Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis and, where applicable, any accompanying data are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis and the accompanying data cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content of the thesis and accompanying research data (where applicable) must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder/s.

When referring to this thesis and any accompanying data, full bibliographic details must be given, e.g.

Thesis: Author (Year of Submission) "Full thesis title", University of Southampton, name of the University Faculty or School or Department, PhD Thesis, pagination.

Data: Author (Year) Title. URI [dataset]

Interculturality and dialogic pedagogy in ELT: an investigation of Algerian secondary school English textbooks and their use in the classroom

By

Amina Douidi

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

October 2021
University of Southampton

Abstract

Faculty of Arts and Humanities
Modern Languages and Linguistics
Doctor of Philosophy

Interculturality and dialogic pedagogy in ELT: an investigation of Algerian secondary school English textbooks and their use in the classroom

by

Amina Douidi

This study sought to explore the concepts of interculturality and dialogic pedagogy as constructed in classroom discourse and language textbooks in Algerian secondary school settings. It has adopted an ethnographically-inspired interpretive research paradigm to investigate the representational repertoire of three English textbooks used by all secondary schools in Algeria and to examine 9 voice-recorded classroom sessions with a focus on interculturality. Accordingly, the main sources of data were the voice-recorded naturally-occurring classroom interactions, participant observation, and field notes, interviews with three teachers, and focus group discussions with the learners.

This thesis aimed to explain the role of pedagogy and representation in facilitating or preventing the promotion of intercultural learning in the classroom. The findings show that the textbooks display a multiplicity of cultural references which, by looking deeper, lack complexity because of the dominance of simplistic and essentialist representational discourses. This study has provided a situated and contextualised interpretation of some of the factors impeding the promotion of intercultural learning in English classrooms. Firstly, it has demonstrated that the national orientation of the curriculum prioritises the development of national identity and pride which reinforces an understanding of the cultural and the intercultural as tightly linked to nations as homes for monolithic cultures, which in turn is translated into essentialist, outdated and unappealing language textbooks. Secondly, it has demonstrated the prevalence of the instructional, teacher-centred pedagogy which thrives to develop primarily the learners’ linguistic competence. As opposed to an instructional pedagogy, a dialogic pedagogy is learner-centred and creates symbolic spaces where learners can draw from their multiple identities and small cultures in order to co-construct knowledge that is critical, fluid, and complex. However, although the classrooms in this setting have shown a potential for the emergence of a dialogic learning environment, the instructional discourse was predominant.

I argue that representation matters significantly, particularly if it includes complex and multiple frames of reference, in addition to appropriate tasks which explicitly address intercultural competences and awareness. Furthermore, I argue that the role of the teacher is central in the construction of a dialogic pedagogy which will subsequently contribute to the promotion of interculturality and intercultural learning in the language classroom.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIE</td>
<td>Critical Interaction Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELF</td>
<td>English as Lingua Franca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>English Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA</td>
<td>Intercultural Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>Intercultural Communicative Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>Research Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US or USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1  Introduction

The first part of this thesis’ title comprises two key concepts: interculturality and dialogic pedagogy. The leading thread of this thesis is to acquire a better understanding of these two concepts in the context of English Language Teaching (ELT) using evidence from secondary schools in Algeria. Intercultural Communication (IC) as a field of inquiry has witnessed a rise in interest since the 1990s particularly in the language learning and teaching enterprise, across the world and Africa is no exception. In Algeria, over the last few years, the concepts of intercultural awareness and intercultural communication have been introduced progressively to Algerian English curricula and my hope through this project is to explore how the intercultural is constructed through pedagogy in Algerian English textbooks and classrooms and how it is conceptualised by the teachers and the learners. In this first chapter, I start by introducing the background of the study with an overview of the relevance of language-and-culture education for Intercultural Communication studies (section 1.1). Then, in section 1.2, I provide working definitions for the concepts of interculturality, essentialism and dialogic pedagogy. In section 1.3, I discuss the current situation of intercultural research in Algeria, followed by a broad account of Algeria’s complex linguistic and language policy context (section 1.5). In section 1.5, I discuss the rationale of the study and research questions. Finally, I provide an overview of the thesis structure in section 1.6.

1.1  Background of the study and overview

It became common knowledge that English holds an important place in the current globalised world. Increasingly, governments are investing in the teaching of English as the language of economic growth and internationalisation. In this sense, globalisation is transforming languages into a *marketable commodity* to use Heller’s (2003) terms, and Algeria is no exception. According to Block and Cameron (2002), ‘the commodification of language affects both people’s motivations for learning languages and their choices about which languages to learn’ (p.5). In multilingual Algeria, Benrabah (2014, p. 52) posits that among the languages of Algeria which include Tamazight [tæmæˈʒʒɪt] language (also referred to as Berber) and dialectal Arabic, there are four other ‘world’ languages, namely, Arabic, French, English and Chinese, predicting that ‘the more Algeria’s economy is integrated into the global capitalist system, the more English will spread in this country’. Hence, besides the indexation of English with values of economic empowerment, it holds complex connotations - more than any other language -, where some of those connotations are related to values such as peace, intercultural and global citizenship (Guilherme, 2007). In
other words, languages, and particularly English for its worldliness, are believed to facilitate intercultural relations among people, globally.

Intercultural communication studies have been conducted in various disciplines such as business, diplomacy, and education. It can be observed in the literature that the term *intercultural* is paired up with an overwhelming number of concepts such as education, sensitivity, awareness, citizenship, communication, competence, dialogue and so on. Depending on the function given to the term and the context of its use, the *intercultural* is associated with an ambitious agenda which is the promotion of ‘transformative reciprocity’ (Paracka and Pynn, 2017), in the sense that it invites to reflect and critically evaluate constructs such as identity and culture to recognise inequalities, privileges and create change beyond the classroom space. Thus, the mainstream understanding of the intercultural dimension in language education is that it promotes openness to the unfamiliar and developing levels of criticality towards knowledge and beliefs about the self, the others and the world (Byram, Gribkova and Starkey, 2002; Porto and Byram, 2015). In the forward of Byram et al. (2017), Martyn Barrett posits that ‘active intercultural democratic citizenship is required’ given the spread of hostility towards those who are different from us (p. viii). This benevolent mission is not always the most appropriate, especially if it is one-directional, as it is the case in projects where it is expected from immigrant students to develop intercultural skills to *integrate* into a host community that has not been prepared to welcome them (e.g. Etxeberría and Elosegui, 2010). Moreover, evidence from a study about teaching the Turkish language in Greek-Cypriot schools, a context of conflict, suggests that promoting intercultural dimensions has proven to be challenging, counterproductive and far from appropriate (Charalambous, Charalambous and Rampton, 2015). In light of those studies, an acute level of reflexivity is needed while implementing an intercultural approach to language teaching.

Scholarly research and works investigating intercultural communication in language education have been informed by studies calling for the integrative teaching and learning of language and culture. Many educational bodies have chosen to incorporate the intercultural dimension in language curricula by enacting the connectedness between language and culture. So, the question is: how is the relationship between language and culture translated in language materials and the classroom? On this matter, Liddicoat (2004) argues that ‘for languages education to develop intercultural understanding it needs to go beyond presenting isolated snippets of information about the target language culture’. In other words, intercultural teaching is not only about adding bits and pieces of cultural references into language materials and educational content. Rather, it is about creating opportunities for reflection, relating and responsibility alongside language learning. On the other hand, the concept of the ‘target language culture’ becomes a problematic matter particularly for English, since the number of speakers of English as a foreign language or
lingua franca around the world is more important than the number of speakers who are natives of the historical centres (i.e., Britain and the United States) (Kachru and Nelson, 1996). Therefore, statements such as the ‘target language culture’ can be misleading or representative of a belief claiming that there is some sort of target culture bound to the English language, for instance. The way English is used around the world requires that we review our understanding of ownership of English, especially with the emergence of English as Lingua Franca (ELF) (Widdowson, 1994; Baker, 2012, 2015a). For this reason, the relationship between language and culture has been subject to discussion from both a theoretical perspective and a practical one in ELT. Furthermore, according to Liddicoat (2008), ‘an intercultural pedagogy is one which engages actively with the interrelatedness of language culture and learning and with the multiple languages and cultures present in the classroom which shape learners and learning’. This way, the intercultural dimension of language learning is meant to approach languages as meaning-making cultural discourses embedded in context, taking into account the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the learners and the teachers, as well as, the linguistic and cultural discourses represented in the learning materials. Another key aspect of the intercultural dimension in language education is the introduction of the concept of ‘intercultural speaker’ (Byram, 1997) as a new model for language learners that challenges the mythical native speaker one. Here the students are not expected to develop native-like language skills; rather, the intercultural speaker is presented as a more achievable goal and requires the development of skills of mediation and negotiation for effective and appropriate communication in intercultural encounters. To sum up, an intercultural approach to language education is an approach which integrates the teaching and learning of language and culture (which is viewed here as a complex construct) in a meaningful way in both materials and practice and aims to help the learners become competent intercultural speakers without disregarding their linguistic and cultural capital. This study aims to explore and understand how the intercultural is constructed whether organically or purposefully in the Algerian secondary school setting by looking at English textbooks and classroom interactions. However, before describing the context of Algerian education and current discussions about intercultural research in Algeria, I introduce my understanding of key concepts namely: interculturality, essentialism and dialogic pedagogy.

1.2 Working definitions

1.2.1 Interculturality

The traditional understanding of intercultural communication research is rooted in the study of communication between people from different cultures where the latter in most cases means
countries or nationalities. As stated by Hinchcliff-Pelias and Greer (2004, p. 5) ‘intercultural communication involves the interaction of persons from cultural communities that are different’. This perspective aligns with the one taken by researchers investigating, for instance, study-abroad experiences of the sojourner (e.g., Jackson, 2006); intercultural communication in professional contexts (e.g., Clyne, Ball and Neil, 1991), or intercultural approaches to second language education where the learner is trained to become interculturally competent, i.e., able to understand the target community and develop skills of mediation and interpretation (e.g., (Corbett, 2003). Byram (1997, p. 22) has put forward three examples of intercultural communication which is viewed as a communication

- ‘between people of different languages and countries where one is a native speaker of the language used;
- between people of different languages and countries where the language used is a lingua franca;
- and between people of the same country but different languages, one of whom is a native speaker of the language used.’

In this sense, for the orthodoxies of intercultural communication research, the notion of ‘difference’ is central. It is the reason why the researcher is drawn into the project. Accordingly, Zhu Hua (2013, p. 200) explains that ‘the field of intercultural communication is primarily concerned with how individuals, to achieve their communication goals, negotiate cultural or linguistic differences which may be perceived relevant by at least one party in the interaction’. In other words, researchers in the field examine behaviours in encounters where differences whether cultural, linguistic, racial, religious, ethic, or other are prominent.

This being said, within the broad and complex field of intercultural communication there is an emergent paradigm called interculturality which challenges the a priori assumption of ‘difference’ that is supposed to shape processes of interaction.

Interculturality in English, interculturalité in French and interculturalidad in Spanish are nouns derived from the adjective intercultural which in broad terms can mean all that is about the intercultural. Conceptually speaking, however, interculturality can be understood differently depending on the context of the study. According to Medina-Lopez-Portillo and Sinnigen (2009, p. 250) ‘in Latin America, interculturality is used to describe the necessary conditions for a new social configuration that allows historically marginalized indigenous groups and others, primarily Blacks, to pursue cultural, political, and economic equality’. On the other hand, they argue that in the US, interculturality is about achieving competences for effective and appropriate communication (Deardorff, 2006). In Algeria, the field of IC research is still emerging and it is hard to assess the tendency or movements of scholarship. This study, however, takes place in school contexts where the students, the teachers, the staff and the researcher are all nationals of
Algeria. Thus, one could ask where does the intercultural stand? To that, I reply that in order to challenge an approach to intercultural research that is solely based on national differences, studies in contexts that are misleadingly considered ‘monocultural’ are necessary.

In this study, I understand interculturality as a dynamic and emergent process where participants show whether their cultural differences are salient or not during an interaction. I follow Higgins’ (2007) conceptualisation of interculturality which does not consider cultural differences as fixed or pre-assumed but as located in the process of conversation. She bases her position on evidence from an investigation exploring membership identity construction within a group of journalists that could be considered from the perspective of traditional intercultural communication studies to be ‘the same’ given their shared nationality. Drawing on Sack’s (1972) Membership Categorisation Devices, where categories such as ‘family’, ‘woman’ or a given ethnicity are assigned through discourse, Higgins (2007) demonstrates that interculturality is made pertinent or not by the participants in interaction through the use of several discursive strategies such as body language, humour, language alternation or code-switching. In Higgins’ study, the participants resist or reaffirm positions of ‘outsider’ or ‘insider’ through talk, therefore deciding the relevance of their cultural differences. As an analyst, Higgins does not assume the homogeneity of the group based on their shared nationality (Tanzanian) or ethnicity. Rather, cultural differences are recorded and interpreted as emergent and dynamic during the group interaction. Consequently, the concept of interculturality here is understood from a perspective where the investigator does not consider cultural differences as a priori factors affecting communication. The agency of the participants pertaining to a seemingly ‘same’ group in determining the significance of their membership to a cultural community or not is made visible in the process of discussion which Higgins calls identity-in-practice. In doing so, Higgins (2007, p. 51) distinguishes her understanding of interculturality and the locus of other intercultural communication researchers taking a discourse approach but whose ‘work tends to take the cultural difference as a starting point, rather than a phenomenon which remains to be empirically located in talk’.

Furthermore and on the question of how much negotiation of cultural identity is available to individuals in interaction, Zhu Hua (2015, p. 216) states that ‘what can be negotiated by participants is the extent of alignment or misalignment between ascription-by-others and self-orientation and the relevance of cultural membership at specific time in interaction’. In other words, if we take the above-mentioned example, interculturality is about the dynamic process of oscillating between matching and mismatching with the ascribed identities or cultural memberships (e.g., journalist, male, Tanzanian, etc.). Informed by Higgins and Zhu Hua conceptions of interculturality, in this research project cultural memberships are not predetermined by the researcher but emergent in interaction. However, it should be noted that in
settings like classrooms and schools, the ‘roles are unequal’ (Walsh, 2011, p. 4), which can limit the possibility to negotiate identities. The power imbalance between the teacher and the learners could be viewed as ascribed or pre-established by the setting itself, i.e., the teacher manages the classroom, the activities, who talks and when; and learners on the other hand have monitored or limited control of what happens in the classroom. Therefore, my position in this project is that interculturality is an emergent and dynamic process of cultural identity negotiation which is put into perspective in Algerian secondary school classrooms through an ethnographically informed methodology that has the objective to deconstruct the complexity of classroom discourse.

1.2.2 Essentialism

In general terms, to essentialise means to reduce and simplify the attributes of an entity to its supposed essence. Hence, essentialism as a philosophy is an act of reductionist overgeneralisations which can be observed in the creation of categories such as ‘collectivist’ and ‘individualist’ cultures or in statements such as ‘French people are (fixed characteristic), women are (fixed attribute), etc.’ In intercultural education, essentialism is presented as something problematic and to be avoided (Holliday, 1999, 2011; Holmes, 2015). According to Cole and Meadows (2013, p. 30), one of the paradoxical issues in intercultural pedagogy is that ‘we say we are aware of the dangers of essentialism but we teach and write and think as though discrete categories of culture and language exist’. In other words, it is acknowledged among scholars and practitioners that language and culture are complex concepts but they are still being taught as static and fixed entities. In fact, for Holliday (2011, p. 4) ‘essentialism presents people’s individual behaviour as entirely defined and constrained by the cultures in which they live so that the stereotype becomes the essence of who they are’. Accordingly, an essentialist narrative sustains a simplistic and reductionist view of the concept of culture, in addition to approaching the relationship between language and culture as linear. For instance, saying that ‘the target language (L) should be taught with the target culture (C)’ or that ‘one should teach L2 with C2’ are discursive practices that maintain an essentialist view of the language-and-culture relationship. Furthermore, by correlating between nations, languages and cultures under the one-language-one-nation-one-culture paradigm, or between gender, age, religion and given characterisation, for instance, a breach to stereotypes is opened. Therefore, in order to avoid essentialism, it is important to adopt a paradigm that acknowledges the complexity and multiplicity of cultural identities. Therefore, taking a non-essentialist approach means recognising this complexity and fluidity that is inherent to culture which is socially constructed. In this study, I engage in a detailed analysis of textbooks and classroom discourse in order to explore the ways in which cultural
memberships are constructed, negotiated, resisted, maintained etc., within the confinement of an English language classroom.

1.2.3 Dialogic pedagogy

As already established, this study takes place in an educational setting and is concerned with learning, teaching and pedagogy in general. Current theories of education recognise the influence of the works of Vygotsky and Bakhtin concerning the sociocultural theory of learning and the dialogic dimension of language. Given the place that language has in the context of this study and the role of teaching practices in the implementation of an intercultural pedagogy, both Bakhtin’s and Vygotsky’s works are insightful which are discussed further in Chapter 2.

A dialogic inquiry in teaching is student-centred and considers knowledge as co-constructed by the teacher and the students (Wells, 1999). It does not follow a specific method rather it draws on a range of strategies and techniques that aim to empower the student in the classroom. Alexander (2008) provides a broad description of most of the strategies known to the teaching profession such as questioning and feedback to facilitate a scaffolded dialogue in the classroom.

In this thesis, I understand dialogic pedagogy as a pedagogy where the languages, cultures and perspectives of the students are not silenced and where the teacher uptakes the contributions of the students for knowledge to be co-constructed in the classroom.

The relationship between interculturality and dialogism is drawn from the focus on reciprocity. Intercultural education as opposed to the multicultural one focuses on interaction, dialogue and reciprocal relationships (Osler and Starkey, 2001; Coulby, 2006; East, 2008; Vilà and Taveras, 2010). Along the same lines, dialogic pedagogy promotes reciprocity (Alexander, 2008) and challenges the teacher-centred instructional discourse that is traditionally translated in the classroom through processes of Initiation-Response-Feedback lines of inquiry. Rather, it aims to establish space for authentic interaction between the teacher and the students and among the students in the classroom. Such cooperative spaces with authentic and meaningful interaction can contribute to the development and implementation of intercultural learning (Barrett et al., 2014; Lázár, 2020). In this research project and based on the evidence presented, I argue that one of the central conditions to implement an intercultural pedagogy in the classroom is to create or keep moving towards a paradigm shift from an instruction-based type of teaching to a more learner-centred approach to teaching. For this, one of the recommended steps to be taken is to introduce dialogic pedagogy in teacher training and practice.
1.3 Intercultural research in Algeria

In Algeria, the intercultural matter interests a growing number of researchers and lecturers particularly in the context of higher education (e.g., Mouhadjer, 2018, 2019; Mizab and Bahloul, 2020). The topic, however, appears to be trivialised in secondary education teaching. For instance, in a study investigating the intercultural in a French textbook which is currently used in 3rd-year secondary classrooms in Algeria, Bouzekri (2019) concludes that the values which an intercultural pedagogy promotes, such as dialogue and reflecting upon the self and the other, are absent from the textbook. He does not provide an appreciation of what happens in the classroom but calls for a revision of the manual in line with the 2008 Orientation Law of National Education.

In fact, in this law there is mention of the need for the Algerian schools to subscribe to the global movement of progress which is partly done through foreign languages:

‘La maîtrise de langues étrangères de grande diffusion est indispensable pour participer effectivement et efficacement aux échanges interculturels et accéder directement aux connaissances universelles’ (Loi d’orientation sur l’éducation nationale, 2008 : 17).

‘Mastering the most common foreign languages is paramount for an efficient and effective participation in intercultural exchanges and a direct access to universal knowledge’ (translation mine).

The law has been designed to guide the development of i) all the curricula of the Algerian national education, ii) the teacher training and iii) the textbooks’ design. I have reviewed the learning objectives of the English curriculum of the three years of secondary education and similarly to the abovementioned law, the intercultural is referred to in relation to intercultural exchanges, as well as, to knowing the self in order to compare it to the other:

- ‘Speak/write about means of intercultural exchanges’ (year 1)
- ‘Compare people’s values and accept them as they are (year 2)
- ‘Developing an understanding of the expression of feelings across different cultures and societies’ (Year 3)

(Ministère de l’Education Nationale, 2019)

No other explicit mention of ‘interculturality’ or the ‘intercultural’ is made in the curriculum of other language subjects (Tamazight, French, Spanish, Italian, and German), except for Arabic while referring to other types of cultures:

- ‘Exposure to aspects of modern culture’
- ‘Openness to cultures of other nations’ (Year 2, Arabic curriculum)

(ibid; translation mine)
From the examination of the different language curricula, English secondary education programmes appear to be the most favourable to integrate some aspects of the intercultural or at least dimensions of comparison and contrast between cultures. It should be noted that the Algerian national education system is structured in 3 main levels, primary education (5 years), middle school education (4 years), and secondary education (3 years). Arabic is the official language of education and a subject of study from primary to secondary school, French is introduced in the 3rd year of primary education and English is introduced in the 1st year of middle school. Tamazight is also a national language besides Arabic, it is introduced as an optional subject of study in the 1st year of middle school but mainly offered in schools where there is a wide number of Tamazight speaking communities (e.g., Kabylia). Moreover, languages such as Spanish, Italian and German are provided for 2nd-year secondary school students who choose to study the Foreign Languages stream. This is to draw an overview of the plethora of language classrooms where it is possible to implement an intercultural dimension.

Research in Algeria investigating interculturality in English Language Teaching is very scarce. Besides the work of Mouhadjer (2018; 2019), Mizab and Bahloul (2020) and current doctoral projects in progress in the context of higher education, I have identified the works of Bouslama and Benaissi (2018), Messerehi (2014) and Messekher (2014) to be among the few studies that touch upon the topic of intercultural communication in the context of English language teaching in Algerian middle and secondary schools. Bouslama and Benaissi (2018) found that the secondary school English teachers who they have interviewed have little familiarity with the intercultural approach to language teaching which may impede the promotion of interculturality in the classroom. Messerehi (2014) conducted a questionnaire-based study that reveals that there is an overall dissatisfaction of English teachers from the cultural content of secondary education year 2 textbook ‘Getting Through’, which I also analyse in this thesis. She found out that the ‘activities leading to intercultural communicative competence are less popular and less frequently incorporated by teachers in English lessons’ (Messerehi, 2014, p. 174). Regarding the languages curricula of middle school, there is no mention of ‘the intercultural’ per se (Ministère de l’Education Nationale, 2019). Though absent from official documents, it is still possible to investigate teachers’ beliefs and practices on the matter. Messekher (2014) has interviewed English teachers and investigated the intercultural dimension in four Algerian English textbooks used in middle schools and she argues that ‘cultural knowledge is omnipresent in the Algerian textbooks, while cultural awareness and how it informs language use and communication is missing’ (Messekher, 2014, p. 82). Based on the abovementioned studies, the gap between the introduction of cultural content in language classrooms and the implementation of an intercultural pedagogy is worth investigating. My objective from this project is to better
understand the context of this divide in order to put forward recommendations on how intercultural pedagogy through the mediation of textbooks and dialogic pedagogy could find its way into the Algerian education context.

1.4 Algeria’s complex rapport with languages

In the previous section, I have mentioned that among the key languages that are taught in Algerian schools are Arabic, French, Tamazight and English (Benrabah, 2007, 2014). The place held by these languages in the Algerian society and within the education system is shaped by a complex history and controversial language policies. At the risk of stating factual information that my readers already have, Algeria is a North African country sharing borders from west to east with Morocco, Western Sahara, Mauritania, Mali, Niger, Libya and Tunisia. Given its strategic geographical position, Algeria has been prey to numerous conquests from Romans to the Arabo-Muslims to the Ottomans to the French who ultimately established its borders (Meynier, 2017). For historians as well as in the Algerian popular memory, Imazighen, or as more commonly known as the Berbers, constitute the original population of the region (Nickerson, 1968; Ruedy, 1992). The word Amazigh means ‘free man’ and its plural Imazighen ‘free people’ (Brett and Fentress, 1997; Maddy-Weitzman, 2011). It was documented by the historian McDougall that the word Imazighen also means ‘white’ and was initially used to describe the light-skinned indigenous population in distinction to the darker-complexed slave descendants called ‘eklan’ meaning ‘black’, highlighting that ‘the word Imazighen became generalised to denote all ‘Berbers’ only in the second half of the twentieth century’ (McDougall, 2017, p. 44; emphasis original). On the other hand, the term Berber stems from the Greek barbarous meaning ‘barbarian’ used by the Romans to refer to the inhabitants of North Africa whose traits, traditions and language were foreign to them but also considered primitive (Brett and Fentress, 1997). Though widely used, particularly among Francophones, the term Berber is considered offensive (Brett and Fentress, 1997; Cheref, 2020). Cheref (2020) explains that it continues to be used because of the ‘ignorance regarding the term "Berber", which bears colonial baggage’. In this thesis, the term Amazigh is preferred to refer to the ethnic community and Tamazight refers to the language spoken by the Amazigh people. During the French colonisation, the distinction between the Amazigh and the Arab-Muslims was instrumentally drawn to divide the Algerian population. This divide was institutionally sustained post-independence with the postcolonial language policies and continues to be the source of conflict up to date.

From a historical perspective, Benrabah (2007) recognises that language policy in Algeria has witnessed three major phases. The first phase, from 1962 to the 1970s, focused on the progressive replacement of French as it symbolised the coloniser’s oppression and a threat to
Algerian sovereignty. This implied the use of both French and Arabic. In fact, following 132 years of French oppressive colonisation and after the independence of Algeria in July 1962, the mantra was unit: a unity organised around one language, Arabic, one religion, Islam and one nation, Algeria. The second phase (the 1970s to 1990s) was characterised by the Arabisation policy which involved the generalised use of Arabic in all public and national institutions including schools. This policy was described as disastrous because its official character contributed to the oppression of the Tamazight speaking population and the discredit of the Algerian translingual practices instilled in the sociocultural fabric of the country for centuries (Sirles, 1999). Moreover, according to Benrabah (Benrabah, 2005, 2007), many attribute the spread of Islamic fundamentalism and the civil war of the 1990s to the hegemonic character of the Arabisation policy, among other socio-political problems. The election of Abdelaziz Bouteflika in 1999 marked the end of the civil war and the third phase of Algeria’s language policy. The latter acknowledged the importance of both Arabic and French in Algerian social, political and economic life and called upon the recognition for the first time of Tamazight as a national language. In 2002 Tamazight was recognised in the Algerian constitution as a national language, a symbolic status which led to timid investments in rehabilitation programmes of Tamazight (i.e., research funds and teaching programmes in some cities). It is until 2016 that Tamazight language was granted an official status leading to concrete changes and consideration of language use in media, official discourse, and schools making Tamazight an optional language that learners can choose to learn from an early age.

Over the years, language use became a political statement creating a complex linguistic landscape and generating heated debates among Algerians. English was considered as a second foreign language after French during the second and third phases of Algeria’s language planning but was attributed a more valuable place during the third phase. In fact, the education reform of 2001 (put into practice in 2003) had for objective to help Algeria get back in the saddle of economic development and international participation; by embracing its multilingualism as part of its identity; and updating the education system to the cultures of the world, and foreign languages, primarily English. The challenge was to restructure four pillars of the education system: i) the reorganisation of school years, ii) the consolidation of pedagogy with a new generation of textbooks, iii) training for in-service teachers and iv) upgrade of the support measures (infrastructures, technology, law, budget, etc.).

The reform involved the introduction of English in the 1st year of middle school (where the learners are between 11-14 years old) becoming compulsory for all majors with a different time volume until the end of secondary school. In total, Algerian learners would have studied 7 years of English with a minimum of 2h per week. For each school year, as for all subjects, an English
textbook is produced by the Ministry of National Education and used in Algerian schools nationwide. The government’s vision for English has been the same since 2001:

‘L’enseignement de l’anglais implique, non seulement l’acquisition de compétences linguistiques et de communication, mais également de compétences transversales d’ordre méthodologique/technologique, culturel, social chez l’élève telles que le développement d’un esprit critique et d’analyse, l’attachement à nos valeurs nationales, le respect des valeurs universelles basées sur le respect de soi et d’autrui, la tolérance et l’ouverture sur le monde’ (Commission Nationale des Programmes, 2006, p. 3)

‘The teaching of English involves not only the acquisition of linguistic and communication skills but also the pupil’s transversal skills of a methodological/technological, cultural, social nature such as the development of a critical thinking and analysis, attachment to our national values, respect for universal values based on respect for oneself and others, tolerance and openness to the world’ (Commission Nationale de Programmes, 2006, p. 3; translation mine).

The association of English with globalisation and economic development is important and represents a move towards modernisation. Yet, nationalist values still constitute an indelible dimension of the Algerian education system as a whole. In a report reviewing three years of the education reform that was undertaken in 2003 in the education sector, Toualbi-Thaalibi (2006, p. 18) highlighted the importance of this reform in challenging the then-dominant ideology of ascribed identity. He explains:

‘L’Algérie qui a trop longtemps souffert d’un système politique de type syncrétique, s’était durablement comme figée dans un immobilisme idéologique dont l’un des effets fut d’avoir induit un système éducatif volontairement orienté vers un objectif restreint d’authentification identitaire. Il en est, à la longue, résulté une espèce de claustration ou de barricadement culturel que le législateur de l’Ecole algérienne a pu, à l’origine, interpréter comme un moyen didactique de défense contre les dangers de la dénaturation identitaire auxquels préparent les processus acculturatifs hérités de la période colonial’ (Toualbi-Thaâlibi, 2006, p. 18; emphasis mine)

‘For so long, Algeria which has suffered from a syncretic political system has sustained a kind of ideological immobility which one of its effects has led to an education system
that is advisedly oriented towards a narrow goal of identity authentication. In the long run, this has resulted in cultural confinement or a cultural barricade and was interpreted by the School’s legislator, as a didactical means of defence against the dangers of identity denaturation/distortion induced by the processes of acculturation inherited from the colonial period’ (Toualbi-Thaâlibi, 2006, p. 18; emphasis and translation mine).

Cultural confinement and barricade are strong qualifiers of a reality experienced during the civil war of the 1990s that could be described with much stronger terms. The adjective ‘syncretic’ here retains the idea of contradictory ideologies that painted the Algerian political landscape post-independence, including the influence of religion and colonial legacy. This evaluation of the education system - inclusive of language-in-education - is among many perspectives that make a direct link between the colonial history of Algeria and the more recent social, education and political spheres. To conclude, today’s Algeria complex rapport to languages is a result of unresolved ideological frictions and a long history of resistance. In fact, ‘yet the present is joined continuously to the past, and becomes the future; today is influenced by yesterday and will condition tomorrow’ (Nickerson, 1968, p. 4).

1.5 The rationale of the study and research questions

I have mentioned earlier that the field of Intercultural Communication research in Algeria is a relatively young one. Therefore, one of the reasons for undertaking this study is to bring a useful contribution to a growing field of interest. In terms of methodology, the works of Bouslama and Benaïssi (2018), Messekher (2014) and Messerehi (2014) could be described as small scale projects because they involve a small population of teachers (ranging from 3 to 11). However, none of those studies explores classroom discourse in addition to investigating the teachers’ or the students’ behaviour and experience, which I do in this project. In fact, following a study exploring the beliefs of English teachers based in the UK, US and France about the appropriateness of Intercultural Communicative Competence in their practice, Young and Sachdev (2011, p. 97) recommend that in addition to interviewing teachers, an ‘investigation of (in-class interaction) may (...) reveal more about the nature of effective and ineffective communicative practices, and of associations between interpersonal, interdiscourse, and intercultural effectiveness’.

Concerning the body of knowledge examining (inter)cultural dimensions in English textbooks, there is a flourishing number of studies approaching the topic from different angles, such as examining the representation of consumerism and the promotion of new capitalism (Gray, 2010), the representation of social origins and class (Gray and Block, 2013), the representation of gender
and gender roles (Barton and Sakwa, 2012), and so on. Thus far, as reported by Canale (2016) and McConachy (2018), only a small number of studies investigate how textbooks’ content is problematised in the language classroom. Admittedly, as it was noted by Carabantes and Paran (2017), the lack of papers on this topic could be explained by the difficulty of conducting classroom research.

Furthermore, Karen Risager in her most recent work (Risager, 2018) reviews a large selection of studies that encompasses analyses of textbooks produced by authors from various backgrounds, from all over the world. She acknowledges, however, that ‘there seems to be no analyst from African countries in the corpus’ (Risager, 2018, p. 52). This could partly be explained by the financial and exposure challenges faced by scholars from the global south while disseminating their research, which leads to more vocal and visible northern perspectives. Hence, one of the motivations behind this research project is to shed light on a context in the global south, which is Algeria, and position it within a global field of interest.

The main aim of this study is to build upon and extend existing knowledge regarding the promotions of interculturality through representation and classroom interaction. In light of the abovementioned research gaps, this research aims to better understand the construction of interculturality in the Algerian educational context. More specifically, it investigates the impact of the textbooks’ content and the teacher’s practices in shaping the classroom discourse. In addition to that, the study attempts to understand the factors that affect the development of intercultural awareness among the students. Taking an ethnographically inspired approach, this study’s research questions are presented as follows:

RQ1 What discourses promoting interculturality are represented in the secondary school English textbooks?

RQ2 How are those discourses interpreted by the teacher?
  a. How do the teachers understand interculturality?
  b. What are the teachers’ practices that facilitate or hinder the promotion of interculturality?

RQ3 How are those discourses interpreted by the learners?
  a. What are the learners’ beliefs and attitudes towards the textbook’s discourses for interculturality?
  b. What are the learners’ behaviours towards intercultural input?

RQ4 How is intercultural learning constructed in the English language classroom?

The first research question is addressed through a thorough analysis of the three English textbooks used in all Algerian secondary schools. The second research question focuses on the
teachers’ practices in the classroom and their beliefs as discussed in interviews and during informal discussions. The third research question focuses on the perspective of the students as informed by their behaviour in the classroom and their input during group discussions. The final research question aims to deconstruct naturally occurring classroom discourses to understand the factors that may facilitate or hinder the process of intercultural learning.

1.6 Overview of the thesis

This thesis consists of seven chapters:

Chapter 1 has situated this research project within the broader field of inquiry of Intercultural Communication. It has also reviewed concepts of interculturality, essentialism and dialogic pedagogy which are further discussed across this thesis. It has explained the rationale for conducting a study that focuses on English textbooks and classroom interaction in Algerian secondary schools which takes into consideration the perspective of teachers and students as well as the broader socio-linguistic and historical context.

Chapter 2 is a literature review chapter. Several key concepts and theories central to the understanding of the field of Intercultural Communication and language learning and teaching are critically examined under the heading of ‘conceptual review’. In addition, studies investigating cultural and intercultural related dimensions are critically reviewed under the heading of ‘review of empirical studies’. In this chapter several issues are discussed, namely, the complexity of language and culture relationship, Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue and intercultural representation and pedagogy in language classrooms.

Chapter 3 is about the research design, methodology and analytical frameworks adapted and adopted for this study. This chapter explains the development of the research questions, the paradigm adopted in this study, the ethnographically inspired approach, the methodology in terms of instruments used to collect data and approach to data analysis and the analytical frameworks developed to deconstruct the textbook and classroom discourses. It finally discusses questions of reflexivity, trustworthiness and ethical considerations.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study drawn from the detailed analysis of the textbooks guided by an analytical framework developed for the deconstruction of the three coursebooks using in the Algerian secondary school English classrooms. In this chapter, patterns in the representation for references from the global north and the global south are assessed against the learning objectives and vision of the educational system. Emerging themes such as banal nationalism are also thoroughly examined.
Chapter 1

Chapter 5 is the second analysis chapter which focuses on the analysis of classroom discourse based on the findings drawn from the ethnographically oriented study and guided by the framework of analysis of classroom talk developed in this project. This chapter aims to explore and describe the role of the participants and the textbooks in creating an environment for intercultural learning.

Chapter 6 is the third and final analysis chapter which discusses the emergent themes: essentialism, banal nationalism and translanguaging in a situated and contextualised way. By drawing on data from the textbook, the classroom transcripts, field notes, interviews with the teacher and input from the students, the classroom discourse is deconstructed informed by the theoretical framework to understand the multifaceted classroom experience which could either hinder or foster intercultural learning.

Chapter 7 concludes the thesis by summarising the findings and shedding light on the implications of this research project in terms of theory, methodology, and teacher training. It also presents the limitations of this study and ideas for future research.
Chapter 2  Literature review

In the first chapter, I have introduced some key concepts that represent the overarching themes that are recurrently referred to throughout this project and are central to the understanding of the field of intercultural communication and language learning and teaching. In general terms, this study aims to understand how interculturality and intercultural communication is promoted through English textbooks and classroom discourse and pedagogy in Algerian secondary schools. To address this aim, it is necessary to position this project within a conceptual framework and base it on the existing body of knowledge. For this reason, this chapter has two main sections. The first section is a conceptual review where I discuss the work of prominent scholars in the field of intercultural language education, namely, Karen Risager, Claire Kramsch, Adrian Holliday, Suresh Canagarajah, Mike Byram, Will Baker, Mikhail Bakhtin and L.S. Vygotsky. The second section, on the other hand, is a critical review of empirical studies exploring the potential of textbooks and classroom practices in developing intercultural learning. At the end of each section, I provide a summary of the key points reviewed and their importance in informing my research.

2.1 Conceptual review and theoretical framework

2.1.1 Karen Risager: Linguaculture and transnational flows

The concept of linguaculture is used by Risager to represent the relationship between language and culture. It is important to reflect on this relationship particularly in the current context of globalisation. The idea of transnational and global flows is omnipresent in Risager’s research. It comes from the observation of a world in constant movement and change. With the European Union, for instance, the notion of a nation-state has changed and so did the approach of teaching languages. In such context, Byram and Risager (1999, p. 1) state that

‘For foreign language teachers, the changes in the nature of the nation-state and its relationships to other states is crucial, since the very notion of ‘foreign’ depends on the clear definition of frontiers and boundaries. When these frontiers and boundaries become less clear-cut, when opportunities for crossing them are made easier, the purpose of language teaching change’

The complex relationship between language and culture represents one of the main issues in language and culture pedagogy in Europe and the rest of the world. Risager used the concept of linguaculture to put forward a proposal to address the debate about the separability and inseparability of language and culture especially in a global context and its implications for English
language teaching practices. In general terms, languaculture later referred to as linguaculture, denotes the connection between language and culture and its role in meaning-making in a given sociocultural context. Risager distinguishes between three potentials (dimensions) of languaculture: i) the semantic and pragmatic potential, ii) the poetic potential and iii) the identity potential (Risager, 2006).

Linguaculture was a concept first coined by the linguist and anthropologist Paul Friedrich (1989) to analyse the interface between language and culture. It was later adapted by Agar (1994) and coined languaculture instead, with the idea of merging between the two concepts of language and culture in order to stress their inseparability. Agar provides an account of the ‘opportunities’ offered by languages and cultural differences which are regrettably limited by ‘the tendency (…) to draw a circle around language’. For Agar, this circle limits languages to a set of grammar rules and neglects ‘the meaning that travels well beyond the dictionary, meaning that tells you who you are, whom you’re dealing with, the kind of situation you’re in, how life works and what’s important in it’ (Agar, 1994, p. 16). In other words, languaculture is personal and relational and it becomes apparent once faced with differences, or during ‘rich points’ of conflicts and misunderstandings. Agar takes a semantic- pragmatic stance to theorise a discourse that is culturally bound. In line with Agar’s description of languaculture, Risager acknowledges the cognitive or psychological aspect of culture in language, as one of the dimensions of her understanding of languaculture. However, she expands it as she argues that it has been conceptualised with a monolingual and national focus. In her opinion, the inseparability of language + culture at the cognitive level is valid ‘for the person who speaks the language as a first language or early second language’ (Risager, 2006, p. 115), and the notion should be extended to foreign language users who have different languacultures. Thus, she takes a sociolinguistic stance in order to challenge this limitation by taking into consideration ‘multilingual awareness in a global perspective’ (Risager, 2006, p. 187).

The second dimension of Risager’s languaculture/linguaculture is the poetic dimension, inspired by the work of Paul Friedrich and the concept of ‘linguaculture’ described as ‘a de facto domain of experience that crosscuts and synthesizes vocabulary, the semantic components of linguistic structure, and the verbal aspects of culture’ (Attinasi and Friedrich, 1995, p. 50). The concept of languaculture has been used to analyse the ideologies of ‘political ideas in action’ (Friedrich, 1989, p. 301), where verbal aspects of culture were put forward in political discourse with hegemonic intentions to differentiate between the values for which different opponents stand (e.g. the Soviet Union and the United States during the Cold War (Agnew and Crobridge, 1995). According to Friedrich (1989, p. 307) ‘linguacultural ideology draws on the less behavioural and less material aspects of culture … it is more located in the unconscious or subconscious of the speaker and
speaker collectivises than any other three kinds of ideology: national, pragmatic, or critical’. Similarly, it is this particularity and focus on the individual that is found in Risager’s understanding of linguaculture. In other words, cultural values and ideologies are embedded in linguistic choices in a given language which differentiates the discourse of a group from the others and of an individual from another. This dimension of linguaculture has been extended by Risager beyond the verbal cultural values of political discourse to include the poetic aspects of individual first language users and foreign language users. She argues that:

‘Depending on their social and personal circumstances, the individuals develop various poetic resources in connection with their first language, both receptively and productively. If they migrate, they naturally take their poetic resources with them, and these perhaps gradually change as they come into contact with other poetic traditions’ (Risager, 2006: 126).

In this sense, the poetic resources lay in the phonological and stylistic aspects of a given language used for meaning-making. These poetic dimensions originally associated with one language are transferred and made apparent in another (foreign) language, which shows the separable potential of linguaculture especially from the first language, but not its neutrality since the first language’s linguaculture is present. Thus, the consideration of the fluid potential of verbal cultural values (and not only) challenges the one language-one national-one culture equation.

The third dimension also approaches language and identity from a sociolinguistic perspective. Risager argues that the individuals’ linguistic practice, resources and systems impact one’s identity construction in social interaction, self-representation, and perception from others. First, while using a foreign language, one’s identity can be marked by the use of particular linguistic resources, such as code-switching or the use of culture-specific terms, in order to differentiate the Self from the Other. Second, in interaction, one can also be identified as a ‘foreigner’, for example, ‘somebody who speaks French as first language can (...) in Denmark encounter Danish stereotypical conceptions of the French language and thereby the person involved is ascribed other linguistic identities than (s)he is used to’ (Risager, 2006: 126). Finally, regarding foreign language learning and its impact on one’s underlying linguaculture, Risager argues that it is possible to assume someone’s social identity from their use of a foreign language based on where they have learned it (e.g. social or academic environment). Hence, while learning a foreign language, one can be confronted with an identity dimension that is linked to the imagined community this given language is linked to, such as a nation or a social group.

Overall, by taking a sociolinguistic stance that covers the semantic-pragmatic, the poetic and the identity potential of linguaculture, Risager (2006: 134) ‘argued in favour of the idea that language (...) is always a bearer of culture and that language is never neutral in terms of linguaculture – not
even when it is used as a lingua franca, as, for example, English’. Notably, with regard to English as a lingua franca (ELF), Baker (2015a, p. 37) argues that ‘communication, including intercultural communication and ELF, is never neutral; there are always participants, purposes, contexts and language choices, none of which are neutral’. Combined with Baker’s argument, the implication of Risager’s concept of linguaculture is that even when English is not linked to its historical owners (Anglophone countries), the individual’s use of English is laden with linguaculture.

In addition, a transnational paradigm, as opposed to a national one allows the conceptualisation of language and culture relationship as separable which, as explained above, allows the association of different linguacultures to languages that are not the ones traditionally assigned to them as part of a one language-one nation-one culture fashion. However, according to Baker (2011, p. 201) ‘these present conceptions, while recognising fluid boundaries of language and cultural associations, still take the national paradigm as the ‘baseline’’. In fact, this becomes visible when there is a regular reference to ‘target’ languages in relation to their historical countries. In this regard, Risager (2006, p. 196) argues that ‘language and culture ‘hang together’ in the single multidimensional language-culture nexus’ because we got used to linking and connecting a language with its national or even social environment as part of a ‘linguistic system’. Despite acknowledging the limitations of a nationalistic approach towards the relationship of language and culture, Risager’s model, through the linguistic system idea, still considers that there should be a historically established language system that is the norm provider. Nevertheless, Risager strongly claims that ‘a language is never culturally neutral in the sense languaculturally neutral: languagculture of some origin or other is always assigned to it’ (Risager, 2006, p. 177). This dimension is very important and informative when it comes to describing how languages are taught and how the intercultural dimensions are represented and promoted in English language teaching classrooms and textbooks.

2.1.2 Claire Kramsch: Symbolic competence and third space

Kramsch has considerably contributed to the discussions about language and culture pedagogy. She argues for the teaching of language and culture in an integrated manner and for approaching language and culture as a Discourse with a capital D. She states, ‘Discourses,... are more than just language, they are ways of being in the world or forms of life that integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities’ (Kramsch, 1998: 61). In this sense, discourses can be negotiated in a classroom discussion and their multiple symbolic meanings could challenge the perception of cultures and languages traditionally pictured as rigid and static. Along the same lines, Scollon and Scollon (2001, p. 544) prefer to investigate communication ‘across discourse systems’ which ‘would include those of gender, generation, profession, corporate or institutional
placement, regional, ethnic, and other possible identities’. Focusing on those systems helps to move away from thinking of communication as being ‘across cultures’. In fact, discourse systems imply complex relationships and patterns which help avoid falling into the fixity trap. Accordingly, by taking into consideration the different discourse systems to which individuals are related or associated, Scollon and Scollon (2001) argue for the need to approach individuals as more than members of one given discourse community because when they are in interaction in a specific context, the interlocutors bring with them various discursive practices which, when analysed at the micro and macro level, can be revealed to be part of a larger discourse system. This approach allows researchers to acknowledge the dynamism of communication and of the relationship between language and culture.

In multilingual settings, Kramsch (2008, p. 390) argues that ‘conversational power comes less from knowing which communication strategy to pull off at which point in the interaction than it does from choosing which language to speak with whom, about what and for what effect’. Based on data from interactions between multilingual individuals negotiating discourses, Kramsch observes that speakers who master more than one language ‘seem to activate more than a communicative competence that would enable them to communicate accurately, effectively, and appropriately with one another’ (Kramsch, 2008, p. 400). This competence is called ‘symbolic competence’, which is about the ‘ability to play with various linguistic codes and with the various spatial and temporal resonances of these codes’ (Kramsch and Whiteside, 2008, p. 664).

Kramsch’s conceptualisation of the symbolic competence has evolved as a result of new research settings to include different dimensions. In intercultural communication, Kramsch (2011) has defined the symbolic competence as the ability to manipulate three dimensions of language as symbolic system: the symbolic representation, symbolic action and symbolic power. The symbolic representation is about the representation of language structures and their indexations or connotations linked to one’s cognitive models of reality. The symbolic action is about what is done with the discourse choices and what these choices reveal about one’s intentions. The symbolic power is about the subjectivities related to one’s discourse in terms of identity, memories and emotions. Furthermore, in intercultural language education, Kramsch (2011, p. 366) suggests that:

‘The symbolic dimension of intercultural competence calls for an approach to the training of language teachers that is discourse-based, historically grounded, aesthetically sensitive, and that takes into account the actual, the imagined and the virtual worlds in which we live’
In other words, creating a symbolic space for intercultural learning in the classroom requires an informed approach to teacher training where teachers are made aware of the importance of their role and of the complexity and situatedness of discourse, as well as the power dynamics.

(Holliday, 2011, p. 167) Another important concept put forward by Kramsch is the idea of a ‘third space’ which was inspired by postcolonial studies scholar Bhabha (2004) who contributed in theorising the state of ‘in-between’ and hybridity experienced by the colonised, immigrants and members of the diaspora. Kramsch’s (1993) interpretation of the theory of ‘third space’ moved from a conceptual space where language learners ‘occupy a position where they see themselves both from the inside and from the outside’ (Kramsch, 2013, p. 62); to a more symbolic, liminal space (Rampton, 1995; Brumfit, 2006) where negotiations of cultural identities and power dynamics take place. Accordingly, the third space is more of a ‘sphere of interculturality’ allowing ‘a process of positioning the self both inside and outside the discourse of others’ (Kramsch, 2011, p. 359). Notably, focusing on ‘discourse’ rather than a structuralist view of culture offers the possibility to approach intercultural communication as a process of creating a hybrid space of dialogue and negotiation rather than a process for effacing the self to adapt to the other.

However, one of the critics against the advocates of this model, is that it stands a ‘state of ambivalence’, ‘in-betweenness’ and ‘cultural limbo’ (Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 5) which still assumes a border, a frontier, and ‘an indelible intercultural line’ (Holliday, 2011, p. 167). Therefore, from this perspective, culture does not have hard borders or boundaries that need to be crossed but a person can be more than one thing at the same time, and this multiplicity of identities can be performed through language and during language learning as well.

2.1.3 Adrian Holliday: Small culture formation

Adrian Holliday (1999) presents the concept of ‘small culture’ as a flexible, extendable and non-bounded alternative to the more popular concept of large culture consisting, for instance, of ‘national’ or ‘ethnic’ cultures which are presented as cohesive and homogeneous. Social groups such as a music band, a neighbourhood, a classroom or a professional group can all be considered small cultures which display some form of cohesive behaviour. Hence, the small culture paradigm aspires to be non-essentialist, not necessarily related to a parent larger culture, and when investigated the appropriate approach is interpretive and acknowledges the emergence of behaviours, rather than their fixity. Notably, according to Holliday (1999, p. 248), ‘the dynamic aspect of small culture is central to its nature, having the capacity to exist, form and change as required’. In other words, in order to avoid the reification of small cultures into an essentialised group and into a version of a large culture, it is important to recognise that it is in constant movement and change. It is this dynamic characteristic that is at the heart of the notion of ‘small
culture formation’ referring to our tendency to create and organise small cultures (1999, 2011). Holliday’s (2011, 2013) grammar of culture positions small culture formation as part of the underlying universal processes which allow us to function within cultures. In summary, the grammar of culture is a conceptual map that helps in understanding social groupings and cultures and it consists of three main domains: particular social and political structures, underlying universal cultural processes and finally, particular cultural products. The dynamic dimension of this model is when the individual’s actions are negotiated across these domains and sometimes influenced by the particular structures where they operate. The following section briefly explains the different domains of the grammar of culture.

- **Particular social and political structures:** this dimension refers to the particularity of larger cultural resources such as nation, ethnic, education, religion, politics, global positions and personal trajectories (e.g., family) from which we draw certain rules and which influence some of our behaviours.

- **Underlying universal cultural processes:** this domain refers to the commonalities shared in all cultures which allow us to work with unfamiliar small cultures thus engage and navigate relationships in the society.

- **Particular cultural products:** they include cultural realisations and outcomes such as art and literature, but also daily cultural practices and discourses that make us present the self and conceptualise the other in a specific way.

