

Fostering Positive Cross-Cultural Attitudes through Language Teaching

D. E. Ingram

Co-Director, ISLPR Language Services

Office Suites, Shopping Centre,

cnr Padstow and Warrigal Roads,

Eight Mile Plains, Qld, 4113, Australia

and

Honorary Professorial Fellow,

Faculty of Education, University of Melbourne.

Email: d.ingram@islpr.org

Paper to an ISQ Languages Forum, *Perspectives and Practices*, ISQ Centre, 96 Warren Street, Spring Hill, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, 22 May, 2009.

Fostering Positive Cross-Cultural Attitudes through Language Teaching

D. E. Ingram

Co-Director, ISLPR Language Services
Office Suites, Shopping Centre,
cnr Padstow and Warrigal Roads,
Eight Mile Plains, Qld, 4113, Australia
and

Honorary Professorial Fellow,
Faculty of Education, University of Melbourne.

Email: d.e.ingram@bigpond.com

I Introduction

In December 2008, PostPressed, a Brisbane publisher of academic books, released for me a book entitled *Fostering Positive Cross-Cultural Attitudes through Language Teaching*. This book was the culmination of many years work on methodology (some of which has appeared in other papers) but, in particular, research into the cross-cultural attitudes of Year 10 students in Brisbane and Akita, Japan and a variety of teaching projects in Brisbane, Japan and Taiwan implementing the methodology that came out of that study. My colleagues in this study have been Dr Shirley O'Neill of USQ, and Professors Masako Sasaki and Minoru Kono of Akita University in Japan.

In this paper, I will refer briefly to the cross-cultural attitude studies we conducted but spend most time talking about the methodology that we developed and trialled in the teaching projects.

II The Cross-Cultural Attitude Studies

As in most research, the nature of the research was determined by the amount of funding made available, in this case very very little. Consequently, we were unable to do longitudinal studies of the changes that occur in cross-cultural attitudes over the duration of a course but, instead, conducted detailed surveys of more than 1200 Year

10 students, 598 in Brisbane and 630 in Akita, Japan, and their teachers. The survey questions sought to elicit the students' attitudes to themselves, their teachers, their own people (i.e., Australians and Japanese) and to various other cultural groups including the target language speakers, minority groups, migrant groups. It also sought the views of both the students and their teachers on language teaching and learning. The Brisbane students were learning a variety of European and Asian languages while the Japanese students were all learning English. Whereas the Australian students had not had much opportunity to travel to countries where their target language was spoken, about a third of the Japanese students had visited English-speaking countries and so we were able to look a little at what effect such opportunities had on their cross-cultural attitudes. In brief summary, this is what we found:

1. The cross-cultural attitudes of both groups of students were quite positive and certainly more positive than negative towards all the groups in the studies, including indigenous people in both countries (Aboriginals in Australia and the Ainu in Japan).
2. There was no evidence that language learning per se had any significant effect on the students' cross-cultural attitudes though it should be emphasised that we weren't able to compare the attitudes of students who had studied another language with those who had not but only those who had learned a language for a longer period (4 or more years) with those who had learned it for less (less than 4 years).
3. However, in the Japan study where there was more opportunity for the students to interact with native speakers during trips abroad, there was some evidence of a positive effect emerging, even though the duration of the stay abroad was generally short and, often, undertaken in a group.
4. However, it was also evident that the nature of the programmes and especially the activities favoured by the teachers were not conducive to the improvement of cross-cultural attitudes. In both Brisbane and Akita, curriculum design and methodology seemed to be largely traditional with a focus on formal learning even though the teachers themselves seemed to acknowledge the importance of interaction with native speakers and cultural understanding.
5. At the same time, the changes that students wanted to see in their programmes tended to be towards activities that are known from the research literature discussed shortly to be more beneficial both for the development of language proficiency and for fostering more positive cross-cultural attitudes.

6. Again, in brief, there was little if any evidence that language learning had had any positive effect on the students' cross-cultural attitudes but the nature of the programmes themselves in contrast to the aspirations of both the teachers and the students was not conducive to positive cross-cultural attitude development.

