

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/171561>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

Editorial

One of the cornerstones of the meetings in ‘cross-cultural capability’ which preceded the founding of IALIC in late 2000 was the often swingeing critique of cultural essentialism, particularly that which underwrites the certain modalities of cultural categorisation and classification (e.g. Hall, 1969, 1973; Hofstede, 1980, 1991); and the ways in which they had been taken up by certain forms of ‘intercultural training’ which were popular at the time. Despite our best attempts over the past two decades, these have largely maintained until the present day. Much of our critique emanated from the fields of anthropology and philosophy, and particularly the thought of poststructuralism such as the work Michel Foucault (e.g. 1979) which, however radical it might seem, remained solidly grounded in the European philosophical tradition (Moore-Gilbert, 1997). This became incorporated in turn into the influential postcolonial writings of Edward Said (1985) and Homi Bhabha (2004). Throughout the noughties, the European foundations of thinking about communication, culture and criticality in our field became challenged in both communication theory and critical discourse studies by advocates of a less occidental perspective towards communication and criticality. Yoshitaka Miike called for an ‘Asiacentric approach’ to communication studies (2006, 2007); and Shi-xu called for a specifically ‘Chinese’ discourse analysis to challenge some of the precepts of the more stolid European traditions of Critical Discourse Analysis (e.g. 2005). However it was not until the last decade that momentum has really built behind voices which challenge more widely the hegemony of European epistemologies – not so much from the perspective of an alternative potentially hegemonic cultural and economic power bloc, but from the purview of the Global South. In this the work of Boaventura de Sousa Santos has been pivotal, not least his *Epistemologies of the South* (2014), but also more recently *The End of the Cognitive Empire* (2018). This lineage has been incorporated into the work of our association, not least the work of Alison Phipps (2019) and Manuela Guilherme (e.g. Guilherme and Menezes de Souza, 2019) and has also informed a recent research project in intercultural pedagogy carried out under the aegis of our Chair, Prue Holmes, and John Corbett (2019a) - one of my predecessors as editor of this journal.

Decolonisation, power and policy

With this trajectory in mind, the first group of papers in this issue reflect some of the issues of decolonisation, power and language policy – both in education and in the media - which have emerged in the work of our association. The collection opens with a provocative essay in which Hamza R’boul asserts that the occlusion of indigenous knowledges and epistemologies which

emanate from in the Global South has led to an ‘imbalance’ in intercultural education in favour of the North. Here, the author is very much in accord with the tenets of this journal in his conceptualization of intercultural communication education as ‘the pedagogical framing of the range of ideas discussed in intercultural communication that carries similar epistemological density rather than training or a classroom solely driven by a particular pragmatic concern, such as developing intercultural competence’. However, in this the author agrees with Aman (2018) that this ‘epistemological density’ at present emanates from a rather singular ‘Western project’ rather than taking account of the variety of knowledges within the world. R’boul goes on to elaborate a number of ways in which the epistemological hegemony of ‘Western-centric’ knowledges is made manifest. But the central thrust of this paper is the case the author makes for ‘pluriperspectivity’ as a more appropriate postmodern approach in which intercultural communication education can promote engaged dialogue with ‘perspectives from underrepresented ontologies...encouraging the acceptance of regional and individual differences’. However, for me the additional paradox that I feel we need to grapple with in confronting this challenge, is that not only do these knowledges include the now well-worn categorisation of cultures, not only are these ontologies derived from the very processes of objectification itself in which our academy prides itself - but that in my view the very processes of critique in which we habitually engage in this journal emanate themselves from the Enlightenment project. This is not to fall into the fallacy that that ‘people from non-European cultures cannot be critical’, a position which itself has been soundly dispatched some years ago (e.g. Grimshaw, 2010), but that the confrontation, transformation and supersession of currently dominant epistemologies may ultimately require something other than the conventional forms of critique as are conventionally practised within the academy. The exploration and practice of these ‘alternative’ forms of intercultural communication education underwrite much of this journal’s engagement with aesthetic and artistic engagement with intercultural communication in both pedagogic and non-formal contexts (e.g. Matos and Melo-Pfeifer, 2020); and more research into this of this will be presented for you later in this volume (Harvey and Tordzro, 2021, forthcoming).

