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Chapter 11
Professional (Re)Visions of Language Teaching for Interculturality

Erin Kearney, State University of New York at Buffalo

Introduction

Widespread support among stakeholders in modern languages education (MLE) for developing interculturality in learners is in stark contrast with actual classroom and teacher education practices. Such practices don’t yet reflect ample theorizing by scholars (e.g., Byram, 1997, 2008, 2012; Kearney, 2015a; Kramsch, 1993, 2006, 2009) and the creative and consistent generation of curricular approaches and practical guidelines by language departments, program supervisors, and professional organizations (e.g., ACTFL, 2016; Byrnes, 2002, 2008; Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010; Levine, 2004; Michelson & Dupuy, 2014; Paesani, Allen, & Dupuy, 2016; Péron, 2010) that stand to transform classroom processes, student experiences, and learning outcomes. To understand this lack of sea change in practice, despite broad acknowledgment of the significance of culture-in-language-teaching and strong willingness to produce practical models, we should look closely at practice itself; that is, a principled inquiry into the discursive processes that constitute how we see and talk about interculturality and language teaching/learning within our profession and how we enact language teaching and teacher development practices with intercultural goals in mind could illuminate current roadblocks while also suggesting avenues forward.

In this chapter, I first review literature that reveals the long-standing and solid support that language teachers, language learners, program supervisors, curriculum innovators, theorists, and professional organizations have demonstrated with regard to the centrality of culture in MLE. I then outline the challenges these stakeholders face as they attempt to move from valuing culture in language teaching to fostering practices that are meaningful in developing interculturality in learners in classrooms and in developing pedagogical readiness in new educators to address interculturality in their language teaching. I next use Goodwin’s (1994) concept of professional vision as a heuristic to guide and
organize a reframing of these challenges. Specifically, I apply Goodwin’s concepts of coding schemes, graphic representations, and highlighting to selected tools of the profession that revolve around interculturality as illustrative examples of how these tools currently reflect, construct, and sometimes constrain our professional vision and action. Finally, I turn to work on core practices (Grossman, 2009) that has grown directly out of Goodwin’s insights on professional practices, discourses, tools, and socialization processes, as this lens brings into clear focus possibilities for adjusting our professional vision and action. I discuss how we can use our existing professional tools more intentionally and effectively while also proposing some new potential tools and practices.

**Consensus that Developing Interculturality Matters**

In recent decades, research and reports have steadily accumulated pointing to a firm, shared belief that attending to culture in language teaching and cultivating interculturality in language learners is a central purpose of MLE. From research on language teachers’ prioritization of culture amongst their pedagogical goals (Rhodes & Pufahl, 2010) to studies of what learners hope to gain from MLE (Kearney, 2008; Mangan, Murphy, & Sahakyan, 2014) to professional standards (ACTFL, 2016) and reports (MLA, 2007) that articulate aspirations for future directions for the field to volumes that draw attention to bridging language/culture and theory/practice divides (Levine & Phipps, 2010) a common refrain to address and promote interculturality through MLE resounds.

Of course, teachers’, learners’, program directors’, and scholars’ reasons for prioritizing intercultural learning in MLE are not necessarily the same, and their ideas about how interculturality is best pursued are less clear. Research reveals a sense of unease among educators, for example, with regard to their readiness to address culture in the language classroom. In one study, Swanson (2011) found that in a pool of over 1,000 language teachers in the United States and Canada, a lack of self-efficacy, especially with regard to the educators’ ability to teach culture, was linked to higher rates of attrition from the profession, highlighting the sometimes serious negative impacts of highly valuing interculturality in MLE while concomitantly failing to adequately prepare teachers for this aspect of their professional work. Sercu (2006), in a similar vein, came to the conclusion that many language educators lack the requisite skills and preparation to be considered well prepared to teach for intercultural competence. In the realm of TA preparation in higher education, little research focuses specifically on the way graduate students are prepared to address culture in their teaching, but more general work (Allen & Maxim, 2013) points to the inadequacy of current models and traditional methods courses that tend to focus on training rather than embracing the view that graduate students are being socialized into professional practice.
Kern (2013) has suggested that what is needed in the professional development of graduate TAs in MLE is no less than a complete and profound reorientation to foundational notions like language and culture, emphasizing the relational dimensions of language use as opposed to language acquisition, and including such constructs as symbolic competence, pluriculturalism, and transcultural competence.

Complementing research on teachers’ preparation (or lack of preparation) when it comes to addressing culture and the potential impact on whether or not they stay in the profession are studies that underscore other impacts of a lack of adequate preparation on classroom practice and student learning. Drewelow (2013), for example, found that students arrive to their introductory level language courses with preconceived notions, stereotypes, or particular images of cultures associated with the languages they are studying and that instruction must consciously seek to promote cross-cultural analysis and reflection in order for those images to be reshaped. Similarly, in Collings’s (2007) work, which documents a Russian instructor’s efforts to incorporate culture into her beginning-level course, there is evidence that our approaches for addressing culture in instruction require attention and rethinking. In this study, the researcher found that, although there were efforts on the teacher’s part to integrate cultural references and content, students seemed reluctant to view these exercises as central to the curriculum; the author argues, rather convincingly, that part of this rejection has to do with the students’ notions of where cultural learning is meant to take place, with many believing that culture is for later, higher-level coursework or for study abroad contexts, whereas language is the appropriate focus of early courses. Beyond students’ preconceptions about the rightful place of culture in language education, we might also interpret the observed student behaviors in this study, however, as traceable to elements of the instructional approach. When there is no deliberate and intentional planning for interculturally oriented learning at both curricular and instructional levels and it is instead approached in a more ad hoc, spontaneous fashion, as seems to have been the case in this study, we can expect that students will reject, discount, or not find significantly meaningful experience or learning in their classroom experiences. In these few examples from the research literature, we begin to see a disconnect between the desire to foster intercultural learning and its actual unfolding in MLE.

Further evidence for the strong commitment to addressing culture in MLE is apparent in the numerous theoretical and practical models that have been generated in recent decades, with a notable uptick in curricular models being developed and shared especially in most recent years, likely as a result of calls to tighten connections between theory and classroom practice. Among the most widely known and cited theories of cultural dimensions of language education are
Byram's (1997, 2008, 2012) theory of intercultural competence and Kramsch's theory that was first anchored in the idea of intercultural third spaces (1993) and which was elaborated and refined over time into a theory of symbolic competence (2005, 2009). The reach of these models is impressive, as evidenced by their frequent citation in the work of other theorists and in empirical research reports and the way they have inspired scholars to launch a sizable, regular conference focusing exclusively on intercultural competence (CERCLL’s International Conference on the Development and Assessment of Intercultural Competence).