Those three domains are not organised in a systematic or rigid manner; they are aimed to offer the possibility to analyse the fluid processes of negotiation, resistance and conforming through which individuals go within their small cultures.

### 2.1.4 Suresh Canagarajah: Translingual practice

Canagarajah is a fervent supporter of the periphery taking ownership of the languages of the centre by demonstrating leadership in legitimising the variety and variability of language practices. Taking a translingual approach, he states that ‘languages constitute mobile semiotic resources that can be freely adopted by people for their purposes and interests’ (Canagarajah, 2013b, p. 78). He argues that meaning-making and language indexation is ecological and contextualised through social practice in contact zones. Based on a research-informed by African skilled migrants in English-dominant countries, who have reported on their own translingual practices in contact zones, Canagarajah has put forward the concept of ‘performative competence’ where he challenges the views which see ‘competence as a cognitive, innate, and abstract according to Chomskyan tradition, treating performance as unsystematic, unruly and superficial’(Canagarajah, 2013b, p. 80). Rather, as a strategic practice-based competence that is triggered by language use, performative competence allows the use and development of language and metalinguistic strategies progressively as Multilinguals engage in contact zones. Code-
switching, negotiation and adaptation strategies seem to be brought by users from their native environment. He observes that for his informants, mainly from the diaspora, performative competence ‘seems natural and intuitive to them’ (ibid. p. 90). One way of explaining this specificity among Multilinguals, is to consider that such skills and strategies have ‘a long tradition in precolonial and non-Western communities’ (ibid. p. 79), where language practice is fluid and finds resources in more than one language thanks to situations of contact. The unpopularity of such a view could be explained by the fact that ‘the dominant constructs in linguistics are founded in monolingual norms and practices’ (Canagarajah and Liyanage, 2012, p. 60). In other words, monolingual norms are problematic because they stigmatise the inherent heterogeneity of societies and their language practices. Moreover, Canagarajah (2013a, p. 1) argues that ‘existing terms like multilingual and plurilingual keep languages somewhat separated even as they address the co-existence of multiple languages’. In other words, by taking a translingual perspective, the separation of languages represented by the prefixes multi- and pluri- is transcended. In fact, for Lin and Li (2015, pp. 81–82) consider that Canagarajah ‘wants to highlight translingual practice as intrinsic to all human communicative activity, not just in contexts which are traditionally labelled as bilingual or multilingual’ (emphasis original). It is for this reason that scholars are advocating for the recognition of translingual practices in language policies and classrooms rather than conceiving languages are separate blocks (Makoni and Pennycook, 2007). It is important to note that the concept of translingual practice includes the notion of translanguaging which refers to the process of the fluid and flexible use of languages during communication and ‘where the boundaries between languages become permeable’ (Creese and Blackledge, 2010, p. 112). Notably, in education settings, they highlight that:

‘Although we can acknowledge that across all linguistically diverse contexts moving between languages is natural, how to harness and build on this will depend on the sociopolitical and historical environment in which such practice is embedded and the local ecologies of schools and classrooms (ibid. p.107).

In other words, the promotion of a translingual paradigm is conditioned by various factors including the political and historical context, as well as the vision of the stakeholders shaping the classroom and communication practices.

### 2.1.5 Mike Byram: Intercultural communicative competence

The concept of intercultural communicative competence has been put forward as an expansion to ‘the communicative competence’ in order to deal with the critiques that faced Hymes’ communicative competence in foreign language teaching for primarily seeking native-like fluency
and correctness. Michael Byram has aimed to address many of the limitations of the communicative approach especially in contributing to developing knowledge, attitudes, and skills that would allow interaction between people from different cultural backgrounds in a foreign language. According to Byram (1997) teaching intercultural communicative competence contributes to raising the students’ awareness and criticality of their own and others’ cultures. It seeks to develop the ability to compare between cultures, and to be conscious of the relative nature of cultural norms, in addition, to have the ability to mediate between cultures.

Byram’s contributions to language and culture pedagogy are based on a considerable number of empirical works and theoretical discussions, mainly in the European context. In 1991, he published with Veronica Esarte-Sarries, Susan Taylor and Patricia Allatt a summary of a study on cultural studies and language learning that took place in Durham’s primary and secondary schools, investigating pupils’ attitudes towards French people as a result of learning French language. The empirical research has shown that despite the adoption of communicative language teaching, the sociolinguistic aspect of language and culture pedagogy was restricted by various factors. First, the unrealistic representation of ‘ways of life’ of the French people, which the pupils did not miss to highlight, was an important factor. As argued by Byram et al. (1991, p. 118), ‘the influence of the textbook on the range and depth of cultural information to which pupils are exposed is perhaps a cause for concern’. Second, the teachers’ input in terms of teaching cultures and their attitudes towards culture pedagogy also appeared to differ from one teacher to another:

‘The differences seem to depend on a teacher’s individual philosophy of language teaching, the nature of his/her experience of the foreign culture and, thirdly, his/her perception of the language-learning ability of the class’ (ibid).

As a result, the learners’ construction of attitudes towards French people was influenced by the materials and content they were exposed to, as well as the personal trajectory, teaching philosophy and experience of their teachers. From this, it was concluded that language and culture are to be taught in an integrative way in the classroom even when the focus is initially on language. Consequently, Byram’s (1997) concept of intercultural communicative competence aims to promote the integrative teaching and learning of language and culture. The model put forward by Byram is also known as the five savoirs model, which was initially developed with Genevieve Zarate in 1994 but only counted four savoirs at first. The distinction between the two versions is at various level, but the addition of a fifth savoir is the most important one because advocates for the critical evaluation of information, knowledge and behaviours, in addition to a political engagement of the intercultural speaker. The aim of this fifth dimension is to encourage
the development a new identity as a global intercultural citizen. In summary, Byram’s Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) is composed of the following five savoirs:

- Savoir: knowledge of self and other; of interaction codes, and individual and societal cultural information
- Savoir comprendre (skills): the ability to interpret and relate
- Savoir apprendre/faire (skills): the ability to use the appropriate skills to discover and interact
- Savoir etre (attitudes): relativising the self, valuing other
- Savoir s’engager: political education, critical cultural awareness

The main purpose behind Byram’s model is to specify learning objectives that can be used in planning teaching and assessment. These objectives are organised according to target knowledge, skills, attitudes, behaviours, and formulated in prescriptive manner in order to achieve successful intercultural communication.

Byram does not extend the discussion on which culture to represent or to teach, but he designed the model with an inevitable reference to the historical inner circle (e.g., UK, US for English, France for French, etc.). Even though Intercultural Communicative Competence is supposed to facilitate the mediation between communicators who are not expected to achieve a native-like level of proficiency. Yet, the model still associates cultures with particular countries and binary distinctions between ‘our’ and ‘other’ cultures. This can be noted in the definition of critical cultural awareness which is conceptualised as ‘an ability to evaluate critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices and products in our own and other cultures and countries’ (Byram, 1997, p. 53; emphasis mine). Thus, one of the limitations of this model according to Baker (2017, p. 50) is that ‘the focus is very much on the national level’. In other words, in the world we live in where English is used globally by people from various backgrounds and making English theirs, it becomes problematic to bind the English language with the inner circle’s cultures, only. Byram has responded to similar critique by saying that:

‘The problem with taking a national culture and identity as the basis for teaching intercultural competences is not (...) the problem of essentializing or reductionism. The problem lies in the exclusive focus on one identity and the assumption that, in interaction in the foreign language, it is the only identity present’ (Byram, 2009, p. 330).

Accordingly, essentialisation and stereotyping are meant to be challenged through the fifth savoir of ICC, Critical Cultural Awareness through critical examination of one’s values, attitudes and behaviours in intercultural encounter. In fact, despite the works that came later taking a global dimension to intercultural communication (Byram, 2008) or a transnational perspective (Risager, 2007) what is retained is that according to both Risager and Byram the centre of reference when
it comes to normalising English language is the historical owners of English: US or UK which cannot be ignored. However, there is a reason for having critical cultural awareness at the centre of Byram’s ICC model, it is supposed to equip learners with the necessary criticality and reflexivity skills that would help them challenge stereotypes and prejudice.

2.1.6 Will Baker: Intercultural awareness

It can be argued that the work of Will Baker is situated at the crossroad of intercultural communication, transcultural research and English as Lingua Franca (ELF). Baker (2015a, p. 68) argues for the need to characterise culture as complex. He posits that ‘the use of the term complex (to characterise culture) provides an essentially powerful heuristic for thinking about culture’. In other words, approaching culture as complex is a perfect way to conciliate between those who see it as a set of values, a way of life, a product or a process and those who equate it to much more than that (e.g., discourse and identity). Informed by Complexity theory, Baker suggests that this perspective ‘offers not a middle way between these two approaches, but a view of culture in which it can be both these things at the same time’ (ibid.). This is an important approach, particularly for language education. In fact, it is argued that language and culture are inseparable due to the socially and culturally situated use of language. This view is influenced by ethnographic, sociolinguistic and sociocultural studies (e.g. Baker, 2009; Sybing, 2011).

Consequently, this leads to whether negligence from practitioners, mainly teachers, who take cultural content for granted, or an essentialist approach that is fostered by a representation of stereotypical cultural references essentially about the UK and US in the case of English. On the other hand, communication is always situated in a sociocultural and historical context, including in the case of English as Lingua Franca, which makes it impossible for language to be neutral. This view is supported by Risager (2012) who takes into consideration the transnational flows which affect language use as people take with them different linguacultures when they use different languages (e.g., a French speaking English in Italy). She states ‘the fact that a language has been spread to many different countries, does not mean that it is culturally neutral. It still has a languaculture – its ever-changing cultural dimensions’ (Risager, 2012, p. 10). This inseparability between language and culture as illustrated through languaculture for Risager is also documented in studies investigating English as lingua franca in transnational contexts. Accordingly, Baker’s (2009) findings show that the participants use different cultural references moving from local, national and global contexts in dynamic ways. For example, in a conversation about a popular game ‘petanque’, it was established by one of the speakers that this game is traditionally associated to elderly people in the south of France, while the other speaker explained how it is associated to youths in some local areas in Thailand. Their negotiation of the cultural indexations
across localities and nations did not appear to put at the fore a dominant view; rather both interpretations seemed to be legitimate and accepted. The fluidity, dynamism, and multiplicity of viewpoints align with the conceptualisation of culture as complex. Therefore, as an alternative to i) an essentialist nationalist approach, ii) a culturally neutral ELF, iii) a discourse approach that preserves a UK-US-centric baseline, this complexity approach suggests to view the relationship between language and culture in ELF as a) dynamic since it is negotiated in intercultural communication, b) fluid since it challenges national boundaries, and c) multiple, for the multiplicity of viewpoints and cultural frames that individual speakers construct and deconstruct.

In a context where English is used more and more as a second language and as lingua franca, Baker (2015a, p. 6) argues that ‘the fact that L2 users of English now greatly outnumber L1 users of English has major implications for the way we view English as a language and as a medium for intercultural communication’. Among these implications is the de-centring of English ownership, which should also extend to language education, i.e., in ELT pedagogy and learning materials. In doing so, intercultural opportunities are created while conformative and sometimes restrictive effects of essentialism are to be avoided. Following this approach, language lessons are no more about a given host country or ‘target’ culture. In Baker’s ICA model for intercultural communication through ELF, there is no clear correlation between one language, one culture, and one nation. Rather, the emphasis is on intercultural awareness and the critical revision of one’s values and beliefs thanks to interactions and exposure in/to ELF. Moreover, Baker (2011) has put forward a model that takes into account the aforementioned principles called a model for Intercultural Awareness (ICA) and the latter is defined as:

‘Intercultural awareness is a conscious understanding of the role culturally based forms, practices and frames of reference can have in intercultural communication, and an ability to put these conceptions into practice in a flexible and context specific manner in real time communication’ (ibid. p. 202).

Baker’s model describes different levels of cultural awareness especially for English language users without referring to any specific target culture that would be attached to English language. These levels of awareness are summarised as follows:

- Level 1: Basic cultural awareness, which includes a general awareness that acknowledges that culture plays a role in our own communication and that other people’s communication too might be influenced by their cultural beliefs. Speakers here may express generalised, simplified or even stereotypical statements about culture.
- Level 2: advanced cultural awareness that is about recognising of the complexity of cultures and the role they play in the interaction.
- Level 3: intercultural awareness is about the awareness of the role that has intercultural communication in negotiating and mediating between individuals. It is also an awareness of a range of cultural frames that can emerge during a conversation (Baker, 2011, 2015a).

By opting for the concept of ‘awareness’ rather than ‘competence’, Baker’s model focuses on situated and context-specific intercultural communication, rather than on given knowledge-based cultural beliefs and practices that could reinforce the fixed and rigid representation of supposed ‘target’ English speaking community. The implementation of such a model is a difficult undertaking. The well-rooted Standard English ideology will need to go through re-foundations and reforms at different levels by challenging the status quo, decentring English and recognising its shared ownership (Baker, 2015a).

2.1.7 Mikhail Bakhtin: Theory of dialogue/dialogism

One of the prominent theoretical perspectives which helps us to understand talk and interaction as socially constructed behaviours is Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue or dialogism. It is acknowledged among scholars that that ‘Bakhtin’s scholarly heritage is impressively wide in scope’ (Cunliffe, Helin and Luhman, 2014, p. 335), and touches on various disciplines. His work and theories are better approached as a philosophical lens, which, thanks to its liminality, offers the possibility to shed light on questions of education, language or even intercultural communication. According to Marchenkova (2005, p.160), dissimilar to traditional theories in second language learning, the philosophical underpinning of Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue ‘can help us to see the relations among languages and cultures in a different light’. In this sense, the relationship between language and culture is considered dialogic. The Bakhtinian concept of dialogue (dialogism or dialogicality) ‘captures the relational nature of all texts’ (Koschmann, 1999). Moreover, the dialogic potential of language as well as language and culture relationship can be observed, for instance, in Bakhtin’s reflection on the cultural load and context in which Shakespeare’s art was created:

‘Shakespeare, like any artist, constructed his works not out of inanimate elements, not out of bricks, but out of forms that were already heavily laden with meaning, filled with it. We may note in passing that even bricks have a certain spatial form and, consequently, in the hands of the builder they express something’ (Bakhtin, 1986).

Accordingly, for Bakhtin, text and discourse is never constructed from a vacuum but rather as a process that could be labelled intertextuality where there is an assumption that the work of an author is a result of the influence of other authors and texts. In fact, for Allen (2011, p. 10), the concept of intertextuality is rooted in the works of Bakhtin. On the other hand, the focus on how art as rigid as it may appear (e.g. bricks) is animated and shaped by a multiplicity of elements,
even centuries of imageries. Bakhtin conceptualises these multiple voices that are imbued and echoed in discourse as polyphony. Polyphony is a key dimension that translates the dialogic potential of language.

Admittedly, Cunliffe, Helin and Luhman (2014) suggest that ‘one of [Bakhtin’s] main contributions lies in offering a different way of viewing sociality and its representations’. These two dimensions, i.e., sociality and representation, are key in this research project, in the sense that social and cultural contexts, as well as their representation, are central elements of intercultural communication. For instance, Bakhtin (1986) understands culture as dynamic as he challenges the idea that understanding a foreign culture requires leaving behind one’s own culture as if cultures were rooms separated by walls of brick:

‘There exists a very strong, but one-sided and thus untrustworthy, idea that in order to better understand a foreign culture, one must enter into it, forgetting one’s own, and view the world through the eyes of this foreign culture’ (Bakhtin, 1986, pp. 6–7).

In other words, one does not leave one culture to enter another one in order to gain understanding. Instead, intercultural dialogue implies enriching one’s culture while being able to preserve one’s identity. He argues that ‘a dialogic encounter of two cultures does not result in merging or mixing. Each retains its own unity and open totality, but they are mutually enriched’ (ibid. p.7). Thus, for Bakhtin an intercultural encounter creates opportunities for constant learning and reflection. On the other hand, Holquist (1990, p. xxxii) highlights that one of the Bakhtinian particularities is that the ‘expectation that no whole should homogenise the variety of its parts -- it should not, in other words, reduce their heteroglossia’. Here the complexity and heterogeneity of this ‘whole’ should be preserved. This ‘whole’ could be understood as the complex characters of a novel, as the language or languages of these characters, as their cultures. Thus, in addition to the concept of polyphony, heteroglossia captures the richness, instability and changeable character of language. In this study, the theory of dialogue helps to inform the analysis of classroom interaction as an environment for dialogue, learning and intercultural communication.

2.1.8 L.S. Vygotsky: Sociocultural theory

One of the most useful theoretical frameworks upon which researchers analyse interactional learning environments is Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory (SCT). Despite being originally designed to study children’s cognitive development in acquiring and learning L1, the theory has been insightful for L2 learning and for other than children, but learners in general. In fact, a number of studies in education and second language learning have been informed by the SCT (e.g. Lantolf, 1994). According to Lantolf (1994, p. 418) ‘Vygotsky’s fundamental theoretical insight is that
higher forms of human mental activity are always, and everywhere, mediated by symbolic means’. Duranti (1997, p. 283) asserts that ‘individual (or intrapsychological) faculties arise out of interactional (or interpsychological) processes’. Building upon the idea that social interaction, through collaboration, plays a great role in cognitive development, Vygotsky (1986) has put forward various concepts that are used to make sense of the process of learning. One of those concepts is the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which is this gap that bridges between the stage where one cannot perform a skill and the stage where the skill is performed independently. This progress is said to be reached thanks to the assistance or mediation of a More Knowledgeable Other (MKO) or an expert. Mediation, according to Lantolf (1994, p. 418), ‘whether physical or symbolic, is understood to be the introduction of an auxiliary device into an activity that then links humans to the world of objects or to the world of mental behavior’. In this study the focus would be on symbolic mediators such as language and physical such as textbooks.

On the other hand, in a context of language learning, as explained earlier, Vygotsky (1978) argued that, in the presence of MKO, learners’ language and cognitive development happens in the context of social interaction. In a social microcosm like the classroom, teachers use textbooks to scaffold learners’ command of language by exposing them to various ideas and concepts through initiation, support and encouragement (Gibbons, 2014). This can be accomplished by engaging them in language skills activities, encouraging reflection and providing feedback about the students’ contributions and the teachers’ input; organised in a thematic or unit-based approach by textbook designers. In a progressive optic, the textbook is aimed to provide opportunities for a meaningful classroom-based discussions and debates. The cultural representations and references that are included in those units expose the learners to a range of images and texts whether authentic or adapted and the teachers are meant to scaffold both the language and the intercultural learning.

Vygotsky’s sociocultural and development theories offer an explanation of the role of textbooks and interactions or collaborations with the teacher and other learners in engaging in knowledge co-construction especially in a sociocultural environment as complex as the Algerian one.

2.1.9 Summary

In this first section of the literature review chapter, several concepts were introduced to establish a conceptual framework aimed to inform this study. Given the ethnographic and emergent nature of this research, it is important to familiarise oneself with the current issues in the field of intercultural communication and their implications for language education. I have started by discussing the concept of linguaculture (Risager, 2006) which emphasises the inseparability of
language and culture especially in the context of transnational flows. It should be noted that my research project takes place in classrooms where all students and teachers are locals to the area, and the students will not go through any study abroad experience which would technically qualify the project as transnational. However, the sociocultural, linguistic and historical context shaping the learning experience of Algerian students make the notion of linguaculture very relevant.

The second concept discussed is symbolic competence (Kramsch, 2011) in intercultural communication and the notion of third space (Bhabha, 1994). These concepts have been developed with specific users and learners in mind, such as immigrants. However, the symbolic dimensions and power relationships can also be found in places still undergoing the aftermath of colonisation. It was established, however, through the discussion above that it is no more realistic to consider a fixed relationship between a given language and a given nation or culture, particularly because of how the world is changing. Thus, the conceptualisation of this state of hybridity which is experienced by bi-nationals, for example as, a distinct fixed third space is not appropriate. The experience documented by research (e.g., Rampton, 1995; Brumfit, 2006) is that individuals have the agency to make of this space a dynamic sphere of interculturality which is liminal. Therefore, one can alternate codes and voices to achieve specific purposes or portrait oneself in a specific way. This liminality is made possible because people are complex and have the capacity of crossing virtual boundaries while using language. The perception of the third space as liminal is important for legitimising code alternations and crossing as a performance of a complex identity: a valuable angle to consider in the Algerian context.

The third concept discussed is small culture formation as part of the grammar of culture which offers tools for approaching culture and the relationship between language and culture in a non-essentialist way (Holliday, 1999, 2011, 2013). The model of grammar of culture gives room to the different structures that influence one’s perception about the self and the other without neglecting the dynamic potential of small cultures. The latter is a useful concept to help examine the complexity of classroom context. In fact, in the case of this study, the learning environment and the centrality of the textbooks are important factors that affect the promotion of intercultural communication. For this reason, by acknowledging the power of bigger structures such as politics, the education institutions, the personal journeys, the learners and the teachers are believed to be able to evolve and negotiate these forces by creating and forming dynamic non-essentialist small cultures.

The fourth concept addressed is translingual practices translated through translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2013a, 2013b). It is argued here that translanguaging, which is viewed as the fluid use of different languages in a communicative setting, is inherent to the human nature. The
challenge is that translanguaging is yet to be considered a legitimate practice in formal and institutionalised settings. Moreover, in line with the views that see language and culture as complex constructs and their relationship as fluid and dynamic, translingual practices approaches the relationship between different codes, languages and voices as fluid as well. In the Algerian sociolinguistic context, the concept of translanguaging can explain a number of linguistic behaviours performed in intercultural communication.

The fifth conceptual framework addressed is Byram’s (1997) intercultural communicative competence model which offers a prescriptive agenda, used internationally, for the teaching and assessment of the intercultural speaker. Given that in this study, the textbooks and the syllabus are designed with an intention to conform to international practices, it is important to be familiarised with the different dimensions promoted by this framework. On the other hand, it should be noted that the intercultural speaker has been an important contribution in the field of intercultural communication because it challenges the native-speaker model and creates a more reasonable and realistic goal to achieve by language learners. However, the notion of a language related to a state nation-state is still omnipresent in this approach.

The sixth theoretical principles discussed are Baker’s (2009, 2011, 2015a) stance for the dynamic, fluid and complex relationship between language and culture especially in the context of English as a medium of intercultural communication. Will Baker advocates for the decentring of English in ELT especially given the wide spread of English globally and the emergence of ELF. On the other hand, Baker’s (2011) intercultural awareness model (ICA) is all about the different levels of cultural awareness that individuals can showcase during an intercultural interaction. The particularity of the ICA framework is the fact that by focusing on awareness rather than competence, it acknowledges that individuals can go through different intercultural awareness paths which are not always straightforward. These principles are a reminder that the research participants are individuals with their own particular trajectories and worldviews and it is up to the researcher to capture the processes they go through while constructing and deconstructing cultural frames.

The seventh concepts discussed are polyphony and heteroglossia which are central to the work of Mikhail Bakhtin. Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue takes into account the cultural and interpersonal dimensions of language and examines discourses that are formed by multiple voices, i.e., which are polyphonic as well as being intrinsically heteroglossic in the sense that they are laden by social, cultural, and historical realities which cannot be dismissed. Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue and the various conceptual tools that his work provides are valuable philosophical lenses which will help in making sense of the naturally-occurring interactions in the language classroom. In fact,
the classroom could be considered a space where the voices of the students are heard and acknowledged particularly if there is a will to promote intercultural awareness.

The eighth and final conceptual framework reviewed in this chapter is Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory which considers the social environment as a central symbolic space where learning takes place. From this perspective interactional processes and the mediation of language, peers, the teacher and materials such as textbooks, are believed to lead to higher cognitive levels, i.e., learning. Given that this study focuses on the potential of textbooks in engaging the learners and their teachers in intercultural learning, Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory and the symbolic means of mediation its promotes help to make sense of the observable experiences of the participants.

To conclude, I view all the above-mentioned concepts as forming a complex range of tools meant to operate as lenses which facilitate the exploration and the understanding of this study’s context and the participants’ experiences.

2.2 Review of empirical studies

This section covers a review of empirical studies on intercultural communication in language learning setting. I start by discussing research papers that analyse the cultural and intercultural dimensions of language textbooks. I then move on to discuss studies that focus on classroom practices and pedagogies for intercultural learning.

2.2.1 Research on the cultural and intercultural in language textbooks

In the field of intercultural communication, textbook analysis is a popular and important topic given that there are as many textbooks as there are ideologies, paradigms and movements. Textbooks are the tip of the iceberg, ‘they are time capsules’ (Weninger and Kiss, 2015), the mirror which reflects the state of educational, political and societal affairs, ideologies and values upon which the curriculum is developed. In Algeria, each educational reform comes with a new generation of textbooks, which sparks public debates and gets the attention of parents, politicians and the media. Researchers, on the other hand, are continuously interested in evaluating and analysing the content of textbooks particularly in terms of cultural content. These studies can be categorised in various ways. Here, I distinguish between studies that focus on the multiplicity in the representation of frames of references and those that focus on the complexity of the representational repertoire.

In Uganda, Stranger-Johannessen (2015) analyses Ugandan textbooks of English with a focus on the multiplicity and variety of cultural representations. Here, the findings indicate that ‘references
to foreign or international elements in texts serve to reflect back on Uganda’ (Stranger-Johannessen, 2015, p. 37). In other words, the cultural references represented in the English textbooks are informative of the editorial line, which aims to focus on Uganda in relation to the rest of the world. The analysis targets the representation of people and places as to whether they are local, foreign or international. Evidently, the researcher contextualises the references which are to be considered local or foreign. Though useful, such procedure does not inform on the values and connotations attributed to the cultural references and the discourses they carry. Neither does it allow the examination of the complexity of the representational repertoire.

Yuen (2011) has developed a framework of analysis that focuses on the four Ps: persons, perspectives, practices and products. The four Ps are categorised in terms of their ‘country’ or region of origin, e.g., Asian, African and Western countries. Moreover, the references originating from Western countries are categorised on the basis of whether the country is English speaking or not (Yuen, 2011, p. 462). This approach to content analysis facilitates the identification of patterns of under-representation and/or of domination of certain references over others. For instance, in Yuen’s study analysing a series of English textbooks used in Hong Kong it was found that there is an under-representation of references to products, perspectives, persons and practices from African countries and that the few of those references are about animals or poverty. Based on the same framework of analysis, Davidson and Liu (2018) have investigated references to Japanese and non-Japanese four Ps in locally published textbooks. They have found that references to Japan are more dominant and the fact of breaking down the references into the four Ps has led to conclude that ‘cultural representation often manifests in the simple, knowledge-based categories of persons and products, rather than complex, conceptual practices and perspectives’ (Davidson and Liu, 2018, p. 9). In other words, it is more challenging to represent practices and perspectives in texts and images because of their inherent complexity. So when analysing a textbook, the references that are mostly dominating are those about peoples and places. On the other hand, though insightful, the use of content analysis only to examine the textbook leaves the reader blindsided with regard to the values or the ‘how’ attached to the four Ps references. In addition, the conceptualisation of culture even though it has been broken down into references to the four Ps, has been analysed in direct reference to countries or nations without a recognition that this can be a slippery rope leading to essentialisation.

Similar observations can be made about a study conducted by Messekher (2014) investigating the intercultural potential of four Algerian English textbooks used during the four years of middle school (when students are aged between 11 and 14 years old). In the process of coding the textbooks which is guided by Yuen’s four Ps, Messekher (2014, p. 80) recognises that ‘there is often no clear-cut between the different categories of culture’. Therefore, based on the studies
reviewed above, the investigation of the multiplicity of references and their origins can be insightful, but there is a need to challenge the constant link to national origins and to further the analysis and gear the focus toward the complexity of representation.

The second focus of this review is the investigation of complex representations. The importance of representation of cultural complexity in language textbooks aligns with the current discussions in intercultural communication research. In fact, the latter has moved beyond *how many countries are represented?* to a focus on the representation of global Englishes, the fluidity of cultural and national boundaries, the relativity of beliefs and the importance of cultural awareness in challenging stereotypes, the representation of the heterogeneity of societies and acknowledgment of their complexity, and more. In order to uncover such discourses, there is a need for analytical tools that allow just that. The latest work of Risager (2018, 2020) is about the representation of the world in a series of language textbooks used in Denmark where she provides a critical appraisal of corpus of works invested in evaluating language materials and the variety of frameworks used for these analyses. In addition, she conducts an analysis based on five different theoretical approaches which she refers to as ‘readings’:

- National studies
- Citizenship education studies
- Cultural studies
- Postcolonial studies
- Transnational studies

Each one of those readings focuses on one particular aspect of the textbook, but, all of them seek to situate the analysis ‘firmly in its historical and geopolitical context, not least in relation to colonial histories’ (Risager, 2018, p. 36). Accordingly, the study of English textbooks in my research project involves taking into consideration the fact they are designed by Algerian authors and are used in all secondary schools across the country. These are central information to establish the situatedness of the materials and clarify their position and relationship to the rest of the world without disregarding the sociolinguistic landscape and history of the country and its education system. It should be noted that the concepts of country and nation have been unavoidable when talking about integration of cultural content is language materials.

Risager (2020) characterises the National Studies approach as being about ‘what’ and ‘how’ countries are represented given that ‘it might be said that the more countries and continents are represented in the textbook, the more it serves as a window to the whole world’ (Risager, 2020, p.4). In this National Studies reading, Risager (2018) distinguishes between *banal nationalism* (Billig, 1995; Piller, 2017), and *the ethnic and political understanding of the national*. Firstly, *banal*
nationalism has been described as the mild, though not benign, manifestation of references to the nation as an imagined community (Anderson, 2006) through means of flags, maps, or expressions like ‘British weather’, and where the nation is viewed as a whole. Secondly, the political understanding of the national is related to what constitutes banal nationalism because the nation, as a separate entity, is represented as homogeneous or monocultural. On the other hand, the ethnic sense of the national is related to the acknowledgement (or not) of ethnic and cultural diversity that constitutes the fabric of the nation. In order to systematically examine the abovementioned dimensions in language textbooks, Risager has put forward the following analytical categories:

‘[Category 1]: Positioning and representation of actors
- How are publishers, authors, teacher and students positioned and represented, particularly with regard to their national affiliations and identities?

[Category 2]: Representation of culture, society and the world
- Which countries (nations/states) are represented? (dealt with, or just mentioned)
- Are different standard varieties of the target language represented?
- Is the country of learning represented?
- How broad and varied are the representations? (Nature, economy, politics, etc.)
- Banal nationalism? Ethnic or political sense of the national?

[Category 3]: Approach to intercultural learning
- Does the approach to intercultural learning promote the development of knowledge about countries? (collecting facts about the target country/ies, reading pieces of national literature, intercultural [international] comparisons, reflections on national stereotypes, perspectives and identities) What is the role of the teacher?’

Risager (2018, p.66, emphasis mine)

The ideas of banal nationalism and the ethnic and political sense of the national are present across the three above-mentioned analytical categories. For instance, the national affiliation of the textbook can be deduced from the choice of the authors, the publishing house and the curriculum guidelines. Furthermore, with regard to the third category, approaches to intercultural learning, the ‘nation’ as a point of reference whether for intercultural comparison or reflection about stereotypes is omnipresent in this reading. It must be noted here, however, that Risager’s explanation of intercultural learning, focuses on comparison and contrast and is, thus, very much related to what Adrian Holliday (2016) calls soft essentialism ‘because the boundaries between national cultures remain uncrossable and confine interculturality to observing and
comparing the practices and values of one’s own and the other’s national cultures’ (Holliday, 2016, p. 319). On the other hand, Risager (2018) also recognises that a National Studies approach may side-line many of the competencies that are necessary for intercultural learning. Based on her analysis of a textbook of German language used in Denmark, she poses that,

‘The emphasis is on the impartment of factual knowledge, there are no suggestions of individual or group work that would try to interpret and critically discuss the different discourses in the texts of images. So, the construction of knowledge is not very much oriented towards intercultural understanding, including awareness of different perspectives’ (Risager, 2018, p. 101, emphasis mine)

The awareness of different perspectives and the ability to interpret and critically discuss cultural information are key competencies which are part of Byram’s ICC model (1997), which also correlate with Baker’s Basic Cultural Awareness which includes ‘an awareness of others’ culturally induced behaviour, values, and beliefs and the ability to compare this with our culturally induced behaviour, values, and beliefs’ (Baker, 2012, p. 66). The analytical category in question here is useful in the sense that it acknowledges the existence of socially and politically established cultural groupings and the need to critically discuss, for instance, national stereotypes. However, approaching intercultural learning only from a comparative and contrastive angle can reduce the potential of interculturality to mere discussion of factual information about others (‘target countries’ for Risager, which is equally problematic); and to consuming information that students may not have and which could lead to the reproduction of decontextualised stereotypes. The holistic approach to deconstructing the complexity of textbook content is therefore meant to be achieved by also considering the other ‘readings’ put forward by Risager.

The second theoretical approach to analyse textbooks proposed by Risager (2018, 2020) is the Citizenship Education studies reading, which is about how engaging the textbook’s content with regard to the world’s global issues which should be the concern of all (e.g., climate change). Informed by critical theory, this reading seeks to uncover the transformative potential of the textbooks’ discourse. For Risager (2020) ‘in this approach, intercultural learning is primarily seen as the development of the student into an engaged (national and global) citizen with some political awareness’ (p. 6). In other words, the analysis requires a look into the representation of global citizenship issues in the textbooks and the opportunities it provides to raise the learners’ awareness and to facilitate reflection and even action.

The third approach put forward by Risager in her take on how textbooks could be a window to the world is the Cultural studies reading. Two central concepts are in play here: identity and culture. First identity is examined in relation to societal and the cultural systems (class, professions,
genders, etc.) and how the different identities find their place in the representational repertoire of the textbook. For instance, the work of Gray (2013) on the investigation of LGBTQ representation, or rather on the lack of representation of LGBTQ identities in learning materials can be considered to fall under the Cultural studies reading. Secondly, culture through the lens of Cultural studies aims to examine if the paradigm adopted is essentialist or a non-essentialist, if culture is represented as a set of behaviours, values and practices or is the focus more on processes and individuals and their agency (Risager, 2020, p.8).

The fourth reading proposed by Risager (2018, 2020) is the Postcolonial studies reading. Here the focus is on the representation (or not) of power relations between countries, imperialist and colonialist histories, eurocentrism, orientalism and the worldliness of textbooks (Said, 1983). In her postcolonial studies reading, Risager puts forward the following analytical categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1: Positioning and representation of actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are publishers, authors, teacher and students positioned and represented, particularly with regard to their position in the historically developed global relations of power?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 2: Representation of culture, society and the world</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How is the international history of target language countries, and of the target language, represented? (References to colonialism and imperialism? North-South and East-West divides? Use of ‘us–them’ dichotomies and exoticising discourses?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the international history of the country of learning, and of the language of schooling, represented? (References to colonialism and imperialism? North-South and East-West divides? Use of ‘us–them’ dichotomies and exoticising discourses?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are historical relations between the target language country and the country of learning represented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 3: Approach to intercultural learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the approach to intercultural learning promote awareness of colonial and postcolonial history? (developing historical awareness, developing awareness of the historical origins of racism, developing critical thinking in a global centre–periphery perspective) What is the role of the teacher?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 4: The textbook in society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What does the textbook exclude or conceal? (postcolonial, contrapuntal reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is this textbook an active voice in the global relations of power? (its worldliness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risager (2018, pp. 163-164, emphasis mine)

Similarly to the National studies analytical reading, the concept of ‘target language countries’ refers to the countries that are considered as the historical norm providers, traditionally situated
in the inner circle (e.g. French/France, English/UK, or Spanish/Spain). However, as it was already argued, given the history of languages, the question of ownership of a given language should not be essentialised through the use of notions such as: target language/target country or culture, L1/C1, L2/C2, etc. Therefore, in order to have a more holistic and inclusive analytical category, I argue that it is necessary to evaluate the representation of countries as positioned in the North and the South and in terms of their relationship to the country of learning. I will develop this position further in Part C of this chapter. This approach will not neglect the imperial history of countries like UK to which the English language is undeniably related. But it will also include references to France as the former coloniser of Algeria for instance. Hence, a particular attention will be given to the representation of the inner circle countries and to the values and connotations they are attributed in relation to their imperial histories, but also to more complex and fluid forms of cultural references. For instance, Santiago (2008) has found that English textbooks designed under colonial and postcolonial Puerto Rico, promoted US dominant cultures. The discussions with the learners have shown their awareness of the lack of representation of their own identities and their criticality towards power relations. In fact, for Risager, the approach of intercultural learning under the Postcolonial reading, should focus on the opportunities provided in the textbook to raise awareness about the colonial history and to critically reflect on its impact on the contemporary world.

The fifth and last reading put forward by Risager (2018, 2020) is Transnational studies which requires from the analyst to look for ways in which the world is represented as connected across borders through technology, movement of people and ideas, transnational collaborations and organisations, etc. In Risager (2018) study investigating the different language textbooks used in Denmark, she concluded that in most the textbooks countries are represented as isolated entities even though there is an effort in discussing transnational humanitarian organisations (e.g., Amnesty international). Travels, migration, virtual connectedness and collaboration across borders are key dimensions that can add to the worldliness of the textbooks and have a valuable role in the intercultural learning experience of the students.

With all the above-mentioned readings, Risager has managed to put together a comprehensive and multidimensional framework of analysis that uncovers the complexity of textbooks. This model can be used fully or partially by analysts to address their research questions but it can also inform textbook designers on the latest movements and expectations in terms of form and content that can facilitate intercultural learning. Overall, the question that analysts investigating the intercultural potential of a textbook can ask is how much and which references are represented and how complex are there? On the other hand, regarding the approach to intercultural learning, developing critical knowledge and awareness are considered necessary to
intercultural friendly materials. In fact, beyond representation, there should be a willingness to activate intercultural competences in the classroom either through the mediation of textbooks or through the teacher’s intervention.

In Tunisia, Abid and Moalla (2020, 2021) have conducted two studies, the first one focuses on the quantitative and qualitative analyses of third year secondary school textbooks and their potential to develop intercultural speaker competences; and the second study takes a historical approach investigating the representation of intercultural contacts in five English textbooks produced in Tunisia between 1973 and 2006. Both studies shed light on the importance of tasks, images and texts about interactions between characters from different cultural backgrounds. The outcome of these two studies have shown that there is a real urge to create learning materials that bring a larger variety and a higher frequency of representation of meaningful, authentic and power-balanced contacts and relationships between characters. Notably, in Abid and Moalla (2020) study, one of the key findings show that the textbook fails to provide explicit tasks targeting intercultural competences such as reflecting on one’s cultural identity and other cultural sensitive issues. Similarly, in their (2021) study, the content analysis demonstrates that despite a change in teaching methods and philosophies across time, the linguistic competence is prioritised and the ‘British’ native speaker is still presented as the main interlocutor with whom Tunisian learners can envision communication. Accordingly, Abid and Moalla (2021, p. 11) argue that ‘the dominance of the British culture and the under-representation of intercultural contacts (...) can negatively influence the learners’ ability to explore different cultures and develop intercultural communication skills’. In other words, the lack of representation of varied intercultural contacts and intercultural tasks can prevent learners from developing skills for interpreting and relating. This eventuality however has not been investigated in classroom context. In fact, all of the empirical studies abovementioned have not explored the actual impact of the textbooks on developing the learners’ intercultural speaker competences.

In Japan, McConachy (2018) has addressed this issue from an original angle by adopting an action research design and working with textbooks that could be considered problematic because of some of the stereotypical and essentialist discourses they carry. The participants in this study were eight adult students with a good proficiency in English and who have some sort of international experience outside of Japan. They were asked to produce written reports reflecting on the textbooks’ content with a focus on the cultural and intercultural representations. The key findings indicate that the students have successfully demonstrated advanced interpretation and critical reflection skills. They were indeed capable to denounce the overly simplistic claims and
one-sided views displayed in the textbook. McConachy argues that the high level of language proficiency and international exposure of his participants have most certainly contributed in their acute level of criticality. He also recommends that even though imperfect materials have been critically deconstructed by the students, it is very important that less linguistically proficient learners benefit from the teachers’ guidance in developing their intercultural competences.

In the following section, I shed light on studies exploring the roles of the teachers and the classroom pedagogy in developing intercultural competences.

2.2.2 Research on intercultural competence in the language classroom

It was established in the first chapter of this thesis that one of the reasons behind the scarcity of research papers on interculturality in the classroom is the fact that conducting classroom-based research can be challenging (Carabantes and Paran, 2017). In this section, I review empirical studies which have been designed within those constraints in order to investigate intercultural learning in the classroom in different parts of the world. All of these studies (Kramsch, 2000; Norton, 2008; Howard et al., 2019; Porto, 2019; Lázár, 2020), except one (Munandar, 2019) have followed an action research design where the teachers are either conducting the research themselves or working collaboratively with researchers (e.g., Howard et al., 2019). Moreover, all of these studies have adopted an interpretive paradigm and have demonstrated an interest in the pedagogy adopted by the teachers.

First, in Ireland, Norton (2008) has transformed what was initially a translation course for business students into a course where the students apply ‘discourse analysis’ principles to advertisements and newspapers. Given that the business students in Norton’s class, as international students, did not all have a shared first language, a practical course such as ‘translation’ seemed inappropriate. Instead, Sue Norton has taken on the mission to introduce notions of ‘discourse analysis’ to her students who were asked to analyse adverts and news articles from their ‘home’ and ‘host’ cultures. Thus, the idea behind this approach is that ‘it would help [the students] to mediate between their home cultures (France, Burundi, etc.) and their host culture (Ireland)’ (ibid. p.3). Among the benefits of the course is that it has created an interactive, reflective and engaging atmosphere among the students. It was also found that the students have showcased an acute level of critical engagement with the materials and have managed to act as mediators and ‘translators’ of their cultures to the rest of their colleagues both during class discussion and on their written reports. Moreover, one of the key findings identified by Norton is the ongoing reflexivity experienced by herself and her students. She states: ‘my students and I soon found ourselves lightly discussing the differences between essentialist and constructivist approaches to
human subjectivity’ (ibid. p.6). In this sense, the students were provided with ‘meta-language to analyse language’ (Martínez, 2012, p. 283) which has led to an increased degree of intercultural awareness. This study is insightful in the sense that it shows that when teachers take a proactive role in designing a course that integrates the students’ background, their linguistic and cultural capital, and equipping them with the analytical tools and language necessary to critically engage with the materials, the outcome is an intercultural experience in the classroom which has the potential to be transferred outside the classroom, i.e., to their professional and daily life. The particularity of such a project is that it is catered to advanced speakers of English and the teacher-researcher has the power to design and tailor the course as they please. Such flexibility is not always possible in programmes where the teacher is required to follow the curriculum which is the case for the participants of my research.

The second study reviewed here is Kramsch’s (2000) action research which similarly to Norton’s study, has been conducted with her own students. They are adult learners from different nationalities, all based in the United States. The task in Kramsch’s (2000) project required the students to summarise a text entitled Crickets by Robert O. Butler (1992). For the purpose of this review, I, as well, engage in the exercise of summarising Butler’s text which is about a Vietnamese-American father who introduces his childhood game which involves crickets, to his US-born son who seems disengaged and cares more about his stained shoes than his father’s effort to connect with him. Kramsch’s students have gone through a process of summarising the text in the privacy of their notebooks then presenting their work to the rest of the class. The students were asked to share their summaries and to explain some of their word choices. In doing so, Kramsch has tried to uncover the intentionality and indexations in their semiotic choices. Thus, by drawing on Vygotsky’s semiotic theory and Bakhtin’s notions of addressivity and dialogism, Kramsch argues that the ‘signs’ chosen by the students to construct their summary are symbolic tools that inform about their own personal immigration history and educational background. In this study, the socio-cultural context has given rise to a rich and varied range of productions and as argued by Kramsch, ‘it is in the context of dialogic relationships that signs get emitted, received, and exchanged; meanings proliferate and are constrained by custom and institutional control’ (ibid, 213). In other words, meaning-making is the result of the interaction with the text, the teacher, the awareness about the audience to whom the summary is addressed, the acquired knowledge of how a summary is supposed to be composed, the linguistic repertoire and more. Therefore, all these dimensions among others come into play in a dialogic interaction. On the other hand, Kramsch’s stylistic examination of the students’ production indicates that interculturality can be observed in the way the students relate personally to the text in order to express their worldview. Accordingly, she finds that
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‘Most of the students who were foreign-born and were recent immigrants to the US wrote summaries that indexed sympathy with the father’s plight, whereas the summaries of the students who were born and raised in the US by foreign parents indexed in most cases impatience with the father and identification with the American youngster’ (Kramsch, 2000, p. 151).

In other words, the pattern observed that related the learners’ immigration journey to their discursive choices and positionality indicates that interculturality is emergent and it can take different shapes in talk. Finally, what has made both Kramsch’s study and Norton’s stand out is the fact that even though the students’ nationalities were mentioned throughout their papers, their relevance only emerged during the activities and also when the students have shown agency in drawing from their personal experiences. These two studies illustrate how an interpretive approach to interculturality has resonance in a classroom. This is a valuable perspective that I have taken into consideration in the context of investigating interculturality in Algerian language classrooms because it pushes to see beyond the fact that all the students are nationals of the same country and to remain open to the emergent and the unexpected.

In Argentina, Porto (2019) has implemented an Intercultural Citizenship Education (ICE) project in order to investigate the ways in which concepts such as critical cultural awareness and intercultural citizenship can be put into action in a language classroom setting. The project consisted of an intercultural telecollaboration experience between 120 EFL Argentinian student teachers and 30 UK-based university students of Spanish as a foreign language. This study has mainly reported on the impact of the project on the Argentina-based EFL student teachers given that their UK-based counterparts faced constraints due to their workload and study obligations. Nevertheless, Porto (2019) has adopted a pedagogy centred on the learners who take an active role in researching, reflecting, and critically engaging with the knowledge and information about a topic of historical relevance for all the participants which is the Malvinas war. The main finding is that the students have relied on intercultural competences and criticality in order to engage beyond the classroom with the local community and online with a more global community. For example, some of the Argentinian student teachers shared their research on the Malvinas war and their awareness campaign for respect and understanding with a local teacher, who then used the materials in her classroom. The key takeaways to retain from this project is the importance of designing a syllabus centred around students’ responsibility to work collaboratively and take action even if this action is in the form of making a bilingual poster or a video and sharing them online. The evidence here shows that cooperative learning is a pedagogy that works perfectly well with an intercultural syllabus while at the same time developing linguistic competences. However, Porto also acknowledges that even if an Intercultural Citizenship Education curriculum is a
powerful resource, it requires a considerable effort from teachers, especially from those who are bound to follow strict guidelines.

In Hungary, Lázár (2020) conducted an experimental study with language teachers in order to investigate what cooperative learning would have to offer as a pedagogy for intercultural learning. Admittedly, most policy documents and language curricula do not necessarily come with clear guidance on how to implement intercultural learning in the classroom and which methods or pedagogy would best help learners develop intercultural competences. In her 2020 study, Lázár addresses this gap by creating a workshop where she introduces the principles of cooperative learning to language teachers and examines their reflections on the parallels to be made between cooperative learning and intercultural learning while at the same time relying on cooperative learning tasks. Thus, informed by principles of cooperative learning and Barrett et al.’s (2014) components of intercultural competence, Lázár (2020) argues that a pedagogy that adopts cooperative learning contributes to the development of intercultural competence. Her study took the form of an experiential professional development workshop, which was conducted in seven different locations in Hungary with a total of 128 participants who were primary and secondary public school language teachers. The researcher-facilitator used several cooperative learning activities such as small group work, the expert jigsaw, discussion with an equal time to speak for each participant, and poster presentations. The data was from the sessions’ recordings, the field notes, the plenary discussion and the survey filled in by the participants at the end of each workshop. By the end of the workshops, the teachers have identified a number of shared learning outcomes anticipated from cooperative learning and intercultural learning such as developing empathy, responsibility and cooperation. The evidence also revealed that even though the teachers considered those skills crucial for their language learners, none of them had tried such pedagogy in their classroom. Among the reasons put forward by the teachers are the lack of time and resources and the difficulty to manage learners who can get easily distracted and out of control. For Lázár, the latter explanations are ‘outside factors’ that teachers use to justify their unwillingness to experiment with pedagogies that would actually help their learners develop a more cooperative behaviour in the classroom with their teachers and with their classmates.

In New Zealand, Howard and colleagues (2019) worked with five school teachers, co-creating lesson plans which promote intercultural learning opportunities with a focus on what they call ‘comparative intercultural explorations’ (Howard et al., 2019, p. 555). The participating teachers have progressively become familiarised with the key principles of intercultural learning and the importance of non-essentialist cultural content. The researchers conducted non-participatory observations in the classes of French, Mandarin, Japanese and Te reo Māori. Besides reporting on the teachers’ shifting perspectives, Howard et al. (2019) focused primarily on the students’
intercultural learning while addressing topics such as food, schooling, family, fashion, etc. The key findings have shown that ‘at least some students reached positions of more moderated ethnocentrism, increased openness to difference, and greater willingness and confidence to engage with cultural others’ (p.562). For example, one student has moved from considering the French way of greeting ‘creepy’ to making parallels with greeting practices in New Zealand and within the Māori community, to finally express cultural relativeness. The findings also revealed that there is variability in intercultural development among the pre- and early – adolescent participants, given that some still held stereotypical discourses. This study argues that there is still a need for more research to investigate the intercultural learning of young learners given that age and neurobiological factors may have an impact in developing intercultural competences such as deep reflective skills and critical cultural awareness (Byram, 1997). In terms of pedagogy, addressing interculturality in the abovementioned language classrooms in an informed and explicit manner has proved to be challenging for the teachers but not impossible.

Finally, in Indonesia, Munandar (2019) conducted a doctoral study investigating the beliefs and practices of Indonesian high-school teachers of English with regard to culture and intercultural learning. The research took place in three types of high schools: a general one, a vocational one and an Islamic one, using classroom observations, interviews with five teachers and focus groups with learners. The languages spoken by the learners and the teachers in and out of school were a mix of Javanese, Madurese, Indonesian and Arabic. The argument put forward in this study is that in the absence of a prescriptive pedagogy for intercultural learning, the teachers are capable to show considerable awareness and agency with regard to the situatedness and complexity of teaching language-and-culture in their multilingual classrooms (Munandar, 2019; Munandar and Newton, 2021). Admittedly, despite exhibiting agency, some of the key findings showed that the teachers’ practices and beliefs were highly influenced by the policy and the general sociocultural environment. For example, in the Islamic school, the learners’ daily school experience was supplemented with religious practices and discourses, which either explicitly or implicitly were integrated into the English classroom discourse. On the other hand, during the interviews teachers have acknowledged the relationship between language and culture and the importance of intercultural learning. However, during their classroom practice they very rarely explicitly addressed cultural or intercultural dimensions. This goes to show that teachers’ awareness about the centrality of interculturality in English language teaching is not enough.

