Umberto Margiotta

How develop intercultural curriculum in learning process. Some issues and considerations

abstract

In both education in general and learning processes in particular, there is an increasing recognition of the need to develop students' intercultural competence. The development of this competence poses a range of theoretical and practical challenges. In this article, it is emphasize the need of developing an intercultural curriculum, considering and discussing steps and dimensions of curriculum. It's introduced an example of description of languages learning within an intercultural orientation and a model for understanding assessment. Consequently, it is introduced and discussed the construct, towards a conceptualisation. Following, it is considered the issues in eliciting intercultural competence in a proposed framework that includes assessment as both performance. The framework is composed by four interrelated processes **Conceptualising** (What to assess); **Eliciting** (How to elicit); **Judging** (How to judge) and **Validating** (How to justify). In the end, it's emphasized the challenge put by the need of not just looking for easy ways to assess but to expand the repertoire of learning to accommodate a more complex view of processes learning that includes the development of intercultural competence.

Sia nell'educazione in general che nei processi di apprendimento in particolare, vi è un crescente riconoscimento della necessità di sviluppare negli studenti la competenza interculturale. Lo sviluppo di una tale competenza pone le basi di una serie di sfide sia teoriche sia pratiche. In questo articolo si sottolinea la necessità di sviluppare un curriculum interculturale, considerando e discutendo gli steps e dimensioni necessari per tale obiettivo. Viene quindi introdotto un esempio di descrizione dell'apprendimento delle lingue con un'orientamento interculturale, nonché le modalità per capire la valutazione come parte finale del processo di implementazione di un siffatto curriculum. Successivamente, si discuttono i costrutti relativi alla costruzione di un curriculum interculturale, puntando alla concettualizzazione. Infine, vengono considerati i fattori coinvolti nella formazione della competenza interculturale, proponendo quindi un framework che includa la valutazione e performance come parti componenti essenziali di un curriculum interculturale, che mira soprattutto ad una formazione per competenze con un focus interculturale. Tale framework si compone di quattro processi interrelati: concettualizzazione (come valutare la competenza interculturale attraverso la descrizione della stessa); Stimolo (come stimolare, considerando le dimensioni prima generate, lo sviluppo della competenza interculturale); Giudizio (come giudicare lo sviluppo della competenza interculturale) e validazione (come validare la competenza interculturale acquisita in diversi contesti sociali di appren dimento)

Key Words: Intercultural Education, Intercultural Competence, Learning outcomes, curriculum.

1. Introduction

In both education in general and learning processes in particular, there is an increasing recognition of the need to develop students' intercultural competence. While this competence is named and understood in very different ways, it is recognised as one of the implications of globalisation and its resulting transformation of economies, technologies, societies and education. Similarly, reflecting critically on the impact of globalisation on contemporary curriculum development, Lovat & Smith (2003: 46) refer to a 'sharing of the horizons of understanding'. In processes education in recent times, there has been a move towards intercultural process learning (Byram 1997; Kramsch 1999; Liddicoat et al. 2003). This orientation builds on a recognition that, in the context of learning processes, communication is at least potentially intercultural, in that it entails students learning to move between two processes and cultures – the students' own process(s) and culture(s), and the processes and culture(s) they are learning.

Making claims about developing this intercultural competence in learning processes raises questions of how it is evidenced for students, parents, teachers and others, and therefore how this competence is to be assessed. This learning poses a range of theoretical and practical challenges. While some initial work has been undertaken in seeking to assess intercultural competence (Byram & Zarate 1994; Byram 1997; Byram, Gribkova & Starkey 2002; Sercu 2004; Liddicoat & Scarino forthcoming), the focus has tended to be on developing tasks for assessing cultural knowledge and behaviour that require students to enact particular roles (Sercu 2004) or on attitudes in attitudinal tests (Cadd 1994) or on cultural awareness tests (Byram, Morgan & Colleagues 1994).However, none of these tasks captures both the students' participation in communication, understood as the interchange of meaning, and their reflective experience of what is at play in particular instances of communication across cultures.