The broad impact of these theories is also apparent in how they have been consciously integrated into practical frameworks too, such as NCSSFL-ACTFL's Interculturality Can-Do Statements (ACTFL, 2017), which were developed with Byram's theory of intercultural competence serving as an orienting frame and as a tool for drafting particular benchmarks. Similarly, the imprint of Byram’s model is directly perceivable in one school district’s approach to teaching for interculturality in MLE from early grades on (Wagner, Perugini, & Byram, 2017). These theoretical models of interculturality in language education, although both well known and overlapping in some ways, certainly envision foundational constructs of culture, the relationship of language and culture, and intercultural experience and learning in different ways. Some of these divergences become apparent in discussions later in the chapter as I turn to consideration of the material representations that play an important role in our professional vision.

These long-standing, well-used, and robust theories mark strong interest in our field in addressing interculturality in MLE; yet, questions remain about the extent to which and the specific ways in which these models are actually used in shaping classroom practice and language teacher preparation practices.

Still, more indication of the profession's positioning of culture as important to MLE is visible in the well-developed practical models that have emerged in recent years. Genre-based approaches to curriculum and instruction (Byrnes, 2002, 2008; Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010), multiliteracies approaches (Michelson & Dupuy, 2014; Paesani, Allen, & Dupuy, 2016), and global simulation approaches (Kearney, 2015a; Levine, 2004; Péron, 2010) are richly described in the literature and connected in empirical studies to positive student experiences and outcomes such as more proficient writing skills, stronger self-efficacy, deeper meaning-making, and more. Nonetheless, adoption of these curricula and approaches still occurs mostly in isolated pockets as opposed to a more widespread fashion. We are prompted to ask ourselves why this might be the case.

All in all, language teachers, language learners, program supervisors, curriculum innovators, theorists, and professional organizations have in different forms all expressed or demonstrated their belief in the centrality of culture in MLE; yet, as has been noted throughout this section, we see that a shift in practice has been slow to follow.
The Challenge in Achieving a More Interculturally Oriented Modern Languages Education

We have firmly established consensus in our field that interculturality is a significant dimension of MLE; however, although we have worked from all corners of the profession to develop many solid theories, models, approaches, and guidelines that seek to promote intercultural teaching and learning, this has not naturally led to significant shifts in practice either in language classrooms or in new teacher socialization arenas. It follows logically that we would begin to wonder why such changes have yet to take place, and indeed elsewhere I have attempted to summarize some of the most pressing challenges with addressing culture in MLE. Based on extensive review of the literature, the following are the challenges I discerned:

• The challenge of integrating language and culture
• The challenge of defining culture
• The challenge of undoing the treatment of culture in essentializing or reductionist ways
• The challenge of getting beyond cultural “facts” to acknowledge complexity and contradiction in cultural knowledge and experience
• The challenge of moving away from conceptions of culture as procedural knowledge and imagining more dynamic roles for learners as language users
• The challenge of specifying interpretive processes involved in intercultural learning
• The challenge of connecting and distinguishing the personal and the individual from the cultural and the shared
• The challenge of overcoming surface comparison
• The challenge of theorizing and implementing broader meaning-making approaches in ML education
• The challenge of more deeply engaging subjectivities in culture-in-ML-education (Kearney, 2015a, p. 19)

Certain of these challenges reside on a theoretical and conceptual level, raising questions of definition, the essence of culture, and its relationship with language and speculating about possible goals of aiming for interculturality in MLE; other challenges fall much more in the practical domain of classrooms, teaching, and learning. Of course, theoretical or definitional challenges are significant to language teachers and classroom practice, as well as to supervisors, language program directors, and teacher educators charged with socialization of new language teachers. While this list of challenges is perhaps a reasonable start in grappling with a lack of transformation in the field toward more interculturally oriented teaching and teacher education practice, we are still left with little explanation of why these challenges exist and why change has not transpired. Why has our
extensive talk and robust thinking not translated into more widespread action and transformed practice?

To understand why the desired change has not yet materialized, we can begin by considering the problem to be a largely discursive one and then looking closely to our professional discursive spaces to both unmask those areas that stymie change and identify specific paths toward possible transformation. Goodwin’s (1994) work on professional vision provides us with exactly the lens we require to carry out such a task.

**Professional Vision and Its Discursive Realization**

According to Goodwin (1994), all professions have their own view of the world, quite different from the layperson’s, a perspective that is constituted by discipline-internal discursive processes, practices, and tools and one that is necessarily learned. He writes that “[a]ll vision is perspectival and lodged within endogenous communities of practice” (p. 606); in our professional communities, he writes:

> Discursive practices are used by members of a profession to shape events in the domains subject to their professional scrutiny. The shaping process creates the objects of knowledge that become the insignia of a profession’s craft: the theories, the artifacts, and bodies of expertise that distinguish it from other professions. Analysis of the methods used by members of a community to build and contest the events that structure their lifeworld contributes to the development of a practice-based theory of knowledge and action. (p. 606)

In the field of MLE, we might contend that the domains most central and subject to our professional scrutiny are language classrooms as well as settings in which language educators experience initial and ongoing professional development. In these contexts, we develop, engage in, aim for, and sometimes re-envision processes that form our most foundational “objects of knowledge.” In our case, these have to do with notions of language, culture, and their interrelationship and place in learners’ development. Our objects of knowledge also include language and culture pedagogies as well as language teacher education pedagogies. We produce theories, tools, lines of research, and approaches to language teaching and educator preparation that come to characterize our profession. As Goodwin points out, these are sites of knowledge production and action, and they are highly consequential in shaping our views, but their normalization through recurring practice does not mean that they are never contested or immune to transformation.

When we look at particular aspects of MLE, as I will later in the chapter for the case of intercultural language teaching, the theory of professional vision encourages us to develop “the ability to see a meaningful event is not a transparent, psychological process but instead a socially situated activity accomplished
through the deployment of a range of historically constituted discursive practices” (p. 606). That is, as we look at particular classroom interactions, particular moments of dialogue in a TA methods course, or particular instances of engagement at conferences and other sites of professional learning, we must recognize that there are discursive tools and practices in play, with histories of use and particular values attached to them, and that these shape the ways we generate and carry out our local activity. Our professional vision, then, is complex and distributed, sedimented and normalized over time while also embodied and enacted in situated moments. As we consider the case of interculturality in MLE and our professional vision of interculturally oriented language teaching specifically, attention to these dimensions is essential.

