Raising EFL Teachers' Awareness about the Enhancement of Learners' Intercultural Communication through Teaching Intercultural Linguistics

Mounya Abdaoui
8 May 1945 University, Guelma (Algeria)

Abstract: The aim of the current research paper is to raise EFL teachers' awareness about the enhancement of students' intercultural communication through the teaching of intercultural linguistics. A limited knowledge of intercultural linguistics could lead to low intercultural competence, miscommunication, and cultural bias. To explore EFL teachers' views about this issue, a structured questionnaire was administered online within the quantitative descriptive method to a total of 86 teachers of English from different Algerian provinces located in the north, south, east, and west of the country. Findings indicated that the main barriers to intercultural communication are: cultural differences (73.25%), vocabulary (56.97%), as well as stereotypes and prejudices (44.18%). Furthermore, 77.9% of the participants agreed that intercultural linguistics is not included in the syllabi. In addition, 98.83% of the informants stressed the necessity to integrate cultural linguistics in the syllabi. Moreover, 84.88% of the teachers advocated the need for a shift in focus from teaching cultural linguistics to teaching intercultural linguistics. The same percentage (84.88%) appreciated teaching intercultural linguistics as a separate module. Concerning the aspects that teachers should focus on while teaching intercultural linguistics, two main factors were selected by the population: enhancing intercultural communicative competence and performance (86.04%) and promoting cultural and intercultural cognition (56.97%).

Keywords: Cultural differences, Cultural linguistics, Intercultural communication Intercultural communicative competence, Intercultural linguistics.

Introduction

Culture is a central element in curriculum design. Studying a foreign language implies Target language culture's acceptance, assimilation and integration. As a result, culture integration in the syllabus is a necessity that help Algerian Students promote their intercultural communication. It is observed in the Department of English, University of 8 May 1945, Guelma that culture is included in the curriculum through some modules like Literature and Civilisation. However, both cultural and intercultural linguistics are not included in the syllabi, which may result in students' low intercultural communicative competence, culture shock, and misunderstanding in different intercultural settings. The aim of this research is to explore Algerian teachers' attitudes towards the teaching of intercultural linguistics as well as to raise their awareness about its importance in promoting students' intercultural communicative competence and enhancing their intercultural communication.

I. Literature Review

A. Definition and Types of Culture

Culture is not easy to define; it is a complex multidimensional concept to which various definitions were assigned by different scholars throughout time. The following is a chronological review of the most common ones. In 1949, Parson defined it as "patterns relative to behaviour and the products of human action which may be inherited, that is, passed on from generation to

generation independently of the biological genes" (p. 8). This implies that culture is hereditary since it is transmitted from a person to another like genes. Children acquire social behaviour from their parents; therefore, culture is the result of one's environment. Similarly, in 1957, Lado (p. 111) considered it as "structured systems of patterned behaviour". In 1973, Cooper defined culture as "what a society does and think" (p. 99). In this context, culture reflects people's way of thinking and acting in a specific social setting. Cooper further explained that culture is divided into three main elements: "perception, norms or attitudes and conceptualisation" (p. 103). Firstly, perception is the experience resulted from one's understanding of the environment through sensation and the employment of cognitive abilities (Efron, 1969, p. 137). Secondly, attitudes were defined by Allport (1935, p. 810) as being mentally ready to respond to "all objects and situations" that could be faced. Consequently, attitudes cover mainly peoples' opinions, emotions, thinking, and perspectives which could influence their behaviour. Thirdly, conceptualisation is described by Ahmad as "the knowledge associated with verbal expression" (2007, p. 121). It is "the knowledge which appears as appropriate to be put into words" (Ahmad, 2007, p. 121). This means providing a conceptual definition for something by making a comprehensive idea that reflects the main elements of the concept. In the same year, Condon defined culture as a way of life since people who live in the same community share the same beliefs and behaviour (1973, p. 3). He also described it as "a system of integrated patterns" (1973, p. 4). In 1976, Samovar and Porter maintained that culture is:

> [T]he cumulative deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relationships, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions acquired by a group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving. (p. 1)

In the above quotation, Samovar and Porter used the word "cumulative" to point out that culture is compiled gradually across time. So, cultural deposits are the result of human activity. In 1980, Arvizu, Snyder, and Espinoza defined culture as "a dynamic, creative, and continuous process including behaviours, values and substance learned and shared by people that guides them in their struggle for survival and gives meaning to their lives" (p. 5). From this, it is noticed that culture is not constant, it is both flexible and changeable. Culture attracted the attention of psychologists too; in 1989, the American Psychologist Harry Triandis viewed culture as "the human-made part of the environment" (p. 306). This implies that culture is the result of people's actions. In 1991, the Dutch cultural psychologist Hofstede also defined culture as "the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category from another" (p. 5). In this respect, what differentiates social groups from each other is culture as if their minds are programmed to act in a specific way.