The impact of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) (Byram & Parmenter, 2012; Trim, 2012) across the 26 nations of the EU has been often reported in these pages (influentially, Beaven and Borghetti, 2016); although it has not been without its critics (e.g. Simpson and Dervin, 2019). However, less commonly considered is the way in which its influence has also been seen, along with its concomitant implementation of frameworks of intercultural competence, in national language policies in countries beyond its point of origin,

such as Malaysia, Vietnam, Thailand, and Indonesia. In our next paper, Muhammad Iwan Munandar and Jonathan Newton report on the beliefs and practices five Indonesian EFL teachers have maintained in relation to culture and interculturality in their high-school classrooms. In particular they explore how they navigated the delicate balance between complying with the Indonesian government's policy to promote a strong sense of national identity in its schools and to simultaneously to encourage the cosmopolitan aspirations expressed in the intercultural competence frameworks of the Common European Framework. For all five teachers, there is no denying that national principles of language education and 'character education' had a strong influence on their beliefs and practices in the classroom. However in so doing they also used materials to explore the relationship between the multifarious language(s) and culture(s) with which their students were engaged. In so doing the teachers regularly made conscious decisions to introduce cultural content into their lessons. While Munandar and Newton do not explicitly reference the theme of decolonisation in their paper, this case study does provide us with invaluable insights into how teachers working in secondary schools in Indonesia wrestle on a day-to-day basis with the tensions and contradictions presented to them between ideologies which operate at a local and national level and more global educational philosophies and pedagogical frameworks.

If our last paper considered how Indonesian language teachers navigated the delicate balance between national language policies and the more cosmopolitan implications of immersing oneself in a foreign language, our next considers how a small group of displaced Tibetan educationalists dwelling in exile in Luding County on the Sino-Tibetan frontier for 'language schooling' juggle their sense of identification with their native language, Tibetan, and the language they are required to learn during their time in exile, Mandarin Chinese. This extensive ethnographic research is grounded in the intensive engagement of the first author, Dongjing Kang, as she herself dwelt amongst these educators while teaching English during the Spring of 2013. During this period she conducted extensive field research along with her colleague and co-author Zhou Li in order to understand the way in which these teachers internalised their experience of dwelling simultaneously in two languages: Mandarin, the language of their exile, and Tibetan, the language of their homeland. For the authors, this was best understood through the lens of Heidegger's concept of 'home-in-language'. Their study reveals that for her participants, their own Tibetan language speaks of both their geographical and cultural home. Paradoxically their simultaneously sharing their native language of Tibetan, while feeling alienated through having to speak Mandarin, made them feel closer to home, even while being geographically distant. And finally, dwelling in their native language simultaneous

with a foreign language helped them to reconnect with their home through Heidegger's four elements of *earth, sky, mortals* and *divinities*.

While the theme of decolonisation is a cornerstone of current progressive thinking in intercultural education and language learning, it can also relate to other lines of engagement in the public sphere, including media, fashion and the arts. In recent years, the burkini has become a totemic symbol of the tension between religion and secularity, tradition and modernity, oppression and emancipation. By contrast with this attire which was explicitly designed to preserve the modesty of Muslim women, fashion magazines produced in North America, Europe and elsewhere often publish images of women clad in the much more revealing bikini. In April 2019, the Somali model Halima Aden became the first Muslim model to appear in a hijab and burkini in the US fashion magazine *Sports Illustrated*. To engage critically with this semiotic milestone, El Shazly and El Falaki draw on Cultural Discourse Analysis (Shi-xu, 2005) in order to carry out a closely observed analysis of two of images of the model Aden from this edition of the magazine. In their analysis El Shazly and El Falaki deploy techniques of multimodal analysis (e.g. Kress and Van Leeuwen, 2006): first, to unpack the component parts that make up the narrative of the images; and secondly to explore the relationship which is constructed in the images between the figure who is depicted and the viewer; and finally to draw out the emotional resonances of the colours which are deployed in the two images. They conclude that the combined symbolism of the burkini, the Kenyan shoreline and the Somali model convey an effect of cultural 'harmony' and diversity, which thereby challenges 'the hegemonic sexualization of women in popular visual culture' and reasserts the 'cultural identity and diversity of developing societies'.