### 2.2.3 Summary

Distinguishing between empirical studies that focused on the analysis of textbooks and studies that investigated what happens in the classroom has helped in exploring the different
methodological approaches to better understand practices around the world in terms of promoting intercultural learning. It was established from this review that there is a growing interest in deconstructing cultural representations in language textbooks in terms of multiplicity and complexity of representation. However, only a few studies looked into explicit tasks or rubrics targeting intercultural competences and integrating learning outcomes such as relating, comparing or reflecting. This can be explained by the fact that linguistic competence remains the prime focus for textbook designers and curriculum developers.

Regarding classroom contexts, the studies reviewed in this chapter have confirmed the difficulty of conducting classroom research. The most practical methodology adopted was action research because it allowed the investigators to test their theories and put into practice intercultural oriented syllabi. Nevertheless, Munandar’s (2019) study is the closest in terms of research design and methodology to my research project. It has successfully demonstrated that by adopting an interpretive paradigm, though challenging, it is possible to explore what happens in a multilingual setting like Indonesian schools and examine the complex and multifaceted experience of the teachers. On the other hand, the common thread observed among the projects discussed above was that learners have showcased intercultural competences in sessions that were designed in a collaborative, cooperative, dialogic and learner-centred fashion.

2.3 Conclusion

This chapter has served two key purposes. The first one has been to establish a conceptual framework that helps in understanding some of the key concepts and models informing the field of Intercultural Communication. The first part of this chapter has, thus, been dedicated to a critical review of the contributions of scholars such as Karen Risager, Claire Kramsch, Adrian Holliday, Suresh Canagarajah, Mike Byram, Will Baker, Mikhail Bakhtin and L.S. Vygotsky. Each one of these scholars has had a considerable impact on the paradigmatic advancements of the discussions and debates at the crossroad of intercultural communication and language education.

The second purpose of this chapter has been to dive deeper into the gap that this study is addressing by providing a critical appraisal of empirical research which have focused on textbooks analysis and others that have a focus on classroom discourse and pedagogy. The array of studies discussed here provide an overview of the current trends and interests of practitioners that should be taken into consideration by textbook and curriculum designers. The findings have also confirmed that there is a real need to integrate intercultural learning more explicitly and purposefully in the language classroom.
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The next chapter is about the process I have taken to develop my research design, methodology and analytical frameworks in order to address my research questions.
Chapter 3  Research design, methodology and analytical frameworks

This chapter addresses this project’s research design, methodology and the analytical frameworks developed to analyse the data gathered. It begins in section 3.1 by discussing the research design including the research objectives of the study which is positioned in the qualitative research tradition, i.e., the interpretive ethnographically-oriented paradigm. Second, the setting of the study and the research participants are described (section 3.2) followed by a discussion of the research instruments (section 3.3). The next section (section 3.4) addresses data analysis in terms of the frameworks of analyses adopted to help deconstruct the textbooks’ discourses and the classroom interactions as well as the participants’ input. I also explain my transcription strategy in section (3.5). Finally, the researcher’s reflexivity (section 3.6), the trustworthiness of the project (section 3.7), and ethical considerations (section 3.8) are discussed.

3.1  Research design

A research design, as commented by Yin (2009, p. 26) is ‘the logical sequence that connects the empirical data to a study’s initial research questions and, ultimately, to its conclusions’. It is an action plan for the research project that is informed by philosophical assumptions and follows a structure instigated by contextualised research questions. Accordingly, in section 3.1.1, I address the aims of this research project and the development of its research questions. Then, in section 3.1.2, I locate the project within a research paradigm where I justify the selection of an interpretive and explain in 3.1.3 the ethnographically inspired research approach.

3.1.1  Research aim and research questions

The overall aim of this research project is to investigate how interculturality is put into practice in the English classroom through the mediation of the textbook. In fact, several studies have investigated intercultural dimensions in language textbooks without considering their use in the classroom (e.g. Yuen, 2011; Messekher, 2014; Risager, 2018), and other studies have focused on intercultural competencies among language learners using textbooks where the learners’ input has been prompted or facilitated by the researchers themselves (e.g. McConachy, 2018). In this project, I was more interested in the interpretation of naturally-occurring instances of intercultural interactions and learning in the English classroom as mediated by the textbooks and where the researcher is not involved in the teaching. With this broad objective in mind, I opted
for a qualitative inquiry that investigates how the intercultural dimension is integrated into the textbooks and the curriculum, and how the latter is enacted by the teacher in the classroom and experienced by the learners. Thus, the following research questions are aimed to help explore the complexity of intercultural learning in an Algerian secondary school setting:

**RQ1** What discourses promoting interculturality are represented in the secondary school English textbooks?

**RQ2** How are those discourses interpreted by the teacher?
   
   a. How do the teachers understand interculturality?
   
   b. What are the teachers’ practices that facilitate or hinder the promotion of interculturality?

**RQ3** How are those discourses interpreted by the learners?
   
   a. What are the learners’ beliefs and attitudes towards the textbook’s discourses for interculturality?
   
   b. What are the learners’ behaviours towards intercultural input?

**RQ4** How is intercultural learning constructed in the English language classroom?

Research questions are valuable guides in qualitative research. Agee (2009) argues that developing research questions is a reflective process that evolves with the theoretical framing and the ethical considerations that emerge throughout the research journey. This process is also described as iterative leading to a project design that serves the researcher’s vision (Hua et al., 2016). In fact, the more I progressed in my research, the more challenges I faced especially in identifying what accounts for ‘an intercultural oriented representation’ or ‘intercultural oriented learning opportunity’, particularly in the context of Algerian secondary school English classrooms where diversity is not approached from the perspective of national identity given that the teachers and the students are all nationals of the same country: Algeria. Hence, a back and forth process between the literature and the fieldwork data was unavoidable. My initial understanding of interculturality in practice revolved around the idea that if a textbook or an interaction included aspects of interculturality that have been documented in the literature, it would be considered intercultural. However, given the representational and discursive nature of the language textbooks (i.e., collection of images and texts) and the complexity of the interactions, it was difficult to adopt a deductive approach where I would isolate given dimensions and put forward claims about the interculturality of an activity or a text aiming to promote certain attitudes over others or certain behaviours over others. As a result, my research has taken new directions, by being primarily inductive and focused on discourses for interculturality that emerge during the practice rather than specific dimensions of interculturality in textbooks and classroom interaction deduced from given assumptions; which led to the development of the analytical frameworks described in section 3.4. In addition, having adopted an exploratory and
ethnographically inspired approach to research, it was necessary to keep an open mind in order to bring a better understanding of interculturality in practice. Accordingly, considering these elements, the aforementioned research questions aim to deconstruct the discursive practices as represented in the English textbooks and as enacted in the classroom by the teacher and the learners, with a focus on interculturality. In the table below, I provide a summary of the research design, which puts together the research questions and their corresponding justifications, research instruments and the methods used for analysing the collected data.
### Table 1: Research design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Research instruments</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **RQ1** What discourses promoting interculturality are represented in the secondary school English textbooks? | This question is of relevance because it aims for an evaluation of textbooks’ discourses in their multiplicity and complexity by deconstructing their representational repertoire. It is a crucial step before investigating the textbooks in use. | Locally published English textbooks:  
- At the Crossroads SE1  
- Getting Through SE2  
- New Prospects SE3 | - Content analysis  
- Thematic analysis |
| **RQ2** How are those discourses interpreted by the teacher?  
  a. How do the teachers understand interculturality?  
  b. What are the teachers’ practices that facilitate or hinder the promotion of interculturality? | It is important to have the teachers’ perspectives because they are key agents in the teaching and learning process. Their experiences and philosophies shape the learning experience of the learners.  
I will examine the teacher’s talk, behaviours with the learners, classroom management, and choice of materials, and pedagogical practices that could have an influence on creating intercultural opportunities in the classroom. | - Voice recorded interviews  
- Informal conversations with teachers  
- Teachers’ written diaries  
- Classroom observations  
- Field notes | - Thematic analysis |
| **RQ3** How are those discourses interpreted by the learners?  
  a. What are the learners’ beliefs and attitudes towards the textbook’s discourses for interculturality?  
  b. What are the learners’ behaviours towards intercultural input? | Students’ perspectives will be recorded from their actions in the classroom, their input in focus group discussion, and their written productions. In addition, information provided by their teachers and school staff are of particular importance since they give context and allow an informed analysis. | - Classroom observation (Voice-recorded and field notes)  
- Pictures of their notebooks  
- Focus groups | - Thematic analysis |
| **RQ4** How is intercultural learning constructed in the English language classroom? | This RQ focuses on classroom practice, which will open the space for more theoretical discussions about teaching approaches and interculturality. By deconstructing classroom discourse, it will be possible to understand what makes an interaction intercultural. | - Classroom observation (voice-recorded and field notes) | - Thematic analysis |
3.1.2 Research paradigm

In this section, I will discuss the different research paradigms or traditions and the rationale for opting for the interpretivist one. According to Willis, Jost and Nilakanta (2007, p. 8), ‘a paradigm is (...) a comprehensive belief system, world view or framework that guides research and practice in a field’. Furthermore, Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 15) consider the ‘systematic set of beliefs, together with their accompanying methods, a paradigm’. In this sense, a paradigm constitutes the assumptions and theoretical underpinnings, as well as their corresponding methods, which influence the way a research project is designed, conducted in the fieldwork and analysed or reported on. This systematicity of the beliefs or values contributes in sustaining consistency between the different parts of the project, from research aims up to drawing conclusions (Ling and Ling, 2016). Conversely, Richards (2003, p. 41) posits that ‘no researcher begins a project by deciding on a paradigm and working things out from this at increasing levels of detail’. Rather, the researcher begins with the project itself and constructs their paradigmatic and intellectual position accordingly. In fact, from the start of this research venture, I was aware, for instance, of the subjectivities, background and values I bring to the project and that those will have an influence on the way I will negotiate access to the field of research. I was also clear about the fact that I needed to approach my participants with an open mind and a level of readiness to listen to their subjectivities. But, it was not until putting the research project together that it became evident that it needed to be framed within a research tradition that subscribes to this openness and acknowledges the complexity of behaviours and their underlying values. For these reasons, locating this study within the interpretive paradigm is deemed to be the most appropriate in comparison to other paradigms. In what follows, I briefly review three of the most popular inquiry paradigms and discuss their relevance in the field of intercultural communication, in general, and to this project in particular.

This study is situated in the field of education and social sciences, where ‘there are several competing paradigms’ (Willis, Jost and Nilakanta, 2007, p. 8). Although the literature reports on them using various terminologies, there is an overall agreement among social scientists that there are three dominant ones (Haverkamp and Young, 2007; Willis, Jost and Nilakanta, 2007; Richards, 2009):

- Positivist
- Interpretivist
- Critical theory
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The main aspects where these three paradigms differ are on how the nature of reality is perceived (ontology), on the way claims about knowledge are made or achieved (epistemology), and the methods used to comprehend this reality (methodology) (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Furthermore, the researcher’s role is a key aspect differentiating between these inquiry paradigms, especially at the time of interrogating the relationship that the researcher has with the participants and their approach to objectivity and/or subjectivity.

First of all, the positivist paradigm is based on the assumption that the researcher can remain detached from the reality being studied and emit a hypothesis on a phenomenon which then can be tested through series of measurement techniques (Richards, 2009). This philosophy is dominant in the natural sciences and has for a long time influenced the social sciences. In the field of intercultural communication, the positivist paradigm (also referred to as the functionalist paradigm) was very influential in the 1980s, where concepts such as culture and communication were viewed as fixed and stable and related to specific groups or nations (Martin, Nakayama and Carbaugh, 2012). For Schwandt (1994, p. 230) ‘structural-functional research frameworks are reductionist in that they claim to discover the one true interpretation lying behind or beneath the complexity of appearances’. Nowadays, this is a very contested and criticised approach in the field of intercultural communication. In fact, functionalists have produced most of the studies that approach cultures as blocks and have developed value frameworks, the likes of individualism and collectivism, where measurements are made to deconstruct or predict patterns (e.g. Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1996). Although, more nuanced claims have been made about the complexity of these cultural constructs, stating that the relationship of equivalence between cultures and countries is considered approximatively, and acknowledging that ‘culture emerges in interaction’ (Triandis, 2018, p. 4), the basic set of beliefs upon which functionalists address intercultural inquiry has led to essentialisation through profiling, categorising and identifying tendencies within or between groups. On the other hand, from the perspective of advocates of the interpretive approach, such value frameworks can quickly become obsolete. As Holmes (2015, p. 239) argues, ‘while such frameworks and categorisations may be useful as sense-making strategies for human behaviour, they are soon rendered unhelpful’, particularly due to change of context and the complexity and variability of people’s values and behaviours. Furthermore, in terms of methodology, measurement models such as Bennett’s (1993) development scale measuring attitudes toward cultural difference has been designed to be largely focused on the cognition of individuals. According to Spencer-Oatey and Franklin (2009, p. 127), this tool’s ‘weakness is that it ignores the very important contextual variation’ which can lead to misleading generalisations. In addition to be rooted in the field of psychology, such frameworks have provided little contribution to classroom research (Byram, 2014, p. 216). Therefore, positivist approaches to intercultural
teaching address cultures as fixed entities that can be measured and classified. The positivist paradigm is not appropriate paradigm for this study. The reason for this is that if we are to understand the processes of interculturality or intercultural interaction especially in the classroom, it is paramount to reflect on the complexity of the context and the variability within and among individuals including the teacher, the learners and the researcher.

The second paradigm that has been adopted by interculturalists is the interpretive paradigm. According to Haverkamp and Young (2007), interpretivists’ basic set of beliefs views reality as relative where knowledge is context-dependent and emerges from social interaction. Interpretivists believe in the existence of ‘a multiple reality’ due to ‘evolving insights and sensitivities’ (Guba, 1981, p. 81). Thus, it is paramount for intercultural scholars working within the interpretivist tradition, to take into consideration the context (e.g., Kramsch, 1993; Byram and Feng, 2004). I have, thus, provided information about this study’s context in several parts of this manuscript (see chapter 1). On the other hand, within the interpretivist tradition, the researcher’s values and subjectivities, unlike in the positivist paradigm, are not suppressed for the only sake of objectivity. Rather, in order to sustain a degree of objectivity and reflexivity in interpretive research, the researcher is required to utilise a range of techniques to ensure trustworthiness (Guba, 1981; Lincoln and Guba, 1985), such as member checks, triangulation, thick description and a research journal reporting on both the reflexivity and the insights on the data. In terms of positionality, the interpretive researcher is often considered a ‘social insider’ with cultural knowledge that allows them to engage in ongoing negotiations with the stakeholders (Shah, 2004). I did consider myself at certain points of the investigation as a social insider given my identity as an Algerian who studied in Algerian secondary schools. This has allowed me to create trust relationships with the research participants who agreed to take part in this project.

Furthermore, conceptually speaking, in the interpretive paradigm culture and communication are understood to be socially constructed and situated as well as complex (Carbaugh, 1990; Baker, 2015a) which entails utilising a methodology that aims ‘to understand, through locally situated investigation, participants’ social construction of reality’ (Richards, 2009, p. 148). In other words, concepts like culture and interculturality particularly in the field of language teaching can hold different meanings for different people. For this reason, a context-based interpretive framework for investigating interculturality requires using research instruments that provide a platform for the participants to voice out their perspectives such as interviews and focus groups. For instance, scholars in the field of intercultural studies, as argued by Kramsch and Hua (2016, p. 41), ‘seek to interpret how participants make aspects of their identities, in particular, socio-cultural identities relevant or irrelevant to interactions through symbolic resources including, but not solely, language’. As such, the complex aspects of the identities of the multilingual subject (Kramsch,
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2006) can be explored through means of ethnographic methods including observations and interviews that allow the co-construction of meaning in interaction.

Furthermore, concerning intercultural teaching, the idea of meaning-making being socially and culturally constructed governs the constructionist philosophy given that, as opposed to the positivists, constructionists argue that ‘the sociology of knowledge (...) must concern itself with the social construction of knowledge’ (Berger and Luckmann, 1966, p. 27). In other words, as a researcher, I care about what the teachers and the learners know and do and consider their reality as they construct it through language and everyday practice, in this case, within the context of the classroom. Berger and Luckmann (1966, p.33) propose that ‘as sociologists, we take this reality as the object of our analyses’. Thus, as a researcher interested in intercultural teaching, adopting the social constructionist lens means interpreting how the participants articulate their subjectivities through actions. Here, Berger and Luckmann (1966, p.34) talk about ‘the objectifications of subjective processes (and meanings)’. Language is a key medium through which this objectification takes place and thanks to which interpretation is made possible for the researcher/sociologist. Accordingly, a methodology that focuses on interpretation is compatible with the social constructionist paradigm because it permits for a multiplicity of realities to be constructed and therefore to exist. This paradigm challenges the essentialist view of culture and social interactions and representations, which forces the researcher to interpret without falling into the trap of creating simplistic causal relationships and overly generalised explanations to what is being observed.

To sum up, as a researcher, in addition, to recognise my subjectivity and my role in the construction of my interpretations, I also see intercultural communication as a process of construction and reconstruction of meaning that is fluid and negotiable. I also subscribe to the interpretive paradigm which recognises that nature is socially situated and constructed and knowledge is achieved by interpreting this reality by taking into consideration its situatedness through means of research methods that do not alienate the researcher. Therefore, in the case of this research project, the rationale for adopting a constructionist/interpretivist paradigm is that it allows exploring the processes of construction of meaning among the students, the teacher and the researcher which are socially and culturally situated in the classrooms and the school environment and the findings in this study are a result of continuous interpretations.

Finally, critical theory is the third research paradigm adopted in educational and intercultural research. According to Lincoln and Guba (1994, p. 110) reality, from the perspective of critical theory, is ‘shaped by congeries of social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender factors, and then crystallized (reified) into a series of structures that are now (inappropriately) taken as
“real”, that is natural and immutable’. In other words, reality as it can be seen by positivists as being ‘out there’ and by interpretivists as being ‘multiple and open to interpretation’, it is viewed by critical theorists, as historically shaped, multi-layered and constructed by a number of power forces. Moreover, the purpose of critical theorists is ‘to liberate human beings from all circumstances that enslave them’ (ibid. p. 459). Thus, critical research aims to investigate and explain those power relations through the lenses of, for instance, feminist theories (e.g. Meyer and Rosenblatt, 1987; Moon, 1996) or postcolonialism (e.g., Hudson, 2003; Manathunga, 2014) with the purpose of emancipation and transformation. In addition, the researcher’s role goes beyond exploring and extending understanding, they take also the role of change-makers. In terms of methodology Bohman (1999) explains that there is no particular or special methodology used by critical theorists and that their insights come from collaborative and interdisciplinary work. In the field of intercultural studies, critical theorists are challenging pedagogies and education enterprises. For Giroux (2010) literacy that promotes criticality and intercultural competencies should aim to deconstruct power dynamics which is an essential asset for democracy. In a study, Manathunga (2014) calls for the transformation of supervisory meetings which are conducted in international higher education settings into a space of more reciprocal learning interaction between supervisees and supervisors which aims to benefit both parties and does not alienate the experiences of the international students. In this study, even though I approach the fieldwork and the theories of interculturality with a certain degree of criticality, I primarily aim to gain a better insight into how interculturality is understood and performed in the context of English classrooms in secondary schools. The scarcity of similar studies in Algeria is, thus, a call for first exploring then challenging the status quo. For this reason, this project does not sit directly within the critical theories paradigm.

To conclude, from the three research paradigms reviewed above, I position my study within the interpretive one where social events are context-dependent, knowledge is achieved through the construction of i) the interpretation of the participants’ accounts, ii) the interpretation of my positionality and subjectivity as a researcher and iii) the methods used which allow for an inductive approach. It should also be noted that the conceptual framework (see chapter 2) upon which these interpretations are made is informed by researchers who also subscribe to the interpretivist paradigm and this provides a coherent paradigmatic positioning in this project.

In the following section, I expand on the qualitative approach adopted which is ethnographically inspired.
3.1.3 Ethnographically-oriented research

At the risk of being repetitive, this research is guided by an overarching research aim which is: better understanding how interculturality and intercultural learning are constructed through representation and interaction in the context of Algerian English classrooms. In order to attain this objective, the study starts from the assumption that reality is constructed and that there is no absolute or singular ‘real’ or ‘singular’ way to interpret reality. Rather, the objective from this investigation is to uncover how interculturality is constructed the teachers and the learners, while recognising the role of the researcher in the interpretation process. Therefore, this study sits within the interpretivist epistemology, where the interaction of people with their social environment is believed to generate knowledge.

Being positioned within this framework, this research is presented as an ethnographically-inspired qualitative study because it uses ethnographic methods which serve ‘to produce situated knowledge rather than universals and to capture the detail of social life’ (Taylor, 2002, p. 3) which is compatible with the interpretive paradigm. In other words, the aim is not to reach generalisable knowledge but to engage deeply in the complexity of the participants’ social activities. On the other hand, a study is qualitative when the researcher conducts ‘the collection of data in a natural setting sensitive to the people and places under study’ (Creswell and Poth, 2016, p. 8). Thus, the situatedness and the emphasis on the participants’ accounts are at the intersection of a qualitative study and an ethnographic approach to inquiry. For this end, I have approached five secondary schools in a city situated in the north west of Algeria in order to allow me access to the school, the teachers and the learners. Two out of five school directors agreed that I conduct my research in their institution. I have provided a narration of the process of access negotiation, which was not as smooth as I expected it to be when I embarked in this research journey, in Appendix I. In school 1, I had the possibility to work closely with one teacher, Ahmed, and in school 2, I was given the possibility to attend English classrooms with various teachers, but only one, Selma, engaged with me in extended informal conversations. In both school 1 and school 2, I had the chance to interact with the students during the various activities I was involved in, such as: classroom observation, one focus group, test invigilation, ice-breaking activities, informal discussions during breaks, and short sessions which I led at the request of the teacher or when the teacher was absent. In order to capture the detail of the students’ and the teachers’ life, I have made sure to be a participant member of their life inside the institutions and for the duration of my fieldwork which lasted five weeks. Accordingly, among the other features of ethnography adopted in this study is the fact that the researcher is immersed in the environment conducting participant observation. In fact, for Brewer (2000, p. 10),
‘Ethnography is the study of people in naturally occurring settings or ‘fields’ by means of methods which capture their social meanings and ordinary activities, involving the researcher participating directly in the setting, if not also the activities, in order to collect data in a systematic manner but without meaning being imposed on them externally’.

In this sense, ethnography falls under the naturalistic paradigm where the focus is on contextual social meaning and where the researcher’s role is one of an insider who ‘is interested in understanding and describing a social and cultural scene from the emic [...] perspective’ (Fetterman, 2009, p. 544). This emic position of the researcher puts them in an advantageous situation which allows them to access perspectives which could be overlooked otherwise and also to act as an interpretive research instrument or as put by Hammersley and Atkinson (2007, p. 17) the researcher is ‘the research instrument par excellence’. Additionally, in an ethnographically-oriented project the emphasis is on an in-depth study of the activities of a small number of people, their behaviours and identities in their natural setting. In this study, the focus on a small population of participants with whom an extended amount of time has been allocated to observe practices in the classrooms and the schools. Furthermore, ethnography as a fieldwork involves systematic methods for collecting data in order to insure rigour. To this end, in addition to field notes, classroom observations and interviewed were voice-recoded when possible.

On the other hand, one of the advantages of an ethnographically-oriented approach to research is the inherently holistic view that it constructs. Accordingly, taking a holistic approach, the researcher has the possibility to draw a comprehensive picture of what is presented in the research field. In naturalistic research, the data is by definition fragmented, unstructured and emerges from a variety of sources. Aided by an interpretive and ethnographic approach, the researcher has the possibility to make sense of it. The researcher’s reflexivity is the key to meaning making. In fact, by engaging in an active exercise of reflexivity, the researcher tells the story of the setting where they are immersed in and the individuals with whom they collaborate.

### 3.2 Research setting and participants

This study was undertaken in two secondary schools located in the centre of a city in the northwest of Algeria. These two schools, like most Algerian public school, are named after historical figures, scientists, scholars or individuals who participated in the war of independence against the French. Those figures who are considered among the national heroes, are mainly locals of the city. One of the secondary schools is for female students only (School 1, henceforth) and the other is a mixed-genders school (School 2, henceforth). Ahmed, one of the teacher informants, is a principle
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English teacher at School 1 and Selma is as well a principle English teacher at the latter. School 1 was founded in the 1930s as a school exclusively for girls and it remained so since then. At the time of the fieldwork (2016), the school counted 54 administrative and support staff, 53 teachers and 854 students 93 of whom reside at the school’s dorm (source: Interview with Director of School 1). School 2, on the other hand, was originally built by the French in the 1870s as a military barracks which has been transformed into a Police Academy after the independence then turned into a secondary school (Lycée). At the time of the study, school 2 hosted over 900 students, of whom over 60% are males, supported by 55 non-teaching staff members and 59 teachers among which 5 are teachers of English (source: Discussion with staff member from School 2). Ahmed’s and Selma’s classrooms have a number of students that range from 40 to 50 students depending on the year and the stream of studies. In fact, Algerian secondary education lasts three years and covers different study streams illustrated in the following figure which is adapted from a diagram put forward by the Ministry of National Education (see Figure 1).
Figure 1: Structure of the Algerian secondary education system (adapted from: Système Éducatif Algérien, 2020; translation mine)

**Exp Sc:** Experimental Sciences  
**Eco & Mgt:** Economics and Management  
**CE:** Civil Engineering  
**EE:** Electronic Engineering  
**ME:** Mechanical Engineering  
**PE:** Polymer Engineering
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Taking an ethnographically-oriented research approach means that I have taken into consideration different settings including other schools which I visited and an event that I have attended to, which gathered: inspectors, retired teachers, and other teachers who work at secondary schools across the city. The research participants therefore include teachers, students but also school directors and inspectors. Next, I introduce the teachers Yacine, Ahmed and Selma as well as the profile of the students who took part in the study.

Yacine is an English teacher who I have met at an educational event and who has agreed to sit with me for an interview in a private school where he works aside of his job as a secondary school teacher in a public school. Selma, Ahmed and Yacine have respectively 22, 16 and 4 years of experience teaching English. During the fieldwork, I have managed to observe 8 classroom sessions with Ahmed, one classroom session with Selma and none with Yacine. I have also had the chance to talk to 15 of Ahmed’s students in a form of group discussion and 7 of Selma’s students in a form of focus group. All the students are speakers of Arabic and French and have varying interests for English. My discussions with the schools’ directors and other staff have been very insightful as they provided me with a better understanding of the context. The figure above (Figure 1) is a diagram which breaks down the way the educational system is organised with a focus on secondary education. From year 1 which is the foundation year, the students are enrolled in two distinct streams: the literary stream and the scientific and technology stream. This distinction between the two streams implies that their curriculum, subjects and modules the students study are different. This distinction is visible in the English textbooks because even though there is only one physical textbook for each study year, the teachers are given instructions about which units are meant to be delivered to the literary stream students and which units are designed for the scientific and technology stream students, and which ones they have in common. The differences in terms of English syllabus are sustained for the second and third year of secondary education. The teachers that have taken part in this study where in charge of different levels and streams. Ahmed teaches both streams but only those of first and second year education. Selma teaches all levels and the maths, experimental sciences and foreign languages specialties. Yacine teaches scientific specialties of first year and second year classes.

The purpose of the following figure is two-fold. First, it presents the research participants and provides a preamble of the research instruments that have been used in this study. Second, it illustrates the holistic approach that I have taken while trying to make sense of the data collected.
Figure 2: Table of research participants and overview of the holistic approach to data.
3.3 Research instruments

In this section I review the different research instruments that have been designed to help answer this study’s research questions (see Table 1). According to Hammersley and Atkinson (2007, p. 184) ‘ethnography often involves a combination of techniques and thus it may be possible to assess the validity of inferences between indicators and concepts by examining data relating to the same concept from participant observation, interviewing, and/or documents’. Therefore, as it has already been established, taking an ethnographically oriented approach to investigate interculturality requires relying on research instruments that facilitate the possibility to examine and interpret the emergent, complex, and socially-constructed reality of the participants. To this end, I discuss here three research instruments: participant observation which includes classroom observation, semi-structured interviews to be conducted with the teachers and focus groups with the learners.

3.3.1 Participant observation: audio recording and field notes

Classroom observations represent a key data source in this study as it helps in extending our understanding of existing knowledge about classroom interactions. According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2002, p. 376), ‘the distinctive feature of observation as a research process is that it offers an investigator the opportunity to gather ‘live’ data from naturally occurring social situations’. As mentioned in the first chapter, there is a need for more research investigating naturally occurring intercultural interactions and textbook use in the classroom. Therefore, the research interest of this study is directed towards the English language classroom as a focal physical and intellectual site where classroom observation is a key research instrument to gather insights about the interactions as well as the participants, i.e., the teachers and the students. On the other hand, many things happen at the same time in a classroom and the dynamism of interaction have the potential of overwhelming the researcher for this reason it is necessary to develop the skill of observation. Merriam (2009, p. 118) argues that ‘training and mental preparation is as important in becoming a good observer as it is in becoming interviewer’. In other words, the researcher’s readiness to utilise observation as a research instrument requires practice in addition to the planning that is done before going into the fieldwork.

In this sense, one of the strategies which I have found to be useful for me was to attend as many classrooms as possible before the main fieldwork and practice note-taking. I have designed semi-structured observation guidelines (see Figure 3), which has quickly become irrelevant and
restrictive because of the rigidity and the lack of space in the document below. Furthermore, my expectations, about the way a classroom session would be, were challenged as soon as I stepped foot in the schools and started talking to the teachers. For example, at first, I had entered the classroom with the intention to ‘observe’ interculturality without being sure how it would be manifested. Consequently, in order to preserve the naturalistic and ethnographic nature of the investigation, I have started taking notes on an agenda with my research questions always at sight and have voice-recorded all the classroom sessions with the consent of the teacher and the students. A total of 17 classroom sessions were observed and voice-recorded for a duration of approximately 14 hours. During the data analysis process, all the sessions were listened to and a first stage of coding was done without transcription which served at categorising and organising the sessions by topics. The second stage of analysis involved a detailed transcription of 9 classroom sessions where the participants’ voices were intelligible supported by field notes. When I started the transcription, I was up taken by a fear of missing out. Therefore, I ended up transcribing about 15 000 words.

Figure 3: Classroom observation semi-structured guideline

The field notes were a very strategic research instrument throughout because they were used to write down questions I wanted to ask the teacher or to reflect on an observed event or an
unplanned interaction. During the classroom observation, despite the voice recording the session, it was necessary to take note of non-verbal behaviours and describe the setting of the classroom such as the number of the students attending, the different positions of the teacher in the classroom and noted written on the board. The field notes were supported by photos taken of the board, notebooks of the students, the different details of the setting such as the walls and the frames. I have provided samples of my general field notes in Appendix I where I write about the different events that happened mainly outside the classrooms and a sample of my classroom observation notes including a reconstitution of one of the classroom settings in Appendix J.

3.3.2 Semi-structured interview

Within the interpretive tradition, interviews are key instruments which help to gain in-depth understanding of the participants and their environment. Researchers have access to the spaces they are granted access to and can report on the contexts they are allowed to observe but when this is not possible, ‘one way to attempt to resolve this dilemma is to treat the interview as a site of knowledge construction, and the interviewee and interviewer as co-participants in the process’ (Mason, 2002, p. 227). In other words, this process acknowledges the role of both the researcher and the research participants in the co-construction of knowledge. For this reason, the skills that interviewers should have are ‘being respectful, non-judgmental, and non-threatening’ (Merriam and Tisdell, 2015, p. 129). In other words, in addition to granting you access to the physical spaces, participants when agreeing to sit with you for an interview are letting you access their symbolic world. Therefore, it is important to be considerate of their time and boundaries.

In my study, interviews were the most challenging to schedule given the busy schedule of the teachers. So the first sign of respect was to show flexibility and allow the participants to get in touch at their convenience. The formulation of the interview questions required the use of non-technical terms such as the concept of interculturalism or intercultural communication. Accordingly, using more general terms such as the representation of cultures, societies or world views was a strategy adopted in order not to trigger a feeling of discomfort if the participants did not understand them. The readiness of the researcher to use the language that the participants were comfortable with as well as to reformulate the questions were a way to create a non-judgmental and non-threatening environment. The interview was designed to take the form of a conversation and the pre-established list of questions was used only as a guide. The English teachers are the main target for whom the interview questions are designed. During the fieldwork, the school directors were also keen to take part in the interview. This helped in understanding the school regulations and routines of the stakeholders.
During the stage of the design of the interview, I have taken into consideration the different objectives of the study and the information that could help shed light on the teacher’s practices and beliefs. Therefore the interview questions were used as an indicative map which covered 4 main areas. The first focus was on getting to know the participant and the questions involved their academic background and professional experience, rapport to languages and experience in English language teaching. The second focus was with regard to experience in intercultural encounters as viewed by mainstream theories of intercultural communication that involve an international experience or interactions with different social and ethnic communities. This second focus was later reviewed reflexively and direct questions about international experiences were avoided. In fact, in many cases asking such question could be interpreted as a question about how privileged the individual is. For this research and to avoid putting the teachers in an uncomfortable situation, questions about travels and international encounters were not asked unless it was addressed by the teachers themselves. The third focus of the semi-structured interview was about the school environment and information about the students and classroom management. The final focus was on the textbook and the textbook use. The interview questions as designed before the fieldwork are included in Appendix K. On the other hand, given the time constraints and taking into consideration that contributing to a researcher project can be demanding, the teachers were given the opportunity to write their thoughts in a diary or a reflective journal of some sort guided by the semi-structured interview list I had prepared beforehand.

3.3.3 Focus groups

Along with observing the learners in the classroom, one of the objectives of this study is to hear about their experience with languages, particularly English and their interpretations of and attitudes towards the textbooks’ discourses. For Howarth (2002, p. 26) ‘inviting [participants] to explore their views with others in a focus group, reveals how they draw on social and cultural knowledge systems to construct their own understanding of realities around them’. In other words, the presence of other participants has the potential of creating a space for reflection and co-creation of knowledge. In fact, Finch and Lewis (2003, p. 171) argue that ‘data are generated by the interaction between group participants’. From this interaction which is mediated by the researcher, it is believed that the students can reach a greater degree of depth and build upon each other’s ideas. Moreover, according to Carey and Asbury (2016, p. 27) ‘meaning always develops within a context, and so focus group data need to be understood within the context of the immediate environment of the session and the larger society’. In other words, meaning construction in a focus group is about the personal experiences of the participants but also about
the classroom, the school and the local environment. Therefore, it is important for the researcher to get a sense of the positionality of the participants in relation to the larger scope and context as much as their individual interpretations.

In this study, I conducted one focus group following textbooks’ guidelines (Creswell, 2014), i.e., with 7 participants with Selma’s students, whereas I ran discussions with smaller groups with Ahmed’s students. The participants of the first focus group were recruited on a voluntary basis from Selma’s second year classroom. Their ages ranged between 16 and 17 years old, 3 female students and 4 male students. Selma has arranged for us to sit at the back of the room where we were able to discuss without disturbing Selma’s classroom session taking place simultaneously. It was not possible to be in a different room as the presence of the students’ teacher was required by the school. Therefore, in order to make sure that the space is safe for the students, I made sure to reassure them that they will remain anonymous and that their input will not affect their marks. With regard to the group discussions with Ahmed’s students, it was not possible to arrange for focus groups with six to eight students because it required some of them to miss a lesson closer to the exam date. Thus, Ahmed has preferred to leave a whole classroom (35 students) under my responsibility for one hour while he went to the teachers’ room in order to do admin work. These students were first-year students (age 14 to 16) to whom I had become a familiar person given that I had attended and observed their class for about two weeks prior to this and had chatted in a friendly way with many of them at each visit. The whole class had already been provided with information sheets (in French Appendix F and in English Appendix D) and a consent form to be signed by their guardians. Only 15 students have returned the signed forms (Appendix B) and have agreed to discuss with me their opinions about their textbooks and experience with languages and the English language. Therefore, my solution was to make the 20 students who were not engaging with my research busy working on song lyrics, I asked the 15 students to pair up or be in small groups to discuss themes or topics they enjoyed from their textbook. My role in this particular case was one of a mentor and a researcher. It should be noted that all the students were given the choice to speak in the language or languages they preferred and many have decided to interact with me in English and were helping each other find the words in English by their peers. Some of the students have started their ideas in English and when asked to develop further they have continued expressing their reflections in French and local Arabic.

3.4 Data analysis

The mission of undertaking data analysis is to make sense of the ethnographic data by keeping the research questions in mind. As was illustrated in Figure 2, the data gathered in this project consists of three English textbooks, voice-recorded classroom interactions, semi-structured
interviews, group discussions with the students, field notes and other documents. In order to
analyse this data thoroughly, I rely on analytical frameworks. The first analytical framework has
been specifically designed to deconstruct the textbooks using both content analysis and thematic
analysis. I rely on content analysis to analyse discourses of interculturality as represented in the
textbooks, supplemented with thematic analysis to explore more in-depth some of the relevant
themes informing this study. Firstly, in the review of empirical studies, it was established that
many textbook analysts use content analysis by having a focus on persons, places, perspectives
and practices (e.g., Yuen, 2011). According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison, (2007, p. 475), ‘many
researchers see content analysis as an alternative to numerical analysis of qualitative data’. In fact,
this idea that content analysis is about the quantification of text-based data is widely spread.
However, content analysis is considered to provide more than that. For Krippendorff (2019, p. 24)
‘content analysis is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or
other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use’. In other words, this technique offers a
systematic process of identifying patterns in text and other forms of data which ensures rigour
and the possibility to verify and replicate the analysis. Moreover, the content analysis of the
textbooks is complemented by a thematic analysis in order to have a multifaceted
characterisation of the discourses put forward in the English learning materials. I discuss the
rationale and the process of the development of the framework for textbook analysis in section
(3.4.1).

On the other hand, classroom data has been organised, categorised and thematically analysed. In
fact, given the complexity of classroom discourse and the ethnographic approach I have adopted,
where I do not go into the classroom with a fixed focus and I allow for naturally-occurring
classroom interaction to guide my interpretation, it was necessary to develop a systematic
process to analyse classroom discourse. Hence, in section (3.4.2) I provide a detailed discussion of
the analytical framework adopted to deconstruct classroom discourse in a systematic way in
order to ensure trustworthiness.

Moreover, concerning the interview and group discussion data, I have relied on thematic analysis
which is a widely used analytic method in qualitative research projects because of the complex
nature of qualitative and interpretive approaches. Simply put, ‘thematic analysis is a method for
identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data’ (Braun and Clarke, 2012, p.
79). In the sense that the researcher takes an active role in identifying how relevant those themes
that emerge from the data are relevant to the overall research objectives. In an ethnographically
oriented research project, the researcher goes into the fieldwork with a broad idea of the
research objectives rather than finite and fixed research questions that require answers. This
open-mindedness is also adopted when examining the literature in the field and while reviewing
other empirical studies. So when conducting a thematic analysis, the themes do not just appear, they become visible to the analyst thanks to the different steps they take throughout the analysis. In fact, I have tried to make sense of the data since the first day of the fieldwork, during and after the fieldwork and data categorisation has played an important role in the analysis.

3.4.1 Analytical framework to analyse the textbooks

As mentioned in the review of the empirical studies investigating textbook discourse, the existing frameworks of analyses rely heavily on the concepts of ‘nation’ and ‘countries’ as a basic unit to evaluate the cultural or intercultural potential of the textbook and this is problematic on many levels. It is, thus, considered a limitation to develop models which have a constant focus on the representation of nations and countries. Even though researchers try to move away from these approaches that can lead to essentialism, ‘national culture still remains the basic unit’ which is considered as neo-essentialism (Holliday, 2011, p. 14). In what follows I explore a more flexible model.

In the first chapter, it was explained that the Algerian education reform aims at preserving national values but also promoting openness to the world. The locally published textbooks are the formalisation of such a vision which is enacted in all the schools of the nation. As a result, the ideological positioning of the policymakers is as relevant as the positioning of the characters illustrated in the English textbook. I have identified three main conceptual models that allow the analysis of such positioning. The first one is Kachru’s (2005) three-circles model, namely, the inner, the outer and the expanded circles. The second is Canagarajah’s (1999) centre and periphery concepts where the centre are the historical imperial powers and the periphery are places where English is not a first language. Finally, the third model is inspired by the discussions around decoloniality especially in the field of education which prefer to use the terms ‘global north’ and ‘global south’. It is the latter model that will be adopted through the coding of the textbook using the codes ‘northern frames of references’ or ‘southern frames of references’.

Before explaining why I finally opted for this last terminology, I will begin by reviewing critically the first two models for positionality, i.e., Kachru’s three circles and Canagarajah’s centre and periphery.

Kachru’s three circles model classifies Englishes in concentric circles called the inner, outer and expanding circles (Kachru, 2005). In Kachru’s model, Englishes of countries like the UK and US are positioned in the inner circle; the Englishes of former British colonies such as Nigeria and India are positioned in the outer circle; and the expanding circle comprehends the Englishes of the countries that traditionally considered English as a foreign language (Kirkpatrick, 2014). Algeria
would therefore be situated in the expanding circle according to Kachru’s model. This model has been designed to situate the use of English in the world or English varieties. Yet, it is utilised in several studies to situate cultural references as well (e.g., Yamada, 2010; Shin, Eslami and Chen, 2011), thus making a shortcut and assimilation between for instance Englishes of the inner circle and inner circle cultural references. This manoeuvre contributes to essentialisation even more because a model which is initially aimed at positioning Englishes has been used to position cultures. Therefore, the Kachruvian paradigm embodies a rigid frame to investigate cultural references within one same circle, in addition, to provide centrality to the native-speaker model (Kirkpatrick, 2007).

The second model aimed to situate the use of English in the world is Canagarajah’s (1999) distinction between the centre and the periphery, where the centre includes ‘the technologically advanced communities of the West’, and where the periphery refers to ‘communities where English is of post-colonial currency’ and to countries that ‘have now come under the neo-imperialist thrust of English-speaking centre communities’ (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 4). This model is of particular relevance when trying to situate the use of English in the world at the macro level, but also at the micro-level as it was the case for the use of English in the Tamil community in Canagarajah’s (1999) study. In fact, this framework views the centre as the norm-providing point of reference (e.g., the UK) and situates the Tamil community in the periphery. Following this same model, Algeria would be situated in the periphery with regard to the use of French and being a former colony of France, and also because it relies on the centre (UK, USA, Australia, etc.) as norm-providers when it comes to the teaching of English. This model merges between Kachru’s outer and expanded circles in the periphery but recognises the centrality of the inner circle. Despite depicting the dynamics of discourses of power through a centre/periphery dichotomy, this view does not acknowledge the need for the communities in the periphery to dissociate themselves from the historical dominant Eurocentric voices, both metaphorically and literally. Similarly to Kachru’s categorisation, the centre-periphery dichotomy seems simplistic to situate the complexity of the particular case of Algeria. Furthermore, Holliday (1999, p. 245) argues that ‘the centre-periphery paradigm, because of its essentialism, maybe serving to reduce rather than liberate the so-called periphery’. As a result, there is a need for a framework where references to communities, places and people do not necessarily gravitate around the English-speaking centre, but rather are positioned and contextualised historically, economically and politically. I argue that the need for a decentralised framework of analysis should mirror the effort of the Algerian curriculum and textbook designers to create materials that are local and translate the ideological positioning of the Algerian education reform.
The third framework, which I would argue is more appropriate for this research makes a distinction between the ‘global north’ and ‘the global south’. According to Meekosha (2011, p. 669), “North/South’ terminology came into use in the 1960s as shorthand for a complex of inequalities and dependencies’. These inequalities and dependencies have been historically created by colonisation and exploitation of ‘southern’ countries by imperial ‘northern’ ones. In the field of intercultural communication and especially when talking about representation, these two terms can help in underpinning power relationships. In fact, in order to examine the dominant discourse in intercultural communication, there should be an acknowledgement of the more powerful discourse but also of the existence of less visible perspectives. The North/South metaphor which makes reference to the Global North and Global South aims at categorising the discourses and ideologies that claim universality, modernity, and centrality as northern, and the invisible marginalised voices as southern. This approach has the potential of covering the macro, meso and micro levels of references that are not restricted to approaches to the English language and should not assume the homogeneity of a given group neither the centrality of the northern discourse. As put forward byDados and Connell (2012, p. 13)

‘The term Global South functions as more than a metaphor for underdevelopment. It references an entire history of colonialism, neo-imperialism, and differential economic and social change through which large inequalities in living standards, life expectancy, and access to resources are maintained’.

In other words, the south and the north offer a flexible framework that transcends the nation-based classification that other models offer. Accordingly, Meekosha (2011, p. 669) argues that the terms north and south ‘are complex and dynamic concepts’. The potential and possibilities that such a framework offer can challenge essentialist and fixed perceptions about the world.

Furthermore, for Trefzer et al. (2014, pp. 1–2)

‘If “South,” unmoored from strict geographic associations, becomes a marker for power compromised by political and economic disenfranchisement and distributed unequally via the conventional hierarchies of gender, race, and class, then we can find “South” in many places: north, east, west, and south’.

This means that the south can also exist in places traditionally considered as First World. From this perspective, the environment of the Algerian school is conceptually positioned as southern. In addition, the codification of the diversity of references in the textbooks and other resources will be guided by the south/north metaphor. The representational repertoire of the textbook includes and is not limited to texts, images, activities and graphs. As a result, references to countries, people, and places are situated in two main categories: northern and/or southern. Each category
is attributed a positive or negative value. These values are based on the context in which the reference is made. If, for example, the US is cited in the context of war and is presented as being on the wrong side of history, this reference will be coded, using NVIVO, as ‘north negative’. On the other hand, if an invention is credited to an American scientist, this reference will be coded ‘north positive’. Or if for example a borough in New York is known to be underprovided and is presented in the context of struggle, the coding would be ‘south negative’ and if the context is one of celebration and empowerment of African-American artists or a member of the indigenous community, the coding would then be ‘south positive’. Therefore, this framework offers the guidelines for the coding of the textbook references. The overall aim is to identify the discourses that are promoted in the language materials and which values are attached to the different artefacts, which ideologies, which references are celebrated, which ones are silenced, and so on. The application of this model and the analysis is undertaken in Chapter 4.

3.4.2 Analytical framework to analyse classroom discourse

One of the leading questions in this research project is about how intercultural learning is facilitated or not during classroom interaction. Answering this question requires voice-recorded classroom observation and a transcription of the interactions. The next step is the organisation and categorisation of a large volume of interactive data, in order to make sense of it in a systematic and rigorous way. For this reason, it was necessary to develop a framework of analysis of classroom discourse that offers tools and techniques which facilitate the coding and interpretation of the data. One of these tools is the Critical Interaction Episode (CIE, henceforth). I have developed this framework as a direct inspiration from the concept of ‘critical learning episode’ developed by my supervisor and his colleagues when working with classroom data with their teacher-participants in order to improve accountability (Davis, Kiely and Askham, 2009; Kiely and Davis, 2010).

‘These episodes, constituting micro-segments of classroom interaction in which the teacher and observer felt that teaching or learning was either promoted or inhibited, provide an unusual perspective on practice’ (Davis, Kiely and Askham, 2009, p. 124)

Kiely and Davis (2010) have developed the notion of Critical Learning Episodes with the purpose of studying meaningful segments of interaction which are characterised by: firstly, boundaries, i.e. a clear-cut beginning and end; secondly, a single theme of interest discussed in class such as a language feature or a phenomenon; and finally, significance of the interaction for learning (Kiely and Davis, 2010, pp. 282–283). It should be noted that the concept of learning in this study is approached in its general terms given that the focus here is on intercultural interaction as a
process of co-construction of meaning. That is to say, the voice-recorded classroom interactions and observation notes constitute a sound source of data to investigate opportunities for interculturality and intercultural learning in an English classroom. Accordingly, analogues to critical learning episodes, I suggest the use of ‘critical interaction episodes (CIE)’ which are used in the context of this research for their practicality in identifying segments of interactions that disregard moments of chatter and planning and focus on moments of meaning co-construction between the teacher and the students. They are characterised by their boundaries, a theme and a significance to interculturality in general terms. The quality of those episodes is assessed in relation to their contribution in the characterisation of the focus of interaction (e.g., grammar, language accuracy, social meaning, etc.). The next step is the categorisation of these episodes.

Given the complexity of classroom discourse and based on a review of literature, I have identified a model which encapsulates the different types of discourse that can be found in the classroom. This model is Kramsch’s (1985) continuum of classroom interaction. The purpose of this model is to categorise and situate the episodes within the continuum is to be able to examine the aspects of the classroom which make it rich and complex.

The idea of situating the CIE within a continuum was motivated by the concern of falling into the trap of cherry-picking episodes. With the aim of categorising language classroom discourse, Kramsch (1985) has put forward a continuum of classroom interaction that ranges from instructional discourse to ‘natural’ discourse. She argues that ‘neither extreme ever exists in the classroom in its pure form’ (Kramsch, 1985, p. 171). In other words, the classroom discourse, in reality, is never solely instructional nor ‘natural’. This is relevant because the continuum will be used for analytical purposes where CIEs are of relatively short length taken from all the classrooms recorded across different levels, and therefore they are not representative of any full classroom session. Rather, they are a rich source of data to explore the fluidity of identities and the role of the textbook in the construction of intercultural interaction.

In Kramsch’s continuum of classroom interaction, she describes the roles of the participants as ranging from fixed to negotiated; and the tasks from teacher-centred to learner or group-centred. Regarding knowledge construction, Kramsch describes it as focused on content and the accuracy of facts in the instructional-oriented discourse and as focused on fluency and the process of interaction in the natural-discourse end of the continuum (see Model 1).
In a study investigating the potential of drama in improving the second language learning experience, Kao and O’Neill (1998) have found particularly useful Kramsch’s continuum in the description of the different activities used in a drama classroom. Building upon the core idea of the original continuum, their continuum ranges from scripted or instructional discourse (e.g. students performing pre-written scripts in order to practice certain linguistic patterns or expressions) to a natural and spontaneous discourse where roles are negotiated (e.g. students taking ownership of the activity and co-constructing progressively a performance beyond the scenario). Therefore, in an attempt to decipher the complexity of drama-oriented language classrooms, Kao and O’Neill (1998) have put forward the continuum of drama approaches for second language teaching and learning which ranges from teaching perspectives that are more closed and controlled, to semi-controlled, to providing space for open communication. Thanks to this framework, they managed to position the different activities most known to drama classes within the continuum (e.g. scripted role-play, dramatized story, language games, simulations, improvisational role-playing, scenarios and process drama) (Kao and O’Neill, 1998, p. 6). They argue that each activity whether at the controlled pole of the classroom continuum or at its more open one would facilitate the learning of different language-oriented outcomes. Moreover, given the particularity of drama classrooms for not working as any other conventional language classroom (ibid. p.44), it is more challenging to investigate their complexity despite the indicating and descriptive aspects that such continuum offers.