In 1993, Kramsch proclaimed that "culture is a social construct, the product of self and other perceptions" (p. 205). This indicates that culture is founded by individuals through their social experiences. In 1998, Herbig defined culture as "the sum of a way of life, including expected behaviour, beliefs, values, language and living practices shared by members of a society. It consists of both explicit and implicit rules through which experience is interpreted" (p. 11). What is new in this definition is that Herbig mentioned two important aspects of interpretation: "explicit and implicit". In 2016, Offorma defined culture as "the totality of the way of life of a people. It involves everything that can be communicated from one generation to another"(p. 4).

He added that "culture is the fabric of ideas, ideals, beliefs, norms, customs and traditions, systems of knowledge, institutions, aesthetic objects, and material things of arts. It involves food habits, languages, festivals, marriage ceremonies, methods of thinking and etiquette" (2016, p. 4).

From the previous definitions, it is deduced that culture is what a generation passes to another. It is also created through *co-existence* with new experiences in one's environment. Besides, cultural aspects differ from one region to another as they are the results of social interaction.

Furthermore, Brooks (1968, p. 211) proposed two types of culture; "formal culture" versus "deep culture" which were later developed as Capital C (Big C) versus little c (small c). Big C culture (Capital C) includes human achievement or refinement, such as, art, literature, history, technology, philosophy while small c culture (little c) refers to factors associated with human daily life in a society. Kramsch (2009) related Big C culture to the "humanistic concept" and "little C culture" to the "sociolinguistic concept". In the 19th century, within the "humanistic concept", teaching culture in academic institutions concentrated on "big C culture" that includes literature and the arts of the target language; on the contrary, within the "sociolinguistic concept", "little C culture" dominates the field of teaching since the 1980s and focused on "the native speakers' ways of behaving, eating, talking, dwelling, their customs, their beliefs and values" (pp. 221-222).

B. Intercultural Communication and Intercultural Communicative Competence

Samovar, Porter, McDaniel, and Roy (2013) defined communication as "a dynamic process in which people attempt to share their thoughts with other people through the use of symbols in particular settings" (p. 29). From this definition, communication is not fixed and static, it is rather flexible and unstable. Effective communication is considered as "interaction that is perceived as affective in fulfilling certain rewarding objectives in a way that is also appropriate to the context in which the interaction occurs" (Spitzberg, 1988, p. 68). This implies that interaction aims at achieving specific goals in a specific setting. More interestingly, James depicted communication as "a cultural/semiotic activity" rather than a "linguistic" one (1996, p. 64). Similarly, McCarthy and Carter perceived culture as "social knowledge and interactive skills which are required in addition to knowledge of the language system" (1994, pp. 151-152).Thus, culture is closely linked to communication which is a process that requires both linguistic and communicative competence. As explained by Hall (1959), "culture is communication and communication is culture". So, the two elements are highly associated.

Since different cultures exist in the world, one cannot live in isolation from others' culture due to interaction between cultures. As advocated by Heckmann "the cultures of immigrants" contribute to "the enrichment of one's own culture" (1993, as cited in Moawad & El Shoura, 2017, p. 803). As a result, one's own culture could be affected by others' culture in the various communicative settings where diverse cultural phenomena exist. Hence, Moran (2001) describes culture as 'a cultural phenomenon' that "involves tangible forms or structures" that are utilized "in ways that reflect their values, attitudes and beliefs" (pp. 25-26).

According to Kramsch, the word 'intercultural' emerged in the eighties in education to refer to *intercultural communication* (2009, p. 223). The latter is defined as follows:

-"the process of symbolic interaction involving individuals and/or groups who possess recognized differing perceptions and modes of behaviour such that those variations will significantly affect the manner and the outcome of the communication" (Asuncion-Lande, 1977, p. 4).

-"intercultural communication is the exchange of cultural information between two groups of people with significantly different cultures" (Barnett & Lee, 2003, p. 260).
-"intercultural communication is a symbolic, interpretive, transactional, contextual process in which people from different cultures create shared meanings" (Lustig & Koester, 2006, p. 46).
-"intercultural communication occurs when the people creating shared meanings have different cultural perspectives and values" (Sadri & Flammia, 2011, p. 10).