The use of creative writing to facilitate intercultural communication has received increasing prominence in the work of our association over recent years – in arts education more generally (Matos and Sylvia-Pfeiffer, 2020; Harvey and Tordzro, 2021, forthcoming) and in projects which take place within conflict zones (e.g. Holmes and Corbett, 2020b; Phipps and Kay, 2016). In our next paper Siobhan Brownlie reports on a project she undertook in Manchester with a small group of female asylum seekers from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) under the auspices of the charitable organisation 'Women Asylum Seekers Together' (<https://www.wastmanchester.com/>). Brownlie uses an autoethnographic approach to draw on a detailed journal she kept during the project. The purpose of the project was to develop pieces of writing created by the women in French, the national language of the DRC, and assemble them into a booklet for publication. Brownlie gives a detailed account of the way in which three aspects of the writing process in combination - languaging,

translanguaging and ‘discursive cross-culturing’ - served to ‘empower’ the women as they found their feet within the new society in which they have recently arrived. We are also delighted to be able to host the booklet which was developed on this project on the LAIC website. So do enjoy one or two of the authors’ pieces as you read Siobhan’s article. This is available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2020.1865391>.

If creative arts projects might help to recharge the personal confidence and communicative resources of participants who have recently arrived in the country, things are not always so heartening when it comes to the brutal business of attempting to earn a living. In Belgium, as in many OECD countries, immigrants comprise a lower proportion of the total number of people in employment than the proportion of the overall population in work, making it in fact ‘the lowest scoring OECD-country for labour market integration of immigrants’. In our next article Van De Mierop and Melina De Dijn investigate whether the communication between immigrant interviewees and their potential employers during the job interview could be one factor that contributes to this situation. They investigate the recruitment of four immigrants for ‘blue collar’ jobs with companies in Belgium. In so doing, they combine a multi-modal approach with Membership Categorization Analysis to carry out a fine-grained, analysis of the communication which takes place between the participants in interview fragments which they select to ascertain just how candidates and interviewees (do or do not) co-construct some sense of commonality through the talk in the interview. In so doing, their approach assumes, after the precepts of Conversation Analysis, that social categories are not constructed ‘outside of the context in which communication occurs’ (Jenks, 2013, pp. 99–100), but rather ‘are talked into being on a turn-by-turn basis’.

While we will see later in this issue that some countries in Asia, such as Korea, now have well established policies of university internationalisation, in some European countries the internationalisation of universities is becoming more problematic, as cracks begin to emerge in the implementation of the Bologna Declaration (1999) agreement ushered in by the European Union. Hanne Tange and Kirsten Jæger report from Denmark on the way in which the current Liberal-Conservative government has placed limits on the number of international students admitted into university programmes. To contextualise this, Tange and Jæger carry out a twenty year documentary sweep and establish three phases of policy orientation towards university internationalisation within Denmark. In so doing, the authors argue (after Flyvbjerg, 2006) that Denmark provides both a paradigmatic and a ‘critical’ case in which ‘general and typical features of HE de-internationalisation’ can be identified. The first and longest phase, from 2000 to 2013, saw Denmark become one of the principal instigators of the Bologna