In this study, it is important to keep in mind the hypothesis that an opportunity for intercultural learning or teaching can take place at any stage of the interaction, i.e., whether during the instructional discourse or what Kramsch calls ‘natural’ discourse, which I prefer to call ‘dialogic’ discourse informed by Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue. Therefore, in designing a parallel continuum where the complexity of roles, tasks and knowledge is acknowledged, I propose an adaptation of Kramsch’s ‘continuum of classroom interaction’ that I call ‘continuum of critical classroom interaction’ (see Model 2).
Besides labelling each pole of the continuum ‘instructional discourse’ and ‘dialogic discourse’, the additional amendments that have been made to the original continuum concern the conceptualisation of roles, tasks and knowledge construction. Firstly, in Kramsch’s continuum the participants’ roles range from ‘fixed statuses’ to ‘negotiated roles’. By keeping the essence of the latter roles, I have narrowed down the focus on the emergent and visible identity of the participants during classroom interaction. Therefore, the roles in the continuum of critical classroom interaction range from institutionalised fixed roles (which are the teacher role and the student role), to dialogic roles (which can be informed by other identities of the participants, e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, member of a given small culture, etc.). Secondly, the dimension of tasks in Kramsch’s mode ranges from being teacher-led in the instructional discourse to learner and group centred in the natural discourse. This distinction is indeed important in language classrooms where students are supposed to be afforded the space to explore and test various discursive practices, ideally in more dialogic interaction. For this reason, this dimension remains the same in the new continuum of classroom interaction. Finally, the third dimension in Kramsch’s model is knowledge is described as ranging from focused on content and accuracy of facts to a focus on process and fluency of interaction. It should be noted that this study is informed by postmodern theories of language learning where a paradigm shift has diverted the focus of language professionals from accuracy and fluency towards an interest in effective and appropriate communication, and more importantly, towards the co-construction of social meaning in interaction. As a result, in the continuum of critical classroom interaction, the knowledge dimension includes the more structuralist approach to language learning which focuses on accuracy and fluency under the instructional discourse pole and the postmodern approach under the dialogic discourse pole where knowledge is focused on the complexity of social meaning and an acknowledgement of heteroglossic and polyphonic processes of interaction. Overall, the continuum of critical classroom interactions serves at positioning critical interaction episodes from the left end of the continuum which is more accuracy-oriented towards the right end which is dialogue-oriented. Finally, I should highlight that two main assumptions govern this new model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Fixed institutionalised roles (e.g. teacher/learner)</th>
<th>Dialogic roles (e.g. visibility of the multiple and fluid identities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Teacher-oriented and position-centred</td>
<td>Group-oriented, dynamic and person-centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Focus on content accuracy of facts (monoglossia)</td>
<td>Focus on complexity of social meaning Acknowledgement of heteroglossic and polyphonic processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 2: Continuum of critical classroom interaction

The first one is that both instructional
and dialogic discourse and the ones in-between are all part of the classroom ‘natural’ discourse. For this reason, I have changed Kramsch’s terminology (natural discourse). The second assumption is that intercultural interaction can take place at any time of the classroom session, and thus, it can be positioned in different places within the continuum, which means that it will be characterised progressively during the data analysis.

To sum up, the continuum of critical classroom interaction is used as an analytical framework to help position the critical interaction episodes which are short instances of interaction where I will examine emergent patterns and themes.

3.5 Transcription

The process of transcription has served two purposes. The first one is that the task of listening to and writing down the voice recordings helps the researcher to be familiarised and engage with the data in a focused and deep manner. The second purpose is to offer a contextualised and trustworthy source that the researcher can get back to as often as it is needed. In this project, the level of details in the transcription of the interview and focus group recordings was minimal because the study only requires a focus on the content, i.e., what the participants say. On the other hand, the transcription of the voice-recorded classroom data has required a higher level of detail which was supplemented by field notes. In other words, given the centrality of classroom discourse for this research project, the form is as relevant as the content. For this reason, I have progressively developed the following transcription conventions (Table 2) which include, tone, turn-taking, pauses, the different languages the participants use, etc. For the Arabic language, I have chosen to transliterate using Latin letters rather than the Arabic alphabet because of the familiarity I have with transliteration, a practice I engage in daily in my communications on social media and with fellow Algerian network, in addition to having only access to a keyboard with Latin alphabet.
### Table 2: Transcript conventions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Student (not identified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1, S2, etc.</td>
<td>Student 1, 2, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>Several students talking simultaneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Name of student)</td>
<td>Student’s name anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R:</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>Start of overlapping speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>End of overlapping speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Small pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(...)</td>
<td>Long pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unintelligible)</td>
<td>Unintelligible speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{context}</td>
<td>Short description of the observed context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech-Fr</td>
<td>Speech in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech-Ar</td>
<td>Speech in Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;English&gt;</td>
<td>Translation in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITALS</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word*</td>
<td>Non-English word pronounced in an English way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3.6 Reflexivity

In designing and conducting qualitative research, researchers are expected to continuously reflect upon their own subjectivity which is known as self-reflexivity. According to Tracy (2020, p. 2) ‘self-reflexivity refers to people’s careful consideration of the ways in which their past experiences, point of view, and role impact their interactions with, and interpretations of, any particular interaction or context’. Indeed, the attention given to the impact of one’s experience or knowledge on the research process does not imply alienating one’s subjectivity. Rather, the researcher should acknowledge as well as find value in all that they bring to the research project. This process takes place when formulating the research questions, when establishing and negotiating access to the research field, when collecting and analysing data, and finally at the time of presenting the project’s outcomes. As asserted by Lune and Berg (2017, p. 131), ‘to be reflexive is to have an ongoing conversation with yourself’. This implies deconstructing my understanding of myself in order to be more aware of, and transparent about, first and foremost, my motivations for conducting this project and second, my role as a researcher and my possible influence on behaviours, and finally my image and the way I am perceived by the different
stakeholders involved in the research project which can have an impact on my credibility and on the good run of the project overall.

First, besides the academic interest, I have for the field of intercultural communication which I explained in section 1.5, the personal motivations for engaging in such a project are linked to my passion for languages and my curiosity about cultures and how they impact relationships. My experience as a tutor/teacher for international students, in Algeria with Tanzanian students, in the UK with Chinese students particularly and a diverse community of international students more generally, have put me in situations where I always question the appropriateness of the materials I use. I was driven to investigate the intercultural potential of Algerian textbooks because they were the only resources I had access to as a high schooler. On the other hand, my experience has taught me that the nationality of my students quickly became irrelevant and the more we engaged in learning, other identities became more important. My identities as female, young, Algerian, a student in Europe, speaker of Arabic, French, Spanish and English have had at various degrees an impact on the way I have experienced access to the fieldwork, interaction with the research participants, interpretation of the data and the overall project. For instance, being aware of the way an encounter outside the school with a male teacher can be perceived, I could only exchange with my male participants during school hours inside the premises of the school. However, with the female teachers, I have had the chance to talk to them outside the school. This has had an impact on the length of the discussion and I believe that my identity as a female had a role to play in this. In terms of interpretation, being a local to the city where I conducted the study, the students have shared with me some thoughts about the local culture which they assumed I was aware of. They would say ‘as you know’, ‘you already know this’. In intercultural communication, such instances are very insightful because they illustrate how I was considered as an insider of their small cultures. However, this meant that many of them would not expand on their ideas and I had to make the conscious effort to ask them to develop further or to explain more what they mean. In other words, taking an ethnographically oriented approach meant that my role was to make the familiar unfamiliar, but also to constantly reflect on what was familiar and how I can make sure not to take it for granted. Having a research journal where I have written regularly has proved to be a key instrument to actively engage in reflexivity. Discussing my research journey within the ethical frame of the project with my supervisors and colleagues have also contributed to my process of reflexivity. Moreover, I have made sure to include excerpts and thoughts from my field notes and research journal in different parts of the text of this thesis.
Chapter 3

3.7 Trustworthiness

The concept of trustworthiness has been put forward with the intention of distancing concerns about validity in qualitative inquiry from the well-rooted quantitative tradition. Since this study is designed to be positioned within the interpretivist paradigm, the term used to refer to the quality and rigour of the project is ‘trustworthiness’. According to Creswell and Miller (2000, p. 125) ‘qualitative researchers use a lens not based on scores, instruments, or research designs but a lens established using the views of people who conduct, participate in, or read and review a study’. In other words, even though many qualitative researchers frame their project within a research design and make sure the instruments are relevant and ethically approved, there are other objectives to be attained while proving the quality of their work. In fact, one of the goals of establishing a sound basis of trustworthiness is to control bias because when biases are ‘uncontrolled, they can undermine the quality of ethnographic research’ (Fetterman, 1998, p. 1).

There are different criteria to verify in order to ensure controlled bias and trustworthiness of an ethnographically oriented qualitative study. Lincoln and Guba (1986) have put forward four main criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

First, credibility refers to how much the research findings are authentic and representative of the participants’ realities. There are several strategies to ensure credibility such as prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, peer debriefing and member checks (Lincoln and Guba, 1986, p. 77). I have spent an extensive amount of time with my research participants across the different spaces they allowed me access to, such as the classroom, the teachers’ room, school meetings and events, and one-to-one encounters. I have also engaged in observation, voice-recording when possible, and note-taking throughout the fieldwork for in-depth documentation of events and behaviours. Concerning triangulation of data, it was ensured through the use of several instruments and methods, namely, participant observation, field notes and research diary, voice-recorded interviews, focus groups and classroom interactions. With regard to peer briefing, I have had the opportunity to present and discuss my work in progress to both a specialised and non-specialised audience. In fact, working closely with my supervisors, going through different examined PhD milestones, being part of postgraduate research and reading groups, presenting at conferences and becoming a member of Cultnet (a community of researchers and educators working in the field of intercultural communication) and TESOL Intercultural Communication Interest Section (TESOL ICIS), have all been valuable platforms which not only helped me insure the credibility of my work but have also been thought-provoking and contributed to the improvement of the quality of my work in general. Finally, members check is about exposing the researchers’ interpretations to the participants. During the fieldwork, I have discussed some of my preliminary interpretations with the teachers who also have also been
curious to see what I was writing in my notebook during their classroom sessions. I have openly shared my notes and some of my reflections with the teachers which have led to further discussions and opened my mind to more areas that deserved my attention. More than checking, the teachers have worked collaboratively with me. On the other hand, given their workload and obligations, it was not possible for the teachers to dedicate more time to read through my transcriptions of the voice-recorded interviews and classroom interactions.

The second criterion aimed to control bias and ensure the trustworthiness of the study is transferability which refers to the ways in which the findings can be transferred or applicable in other contexts. The objectives of naturalistic studies are not to be replicated or generalised because each qualitative research is unique in its own way. Rather, the aim is for the reader to be able to think of ways to apply the knowledge of this particular project in another context. One strategy to ensure trustworthiness through transferability is the thick description which is a rich ‘narrative developed about the context so that judgements about the degree of fit or similarity may be made by others who may wish to apply all or part of the findings elsewhere’ (Lincoln and Guba, 1986, p. 77). Accordingly, the ethnographic approach facilitating my insider or emic perspective is supplemented by the voice-recorded and transcribed interactional data as a focal basis for interpretation and analysis. In doing so, a detailed and rich description of the events through field notes and recordings contribute to creating a trustworthy account of the findings.

Dependability is the third criterion of trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiry which is considered as the equivalent of reliability in positivist studies (Guba, 1981). To ensure dependability means to prove the stability through an audit trail (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) which basically means keeping a detailed track of how the project was constructed and the data collected and reported on. For Shenton (2004, p. 71) ‘such in-depth coverage also allows the reader to assess the extent to which proper research practices have been followed’. Positioning this project within a research paradigm and being explicit about the research design and the different instruments used to collect data and categorising the latter in an explicit way are all strategies aimed to help the reader trace back the progress of the work and the data that have contributed in reaching specific findings. Moreover, Anfara, Brown and Mangione (2002) ‘argue that the process employed in the research must be made more public’. For this reason, I have detailed the processes and conditions of data collection and analysis to make sure that readers have a full picture in the analysis chapters (4, 5 and 6). Additionally, I have included appendices about my field notes, observation and research protocol and coding schemes.

Confirmability is the last criterion to evaluate the value and quality of a naturalistic inquiry which is the equivalent of objectivity in positivist research (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). For Amankwaa
confirmability refers to ‘a degree of neutrality or the extent to which the findings of a study are shaped by the respondents and not researcher bias, motivation, or interest’. The ethnographic nature of this study implies that the researcher is fully involved in the study which makes the concept of neutrality relative and hard to achieve. Thus, to ensure rigour, Guba (1981) suggest that keeping a confirmability audit trail, triangulation and practising reflexivity. This last criterion is linked and complementary to the above-mentioned ones because most of the strategies used to ensure the latter contribute to controlling the researcher’s bias. It should be noted that throughout this study I have taken conscious steps to constantly practise reflexivity such as explaining the rationale for the theories and literature used to inform the project, justifying methodological choices and constantly reporting and documenting the events and reflections that have shaped this project.

3.8 Ethical consideration

Researchers should be aware of ethical issues throughout the whole process of the research. Issues may arise at the moment of designing the research instruments but also while administrating or conducting the fieldwork, and later while reporting it. Qualitative research especially in the field of education involves working with young participants, as is the case here, who are students aged between 15 and 17 years old. The students and the teachers were provided with information sheets both in English and French and the research project was presented orally to the students at each first encounter using the local Arabic language, English and French. Students under the age of 16 who agreed to participate in the focus group were provided with consent forms and a summary of the research in French to be signed by their parents.

While reporting the data whether at the time of transcription or in the process of writing the thesis, the names of the participants were anonymised and the schools were referred to in general terms as School 1 and School 2. All the details that would make the location of the research field easy to identify were deleted or replaced by general indications as is the case for the region where the fieldwork was conducted.

All the participants were asked if they were comfortable with the interaction to be voice-recorded at the start of each interaction. With time they became comfortable with the presence of a voice-recording device. Students were informed that accepting or refusing to participate in the study will not affect their marks or grades, nor will it in any way impact their relationship with their teachers. The teachers were informed that the data collected and information shared will not be
disclosed to their colleagues or school directors and that it will be used solely for research purposes.

This study was developed in conformity with the Ethical Guidelines for Research developed by the University of Southampton. Before starting the fieldwork, a detailed description of the research project and plans including the research instruments were submitted to Ethics and Research Governance Online (ERGO) system on 08/01/2016, and it was approved on 16/02/2016. No data at all were collected before obtaining the ERGO approval. The ethics checklist can be found in Appendix A.

3.9 Conclusion

To conclude, this chapter offered a detailed discussion of the processes and procedures undertaken to design this research project, conduct the investigation and analyse the ethnographic data. This project follows an interpretive ethnographic approach because it aims to gather rich data from the participants’ experience in the English classroom and while using the learning materials. The frameworks of analyses have been developed in order to allow the exploration and deconstruction of the complex learning materials and classroom experiences. This study’s rigour is ensured through active involvement in reflexivity and practical steps towards trustworthiness as recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985; 1986). The following chapters are analysis and discussion chapters. Chapter 4 focuses on the content and thematic analysis of the corpus of English textbooks informed by the analytical framework discussed in section (3.4.1). Chapters 5 and 6 focus on classroom discourse and participants’ experience and the analysis follows the framework developed in section (3.4.2).
Chapter 4  Analysis of textbooks

This chapter is the first of the three analysis chapters. Here I apply the framework of analysis developed in section (3.4.1). First, I begin in section 4.1 by a description of the textbooks which constitute the central piece of this research project. In section 4.2, I conduct a content analysis informed by the above-mentioned framework using the main codes: ‘southern frames of references’ and ‘northern frames of references’. In order to position these references, I also code the values attributed to them as either ‘positive’ or ‘negative’. The aim here is to evaluate the multiplicity and variety of cultural references. In section 4.3, I undertake a thematic analysis which is aimed to deconstruct the complexity of the dominant discourses in these textbooks. Finally, in section 4.4, I discuss the significance of the findings in relation to this project’s focus which is interculturality and intercultural learning.

4.1 Description of the three English textbooks

The three textbooks used in each of the three years of secondary school are respectively: At the Crossroads SE1, Getting Through SE2 and New Prospects SE3 (see Figure 4). SE is an acronym for Secondary Education.

©2006 © 2006 © 2008

Figure 4: The three Algerian secondary school English textbooks

The three textbooks have been designed in compliance with the National Curriculum Committee of the Ministry of National Education and published in 2006 for the first and the second textbook and 2008 for the third textbook. At the time of the data collection (2016) and thesis writing (2020), those three textbooks were still being used. Other levels have seen their textbooks changed in the last 2 to 3 years, namely primary and middle schools across subject. However, till
now the abovementioned textbooks are still the main and only learning materials used in English secondary level classes. They are meant for teaching English at the National level in all public schools where the students are aged between 15 to 17 years old. They have been designed in a logic of continuity where pedagogical content is organised as task-based and promotes functional language. The cultural dimension is prevailing across the three books and the different units and themes. This can be observed through the representation of artefacts, but also through texts about ways of life and values, the choice of characters and images.

4.1.1 Objectives and structure of each textbook

As mentioned earlier, for each of the three years of secondary schools there is a specific textbook. For the first year, students have been using a book entitled At the Crossroads SE1, for the second year, Getting Through SE2 and for the third New Prospects SE3. The objectives of each textbook are communicated to the teacher and the learners in the first pages in a form of a letter or an email. Throughout the three textbooks, there is a focus in developing the four language skills: speaking, reading, writing and listening. In the first textbook, At the Crossroads SE1, the students are supposed to develop strategies such as: anticipation, checking and correcting their language. Learners are encouraged to use the different rubrics of the textbook to develop different aspects of the languages (pronunciation, grammar, etc.). The teacher, on the other hand, is reminded of their role as facilitator and that the approach to be used is learner-centred and competency-based:

‘As it appears from this presentation, it has become clear by now – or so we hope – that At the Crossroads is meant to be ‘taught from’ rather than ‘taught’. This makes the teacher’s role as facilitator and guide all the more significant’ (At the Crossroads SE1, 2006, p.9)

‘We hope that this textbook will be a valuable aid for teachers cum-facilitators guiding their learners in lively and attractive projects’ (Getting Through SE2, 2006, p. 7)

‘Naturally the overall approach remains basically competency-based, learner-centered and project-geared’ (New Prospects SE3, 2008, p. 4)

The competences that the students are supposed to be developing are not stated explicitly in the foreword letter. But, for each unit there is a list of skills that the students should be developing. For example, in unit 1 of the 1st English textbook, the skills to be developed are: i) listening to instructions and confirming understanding, stating point of view and justifying it; ii) reading and interpreting an e-mail message, writing and e-mail message; iii) listening and responding to
telephone messages, reading and responding to short written messages, writing a letter of enquire; iv) reading and responding to an advert, filling a form and writing a letter of application, dealing with telephone conversation problems (At the Crossroads SE1, 2006, p.3). Accordingly, those skills are listening, reading, writing and speaking, with very little emphasis on speaking.

This first textbook counts five units as follows:

**Year one: At the Crossroads SE1**

Unit (1): Getting through – The main topic is communicating using the internet.

Unit (2): Once upon a time – The main topic is reading fairy tales, stories and biographies.

Unit (3): Our findings show – The main topic is doing interviews and interpreting simple data.

Unit (4): Eureka! – The main topic is technologies and their impact on daily life

Unit (5): Back to nature – The main topic is about climate change and pollution.

Concerning the second textbook used with second year students, it is presented as a continuity of the first textbook. The authors of the textbook state in their letter (e-mail) to the teacher that their ‘goals are to make the students consolidate their knowledge of functional English, in terms of vocabulary, grammar and pronunciat’ (Getting Through SE2, 2006, p. 6). Other objectives include working with authentic materials and providing opportunities for the learners ‘to communicate correctly and fluently in English’ in addition to creating portfolios of pair and group projects (p.4). The themes of each unit are presented as follows:

**Year two: Getting Through SE2**

Unit (1): Sign of the time – topic: lifestyles

Unit (2): Make peace – topic: peace and conflict resolution

Unit (3): Waste not, want not – topic: world resources and sustainable development

Unit (4): Budding scientist – topic: science and experiments

Unit (5): News and tales – topic: literature and media

Unit (6): No man is an island –topic: disasters and solidarity

Unit (7): Science or Fiction-topic: technology and the arts

Unit (8): Business is business-topic: management and efficiency

The structure of each textbook is summarised in the first pages of the manual in a ‘book map’. An example of a book map is reported in Table 3 below. The second textbook Getting Through SE2, for instance, contains eight units and each unit covers a specific topic. Units are divided in three
main parts: discovering language, developing skills and projects. In the first part, discovering language, students are presented with grammatical themes, pronunciation rules, and new vocabulary. This is done whether explicitly through a ‘tip box’ where grammar rules, for example, are explained, or implicitly through elicitation activities. The second part ‘developing skills’, students have more opportunities to practice functional language and develop the four language skills. The final part is about projects that students could work on individually or in groups.

Finally, the third textbook, New Prospects SE3, was published in 2008 and contains five units. The themes move from topics of ancient civilisations to topics about astronomy and space exploration. The units are organised as follows:

**Year three: New Prospects SE3**

- **Unit (1):** Exploring the past – topic: ‘ancient civilizations’
- **Unit (2):** Ill-gotten gains never prosper – topic: ethics in business: fighting fraud and corruption
- **Unit (3):** schools, different and alike – topic: education in the world: comparing education systems
- **Unit (4):** Safety first – topic: advertising, consumers and safety
- **Unit (5):** It’s a giant leap for mankind – topic: astronomy and the solar system
- **Unit (6):** We are a family – topic: feelings, emotions, humour and related topics.

The students in year 3 are preparing to sit for the baccalaureate exam at the end of the year, which is a national contest that will lead to Higher Education. Therefore, all those five topics are supposed to be covered in class because the national exam could be about one of those topics.

As stated by the authors of the textbook: ‘three major features of the syllabus have been given careful consideration in designing this book: i) the fact that the baccalaureate is exclusively of the written mode; ii) the emphasis on a thematic orientation; iii) the need to cater for the pedagogical requirements of all baccalaureate streams’ (New Prospects SE3, 2008, p. 4). In fact, in addition to be designed to be used across all Algerian secondary schools, this textbook has the particularity of having units that should be studied by all streams. What is meant by streams here is the fact that when students join the secondary school, they choose between two main streams in their first year which are called sciences and technology stream (commonly called scientific stream) and literary stream (see Figure 1 above). In the former, the volume of hours for mathematics, science and physics subjects are more important than the volume of hours of languages and philosophy subjects, which are rather more important in the latter. In the first and the second textbooks, the teachers are made aware which units are meant to be taught to scientific stream classes, which
ones are meant for literary streams classes, and which ones are meant for both. This last textbook, New Prospects SE3, has six units to be taught to all streams.

One other particularity of this last textbook is an explicit mention of intercultural learning. In fact, in this book, intercultural learning is presented as integrated in all aspects of the syllabus. In the forward note to the textbook’s users, the authors state that: ‘the Learner’s outcomes and the Intercultural outcomes for their part are in-built, i.e. made to be part and parcel of the process of teaching/learning at all times, notably through a pertinent typology of activities’ (New Prospects SE3, 2008, p.6; emphasis original). The learner’s outcomes and the intercultural outcomes categories refer here to the concepts that learners are meant to be introduced to and discuss for each unit. Therefore, intercultural outcomes are related to the unit’s theme. For example, the learning outcomes of the first unit which is about ancient civilisations, the students are meant to develop positive attitudes towards one’s culture and those of other people; in addition to raising awareness about the contribution of the various civilisations to man’s progress. Table 4 below puts together the intercultural outcomes of each unit. Those intercultural outcomes are mainly referred to as intercultural awareness outcomes.
Table 3: Getting Through SE2, Book Map – Unit 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discovering language</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Developing skills</th>
<th>Reading and writing</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SINGS OF THE TIME</td>
<td>Lifestyles</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Vocabulary related to food, clothes ...</td>
<td>Listening for specific information</td>
<td>Writing a profile about lifestyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Semi-modal used to</td>
<td>- Vowels</td>
<td>- Describing</td>
<td>- Listening for specific information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Present simple tense</td>
<td>- Diphthongs</td>
<td>- Narrating</td>
<td>- Reading for general ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Going to and will-future</td>
<td>- English and French phonetics</td>
<td>- Predicting</td>
<td>- Reading a biography, a newspaper article ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Modals may/might</td>
<td>- Homophones</td>
<td>- Expressing certainty and doubt</td>
<td>- Writing a policy statement, slogans, a newspaper article, a letter ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Relative pronouns</td>
<td>- Homonyms</td>
<td>- Expression intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Link words: in contrast to/by contrast/h owever, on the contrary</td>
<td>- Comma and full stop pauses</td>
<td>- Comparing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The comparative and superlative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Intercultural Outcomes, from New Prospects SE3 Book map (2008, pp. 08-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercultural Outcomes</th>
<th>Unit 1: Ancient civilizations</th>
<th>Unit 2: Ethics in business</th>
<th>Unit 3: Education in the world</th>
<th>Unit 4: Advertising, consumers and safety</th>
<th>Unit 5: Astronomy and the solar system</th>
<th>Unit 6: Feelings, emotions, humour and related topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Developing positive attitudes towards one’s culture and those of other peoples</td>
<td>- Developing awareness about the importance of fighting fraud and corruption at the national and international levels</td>
<td>- Comparing educational systems: past and present</td>
<td>- Raising awareness about the effects of advertising on different cultures and societies</td>
<td>- Developing interest in outer-space exploration</td>
<td>- Developing understanding of the expression of feelings across different cultures and societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Raising awareness about the contribution of the various civilizations to man’s progress</td>
<td>- Raising awareness about the similarities and differences between today’s educational systems in the world</td>
<td>- Understanding the importance of integrating cultural features of a society into advertising</td>
<td>- Raising awareness of the contributions that various peoples have made to astronomy</td>
<td>- Discussing the change of natalities brought about by advances in astronomy</td>
<td>- Raising awareness of others’ thoughts and feelings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the review of the structure and the stated objectives of the textbooks, it can be noted that:

- Teachers are expected to design their sessions to be learner-centered
- The roles of the teachers are supposed to be of facilitation and guidance
- Intercultural learning is only explicitly included in year 3 textbook and it is concerned with developing and raising awareness, developing positive attitudes, developing understanding, and comparing between the self and the others.

The presentation of the textbooks shows that textbook designers have integrated dimensions from curriculum guidelines particularly with regard to learner-centeredness and intercultural learning (Ministère de l’Education Nationale, 2019). It is not indicated in the textbooks how long teachers should take to cover a given unit. However, during their trainings, teachers are informed by inspectors on what is expected from them in terms of timeline. In addition, the time allotted to each unit is stated in the curriculum that is provided to the teacher by the inspectors or which could be found on the government’s website. For instance, for the unit ‘we are a family’ which is unit 6 of year 3 textbook, the teachers are expected to cover it throughout a period of 6 weeks and it is supposed to be allocated 18 hours of teaching (General Inspectorate of Pedagogy, 2018, p. 8).

I have asked my teacher participants about the way they planned their lessons and the place of the textbook in their practice. In his reflective text, Ahmed has stated that:

‘Most of the time teachers are urged to adopt the textbook and to be a slave of it. This means that the teacher cannot plan his lessons independently of the textbook therefore it remains a masterpiece for the teacher’.

(Ahmed’s reflective text, 2016; emphasis mine)

During our interview, Ahmed also mentioned being a slave to the textbook:

‘As I told you at the beginning that the teacher has got a programme to finish by the end of the year and he has got a unit plan and a lesson plan but in fact it’s difficult to fulfil either this unit plan or this lesson plan because first of all to tell you the truth most teachers buy time through the years they become accustomed or they become slaves of the textbook because there is not really something which is ... they don’t find ... how to say ... that fruits or benefits either from the learners who tend to work to learn to study for specific purposes which means to have an exam a written exam’.
It should be noted that throughout the whole five weeks which I have spent working with Ahmed, each time I ask a question about his practice, he replies by saying ‘the teacher’ or ‘teachers’. In fact, though Ahmed is talking about his own practice or his beliefs, he uses the third person singular or plural. This could indicate a style of expressing one’s modesty or a desire to distance oneself, but it could also mean that Ahmed prefers to present the issues related to his profession as matters that concern a community of practice he belongs to, i.e., other teachers who share the same concerns, beliefs or practices. From Ahmed’s reflective text, our conversations and interviews, as well as my classroom observations, it is clear that the textbook has a central place in shaping Ahmed’s practice. This indicates that the textbook is assigned an authoritative symbolic place which is reinforced by inspectors and sustained by the practices of the teacher.

In fact, Selma has also made reference to the importance of the textbook for an English teacher. From an informal conversation that I had with Selma, she mentioned that in addition to be a teacher of English, a principle English teacher in her school, she is also a teacher-trainer. She has been solicited by the lead inspector to ‘take under her wings’ student-teachers whom she invites to her classrooms in order to observe her sessions. She also acts as an examiner of teachers-to-be. While discussing her role as an examiner she shared an anecdote about a student-teacher that she failed at the confirmation exam because of an inappropriate use of the textbook. Selma was observing the candidate during a teaching session that focused on a reading activity and from Selma’s narration, the student-teacher did not refer to the textbook at all. ‘How can you teach a reading activity without asking the learners to use their textbooks?’ Selma wondered. ‘Not once, did she look at the textbook’. As intriguing as this anecdote could be, it is a reminder that teachers in this context have to use the textbook. This sense of obligation can also be found in Yacine’s accounts.

Researcher: And which kind of materials do you use to prepare ... How does your routine look like in terms of lesson preparation?

Yacine: Yes. That’s an interesting question, because in our schools we don't work the way we like to because we must follow a programme. We have a curriculum to finish. So we plan our lessons according to what the curriculum says.

(Interview with Yacine, 2016; emphasis mine)

Throughout my discussion with Yacine, he uses ‘curriculum’ and ‘textbook’ interchangeably which leads to understanding that the textbook is the curriculum. As a result of the examination of the above statements, it could be concluded that the role of the teacher as interpreted from the perspective of Ahmed, Yacine and Selma is to teach the content of the textbook in a timely
manner. Thus, the centrality and authoritative symbolic power of the textbook is justified by a top-down policy (i.e., the curriculum and the inspectors).

In what follows I examine the textbook more thoroughly with a focus on (inter)cultural representation and discourses. I first present the findings of the content analysis followed by the findings of the thematic analysis.

4.2 Content analysis of the textbooks

At the risk of being repetitive, the content analysis of the corpus of textbooks is focused on two key indicators or codes: southern frames of reference and northern frames of reference. Those frames of reference include any mention of people, places, perspectives, practices, beliefs, and symbols, objects which could be connected or traced back to either the conceptual north or the conceptual south. It has been explained in chapter 3 (section 3.4.1) that I am using the concepts of south and north as a metaphor which could be considered an equivalence of the global north and the global south. Furthermore, the identified frames of reference are attributed positive or negative values. Those values are connotations associated with the references in context. As explained in section 3.4.1, contexts of war and poverty are considered negative attributes and contexts of development and discovery are considered positive attributes. The following excerpts (see Table 5) from the textbooks corpus further illustrate how the framework of analysis has been applied.

Table 5: References attributed positive values from Getting Through SE2 (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive South</th>
<th>Positive North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘The Amazon rainforest is one of the world’s greatest conservation challenges. There are four countries with areas inside the Amazon ecosystem: Brazil, Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia. This vast equatorial forest is home to one fifth of the planer’s plant and animal species. Carbon stocks equivalent to more than a decade (ten years) of global fossil fuel emissions are stored in the wood of its trees’ (p.60)</td>
<td>‘Germany ______ join the Security Council soon because it is the third economic power in the world’ (p.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Dag Hammarskjold, who served as Secretary General of the UN from 1953 to 1961, ______ organize peacekeeping task forces’ (p.40)</td>
<td>‘Imagine you are in Hyde Park at the Speakers’ Corner, in London, England. Read the information in the tip box below. Then complete the speech that follows’ (p.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The Algerian government will ban cigarette smoking next year. Cigarette smoking _________________’(p.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘However, solar energy is by far the most viable. It is cheaper, safer and less polluting. SONELGAZ has already built power plants in Biskra, Djelfa, Hassi Rmel and other localities in the South of Algeria’ (p.64)

‘Above all, let’s stop shifting the blame. People start pollution, people can stop it. When enough Americans realize this we’ll have a fighting chance in the war against pollution. [USA flag] Keep America beautiful’ (p.54)

‘Your conservation plan will be presented in the form of a prospects. It will include:
A. a fact sheet synthesizing the main conservation measures that have already been taken by the Algerian government’ (p.72)

‘In Los Angeles, researchers have found that people living near airports have a higher rate of mental illness than people living eight kilometres away (…) This health alert against the dangers of noise pollution is seriously taken by the American public authorities’ (p.69)

‘The Arabs made important contributions to mathematics.’ (p.96)

‘Interview with Bill Gates, (Man of the Year 2005)

...I: How much money have you donated this year?

G: $3.2 million’ (p.122)

As it can be observed in this collection of excerpts that the cultural frames of references include people, countries, institutions, currency (e.g., $), ethnic groups, companies and so on. In all these excerpts, the positioning of the references is established in accordance to the text’s, the activity’s or the unit’s context. Those examples illustrate the complexity of putting a pin on what is a cultural representation and what is not. Therefore, in considering the textbook’s representational repertoire as a complex construction of frames of references, the coding process helps to position the textbook discourses in a broader context. In this textbook (Getting Through SE2), there is an overall balance between the positive representations of the north and the south, but the difference of treatment is more visible while examining the nature of the negative connotations attached to the northern references in contrast with the southern ones. In fact, the instances where the south is represented in a negative context other than a recall for a history of colonisation or oppression, are instances of car accidents or natural disasters such as the 2003 earthquake that took place in the Algerian city Boumerdes. However, the negative contexts where the north is positioned, besides a history of imperialism, are more complex and are not only related to accidents or natural disasters. Rather, they are more related to human-made damage such as pollution. For example, the company Exxon was referenced in a context of pollution (p.62) while the Algerian national oil and gas company Sonalgaz was mentioned in context of innovation (p.64).
Guided by this process of coding, the following tables (Table 6, Table 7 and Table 8) summarise the number of references made about the metaphoric north and south and the values attributed to those references in each of the three textbooks respectively. Each table has three main columns (positive attributes, negative attributes and total) and two main rows (northern frames of reference and southern frames of reference).

Table 6: Content analysis of 'At the Crossroads SE1'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At the Crossroads SE1</th>
<th>Positive attributes</th>
<th>Negative attributes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern frames of reference</strong></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern frames of reference</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Content analysis of 'Getting Through SE2'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting Through SE2</th>
<th>Positive attributes</th>
<th>Negative attributes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern frames of reference</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern frames of reference</strong></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Content analysis of 'New Prospects SE3'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Prospects SE3</th>
<th>Positive attributes</th>
<th>Negative attributes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern frames of reference</strong></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern frames of reference</strong></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation of the findings:

- First: At the Crossroads SE1

It can be observed that in Table 6, the number of northern frames of references (89) exceeds the number of southern frames of references (51) and there is an overwhelming tendency to attribute positive values or connotations to either of those references, given that I could only identify 7 negative attributes associated to northern references and 4 negative attributes associated to the southern references.

The textbook At the Crossroads SE1 has 175 pages and the pictures illustrated in the cover page has a girl looking in a microscope, a boy holding a book of Shakespeare, a panoramic view of Algiers, the Algerian Capital, and a picture of Big Ban. The heading of the cover page has been written in Arabic: People’s Democratic Republic of Algeria and Ministry of National Education. The title of the textbook is written in English and addressed to Secondary Education, year one, which is written both in Arabic and English (see Figure 4). The contexts of all those references are positive, illustrating sites (UK, Algeria) and actions (learning, studying). The reference to Algeria is coded in NVIVO as ‘south positive’ and the references to Shakespeare and the Big Ban are each coded as ‘north positive’. Another example of the northern frames of references, attributed a positive value is a letter sent by a Finnish student named Kirsi, addressed to Amel, an Algerian student. In the letter Kirsi speaks about her family, her school and her country Finland (At the Crossroads SE1, 2006, p. 21). For a way of illustration, other northern positive references in the same book include Jim, Bob and Jack who played basketball from 2 p.m. to 4p.m. (p.61) or an excerpt adapted from Jean de La Fontaine’s fable of the Oak Tree and the Reeds (p.68).

Concerning, the references to the south that have positive connotations, we can count a picture of the building of the Algerian Radio and TV with Algerian flags meant to make a reference to communication which is the theme of the first unit: getting through (p.14). Other examples of southern positive references are dialogues where Hind Benmouloud and Djamila take part in (p.37), bearing in mind that those names are Algerian sounding names. Illustrations and references to tales from the Arabian Nights were as well coded as southern and positive.

The negative references are considerably outnumbered by the positive ones, and the few negative connotations that are about the north include an excerpt adapted from Charles Dickens’ Hard Times saying ‘there was neither a leisure centre nor a public library where children could go’ (p.57), or in a ‘fill in the gaps activity’ with the sentence ‘The _____ of black slaves was a major problem in 18th Century America’ (p. 137). The word to be used by the students in the latter sentence is ‘emancipation’. Coding those references as negative is justified with the fact that the
textbook designers have taken informed decisions in choosing an excerpt or a sentence over another and that those choices are not random. With regard to the negative connotations associated with southern frames of references, only 4 were identified. Two of those references are instructions of role play activities. The instructions read:

‘Pair work: Imagine your partner and you are respectively John and Peter. Use the information between brackets in the dialogue below to write meaningful sentences with the conjunctions when, while and as. Check your answers with Reminder II on the next page’ (At the Crossroads SE1, 2006, p. 61; emphasis original).

‘Imagine you are a British dietician. Describe orally the graph above using the plan below’ (At the Crossroads SE1, 2006, p. 98)

In both of those activities, the students are asked to roleplay identities for the purpose of using the language fluently and correctly. I coded those two references as negative, because I find them problematic as they put northern identities (John, Peter and British dietician) as a model to imitate or attain, neglecting the potential of the students’ input as individuals from the south. Such statement negates the identities of the students who can perform the dialogues or texts without stepping into the shoes of imaginary identities from the north or inner circle. Accordingly, Kramsch (1997, p. 363) argues that the native speaker is indeed ‘an imaginary construct’. Therefore, asking the students to be British or to imagine that they are John or Peter falls within a reproduction of imaginary constructs that delegitimises practices other than those of the centre. This argument has led to coding the abovementioned activity instructions as negatively connoting southern frames of references.

The next example of southern reference to which was attributed a negative value in NVIVO is a text about George who was born of slave parents in the US of the 1860s and who was not strong. So he did ‘women’s’ work such as washing and ironing. He finally went to school and obtained college degrees in Agriculture (At the Crossroads SE1, 2006, p. 127). This text about George is aimed for an activity to match and reorder the text’s paragraphs in order to form a coherent whole. Here, the direct reference to black slaves is coded as a negative connotation to the south. In the same text, references to the plantation master and to the fact that ‘George washed white people’s clothes in order to pay for his meals and books’ (ibid), are coded as north and negative.

Second: Getting Through SE2

The findings presented in Table 7 result from the content analysis of the second English textbooks: Getting Through SE2. The textbook counts 207 pages. It can be observed that there is a balance between the total number of northern (96) and southern references (98) which implies
that there is not a discourse that is more dominant than the other. Despite this balance, there is a higher number of positive values attributed to southern frames of reference (88) in comparison with the northern ones (81); and a higher number of negative values attributed to northern frames of reference (15) in comparison to the southern ones (10).

For a matter of illustration, here is an example (Figure 5) where northern frames of reference are attributed negative connotations:

![Image](image_url)

Figure 5: French colonisers in the Kasbah of Algiers (Getting Through SE2, 2006, p. 19, sic original)

In this text, the north is France and more specifically the colonial France. In NVIVO, I have attributed two negative values to this excerpt, given that for each one of the two paragraphs, different discursive strategies are used to describe the French dockers and the privileged French community living in Algeria during the colonisation period. The reason why two negative values were attributed to one same text is because I have taken into consideration the ‘weight’ of those references. In Gray’s (2010) application of the representational repertoire, ‘weight’ refers to the emphasis and consideration dedicated to a given content made through ways of different discursive strategies (e.g., repetition). This ‘weight’ can be extracted from NVIVO through the function ‘Coverage’ which is the percentage of space that is occupied by a given node/code. Accordingly, in this example, the author has written two distinctive paragraphs that I coded separately. With regard to negative references to the south, this text counts two, one in each paragraph, where the characters are presented as victims: ‘My mom cries but the poor old dad never says a word’ and ‘All day long, we look at the toys displayed in the shop windows and envy the children of the French colonists playing in the park’ (ibid, emphasis mine).
Third: New Prospects SE3

The last textbook to be analysed is New Prospects SE3 for final year secondary school students. It counts 270 pages and covers 6 units. In Table 8, it can be noted that the number of norther references (131) is higher than the number of southern references (109) whether in terms of positive attributes or negative attributes.

The rationale for attributing positive or negative values for the frames of references in this textbook remains similar to the previous textbooks’. The particularity of the process of coding of New Prospects SE3 is that the number of southern references was higher in the first units of the textbook, and it started decreasing towards the last units. This is explained by the fact that in the first unit, for instance, the main theme is ‘exploring the past’, where the focus is on ‘ancient civilisations’ which focused on Algeria. For a matter of illustration, Figure 6 is a snapshot of a text from the first unit about the history of Algeria and the populations that settled in over the past centuries. In this case the discourse used is one of prestige and celebration. Such discursive strategies constitute the basis for attributing a positive value to different elements of the textbook’s representational repertoire.

On the other hand, the last units focus on business, education and space exploration. In fact, the north is put forward in unit 3 where the topic is about education and mainly education systems around the world (e.g. India, US, UK) and students are asked to compare between their own school system and the British one for instance. Furthermore, the fifth unit is about astronomy and the solar system and the texts and images used to support the theme make many references to contributions from the north. Finally, the last unit is called ‘we are family’ and focuses on the theme of feelings and emotions using content about the way ‘British and Americans’ express their feelings (New Prospects SE3, 2008, pp. 174-175). This particular text is further discussed in Chapter 6 because I could observe a lesson where this text is discussed.
To summarise, the quantitative examination of the three textbooks has allowed to situate the content and representation repertoire of each textbook in a frame of reference taking into consideration the global north/global south metaphor and the ideological positioning of the textbook designers. It was noted that this positioning was determined by the topics of each unit, so when for example, the topics were about tales or technological inventions, many northern references were utilised. This is understandable given the richness of literary resources available in English and the technological innovations brought from the north. Southern references were not neglected by the authors of the three textbooks because there were texts from the Nigerian...
writer Chinua Achebe and references to the contributions of Arabs and Persians to the field of Astronomy, for instance. Across the three textbooks, there was a balance between the names of the characters since there were as much Algerian sounding names as much as there were Johns and Smiths. However, the role or jobs assigned to the latter were those of journalists or scientists, while Omar or Karim were more often imaginary characters used in contexts of casual activities. Finally, the distinction between the north and the south was found to be necessary because it sheds light on the effort of the textbook designers in making the textbook polyphonic (Bakhtin, 1986), i.e., deconstructing the broad range of voices and perspectives. However, the technique has proved to have limitations as well especially with regard to determining which references fall into the category of south and which ones fall into the category of north. The complex nature of those references makes it challenging to categorise them following binary frame. For example, an international organisation such as the United Nations Security Council which serves a global purpose has members that could be situated whether in the north or in the south. So the organisation in itself was not coded in NVIVO. However, the text mentioned the permanent members of the organisation which are economically and technologically strong states (Getting Through SE2, 2006, p.38). Therefore, those members were assigned a code as ‘northern frames of reference’. To extend on this analysis, I examine further two more themes in the next section.

4.3 Thematic analysis: banal nationalism and essentialism

The southern and northern frames of references are considered as themes that have guided the first stage of the textbooks analysis. Among the other themes which have emerged as the result of the scrutiny of the content analysis are: banal nationalism and essentialism.

4.3.1 Banal nationalism

Banal nationalism has been defined in chapter 2 (section 2.2.1) as the subtle reference the nation through symbols such as flags. It has been noted from the above content analysis that many of the southern and northern frames of reference were about countries and nations (e.g., US, Brazil, France, etc.). They have been mentioned explicitly in texts and sometimes only through a picture of a flag or other national symbol. However, among the situations of banal nationalism that stood out are related to Algeria. In fact, in the three textbooks examined, Algeria is overwhelmingly represented. References to Algeria as a nation were made through a display of flags and activities mentioning Algerian institutions such as schools and other governmental bodies. The following picture illustrates how the Algerian flag has been integrated into an image in an attempt to associate the country with strength and development.
Figure 7: Insertion of the Algerian flag (Getting Through SE2, 2006, p. 55)

This content is one of the resources that the teachers can choose to use for their teaching in Unit 2 of the second textbook. The poem is from Ralph Waldo Emerson, an American essayist, lecturer, philosopher, and poet. The picture in black and white on the right represents industrialisation and construction. The discourse constructed while combining the black and white image with the poem’s content, the idea represents the individuals’ role in building the nation. The Algerian flag in its full colours has been added to construct a fragmented discourse celebrating the Algerian nation.

While discussing national symbols in the textbook with Yacine, a teacher participants, spoke about an image in Getting Through SE2 textbook that his students considered fake. The image is one of the UN peacekeepers on their while vehicles and their blue helmets. One of the UN peacekeepers’ armband has the Algerian flag in bright red, green and white colours. Yacine’s students argued that it was photoshopped, i.e., added to the original picture (Figure 8). During our interview who stated:

‘In Make Peace and, uh, they modified something and it is quite good. Here for example, this is the U.N blue helmet and they focused on the flag, the Algerian flag. That is photoshopped. They put it in on a purpose’ (Interview with Yacine, 2016).
Here, Yacine is referring to the textbook designers when he says ‘they’. For Yacine, the Algerian flag in the armband is a deliberate modification added by the authors of the textbook. He adds:

‘Uh, my students discovered that it is photoshopped. They said it is not real. The Algerian flag is not real. Yes, and so what? Does it mean that we don’t help each other? Does it mean that we are not peaceful? We are peaceful. And here, I would mention our experience with terrorism and how we dealt with it, how we fought it and how we solved our problem peacefully. And this is a way and introducing the idea that Algerians too are peaceful’ (Interview with Yacine, 2016).

Yacine agrees with his students regarding the fabricated image, but chooses to see beyond the image and rather focus on the symbolic message of peace intended from this picture and to explore how peace was Algeria’s solution to fight terrorism. Here, Yacine is referring to the 90s Black Decade and how the only way out from the civil war has been to opt for peace, between the civil society, the government and the terrorists. My question for Yacine then was about how comfortable he feels discussing the topic of war with his students.

Researcher: And do you feel confident using those examples in your classroom?

Yacine: Yes. Yes. Yes. I’m not going to mention the dark side of it. They are teenagers. They accept what I say, and I say only the positive part. There is a dark side in everything but I don’t I don’t mention it.

Researcher: Why?
Yacine: In order to give them hope. In order to give them a national value. I want my learners to believe in their country. I want them to even if you want to go out go out, go abroad, learn something, then come back, try to make a change. Don’t wait for the others to make a change for you. And this is our responsibility. Yes.

(Interview with Yacine, 2016).

From this discussion with Yacine, it is clear that his students are not insensitive to banal nationalism. They have noticed the Algerian flag which started a conversation about peace and positive national values. For Yacine, he has a responsibility to promote those positive perceptions about the nation even if it means putting aside the ‘dark side’ as he says.

After my conversation with Yacine, I have tried to identify the source of the image or to find images with Algerian UN peacekeepers, without success. However, I have found a number of images of UN peacekeepers from around the world with the flag of their countries as an armband. Here is an image with Irish UN peacekeepers in Figure 9.

![Image of Irish UN peacekeepers](Gorriz, 2011)

Though there is a possibility for the textbook’s image to be authentic, the students’ suspicion is confirmed by the quality of the colours and the fact that this is not the only instance where a flag has been added in their textbook. Therefore, the above-mentioned examples are a clear illustration of banal nationalism and the conscious effort of the textbook designers to paint a positive image of Algeria by associating the flag to discourses of peace and development.

Banal nationalism is a central dimension in Risager’s (2018, 2020) National studies reading which was reviewed Chapter 2. On the other hand, one of the questions Risager asks is about the positioning and representation of actors (publishers, authors, teachers and students) with regard
to: i) their national identities and ii) in relation to historically established global power relations. The authors of the tree textbooks form more or less the same team with two authors who participated in the creation of all three books: S.A. Arab and B. Riche. All authors are Algerian professors who work as lecturers and researchers in Algerian universities. I only managed to find academic papers published by B. Riche whose interests are in literature, namely postcolonial literature in French and English (e.g., Yassine and Riche, 2012) and discussions on otherness and orientalism (Riche and Rezzik, 2016). Those scholarship orientations are visible in the selection of the resources that constitute the textbooks’ representational repertoire, but also in the fact that there is a clear tendency to bring to a level of balance the northern and southern frames of references. This is observed in the choice of the names of the characters for instance. With regard to the students and the teachers, their national affiliation as textbook users is considered Algerian. This is constructed through forward notes or letters addressed to the textbook users at the start of each textbook and also through the formulation of activity instructions and project themes. The textbooks are designed and presented as a translation of the objectives set by the Algerian Ministry of Education and are addressed to Algerian students and teachers. Regarding the construction of the local sociocultural environment, it is as well-positioned in Algeria and its various regions. This can be deduced from the use of culture-specific concepts without adding translation or further explanation. For example, in the following excerpt from a text entitled ‘What people eat’, some Algerian local dishes are mentioned without description:

‘The Friday breakfast is ‘a shared meal’, with all the members of the family more likely to be sitting together than during weekday meals. The Friday lunch is the most ritualised meal of the week. A Mesfouf with peas or a kouskous with meat and vegetables is generally served’ (Getting Through SE2, 2006, p. 25; emphasis original).

In this example, there is an assumption that Friday is a weekend day which is the case in Algeria and that the textbooks are used by Algerians only. I have not identified elements from neither one of the three textbooks where there is a consideration of the possibility that Algerian schools could host nationals from other countries. Moreover, given that the textbooks’ target users are Algerians, the languages referred to in the textbook besides English are Arabic and French. In the glossary for example at the end of each textbook there is a table with concepts in English and their corresponding Arabic translation. However, French is used in activities mainly about pronunciation and phonetic transcription. There is no reference to Tamazight language in neither of the three textbooks. All those elements correlate with the fact that the textbooks are locally designed and published.
With regard to the ethnic and political sense of the national, on the one hand, countries like Brazil, France, US and the UK were not referred to as multicultural and multiracial. They were approached mainly from the political stance as a national entity. There were few exceptions where the American indigenous population was mentioned but not with much depth or complexity. Regarding the different ethnicities of Algeria few references were identified. For instance, the use of an image of a road sign directing towards a town known to be home to the Tamazight community (Getting Through SE2, 2006, p. 72) and a text originally published in French but translated to English of the author Taos Amrouche, who is known to write about Kabylia, a Tamazight Region in Algeria (p. 115) were hints but not focal topics. Various resources of the representational repertoire also involve examples citing different towns from the north or the south of the country, but not discussed as a central material.