In a nutshell, intercultural communication is interaction between people from different cultural backgrounds. Intercultural communication occurs when "a person from one culture sends a message to be processed by a person from a different culture" (Samovar, Porter, & McDaniel, 2009, p. 7). More importantly, intercultural communication necessitates a good *intercultural competence* that is defined by Deardorff (2004) as "the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (as cited in Deardorff, 2006, pp. 247-248). Similarly, intercultural competence is viewed by Fantini, Arias-Galicia and Guay (2001) as "multiple abilities that allow one to interact effectively and appropriately across cultures" (p. 8). It is also defined by Tennekoon as "the ability to communicate successfully with culturally different others using one's intercultural knowledge, skills and attitudes" (2015, p. 1). Consequently, being competent culturally stipulates an ability to communicate effectively with persons from different cultures. As intercultural competence is manifested through communication, intercultural communicative competence (ICC) is highly influential in promoting one's MTC (Motivation to Communicate) in the Target language. ICC is a multifaceted complicated concept which is defined as "the ability to effectively and appropriately execute communication behaviours that negotiate each other's cultural identity or identities in a culturally diverse environment" (Chen & Starosta, 1999, p. 28). So, it is the ability to interact efficiently in settings where cultural diversity is dominating.

Byram (1997) defined ICC as "the ability to communicate and interact across cultural boundaries" (p. 7). He further concurred that ICC is composed of four components: *linguistic competence*, *sociolinguistic competence*, *discourse competence*, and *intercultural competence* (1997, p. 7). In 2002, Byram, Gribkova and Starkey provided a new definition to ICC as "the ability to ensure a shared understanding by people of different social identities, and the ability to interact with people as complex human beings with multiple identities and their own individuality" (p. 10). In this definition, Byram et al. pointed out that in an effective speaker who has a good ICC is the one who can communicate with the other cultures and at the same time preserves his/her own cultural identity. Moreover, Byram et al. (2002) insisted that critical cultural awareness is crucial in learning about the Target Language Culture, and stated it among the five components (five savoirs) of ICC as follows:

1-Intercultural attitudes (savoir être): curiosity and openness, readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief about one's own,
2-Knowledge (savoirs): of social groups and their products and practices in one's own and in one's interlocutor's country,
3-Skills of interpreting and relating (savoir comprendre): ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents or events from one's own,
4-Skills of discovery and interaction (savoir apprendre/faire): ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices and the ability to operate knowledge,

5-Critical cultural awareness (savoir s'engager): ability to evaluate, critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries (2002, p. 12).

As indicated above, ICC is the sum of attitudes, social practice, interpretation and corroboration, discovery and application, evaluation and critical thinking about one's and others' culture. Byram further argued that cultural awareness is "non-linguistic dimension of culture" which is based on "the question of change from monocultural to intercultural competence" (Byram, 1991, p. 24). Learners could achieve intercultural competence through socialization which is "the integration of language and culture" (Byram, 1991, p. 19). To refer to *socialization*, Kim and Ruben (1992) used the term "intercultural transformation" that means "process of change in individuals beyond the cognitive, affective, and behavioural limits of their original culture".

The process of transformation/change is also described as acculturation. Berry's model (2003) presents four acculturation strategies: assimilation, separation, marginalization, and integration. Assimilation is to diminish the effects of national/original culture and to try to act under the values of the Target Culture. Separation is preserving the original culture and eliminating the influence of the foreign culture. Marginalization is to stay in the margin and avoid adopting the values of the Target Culture. Integration is accepting to live by acquiring both cultures.

C. Obstacles to Intercultural Communication

Interaction between people from different cultural backgrounds may often lead to misunderstanding and false stereotypes. As indicated by Kuo and Lai, "culture is also a matter of habit, and it is habit that becomes tradition and tradition that gives rise to culture. Local people begin with habitual actions and go on to create common stereotypes" (2006, p. 2). Miscommunication is the result of many causes that are related to low intercultural communicative competence including "the use of vocabulary", "the different discourse patterns", "the different language functions", and "the different concept of time in different cultural backgrounds"(Tiono, 2002, p. 41). Another challenging issue within intercultural communication is apparent through Jensen's definition of intercultural competence as "the ability to stabilize one's self-identity while mediating between cultures" (Jensen, 1995, p. 41). Preserving one's identity is hard to achieve because of cultural imperialism and the negative effects of cultural diversity. To solve this dilemma, a new community should be built where the original culture meets the new culture as advised by Moawad and El Shoura in their definition of diversity when they stated that "people of different ethnic, races, nationalities, sexes and religions background come together to form a new community" (2017, p. 804).

According to Barna (1997), there are six obstacles in intercultural communication: anxiety/tension, assuming similarity instead of difference, ethnocentrism, stereotypes and prejudice, language and non-verbal misinterpretation. Thus, anxiety must be reduced. In addition, cultural differences should be given priority over similarities in intercultural communication to avoid wrong interpretation. Besides, stereotypes should be avoided since they are judgemental and illogical. Verbal and non-verbal misinterpretation can be avoided through enriching one's linguistic knowledge specifically and knowledge about the culture generally.

Kim (1992) introduced *adaptability* as a central element of intercultural communication competence and explained it as "the individual's capacity to suspend or modify some of the old cultural ways, and learn and accommodate some of the new cultural ways, and creatively find ways to manage the dynamics of cultural difference/unfamiliarity, intergroup posture, and the

accompanying stress" (p. 377). As a result, one has to adapt to the new cultural settings by overcoming stress and cultural differences to reduce cultural shock and reach effective intercultural communication.