Declaration, with the country seeing a fourfold increase in the number of international students undertaking degree programs at Danish universities. Consequently, as we shall see later in Korea, many programmes became taught in English rather than Danish, particularly taught postgraduate courses, although this remained controversial in the media. The second phase began in 2013, when the decision was made by the European Court of Justice that anyone who is an EU citizen has the right to receive the same grant as a Danish student to study at a Danish university. While the policy of internationalisation was upheld by university policy and strategy papers and leftist political parties, it was increasingly challenged within the media and by Liberal-Conservative parties. This culminated with the beginning of the current period of de-internationalisation, which continues up to the time of writing. After 2018 the Liberal-Conservative government placed significant restrictions on the number of international students admitted to Danish universities, and also limited the number of programmes which may be delivered in English. The significance for readers of Denmark's case with regard to the eruption of de-internationalisation policies lies in the potential widening of the trends towards 'cultural nationalism' realised through policies relating to maintenance of national language and 'welfare nationalism' arising from the restriction of government grants to Danish nationals to students from other EU countries across Europe, and worldwide.

Intercultural Communication and language learning

Students travel to other countries to learn a foreign language in a variety of settings. These might be formal language courses, cultural studies courses, or a language might be learnt less formally as part of content degree courses. These sojourns can range in length from a few days or a few months to a number of years, as is the case in undergraduate degree courses. However, a language can also be learnt more or less incidentally during the process of travel. To round off this issue, I present a second cluster of papers which report on the variety of ways in which intercultural awareness is developed in a range of contexts in which a language is learnt in a foreign country.

If critiques of cultural essentialism and cultural categorisation were the negative foundations of IALIC, one of the many productive aspects of intercultural communication which have been explored over the past twenty years in the association has been study abroad programmes, with short term programmes from a few days to a few weeks being most recently reported in these pages (e.g. Beaven and Borghetti, 2016; Bloom and Arturo, 2015). In our next paper, Humphreys and Baker report on the experiences of a small cohort of Japanese students, who have studied on a variety of different courses abroad. They argue in their paper that these

programmes are all too often preoccupied with participants' interaction with local inhabitants and students and the gleaning of local and national knowledge about the country and culture in which the participating program is located. For them, this can lead to something of a reductionist approach in which the importance of participants' interactions with other international students is undervalued. Drawing on Baker's earlier framework for developing intercultural awareness (2011, 2016), the study argues that something of an uneven development in intercultural awareness was seen in students' conceptualisation of language, culture, and identity in communication in these short-term study abroad courses. While some students did not move much beyond 'simplistically' linking language, culture, and nation before and after their programmes, others moved more towards accepting cultural differences and engaging in a deeper interpretation of culture. In keeping with the authors' initial thesis, wider pedagogic and communicative engagement with the international student body on campuses appeared to be commensurate with a greater intensity of intercultural encounters and enhanced intercultural development.

If Humphreys and Baker's Japanese students found a measure of satisfaction in their exchanges with their international peers, this is not always the case in every context. In order to attract international faculty and student body, for some time now English has been widely used as the medium of instruction for entire programmes in universities worldwide. This is particularly the case in universities in Korea, where staff and both home and international students are required to study in English and hopefully communicate on campus in English in order to create an incisive atmosphere for international students. In our next paper, Choi reports on an ethnographic engagement with students at a Korean university as a follow-up to a previous larger-scale study. Specifically she considers how both home and international students communicate outside the classroom environment. The findings reveal some ambivalence on the part of Korean students towards their use of English for on-campus communication inside and outside the classroom (EMI). This is largely contingent on the specific spaces in which students are communicating, which can give rise to the mobilisation of different 'language ideologies'. For example, some Korean students thought that international students should be able to learn enough basic Korean to understand simple administrative messages sent by the university or that the university administration should have enough resources in order to render these into English themselves. However, in a different situation, international students report on encouraging to their Korean peers to use Korean in order to complete a collaborative out-of-class project more efficiently.