Some of the discursive practices involved in professional vision that Goodwin describes are coding, producing and articulating material representations, and highlighting. A closer look at how each of these tools shapes our thinking and action as language professionals who aim for interculturality is presented in the following sections. In a final portion of the chapter, potential (re)visions of our professional approach to interculturality in MLE through recoding, producing novel material representations, and a more substantive attention to the way we highlight practice during new educator socialization are advanced.

**Our Current Coding Schemes and Their Material Representations**

Coding, Goodwin explains, “transforms phenomena observed in a specific setting into the objects of knowledge that animate the discourse of a profession” (p. 606). Essentially, coding is a way of measuring or classifying, a means of carving up a complex perceptual environment, stimulating social experience, and putting names and labels to particular pieces of it. We apply coding schemes to our professional settings and the activity that takes place within them in order to more easily speak about how pieces of the scene relate to each other as well. In the professions Goodwin references, measurement tools in archaeology, like a Munsell color chart for categorizing plots of dirt and schemes for determining escalation of force in police work, are examples of coding. In MLE, our theories and models can serve as coding schemes, the rubrics we use to guide and evaluate both learning and teaching are also coding schemes, and sets of criteria for evaluating proficiency levels or competence are also coding schemes for transforming language use and language education activities into objects of knowledge that are relevant to our discourse and professional actions.

In the more narrow area of intercultural teaching and learning in ML classrooms, the ACTFL standards and the two most dominant theories of competence related to interculturality serve as good illustrative examples of how we code and the material representations that accompany our coding schemes. Materials representations are, Goodwin explains, the basis around which much
of our embodied practice takes place and in essence mediate between our overall coding schemes and embodied practice. Material representations also function to focalize our professional vision in particular ways, as they operate by “using the distinctive characteristics of the material world to organize phenomena in ways that spoken language cannot—for example, by collecting records of a range of disparate events onto a single visible surface” (p. 611). So when we project an image that summarizes Byram’s theory of intercultural competence as we explain to new teachers what an intercultural learning process involves or when we ask new teachers in a methods course to sit with a copy of the ACTFL standards as they practice planning lessons, these material representations will shape their view of the professional task at hand. These theoretical and practical professional tools include coding schemes that provide us with common terms to employ as we talk about how to conceive of, approach, and enact intercultural language teaching, and they provide the discursive resources that form the basis for our actual engagements in the classroom or professional learning settings. They also train our professional gaze in certain directions over others.

The two theories of competence most relevant to intercultural dimensions of MLE, as has been referenced above, are Byram’s theory of intercultural communicative competence and Kramsch’s theory of symbolic competence. Byram’s theory, as can be observed in Figures 11.1 and 11.3, enumerates

---

**Figure 11.1** From Byram (1997, p. 73)
components of intercultural communicative competence, including linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and intercultural competence. Within intercultural competence (Figure 11.2), a set of *savoirs* or knowledges are presented as components, with a critical awareness and engagement component at the heart of the other four boxes that reflect knowledge, skills, and attitudes orientation. Figure 11.3 reflects the way Byram codes the
process of developing intercultural communicative competence, depicting a back-and-forth trajectory between experiences with language and culture and reflection on or awareness-raising pertaining to those experiences.

In all cases, the details of the visual depictions of the coding schemes Byram’s theory proposes matter for our professional vision. The material representation in Figure 11.1 suggests that intercultural communicative competence is in fact made up of several separate competences, which are, according to the visual, related to each other in some type of reciprocal fashion. Beyond a general sense, we cannot discern from the visual anything further about the precise nature of their interrelatedness. Also in Figure 11.1, the components of intercultural competence are intertwined, almost like a system of tangled roots under the surface, but their precise interrelationship remains unspecified. Clarification of their relationships would present a more precise description of what intercultural competence is theorized to be and could perhaps begin to suggest how it is developed in classroom settings if, for example, specific connections between skills and knowledge or skills and attitudes were theorized and illustrated. That intercultural competence is located where it is in the diagram and that it is further broken down into its subcomponents encourages the interpretation that this competence merits our special focus and attention. These same subcomponents appear in the material representation in Figure 11.2 through an alternative visual. They are located in separate boxes, seeming to suggest they are discrete from each other, and in this case, Byram explains, critical cultural awareness is positioned at the center of the other savoirs, as it is the goal toward which development of the other knowledge, skills, and attitudes is aimed. There is a suggestion that critical cultural awareness then is dependent on and perhaps the only result when a learner has reached some threshold of developing the other components of intercultural competence. Figure 11.3 presents a different type of material representation in that it depicts another aspect of Byram’s overall coding scheme—the process through which intercultural competence develops. Whereas the first two figures show what intercultural communicative competence is made up of, this one encodes and allows us to consider the process of alternating between experience and reflection that Byram theorizes is at the heart of the intercultural learning process. What a brief analysis of these three figures intends to point out is that Byram’s theory, the coding schemes it advances, and related material representations both support and constrain our understandings of intercultural teaching and learning, if and when we attempt to apply them as we carry out our professional activities in language teaching or teacher education. They promote our ability to focus in on certain elements of intercultural language teaching and learning for example, but they also constrain the way in which we do so.

One of the particular limitations of Byram’s coding scheme is that interrelationships among the various competences he includes are not clarified, and
the interrelationship between linguistic and intercultural competence especially remains unelaborated, as Byram himself has acknowledged:

It is noticeable that only a small minority of the models of intercultural communicative competence have explicit reference to language and language competence and those that do, including mine, do not clarify the relationships between linguistic competences and cultural competences, the language-culture nexus, as realised in people’s psychology. What we need is a model which represents language and culture competence holistically and shows the relationship between language competence—including language awareness—and intercultural competence, including critical cultural awareness. Such a model should be produced for pedagogical purposes, i.e. it should help teachers and learners to clarify what needs to be taught and learnt, and in such a model, the concept of awareness would be crucial. (p. 7)

It is notable that in assessing his own model, Byram emphasizes that one of the main purposes for clarifying the theory, and ostensibly its depiction in visual representations as well, would be to make the concept and the tools that accompany it more useful for language teaching and language teachers. There appears to be some awareness on his part that, despite the major impact of his theories and ideas in a broad sense, application in practice remains an issue. Importantly, and in line with a theory of professional vision, this problem likely resides at least in part in the way the theory encodes and in what it might be leaving out that could be of use to practitioners. The issue is then, on one hand, a lack of clear theorizing in the model of intercultural competence on some very fine points; on the other hand, and much more significant to the problem of little change in addressing interculturality in ML classrooms, the issue is that Byram’s theory does not directly address teaching practice. That is, his is a theory of intercultural communicative competence, not a theory of a pedagogy supportive of developing such competence, and although there are some insights about teaching practices we can discern or deduce from the model, it does not specifically guide our instructional efforts.