Moreover, cultural ethnocentrism could often be the cause behind miscommunication. It occurs when the foreign culture is interpreted similarly to one's culture. There is positive and negative ethnocentrism. The former is to consider others' culture as superior in comparison to one's culture which is inferior. On the contrary, the latter is to think that one's culture is superior (Nieto, 2006, p. 8).

In multicultural communities, racism could be avoided when people are able to accept the others' culture (Moawad & El Shoura, 2017, p. 803). Acceptance helps people to be tolerant with others' values and cultural differences. In this respect, Bennet (2004, p. 62) introduced two main stages that deal with cultural differences: *ethnocentrism* and *ethnorelativism.* Within these two stages there are six substages: denial, defence, minimisation, acceptance, adaptation, integration. The first three substages fall within ethnocentrism while the last three substages are classified under ethnorelativism. *Denial* denotes a refusal of the foreign culture; it means that solely the original culture is "true" while the foreign culture is denied because it is "vague" and not "real". Hence, there are no cultural differences (p. 64). In the stage of *defence*, one's own culture is more "real" and superior and cultural differences are more real too (p. 65). In *Minimization* stage, people think that one's culture is similar to others' culture (pp. 66-67). Then, in *acceptance* stage, people do not deny others' culture (p. 68). *Adaptation* implies total tolerance with the others' culture (pp. 70-71). Finally, *integration* is accepting both cultures (p. 72). Thus, there is a gradual move from denial of others' culture to acceptance and integration.

1. Teaching Culture within Culture-based Curriculum

Tseng (2002, p. 13) proclaimed that effective language learning is based on "the acquisition of cultural knowledge" for the aim of interaction and understanding the Target Language. In the same line, Clark (1990) insisted that "positive identification with one's culture is the basis for academic success" (p. 7). So, teaching a foreign language implies teaching its culture. Therefore, high academic achievement is related to a good knowledge of culture. To achieve this aim, Gay (2010) introduced what is called "culturally responsive teaching" as a teaching method that necessitates "the cultural competence of a teacher" in addition to "classroom strategies" that promote both cultural and linguistic competence. As Alptekin (2002, p. 58) pointed out that "learning a foreign language becomes a kind of enculturation". However, this does not mean neglecting the original culture for both cultures are needed in language learning (Kramsch, 1993, p. 205). In this respect, integration denotes that what students receive in school should be in accordance with the community needs (Agwu, 2009, p. 172).

Teaching culture requires teaching its three domains: the cognitive, the pragmatic and the attitudinal domain. Firstly, in the cognitive domain, the teacher has to focus on "other cultures and the learners' relation to them". Secondly, the goal of the pragmatic domain is enhancing intercultural communication through developing learners' "practical skills". Thirdly, within the attitudinal domain, learners must promote some positive attitudes like "open-mindedness, respect and tolerance and stereotypes' avoidance (Sárosdy, Bencze, Poór, & Vadnay, 2006, p. 84).

2. Teaching Intercultural Linguistics to Enhance Learners' Intercultural Communication

Brown maintained that "a language is a part of a culture and a culture is a part of a language; the two are intricately interwoven so that one can not separate the two without losing the significance of either language or culture" (2000, p. 177). Apparently, there is a shift in Foreign Language Teaching from *the communicative approach* to *the intercultural communicative approach* by focusing on language use in different cultural settings (Risager, 2007). Within this scope, the teacher has to focus on both language and cultural awareness (Byram, 1997, p. 23). "Direct experience" is also useful through exposure to the target culture in different opportunities like "exchange holidays, educational visits, contact with native-speakers teachers and assistants, family holidays" (Byram, 1997, p. 26).

As stated by Douglas (2000), language structure consists of four different areas: phonology (speech sounds), semantics (word meanings), grammar (morphology and syntax), and pragmatics (language use in different contexts). Definitely, intercultural communication is one of the fields of pragmatics as well as a central factor within *intercultural linguistics*, a term that was coined by Blommaert in 1987 to refer to a new branch of linguistics that is interested in interculturality. Later on, Palmer coined the term *cultural linguistics* in 1996 to relate language to culture. Consequently, intercultural communication could be enhanced through teaching *intercultural linguistics* as "a new academic discipline" (Pikhart, 2016, p. 4) which is clearly defined in the following quotation:

> Intercultural linguistics theoretically describes communicative principles which create the basis for intercultural communication. Knowing the universal sociopragmatic interactional principles means that we know the importance of individual speech acts inasmuch they influence everyday communication by attaching various meanings to the words we say. (Pikhart, 2016, p. 1)

As explained by Pikhart, sociopragmatic interactional principles (SIPs) include mainly speech acts and utterances. Spencer-Oatey and Jiang defined them as "socioculturally-based principles" that control "people's productive and interpretive use of language" (2003, p. 1634).