The other analytical category in Risager’s (2018; 2020) National and Postcolonial readings concerns the representation of countries or nations and their historical relationships with Algeria. There are in fact references to a wide range of countries such as Brazil, Japan, Italy, China, US, Nigeria, Egypt, France, and UK (mainly Great Britain), etc. Texts and images are about various topics such economy, environmental issues and politics. However, through the examination of the northern frames of references in comparison to the southern ones, I could observe that African countries are not given much space. At the exception of Nigeria while discussing some of Chinua Achebe’s works in the first and third textbooks and Egypt while discussing the Pharaohs in the third textbook. One other exception is in the second textbook, where there is a clear positioning of the authors in favour of the economic autonomy of African countries (as a whole) and pointing out the disadvantages of the aid culture and charity model. In an activity where the students are asked to formulate argumentative paragraphs, the supportive statements provided are as follows: ‘African countries rich; African long history/ culture; people lazy and depend on charity; stopping conflicts to allow people to work on the land’ (among other statements) (Getting Through SE2, 2006, p. 131).

With regard to histories of colonisation and slavery, the authors did not shy out in putting those topics at the forefront. France is represented as Algeria’s former coloniser in several occasions (e.g., Figure 5) and the US’s history of slavery is illustrated by explicit images and texts. Even though the activities that follow the texts and images about former empires do not address the topic directly but rather focus on language-oriented questions, there is a clear positioning of the authors recognising colonialism and slavery as negative historical events. Few exceptions are identified which are in the excerpts addressing Columbus’s exploration of North America. In fact, the Eurocentric discourse considering Columbus as an explorer who ‘discovered’ America rather than an invader, is reproduced in an uncritical manner.
4.3.2 Essentialism

Essentialism has been defined in Chapter 1 as the act of reducing something to its essence. For Holliday (2011, p. 4) ‘essentialism presents people’s individual behaviour as entirely defined and constrained by the cultures in which they live so that the stereotype becomes the essence of who they are’. The following examples are extracted from each textbook.

First, in the first textbook, At the Crossroads SE1, an adapted text about George Washington Carver entitled ‘the Making of a Scientist’, says that George did ‘women’s work’ (Figure 10).

Figure 10: Extract from adapted text ‘Making of a Scientist’ (At the Crossroads SE1, 2006, p.127)

The text on the life of George Washington Carver is an adaptation but the source is cited nowhere. I have nevertheless searched for his biographies online and in neither of the ones I have identified are the house chores he did characterise as women’s work. Here are a few examples:

‘Carver spent much of his boyhood assisting Susan with domestic chores since his fragility apparently meant he could not help Moses with the farm chores. As a boy, Carver learned how to cook, mend, do laundry, and embroider. He also developed an interest in plants and helped Susan with the garden’ (American Chemical Society National Historic Chemical Landmarks, 2005).

‘George was not a strong child and was not able to work in the fields, so Susan taught the boy to help her in the kitchen garden and to make simple herbal medicines. George became fascinated by plants and was soon experimenting with natural pesticides, fungicides and soil conditioners’ (Bagley, 2013).

In each of the two last extracts of the biography the activities of George Washington Carver as a boy born into slavery and developing a passion for plants which then led him to become a recognised scientist, are used to set the scene and the context where he was nurtured. An argument could be made that ‘as a boy’, ‘Susan taught to the boy’ could be markers emphasising that males at the time were expected to work in the farm and not in the kitchen. Thus, when the adaptation in the textbook became ‘he did ‘women’s’ work’, one could argue that it is an expression to represent the reality of that time. However, another argument could be made
where it is the ideology of the author adapting the biography which slipped into the text. Both interpretations are plausible given that the textbook at the Crossroads SE1 was published in 2006. Here, essentialism is constructed through a simplistic and reductionist association between an action and a gender. Thus, it could be argues that essentialism here takes the form of sexism: an ideology that has been considered normative for centuries in different societies. The fact that such text is still used in the Algerian classroom illustrates how outdated the materials are. On the other hand, the activities following the text are mainly about reorganising the paragraphs and grammar in general. This means that there is no instruction inviting the students to critically evaluate the text or discuss the life conditions of that time. I did not have the chance to attend a session where this text was discussed in class.

The following example is also from an adapted text. This time it is about how British and American people express feelings.

![Figure 11: Extract from Text entitled ‘Feelings’ (New Prospects SE3, 2008, p. 74)](image)

‘Nearly all Americans believe that it is better to share what they think or feel than hide it’ and ‘the traditional British reserve, a national tendency to avoid showing strong emotion of any kind’ are an illustration of how essentialism is formulated by considering the population of a country as monolithic by generalising emotional traits, in this case. Moreover, even if the text says ‘nearly all’, or ‘few Americans’, which could make the statements more nuanced, the discourse is still one that views people as defined by some sort of national culture.

### 4.4 Discussion and conclusion

In this chapter, I have applied a framework of analysis where the unit of evaluation is not ‘the nation’ but rather ‘the cultural frames of references’ which are whether positioned in the global
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south or the global north. The findings show that there is a clear effort from the textbook
designers to integrate positive imageries and stories from both parts of the globe. This finding
correlates with the study of Risager (2018) where she argues that the inclusion of references from
different parts of the globe is an indication of the worldliness of the material and an effort to
connect with and know more about the rest of the world. Nevertheless, this study extends
Risager’s study in showcasing how ideology can be voiced in a more powerful and explicit manner
when it is about a negative experience such as colonialism. In fact, like any other discourse,
ideology has a seat at the table. However, this ideology is more apparent with the references
which have been attributed negative values, such as the text about the French colonisers who
have all the toys and ships and who oppress the locals. Here the authors of the text have chosen
to provide a black and white picture, free from nuances. In fact, the colonial history is a history of
oppression and one should not shy away from stating it clearly. Thus, to decolonise discourses is
to call it what it really is, i.e., oppressive. However, even in texts where the ideology of the
authors has the potential of triggering discussions, the tasks are designed in a way which only
focusses on grammar or language skills. This finding is consistent with Abid and Moalla’s (2020)
study which demonstrate that tasks that address explicitly intercultural competences are very
rare.

This is where classroom observation can help answer many questions about the way the learners
and their teachers work with ideologically laden texts. In fact, as much as some texts can be
considered ideologically laden, others are superficial. Despite the variety of frames of references
related to both the global south and the global north, there is still superficiality in representation
and oversimplification of the tasks accompanying the texts and images. Accordingly, the findings
from the above analysis align with other research arguing that such superficiality prevents the
promotion of intercultural understanding and awareness (Davidson and Liu, 2018), and may as
well create a bias among learners and hinder their appreciation of the self and the other unless
there is an intervention from the teacher (Song, 2013). Thus, this study’s outcomes align with
Davidson and Liu (2018) who found that textbooks perpetuate stereotypical discourses about the
students’ countries and cultures. However, the findings discussed in this chapter extend our
understanding of how oversimplified texts and tasks are also catered to young learners to
promote predominantly a positive image of their home cultures and country. This can be
explained by the desire of Algerian education policymakers who aim to educate learners on the
importance of national citizenship and appreciation of what is here a prescribed national identity.
Moreover, in his study of McConachy (2018) makes a very important point with regard to the role
of the teacher in encouraging students not to take the content of the textbooks for granted and
to approach it critically. Similarly, Yacine students have felt confident and comfortable showing
criticality towards the inclusion of the Algerian flag in the textbook’s image. This finding is a
confirmation that, if given the chance and the tools, the students can develop complex ideas and
improve their intercultural competences.

On the other hand, the lack of representation and non-representation can be as informative as
what is actually represented. With regard to the languages which compose the text of the
textbooks studied here, English is the main language. But, Arabic and French have also found their
way in the glossary of terms. However, there is no mention of Tamazight. For a textbook that is
used across the national territory, the denial that is reserved to Tamazight language echoes a
language policy that has for long marginalised an ethnic and cultural community. Over the last 5
to 6 years, the integration of Tamazight language into the visible linguistic fabric of Algeria has
been progressively introduced through trilingualism (e.g., banners of public institutions). For this
reason, I look forward to the next generation of English textbooks to see how the question of
Algeria’ multilingualism has been addressed. Comparatively to this lack of representation of the
ethnic populations of Algeria in the English textbooks, Azimova and Johnston (2012) who have
investigated the representation of Russian ethnic diversity in 9 US-published textbooks used for
teaching the Russian language to English speakers in the United States, have found that even
though ‘the Russian language is owned by a hugely diverse array of peoples’, their ‘diversity is
glaringly absent in the Russian-speaking world portrayed in Russian language textbooks’ (Azimova
and Johnston, 2012, p. 346). They argue that their invisibility is misleading and denies ownership
of the Russian language to many populations and individuals who speak Russian as a first or
second language, as well as lingua franca. In the case of the corpus of textbooks analysed in this
study, the fact that the glossary includes French and Arabic and excludes Tamazight is an example
of the poor and inconsiderate practice.

One of the key findings to be highlighted from the above analysis is the reoccurrence of
references about Algeria in the form of banal nationalism. Similarly to Stranger-Johannessen’s
(2015) study investigating Ugandan textbooks of English where references to Uganda were
dominant, there is considerable evidence of the centrality of Algeria and Algerian cultural
artefacts in the three textbooks analysed here. This could be considered another way of
constructing an essentialist discourse as part of nationalist discourse. In fact, Keesing (1990, p. 48)
argues that ‘our essentialist, reified conception of ‘culture’, having passed into everyday Western
discourse, has been adopted by Third World elites in their cultural nationalist rhetoric’. Apart
from the labelling of countries of the global south which have endured colonialism as ‘Third
World’, a label which I find extremely problematic and pejorative, the argument put forward here
is that both in the south and the north, it is possible to 446essentialise in a very strong way.
Moreover, for Keesing, countries that have experienced colonialism reify and exaggerate the
celebration of their cultural heritage and traditions as a way to affirm their cultural identity and the strength of their attachments to their roots which resisted colonial threats.

‘Culture, so reified and essentialised, can be subjected to metonymic transformation, so that the cultural heritage of a people or a post-colonial nation can be represented by its fetishized material forms and performances: ‘traditional dress, dances, artefacts’’

(Keesing, 1990, p. 53)

With regard to intercultural learning, the analysis shows that the textbook designers dedicate little attention to developing intercultural competences and awareness, except when the learner is asked to compare and contrast between the Algerian school system and the British one, and to write a letter describing cultural monuments and showing curiosity towards their pen pal’s culture. This finding is yet another example of the similarities between the Algerian textbooks of English and the Tunisian ones, given that Abid and Moalla (2020, 2021) have demonstrated that the representation of intercultural contacts that would help the development of intercultural competences such as skills of relating and interpreting are absent from the Tunisian English textbooks. Furthermore, the content analysis in this chapter has also demonstrated that characters with Algerian sounding names are relegated to mere mentions or to performing casual actions, whereas the characters with European sounding names are indexed with professional identities that are of journalists or scientists. This key finding aligns with Abid and Moalla’s (2021, pp.9-10) evidence from their analysis of a series of Tunisian English textbooks where ‘Tunisian participants played the role of information seekers as opposed to the foreigner knowledge owner and a rescuer. In other words, the mutual and equal representation of the two cultures inquiring and exchanging information was totally absent in the five textbooks’. Even though there are instances in the Algerian textbooks where the Algerian characters are portrayed as cultural ambassadors of Algeria, writing letters to pen pals about the beauty and the history of their country or reporting on the generosity and solidarity of the Algerian people in times of crisis to a British journalist, the power imbalance is still prevailing especially with regard to representing personalities from the global north as the ones with the authoritative expertise. Thus, expanding on the contribution of Abid and Moalla, this finding reveals the need to challenge imbalanced symbolic powers between references of the global north and the global south in the materials, given that these are potential factors preventing the development of intercultural competences through the language textbooks.

On the other hand, besides intercultural contacts, Byram (1997) suggests procedures to integrate intercultural outcomes in the teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence. However, the analysis above indicates that the tasks are still predominantly focused on language
learning. It is evident from the description of the representational repertoire that the authors have relied on the multiplicity of cultural references which can give the impression of a platform for intercultural learning. However, as the thematic analysis has shown, many of the references are problematic because of their essentialism. As argued by Baker (2011, p. 202), ‘while knowledge of specific cultures may still have an important role to play in developing an awareness of cultural differences and relativisation, this has to be combined with an understanding of cultural influences in intercultural communication as fluid and emergent’. Accordingly, if the textbook does not have an explicit and direct approach to address intercultural communication competences, it is left to the teachers to discuss the complex, fluid and emergent nature of cultural discourses and often times it is the least of their priorities as it will be shown in chapter 5 and 6.

Thus, referring back to the conceptual framework informing this research project (Chapter 2), the analysis of the textbook has recognised the multiple voices and perspectives constructed through texts and images and demonstrating their polyphony and heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1986). It has also shown that the choice of the English texts and topics carries linguacultures which link the English language studied in class to the learners’ cultural background and to their context either by making references to Algeria, the Arab world or Islamic cultures in addition to discuss aspects of the transnational world (Risager, 2007). Moreover, it was highlighted that the lack of representation of Amazighity can inform about the historical struggle for recognition of the indigenous and native community of Algeria. Thus, it can be argued that underrepresentation or the absence of representation is a missed opportunity to develop learners’ symbolic competence (Kramsch, 2011) which would have allowed them to discuss and deconstruct the symbolic powers of the discourses represented in their learning materials. Even though learners are capable of criticality as it was shown with Yacine’s students who criticised the insertion of the Algerian flag in a picture, it is very important that such critical skills are harnessed in the classroom by including tasks that help develop the learners’ critical cultural awareness (Byram, 1997). On the other hand, the findings have also indicated that the lack of explicitness in tasks aiming to develop intercultural awareness and competences (Byram, 1997; Baker, 2011) can hinder the promotion of intercultural learning in the classroom. As for essentialism and banal nationalism, the work of Adrian Holliday and Karen Risager has contributed considerably in unveiling the problems that most language textbooks have, including the ones analysed in this project.

To conclude, in this chapter the mission was to investigate the multiplicity, complexity, positionality and the values attributed to cultural references and the textbooks’ approach to intercultural learning. The quantitative examination of the three textbooks through a content analysis procedure has established that the multiplicity of perspectives was given an important
space. This was determined via the examination of the number of southern and northern frames of reference and the positive and negative values associated with them. The first and the third textbook counted more northern references than the second textbook. The latter appeared to have a balanced number of northern and southern references. The high number of northern references is due to the units’ themes that cover topics such as technology and science which are indexed to northern voices and perspectives. It was argued that there is a need for a more balanced power representation by including more examples of scientific contribution and expertise from the global south. It is in examining the second textbook that the effort to create a balance between these references is observed. This effort has resulted in a fragmented superficial representational repertoire. In terms of the complexity of representation, the length of the texts increases throughout the three stages which leads to progressive exposure to a broader range of vocabulary and more complex texts across the three levels of study. However, one of the key findings is that the main focus of the textbook is to develop linguistic competences. In addition, in the three English textbooks, there is a tendency to use generalisations and simplifications as a discursive strategy that sustains essentialist discourse. Therefore, it is argued that when intercultural learning is not facilitated by the textbooks’ instructions due to essentialisation and the lack of explicit tasks developing intercultural competences, i.e., relating, interpreting, reflecting and criticality. Hence, the teacher is left with the responsibility to create a space for critical discussions with the learners. In the next two chapters, the focus is on the deconstruction of classroom discourse with the aim to explore further interculturality and the roles of the teachers and their pedagogies.
Chapter 5  Exploration of classroom discourse

In the previous chapter, I conducted an analysis of the three English textbooks used in all secondary schools across Algeria with a focus on southern and northern frames of references which aimed to characterise the vision of the textbook designers and to challenge and uncover the reduction of cultural representations to their national situatedness. A number of themes have emerged from the analysis of the textbooks, namely, banal nationalism and essentialist representations constructed through various discursive strategies such as generalisation and simplification. In this chapter, I present the analysis of voice-recorded critical interaction episodes (CIEs) with the purpose of describing and exploring the classroom as small culture in formation (Holliday, 1999; Holliday, 2011). These episodes are extracted from Ahmed’s and Selma’s classrooms and are supplemented with the researcher-analyst’s emic lens documented in the field notes. Thus, this chapter is purposefully exploratory and focuses on the characterisation of the behaviours observed in the classroom (e.g., languaging, time management, pedagogy, etc.). Furthermore, the deconstruction of the classroom discourse is conducted through the medium of the continuum of critical classroom interaction which was presented in Chapter 3 (section 3.4.2).

In other words, in this chapter, I deconstruct the classroom discourse into critical interaction episodes (CIEs) which are positioned within a continuum of critical classroom interaction, with the aim to better understand Ahmed’s and Selma’s classrooms as small cultures on the go.

The analysis of these critical interaction episodes is conducted in an integrative way, in the sense that it is interrogated in relation to other sources of data, namely, the field notes, the teachers’ comments during interviews and students’ input as well. Therefore, this chapter is aimed to partly address the 4th research question:

RQ4  How is intercultural learning constructed in the English language classroom?

5.1  Classroom as small culture

There are a number of studies that take a sociocultural perspective investigating discourses of language classrooms focusing on learning opportunities as they emerge through interaction as reviewed by Hall and Walsh (2002). This chapter puts an emphasis on the complex process of pedagogy and the place of interculturality and intercultural learning within the classroom as small culture. As discussed in the introductory chapter, I understand interculturality as emergent in interaction, where the relevance of identities is made apparent in talk and the individuals in interaction have the agency to determine the significance of their different cultural or social memberships and experiences in shaping their talk. It should also be noted that one of the key
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findings of the previous analysis chapter (chapter 4) demonstrated that the English textbooks of this study have no space specifically dedicated to developing intercultural competences. In addition, I had highlighted in my review of the literature that there were few studies that investigated interculturality in the classroom as mediated by text or textbooks. Among those few studies, I have identified the work of Kramsch (2000) which I characterise as action research permitting methodological decisions to be taken by the teacher/researcher, i.e., Kramsch herself, to evaluate the students’ sociocultural bearing that has been put into or echoed in the text composition. That is to say, in the process of teaching with an intention to analyse the students’ discourses and interaction with the text during the activity of writing a summary, Kramsch had the opportunity to gather valuable information about the intentionality of the students’ word and sentence choice and metalanguage decisions, by simply asking them, for instance, why they have chosen a nominal clause instead of a relative clause (Kramsch, 2000, p. 143). During my fieldwork, I have had somewhat limited opportunities to interact with the teachers or the students after a classroom session. In addition, in a single session of 45 to 50 minutes, the number of critical interaction episodes can vary which have made it almost impossible to ask the teacher or the students what informed their decisions in terms of word choice or reaction, retrospectively. Though, in certain cases, I managed to ask the teacher to clarify the reasons behind some decisions such as making a task as a class activity instead of an activity for several small groups. Therefore, for most situations, I rely on thick description to analyse classroom data which was made possible by an emic perspective. Furthermore, where possible, I take into consideration the comments of the teachers and the students gathered during the observations, discussions and interviews.

One of the characteristics of small cultures formation is routinisation, also called, naturalisation, where, according to Holliday (1999, p. 251) ‘behaviour which is socially constructed for the sake of group cohesion becomes routine’. When I entered the schools and the classrooms of my teacher-participants, I have observed behaviours and routines which I had experienced myself as a learner in Algeria. For instance, following the first 10 to 15 minutes of a session, an administrative staff enters the classroom and greets the class, hands over a big notebook to the teacher, where they immediately write something down, they then both look at the whole class, counting the number of student with a simple brushing gaze, and asking if anyone is absent. This is an illustration of a recurrent scene though there were variations. This big notebook is commonly called ‘registre’ (in French) and is basically aimed to record both teachers’ and students’ attendance. In this chapter, I look into the classroom at the meso level in terms of behaviours that get naturalised and taken-for-granted, but also at the micro-level, i.e., at the actual interaction transcribed from the voice-recoded sessions. The analytical framework which I have developed (see section 3.4.2), is aimed
to guide me in identifying what is important and as stated earlier, it is paramount in this chapter to characterise the routine that is taken for granted in the classroom. Classroom interaction processes are deconstructed into critical interaction episodes (CIEs) and situated within the interaction continuum in a systematic way and allow the recognition of the non-homogeneity and complexity of classroom discourse.

5.1.1 Categorising of critical interaction episodes

The first step of the analysis has been the organisation of data, i.e., the observed classroom sessions, by activities or topics informed by the textbooks or other materials (e.g., exam papers) which have been addressed by both Ahmed and Selma at the time of my presence as an observer. The second stage of organisation has been to transcribe the classroom sessions fully and to identify what constitutes a critical interaction episode. As already established in chapter 3 (see section 3.4.2), a critical interaction episode is a short instance of teaching (which has boundaries) that keeps the focus on meaning co-construction (centre of gravity) and is important for the process of intercultural interaction (significance) (adapted from Kiely and Davis, 2010). Given that one of the leading questions in this project is to determine what makes an interaction intercultural, the significance of the CIEs is determined progressively during the analysis. The next stage of the data organisation is to situate the CIEs within the continuum of critical classroom interaction which ranges from a focus on instructional discourse to a focus on what Kramsch (1985) coins natural discourse. As already discussed, one could argue that in the classroom context, instructional discourse is also a natural form of discourse. For this reason, in the adapted version of the interaction continuum, I prefer to use the term ‘dialogic’ discourse instead of natural discourse. A detailed rationale for this decision has been discussed earlier in chapter 2. The final stage of the categorisation is to examine the three dimensions of the classroom discourse as described in chapter 3 (see section 3.4.2). These three dimensions are (1) the observed roles that the participants appear to adopt, (2) the tasks at hand and (3) the nature of the knowledge exchanged during the interaction. The following table (see Table 9) reiterates the different areas of focus of these three dimensions at each pole of the continuum.
Table 9: Dimensions of the continuum of critical classroom interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional discourse</th>
<th>Dialogic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles</strong></td>
<td>Fixed institutionalised roles (e.g. teacher/learner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogic roles (e.g. visibility of the multiple and fluid identities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
<td>Teacher-oriented and position-centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group-oriented, dynamic and person-centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Focus on content accuracy of facts (monoglossia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on the complexity of social meaning Acknowledgement of heteroglossic and polyphonic processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be noted from the table above that the descriptors of each dimension serve to guide the examination of the CIEs at the micro-level, but also to illustrate the tension that might exist between the two poles of the continuum.

The following figure (Figure 12) presents the process of data categorisation which has facilitated the emergence of relevant themes and the identification of the CIEs that are analysed in the current and following chapter. The transcription of 9 voice-recorded classroom observations (8 sessions with Ahmed and 1 session with Selma) has resulted in approximately 15 000 words. Ahmed was in charge of year one secondary education classrooms (SE1) and year three secondary education classrooms (SE3). Selma, on the other hand, was in charge of the three levels, but I only managed to voice-record one of her sessions with year one students (SE1), though I have attended year 2 classrooms as well (SE2). The process of mapping out the classroom data has been structured on the basis of the level of study, topics discussed in class and emergent themes (see Figure 12). Finally, the critical interaction episodes that are presented in chapters 5 and 6 are illustrative of the main relevant generated themes. Next, I address two emergent themes which help in describing the classrooms as small cultures and in deconstructing the classroom discourse within the continuum of critical classroom interaction. These themes are instructional discourse and dialogic discourse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's classroom</th>
<th>Number and level of classes</th>
<th>Topics discussed in class</th>
<th>Emergent themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed's classrooms</td>
<td>05 Classes of 1st year SE1</td>
<td>Asking for advice</td>
<td>Instructional discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology:</td>
<td>Dialogic discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cell phones, television, the walkman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The invention of the microwave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The invention of the dishwasher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03 Classes of 3rd year SE3</td>
<td>Education systems (UK, US, Algeria)</td>
<td>Essentialised gender roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expressing wishes / regrets</td>
<td>Resisting essentialisation of gender roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of reading</td>
<td>Translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Answering exam questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expressing feelings in different cultures (UK, US, Algeria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selma's classroom</td>
<td>01 Class of 1st year SE1</td>
<td>Communication technology</td>
<td>Instructional discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clothes washing</td>
<td>Essentialised gender roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Translanguaging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SE1: Secondary Education year one  
SE3: Secondary Education year three

Figure 12: Systematic process leading to generating themes
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5.1.2 Instructional discourse

In the context of classroom discourse, instructional discourse is, according to Kramsch (1985), a discourse where the participants are performing their institutionalised roles, i.e., the teacher is leading the instruction and the learner is being responsive to the directions set by the teacher. The tasks, thus, are teacher-oriented where the teacher represents the authority in one way or another. Concerning knowledge, there would be an interest to achieve accuracy whether in terms of content or in terms of form. The critical interaction episodes that are put forward under the theme of instructional discourse share at varying degrees common characteristics. These characteristics converge to illustrate a typically routinised process of communication taking place in the classroom. The episodes that are used here depict fragments of Ahmed’s and Selma’s teaching sessions. Before diving into the analysis of each CIE, I start here (see Table 10) by deconstructing a short extract from CIE1 where the teacher is Ahmed and the students are final year females.

Table 10: Illustration of the IRF process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line number</th>
<th>Voice-recorded excerpt</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>What I believe is intended (my interpretation in italics)</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Initiation (I)</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Who wants to read question number three?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Students (Ss)</td>
<td>Response (R)</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>(more than one student raised their hands and called on the attention of the teacher saying ‘Sir’) Sir! I would like to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>(Ahmed makes eye contact with and nods to one of the students who expressed interest in reading the question, giving permission to speak, starting thus another turn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Student (S)</td>
<td>Response (R)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Read the text and answer the following question (.) what degrees did the writer obtain?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Initiation (I)</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Yes. - Can you answer the question?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This observation has taken place in Ahmed’s classroom, in April 2016, which was few weeks before the baccalaureate exam. The session is about the correction of a language test that was conducted a week prior to the observation. The pedagogical purpose of this session is therefore
to correct and review the test collectively as a class and identify challenges to prepare for the upcoming high-stakes exam (the baccalaureate). In the following table, I have put side by side the transcription of a naturally-occurring short instance of interaction and its reformulation to what I believe is intended but not vocalised.

On the left-hand side of the table above (Table 10), I present the voice-recorded interaction between Ahmed and his students which is initially coded IRRI. However, by taking into consideration the intended meanings and non-verbal behaviours (silence, eye contact, nodding), the interaction between Ahmed and his students appears to rather follow an IRF-IRF-I process. Such a process is observed and recorded throughout the duration of all and every session I have observed with both Ahmed and Selma.

The first three critical interaction episodes CIE1, 2 and 3 have taken place in a setting that I label ‘test correction with year 3 students’. Ahmed is asked by one of the students (S) as soon as he enters the room, about the test results and when they would have a chance to do the correction. The student is reassured immediately and the class is informed that today’s session is actually about the correction of the test. The structure and format of the test are similar to the ones expected at the baccalaureate exam. The test includes firstly, a text about a writer who narrates her career path and her passion for reading; secondly, it includes a section about the comprehension of the text with questions about information, expressions and vocabulary to deduce from the text; and thirdly, there is a section about language mastery with questions mainly about grammar. Some students have volunteered to read the text one paragraph at a time and few comments about the pronunciation of the words were made both by the teacher and other students. For example, while reading a section about the degrees that the author obtained, one student read ‘baccalaureate’ instead of ‘bachelor’s’ and she was called out on it by the teacher and other students. After reading the text, the tasks are discussed one by one between the teacher and the students.

In CIE 1 below, the task is to answer the question from the test’s comprehension section: ‘what degrees did the writer obtain?’ (516). As explained above, the interaction is constructed following IRF sequences which are teacher-led.
Chapter 5

CIE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>514</th>
<th>Ahmed: I</th>
<th>Number three?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Ss: R</td>
<td>Sir? Sir? Sir?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>S: R</td>
<td>Read the text and answer the following question. What degrees did the writer obtain?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Ahmed: I</td>
<td>Can you answer the question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>S: R</td>
<td>The writer obtained baccalaureates and master’s in literary (unintelligible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Ahmed: F I</td>
<td>Euh is it stated baccalaureate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Ss: R</td>
<td>Bachelor (.) Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Ahmed: F I</td>
<td>BACHELOR’S AND?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Ss: R</td>
<td>Masters masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>S: R</td>
<td>In literature?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Ahmed: F I</td>
<td>So can you repeat please the answer? Euh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>S: R</td>
<td>Writer obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>Ahmed: F</td>
<td>Wait a minute. (Name of student) you are not listening. Listen to the way you answer in the test or the exam please pay attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>S: R</td>
<td>The writer obtained (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Ahmed: F</td>
<td>The writer? [obtaINED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Ss: F</td>
<td>Obtained]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Ahmed: F I</td>
<td>Because we have DID it’s the?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>S: F</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>Ahmed: I</td>
<td>The writer obtained what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>S: R</td>
<td>[Bachelor’s and Master’s in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Ahmed: F</td>
<td>Bachelor’s and Master’s in?] literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this episode the teacher initiates the interaction by stating the number of the task with a rising tone (514). It can be observed that students raising their hands and calling out for the teacher’s attention saying ‘Sir?’ (515) is a recurrent and routinised behaviour. The teacher then elects one student among the volunteers whether by citing her name or by approving of her making eye
contact or a head movement. The student (S) reads the task’s instruction then is asked by the
teacher to answer the question of the given task. The response (R) of the student ‘the writer
obtain baccalaureates and master’s in literary’ (518) is received with feedback and follow ups
from the teacher and other students that gradually scaffold the construction of a more
appropriate response approved in (535). The focus of the first feedback (F) in (519) is on the fact
that the student replied ‘baccalaureate’ instead of ‘bachelor’s’. The same assimilation has been
observed at the start of the session while reading the text by another student. This could be
explained by the fact that the two concepts have similar first syllables and given the familiarity
that those students have with the concept of ‘baccalaureate’ the confusion is then easily created.
Thus, the teacher asks the student to refer back to what is stated in the text to review her answer
(519). In the second part of the episode, the focus has shifted towards the appropriate tense to be
used with the verb ‘to obtain’. The contextualisation of the sentence is established co-
constructively with the help of other students (530, 532) and the scaffolding is facilitated by the
teacher in the F moves (527, 529, and 531).

This first episode demonstrates how the three dimensions of instructional discourse, i.e., roles,
tasks and knowledge, are discursively constructed to achieve the accuracy of knowledge. These
discursive practices include repetition, interruption and emphasis framed within an IRF model. In
the case of this example, the accurate answer is ‘bachelor’s’ and not ‘baccalaureate’, as well as
the correct tense to use, is the past tense ‘obtained’. The particular context of this activity being
the preparation for a high stake exam could explain the importance the teacher is giving to
accuracy. In fact, in 527, Ahmed reminds the student of the strategies that she needs to use in
order to be able to provide a correct answer, i.e., paying attention and reflecting on one’s
response.

The next episode is another illustration of a series of IRF sequences shaping the instructional
discourse. It should be noted that the last communicative event of CIE1 is numbered 535 and the
number of the first line of CIE2 is 561. The interaction taking place between these two episodes is
analysed in section 5.1.3.

CIE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Ahmed: Now number three A what degrees did the writer obtain? THE WRITER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Ss: Obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Ahmed: E D please obtained past simple (.). Bachelor’s a Bachelor’s is it with the S or apostrophe S?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this episode, the teacher reiterates the question about what degrees the writer obtained. Though the class has already achieved an appropriate answer in the precedent episode, the teacher chooses to address this same question again, in order to insure the assimilation of knowledge. In line 561, after asking the question, he says in a rising tone and a loud voice followed by a pause ‘THE WRITER?’ so to give the start note to the students who are expected to finish his sentence. Responsively, they do add to his utterance ‘obtaNED’ with an emphasis on the final cluster: _NED (562). Their contribution is an affirmation that they have assimilated the fact that the verb obtains should be conjugated in the past tense. Similar behaviours can be observed in Ahmed’s talk where he would start with a fragment of a sentence and expect his students to complete it, as is the case in line 567: ‘bachelor’s degree and?’. Having the students respond immediately to his input proves that this style of communication has been accepted by the students as part of the classroom small culture. None of the students’ interventions follows this style of communication, where they would start an utterance knowingly expecting the teacher to finish it. This demonstrates that the roles of the participants are clearly inscribed in a well-established tradition of a fixed and linear mode of interaction. Secondly, the teacher is the one initiating turns, therefore, leading the discourse, which makes the task mainly teacher-oriented. Finally, by flagging the importance of using the correct tense in 563 and asking the students about the use of the apostrophe in the same breath, Ahmed has clearly established the importance of content accuracy. Those three dimensions align with Kramsch’s (1985) description of instructional discourse and result in the positioning of CIE1 and CIE2 closer to the left end of the continuum of critical classroom interaction.

The next episode sits along the same lines as the first ones and aims to demonstrate the redundancy of the IRF sequencing during classroom interaction.
In CIE3, the task in hand is an activity about the different ways of formulating conditions in order to express past and present regrets and desire for change in the future. The tense in which the verbs are, is central to this task. In the process of interrogating the accuracy of expressing a wish in the statement ‘I wish she had read a full book’, one of the students is trying to catch up on what I have observed to be a dynamic and rapidly evolving interaction between the teacher and the students. With a rising intonation, she asks about the past perfect of the verb to read (623). The teacher’s approach here is to repeat with a louder voice the statement of the student S1, adding an emphasis on the verb ‘to read’ (624) in order for the rest of the class to be able to hear. The combination of the rising tone and repetition means that the teacher is expecting other students to answer rather than giving the answer himself. Thus, student S2 provides an answer in line 625. The follow up question from the teacher is then about the spelling (626), to which student S2 replies: E A D. The episode ends with Ahmed’s feedback repeating the response of student S2 and adding a context saying ‘to read read read {which is pronounced /tuː/ /riːd/ /red/ /red/}’ (628). In doing so, Ahmed makes reference to a shared knowledge that students had acquired in earlier years which is commonly presented in a table of irregular verbs (as illustrated in the table below). The irregular verbs are lined up alphabetically and the table has three columns: infinitive, past simple and past participle. The students are supposed to learn those three columns by heart which would explain the way the teacher said ‘to read read read’ (628).
which is phonetically transcribed (/riːd/ /red/ red/). Even though the answer was about the past participle rather than the past perfect which was S1’s original question in 623, the student S1 appeared to be satisfied with the responses she had.

Table 11: Table of irregular verbs extracted from 1st year’s At the Crossroads SE1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Past simple</th>
<th>Past participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awake</td>
<td>Awoke</td>
<td>Awoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>Bent</td>
<td>Bent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleed</td>
<td>Bled</td>
<td>Bled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>Wrote</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated earlier, the above episodes illustrate the recurrence of IRF moves. However, in CIE3, though student S1 has initiated a turn by asking a question about the verb’s tense, it is clear that the question was addressed to the teacher who is here considered an authority. In addition, by handing over the responsibility of responding to the rest of the classroom, the teacher is still the one who has the final validating word, approving or disapproving answers. As a result, similarly to CIE1 and CIE2, in this episode, the roles of the participants are institutionalised, the task is under the authority and control of the teacher, and knowledge is accuracy focused. Furthermore, with regard to the classroom’s small culture, the fact that the students have shown an understanding and a satisfaction with the teacher’s reference to the table of irregular verbs illustrates the polyphony of classroom discourse. Moreover, despite being moulded in an instructional flow this interaction is far from linear, because the collaborative dynamic which is instilled in the classroom challenges the fixity of an instructional discourse. Indeed, the fact that students have initiated turns indicate that they are fully aware of the classroom’s codes allowing them to bring contributions to the talk.

The following two episodes are extracted from Selma’s classroom with first year students of School 2. The setting of the classroom is more or less similar to Ahmed’s classrooms as well as most classrooms I was given the opportunity to observe. School 2 is a mixed-gender school where the number of students in the classroom at each level ranges between 35 and 50. This session counts 37 students sitting in rows facing the whiteboard as illustrated in Figure 13 below. The teacher, Selma, has recorded 3 absences which were reported on the ‘registre’.
The activity addressed here is from the textbook ‘At the Crossroads SE1’, unit 4 entitled ‘Eureka!’
The skills aimed for the students to develop during this sequence are: ‘reading an article about
the evolution of telecommunications and writing from a flow chart’ (At the Crossroads SE1, 2006,
p. 4). The text studied here is about the development of means of communication throughout
history (Figure 14). The task is to answer the three following questions based on the text:

Read the text again and answer the questions below:
A. What invention was the ancestor of the radio?
B. What was the problem with long-distance voice communication?
C. What was the solution to the problem? (At the Crossroads SE1, 2006, p. 115)
I have attended two sessions with this particular classroom, one where I was first introduced to the group by Selma and a second time where I was an observer non-participant sitting at the back of the room quietly taking field notes and voice recording on my device. At the beginning of the class, Selma has asked the students to take their textbooks out with at least one textbook per desk. She has instructed them to read in silence the text in page 115 (Figure 14) and to reflect on the questions of task 3 presented above. The students were already familiar with the text as they have worked on it in an earlier session. After a couple of minutes, she asked the first question of the task: ‘what invention was the ancestor of the radio?’ The students were chatting among themselves quietly but nobody provided or suggested an answer. After repeating the question a couple of times without hearing a response back, Selma has asked another question instead: ‘how did men communicate in the past’ (1200).

The following critical interaction episode CIE 4 depicts the start of the classroom interactions.
The above episode is constructed from a series of IRF sequences. By reformulating the task’s question, Selma has managed to position the students in a time frame allowing them to identify more easily an accurate response from the text which is structured chronologically. Thus, by replacing the word ‘ancestor’ by ‘in the past’ and the words ‘invention and radio’ by a more general expression referring to communication, Selma has directed the students’ attention to the first sentences of the text (Figure 14). Accordingly, she has led the IRF moves using questions which aim to shape the bits of responses given by the students. For instance, each of the responses provided by the students in 1203, 1205, 1206, 1208 and 1212 has been built upon in order to take the interaction forward. In addition, similarly to Ahmed’s style of communication
illustrated in CIE 2, Selma has also started utterances expecting the students to complete her sentences (1202, 1212) constructing thus a flow of thoughts which is under her control. This episode is therefore another illustration of instructional discourse where the roles of the participants are clearly determined, i.e., the teacher asks and the students respond. Moreover, the movements of Selma in the classroom (Figure 13) added to her dominating voice and the rapid pace of the instruction indicate that the task is symbolically teacher-oriented. Finally, meaning making is primarily evaluated against the textbook’s content as a central reference from which the students are supposed to deduce ‘accurate’ knowledge.

The next episode is a continuation where Selma carries on shaping and guiding the students to the accurate answers through means of IRF mode of interaction.

CIE 5

| 1221 | Selma | Yes (.). What was the problem with the telephone? |
| 1222 | S7    | Mrs? Mrs? |
| 1223 | Ss    | Long distance (more than one student provided ‘long distance’ as a response in a quiet manner almost unintelligible) |
| 1224 | Selma | Also long distances where? |
| 1225 | S8    | Over the seas |
| 1226 | Selma | Ah overseas(.). we were given the example? it was impossible to communicate between? They have cited two examples (.). between? |
| 1227 | Ss    | France and England |
| 1228 | Selma | The problem was? the sea it means how can they establish? |
| 1229 | S9    | Cables |
| 1230 | Selma | Towers and cables or wires (.).good |

The importance of accuracy can be observed when student S8 answers ‘over the seas’ (1425) and Selma’s feedback is corrective: ‘overseas’ (1426). She also scaffolds for further input from the students when she says ‘they have cited two examples, between?’ (1426). ‘They’ here refers to the text’s authors which indicates the centrality of the textbook as a frame and source of accurate information. It should be noted that during the whole session of over 50 minutes, none of the IRF
moves were initiated by the students, they were rather at the response end of the communication channel. Each time there was chatter or some students seemed distracted, Selma would call them out and ask them to focus back with the rest of the class. At the end of the session, I have asked Selma about what she thinks of the involvement of her students in class, to which she commented that today’s generation is distracted by cell phones and is not very hardworking. She also mentioned that students needed structure and constant guidance and discreetly indicated some students who she considers the most active in her classroom. In fact those same students have contributed or expressed their desire to contribute throughout the whole session. Furthermore, Selma has explained that she considers her classrooms crowded which prevents her from creating more interactive activities (field notes, 2016).

Ahmed has expressed similar concerns during our interview. While I had asked him a broad question about his role, he drew my attention to the importance of sustaining order in his classrooms.

Researcher: How would you define your role, what is your role actually?

Ahmed: To discipline them. Maybe you noticed that the teacher spends much time saying: would you please keep quiet, would you please sit properly, would you please don’t speak with your friend whilst the other is answering the question, would you please write when the teacher finishes explaining the lesson. There is a problem of discipline, especially in large classes; maybe you noticed that first year classes there are 44 students in both classes there are 44. 44 students of different levels

Similarly to the testimonies put forward by Selma and Ahmed, Yacine who is the third English teacher with whom I had the chance to sit for an interview has recognised that despite his best efforts in planning his lessons by following the curriculum’s guidelines, he is overwhelmed by the large number of students in his class.

Researcher: And which kind of materials do you use to prepare? How does your routine look like? Lesson preparation? How does your ...

Yacine: (...) the problem is that the classroom contains about 40 pupils, which makes it a little bit difficult because 40 pupils, 40 competencies 40 backgrounds and we cannot observe all of them. We cannot test them or evaluate them at the same session. All of them. I can evaluate 10, I can interact with 15 or 20, but I would miss the other 20 because of the number.
All three teachers agree on the fact that large classrooms represent a considerable challenge, or problem (as they put it) which is at the expense of the learner’s learning experience. In addition, they all recognise that the diversity among their students in terms of language proficiency and educational background requires more attention which cannot be fulfilled due to their large number.

To sum up, the above episodes are characterised as instructional discourse which are positioned toward the left end side of the continuum of critical classroom interaction. By focusing on the participants’ roles, tasks and knowledge co-construction, it was demonstrated that the reoccurrence of the textbook-centered and teacher-led IRF model contributes in shaping the development of talk in the classroom as monologic, even though, there is some sort of internal dialogue with the text and between the teacher and the students. Furthermore, the thick description of both Ahmed’s and Selma’s classrooms has uncovered settings, behaviours and routines that cannot be disregarded in their role in constructing the classroom’s small culture which in turn has an impact on the students’ involvement in talk. On the other hand, by definition, the critical interaction episodes are snippets of a more complex discourse which is further analysed in the following sections.

5.1.3 Dialogic discourse

In this section, the emergent theme discussed is dialogic discourse. The analysis of the episodes is guided by the model of the continuum of classroom interaction (Table 9) and informed by Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue and studies on dialogic teaching and pedagogy. Accordingly, the aim here is to focus on the three dimensions of the continuum of classroom interaction, i.e., roles, tasks and knowledge. In the first dimension the roles are dialogic in the sense that besides performing their institutionalised teacher and learner roles, the participants let their other identities be echoed in talk (e.g. gender, national, etc.). Regarding the second dimension, the tasks are centred on the group and provide a space for individual participants to express themselves in a less linear dynamic. For the third and last dimension, the focus is on the social meaning where there is a recognition of the complexity of language, culture and knowledge.

The three following critical interaction episodes from Ahmed’s classroom are analysed in order to help in the characterisation of dialogic discourse in the context of an Algerian English classroom. Even though instances of dialogic discourse did not emerge from Selma’s session, I cannot claim that her classrooms’ small culture and pedagogy are only constructed around instructional discourse, particularly given that I had the opportunity to voice-record only one of her sessions.
The setting of the following episodes has been described earlier as ‘test correction with year 3 students’. CIE 6 is thus a continuation of CIE 1, where in the latter, the task was to answer a question about the degrees obtained by the text’s main character: the writer.

CIE 6

| 536 | S1: Sir? (.). Sir matjish-Ar <would it be appropriate to say> became a good writer and euh teacher in upper high school? |
| 537 | Ahmed: (name of student S1) in the second term when we studied the theme of Education the first the introduction to the unit we saw what are the degrees granted in euh schools in British schools from the primary to the high school (.). do you remember some of the degrees (unintelligible) (.). Do you remember some of [the yeah? |
| 538 | S1: Arts |
| 539 | Ahmed: What arts? |
| 540 | Ss: (unintelligible) {students discussing the matter quietly} |
| 541 | Ahmed: Do you remember what are the degrees granted in schools in the public schools in British schools in general? (…)
| 542 | S2: Primary (...) |
| 543 | S3: Philosophy |
| 544 | Ahmed: Yes? Philosophical degree or doctorate what else? You started from the highest okay? After that? Before (.). Where do we grant where do you get a philosophical degree? It’s the?
| 545 | S4: The highest |
| 546 | Ahmed: The highest degree in [a (.). at the university |
| 547 | S4: Assessment |
| 548 | Ahmed: Yes? |
| 549 | S4: Standard assessment |
| 550 | Ahmed: Standard assessment test YES where is it granted? (.). at what stage? (.). Standard assessment test (.). where is it granted? (.). Or where is it given? (...) |
| 551 | S1: At fourteen |
| 552 | Ahmed: At fourteen years? At fourteen years at what stage are you (.). at what stage of education are you in at fourteen?(.). Where? Primary middle? |
| 553 | Ss: Middle middle |
| 554 | Ahmed: In middle school? |
| 555 | S2: Yeah college |
| 556 | Ahmed: In the college? High school? |
| 557 | S1: At fourteen? |
| 558 | Ahmed: At fourteen years (...) okay please REVISE this means [that |
| 559 | S2: Middle school |
| 560 | Ahmed: Middle school? (...) Please READ again the texts and the activities which talked about this in the unit about the different stages of school education in Great Britain and in the US please (.). |

CIE 6 is initiated by a student who asks the teacher if it is appropriate (in local Arabic) to respond to the question about the degrees obtained by the writer as follows: ‘...became a good writer and teacher in upper high school’ (536). Her suggestion is put forward in English. The combined and fluid use of local language which is a variety of Arabic and English indicates that it is a naturalised
behaviour in the classroom’s small culture. It also indicates that the student is concerned with the verification of her answer in English, rather than the idea behind her answer which she could have formulated in local Arabic. In addition, the fact that the teacher did not call out the student S1 on the use of a language other than English shows that translanguaging is permitted in the classroom and has helped student S1 to successfully communicate her concern to the teacher. The teacher’s response is an invitation to remember or to refer back to prior learning. This action has been coded as: ‘Connect – Refer back’ based on the coding scheme for Educational Dialogue Analysis (SEDA) (Hennessy et al., 2016). Accordingly, the teacher is explicitly referring back to prior learning which took place during an earlier term. Throughout this critical interaction episode, the teacher has repeatedly tried to remind the students of the content about the types of degrees which are provided in the British educational system. It should be noted that each unit of the textbook is sometimes covered during more than one week, which means that when Ahmed’s students have studied the unit about Education, they must have spent considerable amount of time addressing different topics and activities. In the following Figure 15, I have put together a collection of texts from year 3 textbook in order to contextualise the contributions of the students in CIE6. The words that have been cited by the students are highlighted and the lines are numbered.
Ahmed has responded to each student’s input by hinting to the full answer or simply by inviting them to elaborate. In fact, Ahmed has used several strategies to develop the discussion about the
themes of the education system in Great Britain (Figure 15). Among those strategies, there is questioning and repetition (537, 541), uptakes (539, 544, 546, and 550) and attempts to scaffold the discussion (544, 546, 552, and 556). However, the students do not succeed in recalling the requested information from the textbook unit and he chooses not to provide them with the answer. Rather, he asks them to revise the unit in question 'Please read again the texts and the activities which talked about this in the unit about the different stages of school education in Great Britain and in the US' (560). Despite the various attempts to direct the students towards the most appropriate answer, they have not provided satisfactory input. The quiet discussions that the students have had among themselves and which were unintelligible at the moment of transcription were a mix between discussions about the test and discussions out of topic (540).

Overall, a general feeling of confusion was observed. The line of questioning of the teacher has generated more questions than answers. In fact, the focus has moved from the degrees in British schools in general (537), to university (546), to the students’ own experience with their local schooling system (552). By referring to the latter, the teacher has attempted to push the students to make parallels between the local education system and the British one. It seems that students had a very limited knowledge about the Algerian higher education system.

Referring back to the three dimensions of the continuum of classroom interaction, even though this episode has been initiated by a student, the teacher is still considered the authority who would provide the correct answer. In addition, despite the teacher’s numerous attempts to redirect the students towards the textbook as a central source of reference, the students only managed to put forward fragmented recalls. Therefore, the roles performed by the participants are those of teacher and learners and the task’s focus has remained on the accuracy of information as assessed against the textbook’s content. Concerning the third dimension which is about knowledge, my interpretation is that though the outcome of knowledge co-construction has failed to gather the needed information. On the other hand, the quality of the process of interaction has shown very little complexity. That is to say, the teacher has used a number of strategies that could be recognised as part of the strategies for dialogic pedagogy, but have not created a genuine and authentic dialogue (Lyle, 2008). Nevertheless, Bakhtin’s dialogic dimensions, namely heteroglossia and polyphony are perceptible through instances of translanguaging and the fragmented recalls respectively. Furthermore, for this textbook’s unit, it was stated that one of the expected intercultural outcomes is ‘raising awareness about the similarities and differences between educational systems in the world’. The teacher has made reference to the students’ own educational system in order to facilitate the identification of the correct answer about the British educational system. This demonstrates that the objective is to scaffold understanding about the other by using references about the self rather than genuinely
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addressing questions of intercultural similarities or differences. Therefore, CIE6 is instructional in the form but also shows some dialogic dimensions in substance.

CIE 7

Critical interaction episode 7 (CIE7) is a continuation of the interaction transcribed in CIE 3, where the discussion is about the expression of wishes (‘I wish she had read a full book’ (CIE3, 621)). CIE7 is initiated by a student asking the teacher, Ahmed, why the negative form is not used ‘Why we can’t put haven’t?’ (631). The teacher has used several strategies such as shaping, scaffolding, confirmation feedback and uptake in order to make the student’s reasoning explicit. In fact, within the Scheme for Educational Dialogue Analysis (SEDA), making reasoning explicit through speculation is one of the codes that can be found in dialogic pedagogy (Hennessy et al., 2016). Ahmed’s speculation is more visible in 641 when he emphasises on the idea of a third year student not reading a book. Furthermore, in 641, Ahmed expands on the importance of ‘reading’ as a valuable educational and cultural practice. He states, ‘imagine that a third year student had
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not read a full book. It’s a catastrophe!’ By emitting such statement, the teacher is positioning himself as an advocate for ‘the culture of reading’. He takes on the example of a third year student making the situation culturally closer to the students’ reality, given that they, themselves, are in their third year of secondary school. In the same line of reasoning, he cites random titles of fairy tales asking the students to give him more examples of books. By doing so he is challenging them while emphasising the importance of reading. Therefore, though the roles of the participants remain fixed, there is an added dimension to the teacher’s role as an advocate for leisure reading. In terms of the task, there is an effort in tapping into the person’s interpretation and understanding, as well as an orientation towards the group rather than centeredness on the teacher’s authority or the textbook’s content. Finally, the third dimension of the continuum of classroom interaction is about knowledge. In this episode, the teacher has provided a nuanced and varied contribution supported by social meaning. Thus, based on the analysis of these three dimensions (roles, tasks and knowledge), I argue that though the interaction is teacher-led, CIE 7 demonstrates characteristics of a dialogic discourse which positions this discourse more towards the right end of the continuum of classroom interaction (Table 9).