The book, *Fostering Positive Cross-Cultural Attitudes through Language Teaching*, discusses both these large surveys in detail, examining not only the students' attitudes to the people of other cultures, but also examining the attitudes of both students and teachers to language teaching and learning. In fact, though their expressed attitudes conformed reasonably well with the aspirations of language policies and curricula around the world, the methodologies were not such as to realise those aspirations in practice.

III What do Syllabuses and Policy-Makers aim for?

Universally, language education policies and syllabuses endorse at least 3 goals:

- language proficiency
- cultural understanding, and
- positive cross-cultural attitudes.

In **Japan**, the Senior High School Course of Study in Foreign Languages in 1999 made frequent references to fostering “a positive attitude toward communication with foreign peoples” and stated:

... consideration should be given to the following points:

- A. *To make students appreciate a variety of thoughts and viewpoints, to cultivate the ability to make a fair judgement, and to foster a richer sensitivity.*
- B. *To deepen students' understanding of the peoples and places of the world ... and to foster an attitude of respect for those cultures.*
- C. *To deepen international understanding... and to foster the spirit of international cooperation. [1999 Course of Study, Foreign Languages (Senior High School), Chapter 8, p. 39]*

In **Australia**, language policies and syllabuses invariably identify proficiency and positive attitudes as key aims. The *Australian Language and Literacy Policy*, for example, asserted that language teaching

... can promote ... greater tolerance within the broader community of linguistic differences in Australia and internationally ...[DEET 1991a: 63]

The present Prime Minister, who wrote the national policy on Asian languages in 1994, stressed both language skills and cultural understanding:

It is critical that Australia attaches the highest priority to the adoption and implementation of a long-term strategy to ensure that the Australian workforce of the future is equipped with language skills, and associated skills of cultural awareness, of direct relevance to our national economic interest [COAG 1994: 14]

and, since becoming Prime Minister, he has reiterated that view in both words and action.

In **Queensland**, the language syllabuses have always stressed both language proficiency and positive attitudes, for example,

... learning a second language widens horizons and leads ultimately to the capacity to look out from the new language and culture and, in effect, to develop a soundly based world view. This, in turn, fosters cross-cultural understanding and empathy with people of other languages and cultures ... [Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies 2001: 1]

In **Europe**, the Council of Europe's Recommendation R(82)18 states that:

.. it is only through a better knowledge of European modern languages that it will be possible to facilitate communication and interaction among Europeans of different mother tongues in order to promote ... mutual understanding and co-operation, and overcome prejudice and discrimination; ... [Recommendation No. R(82) 18 of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers]

John Trim, the architect of the Council of Europe's language policies, who has had more influence on language education worldwide than any other individual, has stated that one of the aims of European language teaching is

... to promote the personal development of the individual, with ... positive attitude towards other peoples and their cultures, free from prejudice, intolerance and xenophobia ... [Trim 1997: 5 – 6].

In **Switzerland**, a group of experts designing Switzerland's language policy argued that

Knowledge of neighbouring or partner languages allows not only communication across national borders but contributes also and especially to mutual understanding and an attitude of tolerance towards other cultures. [Conférence Suisse des directeurs cantonaux de l'instruction publique 1998: 4]

In **Brazil**, the great applied linguist Gomes de Matos has written:

Language users/learners should learn how to interact and to be interacted with in human-dignifying, peace-promoting ways. [Gomes de Matos 2002/2003: 5]

Numerous international conventions of the **United Nations** endorse the importance of developing language skills and of teaching languages in order to foster international understanding and tolerance. In one document citing the “guiding principles” of the conventions, UNESCO states:

UNESCO supports language as an essential component of intercultural education in order to encourage understanding between different population groups and ensure respect for fundamental rights. [UNESCO 2003: 30]

And, as I indicated earlier, in large scale surveys in Australia and Japan, teachers but, especially, students laid stress on these same attitudes even though the methodology the teachers used tended not to be effective in achieving them.

IV What do we know about language learning?

If these are the principal aims but the methodology that many teachers use does not do much to achieve them, then we need to try to develop more effective methods and, in the book, I elaborate at some length on the sort of methodology that is required to achieve both proficiency and positive cross-cultural attitudes.

The starting point in developing language teaching methodology is to ask what language is really like and how, in natural learning circumstances, we go about learning it, as most of us have done, at least once. In fact, developing methodology should be a rational process based on the nature of language, the nature of language learning, the nature of the language learner, and the nature of the society, especially the learners' relationship to the society within which they move and use the language [cf. Ingram 2008: Chapters 1 and 2].