But before considering how to assess this intercultural competence, it is necessary to characterise learning process within an intercultural orientation and the perspective that has informed the studies. It is also necessary to acknowledge the fundamental paradigm debate in learning (McNamara 2003), for it shapes participants' conceptions of what is and is not feasible in learning.

2. Learning processes within an intercultural orientation

There have been numerous contributions towards understanding 'what the nature of intercultural communication might be and how it might be taught' (Kramsch 2002: 277; see also Alred, Byram & Fleming 2003; Liddicoat et al. 2003).The major characteristic of intercultural process learning is that it engages with the process of understanding and interpreting human communication and interaction – not only with observation, description, analysis and interpretation of phenomena shared when communicating and interacting, but also with active engagement in interpreting self (INTRA-culturality) and 'other' (INTER-culturality) in diverse contexts of social and cultural exchange (Papademetre & Scarino 2009). Intercultural process learning is fundamentally about how process and culture come into play in creating and exchanging meaning. It develops in students the competence to recognise and integrate into their communication an understanding of themselves as already situated in their own process(s) and culture(s) when they communicate

with others, and to recognise that others also approach communication from the background of their own experiences within their own process(s) and culture(s). It also recognises that people interpret communication and relationships through the frame of reference of their cumulative experience within their own process and culture. This cumulative experience is constantly reconsidered and re-articulated, and re-shapes the frame of reference that people draw upon in creating and interpreting meaning. Learning an additional process and culture, especially through experiences that invite students to move between the two linguistic and cultural systems, contributes to re-shaping this frame of reference.

The goal of intercultural process learning is to develop, extend and elaborate upon students' interpretive frames of reference through experiencing and reflecting upon communication in increasingly complex intercultural contexts. This means extending students' repertoires of communication and their meta-awareness of the relationship between process, culture, meaning and learning. Students therefore have dual roles. As participants of the target process they use process to communicate meanings and experience different ways of making meaning between processes and cultures. They are also LEARNERS/ANALYSERS of the target process, constantly reflecting critically on the exchange of meanings from multiple perspectives; reflecting on their own values and those of others. In the dual process of experience and analysis of communication between processes and cultures, students are invited to de-centre from their own linguistic and cultural situation to consider that of others. They become participants in diversity. Through these experiences, students come to understand over time that in intercultural interaction the ethical consequences of communication are always amplified, because intercultural interaction involves negotiating difference as well as experiencing new and at times challenging ways of 'reading' the world.

Assessing intercultural competence therefore involves assessing students' performances in experiencing and analysing communication, a dual process that requires moving between the students' own processes and cultures and the process and culture being learned.

3.Understanding the learning process

In the ongoing studies on intercultural competence we assume that is possible to organise and develop an intercultural curriculum as a set of four interrelated processes **Conceptualising** (What to assess); **Eliciting** (How to elicit); **Judging** (How to judge) and **Validating** (How to justify). The starting point is the conceptualisation of what is to be assessed, that is, the construct. In processes education within an intercultural orientation, this means conceptualising what it means 'to know' an additional process in the context of diversity.

This process drives all the other processes in the cycle. It is also a reminder that, more than being a technical issue, learning is a profoundly conceptual one. The way the construct is conceptualised influences the process of elicitation; that is, the nature of the tasks that are provided influences the type of evidence of the construct that the task can generate. The conceptualisation of the construct influences the criteria for judging performance; these in turn influence the construction of the tasks. The judgments made of students' performance must be justified as accounts of the construct being assessed. Inferences that are made about students' performances are warranted through the process of validation. This involves

matching the construct with the evidence-eliciting processes and interpreting and justifying the inferences made, based on the evidence. These four processes, operating in a mutually informing cycle, provide a framework through which to consider conceptual and practical issues in assessing intercultural competence.