In the Digital Age, learners need a new type of intercultural linguistics training. Throughout his study on emails, Karasavvidou insisted that email language includes "social, cultural and psychological cultural connotations" (2004, p. 1). Therefore, it should be studied within intercultural linguistics.

II. Methodology

This research was conducted through the quantitative descriptive method to explore intercultural communication and the teaching of intercultural linguistics at the Department of English in Algerian Universities. A total of 86 teachers (73 females/13 males) of English as a Foreign Language responded to the online survey. They work in twenty-eight (28) universities located in 28 provinces in north, east, west, and south of Algeria, including Guelma, Annaba, Souk Ahras, Skikda, Oum el Bouaghi, Constantine, Tebessa, Mila, Biskra, Laghouat, M'sila, Ain Temouchent, Khenchla, Djelfa, Ghardaia, Biskra, Ouargla, Adrar, Algiers, Blida, Tipaza, Bejaia, Jijel, Oran, Saida, Sidi bel Abbes, Mascara, and Tlemcen.

The questionnaire is a structured one; it is composed of three sections and 19 items. Section one includes four questions about teachers' general information: gender, qualifications, teaching experience, and university location/province. Section two comprises seven questions

which investigate learners' obstacles in intercultural communication and possible ways to improve it. Section three consists of seven questions that explore teachers' attitudes towards the enhancement of learners' intercultural communication through teaching intercultural linguistics. It also compares the role of both culture-based curriculum and teaching intercultural linguistics in promoting intercultural communication.

III. Results and Discussion

Quantitative data from teachers' questionnaire yielded interesting facts about intercultural communication and the teaching of cultural and intercultural linguistics. The main findings are displayed in the following tables.

Table 1. *The Most Influential Factors that could Hinder Students' Communication in Intercultural Contexts*

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Vocabulary	49	56.97%
Discourse patterns/strategies	27	31.39%
Non-verbal communication	14	16.27%
Bad interpretation	36	41.86%
Cultural differences	63	73.25%
Ethnocentric views	31	36.04%
Stereotypes and prejudices/preconceptions	38	44.18%
Other(s)	1	1.16%

Concerning the most influential three factors that may hinder intercultural communication, the majority of the teachers (73.25%) declared that cultural differences are the main cause behind miscommunication in intercultural contexts. More than half of the population (56.97%) considered vocabulary as the source of communication problems in intercultural settings. 44.18% of the participants argued that stereotypes and prejudices/preconceptions are the cause of intercultural miscommunication. Moreover, 41.86% of them stated that bad interpretation is the main cause of miscommunication. Besides, 36.04% of the informants maintained that ethnocentric views hinder intercultural speakers' interaction. 31.39% of them claimed that communication obstacles result from non-understanding of discourse patterns. In addition to that, 16.27% of the teachers asserted that the cause of miscommunication is non-understanding of non-verbal communication. One teacher added that another cause of communication obstacles is "less exposure to multicultural environments". Consequently, the main barriers to communication are: cultural differences, vocabulary, stereotypes and prejudices/preconceptions. These problems could be overcome through promoting learners' knowledge about the foreign culture.

Table 2. *Enhancing Learners' Intercultural Communication through Traditional vs. Technology-based Learning*

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Traditional Learning	1	1.16%
Technology-based Learning (TBL)	16	18.6%
Both can be effective	69	80.23%
Total	86	100%

As indicated in Table 2, 80.23% of the participants opted for both traditional and technology-based learning (TBL) as interesting factors for enhancing learners' intercultural communication. This implies that teachers think that the use of technology is not a prerequisite element in promoting intercultural communication. 18.6% of the teachers gave priority to technology-based learning in promoting learners' intercultural communication. This implies that they highly appreciate the importance of technology in exposing learners to cultural virtual environments and online intercultural interaction. Only one teacher supported traditional learning to improve intercultural communication. In a nutshell, technology is highly influential in improving learners' intercultural performance.

Table 3. Improving Learners' Intercultural Communication through Intercultural Training Using Authentic Intercultural Activities

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	85	98.83%
No	1	1.16%
Total	86	100%

As shown in table 3, 98.83% of the participants declared that authentic intercultural activities could help students improve their intercultural communication. This is due to exposure through authentic activities to foreign cultural and linguistic aspects or what is called "intercultural authenticity" (Feng & Byram, 2002). Direct and explicit cultural input could result in intercultural knowledge. However, one teacher opposed this fact.