First, language is a system of systems and, traditionally, teachers spent most of their time teaching those systems, basically presenting rules of grammar which students

memorised and consciously applied. However, this is not really how we use a language and learning a language simply by memorising and applying rules rarely leads to fluent proficiency though there is evidence that, granted such formal knowledge, when the opportunity to use the language practically comes about, practical proficiency can develop quite quickly.

However, language is essentially a tool to carry out communication tasks between people in particular situations or contexts. The relationships between the people, the nature of the situations or contexts, the nature of the tasks, and the purposes for which the tasks are being carried out both prompt the language that is used and determine its form. Formal classrooms or formal testing rooms are inherently limited in the situations that can occur, the relationships that exist, and the range of tasks that are possible. The first article I wrote 35 years ago looking at these limitations and how to overcome them was called "Something there is that doesn't love a wall" [Ingram 1974] and these ideas were further developed in what I will call later my "community involvement" approach to methodology. The "community" in which learners can be involved as an integral component of their language learning is not only the immediate social or geographical community around the school but includes the virtual community of the country and contexts where the language is spoken that can be created on a computer screen as well as the global community accessible via technology. The need is to understand how real language learning takes place (i.e., in real life), how the natural acquisition processes can be drawn on and enhanced through appropriately designed language teaching, and then to think creatively and imaginatively about how to use the capacities of modern technology to maximise the efficiency and effectiveness of learning that draws on our understanding of real language learning. In doing so, we need to ask how we can capture these natural processes to help us achieve our goals of language proficiency, cultural understanding and positive cross-cultural attitudes. In summary, what we know about language learning can be summed up in about a dozen or so points:

1. Humans know innately how to acquire language; the role of teaching is not just to transmit linguistic facts but to facilitate learning.
2. Language is most effectively learned when learners are actively involved in using language as a means to communicate and achieve desired ends.
3. Learners seek, impose, learn and use rules, progressively modifying their rule system with experience and use of the language. The most effective stimulus to this process is the learners' wish and attempts to communicate and gradually develop their language systems in order to communicate successfully. There is also a contemplative process in this wherein learners focus on the language, perceive relationships and how they are

expressed, and internalise the language systems. This is the process of “cerebration” [see Ingram et al 2008: Chapter 6; also Grenfell 2000: 24 – 25].

4. The grammar of the language may be learned by both formal and informal means with formal teaching most effective in response to need and when designed to assist the learner to perceive and comprehend the form of the rules that comprise the linguistic system and to apply them spontaneously.
5. Language learning is greatly promoted by social interaction and wide, diverse experience of the language (not least in active and purposeful listening and speaking but also in using the other macroskills).
6. Language learning progresses most rapidly in a receptive, accepting environment.
7. Language exists and is best learned in context, including its cultural context.
8. Language learning is an active, dynamic and heuristic process. Language teaching should encourage learners to use and develop their own language learning capacities and encourage independence rather than dependence.
9. Language development occurs in response to need. Need takes many forms: at the macro level, the need is to use the language to achieve desired purposes (especially to communicate); at the micro level, the need is to acquire certain elements of the language at the appropriate time in the progressive development of the language. One of the teacher’s aims should be to ensure that the needs are both felt by the learners and answered appropriately at the appropriate time.
10. Meaningful and contextually appropriate language is inextricably related to the culture: both are learned and should desirably be taught together.
11. Language learning entails matching the forms being learned to the meaning system or culture that underlies the language. To communicate fluently, it also entails re-organising the learners’ own knowledge system to match the requirements of the new language, i.e., the learners have to learn to see their own world as well as the new “world” of the new culture through the eyes of the target culture.
12. Lave suggests that a main aim of teaching is to create situations that optimise the learner’s “successive approximations of mature practice” within a speech community [Lave 1990: 314]. He refers to Vygotsky’s “zone of proximal development”, the gap between the learners’ actual

developmental level and the level of potential development as determined by problem-solving under the teacher's guidance. Sensitivity to the learners' "zone of proximal development" (ZPD) can create the condition under which learners carry out tasks that encourage further development or, as Vygotsky says, that "force him to rise above himself" [cf. Vygotsky 1978: 86, 1987: 213].

