Editorial

In the first issue of this volume (LAIC 19.1), as we caught up with the delegates who trekked to the IALIC conference held in Edinburgh in the summer of 2017, we explored the metaphor of 'Third Space' (after Bhabha 1994). As we saw back in January, this trope can be used in research into intercultural communication either to symbolise the hybrid identities of those who are straddling two or more 'cultures', or to represent a synthetic, hermeneutic zone in which texts from one 'culture' are (re)interpreted in the context of 'another culture' to generate new and potentially transgressive meanings. In this second issue of the year, we return to possibly more familiar territory for some readers of these pages. As a journal which focuses on *language* and intercultural communication we necessarily reflect contemporary research which investigates not only the ways in which different languages and cultures are used in social situations and mobilised as the cornerstone of subjects' identities, but also the ways in which these languages and cultures are acquired in both formal and non-formal settings. In this, the mission of the journal and the Association has, as I see it, an educational dimension which embraces some of the origins of the field (e.g. Byram 1989; see also Martin, Nakayama and Carbaugh, 2013). Thus in this first 'open' issue of Volume 19, we return somewhat to origins to present a collection of papers which relate for the most part to some aspect of intercultural pedagogy, finishing off with a challenging exploration of the interactions that takes place in business meetings. What is conspicuous about these papers is the range of different contexts and approaches which are represented: the continuing hegemony - and indeed 'racialisation' - of the 'native speaker' in language classrooms in the global South (Khan); 'communicative language teaching' and 'traditional Chinese language teaching' (Clark-Gareca and Min Gui); a 'discourse approach' to teaching culture (Gyogi); 'community schools' for the children of Chinese migrants living in the UK (Ganassin); 'intercultural training' in the workplace (Barakos); and 'discursive leadership' (Chan and Du-Babcock). The striking thing about these six papers is how each of their pedagogic contexts/discursive approaches is conventionally presented as hermetically sealed – each with their own literatures, narratives, practices and contexts – although the aspiration for, and the exercise of, some sort of intercultural communication is a thread which remains common to each. As Elisabeth Barakos brings out explicitly in her paper, the specific realisation of intercultural pedagogy at any one moment is embedded in the specific social and institutional conditions in which the activity is carried out.

It is over twenty years since Claire Kramsch and Michael Byram crystallised their respective critiques of the hegemonic position of native speaker norms in language teaching and learning

(Byram, 1997; Kramsch, 1997). And indeed meetings held in Leeds Metropolitan University in the late 1990s on 'Intercultural Capability' travelled in part in the pedagogical and intellectual slipstream of these developments towards the end of the 20thc. (http://ialic.international/ about-ialic/ialic-history/). However – as any of us who have taught courses on language teaching methodology will recognise – twenty years later, such standards remain entrenched within the teaching of many different languages, and perhaps most especially English. Our first paper, by Cristine Khan, reprises some of the issues around 'native-speakerism' and reviews the ways in which this argument has developed over the intervening period, embedding it in her own personal biography and identity. Colombia, like many countries in the global South, has apparently developed programmes to improve bilingual education in English and Spanish within its educational system. Drawing on a carefully documented series of formal and informal interviews with undergraduates studying modern languages in Colombian universities, Khan concludes that hegemonic discourses maintain a 'racialized figure' of the native English speaker, which occludes the intercultural awareness that should surely underwrite all language teaching. Her detailed investigation suggests that there still remains a need for the incorporation of 'non-Western' contexts into English language teaching and for the development of more intercultural training and critical cultural approaches when teachers are 'native English speakers'. And there still remains a need for the recognition of the importance of learning about the plurality of Englishes, rather than a focus on one normalised form of the language.