The learning process in education is located in a tension between two contrasting epistemological cultures that influence views of learning on the one hand, and views of learning (Shepard 2000) on the other. These are traditional psychometric perspectives set within a positivistic paradigm, and more recent qualitative sociocultural perspectives set within an interpretive paradigm (Gipps 1999; Delandshere 2002). In her highly influential paper, Sfard (1998) draws a distinction between the 'acquisition metaphor' (i.e. having knowledge) and the 'participation metaphor' (i.e. knowing through doing with others). These metaphors can be connected to learning paradigms. Within the acquisition metaphor, learning is understood as a process of acquiring factual knowledge that is then abstracted and generalised. This view of learning fits best within the traditional psychometric paradigm, which focuses on testing content through objective procedures. In the psychometric paradigm, student learning is referenced to either the performance of other students (norm-referencing) or a predetermined standard (criterion-referencing). Within the participation metaphor, learning is understood as a process of constructing understanding by interacting with more knowledgeable others in diverse contexts. This view of learning aligns with the qualitative, sociocultural, interpretive paradigm, which provides a contextual and personalised view of learning. Curriculum-related, authentic content is assessed using both objective and subjective procedures. It is designed to show in the best way possible what it is that students know. Sfard highlights the need for both metaphors to be taken into account.

The learning of intercultural competence is set within these contrasting paradigms. The challenge is to reconcile the two perspectives in practice.

4. Conceptualising

Considering the learning of intercultural competence must begin with defining the construct. This is by no means straightforward as it has been conceptualised in diverse ways (Byram, 2003) Furthermore, with regard to intercultural competence in processes education, two additional matters need to be taken into account. First, learning processes necessarily involves the movement between at least two processes. In other words, the construct is per force plurilingual and pluricultural: the students' first or home processes and cultures are an integral part of and not separate from learning an additional process. Second, intercultural competence needs to be considered both in particular instances or episodes and developmentally.

Intercultural competence has been conceptualised in a number of different ways. Risager (2007) describes two models of intercultural competence, one of which adopts an anthropological point of departure while the other has a linguistic point of departure. The anthropological models describe intercultural competence as allied to but separate from communicative competence (process-in-culture). The linguistic models frame cultural competence within communicative competence (culture-in-process). One of the most elaborated of the anthropological models is that of Byram & Zarate (1994). It includes four sets of skills, attitudes

and knowledge which they call "savois" :*savoirs*, *savoir comprendre*, *savoir apprendre/faire*, *savoir ˆetre*. To these four Byram (1997) has added a fifth: *savoir s'engager*. This view of intercultural does not specifically deal with the interrelationship between these *savoirs* and linguistic competence. Byram (1997) also developed a model of intercultural, not only communicative competence that includes: linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and intercultural competence, defined as the *savoirs*. Byram sees these dimensions as interrelated but also separable. There is therefore a lack of clarity about the level of integration within the model. Risager (2007) extends Byram & Zarate's model by foregrounding the plurilingual nature of intercultural communicative competence within a transnational perspective. She foregrounds the centrality of resources, creating two additional categories beyond structural, semantic and pragmatic competence (Byram's linguistic and sociolinguistic dimensions), namely, languacultural competences and resources (linguistic identity) and transnational cooperation. WhileRisager's model captures additional important dimensions of intercultural communicative competence, an issue remains that is inherent in all models, and that is how the dimensions interrelate, in particular for the purposes of learning. Sercu (2004) has also extended the construct, but in a different direction. She includes a 'meta-cognitive dimension' to enable learners to plan, monitor and evaluate their own learning processes. The monitoring of one's learning processes, however, does not necessarily include meta-awareness of the play of process and culture in the process of communication itself in variable contexts, or in the dynamic process of negotiating meaning across cultures or, indeed, in working towards the fundamental goal of the learning process that is the development of self-knowledge-and-awareness as the basis of all human understanding.

Through these models we gain an elaborated and valuable understanding of the range of dimensions that might be included in conceptualising intercultural competence. How these various dimensions and combinations are operationalised for learning remains an issue. For example, values classification, while an important dimension, is insufficient on its own as a model of intercultural competence in the context of learning processes. As such, learning of intercultural competence through attitudinal tests (Cadd 1994), culture assimilator tests (Brislin et al. 1986) or cultural awareness tests (Byram, Morgan & colleagues 1994) would be too limited.