Our previous case study suggested that optimal levels of language learning and intercultural awareness can be in fact be problematic for international students studying in an in an EMI environment where the local language is not English. However, our next case study, carried out in a university in the American South West, suggests that where the language of instruction is the same as that spoken locally (in this case English again), the outcome can be more positive. In recent years, studies of the increasing numbers of Chinese students who have been travelling abroad to study on shorter language learning courses have been widely reported. However, business schools worldwide are also major draws for cohorts of international students who travel abroad for longer periods of study and, in particular these have become the top attraction for Chinese students over recent years. To investigate this context, Shi and Guo revive the potent concepts of identity and investment, originally synthesised by Bonny Norton in Canada over twenty years ago (1997, 2000), to explore the social and individual factors that shape the language and cultural learning of three Chinese MBA students studying in a US university. In depth engagement with their three cases revealed considerable variability in the students' engagement with the local language and culture. This was apparently related to their sense of themselves and their different imaginaries regarding the international professional community in which they envisaged participating after completing their programme which impacted upon their capacity for learning English and engaging with the American culture both at a local and national level during their period of study.

If the papers we have lined up for you so far in this issue reference their criteria for intercultural awareness and competence through reference to external, or 'etic' criteria, our next paper undertakes a fine-grained analysis of the talk that takes place between learners within a language learning task in order to establish criteria for intercultural competence that are actually intrinsic to the interactions which takes place between the learners, that is to say, these are 'emic' criteria. Tandem learning has achieved some attention of late in intercultural pedagogy (e.g. Woodin, 2018; see Abid, 2020, for a review). Tandem learning comprises a series of exchanges which are dyadic interactions in which learners can improve their communication skills within a foreign language through authentic communication in order to, amongst other things, improve their intercultural competence. While previous work has deployed the techniques of Conversation Analysis (CA) to unpack how 'interculturality' emerges from real time conversation as it is made relevant through the talk of the participants (e.g. Brandt and Jenks, 2011), our next paper is one of the first pieces of research to use CA to study interactions in a face-to-face tandem language learning context. In so doing, Angela Sabbah-Taylor deploys CA to investigate the ways in which intercultural competence arises

from face-to-face tandem language learning between Chinese and English students. What emerges from the author's judicious selection and interpretation of extracts of the talk is a minutely calibrated description of how an 'asymmetrical orientation to knowledge' is constructed in these language learning tasks, in which one learner adopts the role of teacher and one adopts the role of learner in order to explore the finer points of the meaning of English idioms. In so doing, Sabbah-Taylor's study demonstrates how cultural differences between the learners arise from the ways in which they 'ascribe[d] to each other the identity of expert [or] novice'.

We conclude this issue with our usual two offerings for you to read. *Educational approaches to internationalization of higher education through intercultural dialogue* (Lundgren, Castro and Woodin) is reviewed by Wendong Li, and ties in nicely with some of the themes introduced by Tange and Choi respectively in their papers in this issue. And then Carl Ruest concludes this issue with a review of Phiona Stanley's *Critical Autoethnography and Intercultural Learning: Emerging Voices* (2020). As ever, we are grateful to both our book reviewers for their efforts in keeping us up to date with these recent publications in the field.

References

- Abid, Nadia (2020) Interculturality, interaction and language learning. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 20(3), 284-286. [10.1080/14708477.2020.1720063](https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2020.1720063)
- Aman, Robert (2018) *Decolonising Intercultural Education Colonial differences, the geopolitics of knowledge, and inter-epistemic dialogue*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Baker, W. (2011). Intercultural awareness: Modelling an understanding of cultures in intercultural communication through English as a lingua franca. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(3), 197–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2011.577779>
- Baker, W. (2016). English as an academic lingua franca and intercultural awareness: Student mobility in the transcultural university. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16(3), 437–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2016.1168053>
- Bhabha, Homi K. (2004) *The location of culture*. London ; New York : Routledge.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura (2014) *Epistemologies of the South. Justice against Epistemicide*. London: Paradigm Publishers.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura (2018) *The End of the Cognitive Empire: The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