Table 4. Teachers' Opinions about the Absence of Cultural and Intercultural Linguistics in the Syllabi

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	23	26.74%
Agree	44	51.16%
Disagree	18	20.93%
Strongly disagree	1	1.16%
Total	86	100%

This question aims at exploring teachers' opinions about the absence of cultural and intercultural linguistics in the syllabi to confirm the fact that intercultural linguistics is not taught at the Department of English in many universities in Algeria, not only in the University of 8 Mai 1945, Guelma. As displayed in Table 4, 51.16% and 26.74% of the participants consecutively agreed and strongly agreed that both cultural and intercultural linguistics are not included in the syllabi; which means the majority (77.9%) confirmed this fact. 20.93% disagreed while 1.16% strongly disagreed about that. By checking the syllabuses designed in the Department of English, University of 8 May 1945, Guelma, I observed that cultural and intercultural linguistics are not taught. What is taught is the module of "*Culture and Foreign Language Learning*" at the level of *second-year Master*, students can also learn about English culture through the other modules such as: Civilisation and Literature.

Table 5. Teaching Cultural Linguistics as a Necessary Element in the Syllabi

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	85	98.83%

No	1	1.16%
Total	86	100%

In Table 5, 98.83% of the informants emphasised the importance of teaching cultural linguistics in the Department of English. Therefore, the syllabi should be revised by including this type of linguistics to facilitate intercultural interaction and improve learners' intercultural competence.

Table 6. *Shift in Focus from Teaching Cultural Linguistics to Teaching Intercultural Linguistics as a Necessary Element to Enhance Intercultural Communication*

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	73	84.88%
No	13	15.11%
Total	86	100%

Recently, with the emergence of intercultural linguistics as a new academic discipline (Pikhart, 2016). A shift in focus is needed from cultural to intercultural linguistics to promote learners' intercultural competence which is the heart of intercultural communication. Table 6 shows that 84.88% of the population confirmed the idea that shift in focus from cultural linguistics to intercultural linguistics is required while 15.11% of the informants neglect the importance of teaching intercultural linguistics. The same proportion (84.88%) agreed that teaching intercultural linguistics as a separate module can improve students' intercultural communicative competence and intercultural communication. Therefore, we highly recommend teaching *intercultural linguistics as a separate module*.

Table 7. *The Most Effective Factor in Enhancing Learners' Intercultural Communication*

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Teaching Intercultural Linguistics	8	9.3%
Culture-based Curriculum	17	19.76%
Both	61	70.93%
Total	86	100%

As displayed in Table 7, 70.93% of the participants admitted that both teaching intercultural linguistics and the use of culture-based curriculum are effective in enhancing intercultural communication. However, it is observed in the Department of English, University of 8 May 1945, Guelma that students of English always study culture through culture-based curriculum but they often face obstacles in intercultural communication. We suppose that these obstacles may be due to the absence of intercultural linguistics in the syllabi. This hypothesis could be tested in the future through experimental research. 19.76% of the teachers viewed culture-based curriculum as the most effective factor that promotes learners' intercultural communication.

Table 8. *The Most Effective Factors in Teaching Intercultural Linguistics*

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Ethnography of speaking/communication	19	22.09%
Ethnosemantics	21	24.41%
Cultural and intercultural cognition	49	56.97%

Enhancing intercultural communicative competence and performance	74	86.04%
Other (s)	2	2.32%

Teachers were asked to choose two factors as the most effective ones in teaching intercultural linguistics. The majority (86.04%) opted for enhancing intercultural communicative competence and performance. More than half of the population (56.97%) selected cultural and intercultural cognition as an interesting factor to focus on in teaching intercultural linguistics. Apparently, 24.41% of the participants gave importance to ethnosemantics while 22.09% of the teachers were interested in ethnography of speaking/communication. Eventually, 2.32% of the population, which equals two teachers suggested two other aspects namely "comparing native culture to foreign culture" and "online cooperation with foreign environments" which may be very helpful in developing intercultural competence. As a general comment, specific guidelines should be identified by scholars and curriculum designers in relation to teaching intercultural linguistics since its components are multiple and not well-defined because it is a new academic discipline.

IV. Implications

To raise students' intercultural communicative competence through the teaching of intercultural linguistics, teachers have to focus on creating an intercultural atmosphere in the classroom that could enrich learners' knowledge of the foreign culture due to exposure as well as facilitating cultural experience through immersion. Furthermore, they have to teach them cultural lexis, cultural syntax, cultural semantics, cultural pragmatics, idioms and cultural phrases or what Peeters (2016) calls: ethnolexicology, ethnosyntax, ethnosemantics, ethnopragmatics, and ethnophraseology consecutively (pp. 149-150).

Moreover, raising teacher's and syllabus designers' awareness about the necessity to teach intercultural linguistics could succeed in improving learners' intercultural communicative competence and result in effective intercultural communication. In addition, including intercultural authentic activities is really helpful in extending students' cultural knowledge. The role of technology is also highly influential in creating online cultural tasks.