Examining learning in the context of communicative process ability and communicative process use Van Ek (1986) describes communicative ability as comprising six competences as well as the non-linguistic dimensions of autonomy and social responsibility. This is the only model that includes sociocultural and expressive competence (understood as familiarity with the frame of reference used by the target culture). The remaining competences in this model are linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, strategic competence and social competence. By far the most elaborated model of communicative process ability for the purposes of learning is that developed by Bachman (1990) and Bachman & Palmer (1996). Like the Van Ek model, the Bachman & Palmer model is a psycholinguistic one that takes as its starting point the native-speaker as the communicative normand assumes that communicative ability is developed as an individual accomplishment. The psycholinguistic models do not capture the social–interactive dimensions of communication (McNamara 1996, 2001; Chalhoub-Deville 2003; McNamara & Roever 2006). Communication is mediated socially and culturally in interaction. This is a defining feature of intercultural competence. It is inter-

active. It is the social–interactional perspective that is of particular interest to the construct of intercultural competence. Claire Kramsch, one of the most important researchers in process, culture and learning, used the term 'interactional competence' to capture the nature of communication as human interaction in a cross-cultural perspective. Successful interaction entails 'not only a shared common knowledge of the world, the reference to a common external context of communication, but also the construction of a shared internal context or "sphere of intersubjectivity"' (Kramsch 1986: 367). For Kramsch, learning an additional process 'entails not only process but also metaprocess skills in the foreign process, such as the ability to reflect on interactional processes, manipulate and control contexts and see oneself from an outsider's point of view' (p. 369). This points to inter-subjectivity (i.e. the movement between subjective life-worlds of the interactants) and a particular kind of meta-awareness about the context of communication as distinctive dimensions of communicative process ability. By engaging in both of these in communication a person comes to understand the self and the other.

The interactional approach to defining the curriculum construction extends the dimensions that need to be taken into account in learning. Chalhoub-Deville (2003) describes the construct to be assessed as the ability-in-individual-in-context. She presents this as a way of rendering the social–interactional perspective, arguing that there is a reciprocal influence between the abilities of the individual process user and the context. She notes that the interactional perspective presents two challenges to learning: (1) 'amending the construct of individual ability to accommodate the notion that process use is . . . co-constructed among participants', and (2) the notion that process ability is local, and the 'conundrum of reconciling that with the need for learnings to yield scores that generalize across contextual boundaries' (p. 373). Kramsch (2006) recently extended the notion of interactional competence to include the likely interaction of process learners not only with monolingual native speakers but also with multilingual users with diverse values and ideologies. She suggests students 'might need more subtle semiotic practices that draw on a multiplicity of perceptual clues to make and convey meaning' (p. 250). She highlights the need to understand the practice of meaning-making itself (p. 251), describing it as 'symbolic competence': Process learners are not just communicators and problem-solvers, but whole persons with hearts, bodies, and minds, with memories, fantasies, loyalties, identities. Symbolic forms are not just items of vocabulary or communication strategies, but embodied experiences, emotional resonances, and moral imaginings. We could call the competence . . . symbolic competence. Symbolic competence does not do away with the ability to express, interpret and negotiate meanings in dialogue with others, but enriches it and embeds it into the ability to produce and exchange symbolic goods in the complex global context in which we live today. (Kramsch 2006: 251)

When diverse processes and cultures are at play in communication this competence extends beyond interaction as a social practice to the interpretation of symbolic systems. This qualitative meta-layer 'makes process variation, choice and style central to the process learning enterprise' (Kramsch 2006: 251). An important concern in learning processes, then, is understanding meaning and meaning-making. Intercultural competence requires both interactional competence and symbolic competence. Thus intercultural competence includes the experience of interpreting and constructing meaning in communicative interaction in diverse contexts and the competence to analyse the process of meaning-making itself in the context of diverse cultures. The relationship between the experiential and analyt-

ic dimensions remains a complex issue for learning because it raises the question of whether they can be assessed in an integrated or separate manner.