CIE 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>642</th>
<th>S:</th>
<th>Les Miserables-Fr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>Les Miserables (pronounced in English) (.) from whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Victor Hugo-Fr (pronounced in French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>From Victor Hugo-Fr (pronounced in French) Did you finish it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>Did you read it in full?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Yes it’s in Notre-Dame de Paris-Fr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>Yes? (another student speaking at the back)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>The wolf (unintelligible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>The wolf and the witch? From who? Who is the writer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>The poor and the rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>The poor the pauper and the rich? Who has written the rich and the pauper?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>I don’t remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>You don’t remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Romeo and Juliet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>William Shakespeare? For Romeo and Juliet (.) Did you read it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Okay (…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Shakespeare Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Do you have any question? Do you have any question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>So what matters is the marks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIE 8 takes place following Ahmed’s request for book references in the previous episode: ‘Give me a title of another book’ (CIE7, 641). The students have made references to: Les Misérables, the Wolf and the Witch, the Prince and the Pauper which is referred to here as ‘the poor and the rich’ (652) and Romeo and Juliet (656). By contributing with these literary references the students have proved to the teacher they have indeed read books which could be considered for leisure. In doing so, they have managed to challenge their teacher’s speculation put forward in the earlier episode. Moreover, the language in which the students have read those books does not appear to be as relevant. For example, one student has mentioned Les Misérables by Victor Hugo, saying it in French suggesting that she has read the book in the French language. Ahmed has repeated the title Les Miserables with an English pronunciation /mɪzərəblz/. This suggests that Ahmed is performing his routinised behaviour of maintaining an English-only space for interaction, but also it can indicate his effort to highlight that there exists an English version of the literary work cited by the student. As opposed to earlier episodes, the interaction here is not about a task, a question or an activity. This episode is a result of the teacher’s invitation to imagine a scenario where third year students would have never read a book, which has created an opportunity for the students to showcase some of their cultural background. Thus, in reference to the dimensions of the continuum of classroom interaction, the participants’ roles here could be considered as book readers even though the main individuals referring to books are only the students, while the teacher has mainly been asking for extra information (e.g., the name of the authors). From my observation, at this stage of the interaction the atmosphere was light and joyful. The students seemed to enjoy reflecting on their own readings. This episode ends with the students asking the teacher for their marks, to which Ahmed replies: ‘So what matters is the marks?’ (665). This comment indicates that the teacher has also appreciated deviating from the scripted activities and discussing a topic other than the tasks. He adds by asking about the students’ appreciation of the text, to which one of them replies that it was ‘interesting’ (674). Accordingly, Ahmed has highlighted repeatedly the complexity of his role and the different facets and factors he juggles and negotiates with:
‘The teacher spends a whole career struggling to adapt, to adapt his method of teaching, his strategies, his savoir-faire, in order to cope with the class situation, the class atmosphere. He has got to find the appropriate method, he has got to find the appropriate strategies in order to find solutions for the problems that may rise or that may appear during the lesson and the problem that he finds, he must cope with them and try to find the appropriate solutions for that lesson and for the future’ (Interview with Ahmed, 2016)

It is clear from Ahmed’s statement that the teacher, in this case himself, is and should be at the centre of the classroom experience and the learners’ journey. From Ahmed’s narrative, learners are not fully involved in this process of constructing the classroom experience. However, in this last episode, they have shown their ability to share their own knowledge and show interest. Even though, the roles of the learners have moved between individuals sharing their reading interests to being concerned with their grades. Regarding the task, as commented earlier, the focus of the interaction has been on the group and their literary interests rather than a specific textbook-centred activity. Finally, knowledge co-construction has focused on the learners’ cultural experience and their literary background rather than on correctness and accuracy. This means that this episode is better positioned towards the dialogic discourse pole of the continuum of classroom interaction. On the other hand, the pedagogic strategies adapted by the teacher can be described as dialogic as they have led to a genuine authentic interaction creating a joyful atmosphere in the classroom. Moreover, in their use of French references, the students’ heteroglossia has been acknowledged as valuable to the interaction and the shared references between the teacher and the students enacted through Ahmed’s reformulation of some of the book titles indicates a shared polyphonic knowledge.

5.2 Discussion and conclusion

Based on the above analysis, all 8 episodes are positioned within the continuum of classroom interaction in the following figure (Figure 16). Each one of the 8 episodes analysed in this chapter serves to illustrate the complexity of the classroom discourse.
Figure 16: Positioning the CIEs on the continuum of classroom interaction

It can be noted from this illustrative figure that the analysis of Selma’s classroom has demonstrated that the dominant pedagogy adopted is teacher-centred and relies on instructional discourse for language education. On the other hand, the deconstruction of Ahmed’s observed session has established a more dynamic process of classroom interaction. In fact, in the figure above, the arrows help to highlight the oscillation from instructional discourse to dialogic discourse. Taking a meso perspective, the back and forth movement from a traditional IRF model of communication to a more open dialogic discourse can indicates tension at the heart of the classroom discourse. As brought by the evidence from the interviews with the teachers, the high number of students in the classroom and time constraints can explain this back and forth dynamic with a constant need to return to a more controlled and structured interaction that would allow the tasks to be fulfilled.

This oscillation is common in the language classroom or any naturally occurring interaction. This phenomenon is similar to Holquist’s (1981) description of Bakhtin’s works and theories about language as ‘a ceaseless battle between centrifugal forces that seek to keep things apart, and centripetal forces that strive to make things cohere’ (Holquist, 1981, p. xviii). This metaphor applies to the classroom context as evidenced by the episodes where the centripetal forces are enacted by a structured IRF, teacher-led, textbook-oriented, accuracy-focused interaction which is then enriched by centrifugal forces enacted by a student’s questioning or a teacher’s curiosity leaving room for a more dynamic and fluid dialogic discourse. Accordingly, Holquist argues that ‘the most complete and complex reflection of these forces is found in human language’ (ibid). From the observer’s perspective, the feeling of clash or tension was not very apparent which could mean that those forces are complementary rather than in opposition. However, the absence of explicit and meaningful dialogic discourse in Selma’s classroom has resulted in a less nuanced and more scripted discourse which leaves limited room for heteroglossia for instance. Nevertheless, in terms of opportunities for developing intercultural competences, the episodes discussed in this chapter demonstrate that despite some efforts from Ahmed in leading the students to reflect and relate, the dominant discourse is still instructional. In fact, during the few
instances where Ahmed encourages the students to draw on their cultural background, the focus is primarily on linguistic competence. Similarly to Munandar’s (2019) study in Indonesian secondary school English classrooms, the target language is indeed the primary goal of both teachers and students. In fact, Munandar and Newton (2021, p. 13) state that ‘open and guided discussion of culture was largely absent from the observed classroom lessons’. It is well documented in the literature that intercultural learning is not always the priority for teachers unless they take informed and purposeful steps to implement an intercultural oriented approach in their teaching (e.g., Norton, 2008; Howard et al., 2019; Porto, 2019; Lázár, 2020), which can be a tedious and a complex journey.

On the other hand, the findings presented in this chapter show that the background of the students was not suppressed or alienated from the interaction and the process of learning (Risager, 2007; Canagarajah, 2013a). It was rather used by the teachers as a resource to scaffold learning. This practice was observed in Norton (2008) and Munandar and Newton (2021) which recognise that intercultural learning is facilitated by the integration of the learners’ linguacultures in the classroom. However, the findings in this chapter extend our understanding of the fact that relying on the students’ cultural background is not sufficient to develop intercultural learning especially if the main concern of the teacher is linguistic competence. It can be argued that the students have indeed displayed basic cultural awareness mainly about the self (Baker, 2011), which is used as a means to an end, noting that the end here or the learning outcome targeted is primarily language-focused. Furthermore, the teacher-led and dominance of instructional discourse does not allow for more opportunities for the students to reflect and draw from their own cultural experiences to develop critical and intercultural competences (Byram, 1997).

With regard to the emergence of interculturality and negotiation of cultural identities, it can be argued that the differences between the students were not about nationality or ethnicity, but more about their small cultures and individual experiences. The latter is relevant and enriching when it comes to developing intercultural competence. In Kramsch’s (2000) study, the students had different nationalities, however, it was through the semiotic devices used by the students to compose text summaries that their personal trajectories and experience with immigration for instance or with previous education systems that their identities were echoed and made visible. Similarly and despite the difference in the setting of the study reported here, it is safe to say that the behaviours and discourse of the participants could have allowed for their identities to compose the heteroglossic and polyphonic talk of the classroom much further. But the remaining issue is that this richness is not explicitly exploited for intercultural learning in the classroom.
The discourse and the utterances put forward by the teachers, the learners, and the textbooks’ content and tasks provide evidence for the situatedness, complexity and fluidity of communication. In terms of situatedness, some studies have investigated the importance of prior knowledge about the other in facilitating meaning-making in the classroom. For instance, Porto (2014) has found that the influence of American culture in Argentina has enabled the participants’ cultural understanding of the text about Christmas. This aligns with the results of the study reported here in the sense that Ahmed’s students have relied on the proximity between their own cultural knowledge (e.g. baccalaureate) to make sense of what seems to be a foreign concept (e.g., bachelor’s) even though they fail to successfully accomplish the task. This is to show that the students are capable of creating links between their knowledge about the self in order to develop understanding and knowledge about the other. This is a very basic stage of cultural awareness (Baker, 2011) but it can be a good started point if exploited with the appropriate pedagogy.

Furthermore, the findings here show that the textbook’s content is not a sufficient resource to develop a cultural understanding of foreign concepts, in this case, the British educational system. Accordingly, Porto (2014) argues that the students’ prior knowledge added to the complex historical and socio-economic situation between the US and Argentina are plausible factors shaping the situatedness of the students’ understanding of the text. Similarly, the familiarity of Ahmed’s students with the concept of baccalaureate rather than bachelor’s may be related to the long history Algeria has with France and French institutions and that Algeria’s educational institutions have a system that is in many aspects similar to France’s. However, the lack of exposure to English speaking countries and their educational institutions and systems may be the reason why students have failed to relate to the British educational system. From a Bakhtinian perspective, the particularity and uniqueness of the settings described here, in addition to the socio-cultural and historical context, represent the centripetal forces creating sense and cohesion and most importantly, situating and shaping the words and their meanings. Thus, this finding expands our understanding of how the socio-cultural, historical and political environment may inform students’ knowledge about the other, and how the lack of exposure can create a cultural distance preventing mutual understanding. However, the same issue remains regarding the explicitness of addressing intercultural learning in the classroom because the teacher only wanted a correct answer to his question and did not direct the discussion towards cultural knowledge and complexity.

The model of the continuum of classroom interaction presented in this chapter offers an opportunity to deconstruct the discourse of an English classroom. Supported by Kramsch’s (1985) framework, the analysis has shown that the interactions examined at the episode level are characterised by a reoccurrence of IRF patterns which is considered in Bakhtinian terms.
monologic discourse. In fact, according to Kramsch (1985, p.179), such a process of communication which follows a restricted flow ‘is not only an unnecessary reduction of the interaction potential of the classroom, but it ignores the social dimensions of language learning’. In fact, the findings from this chapter have shown that dialogic discourse is not the dominating form of discourse in neither Ahmed’s nor Selma’s classrooms. This can be explained by the need to effectively tackle and complete the lesson plan or the list of activities that are language focused which imposes such a format of communication, considered as instructional and teacher-centred. On the other hand, the complexity and fluidity of the classroom discourse have been captured at the micro-level (words, utterances, turns, etc.) despite the focus on accuracy and correctness, which similarly to Kramsch (1996, p. 90) should encourage us to ask: ‘how can language teaching focus less on language structures and functions and more on the social process of enunciation?’ From the evidence presented under the dialogic discourse theme, the instances where there was a focus on social meaning such as when addressing the importance of reading, for example, the learners were given an opportunity to showcase the richness of their linguistic and cultural capital. Such interactive and authentic situations could be an ideal opportunity to promote intercultural learning. Ildiko Lázár (2020) suggests a solution and argues that cooperative learning is compatible with intercultural learning. In fact, cooperative learning advocates for learner-centeredness and allocates time to all students to reflect, interact and express their point of view. Cooperative learning can be situated under the overarching philosophy of dialogic pedagogy. This solution aligns with Kramsch’s (1996, p. 91) argument stating that ‘learners have to be addressed not as deficient monoglossic enunciators, but as potentially heteroglossic narrators’. According, Hennessey et al. (2016, p.21) argue that when teachers invite students to speculate and imagine possibilities, ‘the continuous contrasting of voices enables a genuine dialogue across difference’. To sum up, the continuum of classroom interactions explored in this study is evidence of the complexity and fluidity of classroom language. However, due to the dominance of the instructional discourse, there were very limited opportunities to promote intercultural learning.

Finally, by looking at the classroom as small culture in formation (Holliday, 2011), the teachers and students have created spaces to perform their agency and dialogue with other big cultures represented by national institutions and other small cultures, which were documented for instance when Ahmed explains his role in adapting and adopting the curriculum. In fact, from the perspective of Holliday’s grammar of culture, the students’ engagement with the textbook content is also a process of creating a small culture relationship with the textbook. Even though the interpretations of the students were oriented towards recalling information about linguistic accuracy, I argue that if given the space for dialogue, the students would have the ability to engage critically with social meanings and intercultural learning. The dominant instructional
discourse and the focus on linguistic competence hinder considerably the development of intercultural competences and the expression of intercultural awareness. Moreover, the teacher has followed all of the textbooks’ instructions and none of these was about developing intercultural competences. It can be argued that given the centrality of the textbook in the Algerian classroom, one of the solutions to promote intercultural learning in the English classroom could be the explicit reference to intercultural outcomes in the tasks and activities.

To sum up, in this chapter, the analytical framework has permitted the examination of classrooms as small cultures in formation by deconstructing the instructional and dialogic discourses. The discursive practices of the participants who through their particularity and by negotiating the institutional frame, have managed to create a cohesive classroom environment. However, the dominant instructional discourse has hindered the promotion of intercultural learning. In conclusion, despite documenting interactions that are situated and complex, they were mainly shaped by the demands of institutional expectations (exams, curriculum, textbook, teacher, etc.) but also the trajectories and individuality of the participants. Just like Bakhtin’s novel, classroom interaction is a dialogised system, however for intercultural learning to take place there need to be more purposeful actions taken towards explicitly integrating intercultural outcomes in the textbook and the teachers’ practice. In the next chapter, I analyse more critical interaction episodes (CIE) in order to further explore what happens in the classroom.
Chapter 6  Interculturality in the classroom

In the previous chapter, the continuum of classroom interaction has served as a framework of analysis facilitating the deconstruction of classroom discourse. It was established that the learners and the teachers have an active and important role in small culture formation. In addition, interculturality has been characterised as a dynamic and complex process taking place when the participants express, in talk, their mindfulness of the particularity of the different small cultures they are part of (e.g., the particularity of behaviours in the classroom), and their awareness of the more symbolically powerful structures that shape their practice (e.g., curriculum, education institution, etc.). However, the evidence presented in the previous chapter shows that instructional language focuses classroom hinder the promotion of intercultural learning. Thus, it can be argued that creating a space of interculturality might require a classroom discourse that leans more towards a dialogic process that focuses on social meanings, authentic discussions and explicit intercultural learning outcomes.

In this final analysis chapter, I examine critical interaction episodes from classrooms discourse as organised thematically. The main emergent themes discussed here are ‘essentialised gender roles’, ‘resisting essentialisation of gender roles’, ‘translanguaging’ and ‘banal nationalism’. Before discussing these themes, I begin by discussing the teachers’ characterisation of culture and the intercultural. Therefore, the aim of this chapter is to address the second and third research questions about the participants’ interpretation of discourses of interculturality:

RQ2  How are the discourses promoting interculturality interpreted by the teacher?
   a. How do the teachers understand interculturality?
   b. What are the teachers’ practices that facilitate or hinder the promotion of interculturality?

RQ3  How are the discourses promoting interculturality interpreted by the learners?
   a. What are the learners’ beliefs and attitudes towards the textbook’s discourses for interculturality?
   b. What are the learners’ behaviours towards intercultural input?

6.1  Characterisation of the cultural and the intercultural

The participants in this study have engaged in several conversations with the researcher (myself), some of which were voice-recorded and others were reported in the researcher’s journal. The total duration of the voice-recorded interviews is about 3h and about 1h30 for the focus groups with the students. The teachers, Ahmed, Selma and Yacine, were informed that the subject of
investigation is broadly about intercultural communication in relation to English language teaching. They were informed that the textbooks are analysed by having this focus in mind and that the observation of their classrooms is considered a central element in the study (Appendix D, for participant’s information sheet). The interviews took the form of conversations allowing a co-construction of knowledge, especially when the topic was about the characterisation of culture and interculturality. In fact, the fieldwork has considerably shaped the formulation of the research questions and the inductive approach to the investigation has contributed to problematising the concepts of interculturality and intercultural communication. When I started the fieldwork, my understanding of what interculturality is, was not yet fully formed. In fact, talking to and observing my participants in their own environment and reflecting continuously on my position, have helped in understanding and identifying how these constructs are understood. In what follows, I report on the parts of the data coded: ‘characterisation of intercultural communication and interculturality’.

First, Ahmed has agreed to sit with me for a voice-recorded interview which took the form of a conversation about his background, the way he designs his lessons and his appreciation of the textbooks’ content. I have not asked explicitly what he thinks intercultural communication is, but I have rather moved from a general question about the appropriateness of the textbooks’ content for his classes, to a question about ‘culture’ and ‘cultural content’:

Researcher: And concerning culture and cultural content what is your opinion about its importance within the language course?

Ahmed: Culture what do you mean by culture? Here the culture of the foreign language taught to the learners?

Researcher: It depends how you?

Ahmed: The learners are always eager to learn something uncommon something that especially that belongs to society or the country that is supposed to be at the top of technology or civilisation etc. They feel eager they like to learn something new whatever is this thing whatever is this aspect either language or part of culture in general so they have that tendency of wanting to learn that’s why we don’t find any problem in this case. Maybe we are at the same time teaching or trying to make a comparison between the culture of the foreign language taught and the culture of the mother tongue which is Arabic so we are always trying to compare the different aspects of culture of the foreign language and that of our culture and maybe even of the local environment the sociocultural etc. economic environment always make a
reference to them. But as I told you time doesn’t really allow to cover many aspects during the three years of study in secondary schools. They receive just some cultural aspects which according to me they are not sufficient really to have to have a clear view of the culture of the language they are learning. They don’t have really the vast view about the culture. (Interview with Ahmed, 2016)

From this extract, it is clear that Ahmed interprets my question as being about the representation of the culture of a given language or country. He emphasises this intrinsic relationship between a culture and a language on several occasions: ‘something that specially belongs to’, ‘the culture of the foreign language’, and ‘the culture of the language’. He reiterates the relationship between language and culture when referring to the students’ mother tongue and to the culture of ‘the English’. He adds: ‘aspects of culture include all the daily life, attitudes of the English, their customs, traditions, the historical monuments, their history, history okay we can talk about the history of England maybe or America’ (Interview with Ahmed, 2016; emphasis mine). It is fairly possible that my position as a researcher who is based in the UK, studying at a UK university, may have propelled Ahmed to think that I am here to verify if there is enough of the Anglo-Saxon’s world represented in the language materials. I have, indeed, noted that when introduced informally to other English teachers to whom I say that I investigate interculturality in English textbooks, for instance, many of them would say something along the lines of: ‘there is not enough representation of British and American cultures in the textbook’ (field notes, 2016). Though my identity could have led to assumptions about my intentions, it is still the case that Ahmed has reiterated the essentialisation of the relationship between language and culture as illustrated when speaking about the learners’ mother tongue. On the other hand, this correlation between English and a ‘big C’ culture can be explained by Ahmed’s training as a former student of ‘British and American literature’ at university, but also by the way students are categorised in secondary schools. I have mentioned earlier when establishing the setting of the study that the structure of the Algerian secondary school system leads the learners towards two main streams: the literary stream and the science stream. The expectations and requirements in each stream are different. Scientific stream students are expected to carry on their education at university studying hard science subjects and a larger range of subjects are offered to them. On the other hand, literary stream students are only offered university subjects in the fields of humanities and social sciences. This means that the curriculum for each stream is different. Notably, in their English textbooks some units about literature, for instance, are meant for literary stream students and others about maths are designed for scientific stream classes. Ahmed explains:

‘The objective of teaching English in Algeria well it depends on the streams that we are teaching. For scientific streams, the aim of teaching English is to function to have the
possibility to communicate or to have a brief luggage in English so that he becomes accustomed with international concepts that are related to his scientific profile that he will choose at the university. But for example for those who are in foreign languages [stream] normally they should have a large luggage a large stock of vocabulary I can say that are related to the culture of this language so that if he or she chooses to go to university and for instance decides to study British Lit [literature] or American Lit [literature], she or he should have she should be prepared for that she would have at least an acceptable background in this field’ (Interview with Ahmed, 2016).

Ahmed’s philosophy about teaching the curriculum seems to be deeply conditioned and shaped by what Holliday (2011) calls particular social and political structures. In this context, these structures have created a clear distinction between two streams: the literary and the scientific stream, which are sustained and further shape the pedagogy of the teachers.

The second teacher, Selma, has also been made aware of my interest in interculturality but we did not discuss the concept per se. She has however talked to me about her love for languages particularly English, a language which she has been teaching for more than 22 years. During my focus group discussion with Selma’s students, she asked me about what we are discussing, to which I responded that we are talking about the languages that the students speak. She then contributed with her thoughts about different languages:

‘French because we have some basics. English is very important. It is essential, it is universal, OK? The language of the world. Sometimes there are some students who may feel better if they study Chinese. They say that Chinese is moving all over the world. I don't think it is going to replace English. It is the language of the powerful country. It's not going to change. It is easier to learn English than Chinese, grammar in English is easier simpler than learning, and it is simpler than in French, than the Spanish. English is very easy to learn, OK?’ (Selma during a focus group with her students, 2016).

Selma argues here that the familiarity that the students have with French is an asset that facilitates the learning of other languages. She has also set out some of the motivations for learning languages: the worldliness of English and its symbolic association with powerful countries. Though Selma does not make a clear statement about the ownership of the English language, she nevertheless links the language to power and to powerful countries. Moreover, during our discussions she has talked about accompanying her husband, a university professor, to international conferences in Turkey and Germany, and how she has acted as a mediator given that all interactions were in English for being more proficient than her husband (field notes, 2016).
Therefore, it could be noted that the approaches to the language and culture relationship as characterised by Ahmed and by Selma is different. Their professional and academic experiences are different. Selma has experienced the use of English internationally and Ahmed has experienced the use of English academically and locally.

My discussion with Yacine has touched on different areas, especially on the importance of representation and which types of materials he uses apart from the government prescribed textbooks. He explained that in his job at the public school, which is a government institution, he only uses the English textbooks that have been analysed in this thesis. However, in the private schools where he teaches a couple of hours a week, he uses a larger variety of materials (videos, images, recordings, etc.). As a singer and a guitarist, he even uses songs to teach English; songs which are mainly sourced from British, Irish and American repertoires.

Yacine: In speaking about English, I would rather to teach it in its context, and in its own culture in order to make them familiar with the culture.

Researcher: Which culture?

Yacine: British and American. Because as I said, I cannot teach a language apart from its culture. This would not be alive it would be a dead language, just words just grammar. And language is not like that, language is alive, is alive.

When I was transcribing this interview with Yacine, I wishes I asked ‘what do you mean by culture’ rather than asking ‘which culture’. My manner of formulating the question signals a rushed interpretation that Yacine might be referring to a reified objectified definition of culture when he says ‘make them familiar with the culture’. He, nevertheless, explains that the context that he wants his students to be familiar with is the context that gives life to the language and this one is in Britain and America. Throughout the interview, Yacine speaks about the inner circle, British and American as something the students are curious to know about in relation to English. I asked him about his strategies for teaching a unit entitled ‘No Man is an Island’ from the first year textbook. Our interaction evolved as follows:

Yacine: Here they are showing the Red Cross. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Crescent. Red Crescent. Yes. Couscous. So it is an Algerian context. So they didn't go out from the Algerian context. And I would prefer that they do these things. I can use it as a lead in, for example. Yes. In order to make them understand what I am talking about. But then I would move to something new. I would move to something more interesting to them. They are curious,
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Researcher: Such as?

Yacine: They want to know what how would American people, for example, or British people react in such cases. We are we are known as solidarity people. We help each other. Yes. And we stay like one man in such disasters. We know that, we can teach them, but they already know that. But I would rather teach them: How would foreign people react in such cases? What would they do? I would bring a video about a broadcaster talking about a disaster in a tragic way, for example.

Researcher: About? Where?

Yacine: For example, tsunami. It is not British or American context, but it is new. They know it. They are interested to it, but they don’t know much about it. We can use it. We can use that curiosity in order to grab their attention.

Among the references represented in this unit discussed with Yacine, we see a building in ruin, a group of women holding large plates with what appears to be Couscous, and volunteers belonging to the Red Crescent, which is the equivalent of the Red Cross, in Algeria. This photo was taken following an earthquake that occurred in 2003 in Boumerdès (Algeria). The text accompanying the photo is about the solidarity that people have shown to each other in such tragedy. In our discussion Yacine says ‘they didn’t go out of the Algerian context’, meaning that the textbook designers, the authors, are making reference to an Algerian setting and event. He then explains that his approach is to move from discussing solidarity during crisis in the local context, to how ‘foreigners’ (to use his term), would react in equivalent context. His approach is to find references in a British or American context. When the latter is not possible or accessible, he can use references from other contexts that are foreign to his students. Accordingly, by walking me through his approach Yacine is taking a Big C approach to culture and expressing an assumption of difference based on the country. He also appears to have the British and the American context as a go-to reference with the assumption that this is what his students want. This indicates that the dominant perception that Yacine has is one where English is the property of the British and the American. The same English language that he uses in an interview with me as an Algerian who speaks English.

As per the characterisation of the intercultural it is not straightforward from neither of the three interviewees. My discussions with Selma were not as extended as I wished, which prevents me from making an interpretation of how she conceptualises intercultural communication. Ahmed has at several occasions explained that he wants his students to
have the necessary background to be able to join university but no clear characterisation of how he views the intercultural, though he essentialises the relationship between language and culture. Yacine, on the other hand, and thanks to our relatively long conversation, his approach to culture as Big C, as related to a country or a nationality was recurrent in his talk. He appears to understand the intercultural as a process of comparison and contrast between two Big Cultures and in the best case scenario, at the other end of the comparison there is the British or the American culture.

6.2 Essentialisation and resisting essentialisation

In this section, the discussion will draw on critical interaction episodes where students and the teacher Ahmed make use of various strategies while working on a writing task. After describing the context, I will first discuss the concept of ‘essentialism’ that emerged from the analysis CIE 9, 11, and 12 while CIE 10 is used as a counter example. Following this, I will analyse episodes CIE 13, 14 and 15 where students have managed to resist essentialisation.

The setting of the following episodes is in two of Ahmed’s 1st year classrooms working on the same activity. The purpose of the activity is to write a paragraph about one of the three inventions studied in an earlier session: the dishwasher, the vacuum cleaner and the microwave over. Having already completed a table about the three different inventions (see Figure 17), the next task is to write a paragraph about one invention guided by a specific procedure, which was also studied in an earlier session. In both classrooms, the teacher Ahmed asks the students to refer to their textbooks, ‘At the Crossroads SE1’, and reminds them of the structure -also available in the textbook- that they should follow which is a four steps procedure (stating the problem, the initial solution, problems with the latter and the invention). During both sessions, this structure has guided the development of the paragraph and the task is accomplished as a whole class activity. That is to say, noting that the textbook presents the activity as a task to be accomplished individually then to be peer-reviewed, the teacher has chosen to involve the whole class in the production of one single paragraph that is reported on the board. In one classroom, there was a consensus to write a paragraph about ‘the microwave’ and in the other, the students agreed to write a paragraph about ‘the dishwasher’. A description of the classroom observation is reported in Appendix J.
6.2.1 Essentialisation

The concept of essentialism in the field of intercultural communication carries a negative connotation given that it is associated to views about cultural beliefs and behaviours that are reduced and simplified and therefore essentialised. The following episode (CIE 9), is an illustration of the route that the teacher has taken to lead the students towards the development of sentences that are over simplistic and disregard the complexity of cultural practices.

Two students have contributed with two introductory sentences for the paragraph about the microwave:

S1: ‘The human in the past spend a lot of time and effort to cook food’

S2: ‘In the old days people used to cook on the ovens which take too long to cook food’

After few moments of chatter and negotiation with the rest of the class, the contributions of S1 and S2 are up taken to start the co-construction of the paragraph. CIE 9 is an extract of the
discussion where the process of essentialisation has been developed by the teacher and endorsed by the students.

CIE 9

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>S1: The humans in the past spend a lot of time and effort to cook food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ahmed: HUMANS what do you mean by humans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>S1: People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ss: People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ahmed: People? Who used to cook?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ss: WOMEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ahmed: Women okay? Generally in tradition in traditional societies or in traditional communities it’s WOMEN who used to cook (.) [meals or food]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ss: Food]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ahmed: So in the [older times yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>S: (Unintelligible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ahmed: In the old days yes in the old days(...) {waiting for the student on the board to write} Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>S: Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ahmed: Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>S: Used to cook in ovens that take a long time to cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ahmed: Women USED to (. ) continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>S: To cook with ovens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Ahmed: To cook (. ) with ovens {dictating to the student on the board} How do you qualify these ovens? How were these ovens?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ss: Old</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In CIE 9, in an attempt to narrow down the focus and to start the sentence with a less generic subject such as ‘humans’ or ‘people’, the teacher has scaffolded the construction of a sentence that puts ‘women’ as responsible of the cooking activity. The teacher has used leading questions which means that he has set expectations of what the students should respond. The aim was to guide the students in their development of an introductory sentence. For example, when he asks ‘humans, what do you mean by humans?’ (40) which could be interpreted as seeking for clarification, the students understand that they need to be more specific and that the term ‘humans’ is not necessarily the most appropriate one. The familiarity that the students have with
their teacher’s talk repertoire has facilitated the development of such interaction. In fact, the teacher has managed to shape the students’ contribution by simply repeating it with a rising tone (e.g. ‘people?’ (43)) where he directs the students towards exploring other answers or using a more regular tone (e.g. ‘women’ (51)) in order to validate or approve of a suggestion. In the latter cases, the teacher repeats the response of the student and waits for her to continue the sentence, which she does: ‘used to cook in ovens that take a long time to cook’ (52).

Furthermore, the teacher dedicates one of the F moves to do an exposition aimed to justify or explain the appropriateness of assigning the action of ‘cooking’ to the subject ‘women’:

‘generally, in traditional societies or in traditional communities, it’s women who used to cook meals or food’ (45). On one hand, this could be an evidence that the process of guiding and shaping the students’ contribution in (40, 43 and 45) was purposeful (Alexander, 2008). On the other hand, the explanation provided by the teacher in (45) could be described as an essentialist evaluation of a social practice given that it is presented as common knowledge that is generalisable which is considered problematic from a non-essentialist perspective.

The following example, CIE 10 shows more relativity than the previous one. It illustrates a process of interaction which has laid ground for an alternative evaluation of a social practice by recognising its relativity and complexity. This social practice is ‘serving the meal’. In CIE 10, the students and the teacher are working on the second step of the paragraph construction which is ‘the initial solution to the problem’. The problem discussed is ‘having old ovens that are slow and consume a lot of energy’. One of the solutions that the students suggest is that oven users have started cooking early. Accordingly, the sentence put forward is ‘they started cooking a long time before serving the meal’ (‘they’ referring to ‘women’). Having scaffolded for some changes in terms of word order, the teacher explains that it is not necessarily to precise the meal time intending that it is a social practice that is relative and not generalisable. The strategy, then, that has been used to avoid falling into essentialisation was to avoid being specific, i.e., not to mention the time of the meal.

CIE 10

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>S2:</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>Seeking clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>S2:</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By referring back to the full classroom transcript, I have observed that Ahmed’s rationale behind the essentialisation process is to make the students think of richer vocabulary but also to be specific. In fact, he states ‘sentences must be short and very, very precise’ (112). Therefore, even though there could have been other alternatives to replace the word ‘humans’, the students went along with an accessible stereotype which they did not contest. Rather, they went into choosing an even more narrowed down agent, associated with the social action of cooking and preparing food, opting for the word ‘housewives’. The following episodes (CIE 11, CIE 12) illustrate how the word ‘housewives’ came into the picture.

CIE 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>122</th>
<th>Ahmed:</th>
<th>Doctor Percy Spencer yes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>The scientist the scientist the scientist that invents euh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Ahmed:</td>
<td>You can here say instead of saying doctor Percy Spencer you can say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>Who was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ahmed: You say you say the scientist PERCY SPENCER

S: It’s the same

... ... ... (chatter)

Ahmed: Here it is important not only to mention scientist why? Why is it important to mention (.).

S: Because (unintelligible)

Ahmed: Because yes?

S: Our unit

Ahmed: Our unit is about?

Ss: Science

Ahmed: Science or or? Scientists famous people in [science or?

Ss: Science]

S: Sir but in the dishwasher Josephine Cochran was a housewife

Ahmed: Excellent very good Because SOME of the inventors were just ordinary people? For instance in the case of the DISHWASHER She was a?

Ss: Housewife

Ahmed: Simple housewife (.). So here it’s normally it’s important to mention here put an arrow A SCIENTIST A scientist (unintelligible) [addressing the student one the board] To specify the job of the inventor comma A scientist comma A scientist (unintelligible) invented the micro? (.)

S: Wave

To sum up, in CIE 11 the teacher has been scaffolding the discussion seeking precision and conciseness. In this process, the students were negotiating whether to use the title ‘doctor’ or ‘scientist’ to describe Dr Percy Spencer, the inventor of the microwave. It was agreed that not all inventors are scientists by profession as was the case for Josephine Cochran, the inventor of the dishwasher who was a housewife as mentioned in Figure 17. Following this, the introduced new vocabulary (i.e., housewife) was then utilised to construct the concluding sentence of the paragraph (CIE 12).

CIE 12

Ahmed: The microwave oven (...)

S: Which solved the problem

Ahmed: Which solved the?

Ss: Problem

S: To help people
In CIE 12, Ahmed asks the students which category of women had their problem solved (170) and the students replied ‘housewives’ (171). He then states what could be characterised as a stereotype that ‘most women who use the microwave are housewives’ (172). The students went along with the statement endorsing it by finishing the sentence of the teacher (173).

Building upon those two last episodes, I argue that the process of essentialisation has been mainly facilitated by the teacher’s intention to guide the students into developing a paragraph that was short and linguistically varied. The students, on the other hand, have not resisted or contested its overly simplified and sexist outcome, in other words, a discourse which essentialises gender roles.

### 6.2.2 Resisting essentialisation

In this section, the focus is on the analysis of critical interaction episodes where the teacher, Ahmed is working with another first year English classroom on writing a paragraph about ‘the dishwasher’ using the information provided in Figure 17. It is necessary to point out that this session has taken place five days after the session where the microwave was discussed and that the class of students who worked on the microwave are not the same ones working on writing a
paragraph about the dishwasher. CIE 13, CIE 14 and CIE 15 depict a complex negotiation process where some students attempt to resist an essentialist discourse.

In this session, the teacher, Ahmed, uses the different strategies to scaffold the writing the following final paragraph:

‘In the old times, dishes got dirty when people used them up. So they were obliged to wash them by hands. However it took a lot of time and effort. Then the dishwasher was invented by a housewife named Josephine Cochran in 1889 to save women labour and time. Today many homes have a dishwasher.’

The parts of the discussion that generated the most dynamic negotiations are those where house chores are said to be the sole responsibility of women. Similarly to CIE 12 where the teacher asks ‘what kind or what category of people are we speaking about?’(160), leading the students to answer ‘women’, in this classroom as well he uses similar leading question in CIE 13: ‘to save who? Who are really concerned by the dishwasher?’ (712); to which one student responds ‘woman’ (713). This intervention is followed by a snowball of confirmations from other students and the teacher himself until one student in (719) expresses disapproval. Unfortunately, her exact words were unintelligible at the time of the transcription, but her use of the conjunction ‘but’ and the route that the discussion has taken confirms that she successfully expressed disagreement. In fact, the teacher’s follow up is a repair that partially acknowledges the relativity of the situation. I say partially because he appears to have interpreted the student’s disapproval to be about ‘housewives’ not ‘women’ and carries on bringing ‘women who work’ onto the discussion (722).

CIE 13

| 698 | Ahmed: So the dishwasher was invented by a housewife named Josephine Cochran |
| 699 | Ss: In 1889 |
| 700 | Ahmed: In 1889 (.). What for? |
| 701 | S: To help |
| 702 | Ahmed: To? |
| 703 | Ss: To help save |
| 704 | Ahmed: To help solve the problem |
| 705 | S: To make resolutions |
| 706 | Ahmed: To make a resolution? |
| 707 | S: To save our labour |
| 708 | Ahmed: To save our? |
| 709 | S: Labour |
| 710 | Ahmed: Labour yeah to save our to save |
| 711 | S: Our |
| 712 | Ahmed: To save who? Who are really concerned by the dishwasher? |
This episode (CIE 13) illustrates a first attempt of resistance towards an essentialist discourse. The dialogic approach to teaching adopted by the teacher has set the ground for the student’s voice to be heard and acknowledged. Despite having limited affordance in terms of time given that the teacher is quick to intervene, only one student expresses opinions that differ from the teacher’s and from other more vocal students.

Further examples of how affordance is established by the teacher can be deduced from the next episode CIE 14. In this episode, the teacher asks several questions to open the discussion about the use of the dishwasher in the students’ homes. Those questions are:

- Why do you think that not many houses have a dishwasher? (729)
- In general, the homes that possess a dishwasher, what are the types of women who use it? (735)
- Sincerely, for those who have a dishwasher at home, do you really use it? (772)

Those questions have generated reactions that were not unanimous among the students. To express disagreement with the ongoing discourse documented in CIE 14, where women would use a dishwasher out of laziness and extravagance, some students interrupted the teacher (742) or repeated politely ‘no sir’ (756, 759 and 760), which are short and effective phrases. The latter strategies have led the teacher to repair or relativise his statements (745 and 762) and
accommodate the students (767). It is interesting to see how the students make use of the few opportunities and affordances they have to formulate their opinion in an effective way. For example, some of the students used their personal experience to resist generalisation and provide contextualisation:

- They are busy sir because my mother is a housewife and she has one (744)
- Sir my mom has one but we can’t wash all dish (776)
- Sir me my mom use it but me no (779)
- Sir my mom use it but me not because she told that I have time and energy so I must do it with my hands (784)

One other student, on the other hand, has tried to express her opinion in her mother tongue (762) then was invited to try and do it in English (765). She succeeded to make the teacher accommodate to her position and agree with her (769 and 771).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162 Ahmed:</td>
<td>Now why do you think that not many or not the majority of houses have a dishwasher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 S:</td>
<td>Because we use our hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Ahmed:</td>
<td>Excellent yeah because they use their hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 S:</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 Ahmed:</td>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 S:</td>
<td>Sir sir to be sure that euh to be sure that there is no dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 Ahmed:</td>
<td>Okay now I want to ask you another question (.). Now in general the homes that possess a dishwasher in general generally what are the WOMEN the type of WOMEN who use it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 S:</td>
<td>Lazy women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 Ahmed:</td>
<td>Lazy women?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 S:</td>
<td>Not housewives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 Ahmed:</td>
<td>Not housewives? They are not housewives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173 S:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174 Ahmed:</td>
<td>This means that they are women who work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 S:</td>
<td>Sir I am not okay we are busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 Ahmed:</td>
<td>They work they have a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177 S:</td>
<td>They are busy sir because my mother is a housewife and she has one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178 Ahmed:</td>
<td>So maybe it’s the opposite the women who work are somehow they are?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179 S:</td>
<td>(unintelligible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 Ahmed:</td>
<td>They don’t want to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 S:</td>
<td>Waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
749 Ahmed: They sacrifice their time and money in order to economise to save some?

750 S: Money

751 Ahmed: Money and there may be the opposite some housewives in order to show they are. They are?

752 S: Rich rich

753 Ahmed: They don’t use the dishwasher they just put it in the corner in order to show people that they are? In order to show people that they are?

754 Ss: Rich rich

755 Ahmed: They are rich

756 Ss: No no sir

757 Ahmed: They are?

758 S: Expensive

759 S: No sir

759 Ahmed: Ex? Extra? EXTRAVAGANT

760 S: No sir

761 Ahmed: Now I am not saying that this is the case of every woman

762 S: Sir Kayen li ghi-Ar <There are some who>

763 Ahmed: (unintelligible) {signalling that the student should use English}

764 S: Sir they put it

765 Ahmed: Can you say can you express what you said in English?

766 S: Euh they are people who um buy it because they don’t have time

767 Ahmed: They need it?

768 S: They need it (.) not to

769 Ahmed: I agree with you

770 S: Not to show that they have MONEY or um

771 Ahmed: I agree with you

772 Ahmed: Now sincerely if I ask the students here now be sincere okay be frank (.) Euh who have a dishwasher at home? We have two here three four (. ) four dishwashers NOW okay so the majority don’t have a dishwasher now pay attention please it doesn’t mean that they can’t afford it NOW pay attention those who have a dishwasher at home do you really use it? Sincerely

773 Ss: Yes sir yes yes yes sir

774 S: Sir just for euh

775 Ahmed: They use it just for a party?

776 S: Sir my mom has one but we can’t wash all dish

777 Ahmed: All the dishes
Referring to the continuum of critical classroom interaction developed earlier in this thesis, I have positioned this episode (CIE14) closer to the dialogic discourse pole of the continuum because it displays a complex dialogic and negotiation process where the students and the teacher have engaged as a result of the teacher’s controversial essentialist views. Thus, some students started to formulate opinions that were different from those of the teacher. The roles of the speakers are dialogic because different identities of the students were made visible since they supported their argumentation and interpretations by referring to evidence from their personal experiences and realities. Thus, by drawing on the particularities of different small cultures (e.g., each student’s home), the students have engaged in an intercultural interaction showcasing intercultural competences. The teacher, however, presented his input as the most legitimate one and never spoke about his personal life, but talked from general knowledge. Following this interaction the teacher has carried on his role of leading a dialogic discourse, besides other instances of instructional discourse.

After a short episode about the strategies that the students could use in the exam in order to write similar paragraphs (e.g. using linking words for coherence, including the date in a sentence, etc.), one student raised her hand and tried to express an idea that one of the reasons a family could acquire a dishwasher is if its members who are males, do not participate in such house
chores. Initiating then a new episode (CIE 15) where there is a clear desire to discuss gender roles in the household. Overall, there is one student who is exposing an observation from her environment where males do not participate in washing the dishes (806, 815) and her claim is backed up by another student (818) who says that ‘even fathers are lazy’. The students engage in a dialogue among themselves and put the teacher in the position of a moderator. He tries to shape the students’ contributions by providing what could be described as a rational and logical frame, i.e. make the student realise that her opinion is not generalisable because only four out of forty-four students have a dishwasher (823). However, she insists on voicing out her opinion saying ‘sir, we are alive just to do the dishes or what?’ (826). By ‘we’ the student here is referring to her female colleagues and excluding the teacher who is a male. His reaction was to distance himself from the identity that the student was targeting ‘male’ and reinforce the ‘teacher’ identity, he says ‘this is not a remark for me’ (827). I could observe an uncomfortable atmosphere following the student’s final input. In order to put an end to the discussion, the teacher observed a relatively long silence during which the students started taking notes of the co-constructed paragraph. He then asked them if they had finished writing. Following this, the same student who earlier expressed their opinions engaged in a new conversation with the teacher about the exam and the discussion went smoothly. Here are the details of the above-described discussion.

CIE 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>804</th>
<th>S:</th>
<th>Sir?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>We can say in general the family which contains just guys the family needs a dishwasher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>The family which?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>contains guys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Guys?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>You mean BOYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Yes (unintelligible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Meme les papas-Fr &lt;Even fathers&gt; Feniyanin-Ar &lt;are lazy&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Euh (…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Sir a family that contains only girls don’t need a dishwasher because girls euh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Yes we are just (unintelligible) {other students speaking at the same time}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>(name of student) (name of student) how many are you in this class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Forty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Forty?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this last episode, the processes of resistance towards essentialisation has involved full engagement of the students. Comparatively with the episodes where an essentialist discourse was documented (in the first set of episodes), the space and *affordance* made available by the teacher has resulted to be a key factor for the discussion to take a more complex and interpretive format in this second set of episodes (resisting essentialisation of gender roles). Therefore, it is safe to say that the dialogic approach to teaching was not sufficient in facilitating an intercultural learning in the classroom even though the students have displayed the ability to construct complex and critical ideas. The additional factor was *affordance* in terms of space since the teacher asked the students for their opinion more often in the second set of episodes in comparison to the first set. The other type of *affordance* was about the *safe space* established by the teacher throughout the school year. It could be observed that the students were fully aware that their voices will be heard even if they were to contradict their teacher. Thus, the classroom’s small culture in its complexity, fluidity and dynamism was established collectively and its particular codes were understood by the students and the teachers.

Accordingly, during the second interview conducted with the teacher, I asked him if he believed that there were some students who were keener to participate then others in classroom discussions. In his answer, he drew a difference or a distinction between scientific stream students and literary stream students. Informed by his experience, he believes that the scientific
stream students perform better than literary stream students. In the following account about scientific stream students he explains:

‘Because their profile permits them or allows them to have a certain competence in this language which permits them to **express themselves freely** even if they don’t have a wide view about culture about foreign culture or even their own culture but they can **express themselves freely**, because they are really motivated. Those kind of students who are really open minded and ready to express themselves’ (Interview with Ahmed, 2016).

This distinction between scientific stream students and literary stream students was drawn at several occasions during my interactions with Ahmed. He explained that the literary stream students chose to study in this field because they were low achievers in middle school. He says:

‘The students join the literary stream because they know from the middle school that **these are very slow learners** and even when they got the average [grades] they got it with difficulty they got it with difficulty there is no other stream which may, may I say contain these learners, because **they are very slow learners** and it is the only possible option to go to study. They can’t study mathematics and there are no technical schools, there are no more technical schools which maybe the students can go to’ (Interview with Ahmed, 2016).

It could be argued that the beliefs and the attitudes of the teacher towards his students is shaped by a larger culture, an institutionalised one, which reinforces this perception which gets widely spread and normalised, creating a stereotype about the literary stream student who is profiled as a slow learner. Such essentialised discourse is confirmed by Ahmed’s first-hand experience:

‘There is a **reality that no one can deny** is that most teachers want to work with scientific or mathematic learners’ streams why? Because they are the most they are the students who have that availability that interest to learn to learn and to help the teacher in his course there is that atmosphere of learning. There is that atmosphere of learning and therefore the teacher is always motivated to work and to do his best for his learners’ (Interview with Ahmed, 2016).

Accordingly, the classroom atmosphere, as he describes, is created in collaboration with the students who have more willingness to engage in the activities. In this case, the scientific stream students were observed to be the most engaged ones. Generalising this findings would be prejudicial with regard to the literary stream students and would contribute to essentialising a belief that the
teacher Ahmed and many other teachers I had the possibility to chat with, consider as ‘a reality that no one can deny’ (Ahmed, 2016).

Regarding this aspect of engagement, or lack of it, in the classroom, it is worth considering the students’ perspective on the matter. I had the chance to voice-record some of the discussions with the students who have shared their opinion on their English learning experience in general and on the textbook in particular. I have asked Ahmed’s students to work in small groups and to share with me their comments and opinions about their textbook. One of the students stated:

Student 4: We think that the textbook is somehow boring because some people find it’s very hard to understand. They don’t understand it. Even though it has many exercises and people think that it’s so old, but it is somehow useful, but it’s also so different from other countries. And some student think that the pictures are bad and boring and others love the translation on some pages.

Student 4 has summarised the comments of her friends who find the topics, the texts and the images of their English textbook ‘boring and old’. She later explains that ‘some of the topics are good, but most of them are boring’. She adds:

Student 4: But the book does not encourage us to do some more research about culture’.

Researcher: It doesn’t?

Student 4: No, it doesn’t. For example, when we read something we want to know more about the cultures of like England or something but some topics are very boring and old.

This testimony is very insightful because it helps in identifying other factors preventing the engagement of the students in the classroom. Even though the students have not presented an elaborate explanation for their negative attitudes towards the textbook’s content, their opinion is still valid and informs about their dissatisfaction with the materials catered to them in the classroom. Moreover, another group of students have also shared their opinion on some of the textbook’s topics discussing technology and how such topics undermine their own background knowledge as a young generation who knows more about technology than their teacher.

Researcher: Alright. Are there any topics that you don’t like?

Student 1: The computer. Lots of humans think that the teenagers don’t know about the computer. So most of the topics are about the computer. They think that we don’t know about the computer. So they comment dire—FR [how to say?]?
Student 2: They give us easy words, like, we know it

Student 1: This is the century of technology. So any young you want to ask about the computer, he answers you easy.

Researcher: So you think that this topic is not useful?

Student 1: Yes. Because this generation is the generation of these things.

Student 3: Yes we know more about it

Student 1: Yes. So the teachers I think that he doesn’t have *la possibilité*—FR

Researcher: Capabilities?

Student 1: Yes. It’s us who teach them

It should be noted that the students have chosen to speak to me in English. They wanted to use our group discussion as an opportunity to interact in English. I have nevertheless informed them that if they feel the need, they can rely on other languages to express themselves. The students have had some time to reflect as a group about the topics or images from the textbook that they wanted me to know about. They had already discussed in my absence some of their opinions.

When I joined their table, they had already been engaging in a very enthusiastic debate. It can be deduced from this last discussion that the students are showcasing mediation, collaboration and critical skills. They clearly state that a topic such as the one about the computer is not appropriate for them given their expertise in all things technology related. Notably, the vocabulary is too easy for them and they do not feel they are learning anything from their teacher. In fact, student 1 states that they think that their teacher is not capable to teach them anything new about the computer. Being in the position of the More Knowledgeable Other (MKO) where their background information and knowledge are not valued, could also be considered important factors preventing engagement in the classroom. During this group discussion, students have repeatedly expressed their frustration with boring and irrelevant content which does not help them in developing their skills of discovery and interaction (Byram, 1997).