- Bloom, Melanie & Arturo Miranda (2015) Intercultural sensitivity through short-term study abroad. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 15(4), 567-580.
- Borghetti, C. & Beaven, A. (Eds.) (2016), Special issue “Perspectives and discourses on student mobility and interculturality”. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16(3), pp 313-515.
- Brandt, A., & Jenks, C. (2011). ‘Is it okay to eat a dog in Korea...like China?’ Assumptions of national food-eating practices in intercultural interaction. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(1), 41–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2010.541260>
- Foucault, Michel (1979) *Discipline and punish : the birth of the prison*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Quantitative Inquiry* 12(2), 219–245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363>
- Guilherme, M. & L. M. T. Menezes de Souza (Eds.), (2019) *Glocal Languages and Critical Intercultural Awareness: The South answers back*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Grimshaw, Trevor (2010) Styling the occidental other: interculturality in Chinese university performances, *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 10(3), 243-258, DOI: [10.1080/14708470903348564](https://doi.org/10.1080/14708470903348564)
- Hall, Edward T. (1969) *The hidden dimension*. Garden City (NY) : Doubleday & Company.
- Hall, Edward T. (1973) *The silent language*. New York : Anchor Press.
- Harvey, Lou and Gameli Tordzro (Eds.) (2021) Beyond and besides language: Intercultural communication and creative practice. Special issue of *Language and Intercultural Communication* 21 (5), forthcoming.
- Hofstede, Geert. (1980) *Culture's consequences : international differences in work-related values / Geert Hofstede*. Newbury Park; London: Sage.
- Hofstede, Geert (1991) *Cultures and organizations : software of the mind*. London : McGraw-Hill.
- Holmes, P. and J. Corbett (2019a) *Building an Intercultural Pedagogy for Higher Education in Conditions of Conflict and Protracted Crises: Languages, Identity, Culture*. Available at <https://www.dur.ac.uk/biphec/>.
- Holmes, P. and J. Corbett (2020b) Conflict, crisis and creativity: Critical intercultural pedagogy for difficult times. Unpublished paper given at the 20th Annual Online symposium of the International Association of Intercultural Communication. *Issues, controversies and difficult questions* (24 November).

- Jenks, C. (2013). Are you an ELF? The relevance of ELF as an equitable social category in online intercultural communication. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 13(1), 95–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2012.748792>.
- Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. Routledge.
- Matos, Ana and Sílvia Melo-Pfeifer (eds) (2020) Arts, intercultural education and citizenship – emergent perspectives. Special issue of *Language and Intercultural Communication* 20 (4), 289-392.
- Miike, Y. (2006). Non-Western theory in Western research? An Asiatic agenda for Asian communication studies. *Review of Communication*, 6(1/2), 4-31.
- Miike, Y. (2007). An Asiatic reflection on Eurocentric bias in communication theory. *Communication Monographs*, 74(2), 272-278.
- Moore-Gilbert, B. (1997). *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, and Politics*. Verso.
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409–429.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England: Longman/Pearson Education.
- Phipps, A. (2019) *Decolonising Multilingualism: Struggles to Decreate*. Series: *Writing without borders*. Multilingual Matters.
- Phipps, A. and Kay, R. (Eds.) (2016) *Languages in Migratory Settings: Place, Politics, and Aesthetics*. London: Routledge.
- Said, Edward W. (1985) *Orientalism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin..
- Shi-xu. (2005). *A cultural approach to discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Simpson, Ashley & Fred Dervin (2019). Forms of dialogism in the Council of Europe Reference Framework on Competences for Democratic Culture. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 41(4), 305-319, DOI: [10.1080/01434632.2019.1618317](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1618317)
- Stanley, P. (Ed.). (2020). *Critical Autoethnography and Intercultural Learning: Emerging Voices*. Routledge.
- Woodin, Jane (2018) *Interculturality, Interaction and Language Learning: Insights from Tandem Partnerships*. New York; London: Routledge.