The learning process needs to take into account the dynamic nature of the construct. We do not have an adequate theory of process development from an intercultural perspective. Attempts to depict development have tended to address what is learned, employing categories that capture the increasing complexification of process and content.Development, however, is 'not just a question of knowledge (content and skills or changing mental representations) but of the relationship between learners and knowledge, which entails questions of identity and agency as they participate in practice where the knowledge has meaning' (Moss 2008: 233). Bennett, Bennett & Allen (1999) have proposed a model for the acquisition of what they call 'intercultural sensitivity': the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). The model describes a progressive series of stages from ethnocentrism to ethno-relativism. The descriptions are highly generalised and do not recognise that intercultural sensitivity may well be context- or task-specific. The linear progression that is assumed does not accord with the complexity of development. Overall, the model does not address the important relationship between process and intercultural sensitivity. The authors have grafted their proposed stages of development onto the process proficiency scale of the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Processes (1985). This grafting process, however, assumes that students have had no exposure to intercultural experiences within their development before commencing their learning of the additional process.

When focusing students' developing intercultural competence we need to expand our conception of what it means to know a process, to include notions such as:

- the experience in situ of interaction among people with diverse cultural and process backgrounds and reflection on the social and cultural construction of meaning, and the variability of context;
- the appreciation of multiple perspectives, and responses to different perspectives, in deciding, comparing, etc. and explaining how they 'make sense' or interpret reflexively;
- the ability to de-centre, to question assumptions;
- growing increasingly aware of the processes of interpretation and meaning-making.

5. Eliciting: operationalising the construct

When eliciting an intercultural competence in learning processes, the conceptual challenges I have already discussed transfer to the process of eliciting. At the same time, insights from sociocultural theories of learning and learning in general education help us to reconceptualise how we might assess an intercultural competence in the learning of processes. Theories of learning from general education emphasise (1)the participation and interaction of the learners as social beings, within communitiesof practice and within the culture of the learning environments; (2) experience and meaning; and (3) a constant critical reflection on process, culture, positioning and identities (Haertel et al. 2008: 8). Experiencing and critical reflection are ongoing dynamic processes in the context of students' developmental trajectories as they learn ways of being, acting, communicating, thinking and valuing. A so-

ciocultural orientation to learning and learning implies two things. First, it implies that learning is evolving and dynamic, as the individual learner interacts within a learning environment consisting of people (with their own particular histories, home and peer cultures, and previous learning experiences) and resources (Moss 2008: 228). In this dynamic view of learning, learning and learning are no longer separate but integrated. Second, it means expanding the instruments of learning to include evidence-based evaluations and judgments from the classroom, both formal and informal, and both tacit and explicit (Moss 2008: 223). Thus, elicitation can include individual tasks, sets of tasks that shape learners' experiences over time, analyses of moment-to-moment action and interaction, and conversations that probe students' meanings, focusing not only on 'knowledge and skill but also on embodied experience, meaning, process, culture, participation, positioning and identities enacted' (Moss 2008: 238). This means eliciting the meanings that students themselves make of experiences, texts and images, and their participation in or engagement with them. This expanded view of elicitation opens useful possibilities for assessing the intercultural competence, not only at designated learning moments but also as an integral part of the continuous process of teaching and learning. However, our experience in the two studies on assessing intercultural competence indicates that teachers who operate within a traditional view of learning find this expanded view of learning challenging.

All processes designed to elicit intercultural competence need to include learning of communication in intercultural interaction that is elicited in 'critical moments' (moments where the exchange matters to the student/participant) and to probe students' meta-awareness of processes of interpretation or making sense, as evidenced in analysis and reflection elicited in commentaries (where students are asked to reflect upon their experience of participation or engagement). There may be different loci in different tasks. For example, students may be invited to analyse and reflect. The critical moment in an intercultural interaction may be when students realise that the way they will be perceived by their interlocutor or reader is vital. The task would also invite students to analyse and reflect upon their own participation, choices, process, culture and meaning. Other tasks could invite students to analyse and reflect on a concept idea. The concept or idea could emerge from exploring personal, cultural or intercultural experiences through texts (print, visual, etc.) based on themes from social life and how they are played out in different ways in different contexts; for example, stereotypes, alternative cultures, or respect for the elderly. Further experiences provided for students could invite students to analyse and reflect on experience itself; for example, a comparative consideration of naming, greeting, forms of address, politeness, or apology in the diverse processes. Given the developmental dimension of intercultural competence, elicitation processes also need to provide for learning over time. This might include processes such as ongoing observation; the use of portfolios; the use of journals for recording intercultural experiences in the target process and reflections on these experiences; and extended projects strengthened by analysis, cumulative commentary, summation, explanation, and elaboration.