Conclusion

Cultural diversity necessitates the acceptance of the other's culture and respect for cultural differences to avoid misconceptions as well as stereotypes and prejudices. Therefore, Algerian students of English as a Foreign Language should be culturally tolerant either in face-to-face intercultural communication contexts or online ones. More importantly, teachers' guidance is a prerequisite factor that could facilitate the process of acculturation within multiculturalism. In this respect, teachers' role is mainly intertwining language and culture in the foreign language classroom in a motivating way that enhances assimilation and adaptation.

Teaching Intercultural Linguistics either as a separate module or within other modules could promote students' intercultural communication by focusing on the different elements within Linguistics that may foster their intercultural communicative competence while interacting with foreigners and people with different cultures. Facilitating the move from a mono-cultural society to a multi-cultural one is the central goal of teaching Intercultural Linguistics.

References

Agwu, S. N. (2009). Emerging issues in curriculum development. In U. Ivowi, K. Nwufo, C. Nwagbara, J. Ukwungwu, E. Ema, & G. Uya. (Eds.), *Curriculum theory and practice* (pp. 271-283). Nigeria: Curriculum Organization of Nigeria.

Ahmad, Z. (2007). *An introduction to Buddhist philosophy in India and Tibet.* India, New Delhi: International Academy of English Culture and Aditia Prakashan.

Allport, G. W. (1935). Attitudes. In C. M. Murchison (Ed.), A *handbook of social psychology* (pp. 789-844). Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.

Alptekin, C. (2002). Toward intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal, 56* (1), pp. 57-64.

Arvizu, S. F., Snyder, W. A., & Espinoza, P. T. (1980). Demystifying the concept of culture: Theoretical and conceptual tools, *Bilingual Education Paper Series, 3* (11). Los Angeles: California State University, National dissemination and Assessment Centre.

Asuncion-Lande, N. C. (1977). Intercultural communication. Teaching strategies, resources, and materials. *The 63rd Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Associator.* Washigton, D. C.

Barna, L. M. (1997). Stumbling blocks in intercultural communication. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication* (8th ed., pp.). Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth Publishing.

Barnett, G. A., & Lee, M. (2003). Issues in intercultural communication research. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Cross-cultural and intercultural communication* (pp. 259-276). Fullerton: California State University.

Bennett, M. J. (2004). Becoming interculturally competent. In J. Wurzel (Ed.), *Toward multiculturalism : A reader in multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 62-77). Newton, MA: Intercultural Resource Corporation.

Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 17–37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Blommaert, J. (1987). How much culture is there in intercultural communication? *The International Pragmatics Conference and the Ghent Symposium on Intercultural Communication.* Antwerp. August 17-22.

Brooks, N. (1968). Teaching Culture in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 1* (3). pp. 204-217.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* USA (NY): Longman.

Byram, M. (1991). Teaching culture and language: Towards an integrated model. In D. Buttjes & M. Byram (Eds.), *Mediating Languages and Cultures: Towards in Intercultural Theory of Foreign Language Education* (pp. 17-30). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. Gribkova, B., & Starkey, H. (2002). *Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching a practical introduction for teachers.* Strasbourg, Council of Europe. Retrieved February 19, 2021, from http://lrc.cornell.edu/director/intercultural.pdf

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1999). A review of the concept of intercultural awareness. *Human Communication, 2,* pp. 27-54.

Clark, E.R. (1990). The state of the art in research on teacher training models with special reference to bilingual education teachers. Paper presented at the *National Symposium on Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students' Research Issues.* Washington, D. C. Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs.

Condon, E. C. (1973). *Introduction to cross cultural communication.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rogers University Press.

Cooper, D. E. (1973). *Philosophy and the nature of language.* London: Longman Group Ltd.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). The identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization at institutions of higher education in the United States. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10,* pp. 241-266.

Douglas, B. H. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Efron, R. (1969). What is perception? In R. S. Cohen et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Boston Colloquium for the Philosophy of Science 1966/1968* (pp. 137-173). Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Fantini, A. E., Arias-Galicia, F., & Guay, D. (2001). Globalization and 21st century competencies: Challenges for North American higher education. *Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration Working Paper Series on Higher Education in Mexico, Canada and the United States* (Working Paper No. 11). Boulder: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education.

Feng, A. W., & Byram, M. (2002). Authenticity in college English textbooks: An intercultural perspective. *RELC Journal, 33* (2), pp. 58-84

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). USA (NY): Teachers College

Press.

Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language.* New York: Doubleday.

Herbig, P. (1998). *Handbook of cross-cultural marketing.* New York: The Haworth Press.

Hofstede, G. (1991). Culture and Organization. *Software of the Mind.* London.

James, J. E. (1996). *The language-culture connection.* Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Jensen, A. A. (1995). Defining intercultural competence for the adult learner. In A. A. Jensen, K. Jaeger, & A. Lorentsen (Eds.), *Intercultural competence: A new challenge for language teachers and trainers in Europe* (Vol. 2: *The Adult Learner*). Aalborg, Danemark: Aalborg University Press.