13. Language is socially constituted and cannot be viewed in isolation from its cultural and social context [cf. Halliday 1974, 1975]. Devoid of its social and communicative context, as often occurs in formal classroom teaching especially at university level, language becomes an end in itself, in Bourdieu's words, "a purely internal and formal analysis with the charm of a game devoid of consequences" [Bourdieu 1991: 34]. Communicative ability is best achieved through social interaction in a range of naturalistic settings in which learners make use of their growing linguistic and sociolinguistic resources to participate in the construction and exchange of meaning and in which the success or failure of their efforts has some communicative significance [cf. Firth and Wagner 1997].
14. Motivation for language learning can be enhanced if students have the opportunity to interact with speakers of the language, first, because there is evidence that many students want such experience [cf. Ingram et al 2008]. Second, integrative motivation which, as Gardner and Lambert [1972] note, can be a powerful factor in promoting effective language learning, is enhanced if students have favourable experiences of meeting with native speakers and find that they can communicate, and can develop friendly relationships, with them.

The native speaking community in a multicultural society or globally provides authentic cultural, linguistic and social contexts for the performance of language tasks and, hence, the learning of language.

Specifically with regard to the development of positive cross-cultural attitudes but with implications for proficiency development, we know the following [cf. Ingram et al 2008]:

1. There are many theoretical and empirical studies that have found a favourable relationship between language learning and positive cross-cultural attitudes [e.g., Ingram et al 2008: Chapters 1 and 2; Riestra and Johnson 1964; Clement, Gardner and Smythe 1977; Bartley 1969, 1970].
2. However, there is no automatic relationship between language learning or teaching and positive cross-cultural attitudes, there may be no effect, the effect may be negative, or other, especially background variables such as socioeconomic class and social and parental attitudes, seem to be more

significant [e.g., Mantle-Bromley and Miller 1991, Byram and Estate-Sarries 1991].

3. Interaction with speakers of the other language seems to be one of the key factors that can strongly influence cross-cultural attitudes provided that it is managed appropriately [Ingram et al 2008: Chapters 1, 2 and 6; Clement, Gardner and Smythe 1977].
4. Cerebration, giving learners the opportunity to externalise their own intuitive responses and attitudes for examination and rational modification, seems to be a vital factor if attitudes are to change in a positive direction [Ingram et al 2008: Chapters 1, 2 and 6; Morgan 1993; Kramsch 1993; Mantle-Bromley 1995].
5. Knowledge alone about another culture does not automatically have a favourable effect and can lead to a worsening of attitudes unless there is intervention that leads to “cerebration” about attitudes [cf., Ingram et al 2008: Chapters 1, 2 and 6; Jones 1996; Mantle-Bromley and Miller 1991]. Nevertheless, profound cultural knowledge and understanding (not just knowledge of the superficial or trivial aspects of a culture) are essential.
6. Through learning about the target and other cultures and through interacting with speakers of the other language, learners need to become aware of, and sensitive to, two important contrasts: the individuality which exists within the universality of a culture and the universal, fundamental human features that underlie and permeate the diversity of cultures.
7. “Culture shock” seems to play an important part in the learning experience since it makes learners aware of their intuitive reactions and pre-conceptions and provides teachers with opportunities to stimulate discussion about cultures and inter-cultural relations, to try to explain and rationally change any of the students’ adverse reactions and prejudices, and so to effect positive attitudinal change [see Ingram et al 2008: Chapters 1, 2 and 6].

Clearly, there is no simple cause-effect relationship between language learning and positive cross-cultural attitudes, the variables that can be controlled in teaching seem to be important factors that may determine a positive or negative outcome, and, for this reason, my colleagues and I conducted the surveys I referred to earlier to try to identify variables of methodology in both Australia and Japan (i.e., in very different societies and educational environments) that were influential in effecting attitude change, how they might be controlled and what the implications are for course design and methodology. We also undertook a number of teaching projects to implement and evaluate the methodology proposed. These are written up in detail in the book but here I will just summarise them briefly.

V What are the implications for methodology and syllabus design?