From the spoken, written, and interpretive performances of intercultural interaction we assess students' ways of managing interaction in the target process, their openness to the expectations of others, their actual communicative exchanges, responding to others, and their processes of interpreting, comparing, connecting, relating and valuing while taking multiple perspectives into account.

From analysing and reflecting tasks we assess students' meta-awareness of variability; interpreting contexts, roles, relationships, purposes, choices, perspectives and change; the social, cultural, linguistic and historical construction of meaning; and ultimately, critical and ethical awareness of process(s), culture(s) and their relationship.

When communicating, people routinely accomplish these two roles; that is, the role of communicator and the role of analyser, reflecting constantly on the nature, process, substance and impact of communication. In eliciting intercultural competence, it is necessary to tap both roles. Nevertheless, finding ways of holding both roles in play simultaneously in the learning process remains a challenge.

6. Judging and validating

Like conceptualising and eliciting, so too the judging and validating processes are situated in the tension between the two contrasting paradigms. Within traditional approaches, judging involves a system of evidence, criteria standards and rules of aggregation applied to student performances. Within qualitative, sociocultural approaches, judging is seen as inherently social (McNamara & Roever 2006), involving an act of interpretation; criteria and standards are understood as constructs that are not formulated through definition but through interpretation and meaning-making in multi-criterion qualitative judgments (Sadler 1987, forthcoming).

Validation is the quality assurance process of learning as a whole: conceptualising, eliciting and judging in relation to the particular purpose and use of learning. In current conceptualisations there has been a meaningful shift from validating tests and scoring to validating the inferences made and their social consequences (Messick 1989; McNamara 2003). This shift highlights both the importance of the process of inferencing and its bases in the learning process and the need to consider the consequences of learning. Teachers and lecturers involved in the two studies on assessing intercultural competence report that they are able to identify important features of the construct and incorporate them in some way in experiences designed to elicit this developing competence. The process of judging, however, presents challenges. One of the participants in the study on assessing intercultural competence in international education (see Crichton et al. 2006) comments on the issue from his perspective as a psychologist, not a specialist in process and linguistics.

This lecturer captures the themes of: (1) the relationship between process and the mediation of meaning, (2) judging as a process of analysis that might be undertaken from diverse points of view, (3) the importance of comparison and standpoints or world views, and (4) the centrality of interpretation. While the complexity of making judgments about intercultural competences can be partly explained by acquiring the vocabulary to talk about the ways in which multiple meanings are socially mediated through process and culture, this issue of process can also be seen as the surface manifestation of a deeper issue. What appears to be absent is a larger frame of reference or fore-understanding that educators necessarily bring to making judgments. All the lecturers involved in the study were able to identify instances of intercultural experience, interaction and understanding, and to analyse evidence of students' engagement and understanding. In order to judge any one instance of performance, however, it is necessary to reference it against a map of other possible, relevant instances representing the scope of the discipline

as a whole, and against a likely trajectory of process learning and development in studies on assessing an intercultural competence in learning processes. It is these interconnected maps of possible instances and development that are not available as frames of reference for making and justifying judgments. These frames of reference are available, albeit tacitly, for skills such as writing in the target process. This is not to say that there is or should be a single agreed frame but rather, based on their own experience and/or the literature in the field, experienced teachers have been able to develop an integrated framework for judging writing. They have also been able to develop a sense of what constitutes evidence of learning, and a common process for talking about the learnings they make. Such a map of possible instances and evidence, and a common process that would facilitate the dialogue necessary for making and justifying judgments about intercultural competence has not yet been developed (or begun). The current focus on understanding the processes of judging is particularly promising because it invites exploration of processes of interpretation (Moss 1996). Understanding these processes is critical to the learning of intercultural competence in process learning; that is, it is important to examine the fore-understanding that students bring to communication and process learning, and to expand their interpretive frames.

Similarly, the goal for teachers is to interpret students' meaning-making both episodically and longitudinally, because a consideration of peoples' continuously developing interpretive frames is integral to human understanding in general, and to the understanding of self and other.