To sum up, the data indicate that the teacher occupies a central role in enacting the dialogic discourse. In fact, he can make the discussion more open, but he can also shape the discussion to have a more instructional and controlled format. This same teacher has expressed an essentialist discourse first towards gender roles during classroom sessions and second towards students of a given study stream and their level of engagement, during our interviews. However, the emergent critical interaction episodes where the students have managed to resist essentialism and the data from the focus group (group discussion) demonstrate that the students have shown agency in resisting essentialism and that the unappealing textbook topics and the undermining of their linguistic, social and cultural capitals could be factors that prevent their engagement and
therefore hinder the development of intercultural competences such as skills of discovery and interaction (savoir apprendre/faire) (Byram, 1997).

6.3 Translanguaging

In this section, I discuss the participants’ translingual practices, namely translanguaging. Given that I have not observed Yacine’s classroom and have only voice-recorded one of Selma’s classrooms, the only corpus I can discuss in this section is Ahmed’s voice-recorded classrooms.

One of the features of Ahmed’s teacher talk is that he uses English almost exclusively. In fact, throughout the classroom observations and during my interactions with Ahmed, he used very rarely French or Arabic. However, the few instances where French and Arabic were used either by Ahmed and his students are worth looking into because they inform on the linguistic practices in the Algerian English classroom and how the participants navigate those complexities. In this section, I aim to understand the place of languages other than English in the classroom.

In this section, references to critical interaction episodes from the previously described settings will be included to supplement and inform the discussion about translanguaging. The new setting described here is about two classroom sessions with two groups of 3rd-year students working on a sample exam meant to help them prepare for the baccalaureate exam that is writing-based focusing on reading and writing tasks. Those classrooms are literary stream classrooms. The text of this particular exam sample is from the textbook ‘New Prospects SE3’ (see Figure 18) and it addresses the topic of attitudes towards expressing feelings among British and American people. This text encompasses simplistic and stereotypical discourses which are key ingredients of essentialism. References to ‘British’ and ‘American’ people were coded as positive northern references and the qualitative analysis covered the ways in which essentialism was encoded. In this context, the students and the teacher work on the different activities. The first set of activities are comprehension and interpretation questions to be deduced directly from the text. The second set of activities is oriented towards grammar and language mastery. The teacher facilitates the session by working with the students on one task at a time. Comparatively with the other classrooms observed, the students’ contributions here were minimal. During those two sessions, the teacher has used a lot of repetitions and body language. After the session, the teacher seemed to be out of breath and tired. At the end of the sessions, he mentioned that it was hard to engage the literary stream students especially when the session is in the afternoon, which was the case here.
As it was mentioned earlier, the text around which the interaction is taking place reproduces a stereotypical representation of the ‘British’ and the ‘Americans’ by assigning fixed traits of character to a wide population meanwhile denying its complexity. Such texts are very common in English textbooks because they are linguistically accessible to students and legitimised by the fact that they are extracted from sources such as ‘the oxford guide to British and American culture’ (a sort of a guarantee of authenticity). It should be noted that in the analysis of the two classroom sessions working on the activities about this text there was no instance of resistance to essentialism. The text was treated as a reference to solve language tasks. They were however few instances where the students’ cultural capital was recalled, namely their multilingual background.
In CIE 16, CIE 17 and CIE 18 the students and the teacher use languages other than English to co-construct meaning. In the first episode, CIE 16, the activity is about deducing from the text what certain demonstrative pronouns refer to. Here the question is about the demonstrative pronoun ‘this’ from the sentence: ‘lovers hold hands in public and sometimes embrace and kiss each other, but many elderly people don’t like to see this’. The teacher guides the students towards identifying what is meant by ‘this’ which is ‘lovers holding hands in public and sometimes embracing and kissing each other’. He then asks the question why the British elderly would not like such demonstration of feelings, leading the students to use the vocabulary they have already been exposed to mainly from the text which are ‘traditional’ and ‘reserved’. The students are not very collaborative and the teacher repeats and reformulates input from the text at several occasions hoping that they would uptake this input and do something with it. So, all what the teacher does is mainly repeating that British people do not show emotions because it is believed that those who do so are considered weak. The teacher then facilitates the use of the antonym strong and directs them back to paragraph number two from the text above which explains that traditional British people are reserved.

CIE 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>He has got a? strong character why? What is the word? We have seen the word in paragraph number two when we started speaking about the British people what is the word which is written? In second paragraph (.). In contrast to this (reading from the textbook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Is the traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Yes? The traditional British is?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>RESERVED the British are? The British are RESERVED the British are reserved what does it mean reserved? They are? They are? What? CONSERVATIVE they are conservative have you understood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1089</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>(unintelligible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1092</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>It’s the same thing in Algeria the old people are? Conservative women still wear el Hayek-Ar &lt;special local outfit&gt; and the men sometimes they put on the Jellaba-Ar &lt;special local outfit&gt; it’s the opposite of the young people they are open they are open minded but the old people are conservative what does it mean conservative? Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mutamassik-Ar &lt;holds to things&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Mutamassik-Ar yeah and muha[fid-Ar &lt;conservative&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1095</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Muhafid]-Ar &lt;conservative&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher’s talk in this particular session is oriented towards scaffolding the use of synonyms and antonyms (strong, weak, traditional, reserved, and conservative). In (1088) he asks the students if they understood what is meant by being conservative, one student’s response was positive and the rest of the students have shown little engagement. In order to reinforce their understanding, the teacher uses the example of local elderly people who still wear traditional outfit to illustrate their conservativeness. Contrariwise, he considers young people as open minded making it sound that the antonym of ‘conservative’ was ‘open minded’. What I describe as a translingual practice here is on the one hand, the use of culture-specific concepts, i.e. el-Hayek and Jebliba, without translating them into English acknowledging, therefore, that the students are familiar with those cultural artefacts. On the other hand, some students managed to negotiate the Arabic equivalent of the word ‘conservative’, showcasing their cultural and linguistic capital. As a result, despite the production and reproduction of an essentialist discourse, the teacher managed to involve more students in the discussion by appealing to their translingual capital and it is for these reasons that this critical interaction episode is positioned towards the dialogic discourse end of the continuum of classroom interaction.

In the next episode, CIE 17, the students are asked to look for a word from the 4th paragraph of the text (Figure 18) that could have as a definition ‘what is generally said or believed about the character of a person or a thing’. It does not take long for the students to give the correct answer which is ‘reputation’ (837 and 839).
In (840), the teacher confirms the appropriateness of the students’ answer by giving positive feedback and expands saying that it’s the ‘same thing in French’. It could be understood from this link or comparison that the teacher is saying that the word ‘reputation’ is spelled the same and carries the same meaning in both French and English. He then asks for the Arabic equivalent.

After few attempts, the students got confused between two Arabic words, one dialectal /Sumaa/ with an emphatic /s/ which means ‘minaret’ and the other from standard Arabic /sumaa/ with a non-emphatic /s/ which indeed is the Arabic equivalent of reputation. The subtle difference between the two propositions which resides in the /s/ sound makes it challenging for the students to agree on which one is more appropriate. Most of the students repeat or shout out their answers reinforcing the feeling of confusion among themselves and only one student uses indexation to highlight the difference between the word with an emphatic /s/ and the one without. She puts forward her input in local Arabic (850) saying that /Sumaa/ which comes with an emphatic /s/ is the thing that belongs to the mosque, i.e., the minaret. It should be noted that the words used to refer to ‘minaret’ and ‘mosque’ are from the local Arabic and won’t be found in
a dictionary of Standard Arabic. But the appropriate equivalent to reputation, i.e. /sumaa/ with non-emphatic /s/, is used both in the local Arabic and in Standard Arabic.

Translanguaging here is embraced and used effectively to reinforce understanding, but also it is a form of recognition of the student’s linguistic capital. Even though the teacher states at the end of this episode that asking the students for the Arabic and French equivalent was only meant to verify understanding, it did nonetheless trigger a higher involvement and participation among the students. Moreover, the teacher has shown inclusiveness by soliciting students’ French and Arabic resources given that some of them are more comfortable in one language than the other.

In the next episode, CIE 18, the teacher uses a grammatical rule of the French language which is known to the students to explain a grammatical phenomenon in English. The transcription of CIE 18 does not really capture faithfully the discourse of the teacher here because there are behaviours that are not verbally articulated but were clear at the time of the observation and while listening to the voice-recording. One example is when the teacher says in (907) that there are two subjects and then speaks about two verbs, he is addressing two dimensions of the activity at the same time. To put this episode in perspective, the students were asked to formulate a question about the underlined word of the sentence: ‘Alex and Jennifer spend their honey moon aboard’. The student in (906) uses the auxiliary ‘do’ which led the teacher to say ‘we have two subjects’, i.e. plural, justifying, thus, for the rest of the class the appropriateness of using ‘do’ and not ‘does’. He then swiftly focuses on the form of the verb ‘to spend’ which is in the infinitive. He expands the explanation by reciting a grammar rule in English then in French. The students’ familiarity with this rule is illustrated by the fact that they finish the teacher’s sentence in (808) and (810).

CIE 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>905</th>
<th>T:</th>
<th>Can you repeat to your friend please?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Where do Alex and Jennifer spend their honey moon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>So we have two subjects the first verb is conjugated the second one is infinitive the same rule as in French quand on a deux verbs qui se suivent le premier verb-Fr &lt;when we have two successive verbs the first one is conjugated and the second&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Se conjugue-Fr &lt;is conjugated&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Le deuxieme se met?-Fr &lt;the second is put?&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>A l’infinitif-Fr &lt;in the infinitive&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Have you understood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6

The important point here is the strategic use of a grammatical reference of one language (French) in the context of another language (English). In this particular example, the transferability of such grammar norm was established by the teacher and proved to be efficient in communicating the pedagogical outcome. Also, the teacher knew that the students were familiar with this particular French grammar rule and his mastery of such rule did not come as a surprise for the students. As an observer having studied most of my life in Algerian schools, this episode revived memories of French lessons of primary, middle and secondary schools. Concerning to the positionality of this example in the broader discussion about northern and southern references, the personal pronouns ‘Alex’ and ‘Jennifer’ that could be considered as northern references, were not particularly discussed or questioned by neither the students nor the teacher. As a result, the focus in this episode was on language form but the knowledge co-construction involved translingual resources and made visible the cultural capital and identities of the teacher and the students as members of the small cultures across the Algerian schooling system.

The following episodes CIE 19, CIE 20 and CIE 21 are extracted from the same classroom session where 1st year students discussed the ‘microwave’ which was described in first setting. Those episodes come under this section of translingual practices because they inform about the participants’ performative competence (Canagarajah, 2013b) and the importance of their multilingual capital. Figure 19 is a screenshot of the activity around which those interactions have taken place.

![DEVELOPING SKILLS](image)

**Figure 19:** Matching activity from ‘At the Crossroads SE1’, p.120

From the full transcript of the classroom session described in the first setting, a discussion about the ‘Walkman’ occupied a large part of the interaction, which was due to the fact that the
students did not know what a Walkman was. It is worth reminding that the textbook ‘At the Crossroads SE1’ was published in 2006 and that this classroom observation was conducted in 2016 and no changes have been brought to the materials since their first year of publication. This could explain the generational gap and the students’ unfamiliarity with similar technology. In episode CIE 19, the teacher, Ahmed, gives the example of a music player device known among Algerian users as MP3. At several occasions the teacher refers to the device in its French name ‘M P trois’ (256, 264) even after one student said the name of the device in English ‘M P three’ (261).

CIE 19

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>T: Well a Walkman is an instrument an electronic instrument which used to be which was used in the past and it was used in order to (.) listen to music it’s like M P trois-Fr &lt;MP3&gt; It is like M P trois-Fr &lt;MP3&gt; okay? But it’s no longer used now (.) Now there is another (.) there is another what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>S: Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>T: There is another?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>S: Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>T: Device (.) what is this device? It is AN?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>S: M P three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>T: Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>S: (Unintelligible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>T: What is M P trois-Fr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>S: To listen music?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>T: It’s a device in order to listen to music (.) it’s an an? It’s what? An?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>S: Invention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>S: Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>T: An Invention very good (.) it’s an invention which is used in order to? Listen? [To? Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Ss: To music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This episode illustrates first the lack of sharedness between the teacher and the students due to the generational gap. But it also informs about a phenomenon called the poetic dimension of linguaeculture (Risager, 2006). As it was discussed in chapter 2, the concept of linguaeculture captures the inseparability of language and culture especially at the level of what Risager describes as the poetic resources that are connected to the language. In this case, it is embedded in the teacher’s language that the device MP3 is called M P trois-FR. Moreover, the teacher has pronounced the R of trois as a rhotic R instead of guttural R, a phonological behaviour that is common among Algerian adult males, though the transcript above does not capture the way the R is produced. From a sociolinguistic perspective, such phonological trait contributes to the
individual’s self-representation whether consciously or unconsciously and informs about what Risager calls the identity dimension of linguaculture (ibid.).

The next episode is about the word ‘Kit-main’ that is used by the teacher as if it was an English word. In (418) one student is trying to say that earphones are used to listen to music but she does not know the English word and contributes with a word that is familiar to her: ‘kit-main’ which is short for the French ‘kit mains-libres’ which translates to ‘hands-free kit’, i.e. headphones or earphones. In addition, the teacher’s pronunciation of ‘kit-main’ sounded like he was saying ‘kit-man’ which could explain that he kept using it as if it was an English word.

CIE 20

| 412 | S: | Walkman experts say it causes hearing problems |
| 413 | T: | Yeah can you repeat please? |
| 414 | S: | Experts say it causes hearing problems |
| 415 | T: | Excellent (. ) A Walkman according to experts it causes hearing problems (. ) why? (. )(name of student) |
| 416 | S: | When the sound is loud |
| 417 | T: | First of all when the sound is loud because we put a? What do we put here? |
| 418 | S: | Kit main-Fr <earphones> |
| 419 | S: | Music |
| 420 | T: | Yes Kit main-Fr <earphones> we put kit main-FR <earphones> in our ears and if we spend a? long time listening to? [ music |
| 421 | Ss: | Music |
| 422 | T: | It causes harm [to? Our? Hearing (. )yes it’s number? |
| 423 | Ss: | One |
| 424 | T: | One (...) |

The teacher has efficiently used dialogic teaching and provided sufficient descriptions to scaffold understanding which resulted in the successful completion of the activity. So, what this episode informs about is of a phenomenon known to second language acquisition research as transfer. Furthermore, the linguistic proximity between French and English could have facilitated such transfer and made the perception that the word ‘kit-main’ was a plausible English word. I personally had to google the word ‘kit-main’ when I first went to buy earphones in a local shop in Algeria. Another interpretation is that the concept of ‘kit-man’ or ‘kit-main’ is an indication of how translanguaging is fluid and knows no hard barriers in the speaker’s mind.

The following episode CIE 21 is about the word ‘deplace’ used by one of the students in (468) which is from the French verb ‘deplacer’ which translates to ‘to move’. She pronounced the verb ‘deplace’ as /depleis/ making it sound English. Another transfer strategy that communicated
effectively the intended meaning to the teacher who ‘repaired’ and reformulated it. I have put the term ‘repair’ between inverted commas because it denotes repairing a false or an erroneous input, and I believe that this translingual practice is not an error rather an effective communication strategy, which was up taken by the teacher who did not flag it. This episode is another confirmation of the importance of sharedness among the teacher and the students with regard to their linguistic and cultural capital.

CIE 21

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>S: Automobile it saves our time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>T: So it saves our time (. ) it saves time when?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>S: When we need euh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>T: It saves time when?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>S: Traveling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>T: When we travel very good excellent (. ) it saves time when we travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>S: And sir it can deplace* for another places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>T: Very good we can we can move to other places (. ) It?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>S: Shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>T: It SHORTENS distances because it saves?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Ss: Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, the episodes that served to document the teacher’s and the students’ resourceful use of translanguaging in order to co-construct knowledge. These episode are an illustration of the enactment of dialogic discourse where the roles and the identities of the participants are multiple and dynamic and the accuracy of the task is secondary. In fact, it was interesting to observe the participants’ performative competence (Canagarajah, 2013) as well as examples of their linguacultures (Risager, 2006), in addition to the valuable place that both French and Arabic have occupied in the process of co-constructing knowledge in English. In the aforementioned episodes neither the teacher nor the students referred to the glossary which has a list of verbs and vocabulary in English, French and in Arabic, because of the emergent nature of the interaction. However, the students are aware that they have a glossary they can rely on throughout the lesson. The teacher in this situation has successfully used the students’ linguistic capital as a symbolic resource.

6.4 Banal nationalism

Banal nationalism is a concept introduced by Billig (1995) that talks about references to the nation that are presented as an unquestioned and natural part of the landscape. He states that ‘the metonymic image of banal nationalism is not a flag which is being consciously waved with fervent
passion; it is the flag hanging unnoticed on the public building’ (Billig, 1995, p. 8). In this research, the theme of the nation has emerged in the analysis of the textbooks where flags and countries were used to showcase the multiplicity and variety of cultural references.

In the school where the main fieldwork has taken place, there are Algerian flags in almost every classroom (see Figure 20). At the entrance of the institution, there is a frame with the national flag and next to it another frame with the national anthem. The name of the institution is of a female martyr that fought for Algerian independence and the national anthem is sung every morning in the courtyard during the flag-raising ceremony. However, in the recorded interactions there were few direct references to Algeria as a nation and fewer references that celebrate national icons. For example, in the ‘mastery of language’ section of a previously discussed exam sample for 3rd-year students, one of the tasks is about interrogative sentences (Figure 21):

![Figure 21: Mastery of language activity extracted from a language test](image)

In this activity, the focus is on formulating questions about the underlined words: Algerians, abroad and Annaba. The process of co-construction of an interrogative sentence about the word
‘abroad’ was partly described earlier in CIE 18. Therefore, the following analysis concerns the words ‘Algerians’ and ‘Annaba’ supported by CIE 22 and CIE 23 respectively. In CIE 22, the generalisation in the sentence ‘Algerians love football’ was neither questioned nor resisted. Rather, the students participated in the dialogic process to co-construct the interrogative sentence: ‘who like football?’ Most of the dialogue in this episode is targeting words’ functions (863, 864, 866, and 869) and the form of the verb ‘to like’ (874, 875 and 880). Apart from one instance when a student said that Algerians are people of Algeria (861) there were no interest neither from the teacher nor the students in resisting the stereotype or the essentialisation captured in the three-words sentence ‘Algerians like football’.

CIE 22

| 856 | T: | Okay going to activity five |
| 857 | S: | Sir sir |
| 858 | T: | What is the underlying underlined word here |
| 859 | Ss: | Algerians |
| 860 | T: | Algerians |
| 861 | S: | People of Algeria |
| 862 | T: | Now what is the function of the word in the sentence? |
| 863 | S: | Noun |
| 864 | S: | Subject |
| 865 | T: | Subject very good (.) you are asking a question about the subject which is a? |
| 866 | Ss: | Person |
| 867 | T: | A person (.) so when the subject is a person |
| 868 | Ss: | Who who |
| 869 | T: | We use the interrogative pronoun? |
| 870 | Ss: | Who who |
| 871 | T: | Who |
| 872 | S: | Who likes football |
| 873 | T: | Who? |
| 874 | S: | Like |
| 875 | S: | Likes |
| 876 | T: | Now here we have AlgerianS |
| 877 | S: | Likes likes |
| 878 | T: | Who likes or who like (.) since here we have Algerians so? We are asking about the? |
| 879 | S: | Plural |
| 880 | T: | Plural so who LIKE who like this means that the person who is asking the question knows that we are asking about the plural (.) who like Algeria |
In this critical interaction episode, the intercultural dimension remains peripheral and the negotiation energy is dedicated to language form and function. It could be argued that the aim of the activity is to formulate interrogative sentences, therefore questioning the essentialist discourse of certain content becomes accessory or secondary. However, it should be noted that several intercultural interactions have emerged in many of the previously analysed episodes despite having a language-focused objective (e.g., CIE 13, 14 and 15). The difference is that in the latter episodes, in order to be accomplished, the earlier task was more complex and required affordance of time and space. In this task, moving from one sentence to another is almost mechanical. In fact, the next episode CIE 23 was introduced smoothly and it was about formulating a question about ‘Annaba’ a city in the north east of Algeria. The students were engaged in the process of co-construction of the interrogative sentence: ‘where did President Boudiaf die?’ and little attention, in order not to say none, was given to the knowledge around this information. Apart from when a student who seemed distracted during the activity asked about the place where President Boudiaf died and the teacher reminded her that this information was given in the activity using a sarcastic tone in (931).

CIE 23

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>913</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Next one and the last one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Sir?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Yes (name of student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Where did President Boudiaf died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>Die</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Again we speaking about the?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>WHERE did why did?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>Because DIED in the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Because the verb to die is in the? [past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Where did President Boudiaf die (...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Where president?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Where president Boudiaf die? Where?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This episode is another illustration of a missed opportunity to engage in an intercultural learning where historical facts and information should have been given more essence and discussed among a younger generation. A small window or opportunity was created by the student asking about the place of death of President Boudiaf but the teacher considered it as a lack of attention coming from her. There were no questions about the conditions in which he died. Rather, the discussion was about the form of the verb ‘to die’. Neither were there questions about the appropriateness of using the word ‘to die’, given that he was assassinated.

Concerning the notion of banal nationalism, those two last episodes are relevant examples of the passiveness of such representations of the nation. It appears that mentions of Algeria and its late president were random and out of place. However, in the context of this specific exam sheet, the text was about attitudes of expressing feelings among Americans and British people, the comprehension questions were mainly related to reinforcing the content of text, but the language mastery questions appeared to have been designed separately from the focus of the text and they do bring southern references (e.g. Algerian football and late president of Algeria, an Algerian town, a character named Ahmed) to balance the overall northern orientation of the text. This is a tendency in design that was observed in the analysis of the textbooks (chapter 4). Therefore, banal nationalism here did not generate discussions that are critical or requiring intercultural competences. But isn’t this the sole purpose of banal nationalism, i.e. to go unnoticed?

From the analysis of textbooks, the main discussion about banal nationalism has turned has concerned the Algerian flag. The next sub-section is about the banal mention of nationalities such as British and American both in text and in talk.
6.4.1 One language, one nation, one culture

This sub-section feeds into the discussion about the separability or inseparability of language and culture. The idea of the interconnection between a given language to a given culture or nation has been discussed in the literature review with the work of Risager (2006, 2007, 2012) and her critical evaluation language-culture relationship while exploring transnational flows. In fact, Risager argues for the necessity to re-evaluate the rigidity of such relationship by considering the linguacultures that people carry with them through the poetic and identity dimensions of their translingual practices. But, she does not disregard the fact that within appellations such as Arabic language or French language, the historical link to linguistic or cultural communities such as Arabs or a nation such as France is not to be ignored or neglected. Furthermore, Baker (2015a) with his work on intercultural awareness in English as lingua franca, challenges the myth of the native speaker and argues for the development of a vision of cultures as fluid, dynamic, emergent and complex. For the case of English, he states that ‘the global use of English as a Lingua Franca in a huge variety of scenarios brings to the fore the limitations of associating a particular language, English, with any one culture or even group of cultures, i.e., the Anglophone world’ (Baker, 2015a, p. 17). In fact, he supports the idea that ‘language and culture [are] closely linked but not inseparable’ (ibid).

The following critical interaction episodes illustrate how the idea of a linear relationship between one language, one culture and one nation is inherent in the teacher’s discourse and sustained through repetition and reinforced by neglecting the few nuances brought by the text. CIE 24, CIE 25, CIE 26 and CIE 27 are extracted from the classroom session described in last setting.

In CIE 24, the students respond to the question ‘how many Americans believe that it is better to express feelings rather than hide them?’ In such task, the students are expected to identify the answer directly from the text and one student responds ‘nearly all Americans believe that it is better to express feelings rather than hide them’ (962) which is confirmed by the teacher who refers back to the text.

CIE 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>953</th>
<th>T:</th>
<th>Number two?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Answer the given questions according to the text {reading from the exam sample sheet}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>How many Americans believe that it is better to express feelings rather than hide them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Than? HIDE them (.) how many? Number one A how many [Americans?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the following episode, the relativity brought by the word ‘nearly’ identified in CIE 24 has dissipated and left room for a series of essentialist statements. In fact, in CIE 25 the shortcut is easily made between American and how they like to express their feelings versus British and how they prefer to suppress their feelings. The nuanced linguistic items put forward by the text that would prevent generalisations are quickly disregarded which results in an interaction as follows:

**CIE 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>970</th>
<th>T:</th>
<th>The American people would rather cry rather than hide their?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Tears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>972</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Tears (.). why? Why do they prefer to CRY? Why? How are Americans (.). How are they? (...) how are the British? (...) how are the British? Are they similar in the ways of showing their feelings? (.). Are they similar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>973</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>No (.). now the Americans (.). what was the answer of the first questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>First question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>The Americans believe that it is better to express their feeling rather than hide them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>So the Americans prefer to express their FEELINGS rather than? (.). Hide them so the Americans? (.). EXPRESS their feelings so they are? (.). How are they? (.). People who express their feelings how are they? We have seen this before (.). Who express FEELINGS? (...) Anyway anyway anyway the Americans would prefer to express their feelings rather than? Rather than what? (.). Rather than what? Rather than?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Hide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following episode (CIE 26), the interaction is tightly related to what is mentioned in the textbook. The students are not engaged with the teacher and their contributions are minimal.
This makes the teacher advance more leading questions and insist in motivating a response from the students. One of the leading questions is about the belief that British people might have that the person who shows feelings is a weak. The aim of the teacher here is to make the students use or reuse as much vocabulary as possible. The focus on the language here as mediated by the teacher and the textbook comes at the expense of deconstructing a complex stereotypical discourse.

**CIE 26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>991</th>
<th>T:</th>
<th>To HIDE where is it said in the text? We said that paragraph number two speaks about the British actually their attitudes or their feelings where is it stated that the British do not express or hide their feelings (...) Where? (...)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>992</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Sir?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>994</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>They rather prefer hiding them {reading from the textbook}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Excellent they rather prefer hiding THEM them THEM refers to what? Them refers to what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>To FEELINGS they rather prefer HIDING their feelings than showing them okay? Because people who show their emotions are thought to be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>998</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following and last episode (CIE 27) is another example of how the British and the Americans are considered as uniform, monolithic, and homogenous and this is done for the sake of a pedagogical activity where students are meant to co-construct the meaning of the concepts ‘introvert’ and ‘extrovert’.

**CIE 27**

| 1021 | T: | The British the British are? |
| 1022 | S: | In introvert |
| 1023 | T: | Introvert why? |
| 1024 | S: | Because they prefer to hide their feelings |
| 1025 | T: | The British are INTROVERT what does it means? They prefer? To hide rather than? Rather than? |
| 1026 | S: | Express |
| 1027 | T: | Express what is the synonym of express? To express or to? You know it (name of student) can you? You must? What’s the verb? |
| 1028 | S: | Show |
SHOW so the Americans SHOW their feelings they don’t feel? Ashamed to show that they are in love with someone or they are angry they don’t they don’t hide they don’t hide their? Feelings it’s completely the contrary of? The opposite of the British who are? Who are? Who are? INTROVERT INTROVERT they don’t they don’t express their feelings they are INTROVERT they leave their feelings INSIDE okay? What about phlegmatic? What about phlegmatic? Who are phlegmatic? (.). The term phlegmatic describes what kind of people? Americans? British? Neither of them? Or both of them? (.). What does it mean phlegmatic? (...) Phlegmatic means when you stay? When you stay? (.). CALM in situations which are difficult one someone has got problems or is in danger or Euh or maybe arguing with someone he says calm this is what we call phlegmatic okay the aptitude to stay calm (.). now who are phlegmatic? The Americans? Or the British? (.)

The British

The British why? Could you explain? Or justify why? (...) we said that the Americans? The Americans?

Express

Express their feelings they show their feelings when they are angry or when they are happy or when they are in love with someone they show their feelings (.). when they have got problems? They? SHOW their feelings why? Because they are?

Extrovert

Extrovert

To sum up, these last episodes illustrate how the process of essentialisation and creating an assimilatory link between a nationality and certain traits or characters is reinforced and perpetuated. The teacher had shared his philosophy and explanation about the lack of engagement of the students which was that they were slow learners. However, the fact that the textbook has represented discourse communities as a fixed entity has added to the lack of criticality from the teacher which did make the process of resisting essentialism much harder. This has led to a reproduction of the problematic ‘one language, one nation, and one culture’ discourse.

6.5 Discussion and conclusion

The interpretation of the interviews with the teachers has shown that there is a dominant understanding of English as pertaining to the inner-circle countries. This leads to an interpretation of the intercultural as a process of comparison and contrast between two big/large cultures such as what is understood here as Algerian and British culture or Algerian and American culture, even
though such a monolithic approach is indeed questionable. Based on Baker’s (2011) model of intercultural awareness, such characterisation of culture and intercultural communication indicates that the participants (here the teachers of English) show a basic cultural awareness (level 1) considering culture as a set of shared behaviours, beliefs, values and world views which could be similar or different from one culture to another. Here, essentialism is observed in the participants’ formulation of a sine qua non relationship between a given language, a given culture and nation, in addition to considering English as the language of the inner circle. Holliday, Hyde and Kullman (2016, p. 70) argue that ‘essentialism is often the natural ‘default position’ of how people view cultures and illustrates how a ‘non-essentialist’ view involves a shift from a ‘large’ to ‘small’ culture perception’ (ibid. p. 72). This shift was observed in the critical interaction episodes where the students have resisted the essentialisation of gender roles. The factors that have facilitated such open discussion can be due to the fact that the students are comfortable with their classrooms’ small culture which they contributed in co-creating and that their teacher has also permitted the co-creation of such space for critical engagement. This finding aligns with Howard et al.’s (2019) study that found that when the teachers adopted an intercultural approach and learner-centred pedagogy in the classroom, the learners have expressed more openly their opinions on what they found weird or bizarre and showcased skills of reflection and criticality regarding their own cultural practices (e.g., greeting in France and greeting in the Maori community). However, the critical interaction episodes analysed in this chapter are illustrations of naturally-occurring interactions where the teacher has not been trained or prepared to mediate an intercultural oriented discussion. He in fact has managed to take the discussion back to the linguistic focus it was initially meant to be about. This key finding expands our understanding of the constraints of the classroom and confirms that there is a real need to train teachers to challenge their own essentialised views on topics related to gender, nationality, origin, religion, and so on.

Regarding the learners’ ability to navigate the complexity of cultural topics, the data from Ahmed’s classroom shows that when the students were drawing knowledge and arguments from their own lived experiences with different smaller cultures, there was little but still informative evidence of the co-construction of discourse that is non-essentialist. Among the examples of small cultures (1999) documented in this chapter, there are i) the students’ experience at home with the dishwasher and the microwave, ii) in the classroom, iii) with different schools, iv) in classrooms of other languages, etc. The resistance to essentialism I believe has been facilitated by their enthusiastic interest in the topic (gender roles) but also by the dialogic discourse which in turn has allowed the visibility and emergence of the multiplicity of views and memberships to different discourse systems of the participants (Scollon and Scollon, 2001). This finding aligns with
Porto’s (2019) study that found that the students have engaged deeply and critically in the different activities given that they cared about the topic (the Malvinas war and the historical relationship between Britain and Argentina). The collaborative pedagogy adopted by Porto has also contributed to creating a platform for the students to deconstruct stereotypes about the self and the other. It is this platform that Ahmed’s students have tried to negotiate in order to express their views about the essentialised gender roles. This evidence expands our understanding of some of the factors that are at play in implementing or hindering an intercultural approach to language learning, i.e., appealing topics and a learner-centred space for dialogue and discussion.

Moreover, Kramsch’s (2011) conceptualisation of the symbolic dimensions of the intercultural helps in deconstructing the teacher’s discourse as well as the students’ discourse. From the critical interaction episodes analysed in this chapter, there is evidence of a number of symbolic dimensions: the reaction (or lack of reaction) to symbolic representations (women are responsible for house chores), the symbolic action (using language(s), interruption, and argumentation) and the symbolic power (navigating the teacher-student and male-female power imbalance). This key finding is the indication that there is real potential in the English classroom to further develop the symbolic competence of the learners. However, engaging in such endeavour is not the objective of the teachers as it was demonstrated with his focus on the linguistic competence of their students.

Furthermore, the analysis shows that the critical interaction episodes where essentialism was not resisted or contested are episodes where the dominant discourse was instructional, teacher-centred, and accuracy-focused. During the interview, Ahmed has tried to justify the lack of engagement of his literary stream students by stating that they are de facto slow learners. Such assumptions are very dangerous and can have a considerable impact on the motivation and the quality of education of students. On the other hand, listening to the students during the focus group discussion, they have managed to provide a more complex, multifaceted and critical explanation for their lack of engagement with the materials (e.g., unappealing and boring topics, too easy/too difficult language, etc.). The focus group discussion with the students have shown that they are capable to express criticality towards their learning materials. This finding aligns with the study of McConachy (2018) who found that his students were capable to showcase advanced criticality skills and deconstruct stereotypical and problematic content. Moreover, this finding extends our knowledge about low proficiency students’ experience in the English classroom who are as capable as advanced speakers to demonstrate skills of reflection and criticality if given the chance. Therefore, the teachers’ justification for low engagement is most certainly informed by his first-hand experience but it is clouded by his essentialist views about literary and scientific stream students.
Regarding translanguaging in the classroom, it was found in this chapter that the teacher has encouraged the students to rely on their linguistic and cultural backgrounds in order to facilitate understanding of the task. This situation resembles several translingual or bilingual practices documented in multilingual classroom settings, such as the ones in Creese and Blackledge’s investigation in Chinese and Gujarati community language schools in the UK. They argue that ‘flexible bilingualism is used by teachers as an instructional strategy to make links for classroom participants between the social, cultural, community, and linguistic domains of their lives’ (Creese and Blackledge, 2010, p. 112). Certainly, the evidence presented in this chapter demonstrates the fluid and strategic use of French and Arabic alongside English, in this case for task achievement. However, it further posits the question about whether it has facilitated intercultural learning, i.e., the development or use of intercultural competences such as mediation, relating, reflecting, criticality and raising intercultural awareness. Referring back to the critical interaction episode discussing the way British and American people express emotions, the teacher has attempted to create parallels between the students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds and the topic discussed in class. However, the fluid use of the different languages did not conceal the blatant essentialism taking place in this instance. On the other hand, Liddicoat (2008) claims that intercultural pedagogy values and actively integrates the students’ languages and cultures, which was indeed documented in this chapter. However, the above findings show that when the teacher does not adopt an explicit critical and interculturally informed approach, the interaction can lead to perpetuating stereotypes that go unnoticed. Therefore, I argue that the active integration of the students’ and the teacher’s translanguaging in the classroom is a positive practice, though insufficient to implement an intercultural pedagogy. There needs to be more explicit integration of intercultural learning outcomes in the language textbooks and the teachers’ practice.

Regarding banal nationalism, the ethnographic notes and photos of the classroom have captured the national symbols scattered in the learning materials and the schools’ walls. The concept of the nation and its symbol belongs to the fabric of the Algerian educational institution. It is also extended to the way other countries and nations are considered. The critical interaction episodes analysed under the theme of ‘one language, one nation, one culture’, demonstrate that countries like Britain and the US are viewed as monolithic and homogenous in the textbook and supported by the teachers’ discourse during the interviews and the classroom sessions. This key finding is in line with Munandar and Newton’s (2021, p. 8) study where the data ‘illustrate how closely intertwined the teachers’ understandings and classroom representations of culture and interculturality were with the State’s policies and underlying ideology’. In fact, it was mentioned in Chapter 4 that the textbooks unit’s that include intercultural learning outcomes mainly expect the students to compare and contrast between national cultures. Thus, similarity to the
Indonesian educational policy documents, the Algerian language curriculum presents countries as monolithic rather than complex entities where cultures are dynamic and socially constructed (Holliday, 2011). This expands our understanding of the challenges facing the implementation of an intercultural approach to learning, given that at the policy and institutional level there are still structural forces that perpetuate a fixed approach to language-and-culture teaching.

In terms of pedagogy, the qualitative analysis of the series of critical interaction episodes presented in this last chapter confirms the dominance of the instructional, teacher-centred, language-focused pedagogy. Despite the few instances where the discussion was more open and dialogic (e.g., resisting essentialism), the desire to achieve linguistic competence and accomplish the prescribed tasks is stronger than deconstructing a complex stereotypical discourse. Similarly to Lázár’s (2020) findings, the teachers here are comfortable with the way they have been running their classroom and they do not show a willingness to integrate more cooperative learner-centred activities. It can be understandable that the volume of work teachers have to deal with daily prevents them from engaging in new practices that may disrupt their routine. However, the essentialist discourse perpetuated throughout this investigation call for a top-down reform that would allow teachers to benefit from training and more appropriate learning materials. In fact, Byram and Wagner (2018, p. 148) argue that ‘such work requires institutional cooperation time, but above all, it requires language educators to see themselves in a different light’. Working closely with Ahmed, Selma and Yacine have most certainly ignited reflections about their own beliefs and practice as educators and gave me the impression that they were open to learning more about this intercultural approach for which I was dedicating my time and passion.
Chapter 7 Conclusion

This research project has adopted an ethnographically-inspired interpretive approach in order to explore the construction of interculturality and intercultural learning opportunities in Algerian secondary school English textbooks and classrooms. This concluding chapter aims to summarise the project and to bring together its key ideas. In the first section (7.1), I address the research questions and summarise the key findings. Secondly, in section (7.2), I outline the implications that could be drawn from these findings in terms of theory, methodology, pedagogy, and policy. Then, in section (7.3), I address the study’s limitations followed by suggestions for future research (7.4). Finally, I complete this thesis with concluding remarks in section (7.5).

7.1 Addressing the research questions

This study is designed to answer the following research questions:

- **RQ1** What discourses promoting interculturality are represented in the secondary school English textbooks?
- **RQ2** How are those discourses interpreted by the teacher?
  - a. How do the teachers understand interculturality?
  - b. What are the teachers’ practices that facilitate or hinder the promotion of interculturality?
- **RQ3** How are those discourses interpreted by the learners?
  - a. What are the learners’ beliefs and attitudes towards the textbook’s discourses for interculturality?
  - b. What are the learners’ behaviours towards intercultural input?
- **RQ4** How is intercultural learning constructed in the English language classroom?

In order to describe this project's contribution to knowledge, I address each research question below.

With regard to **RQ1**, the aim was to deconstruct the textbooks’ content in order to see whether there is an agenda to promote intercultural learning and explore what type of discourse is prevailing across the three textbooks. The content analysis focused on identifying southern and northern frames of reference and the values attributed to them. I have elaborated extensively in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 on the rationale for this coding scheme. In terms of the multiplicity of cultural references, the findings have revealed that the three textbooks include a balanced
number of references from the global north and references from the global south and favour primarily positive content. This finding is a confirmation that there is a willingness from textbook designers to provide a rich and varied array of topics about the local and the global (Risager, 2018). On the other hand, in terms of symbolic power (Kramsch, 2011), the analysis shows that the northern characters represented detain a more authoritative voice when the topics discussed are about technology, science and innovation, whereas most of the southern characters are relegated to mentions in unauthentic settings. Thus, by using the north/south references, we move the conversation beyond ‘the native-speaker’ and explore further the power dynamic between the global north and the global south in English textbooks.

Additionally, the thematic analysis has permitted an in-depth examination of these references and their potential to promote interculturality which is considered here low and insignificant. In fact, in terms of complexity, the texts and images have carried out essentialist discourses through means of simplifications and generalisations (Holliday, 1999; 2011). Such discursive practices serve a strategic role in catering content that aims to promote linguistic competence. Accordingly, the tasks and rubrics accompanying these texts and images target primarily the development of language skills. Aside from few examples where the learner is asked to compare and contrast between cultures, there are no tasks or activities that promote intercultural awareness and intercultural competences in a clear and explicit way (Byram, 1997; Baker, 2011). Moreover, one other key finding worth mentioning is the centrality of ‘Algeria’ in the representational repertoire of the three English textbooks which is constructed through banal nationalism and explicit tasks and texts focusing on the learner’s national citizenship. This finding is an indication of the influence of the country’s education policy which aims to promote and foster national identity and pride even via the English curriculum (Risager, 2018).

Therefore, to answer RQ1 directly, the discourses promoted in the English textbooks are predominantly essentialised and the tasks and activities do not explicitly tackle intercultural learning. Though there is a multiplicity of cultural references from the global north and the global south which testify to the textbooks’ worldliness, it is not sufficient to promote interculturality. There should be a conscious effort from the textbooks’ authors to create space for developing skills for reflection, relating, mediation, curiosity and criticality alongside inclusive representations that view culture as a complex construct.

The focus of RQ2 is on the teachers’ understanding of interculturality and intercultural learning and their practices in the classroom. One of the key findings based on the interviews and discussions with the three teachers who took part in this research project is that there is a clear tendency among teachers to link the English language with the inner circle and countries from the
global north. In their narratives, all three teachers have talked about culture as an important element of the language classroom. However, their understanding of the language and culture relationship appeared to be simplistic and essentialist. The idea that English is tightly linked to a mythical monolithic British or American culture is prevalent especially in Ahmed’s and Yacine’s talk. This finding is not surprising because, in the curriculum and training documents provided to the teachers, the dominant approach to language and culture education is superficial and essentialist. It should be noted, however, that the time we have spent discussing on a one-to-one basis was very limited and my interpretation should not dismiss the complexity of the teachers’ views. In fact, the teachers’ philosophies are informed by their educational background and professional and personal experiences, but they are also constrained by a national educational policy with high expectations and a strong national focus. Nevertheless, the classroom observations have confirmed the secondary status of a culturally informed and interculturally oriented English language education. On the other hand, the findings show that the dominant discourse in the classroom was instructional, teacher-centred and focused on developing linguistic competence. This indicates that the stated beliefs about the importance of culture in language education are not reflected in practice which aligns with the findings of a number of empirical studies (e.g., Bouslama and Benaisi, 2018; Lázár, 2020). However, this study expands our understanding of the teachers’ role in hindering the promotion of intercultural learning. In fact, the analysis of the critical interaction episodes of Ahmed’s and Selma’s classrooms have documented a large number of missed opportunities where interculturality could have been addressed. Rather, the desire to achieve tasks in a timely and controlled fashion and the priority given to linguistic competence have taken over and prevented intercultural learning. Therefore, to address the second research question more directly, this study has shown that the textbook has a central role in the teachers’ teaching practice and that its essentialist and often superficial discourse is not challenged by the teachers. Notably, the teachers’ understanding of interculturality and language-and-culture teaching comes down to utilising the cultural references however imperfect they are to achieve linguistic competence. This focus on completing tasks that are solely language-oriented contributes to hindering the promotion of intercultural learning in the Algerian English classrooms.

As for RQ3, studies investigating the perspectives of learners, especially young learners are very limited in the field of intercultural language education (Howard et al., 2019). In this research project, I have relied on focus group and informal discussions with Ahmed’s and Selma’s students and on classroom observations in order to capture some of the students’ attitudes and behaviours towards the learning content and the English classroom experience. One of the prominent findings documented in this research is that the students have confidently stated that
they find a number of the textbooks’ topics, texts and images ‘boring’ (see section 6.2.2). They have shared with me their craving for engaging and relevant content and how the textbooks and the classroom experience do not satisfy or ignite their curiosity about other cultures. This finding is very important because it puts into perspective the lack of engagement observed in the English classrooms and challenges the teachers’ perception of their students as being passive and slow learners. On the other hand, the classroom observations have shown that the students had few opportunities to express their opinions due to the restrictive effect of the teacher-led, language-focused, instructional mode of teaching. But when they did manage to express themselves, it resulted in the creation of a dialogic discourse where they have shown an awareness of the particularity of various small cultures they are part of and negotiated meaning using their linguacultures and other symbolic resources (Risager, 2006, 2007; Kramsch and Whiteside, 2008; Kramsch, 2011). Accordingly, the level of criticality showcased while resisting gender roles essentialisation, for instance, is an indication that interculturality is a process that requires the engagement of the teacher and the students in meaningful and interesting discussions. Moreover, this evidence adds to our knowledge of the elements that can influence the promotion of intercultural learning in the language classroom, namely, i.e., interesting topics and a learner-centred environment for dialogue.

Therefore, this study’s findings show that the students are capable to identify and call out problematic and unengaging language learning content and teachers’ input. They have, however, an eagerness for appealing content that would feed their curiosity about the self and the other. In fact, their behaviour in the classroom demonstrates an untapped potential to engage in complex intercultural discussions and develop further intercultural competences such as relating, reflecting, expressing curiosity and criticality.

Finally, RQ4 is about the ways intercultural learning is constructed (or not) in English language classrooms. Based on the review of the literature and the theories discussed in Chapter 2, there is an overall agreement that intercultural language learning is a complex and multifaceted endeavour that requires a contextualised, situated and informed approach to interculturally oriented language education. The analysis and interpretation of the classroom discourse of the Algerian English language classrooms of this study have shown that there is a dominance of instructional discourse and confirmed the centrality of the textbook. The teachers’ talk is heavily constructed following the Initiation-Response-Feedback mode of instruction which restricts learner-centeredness and limits the opportunities for complex and dialogic discussions in the classroom (Chapter 5 and 6). It was already established in Chapter 4 that the textbooks carry simplistic and essentialist cultural representations and that the tasks are predominantly language-
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focused. Additionally, the classroom observations revealed that even the teachers contribute to reifying and perpetuating essentialism.

On the other hand, there is evidence that the linguistic and cultural capitals of the students are valued and that translanguaging is an integral part of the English classroom (Section 6.3). However, the positive attitude towards translanguaging and the integration of the students’ and teachers’ multilingual backgrounds in the classroom is not sufficient to promote intercultural learning. In fact, there were very few opportunities for the students to activate intercultural competences. For instance, when they were asked to compare their cultural context and others’, the main aim was to achieve linguistic competence. As such, the instances where the students have shown criticality and curiosity indicate that the Algerian classroom has the potential to foster interculturality. Nonetheless, the lack of explicitness of intercultural learning and the absence of clear learning objectives that address intercultural competences and awareness limit the construction of intercultural learning opportunities in the English classroom. Furthermore, the understanding and interpretation of ‘the cultural’ in direct relation with ‘the national’ by the stakeholders is consistent with the Algerian education policy which heavily promotes national citizenship and constructs intercultural competences as pivoting around comparing and contrasting between national monolithic cultures. Therefore, it is not surprising to observe the construction of the one culture-one language-one nation paradigm in an uncritical way. This is evidence for the need for teacher training and language materials that approach culture as complex and emergent, which raises awareness about the danger and prejudice that can cause essentialism.

Finally, it is safe to say that the data presented in this project report on the missed opportunities for intercultural learning in the English language classrooms and contextualises the possible factors that prevent the development of an interculturally oriented language education, i.e., a poor understanding of what intercultural learning requires both in policy documents and among language teachers, the dominance of the national understanding of culture, essentialist representations and no explicit activities or rubrics in the textbooks that target intercultural competences, the dominance of instructional, teacher-centred and language-focused pedagogy. In the following section, I discuss the theoretical and practical implications that these findings have.

7.2 Implications of the study

The research questions have served as a guide to help address the gap identified at the beginning of the project. In the first chapter, it was established that despite the fact that the Algerian English
textbooks do indeed cover cultural topics, little is known about the way this cultural content contributes to the development of intercultural awareness and intercultural communication (Messekher, 2014). In fact, there are few studies that explore the way textbooks are problematised in the classroom for the sake of promoting interculturality (Canale, 2016; McConachy, 2018) and even fewer studies that take a holistic approach which includes an exploration of the teachers’ and the students’ perspectives, the textbooks and the naturally-occurring classroom interaction. The only study I could find which takes into consideration all these dimensions without direct intervention from the researcher is Munandar’s (2019) investigation in Indonesian secondary schools. Moreover, in the context of Algeria, there is a lack of empirical studies in secondary school settings which could help considerably to inform policy and practice. Therefore, in response to the above research needs, this study has offered a number of insightful contributions in relation to the field of Intercultural Communication and ELT research which explain some of the constraints hindering the promotion of intercultural learning.

Despite the abundant research in the field of Intercultural Communication and language education and the documented importance of adopting interculturality in language teaching, the triviality of an interculturally informed practice seems to persist among policymakers, curriculum designers, language materials writers and teachers. Denouncing this paradox, Baker (2015b, p. 135) argues that due to the lack of guidance ‘it may not always be clear to teachers how the intercultural should be integrated into teaching’. This study has provided a situated and contextualised interpretation of some of the possible factors impeding the promotion of intercultural learning in Algerian English classrooms. It has demonstrated that, first, the national orientation of the curriculum prioritises the development of national identity and pride which reinforces an understanding of the cultural and the intercultural as tightly linked to nations as homes for monolithic cultures which in turn is translated into essentialist, outdated and unappealing language textbooks. Second, it has also demonstrated the dominance of the instructional, teacher-centred pedagogy which thrives to develop primarily the learners’ linguistic competence. This study has also revealed that this disregard of the cultural and the intercultural requires a multi-dimensional response at the level of theory, methodology, pedagogy and policy.

In this sense, the results of this study have a number of significant implications related to the theories reviewed in Chapter 2. This research has provided evidence and data of the complex, emergent and fluid linguacultures and translingual practices (Risager, 2007; Canagarajah, 2013a) in an understudied context situated in the global south. In fact, translanguaging belongs to the fabric of Algerian society and stems from its complex and rich history. This study has also documented teaching practices of English in the expanded circle which are influenced by institutional forces and symbolic powers (Canagarajah, 1999; Kramsch, 2011; Baker, 2017), but
their heteroglossic and polyphonic characters (Bakhtin, 1986; Kramsch, 2000) have the potential to facilitate more interculturally oriented learning. Furthermore, this thesis has specifically focused on investigating the intercultural dimension of language learning materials and classroom discourse in an integrative way which has benefited from very little research attention especially in Algeria. The findings have suggested that challenging essentialism at different levels (gender, education, nationality, culture, age, religion, etc.) is an essential step that should be taken in order to improve practice and learning experiences and facilitate the implementation of an intercultural oriented programme (Holliday, Hyde and Kullman, 2016). Moreover, the empirical evidence from the discursive practices in the classroom as mediated by the textbooks and the teachers further confirm the lack of clarity and guidance on how to promote intercultural communicative competences and intercultural awareness in the English classroom (Byram, 2009; Baker, 2015b). This evidence is much needed to better theorise and understand the construction of intercultural learning through English in global south contexts and the necessity to operationalise the key concepts reviewed here for the benefit of the teachers and the learners.

In terms of methodology, most of the studies exploring the intercultural dimension of the Algerian language curriculum had limited scope which offered an obscure vision of how the intercultural is approached in Algerian schools (Messekher, 2014; Messerehi, 2014). This is what my ethnographically oriented interpretive research has attempted to do: expand and further the investigation in this specific context with a focus on the interplay between language and culture education in the classroom by taking into consideration the experience of the students and the teachers alike. Thus, the methodological implications that emerged from adopting this research paradigm informs about the need of embracing more holistic approaches and thick descriptions to capture the complexity of the experiences and beliefs of teachers and learners. The issue of deconstructing the complexity of the classroom discourse for instance has required the use of the critical interaction episodes and the continuum of the classroom interaction (Section 3.4.2). Such analytical tools have indeed improved the rigour of the analysis and helped to capture the richness and variety of discursive practices in the classroom. They have also helped in identifying patterns of instructional discourse that dominated the language classroom. On the other hand, the analysis of the language textbooks has required a framework that accounts for the multiplicity and variety of frames of references that could either be related to the global north or the global south. It was also necessary to examine the complexity of these frames of reference which revealed instances of essentialism and banal nationalism (Chapter 6). The other methodological implication that emerged by adopting the model of textbook analysis is the need to examine rubrics, also called learning sequences, that explicitly target intercultural competences. This explicitness is necessary for the teachers to implement intercultural learning and thus necessary.
for the researcher to investigate the potential of the textbooks in promoting intercultural learning.