A second dominant theory relating to interculturality in MLE is Kramsch’s theory of symbolic competence. Growing out of earlier work on intercultural third spaces (1993) and presented initially in 2006 as an alternative to and expansion of a previously available coding scheme (communicative competence), symbolic competence was introduced as a more fitting type of competence for a globalized world in which the nature of communication, cultures, communicative practices, and meaning-making is more diverse, hybrid, complex, and dynamic. Indeed, Kramsch (2014), keenly aware of the fact that our theoretical models impact and shape the work that we do in MLE, writes that globalization and postmodern realities have “destabilized the codes, norms and conventions that FL educators relied
upon to help learners be successful users of the language once they had left the classroom” (p. 296). By introducing a new model of competence, Kramsch introduced the possibility of also shifting our language teaching and language teacher education practices.

Symbolic competence, as a theory and when considered as a potential coding scheme, proposed three dimensions initially: production of complexity, tolerance of ambiguity, and form as meaning (2006, pp. 251–252). The original scheme was elaborated through a complexity theory lens to offer other possible means for construing symbolic competence as the ability to agentively self-position, be aware of the historicity in language features and uses, and reframe and transform contexts for interaction (Kramsch, 2008). Finally, a subsequent formulation of the theory (Kramsch, 2011) offers yet another scheme for organizing our outlook on intercultural language learning and teaching and symbolic competence, including language use as symbolic representation, symbolic action, and symbolic power. These various articulations of the theory represent an evolving but useful coding scheme, especially for those of us who apply the theory in our empirical research on language classrooms.

While both the theory and the evolving coding scheme are quite compelling, and although there are increasingly published reports of the theory having been applied in a range of practical ways in language classrooms (e.g., Etienne & Vanbaelen, 2017; Vinall, 2012, 2016), there are as of yet no material representations of the theory, no figures or visual representations, which may be one of the reasons we have not yet seen widespread adoption of symbolic competence principles in language teaching or in language teacher education. This lack of material representation may hinder some of the embodied professional practices that could take place with symbolic competence as a discursive driver, for example, curricular revisions, the teaching of lesson planning in methods courses for new language teachers, or use of the theory for articulating profession-wide standards and guidelines. With material representations of symbolic competence available, we might better be able to imagine these practices taking place.

Shifting away from theory now to focus more intently on a very practically oriented coding scheme and the material representation that shapes the discourse and work within our profession, consider Figure 11.4, which presents the ACTFL standards that have to do with culture in language education. The ACTFL standards are far-reaching in their impact (Glisan, 2012; Phillips & Abbott, 2011) in language teaching and in language teacher education and therefore worthy of our analytic attention as we consider what coding schemes might be shaping our professional vision when it comes to interculturality in MLE. Insofar as the standards suggest a coding scheme that focalizes and animates our professional work, there are several points that can be made. First, culture is referred to in the plural in the Cultures standard, with “the cultures studied” posited as the focus of attention and learning. It is analysis, investigation,
interaction, and reflection around products, practices, and perspectives of “the cultures studied” that form the core of the standard. There is nothing to preclude students’ familiar cultures from figuring in this mix of cultures studied, but there is an implication, when worded and encoded this way, that “cultures” are distinct, each with their own products, practices, and perspectives to be explored. In such a formulation, interculturality finds no expression; indeed, we see no mention of interculturality in the standards themselves, although other ACTFL documents, such as the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Proficiency Statements (2017), do explicitly take up interculturality. Culture is also referred to as an abstract “concept” in the Comparisons standard, adding to the way that culture is coded by the standards and in the chart that serves as a material representation of this scheme. We might also assert that the explicit mention of processes of analysis, investigation, interaction, and reflection offers us an additional coding scheme; not only do the standards create an object of knowledge having to do with cultures as something to be studied in language classrooms, with their attendant products, practices, and perspectives—the content of language education—but also a second object of knowledge, the process through which cultural learning can occur. These formulations have the potential for shaping our professional vision and work in a productive way, providing shared touchstones as we discuss interculturality in MLE, and offering guidance on how we can plan for and enact language instruction and how we can work with new language educators who need to develop their approach to addressing culture in their own classrooms. However, research (Phillips & Abbott, 2011) has shown that, although there is broad familiarity with and inclusion of the Cultures standard in the work of language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. CULTURES</th>
<th>2.1 Relating Cultural Practices to Perspectives: Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between the practices and the perspectives of the cultures studied</th>
<th>2.2 Relating Cultural Products to Perspectives: Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between the products and the perspectives of the cultures studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interact with cultural competence and understanding</td>
<td>4. COMPARISONS Develop insight into the nature of language and culture in order to interact with cultural competence</td>
<td>4.2 Cultural Comparisons Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the concept of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and their own</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11.4** Cultures and comparisons standards from the ACTFL World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (2016)
teachers and teacher educators, it is not clear that there is deep understanding of what the coding scheme actually proposes; that is, teachers and teacher educators do not necessarily demonstrate an understanding of which instructional practices are both supportive of students’ intercultural learning and development and are in alignment with the Cultures and Comparisons standards.

In summary, the nature of some of our most prominent coding schemes and the material representations associated with them are potentially, at least partially, the reason behind a lack of change in practice on a broad scale. While they can serve to organize our discussions of language teaching, our teaching practice, and our efforts to socialize new teachers, they also constrain those same practices and are relatively ambiguous when we do not have access to understanding how they are actually taken up in language teaching and new language teacher socialization. The important question of how coding schemes and material representations are put to use in these meaningful contexts and interactions and how they draw attention to particular facets of practice is taken up in the next section, which discusses highlighting.

How We Currently Highlight Intercultural Teaching Practices

Goodwin explains that highlighting is a discursive process that “makes specific phenomena in a complex perceptual field salient by marking them in some fashion” (p. 606). While related to coding schemes and material representations, highlighting is a more interactional dimension of the way professional vision is socialized among novices. Highlighting can be achieved in a variety of ways, as experts attempt to draw novices’ attention to elements essential to professional practice. In socializing and apprenticing new language teachers into professional vision, a teacher educator might point to particular elements of Byram’s model while projecting it on a screen during a methods course. He or she might exaggerate certain elements of instruction while performing a model lesson, attracting novices’ attention to interactionally and pedagogically relevant features of instructional practice.