In the approach to language policy, language assessment and language teaching methodology we proposed [see Ingram et al 2008: Chapters 6 and 7, Ingram and Wylie 1979/1999], the theoretical framework sketched earlier leads to a number of key principles of methodology, which may be summarised as:

- Focus on the learner
- Focus on use
- Focus on communication
- Contextualise the language
- Provide wide, diverse experience
- Respond to the learner's felt needs, and, most fundamentally,
- Focus on social interaction.

These basic principles of methodology lead to a number of key issues for language teaching practice:

1. First, let me reiterate the vital importance of **education systems** around the world seriously and systematically identifying the fostering of more positive cross-cultural attitudes as a central goal of education and specifically of language education and that they develop programs and methodologies that will achieve that goal.
2. It is probable that such intervention in children's attitude development will be more effective if it occurs before attitudes become less malleable with the stabilisation of personality through adolescence and so it is desirable that **foreign language teaching** commence early **in the Primary School** and that it envisage from the outset in its goals, its course design and its methodology the fostering of positive cross-cultural attitudes.
3. The central learning activity should be seen as **interaction** or "**community involvement**" in which learners are given continual opportunities to interact with speakers of the target language and to use it for real communicative purposes and for normal social interaction, whether that is face-to-face or over the web [see Ingram et al 2008: Chapter 6]. In this approach to methodology, there are three broad (but obviously overlapping) forms of community involvement (CI) with a fourth that applies to all the other three:

Extramural CI activities extend the language learning beyond the classroom in activities that essentially enable learners to re-experience their own environment and concepts through the foreign language, e.g., field trips, excursions, local newspapers, magazines, radio and television in the target language.

Formal CI activities are a formal course requirement that mandates interaction with speakers of the language. This interaction may take a range of forms from very simple directed tasks such as asking directions through to extended enquiries about some topic of interest. This might occur through face-to-face interaction in the local ethnic community, during travel abroad or mediated electronically by telephone, videoconferencing, web cameras, internet chatpages, and so on.

Informal CI activities are ultimately the most desirable and involve normal social interaction with native speakers in ordinary social situations such as, for example, parties, excursions, home visits, or work experience in a company where the language is used in the workplace. The internet also provides many opportunities for informal interaction [cf. Trim 1997: 62].

Mediated CI activities are activities that fall into all of the above categories but mediated by technology: the internet, email, chatpages, videoconferencing, telephone, and so on. In Japan, the Japanese Ministry of Education encourages schools to set up their own homepages in English for such purposes. In Europe, the Council of Europe has laid great emphasis on encouraging interaction amongst the people of Europe and on the use of technology to assist in this by building partnerships between schools in different countries [see Ingram et al 2008: 160 – 162]

4. **Culture learning** is a vital part of any language program, it can play an important role in fostering positive attitudes, and it is essential for proficiency development [cf. Ingram 1978, 2008: Chapter 6]. Culture learning should occur through formal systematic teaching, incidentally to the language teaching, and as a result of interaction with native speakers through community involvement. Through systematic culture teaching combined with the immediate experience of the personal, individual culture that governs the everyday lives of real speakers of the language, learners can transcend the stereotyping which formal culture teaching risks creating and which often forms the basis of negative attitudes, to realise the individuality that exists within the universality of a culture.
5. Learners need the opportunity to **re-conceptualise their own experience**, to see it through the eyes of the target culture, and so to realise that both their own and the target culture have their own equally defensible internal logic. To achieve this, learners need the opportunity to interact with native speakers and to discuss their own experiences and their own environment with native speakers using the target language [see also Ingram 2008: Chapters 1, 2 and 6; Morgan 1993]. Community involvement provides such opportunities.
6. “**Cerebration**” or “**cognitive processing**” plays a vital role in both language learning and in fostering cultural understanding and positive cross-cultural attitudes. Learners need the opportunity to think about issues of inter-cultural relations and subject their often sub-conscious reactions and entrenched

attitudes to rational examination and, if necessary, change. For this purpose, community involvement, often accompanied by some form of "**culture shock**", serves a vital purpose.