This research has also implications for English language teaching pedagogy. The findings in this project align with the body of research problematising the dominance of the linguistic focus and the superficial and essentialist treatment of culture in the language classroom and materials (McConachy, 2018; Abid and Moalla, 2020, 2021; Lázár, 2020). It also expands our understanding of the process of the construction of instructional discourse which limits opportunities for intercultural learning. Alternatively, it suggests adopting more learner-centred and dialogic pedagogy and to teach language and culture in an integrated way. In other words, in order to facilitate intercultural learning, teachers need to design their lessons with more tasks where the students can openly and collaboratively discuss topics with a social and cultural relevance such as gender roles. As for textbooks’ content, there is an urgent need to explicitly formulate intercultural outcomes and integrate them consistently across the textbooks’ tasks. For instance, alongside a grammar activity about formulating ‘WH’ questions, there should be other tasks asking the students to demonstrate curiosity about their classmates’ daily routines and to reflect on possible differences and similarities they may have. Furthermore, it is necessary for schools to provide opportunities for teachers to receive constructive feedback from their peers and their learners which can help them review their essentialist beliefs and the teacher-centred approach.

In fact, in the absence of opportunities for professional development and training, it could be useful to engage in reflective teaching and welcome feedback from colleagues and students in addition to reading about trends and practices promoting interculturality in the classroom around the world.

Finally, in terms of policy, intercultural dimensions have been mentioned uncritically and with a national focus in the Algerian national language curriculum for secondary education (Commission Nationale des Programmes, 2006). The curriculum and the textbooks do not provide guidelines on how intercultural learning outcomes should be achieved. In the case of Algeria, the textbooks are a direct articulation of the language curriculum and the forward sections and book outlines are usually the spaces where teachers are informed about the vision and the approach to be adopted. Thus, adding to the abovementioned pedagogic proposals, there should be a more explicit strategy on how to implement intercultural learning in the classroom which is clearly communicated to the teachers through the textbooks and the policy documents as well as other forums. This policy should go beyond comparing and contrasting national cultures and rather aim to develop attitudes, knowledge and skills for relating, reflecting, and demonstrating curiosity and criticality about the self and the other. It also needs to clearly advocate for the value-added from challenging stereotypes and essentialism and the need to train intercultural speakers and global
citizens. Moreover, the teachers’ continuous professional development needs to be prioritised alongside the inclusion of a comprehensive intercultural model integrated into the teacher training. Consequently, policymakers should consider creating more spaces to discuss the teachers’ on-the-ground reality and the challenges they face which could either take place online or during regional and national conferences.

7.3 Limitations of the study

This study aimed at exploring and better understanding interculturality in an Algerian school setting. The ethnographically inspired interpretive research focused on the classroom experience of Algerian English teachers and their learners working with the locally published textbooks. While the research protocol has been designed and implemented rigorously to achieve this goal (Appendix L), there are also a number of limitations to this work, which require methodological refinement in order to enhance the quality of future ethnographic work in this domain. The first limitation concerns the number of participants who took part in the project. Even though working with three teachers over a period of five weeks was intense and has resulted in a rich body of knowledge, the study could have benefited from more diverse perspectives if I had the opportunity to collaborate with more English teachers. In addition, both Ahmed and Selma are experienced teachers with more than 15 years of teaching, while Yacine had cumulated 4 years of experience at the time of the interview. A larger number of teacher participants could have allowed me to hear from early professionals, mid-career as well as senior teachers and may lead to a more complex and nuanced interpretation of the data.

The second limitation worth mentioning is with regard to the time spent on the fieldwork. Ethnographic research is known to require the researcher to be immersed in the fieldwork for a significant amount of time. How long or how short this amount of time should be is not prescribed. However, the more time spent within the participants’ environment, the deeper the understanding of the social and cultural phenomena will be. More time in the schools would have provided more opportunities to speak with learners with limited interference with their studies. It could also have allowed me to observe my participants in situations such as extracurricular events and activities. Nonetheless, due to the time and financial constraints of a PhD programme for an international student and to the teachers’ busy schedule, it was not possible to stay longer than five weeks.

Another noteworthy limitation in this research stems from the highly subjective nature of qualitative interpretive research. In fact, my subjectivities and identities as a researcher have in many ways impacted the research process. For instance, it is very possible that negotiating access
to schools would have led to another path with another researcher who is: male, female wearing a headscarf, from a local university, from another region or area of the country, originally from another country, and so on. In addition, another researcher would have made dissimilar observations and interpretations given that my background, interests and biases might have influenced my analyses and readings. Although it was clearly stated that this study is not positioned within the positivist paradigm and does not aim to generalise its outcomes (in section 3.2.1), it was necessary to rely on various strategies to enhance trustworthiness and rigour such as thick description, triangulation, a detailed trail audit and reflexivity. Thus, the notion of transferability is more applicable for this small scale interpretive study. The process and outcome of this project might inspire researchers investigating other settings and contexts just like other researchers’ projects have inspired this one.

### 7.4 Suggestions for future research

Few suggested research ideas have emerged from the findings, the limitations and the appraisal of the empirical studies discussed in this thesis. Firstly, from the review of studies investigating interculturality in the classroom, it was observed that most of them are action research (e.g., Kramsch, 2000; Norton, 2008; McConachy, 2018; Porto, 2019; Lázár, 2020). The design of action research has many advantages, such as the freedom it offers to the teacher-research to implement an interculturally-informed curriculum. For this doctoral project, the aim was to first understand an understudied context (Algerian school setting), its opportunities and its constraints. Hence, it would be interesting to build on this and to design action research where I can introduce some of the key recommendations put forward in section (7.2). Notably, in addition to adopting a researcher mindset, it could be both challenging and stimulating to adopt a practitioner mindset that is much more solution and practice-oriented. Secondly, one of the key findings of this study was the lack of explicitness regarding intercultural learning in textbooks. Teachers have many obligations, and their role in society and within the walls of their schools is complicated. As researchers, we should strive to assist them in having a positive impact on the lives and education of the next generation. Finally, in light of the aforementioned limitations (section 7.3), future studies should consider dedicating more time for the fieldwork in order to document more diverse perspectives and gain a better knowledge of teachers’ realities, their use of materials, and their students’ experiences. In fact, the students’ voice was not as prominent in this project as the teachers’. A longitudinal study would allow the researcher to create more spaces for the learners to express themselves extensively and safely. It
would also advance further our understanding of the learners’ role in the interpretation of the learning materials and the co-construction of intercultural learning opportunities.

7.5 Concluding remarks

Working on this doctoral study has changed me as a person. Reflecting back at the people I have met, the training I have attended, the projects I have worked on besides the thesis, the sleepless nights and the learning I have undertaken to care for my mental health, I can confidently state that the change was for the better. It has raised my awareness of how difficult it is to constantly examine your bias and challenge your beliefs. Becoming an intercultural speaker or interculturally competent is not a straightforward endeavour. It is indeed an ongoing process that I have learned to integrate into my daily life. I have also been privileged to benefit from a fully-funded scholarship from the Algerian government to study at a Russell Group university which has opened doors for me both professionally and academically. I have done my best to use this privilege to uplift my peers who do not have access to such platforms, in order to have more representation of scholars from the global south in conferences, academic citations, research networks and so on. In the end, this research project has added further evidence to the body of knowledge that strives to improve the Algerian educational system which impacts millions of young people every year. It is my hope that this project inspires or helps in this direction.
Appendix A    Ethics checklist

Student Research Project Ethics Checklist 2015/16

This checklist should be completed by the student (with the advice of their thesis/dissertation supervisor) for all research projects.

Student name: Amina Douidi
Student ID: 27493997

Supervisor name: Prof. Richard Kiely
Discipline: Modern Languages

Programme of study: PhD

Project title: Intercultural communication in EFL classroom and textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Will your study involve living human participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does the study involve children under 16?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does the study involve adults who are specially vulnerable and/or unable to give informed consent? (e.g. people with learning difficulties, adults with dementia)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Will the study require the cooperation of a third party/ an advocate for access to possible participants? (e.g. students at school, residents of nursing home)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Does your research require collection and/or storage of sensitive and/or personal data on any individual? (e.g. date of birth, criminal offences)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Could your research induce psychological stress or anxiety, or have negative consequences for participants, beyond the risks of everyday life?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Will it be necessary for participants to take part in the study without their knowledge and consent at the time? (e.g. covert observation of people)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Will the study involve discussion of sensitive topics? (e.g. sexual activity, drug use)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Will financial inducements (other than reasonable expenses or compensation of time) be offered to participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Are there any problems with participants’ rights to remain anonymous, and/or ensuring that the information they provide is non-identifiable?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Will you have any difficulty communicating and assuring the right of participants to freely withdraw from the project at any time?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>If you are working in a cross cultural setting, will you need to gain additional knowledge about the setting to work effectively? (e.g. gender roles, language use)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Are there potential risks to your own health and safety in conducting the study? (e.g. lone interviewing in other than public spaces)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Will the study involve recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Does the research project involve working with human tissue, organs, and bones etc. that are less than 100 years old?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to the Research Project Ethics Guidance Notes for help in completing this checklist.

If you have answered NO to all of the above questions, discussed the form with your supervisor and had it signed and dated by both parties (see over), you may proceed with your research. A copy of the Checklist should be included in your eventual report/dissertation/thesis.

If you have answered YES to any of the questions, i.e. if your research involves human participants in any way, you will need to provide further information for consideration by the Humanities Ethics Committee and/or the university Research Governance Office. This information needs to be provided via the Electronic Research Governance Online (ERGO) system, available at www.ergo.soton.ac.uk.

**CHOOSE ONE STATEMENT:**

- □ I have completed the Ethics Checklist and confirm that my research does not involve human participants (nor human tissues etc.).

- X I have completed the Ethics Checklist and confirm that my research will involve human participants. I understand that this research needs to be reported and approved through the ERGO system, before the research commences.

Signature of student: Amina Douidi

Date: 31/01/2016

Signature of supervisor: Richard Kiely

Date: 31/01/2016
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Study title: Intercultural Communication in EFL Classrooms and Textbooks

Researcher name: Amina Douidi
Staff/Student number: 27493997
ERGO reference number: 18774

Please initial the box(es) if you agree with the statement(s):

I have read and understood the participants' information sheet and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study.

I agree to take part in this research project and agree for my data to be used for the purpose of this study

I understand my participation is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time without my legal rights being affected

I understand that information collected about me during my participation in this study will be stored on a password-protected computer and that this information will only be used for the

I certify that I am 16 years or older. I have read the above

Name of participant (print name).........................................................................................

Signature of participant........................................................................................................

Date....................................................................................................................................
CONSENT FORM (FACE TO FACE) for teachers

Study title: Intercultural communication in EFL classroom and textbooks

Researcher name: Amina Douidi
Staff/Student number: 27493997
ERGO reference number:

Please initial the box(es) if you agree with the statement(s):

I have read and understood the information sheet and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study. 

I agree to take part in this research project and agree for my data to be used for the purpose of this study

I understand my participation is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time without my legal rights being affected

I understand that information collected about me during my participation in this study will be stored on a password-protected computer and that this information will only be used for the purpose of this study. All files containing any personal data will be made anonymous.

Name of participant (print name).................................................................

Signature of participant.............................................................................

Date............................................................................................................
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CONSENT FORM for students under 16

Study title: Intercultural Communication in EFL Classrooms and Textbooks

Researcher name: Amina Douidi
Staff/Student number: 27493997
ERGO reference number: 18774

Please initial the box(es) if you agree with the statement(s):

I have read and understood the participants’ information sheet and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study.  

I agree to take part in this research project and agree for my data to be used for the purpose of this study.

I understand my participation is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time without my legal rights being affected.

I understand that information collected about me during my participation in this study will be stored on a password-protected computer and that this information will only be used for the purpose of this study. All files containing any personal data will be made anonymous.

I have been authorised by my parent/guardian/carer to take part in the study.

Name of participant (print name)...........................................................................................................

Signature of participant..........................................................................................................................

Name and signature of the parents...........................................................................................................

Date.....................................................................................................................................................
Appendix D  Participant information sheet

Participant Information Sheet (Face to Face)

Study Title: Intercultural Communication in EFL Classroom and Textbook

Researcher: Amina Douidi  Ethics number: 18774

Please read this information carefully before deciding to take part in this research. If you are happy to participate you will be asked to sign a consent form.

What is the research about?

My name is Amina Douidi. I am conducting this research as part of my PhD degree at the University of Southampton. I am interested in intercultural communication and how it is integrated in the English as Foreign Language (EFL) curriculum, classroom and textbooks, as well as in the teachers’ and learners’ views about English and cultures. In order to understand the realities of the language classroom, the following questions will be asked:

1. How does the representation of cultures in EFL textbooks provide opportunities for intercultural understanding and communication?
2. What is the role of the teacher in promoting intercultural communication in the EFL classroom
   ➢ 2. a. How do the teacher’s talk and behaviour provide opportunities for intercultural communication
   ➢ 2. b. What are the teacher’s practices in order to promote intercultural communication
3. What are the teacher’s beliefs and attitudes towards English, cultures, and intercultural communication
4. What are the learners’ expectations, beliefs, and attitudes towards English and cultural content
5. What are the students’ actions and reactions in an interactive intercultural situation

This project is funded by the Algerian Government and sponsored by The University of Southampton

Why have I been chosen?

This study aims to compare between three secondary school EFL classrooms. Each one in a different country: Spain, Algeria and Finland. You have been chosen to take part in the research because you are whether a learner or a teacher of English as Foreign Language in secondary school. The choice of your school was
random. The researcher (myself) has approached you after visiting your school’s website, talking on the phone with a teacher/head of department and sending e-mails outlining the idea of the work, where were attached an abstract and the researcher’s CV.

What will happen to me if I take part?

The length of the study will be of five weeks, including the observation of the class of English at teacher’s and the school manager’s convenience. The researcher will:

- Audio record all the sessions
- Take notes
- Take pictures of empty classroom
- Take pictures of the black/white board
- Take pictures of learners’ worksheet

If you are a learner

- You will be asked to discuss about your background and language and cultural experience. There is no need to write down your name. You will be provided with a reference number.

- You will be asked to volunteer to take part in a focus group (group discussion) with 3 to 4 other students. The discussion length will be of 45 minutes and organised at your convenience. It will be about:
  - What you think of your learning experience of English and your expectations from it.
  - Commenting on a short text and a picture
  - Sharing an anecdote of an intercultural experience

- You will be asked to sign a consent form agreeing for your participation in the study.

- If you are under 16 years old, your parent/guardian/carer will be provided with an information sheet (in Spanish, French or Arabic) and will need to consent for your participation in the study by signing a consent form.

Your decision of whether you agree or not to take part in the study will not affect your marks.

If you are a teacher

First-of-all you will be invited for a face-to-face interview with the researcher at the beginning of the study. The questions will be about:

- Your personal and professional experience with languages and cultures.
Appendix D

- Your lesson plans
- Your views about the English curriculum and the textbook
- Your views about the classroom atmosphere
- Your views about the learning experience of your learners

The length of this first interview will be about 1h. It can take the form of an informal discussion around a coffee at the expense of the researcher and organised at the convenience of the teacher.

The interview will be audio recorded for transcription matters. If you are not comfortable with the audio recording during the interview, the researcher will be happy to take notes, only.

You will be provided with a notebook where you are invited to write down your thoughts as regularly as possible. If you prefer to write on a computer, you can send your notes to the researchers’ email address (ad1e14@soton.ac.uk)

The following topics are hints to guide you in your reflective writing, but not limited to:

- Describe a typical day as a teacher of English
- What are the challenges that you face in your work?
- What are the challenges that you face with your learners?
- Lesson planning
- Exams
- Conflicts and anecdotes
- Success stories related to your work (inside/outside classroom)
- Other…

Before a classroom observation, you will be asked to inform the researcher about the textbook’s unit that you will be teaching. If you are not using a textbook, the researcher will request to make a copy of the lesson sheets.

During the classroom observation, the researcher will make sure not to disturb the lesson by coming 15 min before the learners and sitting in the back.

After an observed classroom, you might be asked to comment on a particular event, which happened during the course. The researcher will be considerate of your schedule and make sure to keep it short. The researcher will also take notes of any informal conversation relevant to the research.

Finally, another interview will take place at the end of the study where you will be asked to comment on the textbook, the classroom interaction and expand the discussion about your teaching experience, English, cultures, and intercultural communication in your classroom.

Are there any benefits in my taking part?

210
Your participation, experience and opinions will be very helpful in finding out what teachers and learners think and believe about English and cultural content, which in turn may contribute in a better understanding of the realities of EFL classroom and the integration of cultural content in the language curriculum.

**Are there any risks involved?**

There are no foreseeable risks to participating in this study.

There is no potential for psychological or physical discomfort, however, if at any point you wish to stop or withdraw from the research project you are free to do so.

**Will my participation be confidential?**

- The information collected is confidential and will be used only for research matters. The researcher is the only person who has full access to the information and her supervisors also will have access to parts of it. In the dissertation, relevant parts of the data will be used for illustration and analysis
  - The researcher will ensure to protect your privacy and keep your participation confidential.
  - To respect the confidentiality of the information, you will be assigned an ID number.
  - The data collected will be kept in a computer secured by a password and the researcher will be the only person to access it.

**What happens if I change my mind?**

If for any reason, you no longer want to participate in the study, you can decide to withdraw at any time and without penalty. The researcher will immediately delete all your information.

**What happens if something goes wrong?**

If you have any concerns or complaint, feel free to contact the Chair of the Faculty Ethics Committee Prof Chris Janaway (023 80593424, c.janaway@soton.ac.uk).

**Where can I get more information?**

Contact the researcher Amina Douidi at ad1e14@soton.ac.uk

Phone number +44 7729018726
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Information sheet for the parent/guardian of participant under 16 years old

Information Sheet for the parent/guardian of participant under 16 years old

Study title: Intercultural Communication in EFL Classrooms and Textbooks

Researcher name: Amina Douidi

Ethics: 18774

My name is Amina Douidi and I am doing a PhD research at the University of Southampton (UK). My research topic is about how the cultural content is integrated to the English curriculum in classroom and textbooks.

The aim from the study is to understand how the textbooks of English as Foreign Language (EFL) and the interaction in the classroom between the students and the teacher contribute in the promotion of intercultural understanding and communication.

Your child will be asked to answer questions covering the following points:

- Age
- Nationality (nationalities)
- Language (e) he/she speaks/learns/studies
- Language (s) exposed to (family, friends, school, TV, etc.)
- Years spent in school
- Countries visited or lived in
- Cultural group/community he/she identifies him/herself to

Your child will be invited to volunteer to take part in an audio-recorded group discussion with 3 or 4 other of his/her classmates in order to:

- Speak about his/her experience with languages (English and others)
- Speak about his/her experience in the school, with teachers and other students
- Speak about the different countries he/she knows
- Speak about what he/she thinks of his/her culture
- Speak about what he/she thinks of other cultures
- Discuss texts, images, and videos about cultures
- Speak about his/her experience with learning English
- Speak about his/her expectations from learning English
- Speak about situations of communication in a foreign language such as English

This study will take place in the school, including classroom observations. A group discussion of 45 min will be organised at the convenience of the students and their teacher.

Your child’s participation, experience and opinions will be very helpful in finding out what teachers and learners think and believe about English and cultural content, which in turn may contribute in a better understanding of the realities of EFL classroom and the integration of cultural content in the language curriculum.

There are no foreseeable risks to participating in this study. There is no potential for psychological or physical discomfort; however, if at any point your child wishes to stop or withdraw from the research project he/she is free to do so.

Will my child’s participation be confidential?

- The information collected is confidential and will be used only for research matters. The researcher is the only person who has full access to the information and her supervisors also will have access to parts of it. In the academic publications, such as the PhD thesis and articles, relevant parts of the data will be used for illustration and analysis

- The researcher will ensure to protect your child’s privacy and keep his/her participation confidential.
- To respect the confidentiality of the information, your child will be assigned an ID number.
- The data collected will be kept in a computer secured by a password and the researcher will be the only person to access it.

What happens if I change my mind?
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If for any reason, you no longer want your child to participate in the study, he/she can decide to withdraw at any time and without penalty. The researcher will immediately delete all your information.

**What happens if something goes wrong?**

If you have any concerns or complaint, feel free to contact the Chair of the Faculty Ethics Committee Prof Chris Janaway (023 80593424, c.janaway@soton.ac.uk).

**Where can I get more information?**

Contact the researcher Amina Douidi at ad1e14@soton.ac.uk
Phone number +44 7729018726

**Signature**

You are making a decision about allowing your child to participate in this study. Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above and have decided to allow your child to participate in the study. If you later decide that you wish to withdraw your permission for your child to participate in the study you may stop his or her participation at any time.

______________________________________
Name of Child

______________________________________
Name of Parents or Legal Guardian

______________________________________    ______________
Signature of Parent(s) or Legal Guardian    Date

______________________________________    ______________
Signature of Researcher    Date
Fiche d'information pour le parent / tuteur / gardien du participant âgé de moins de 16 ans

Titre de l'étude : la communication interculturelle en classe et dans les manuels scolaires de l'Anglais langue étagère (ALE)

Nom du chercheur : Amina Douidi Code éthique : 18774

Mon nom est Amina Douidi et je fais une thèse de doctorat à l'Université de Southampton (Royaume-Uni). Mon sujet de recherche est sur la façon dont le contenu culturel est intégré au programme d'anglais en classe et les manuels scolaires.

L'objectif de l'étude est de comprendre comment les manuels d'anglais langue étrangère (ALE) et l'interaction en classe entre les élèves et l'enseignant contribuent à la promotion de la compréhension et la communication interculturelle.

Votre enfant sera invité à répondre à des questions portant sur les informations suivantes :
- Âge
- Nationalité (nationalités)
- Langue (s) qu’il / elle parle / apprend / étudie
- Langue (s) auxquelles il/elle est exposé(e): entourage familial, les amis, l'école, la télévision, etc.
- Années passées à l'école
- Pays visités ou ou ayant vecu
- Groupe culturel / communautés auxquels il / elle s'identifie

Votre enfant sera invité à se porter volontaires pour participer à une discussion de groupe audio-enregistré avec 3 ou 4 autres de ses camarades de classe dans le but de :
- Parler de son expérience avec les langues (anglais et autres)
- Parler de son expérience à l'école, avec les enseignants et les autres étudiants
- Parler des différents pays qu'il / elle connait
- Parler de ce qu'il / elle pense de sa culture
- Parler de ce qu'il / elle pense des autres cultures
- Discuter de textes, d'images et de vidéos sur les cultures
- Parler de son expérience avec l'apprentissage de l'anglais
- Parler de ses attentes envers l'apprentissage de l'anglais
- Parler de situations de communication dans une langue étrangère comme l'anglais

Cette étude aura lieu à l'école, y compris les observations en classe. Une discussion de groupe de 45 minutes sera organisée à la convenance des étudiants et leur professeur.

La participation, l'expérience et les opinions de votre enfant seront très utiles pour trouver ce que les enseignants et les apprenants pensent de l'anglais et du contenu culturel, qui à son tour peut contribuer à une meilleure compréhension des réalités de l'enseignement de l'ALE et l'intégration de contenu culturel dans le programme de langue.

Il n'y a pas de risque prévisible à participer à cette étude. Il n'y a aucune possibilité d'inconfort psychologique ou physique. Toutefois, si à tout moment votre enfant souhaite arrêter ou se retirer du projet de recherche, il / elle est libre de le faire.

**Est-ce que participation de mon enfant sera confidentielle ?**
- Les informations recueillies sont confidentielles et ne seront utilisées que pour des questions de recherche. Le chercheur est la seule personne qui a un accès total à l'information et ses superviseurs auront également accès à des parties de celle-ci. Dans les publications académiques, comme la thèse de doctorat ainsi que les articles, les parties pertinentes des données seront utilisées pour l'illustration et l'analyse.

- Le chercheur fera en sorte de protéger la vie privée de votre enfant et de garder sa participation confidentielle.
- Pour respecter la confidentialité de l'information, votre enfant sera attribué un numéro d'identification.
- Les données collectées seront conservées dans un ordinateur **sécurisé par un mot de passe** et le chercheur sera la seule personne à y accéder.
Qu’advient-il si je change d’avis ?
Si pour une raison quelconque, vous ne voulez plus que votre enfant de participer à l’étude, il / elle peut décider de se retirer à tout moment et sans pénalité. Le chercheur va immédiatement supprimer toutes vos informations.

Qu’advient-il si quelque chose se passe mal ?
Si vous avez des préoccupations ou des plaintes, vous pouvez communiquer avec le président du Comité d’éthique de la Faculté Prof Chris Janaway (023 80593424, c.janaway@soton.ac.uk).

Où puis-je obtenir plus d’informations ?
Contacter le chercheur Amina Douidi à ad1e14@soton.ac.uk
Numéro de téléphone +44 7729018726

Signature
Vous prenez la décision de permettre à votre enfant de participer à cette étude. Votre signature ci-dessous indique que vous avez lu les informations fournies ci-dessus et avez décidé de permettre à votre enfant de participer à l’étude. Si vous décidez plus tard que vous voulez retirer votre autorisation, vous pouvez arrêter sa participation à tout moment.

_________________________________
Nom de l’enfant

_________________________________
Nom du parent ou du tuteur légal

_________________________________  _______________________
Signature du parent (s) ou tuteur légal  Date

_________________________________  _______________________
Signature du chercheur  Date
## Appendix G Coding scheme: textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Files</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About the English language</td>
<td>References about the English language, information, history, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About young people</td>
<td>References to young people. Emergent theme where there is inter-generational comparison.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazigh references</td>
<td>Appearance or references to Tamazight language or Imazighen region</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-orientalist discourse</td>
<td>Text or images that challenge orientalist representation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>References to the Arabic language or text in Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banal nationalism</td>
<td>Flags, nations, countries, nationalities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre as norm provider</td>
<td>Kachru’s inner circle: UK, US, Australia, Oxford, etc. from where the norms of the language are said to come. Hints: Grammar rules, according to inner circle sources, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essentialism</td>
<td>Simplification, categorisation, objectification, reduction, generalisation, stereotyping, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurocentrism</td>
<td>The Eurocentric basis of seeing the world often meant marginalising into the periphery that which comes from the rest of the world” (Miike, 2014: 114). “To be Eurocentric is to perpetuate the colonial and neo-colonial structure of the imperial West and refuse to acknowledge its pervasive impact on the contemporary world” (Miike, 2014: 128)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French language</td>
<td>References to the French language or text in French</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral behaviour</td>
<td>Values, good behaviour, ethics, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberalism</td>
<td>Features include and are not limited to references to the role and responsibility of the individual in changing the &quot;world&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Files</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-essentialist discourse</td>
<td>Complex cultures, multiple identities, fluidity, criticality towards stereotypes, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North SE1</td>
<td>References to the metaphoric north in textbook 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North SE2</td>
<td>References to the metaphoric north in textbook 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North SE3</td>
<td>References to the metaphorical north in textbook 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcolonial</td>
<td>References to colonisation, resources from post-colonial literature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativity</td>
<td>Challenging fixed ideas and expressing relative perceptions or relativity of interpretation. E.g., it depends, not all are the same, things are more complex than, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities and differences</td>
<td>Comparison between references in terms of similarities and differences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences</td>
<td>Focus on differences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities</td>
<td>Focus on similarities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South SE1</td>
<td>References to the metaphorical south in textbook 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South SE2</td>
<td>References to the metaphorical south in textbook 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Files</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South SE3</td>
<td>References to the metaphoric south in textbook 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The global</td>
<td>The world, global references, universal, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The war</td>
<td>References to war, any war.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokenism</td>
<td>Diversity tokens: disability, races, gender.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition Vs. Modernity</td>
<td>Text or images where the focus is on the comparison between tradition and modernity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H  Coding scheme: interview, focus group, group discussions and participants’ reflective text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordance</td>
<td>This code is focused on opportunities or the lack of them, either the space to talk or the time to express oneself. The key words that have been used for quick search are: time, chance, express, free. To cite a few. Initially my RQ was about which opportunities are there for intercultural interaction. Finally, the theme Affordance emerged as more relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newness</td>
<td>This code covers the instances where the participants express their desire to learn new things, their eagerness to discover new knowledge and ideas. Emergent theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>References to the metaphorical north. Pre-established code from the analytical framework for textbook analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme chargé</td>
<td>Translation to English: Packed curriculum. I prefer to code it in French because this is how I understand it. It resonates more with me as a multilingual researcher to put the code in French. This code covers all instances where the participants express their opinions about the curriculum saying that it is too demanding, too packed, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport aux langues</td>
<td>Eng. Relationship to languages, I prefer to use the code in French because this is how it resonates better with me. Rapport to languages also could be an appropriate translation. This code is inspired by a question that I have asked during interviews and focus group discussions regarding the participants' attitudes to their own languages. The languages they speak or study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Key words: religion, Islam, Muslim, Muslman, Islem, etc. Emergent theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>References to the metaphorical south. Pre-established code from the analytical framework for textbook analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The historical centre</td>
<td>Key words: American US British England Britain America. This code is about references to Kachru's inner circle, which is labelled the historical centre for English by the researcher, but is considered the legitimate owner of English by the participants or in the textbook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I  Sample field notes

Field notes extract

"Names of the participants have been replaced by pseudonyms or ID numbers. Each time there was mention of specific people, places and dates or of personal information, I have omitted it or replaced with a generic label. For example, ‘I come for London’ would be replaced by ‘I come from [name of city]’. However, if the location of the city is relevant to the discussion ‘I come from London’ becomes ‘I come from a big city’.

Week 1 of fieldwork

Early April 2016

Visited 5 schools in the city which are accessible by car or foot. Was turned down by 3, accepted by 1 and 1 required a written authorisation from the Ministry of Education or the local Direction of Education (called L’Academie). I was informed by the school directors that as a student of a University abroad (in the UK), I was considered a foreigner and I have to go through security checks.

I label the school which required a permission from L'Academie: School 1

I label the school which accepted me without a permission from L'Academie: School 2

Had a long discussion with director of school 2 about:
- My research, research instruments and ethical procedures
- The school issues about absences related to extra-courses outside the school organised during school hours
- The length of the programme
- The importance of Baccalaureate exam and exams preparation
- The level of the students judged by the concerned parties to be low in the majority of the subjects

He was positive and offered me access to the school and permission to talk to the students and teachers or other members of staff as long as they would consent to talk to me.

The architecture of School 2 is made in a way that the building where the offices of the non-teaching staff are relatively far from the classrooms and the teachers’ room. So I asked if I could have a written permission which will facilitate my first contact with the teachers or if somebody from the director’s team could introduce me or inform the teachers of my presence. The director said that he will inform the teachers of my presence.
Visited the local Direction of Education, i.e., L’Academie to ask about the procedure that I should take in order to be granted permission to access School 1. I was asked to write a letter addressed to the director of L’Academie where I explain who I was and my research plans. But first, I was advised to have permission to access the school from the Wali (the Governor) who is the highest person in the administrative pyramid of the province. The reason is that as I was considered a foreigner, I needed the clearance from a representative of the Ministry of the Interior (Ministère de l'Intérieur).

I have visited the local People’s Provincial Assembly which is called in French: Assemblée Populaire de Wilaya where I was supposed to deliver my letter to the Wali. I was directed towards several offices and nobody considered having the authority to provide me with the clearance to access School 1. I was asked to come back next week.

Visited School 2 again and introduced myself to English teachers, security agents and other teachers who I met in the teacher’s room.
Attended 2 classroom sessions with teacher T1M-SS1
Attended 1 classroom session with teacher T2M-SS1
Introduced myself to the students and discussed the reason of my presence.
Sat at the back.

Notes from observation of T2M-SS1 Classroom

- T: “What does the exercise ask me to do?”
- T: “Where is the past perfect?” Do you know the past perfect”
T: Do you know how to make the past perfect?
T: Vous n’êtes même pas capable de dire YES wella No! (continues in Arabic)
Translation: You are not even able to say YES or No (Note: I need to develop transcription strategy).
- Participants manage to solve the exercise “grammar activity” with a considerable involvement of the teacher -Repetitions, scaffolding, IRF sequence
T: If you don’t know how to make the past perfect go to your text, on page 100.
T: Sit correctly or go out (in Arabic then in English)
Then teacher tells me “Record this”

The teacher’s practices in managing the classroom and having the students’ attention are very special. He does not hesitate to use bitter words. The students either laugh or ignore. They are familiar with his way of working.

It makes me very uncomfortable because the teacher knows that I am reporting everything. Is that relevant to my research? It is culture-related so! Maybe
T: Speak up so that the recording goes to America. (Laughs)

The students are very agitated. Some chairs are broken and left at the back of the room. Some doors do not close. The noise coming from the corridor makes it hard to fully listen to what is said in the classroom. I will try to talk to ‘les surveillants’: they are non-teaching staff who are in the corridor before and after the bell rings. They make sure that
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the students are inside their classrooms. They are also the link between the teachers and
the administration.

The classrooms seem overly populated, crowded. (I count more than 30 students per
classroom).

Reminder: Ask teacher and admin staff about student number per class.

Week 2 of fieldwork

I had a meeting with the General Secretary of the Governor to whom I exposed my
research project and who agreed to write a recommendation addressed to l'Academie. I
was asked to wait for 3 working days and then check with l'Academie if they received my
recommendation and if they want to provide me with an authorisation to access School 1.

Visited l'Academie and was provided with a phone number to call and check on the
progress of my request.

Following this, I went back to School 2 and attended a lesson with teacher **T2M-SS1**. I do
not feel comfortable around T2M-SS2 because I feel challenged. In the middle of the
session, he asked me to come to the front of the room and teach his class ‘something’. I
refused to say that this was not why I was here but he insisted. I went in front of the class
and asked questions about whether the students liked learning the English language:
some students interacted with me, but the teacher kept asking me to teach them
something. They were working on an activity about the past tense, so I questioned them
about some irregular verbs. I was confused and disturbed. I think that he did not
appreciate being observed.

Day 2, after my experience with teacher **T2M-SS1**, I felt I needed to get closer to other
teachers of English in School 2. Attended one class of **T2M-SS1** again. I was sitting at the
back and taking notes. In the middle of the session, he approached me and asked to see
what I was writing. He read my notes and commented on them. My notes were about the
textbook page and the title of the activity. I wrote observation about the students at the
back being chatty and that it was possible that I distracted them. I wrote ‘ask teacher if I
could come earlier next time and sit at the back quietly’. He commented saying that
sometimes teachers who are in the class before do not finish on time and over stay in the
room, this is why it is better if I enter the room at the same time as him.

After the session, I was introduced to **Selma** another English teacher who kindly agreed
that I attend her sessions. I took photos (below) of the walls, tables, and empty
classrooms.
**Day 3**, L’Academie arranged for me to meet the General Secretary of the Head of the Direction of Education (i.e., l’Academie). I prepared copies of the Participant Information Sheet (in French) and an abstract of my PhD project.

Attended two sessions with Selma. The classroom sessions were not audio-recorded because I did not have the chance to introduce myself to the students. The two sessions were with first-year students and were about checking the progress of the students on their projects (homework). Selma and I chatted in-between sessions as she informed me of her availability and asked questions about my studies abroad. I felt comfortable exchanging with Selma.

Some students approached me during the break and asked me if I come from London. I answered that I was from Algeria but I study in the South of England. Another one asked me if I had a boyfriend in England. I did not reply as it made me uncomfortable.

School 2 students are very energetic. In all the classrooms I have attended so far, the teachers invest a considerable amount of time trying to calm the students down. The noise in the corridor is constant. I discussed with a hall monitor and he informed me that those students who are making noises are those whose teacher is absent. The hall monitor’s role is to replace the teachers when they are absent.

**Day 4**, my meeting with the General Secretary of the director of l’Academie went smoothly. I provided copies of my ID and a summary of my PhD project. He arranged for another meeting with the Director of l’Academie to whom I should prepare a short presentation of my project.

**Day 5**, met with the Director of l’Academie and his General Secretary who asked me about the motivations of my research and where the recordings of the classrooms will be stored. They asked about the topics that I want to discuss with the students and if my investigation would affect their studies. They asked me about how I plan to avoid distracting the students especially those who are in exam classrooms (baccalaureate exam). The meeting was successful and I was informed that a recommendation letter will be sent (by fax) to School 1 next week. The only way for me to know if the fax was well received is to visit School 1 and ask.

The photos below are from the schools where the fieldwork was undertaken. I do not indicate either they are from school 1 or school 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National anthem framed on the right hand side</th>
<th>Frame of the national anthem and Algerian flag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scribbles and tags on tables done by students</td>
<td>Scribbles and tags on tables done by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom front wall, Algerian map and flag</td>
<td>Classroom, tables and chairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sample of classroom observation field notes

Study Title: Intercultural Communication in EFL Classroom and Textbook
Researcher: Amina Douidi  
Ethics number: 18774
School: 1
Date: April 2016  
Class: 1st year scientific stream  
No. Students: 40
Time: 8am-8.50am  
Lesson: textbook SE1, p.117, task 3.  
Teacher: Ahmed

*Session audio recorded

Classroom Layout
**Descriptive notes:**

Teacher is wearing a white blouse as it has been the case since the start of the fieldwork.

The students entered the room before the teacher and joined their places.

Students greet the teacher and myself: ‘*Good morning, sir!*’ ‘*Good morning, miss!*’

Teacher goes at his desk and takes out the textbook and a notebook.

I go to the back of the room and find a chair.

The teacher asks the students to take out their textbooks and copybooks.

First part of the session is about the different steps that we take in order to describe an invention (structuring a paragraph).

Teacher: *In the last session, how many inventions have we seen?*

Teacher calls out student’s names and asks them to remind the class which are the three inventions.

More than one student replied saying: the vacuum cleaner, the microwave over and the dishwasher.

Teacher reminds the students of the page and activity numbers (Activity 3, p.117).

One student volunteers to read the activity’s instructions.

The teacher asks the students to choose one of the three inventions to write about. An overwhelming number of students told their choice ‘the microwave’. One of the students has volunteered to report the write the progressively constructed paragraph on the board.

**Reflective notes:**

The task is about writing a paragraph about the microwave following the steps studied in an earlier lesson. I should ask if one of the students agrees to let me have a look at their notebooks.

In the textbook, this activity is presented as a task to be accomplished individually and peer-reviewed afterwards (see picture). However, the teacher has decided to make it a group activity where the paragraph is constructed sentence by sentence by the students.

Teacher appears to be patient with the students.

Teacher scaffolds the construction of the paragraph by shaping the contributions of the students.

Teacher picks volunteers to answer his questions or to contribute to the paragraph construction from different areas of the class (front, middle and back). From the 40 students about 10 students are actively contributing, the others seem to be taking notes and discussing with their peers.

Even though the activity was designed to be student-led, the teacher is the one leading the task through: initiation, repetition, elicitation, validation, organisation of ideas, etc.
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Figure: Textbook year 1, page 117, activity 2 and 3

Extract from the classroom interaction (recorded):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ss:</th>
<th>Microwave, microwave, microwave.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Okay, it doesn't matter. We choose one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>Microwave, microwave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Now, wait a minute. What is the most used device in our homes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>MICROWAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Microwave. Okay we are going to write a short paragraph about the microwave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>(unintelligible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Yeah? What do you want to write?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>(unintelligible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Okay, let us first discuss something then you can write okay? How can we start our paragraph?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>A problem. Of course we respect the different STEPS of the description or profile of the invention. Can we start?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>S1:</td>
<td>Sir?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>S1:</td>
<td>Euh the humans in the past spend a lot of time and effort to cook food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S2:</td>
<td>A long time take a long time for cook (unintelligible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Can you repeat please? (addressing S1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>S1:</td>
<td>The human in the past spend a lot of time and effort to cook food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Good May be? Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yes it is a possible introduction yes or?

21 S2: In the old days people used to cook on the ovens which take too long too long euh (.) to cook food

22 T: Yes another possible introduction (.) yes we refer to what what what was the (.) we identify th[e (.)

23 Ss: Problem

24 T: PROBLEM the problem which was the origin for the (.) for the?

25 S: invention

26 T: Invention okay?
Now (.) How can we start?
Someone write on the white board

27 S: Sir?

28 T: Yes (unintelligible)
Who can euh? Now? Who can? What can we say? What can we say? We choose between the two introductions given by your classmates here (.) What can we yeah? (…) WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

29 S: Euh long time

30 Ss: Oven take long time to cook

31 S: Consume energy

32 T: Can you repeat?

33 S2: Ovens take long time to cook (unintelligible)

34 T: What types of ovens are we speaking about?

35 S2: The old [ovens

36 T: The old] the old ovens took (…)

37 Ss: A long time to cook

38 T: Okay yes
Can you write this? [addressing the student on the board]
Or as you said as you said at the beginning [addressing S1]
Wait a minute please [addressing the student on the board]
Appendix K  Semi-structured interviews with the teacher

Study Title: Intercultural Communication in EFL Classroom and Textbooks

Researcher: Amina Douidi  Ethics number: 18774

Dear teacher,

Thank you for accepting to take part in this interview. The interview will be audio recorded in order for me to transcribe faithfully our conversation. Please feel free to interrupt me at any time. The length of the interview will be about 45 minutes. If you want to end the interview please feel free to do so.

The interviews are guided by and not limited to the following questions:

1) Experience with languages and English
   • Tell me about your academic and professional background
   • Tell me about your experience with languages and how was your journey with English in particular
   • What do you think of English?
   • In which occasions do you use/speak English?

2) Experience with cultures (community and international world)
   • How would you define culture?
   • Have you ever been in another city or country other than yours? Tell me about it.
   • Do you have friends, family members who don’t have the same language and culture as yours and with whom you communication whether face-to-face or through technology? Tell me about how the conversation goes.
   • Tell me about an anecdote where you were in a situation of communication with another person who does not have neither the same first language as yours and nor the same culture.
   • How exposed are you to cultures other than yours (media, literature, travels, etc.)

3) School environment
   • Tell me about your work environment: the school, the students, the workload, etc.
   • For how long have you been teaching in this school?
   • What do you think of the language level of your students?
   • How would you describe your classroom in terms of diversity (cultural, language, English proficiency, educational level, etc.)
   • How do you manage your classroom?
   • What kind of conflicts do you experience in your work or in the classroom (colleagues, students, parents, etc.)
   • Have you ever experienced a conflict in the classroom or school that you would relate to culture? Tell me more about what happened

4) The textbook and teaching materials
   • Tell me about your lessons
   • What do you think of the English curriculum?
• Do you use a textbook for your teaching?
• Which place does the textbook take when designing your lesson?
• What do you think of the current textbook you are using in comparison of those that you have been using before, if any?
• What do you think of the cultural content of the textbook?
• Which place does “culture” take in your course?
• Do you think that the textbook covers sufficiently cultural topics?
• Are you comfortable with these topics? (E.g. stereotypes, gender representation) (Gray, 2000)
• How relevant they are with your classroom, students and lesson plan
• In this textbook, which topics would you avoid to cover with your students? Why? (Gray, 2000)
• When you plan your lesson, do you adapt the textbook’s content? Why? How? (Gray, 2000)
• In your opinion, which effect does the textbook have on the students’ language acquisition and development? (Tomlinson, 2012)
• Does the textbook encourage you (or your students) to try new types of materials (more references, videos, books, etc.)? (Tomlinson, 2012)
• In which sense? How?
• Concerning, the majority of cultures represented/tackled in the textbook, do you think that they help the students to know/learn more about them? And develop a positive attitude towards them?
• Etc.

This second interview is the occasion to ask the teacher to:
• Comment on events that happened in the classroom
• Reiterate the discussion about English, cultures.
• Comment on some units from the textbook and the exams.

It will be also be the occasion to thank the teacher for their collaboration.
Appendix L  Research protocol

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

OUTLINE OF PROPOSED RESEARCH WITH HUMAN PARTICIPANTS, TO BE SUBMITTED via ERGO FOR ETHICAL COMMITTEE APPROVAL

STUDENTS PLEASE NOTE: You will need to discuss this form with your Supervisor. In particular, you should ask him/her to advise you about all relevant ethical guidelines relating to your area of research, which you must read and understand.

ALL RESEARCHERS PLEASE NOTE: You must not begin your study until Faculty of Humanities ethical approval and Research Governance Office approval have been obtained through the ERGO system. Failure to comply with this policy could constitute a disciplinary breach.

1. Name(s): Amina Douidi

2. Start date: 11/02/2016  End date: 30/04/2016

3. Supervisor (student research only): Professor Richard Kiely

4. How may you be contacted (e-mail and/or phone number)?
   e-mail: Ad1e14@soton.ac.uk
   UK phone Number: +44 7729 018726

5. Into which category does your research fall? Delete or add as appropriate.
   PhD

6. Title of project
   Intercultural Communication in EFL Classroom and Textbooks

7. Briefly describe the rationale for carrying out this project, and the specific aims and research questions
   I am interested in intercultural communication and how it is integrated in the English as Foreign Language (EFL) curriculum, classroom and textbooks, as well as in the teachers’ and learners’ views about English and cultures. In order to understand the realities of the language classroom, the following questions will be asked:

   6. How does the representation of cultures in EFL textbooks provide opportunities for intercultural understanding and communication?
   7. What is the role of the teacher in promoting intercultural communication in the EFL classroom
      ➢ 2.a. How do the teacher’s talk and behaviour provide opportunities for intercultural communication
      ➢ 2.b. What are the teacher’s practices in order to promote intercultural communication
8. What are the teacher’s beliefs and attitudes towards English, cultures, and intercultural communication
9. What are the learners’ expectations, beliefs, and attitudes towards English and cultural content
10. What are the students’ actions and reactions in an interactive intercultural situation

**What is the overall design of the study?**

I have chosen to conduct this research in Algeria. For the moment, I have been authorised access to two secondary schools (Algeria).

1. A descriptive perspective will be possible by using ethnographic methods where the data will be mainly analysed from a qualitative perspective. After collecting the data I will come back to Southampton.

**What research procedures will be used?**

For each case study, the data collection will include:
- Textbook analysis
- Classroom observations:
  - As many as I am authorised to
  - Audio-recording of the lesson
  - Filed notes
- 2 interviews with the EFL teacher, which will be audio-recorded
- Collecting reflective writing of the teacher
- A focus group with 4 to 5 students who would agree to volunteer:
  - The group discussion with the students will last 1h30, which will be audio recorded. They will be asked to comment on a short text and a picture and to expand the discussion about English and cultures
  - Notes of informal conversations (after class, before class) will also be included in the data.
  - Pictures using phone camera of the empty classroom, black/white board and students’ worksheets.

**Who are the participants?**

The participants are

1. **EFL teachers:**
   In each country I am collaborating with a secondary school EFL teacher who agreed to take part in the study after contacting his/her via email and phone calls.

2. **Secondary school students**
   I will invite students to volunteer to take part in a focus group. Since it is very probable that some of them will be under 16 years old, I have prepared consent forms and information sheets for the parents or the their legal guardians detailing the study in English and French language.
   I am also providing the schools with a copy of Criminal Records, which I have withdrawn from the Algerian Consulate of London on the 14/01/2016 valid 3 months. The original document is in French and there is no mention of any condemnation. I have also prepared two certified official translations both in English and French.

**How will you obtain the consent of participants, and (if appropriate) that of their parents or guardians?**

- The consent forms will be provided in person (face-to-face) to the teachers and the students.
- The students who are under 16 years old will be asked to give a consent form and an information sheet to their parents or legal guardians to sign.
- My contact details are available in the information sheets and I will be more than happy to meet the parents/guardians if they request further explanations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12| **Is there any reason to believe participants may not be able to give full informed consent? If yes, what steps do you propose to take to safeguard their interests?**  
   The teachers can have the impression of being judged or assessed, which is in any means the aim of the research. None of the information collected will be shared with any authoritative body such as director or school manager and the confidentiality of the individuals will be respected by providing them with ID numbers at the beginning of the study.  
   Concerning the learners, they might be worried about their marks. Thus, it is clearly mentioned in the information sheet and it will be repeated during the focus group, that participating or not in the study will not by any means affect their grades. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 13| **Detail any possible discomfort, inconvenience or other adverse effects the participants may experience arising from the study, and how this will be dealt with.**  
   The participants will experience no psychological or physical inconvenience or discomfort.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 14| **How will it be made clear to participants that they may withdraw consent to participate at any time without penalty?**  
   It is clearly mentioned in the information sheets that the participants can withdraw from the study without reason and at anytime without penalty, and it will not affect their learning. They are informed that the information collected will be immediately deleted after their decision.  
   If I feel that the participants are hesitant or shy, I will reaffirm it verbally.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 15| **How will information obtained from or about participants be protected?**  
   The information collected will be stored in a computer secured with a password.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 16| **If this research involves work with children, has a CRB check been carried out?**  
   Since the study is carried out in countries other than UK, the Algerian Consulate in London has provided me with the Criminal Check Records.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Yes  
   No                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 17| **Outline any other information you feel may be relevant to this submission.**                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
Appendix M  Focus group

Study Title: Intercultural Communication in EFL Classroom and Textbook

Researcher: Amina Douidi  Ethics number: 18774

Date:  Class:  No. Participants: F M  Time:

Participants ID:

1. Provide ID numbers to participants
2. Ice-breaking activity (favourite music/hobbies)
3. Discussions about the students’ attitudes and beliefs towards, languages and cultures
4. Discussion with students about the textbook (I will have a copy of it)
   The directive questions will be as follows:

   • What do you think of the textbook you are using in your English course?
   • Do you think that the textbook is useful for knowing about the English culture (or other cultures)
   • Can you identify some cultural aspects from the textbook
   • Do you refer to the textbook to enrich your knowledge about English?
   • Do you think that the textbook covers sufficiently cultural topics?
   • Are you comfortable with these topics? (E.g. stereotypes, gender representation) (Gray, 2000)
   • How relevant are they with what you want to learn? In other words, do you think it will help you in real life?
   • In this textbook, which topics you would not want to study or discuss?
   • In your opinion, which effect does the textbook have on your language acquisition/learning and development? (Tomlinson, 2012)
   • Does the textbook encourage you to do more research about other cultures (more references, videos, books, etc.)? (Tomlinson, 2012)
   • Concerning, the majority of cultural references represented/tackled in the textbook, do you think that they help you to know/learn more about them? And develop a positive attitude towards them?
   • Do you mind if nothing is said about your own culture in the textbook?
   • What topics would you want to discuss in the English class?
   • Do you think that there should be more references to your culture in the textbook?
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