In the second paper of the issue, Clark-Gareca and Min Gui carry out a focused survey into the differences in beliefs about language teaching between American English language teachers teaching in English in China, and their Chinese counterparts. While in both in the journal and the Association we are becoming increasingly resistant to embracing intercultural research which presupposes nationality as a marker of cultural identity, this paper is telling in as much as is does afford some counter-indications as to some of the assumptions which are often made about the differences in pedagogy between language teachers from North America (and Europe) and language teachers from China (and arguably other Asian countries). While their findings still support the commonplace assumptions associated with a certain fraction of the teachers – predominance of grammar translation and audiolingualism, emphasis on language testing and lack of student centredness - in contrast both American and Chinese teachers did favour communicative language teaching methods. Thus, Clark-Gareca and Min Gui begin to capture the complexity of the assumptions that teachers from different national systems bring

to the language classroom, and in part dispel some of the binarism that can unwrite discussions of the practice of foreign language teaching in China. Further research could possibly move on from the predominance of surveys reported in this study and adopt more ethnographic techniques, perhaps in order to focus upon the lived realities of Chinese foreign language teachers. This not least because – despite early empirical pointers to this end (e.g. Oskarsson, 1972) - it is finally becoming acknowledged in educational research that what teachers say they do, and what they actually do, can be two very different matters.

Despite the range of teaching methodologies uncovered by Clark-Gareca and Min Gui, at present translation is under-represented as a means of engaging with 'culture' in many contexts of language teaching and learning. Eiko Gyogi's paper offers a corrective to this by carrying out a small-scale experiment in translation with undergraduates learning Japanese in extra-curricular classes at a UK university in order to (re)establish what she calls a 'discourse approach' to teaching culture (after Kramsch and Zhu, 2016). In this, students can employ translation in order to develop their critical awareness of culture as a process of social interaction and identity negotiation by exploring the potential of a foreign language to construct meanings. Out of a range of contemporary genres, this paper describes how students engaged through pair work and class discussion with the novel form of the tweet in order to explore the cultural embeddedness of meanings. In this process of negotiated meaning, students were not just using their own language to create 'word-for-word' substitutions, but were rather creating 'alternative realities through the use of language'. The act of translation involved the students in re-creating a text through the 'mobilisation of their language resources' in negotiation with their peers, while simultaneously mediating between the authors of the source text and potential readers of their translations.

In the fourth paper in this issue, Ganassin explores how language heritage and 'culture' are maintained within Chinese communities living in the UK. Here, voluntary multilingual schools have been set up to encourage the learning of Cantonese and Mandarin as well as different aspects of Chinese 'culture'. Drawing both on Holliday's earlier conceptualisation of 'small culture' (1999), and his later expansion of this into a wider ranging 'grammar of culture' (2013), Ganassin uses ethnographic techniques in order to engage with both teachers and pupils in her exploration of just how 'culture' is constructed in two such schools in the UK. In this, differences emerged between the perspectives of teachers and pupils - while teachers were more preoccupied with instilling appropriate values and beliefs, pupils were more interested in how Chinese culture could be experienced personally in ways that appeared relevant, not least

in relation to their own family biographies. These differences led to a complexity in the construction of Chinese culture as it was negotiated within the local cultures of a particular school, institution or social group. In this respect, the pupils within the school emerged as active participants not only in their engagement with cultural activities, but also in their criticism of some of the educational approaches adopted by the schools. Crucially, this paper offers closely observed evidence for the ways in which, even in heritage education, the idea of culture emerges, not as some preconceived, essentialist model – but as locally co-constructed, and contingent, as it is negotiated within local contexts.