7. This approach does not neglect the teaching of the elements of the language (i.e., the **grammar** in the broadest sense) but they are taught either in the context of preparing for the community involvement experiences or in response to needs identified during them.
8. Clearly, this approach to methodology emphasises the development of practical language skills and so has important implications for **testing** which should also focus on practical skills rather than just formal knowledge about the language. In the teaching projects I'll mention shortly a form of direct proficiency assessment was used involving the *International Second Language Proficiency Ratings* (ISLPR) [Ingram and Wylie 1979/2007. However, in the course of language teaching formative assessment also makes an important contribution to teaching and, for that purpose, more traditional, analytic assessment methods are appropriate.
9. Clearly, all this has important implications for **teacher education**. Language teachers' role includes not only the presentation and exemplification of the target language but also guiding the student through the experiences that will assist them to develop more positive cross-cultural attitudes, to understand other cultures and the nature of cultural difference, to help students to cope with and work positively through "culture shock" experiences, and, not least, to understand, manage and implement those features of methodology that are known to promote both language development and more positive cross-cultural attitudes [for further elaboration on this, see Ingram 2008]. A necessary starting-point if teacher education programs are to take on these tasks is to specify the sorts of skills and attitudes, or 'competencies' that language teachers require [cf. ALLC 1996: Chapter 5]. Some years ago in the centre that I directed at Griffith University, we drew up a set of language teacher competencies in two parts: a specific purpose language proficiency scale for use with language teachers [Wylie and Ingram 1995] and a set of professional competency specifications that teachers require including, in particular, specification of the cross-cultural attitudes that teachers should show and the teaching skills required to enable them to develop appropriate attitudes in their students [Commins 1995].

VI Does it work?

This approach to methodology has been implemented in practice in a number of projects over recent decades.

I first applied it in a large-scale **migrant English program** across Australia catering for more than 100,000 students at any one time. This was a modular programme using themes responding to the survival needs of newly arrived immigrants. The central teaching-learning activities took the form of community involvement in which the students were set tasks to carry out in the community, ranging from such simple things as asking a passer-by directions to informal interaction with, for example, community organisations who visited the migrant hostels or invited the learners to their homes or social gatherings. The basis of assessment and accountability in this government-funded programme was in terms of the ISLPR. Nunan [1988] has commented on the significant proficiency gains that were made by learners in the programme.

Second, about the same time, I implemented the approach in a **College French course** in Brisbane. The central learning activity was “community involvement” in which students set up meetings with French speakers in the Brisbane community and discussed some topic of mutual interest with them (e.g., their life in Australia in comparison with the country from which they had come, how their restaurant, oil company, or other business operated, or any other issue that interested them). Afterwards, the students presented a detailed oral report to their class and submitted a written report to the lecturer. In most cases, this formal activity led to informal social interaction with the community members in their homes or in a social event. The course also contained formal teaching of the language in response to student need, another segment focussed on different registers and genres of the language, there was a course of French and Australian social studies taught in French once a week, and there were many opportunities given to listen to daily Radio Australia newsbulletins in French and to view and discuss French films or slide shows. Regular discussions were held on intercultural and interracial relationships and attitudes and occasionally games were used that highlighted issues of relationships between dominant and smaller societies or communities. The outcomes were very positive. The students became much more willing to use the language in conversation, their confidence in doing so increased greatly, and they were very willing to meet with French people at work or in their homes. Their overall proficiency improved greatly and there was strong evidence that their cross-cultural attitudes, not only towards French people but towards other cultures and races as well, improved markedly. In addition, the community members they interacted with gained in their understanding of Australians and Australian society and expressed their pleasure at being involved in the project.

Third, in the late 1990s, colleagues and I implemented this approach in the teaching of **Asian and European languages** at Griffith University. Without going into details here, the outcomes were very positive and were similar to those I have just described for the early French program [see Ingram et al 2008].

Fourth, Shirley O’Neill, one of my co-authors in the book under discussion, implemented the approach in a university course in which **Taiwanese and Japanese** students interacted. Again, the outcomes are discussed in the book but, in brief, they were similar to those I have described for the other projects: enhanced language skills and more positive cross-cultural attitudes. The important point is also made, however, that

the course needs to be long enough for students to overcome the inevitable culture shock that they feel when they first encounter another culture and to develop a more balanced perception of the other culture and its people.

In brief, one has to conclude from the research, the surveys reported in the book, and the teaching project just mentioned that language learning does not automatically achieve proficiency or positive cross-cultural attitudes but the methodology is important and can be designed both to foster positive cross-cultural attitudes and to develop proficiency. However, there is no single feature of methodology that is effective on its own but a combination of the features discussed earlier is necessary.