In contrast to the relative abundance of coding schemes and material representations that reveal the way our profession approaches the task of addressing culture in MLE, locating instances of highlighting that occur as experts socialize novices into intercultural teaching pedagogies is far more challenging. These interactions are ephemeral and do not endure like material representations, and they have only very rarely been studied. One study (Fox & Diaz-Greenberg, 2006) that sought to qualitatively analyze novice teachers’ ability to develop an approach to teaching culture describes what we might call a socialization into the ACTFL coding scheme of the 5C’s (Communication, Cultures, Comparisons, Connections, and Communities), with special attention to the extent to which the teacher candidates were able to design lessons that conceived of culture in the
way suggested by the ACTFL standards. This research is a glimpse into the ways coding schemes and material representations might play a role in new teacher preparation and professional development, but more and deeper research into the ways teacher educators and their novice teacher students interact would greatly illuminate our understanding of the ways new teachers make the transition from hearing about available coding schemes, theories, and formulations of intercultural teaching to actually animating teaching practice that reflects some of these principles.

Alternatively, Goodwin’s theory of professional vision, as a practice-based theory of professional knowledge and action, suggests another possibility. Namely, we can put aside the approach of attempting to generate theories, coding schemes, and material representations from a detached and generalized point of view, and we can take up a process of generating our coding schemes and representations from analysis of practice itself. This is not to say that existing theories become irrelevant. On the contrary, it is likely that practice-based theories of professional knowledge and action related to interculturally oriented language teaching will interface productively with extant models. It is simply a matter of taking an alternative approach to understanding and developing approaches to interculturality in MLE, one that begins with practice as enacted in classrooms and teacher education settings and builds out, rather than transposing conceptual models onto the practical work of teaching. I elaborate more on this in the following section and illustrate my argument with the example of a teacher education workshop I have been employing and studying in recent years to assist language educators in developing their instructional approach to interculturality in the ML classroom.

A Goodwinian Retake: Sharpening Professional Vision and Developing a Grammar of Practice to Spur Change

Thus far, a review of our profession’s predominant tools (coding schemes and material representations) surrounding culture in language teaching has revealed some possible explanations for why we have not witnessed more extensive transformation at the level of classroom practice or a sharp turn toward interculturally oriented language instruction in classrooms of all levels. The tools of our profession, however, need not always emerge from abstract contemplation and theorizing by scholars alone, however persuasive, compelling, and useful it may be for some purposes. In fact, these kinds of theories will benefit from the development of coding schemes and material representations, which emerges in the process of closely investigating language teaching practice that attends to culture and documenting the interactions that lead to generation of these new tools. Our processes for arriving at deeper understandings of instructional practice are exactly what need to be replicated across teacher education contexts.
in order for more broadscale transformation of professional practice to take place. What is needed, in a nutshell, is a model of interculturally oriented teaching practices, developed and continually refined through analysis of actual practice, and accompanying coding schemes and representations to go with it.

**Core Practices for Teaching and for Teaching New Teachers**

This task is facilitated by a substantial and growing body of work that has anchored itself in Goodwin’s notion of professional vision, resulting in development of practice-based theories of core instructional practices in education. Simultaneously, this work has elaborated a particular teacher education pedagogy that focuses squarely on apprenticing novices into professional vision through engagement with core practices. Grossman (2011) has been a leader in these efforts, establishing a framework for the teaching of practice. Basically, she writes,

> [T]he framework discusses the use of representations, decompositions, and approximations of practice in professional education. Representations of practice include all the different ways in which the work of practitioners is made visible to novices during professional education… . The ability to decompose practice depends on the existence of a language and structure for describing practice—what we’ve described as a grammar of practice. Without such a grammar, it is difficult to name the parts or to know how the components are related to one another… . These decompositions also help to support students as they learn to enact complex practices. By focusing on one component of a more complex practice, novices have opportunities to work on a more discrete set of moves or strategies … [these are] opportunities for novices to engage in approximations of practice … pedagogical simplifications … that can help simplify the demands of the work… . Approximations also provide the opportunity for specific and targeted feedback. (pp. 2837–2840)

This approach to the teaching of practice is one that relies on ever more research that identifies what are the “core” instructional and professional practices that might be included in teacher education and ongoing research into the specific ways that novices are successfully appropriating and enacting instructional practices.

**The Process of Discovering Core Practices in Intercultural Language Teaching and Developing a Parallel Teacher Education Pedagogy**

Drawing on such an approach and with keen interest in clarifying those instructional practices that seemed to be “core” to interculturally oriented language
teaching, I have engaged in a multi-year process of developing a set of such practices from analysis of classroom-based video data in a variety of settings and working with language teachers to identify, appropriate, and adopt interculturally oriented practices into their instructional repertoires. In what follows, I describe my method, which spans two levels of inquiry and action, and I then share a few examples from this work to illustrate a core practices process that can be used in teacher education settings. I also share two of the tools that have been generated and refined both through classroom-based research and several iterations of methods and professional development courses for new and experienced language teachers. These tools are potentially useful coding schemes and material representations as we approach our work of socializing new language educators and examples of what can be generated as we work with teachers.

My method, broadly speaking, was exploratory and grounded in general principles of action research. As Peercy and Troyan (2017) have also experienced and explained, when teacher educators attempt to implement a core practices approach in their methods courses and as they work with novice teachers, they must grapple with the dual task of defining core practices while also figuring out their own pedagogical approach for engaging teachers with core practices. I was most certainly caught in that same tension, but I benefited from having developed candidate core practices through extensive classroom-based research around interculturally oriented language teaching; these formed a stable foundation upon which work with teachers could be built. This research, conducted before embarking on my core practices work with teachers, included studies of a few different contexts, from a pre-K language exploratory program (Kearney & Ahn, 2014; Kearney & Barbour, 2015) to high school Latin and Spanish classes (Kearney, 2015b) to a university-level French classroom (Kearney, 2008, 2015a). These studies all focused on documenting teaching and learning interactions in classrooms through video and analyzing video records using micro-ethnographic techniques (Erickson, 2006) to identify typical instructional activities, patterns in pedagogical practices and purposes while also examining the situatedness of particular interactional realizations of these practices. This body of work and my reflections on how it might apply to a wide range of language classrooms yielded five candidate practices, as shown in Table 11.1.