In our fifth paper, Elisabeth Barakos carries forward a long-standing tradition of research into 'language workers' within the context of language and intercultural training – a context which was again pivotal to the series of meetings in Leeds Metropolitan University (1996-1999) which were the precursor to our Association (http://ialic.international/about-ialic/ialic-history/). In it, she uses a highly contemporary combination of critical discourse studies and ethnography to relate the everyday praxis of language workers in an Austrian company to the dominant discourse and ideology of their employers' company. The paper reveals how workers in the company conceive of their identities as 'trainers' as distinct from 'teachers' or 'instructors', and the competencies associated with mastery of 'language and culture' as portable 'skills' within a predominantly neoliberal lexicon. These are associated with both (an apparently *em*powering) self-reflexivity and (an inevitably *dis*empowering) precarity, under the prevailing conditions of employment within the current neoliberal ethos. While the workers for the company saw 'language' and 'culture' as being interrelated within their 'training', the company's website and associated literature tended to dissociate 'language' and 'culture' as discrete components which were delivered by their operation. Thus, the concept of 'culture' as a nationally bounded and impermeable category still appeared to prevail within this particular corporate environment, despite our best attempts within the academy to challenge these assumptions over the past twenty years.

We conclude this collection of papers with Chan and Du-Babcock's exploration of how language is actually used in business meetings. Their study uses conversational analysis to carry out fine-grained analysis of the ways in which leadership is constructed within two different kinds of business meetings in a Finnish-Swedish corporation – one an editorial meeting and the other a human resources meeting - where the chairs both happen to be Swedish. While its national locatedness is perhaps a necessary starting point for this study, this is pretty much where considerations of nationality and national culture end. Drawing on a rich

seam of previous research which has investigated the social constructedness of leadership in business meetings, Chan and Du-Babcock analyse the discursive specificity of the ways in which leadership is constructed in these two meetings. In doing so, they are able to illustrate that, although both the meeting chairs happen to be Swedish, they realise their leadership styles in radically contrasting ways. Consequently one group exhibits a leadership style which directly contrasts with the egalitarian and consultative ethos that is commonly regarded as being a core Nordic cultural value. Furthermore, they contend that leadership style is not just influenced by the personal approach of the leaders themselves, but is constructed collaboratively by either leader, along with their co-workers. In keeping with Etienne Wenger's theory of community of practice (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015), this can be specific to the team's shared sense of purpose, given the two different kinds of meeting taking place. All in all, this study once again presents powerful evidence that a discursive approach to analysing the talk that actually takes place within a particular social situation can be more revealing more about how 'culture' is collaboratively constructed, contingent to local conditions, than large scale questionnaires and surveys which attempt to generalise self-reported psychological constructs across national cultures.

To round off this issue, we feature two book reviews brought to you by Bernie Mak and Leticia Yulita. We are grateful to our reviewers for taking the trouble to update us on what is current in the field. Apropos of the mention of the 'grammar of culture' in Sara Ganassin's paper, readers might also be interested to know that a new and extensively revised second edition of Adrian Holliday's book, *Understanding Intercultural Communication*, was published by Routledge last September. We hope to get a review of this to you later in this volume.

References

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). The Commitment to Theory. In *The Location of Culture* (pp. 18-40). New York, NY: Routledge.

Byram, M. (1989) *Cultural studies in foreign language education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. (1997) *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Holliday, A. R. (1999). Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(2), 237–226.

Holliday, A. R. (2013). *Understanding intercultural communication: Negotiating a grammar of culture*. London: Routledge.

Holliday, A. R. (2019). *Understanding intercultural communication: Negotiating a grammar of culture* (2nd edition). London: Routledge.

Kramsch, C. (1997) The Privilege of the Nonnative Speaker. *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association,* 112 (3), 359-369.

Kramsch, C., & Zhu, H. (2016). Language and culture in ELT. In G. Hall (Ed.) *Routledge handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 38–50). London: Routledge.

Martin, Judith N., Thomas K. Nakayama and Donal Carbaugh. (2013) The history and development of the study of intercultural communication and applied linguistics. In Jane Jackson (Ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 35-54). NY; Abingdon: Routledge.

Oskarsson, Matts (1972) Comparative method studies in foreign language teaching. *Moderna Sprak* 64(4), 350–366.

Wenger-Trayner, E., & Wenger-Trayner, B. (2015). *Communities of practice: A brief introduction*. Retrieved from http://wenger-trayner.com/wp-content/uploads/ 2015/ 04 /07-Brief-introduction-to-communities-of-practice.pdf