Universitas, 2007.

---

<sup>63</sup> M. Byram, *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997, pp. 70-71.

4. Bennett M. J., "Towards a Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity", [in:] *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, ed. R. M. Paige, ME: Intercultural Press, Yarmouth, 1993.
5. Berlin I., *The Crooked Timber of Humanity*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.
6. Boski P., *Kulturowe ramy zachowań społecznych. Podręcznik psychologii międzykulturowej*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2009.
7. Byram M., *From Foreign Language Education to Education for Intercultural Citizenship*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2008.
8. Byram M., *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997.
9. Byram M., Fleming M., *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
10. Byram M., Gribkova B., Starkey H., *Developing the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching: a practical introduction for teachers*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2002
11. Corbett J., *An intercultural approach to English language teaching*, Clevedon 2003.
12. Craig R. T., "Communication theory as a field", *Communication Theory*, vol. 9 (2), 1999.
13. Culturas cara a cara. *Relatos y actividades para la comunicación intercultural*, ed. F. Raga Gimeno et al. (Grupo CRIT), Madrid: Edinumen, 2009.
14. Dervin F., "Cultural identity, representation and othering", [in:] *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*, ed. J. Jackson, New York: Routledge, 2012.
15. Dijk T. van, "Contextual knowledge management in discourse production. A CDA perspective", [in:] *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis. Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity*, eds. R. Wodak, P. Chilton, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005.
16. Guilherme M., "Critical language and intercultural communication pedagogy", [in:] *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*, ed. J. Jackson, Routledge, 2012.
17. Hadaś J., "Developing transcultural awareness as a basis for intercultural dialogue: between theory and pedagogical reflection", [in:] *World in Dialogue. Intercultural Problems in the Religious, Economic, Communication and Educational Contexts*, eds. A.W. Mikołajczak, R. Dymczyk, Poznań, 2016.
18. Hadaś J., "El uso de monólogos argumentativos orales y el desarrollo de la competencia intercultural. Una reflexión acerca de los temas socioculturales en didáctica de ELE", [in:] *Tendencias en la enseñanza del español LE. Perspectivas gloto didácticas y metodológicas contemporáneas*, eds. E. Stala, S. Balches Arenas, C. Tatoj, Cracow: Wydawnictwo UJ, 2015.

19. Hofstede G., *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related values*, Beverly Hills: Sage, 1984.
20. House J., "What is an Intercultural Speaker", [in:] *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, ed. E. Alcón Soler, Dordrecht: Springer, 2007.
21. Iluk J., *Nauczanie bilingwalne. Modele, koncepcje, założenia metodyczne*, Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ, 2000.
22. *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, eds. E. Alcón Soler, M. P. Safont Jordà, Dordrecht: Springer, 2007.
23. Judycki S., „Introspekcja jako problem filozoficzny”, *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, nr 50, 2002.
24. Kramersch C., "Culture in foreign language teaching", *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, vol. 1(1), 2013.
25. Kramersch C., "Intercultural communication", [in:] *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*, eds. R. Carter, D. Nunan, Cambridge 2001.
26. Kramersch C., "The Cultural Component of Language Teaching", *Zeitschrift für Interkulturell en Fremd sprache nunterricht* [Online], 1(2),13, [[http://www.spz.tudarmstadt.de/projekt\\_ejournal/jg\\_01\\_2/beitrag/kramersch2.htm](http://www.spz.tudarmstadt.de/projekt_ejournal/jg_01_2/beitrag/kramersch2.htm)], 1996.
27. Kramersch C., Aden J., "ELT and Intercultural/Transcultural Learning. An Overview", [in:] *Approcheculturelleendidactique des langues*, eds. J. Aden, F. Haramboure, C. Hoybel, A-M Voise, Paris: Éditions le Manuscrit, coll. Recherche et Université, 2013.
28. Maya Jariego I., "Estrategias de entrenamiento de las habilidades de comunicación intercultural", *Portularia. Revista de TrabajoSocial*, vol. 2, 2002.
29. Majewska R., *Zintegrowane kształcenie przedmiotowo-językowe. Dydaktyka zadaniowa a rozwój osobistej kompetencji komunikacyjnej w warunkach półautonomii, Nieopublikowana praca doktorska*, UAM Poznań, 2013.
30. Miquel L., Sans N., "El componente cultural: un ingredientemás de las clases de lengua", *Cable*, vol 9, (15-21), 1992.
31. Morawiec N., "Małe ojczyzny a transkulturowy, intertwingularny i transkluzyjny character historiografii", [in:] *Doświadczenie pokoleniowe a perspektywa osobista*, ed. B. Płonka-Syroka, M. Dąsal, K. Marchel, Warszawa-Bellerive-Allier: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2016.
32. Murphy-Lejeune E., *Student Mobility and Narrative in Europe: The New Strangers*, London: Routledge, 2002.
33. Paige R. M. et. al., "Culture learning in language education: A review of the literature", [in:] *Culture as the core: Integrating culture into the language curriculum*, eds. R. M. Paige, D. L. Lange, Y. A. Yershova, Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, 2000.
34. Risager K., *Language and Culture Pedagogy: From a National to a Trans-*

- national Paradigm*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2007.
35. Spivak G.C., *Strategie postkolonialne*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej, 2011.
  36. *Voces y caminos en la enseñanza de español/LE: desarrollo de las identidades en el aula*, ed. C. Tatoj, S.R. Balches Arenas, Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2018.
  37. Wilson T., *Strangers to Ourselves: Discovering the Adaptive Unconscious*, Harvard University Press, 2004.