These candidate core practices for intercultural teaching were newly shaped objects of professional knowledge, generated from analysis of classroom teaching, but my research codified and represented them to varying degrees by the time I wanted to start using them with novice teachers. In some cases—for the intercultural teaching practice of “interpreting meaning from cultural representations” especially—I had gone through a detailed process of identifying micro-practices or the range of likely constituent parts of the larger practice. That is, when a language teacher engages students in interpreting any text for its cultural meanings, he or she is likely to set up a meaningful context for interpretation, provide any terms
and concepts students will need to perform the interpretation, identify symbolic forms, invite hypotheses about the meanings of the text, scaffold students’ interpretations through questioning, and so on. In the examples in my classroom data of teachers leading students through interpretation of texts of all kinds for cultural meaning, these were common micro-practices; of course, not all micro-practices need to be present for the practice to be apparent, and teachers will in all cases realize the micro-practices interactionally in unique ways depending on their students, the content, the text at hand, and their own teaching styles, among other factors.

By contrast, other candidate practices emerging from the classroom-based research were much less well developed. For example, in one class I studied, the instructor had designed an extended global simulation project, and the long-term, regular engagement with interpretation and generation of cultural meaning, as built into the curricular project, was crucial to students’ intercultural learning in the class. Therefore, it seemed reasonable to propose a planning-related practice focused on creating extended engagements with cultural meaning.

Guiding my inquiry in the first classroom-research based phase was the question: What are possible core practices in interculturally oriented language teaching? With some candidate practices generated through classroom-based research, a second research focus arose: How can novice and more experienced teachers be engaged in developing their abilities to both see and enact these practices? To address this second question, practically speaking, I began introducing the candidate core practices for intercultural teaching in my methods courses with novice language educators and in professional development seminars offered to more experienced teachers. I also began collecting data to keep account of the way teachers and I worked with the candidate practices, how these practices were themselves elaborated or refined as we worked, and ultimately how the teachers came to identify and apply these practices. Specifically, the data formally gathered across three contexts of language teacher education include those given in Table 11.2.

### Table 11.1 Candidate Practices for Intercultural Teaching Derived from Classroom-Based Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Practices</th>
<th>Instructional Practices</th>
<th>Assessment Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning for extended engagements with cultural meaning</td>
<td>Supporting identification of symbolic forms, formation of meaningful associations around these and creation of a network of cultural references</td>
<td>Creating opportunities for students to recontextualize, re-accent, and/or re-signify culturally meaningful forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipating students’ misunderstandings or questions and planning possible responses/instructional scaffolds</td>
<td>Interpreting meaning from cultural representations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding my inquiry in the first classroom-research based phase was the question: What are possible core practices in interculturally oriented language teaching? With some candidate practices generated through classroom-based research, a second research focus arose: How can novice and more experienced teachers be engaged in developing their abilities to both see and enact these practices? To address this second question, practically speaking, I began introducing the candidate core practices for intercultural teaching in my methods courses with novice language educators and in professional development seminars offered to more experienced teachers. I also began collecting data to keep account of the way teachers and I worked with the candidate practices, how these practices were themselves elaborated or refined as we worked, and ultimately how the teachers came to identify and apply these practices. Specifically, the data formally gathered across three contexts of language teacher education include those given in Table 11.2.
As I considered the data I gathered and the theory of professional vision that inspired the work in the first place, it was natural to look at the interactions I had with teachers and the tools we produced and refined as we analyzed, discussed, and dissected representations of intercultural teaching (lesson plans, model lessons, recordings of interculturally oriented language instruction) as coding schemes, material representations, and embodied practices. Our development of core practices tools (observational schemes of sorts) were coding schemes and material representations, in Goodwin’s terms, around which further socializing interactions could occur. As already noted, these were mediational tools that were not only helping us interpret examples of others’ teaching for interculturality but also plan and rehearse teaching practice; intertwined with our development of professional vision was the actual refinement of several of the practices themselves, lending a complex but highly generative nature to the work we undertook. This overlap is appropriate in a practice-based theory of professional knowledge, as it approaches the question of what constitutes intercultural teaching in a bottom-up or practice-up fashion that has been absent from our theories and models of intercultural teaching in MLE to date.

A Roadmap (with Illustrations) for Socializing Novices into a Core Practices Vision of Intercultural Language Teaching

In all of my work with teachers around development of interculturally oriented language teaching practices, I have followed a set of procedures that are likely replicable in a range of teacher learning environments, from TA training to individualized instructional coaching to methods courses for pre-service K-12 teachers. While participants in my own research and in much of my professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recordings of class sessions</td>
<td>Six video recordings of an advanced methods course for preservice teachers (summer 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six audio recordings of a professional development course for in-service teachers (fall 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three audio recordings of a professional development course for in-service teachers (fall 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>My own lesson plans for all three courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handouts and assignments for the three courses (including an evolving micro-practices checklists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The pre- and in-service teachers’ work for the courses (including lesson plans, reflection, and a few video recordings of attempts at implementation in their own classrooms)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development work around this area have been in the K-12 arena, the concerns expressed by K-12 educators, however veteran or novice they are, are quite similar to those faced at the postsecondary level when it comes to developing an instructional approach for teaching for interculturality. For these reasons, the steps I describe in this section should be of use to a wide range of language teachers and language teacher educators. The phases of activity I follow, inspired by a core practices approach to teacher education (Grossman, 2011) and summarized in Table 11.3, include certain standard activities for teachers and certain activities I routinely engage in as the teacher educator. All of this activity is driven by particular goals for teacher learning and experience.