VII Conclusion

In summary, methodology should derive from a rational understanding of its basic determinants: the nature of language, the nature of the language learner, and the relationship between the learner and the society. These lead to certain basic principles which can be encapsulated in four statements:

- Focus on the learner
- Focus on use
- Respond to the learners' felt needs, and, especially,
- Focus on social interaction.

Most language education policies and syllabuses emphasise the development of practical proficiency and positive cross-cultural attitudes as central goals of language learning programs but merely being a student in a language course does not ensure either proficiency or positive cross-cultural attitudes. Nevertheless, the issues discussed in this paper do seem to be important in combination though no one aspect of methodology, on its own, will achieve these vital goals. T

In brief, if language teaching is to play an effective role in generating real language proficiency and more positive cross-cultural attitudes conducive to life in multicultural societies and the global village, it must be structured specifically to do so. In particular, appropriate activities include progressive communicative language teaching, interaction with native speakers or their realistic surrogates, thorough knowledge and understanding of the target culture, in particular, the real culture of the people, their ways of thinking, feeling and viewing the world, a culture that learners can best sense as they interact with native speakers both face-to-face and through modern technology. In addition, teachers must be aware that interaction may lead to more positive or more negative attitudes, that some form of culture shock is an integral part of attitude development and that it is the teachers' task to try to help students to manage that experience, to monitor and understand their intuitive reactions, and to subject those intuitive responses to reasoning and correction.

In the teaching projects reported here, not least in the opinion of the students in the university programmes, the use of community involvement achieved considerable success in all its major features: in the improvement of the students' language proficiency, in their confidence to use the language for everyday purposes, in their improved cultural understanding, and in the successful and agreeable contact they had with native speakers and the corollaries that suggests as likely in promoting more positive cross-cultural attitudes, and in the creation of on-going relationships that hold promise of continued improvement in both language skills and cultural understanding beyond the completion of the formal course.

Finally, let me reiterate, if individuals are to demonstrate positive cross-cultural attitudes, they must be aware of and ready to accept human diversity while also valuing the essential humanity that permeates all cultures. Language teaching can help to achieve this understanding because it can provide the essential supplement to knowledge and understanding, the awareness and insight that comes from equal status interaction between the learner and the people of other cultural, racial, and language backgrounds. As a former teacher of French, I like to quote Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. He was a philosophical writer of books for children and adults, who wrote about human relationships. In two places he said, in approximate translation:

It is very simple: you can see only with your heart. The essence of things is invisible to the eyes. [Saint-Exupéry 1958: 72]

Knowing is neither showing nor explaining. It is yielding to the vision. But to see, you must first participate. That's the hard lesson. [Saint-Exupéry 1942: 54]

REFERENCES

- Bartley, D. E. 1969. "A pilot study of aptitude and attitude factors in language dropout". In *California Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 20: 48 – 55.
- Bartley, D. E. 1970. "The importance of the attitude factor in language dropout: a preliminary investigation of group and sex differences". In *Foreign Language Annals*, Vol. 3: 383 – 93.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Byram, Michael and Veronica Esarte-Sarries. 1991. *Investigating Cultural Studies in Foreign Language Teaching: A Book for Teachers*. Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Clement, R., Gardner, R.C., and Smythe, P.C. 1977. "Inter-ethnic contact: attitudinal consequences." In *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 1977.
- Council of Australian Governments Working Group (COAG). 1994. *Asian Languages and Australia's Economic Future – A Report for the Council of Australian Governments on a Proposed National Asian Languages/Studies Strategy for Australian Schools*. Brisbane: Queensland Government Printer.
- Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET). 1991. *Australia's Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET). 1991a. *Australia's Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy – Companion Volume to the Policy Paper*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Firth, A. And J. Wagner. 1997. "On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research". In *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 81, No. 2.
- Gardner, R. and W. Lambert. 1972. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