Karasavvidou, E. (2004). Email and intercultural linguistics. *International Journal of Information Ethics*, 2, pp. 1-11.

Kim, Y.Y. (1992). Intercultural communication competence: A systemsthinking view. In W.B. Gudykunst & Y.Y. Kim (Eds.), *Readings on communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (pp. 371-381). USA (NY): McGraw-Hill.

Kim, Y.Y., & Ruben, B. D. (1992). Intercultural transformation. In W.B. Gudykunst & Y.Y. Kim (Eds.), *Readings on communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (pp. 401- 414). USA (NY): McGraw-Hill.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2009). Cultural perspectives on language learning and teaching. In K. Knapp & G. Antos (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Linguistics: Communication competence, language and communication problems, practical solutions* (Vol. 6, pp. 219-246). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.

Kuo, M., & Lai, C. (2006). Linguistics across cultures: The Impact of culture on Second Language Learning. *Journal of Foreign Language Instruction, 1* (1), pp. 1-10.

Layes, G. (2010). Intercultural learning and acculturation. In A. Thomas, E. Kinast, & S. Schroll-Machl (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural communication and cooperation* (2nd ed., pp. 110-120). KG, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co.

Lustig, W, M., & Koester, J. (2006). *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures* (5th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Lado, R. (1957). How to compare two cultures. In R. Lado (Ed.), *Linguistics across cultures (pp. 110-122).* USA: Ann Arbor University of Michigan Press.

McDaniel, E., Samovar, L. & Porter, R. (2009). Understanding cultural communication: The working principles. In E. McDaniel, L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (12th ed., pp. 6-17). Boston, MA: Wadsworth.

Moawad, N. M. I. & El Shoura, S. M. (2017). *Toward a richer definition of multiculturalism. International Journal of Advanced Research*, 5 (7), pp. 802-806.

Moran, P. R. (2001). *Teaching culture: perspectives in practice Ontario, Canada.* Australia, Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Nieto, V. G. (2006). *Understanding social distance in intercultural communication.* University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (Spain).

Offorma, G. C. (Ed.). (2002). *Curriculum theory and planning.* Enugu: Donze Press.

Palmer, G. B. (1996). *Toward a theory of cultural linguistics.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Parson, T. (1949). *Essays in Sociological Theory.* New York: The Free Press.

Peeters, B. (2016). Applied ethnolinguistics is cultural linguistics, but is it cultural linguistics? *International Journal of Language and Culture, 3* (2). *pp. 137-160.*

Pikhart, M. (2016). Intercultural linguistics as a new academic approach to communication. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 26, pp. 1-4. DOI: 10.1051/shsconf/20162601005

Risager, K. (2007). *Language and Culture Pedagogy: From a National to a Transnational Paradigm.* place Clevdon, Multilingual Matters.

Sadri, H. A., & Flammia, M. (2011). *Intercultural communication: A new approach to international relations and global challenges.* USA: The Continuum International Publishing Group.

Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (1976). Communicating interculturally. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader (2nd ed., pp. 1-18).* Belmont, California: Wadswarth Publishing Company.

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E. & McDaniel, E. R. (2009). *Communication between cultures* (7th ed.). USA: Boston, MA: Wadsworth.

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E. McDaniel, E. R. & Roy, C. S. (2013). *Communication between cultures* (8th ed.). USA: Boston, MA: Wadswarth.

Sárosdy, J., Bencze, T. F., Poór, Z., & Vadnay, M. (2006). Culture in teaching English. In *Applied Linguistics I for BA students in English* (pp. 83-88). Budapest: Bölcsész Konzorcium.

Spencer-Oatey, H., & Jiang, W. (2003). Explaining cross-cultural pragmatic findings: Moving from politeness maxims to

sociopragmatic interactional principles (SIPs). *Journal of Pragmatics, 35* (10-11). pp. 1633-1650. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(03)00025-0

Spitzberg, B. H. (1988). Communication competence: Measures of perceived effectiveness. In C. Tardy (Ed.), *A handbook for the study of human communication* (pp. 67-105). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tennekoon, S. R. (2015). Crossing the Cultural Boundaries: Developing Intercultural Competence of Prospective Teachers of English. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 5* (4), pp. 1-15.

Tiono, N. I. (2002). Language and Culture in Relation to Intercultural Communication in a Business Context. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 4* (1), pp. 36-41. DOI: 10.9744/kata.4.1.53-61

Triandis, H. C. (1989). Intercultural Education and Training. In P. Funke (Ed.), Understanding the US – Across Culture Prospective. Tübingen, pp. 305–322.

Tseng, Y. H. (2002). A Lesson in Culture. *ELT Journal, 56*, pp. 11-21.