**Selecting Representations**

In the analysis of teaching stage, it is essential to consider what representations of practice teachers will analyze and how these address planning, instructional, and assessment practices. In my own work and research, I have, for example, provided selected pages from MIT’s Cultura website (https://cultura.mit.edu/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Language Teacher Activities</th>
<th>Teacher Educator Actions</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Describing and analyzing representations of teaching</td>
<td>Selecting representations of teaching Establishing a routine for guiding teachers through description and analysis Drawing teachers’ attention to levels of practice (micro-practices, interactional moves, and the instructional activities and contextual specificities these are embedded in)</td>
<td>Deconstructing practice into constituent parts Naming elements of practice (developing a shared coding scheme) Identifying concretely and pedagogically what teachers do in enacting practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Applications of coding schemes to simplified instructional tasks (i.e., rehearsals)</td>
<td>Providing summaries of the coding schemes being developed within the group for each practice studied Encouraging teachers to cross-check their instructional plans with micro-practices to develop their activities Creating a comfortable environment for rehearsal of practice Setting some parameters for the rehearsal task Leading debrief post-rehearsal that hews to the coding scheme</td>
<td>Matching micro-practices with instructional activities and instructional moves Making space for teachers to appropriate and deploy micro-practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(see Appendix 11.A for excerpts) or overviews of global simulation scenarios (Caré & Debyser, 1995; Michelson & Dupuy, 2014; Péron, 2010) in order to provide representations of curricular planning efforts, which can be decomposed and analyzed by teachers. To focus on day-to-day planning, I have offered teachers lesson plans from my own and colleagues’ teaching as well as examples we find online and in ACTFL materials (e.g., Clementi & Terrill, 2017). Most often, though, since I focus largely on development of classroom instructional practice when I work with teachers, I include many different video-recorded samples of teaching as representations of instructional practice. Some of these are from my own classroom-based research in pre-K to university-level classrooms, some come from the Annenberg “Teaching Foreign Languages K-12: A Library of Teaching Practices” resource (https://www.learner.org/resources/series185.html), and still others are videos that the teachers I work with film of themselves. Another option for the teacher educator is to model lessons or activities in real time; this allows for teachers to experience instruction in a way that is different from observing a video and consequently may alter subsequent analysis activities and understanding of the practices in focus.

**Guiding Teachers Through Descriptions and Decompositions of Practice**

Once a representation of teaching practice has been chosen, the teacher educator must consider processes for leading teachers through analysis of the selected curriculum document, lesson plan, recording of teaching, or observation of real-time teaching. In the teacher education settings I have studied, a clear analytic procedure is paramount. This begins with an invitation to teachers to first describe a named practice. For example, when I asked teachers to analyze the practice of “supporting interpretation of cultural representations” in the Annenberg library’s video of a Spanish teacher working with her class to understand Picasso’s *Guernica*, I requested they view the recording on their own and independently describe and launch their analysis of the teaching practice (see Figure 11.5).

What such a routine permits is a training of teachers’ attention on just the focal practice while also prompting them to take notes on descriptive elements and features of the practice, which can then be brought into collective discussion with peers and the teacher educator. The naming of practice that teachers begin on their own is continued in group discussion, as teacher educator and teachers deconstruct practice into its constituent parts, characterize its features, and begin to classify them and comment on how these elements were achieved in the particular environment the representation presents. The teacher educator’s role at this stage is to manage teachers’ observations, draw their attention to micro-practices the teachers don’t comment on, and help emphasize various levels of practice from the micro-practices that are likely to appear across examples of the practice to the more situation-specific interactional moves and instructional activities that define the unique realization of the practice under observation.
In the methods course where teachers took notes on the *Guernica* teaching segment, I worked as teacher educator to apprentice the teachers’ gaze, and we worked together to build a common understanding of and a shared coding scheme for the intercultural teaching practice of “supporting interpretation of meaning from cultural representations.” While my own research generated both a name for this practice and a set of micro-practices (see Appendix 11.D) well before I worked with this group of teachers, the directions they received for viewing the recoding on their own only provided them with the name for the practice. I intentionally held back the existing list of micro-practices. While this is an available coding scheme and could be the basis for discussion and analysis, I preferred for teachers to engage in their own practice-based theory-building process after viewing a segment of recorded teaching. In this way, teachers had the opportunity to hone their own observational skills. At the same time, this means that the practices themselves are also routinely tested as they are applied to new representations of teaching (i.e., new video recordings of practice) and analyzed by new sets of teachers. Once I proposed the name of the practice to teachers, they watched and described the recording of instructional practice, and in coming back together as a group, I asked them to draw on these notes to articulate the specific actions they observed and to note and name physical actions, verbal utterances, use of

---

**VIDEO ANALYSIS #4**

The practice in focus for this video analysis is **supporting interpretation of cultural representations**. Your goal is to begin separating from an ongoing flow of teaching and learning interaction those segments that seems to relate to this practice and to then analyze and deconstruct the practice for the ways that the teacher accomplished it.

**Procedure:**

1. View the whole 27-minute video, which first gives you some context for the classroom instruction you will see and then shows pieces of that instruction.
2. Take notes as you watch the clip, noting anything that stands out to you with regard to the teacher’s efforts to engage learners in interpretation of cultural representations (written, visual, etc.).
3. Provide responses to the questions below (changing the font to red so I can read them more easily) and submit this analysis sheet to **UBLearns** under the Assignments tab.

---

1. Type in the notes you took while viewing the clip.
2. Overall, how would you describe the teacher’s approach to supporting students as they interpret cultural representations?
3. What are the specific instructional moves that help the teacher to support students’ interpretations? In other words, what micro-practices have you noticed in this teacher’s instructional approach?

---

**Figure 11.5** A Routine for launching analysis of a representation of instructional practice

In the methods course where teachers took notes on the *Guernica* teaching segment, I worked as teacher educator to apprentice the teachers’ gaze, and we worked together to build a common understanding of and a shared coding scheme for the intercultural teaching practice of “supporting interpretation of meaning from cultural representations.” While my own research generated both a name for this practice and a set of micro-practices (see Appendix 11.D) well before I worked with this group of teachers, the directions they received for viewing the recoding on their own only provided them with the name for the practice. I intentionally held back the existing list of micro-practices. While this is an available coding scheme and could be the basis for discussion and analysis, I preferred for teachers to engage in their own practice-based theory-building process after viewing a segment of recorded teaching. In this way, teachers had the opportunity to hone their own observational skills. At the same time, this means that the practices themselves are also routinely tested as they are applied to new representations of teaching (i.e., new video recordings of practice) and analyzed by new sets of teachers. Once I proposed the name of the practice to teachers, they watched and described the recording of instructional practice, and in coming back together as a group, I asked them to draw on these notes to articulate the specific actions they observed and to note and name physical actions, verbal utterances, use of
materials, gestures, and the like, in order to describe instructional moves. I also asked them to articulate what they think the impact of teacher actions were on students in those moments. This process of describing teacher action and the perceived effect on students helps to start putting labels to particular instructional moves that relate to teaching and learning. Essentially, what we are doing in this phase of deconstruction is developing a descriptive classification system for talking about the practice through very focused looking and detailed description.