- Gardner, R. C. and P. C. Smythe. 1975. "Second language acquisition: a social psychological approach". Research Bulletin No. 332, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.
- Grenfell, Michael. 2000. "Modern languages – Beyond Nuffield and into the 21st Century". In *Language Learning Journal: Journal of the Association for Language Learning*. No. 22, Winter 2000: 23 – 29.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1975. *Learning how to Mean – Explorations in the Development of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1974. *Language and Social Man*. London: Longman.
- Ingram, D. E. 1978. *An Applied Linguistic Study of Advanced Language Learning*. Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Essex, Colchester, England. Reproduced in ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, ED168 359.
- Ingram, D. E. 1974. "'Something there is that doesn't love a Wall' - Current Developments in Foreign Language Teaching". Paper to the Curriculum Development Workshop for Modern Languages for the Interim A.C.T. Schools Authority, Canberra, 27 – 29 November, 1974. Reprinted in *Modern Languages Workshop Report*. Woden, Australian Capital Territory (A.C.T.): Interim A.C.T. Schools Authority, 1974.
- Ingram, D. E., M. Kono, Shirley O'Neill, and Masako Sasaki. 2008. *Fostering Positive Cross-Cultural Attitudes through Language Teaching*. Teneriffe, Brisbane, Australia: PostPressed.
- Ingram, D. E. and Elaine Wylie. 1979/2007. *The International Second Language Proficiency Ratings (ISLPR)*. Brisbane: Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages, Griffith University/ISLPR Language Services.
- Jones, Carolyn. 1996. "Religion studies fail to end bias". In *The Australian*, 17 April, 1996.
- Kramsch, C. 1993. "Foreign languages for a global age". In *ADFL Bulletin*, Vol. 25: 1, 5 – 12.
- Lave, J. 1990. "Acquisition and understanding". In Stigler *et al* 1990.

- Mantle-Bromley, Corinne. 1995. "Positive attitudes and realistic beliefs: Links to proficiency". In *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 79, No. iii, 1995: 372 – 386.
- Mantle-Bromley, Corinne and Raymond B. Miller. 1991. "Effect of multicultural lessons on attitudes of students of Spanish". In *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 75, No. iv, 1991: 418 – 425.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). 2002. *Developing a Strategic Plan to Cultivate "Japanese with English Abilities"*. At <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/news/2002/07/020901.htm>
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). 2001. *Japanese Government Policies in Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology 2001: Educational Reform for the 21st Century*. At <http://www.mext.go.jp/eky2001/>
- Morgan, Carol. 1993. "Attitude change and foreign language culture learning". In *Language Teaching*, Vol. 26, April 1993: 63 – 75.
- Nunan, David. 1988. *Learner-Centred Curriculum Design*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies. 2001. *Senior French Syllabus*. Brisbane: Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies.
- Reiber, R. And A. Carton. (eds). 1987. *The Collected Works of L. S. Vygotsky*, Vol 1. New York: Plenum Press.
- Riestra, M. A. and C. E. Johnson. 1964. "Changes in attitudes of elementary school school pupils towards foreign-speaking peoples resulting from the study of a foreign language". In *Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol. 33: 65 – 72.
- Saint-Exupéry, Antoine de. 1958. *Le Petit Prince*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Saint-Exupéry, Antoine de. 1942. *Pilote de Guerre*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Stigler, J., R. Schweder and G. Herdt. (eds). 1990. *Cultural Psychology: Essays on Comparative Human Development*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Toyama, Atsuko. 2003. "Regarding the establishment of an action plan to cultivate 'Japanese with English Abilities'". Ministerial statement, 31 March, 2003. <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm> .
- Toyama, Atsuko. 2003a. "Action plan to cultivate 'Japanese with English Abilities'". Ministerial statement, 31 March, 2003. <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm> .
- Toyama, Atsuko. 2003b. "Action to improve English education. Ministerial statement, 31 March, 2003. <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm> .
- Toyama, Atsuko. 2002. *Foreword*. In *Japanese Government Policies in Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology*. At <http://wwwwp.mext.go.jp/eky2001/index-1.html>
- Trim, J. L. M. (ed. and compiler). 1997. *Language Learning for European Citizenship – Final Report of the Project Group (1992 – 96)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). 2003. *Education in a Multilingual World – UNESCO Education Position Paper, 2003*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Vygotsky, L. 1978. *Mind in society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. 1987. "The development of scientific concepts in childhood". In Reiber and Carton 1987.
- Wylie, Elaine and D. E. Ingram. 1995. *Minimum Skills/Competencies needed by LOTE Teachers, Part One: Language Proficiency*. Brisbane: Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages, Griffith University.