A second example of the way this analytic approach unfolds comes from a different class in which I asked teachers to focus on the practice of “planning for extended engagement of cultural meaning.” To this end, I gave them documents from the Cultura project as well as a global simulation. The Cultura project sets up intercultural dialog and inquiry projects and then shares student work from these exchanges online. From this project, I selected word association, sentence completion, and situation reaction tasks completed by a group of students in Michigan and another class in Chambery, France, as well as the discussions that ensued online, in French and English, among the students. Half of my group of teachers were asked specifically to list all of the planning actions they thought a teacher would have to go through to plan such an extended project. The other half of the class looked at an example of a global simulation project (see Appendix 11.B for materials shared with the teachers), another type of curricular structure that aims for extended engagement with cultural meaning, and they were asked to carry out the same analyses. As the groups reported back and we began to record possible micro-practices related to the overall core practice of “planning for extended engagements with cultural meaning,” there was some overlap across their deconstructions of the two representations of curricular planning the teachers had analyzed. It is in this general fashion of analyzing representations of practice and generating descriptions of the smaller constituent practices that went into the practice that teachers and I have engaged in producing and refining descriptions of core practices in intercultural teaching. Although my own theoretical proclivities and previous experiences with researching intercultural learning in MLE shaped the overall naming of the core practice I asked teachers to analyze in this case, it was in the teachers’ analysis of the curriculum plans and documents that a set of possible constituent parts or micro-practices was generated. We talked about them, revised them based on the ways they appeared in slightly different forms from one curriculum plan to another, and we recodified them on the board (see Figure 11.6).

This guided analysis of similar but not identical representations of interculturally oriented planning practices led to consensus building and establishment of a common language for talking about planning for intercultural teaching. Subsequent to this iteration of the professional development seminar, I developed a coding scheme for the practice of “planning for extended engagement with cultural meaning,” complete with the micro-practices generated by our group as we analyzed artifacts of other teachers’ planning efforts (see Appendix 11.C). I have
continued to elaborate and adjust this visual representation as it is applied each time I work with new groups of language teachers.

Over time and as I have engaged various groups of teachers in the same processes of analyzing a wide range of examples of planning and instructional practice, many of the micro-practices that were generated from my own independent analysis of classroom videos and through early analyses by teachers have seemed to resurface and be applicable in new instances and representations, and fewer and fewer new micro-practices are being identified. The coding schemes, then, have stabilized and coalesced through our collective work of building a descriptive grammar of practice when it comes to intercultural teaching. These tools can be turned to teachers’ advantage as they start planning for, enacting, and reflecting on their attempts at intercultural teaching. The coding scheme and material representation, then, become useful in the approximations of practice phase of learning to teach for interculturality in MLE.

Providing Opportunities for Rehearsal

Observation and analysis of teaching practice is essential, but there must also be opportunity for teachers to appropriate and rehearse new planning, instructional, and assessment practices if they are to integrate these into their pedagogical repertoires. From the teacher educator’s point of view and what my research supports
is that, in transitioning from the analysis to the enactment phase, summaries of the coding schemes the group of teachers have been developing through analysis activities should be provided for each practice the group takes up. These lists of micro-practices are useful as teachers plan for their rehearsals and can be a resource that guides debriefing discussions once rehearsals of practice have taken place. It is further recommended for the teacher educator to establish some clear guidelines for the rehearsal task; that is, it can be helpful to indicate a specific thematic unit and proficiency level an activity should be geared toward, or a specific text or image can be provided to teachers as they envision a plan for instruction that also aims for the focal intercultural teaching practice.

Continuing the example above from my research, as a rehearsal of the planning practice, “planning for extended engagement with cultural meaning,” the group of teachers was asked to choose either a Cultura-like inquiry-based intercultural exchange or a global simulation format to envision a curricular unit they expected to teach later in the year. For these practicing teachers who replied on pre-course surveys that their approach to addressing culture was “conflicted,” presenting only “snapshots” of culture in ways that were not well integrated with language instruction, this meaning-centered approach to planning curricular units offered new purpose and direction.

Based on this exploratory project in generating core practices for intercultural language teaching and working with new teachers to build their approach to intercultural teaching, we can conclude that there is still much work to be done when it comes to identifying the planning, instructional, and assessment practices we collectively think will have the most value. What is clear, though, is that although there is much more ground to cover, the process of analyzing practice with new language teachers is an entirely viable site for filling the gaps that our current coding schemes and material representations don’t address. Such projects also serve to further develop our understandings of and approach to socialization of new language teachers in preparation programs and professional development settings. Peercy and Troyan (2017) point out that “the scholarship on core practices is currently limited [as well] by an underdeveloped pedagogy of teacher education” (p. 28). We have further to go, but there is much reason to continue on this path; simultaneously re-envisioning our objects of knowledge and attending to and documenting our practices for highlighting and making sense of important instructional practices will likely begin to shift classroom practices toward more meaningful intercultural learning where we have not seen such movement to date.

**Conclusion**

In response to the dilemma outlined at the start of this chapter—a lack of sea change when it comes to addressing culture in language classrooms—I hope to have shown that a professional vision frame can help to illuminate both why we
have not yet seen widespread change in practice materialize and what we can do to prompt the transformations we desire. Specifically, there is enormous potential in producing new representations of practice in reconceptualizing our objects of knowledge, theories, and coding schemes, especially in ways that better illuminate the complexity of interculturality, its development and enactments in practice and that underscore the centrality of cultural and intercultural meaning-making as the quintessential processes that are the focus and hallmark of interculturally focused curriculum, instruction, learning, and teacher education. These kinds of coding schemes and material representations relate to existing theories and coding schemes and elaborate, nuance, and enhance them rather than replace them. (Clearly, Kramsch’s theory of symbolic competence and her centralizing of the semiotic enters into the way I have worked with teacher-learners to develop core practices for intercultural teaching.) Precisely, we should take up insights gained from generating new theories of practice to re-encode our phenomenon of interest—interculturality and its development in MLE—in the theories and models with which we already animate much of our professional discourse (dominant theories in scholarship and ACTFL guidelines and standards especially).

Furthermore, we will do well to be conscious of our highlighting practices and engage in them in new and more intentional ways as we engage with our colleagues and future colleagues around intercultural learning and teaching. We can be sure to deliberately and thoughtfully draw attention to specific elements of instructional practice, the details of how interculturality develops, and how it can be nurtured in teaching and learning interactions. Of course, this is by no means a call for our work as educators of new professionals in MLE to happen in lock-step fashion or a call for the same exact elements of practice to always be highlighted. Rather, as a core practices approach underscores, developing a “grammar of practice,” a common language for talking about intercultural language teaching, entails a more flexible and dynamic, although still grounded and intelligible, discussion of practice’s moving parts, situatedness, and complexity.
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