Research continues in both studies using the four interrelated processes of the learning cycle. The process of learning, because of its very nature, sharpens the focus of thinking towards addressing what it is that we are assessing (and teaching), what it is that students are learning, how we assess it and why. An issue, however, is the resilience of traditional views of learning, which may interfere with the need for further inquiry and experimentation. We need to keep recognising both the challenges and opportunities in learning.

7. Conclusion

Much more research is needed towards understanding the intercultural competence in learning and using processes in diversity. The role of learning is important both because it sharpens the conceptual focus on the nature of learning and using processes within an intercultural orientation and because it provides valuable information about students' actual learning. It is also important because learning has the power to shape what process learning is; who the learners are and their understanding of what it is that is important to learn. The challenge is not to look for easy ways to assess but to expand the repertoire of learning to accommodate a more complex view of processes learning that includes the development of intercultural competence. Grounded research with teachers and lecturers, as in the studies in- progress reported here, begins to provide a fine-grained picture of the nature of this intercultural competence. It generates ways of eliciting it and ways of understanding and evidencing it, while always foregrounding the intimate relationship between process, culture and meaning, which is the core work of teachers of processes.

References

Alred, G., M. Byram & M. Fleming (2003). *Intercultural experience and education*. Clevedon: Multicultural Matters.

American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Processes (1985). *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines* (revised edn.), Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: ACTFL Materials Center.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in process testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L. F. & A. Palmer (1996). *Process testing in practice: Designing and developing useful process tests* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bennett, J. M., M. J. Bennett & W. Allen (1999). Developing intercultural competence in the process classroom. In R.M. Paige, D. L. Lange & Y. A. Yershova (eds.), *Culture as core: Integrating culture into the process curriculum*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, The Center for Advanced Research on Process Acquisition, 13-46.

Brislin, R., K. Cushner, C. Cherrie &M. Yong (1986). *Intercultural interactions: A practical guide*. NewYork: Sage.

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

Byram, M., B. Gribkova & H. Starkey (2002). *Developing the intercultural dimension in process teaching: A practical introduction for teachers*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Byram, M., C. Morgan & Colleagues (1994). *Teaching-and-learning process-and-culture*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. & G. Zarate (1994). *D´efinitions, objectifs et ´evaluation de la comp´etence socioculturelle* [Definitions, objectives and evaluation of socio-cultural competence]. Strasbourg: Report for the Council of Europe.

Cadd, M. (1994). An attempt to reduce ethnocentrism in the foreign process classroom. *Foreign Process Annals* 27.2, 143-160.

Chalhoub-Deville, M. (2003). Second process interaction: Current perspectives and future trends. *Process Testing* 20.4, 369–383.

Council for the Australian Federation (2007). *The future of schooling in Australia: A report by the States and Territories* (Federalist Paper 2). Melbourne: Department of Premier and Cabinet.

Crichton, J. & A. Scarino (2007). How are we to understand the 'intercultural dimension'? An examination of the intercultural dimension of internationalisation in the context of higher education in Australia. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 30.1, 4.1-4.21.

Crichton, J., A. Scarino, L. Papademetre, S. Barker, K. Lushington & M. Woods (2006). *Assessing and evaluating intercultural teaching and learning: A focus on sites of intercultural interaction* (A commissioned Teaching and Learning Study by the University of South Australia). Adelaide: Research Centre for Processes and Cultures, University of South Australia.

Delandshere, G. (2002) Learning as inquiry. *Teachers College Record* 104.7, 1461-1484.

Gipps, C. (1999). Sociocultural aspects of learning. In P. D. Pearson & A. I. Nejad (eds.), *Review of research in education* (vol. 24). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association, 357-394.

Haertel, H. H., P. A. Moss, D. C. Pullin & J. P. Gee (2008). Introduction. In Moss et al. (eds.), 1–17.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From process proficiency to interactional competence. *Modern Process Journal* 70.4, 366-372.

Kramsch, C. (1999). The privilege of the intercultural speaker. In M. Byram & M. Fleming (eds.), *Process learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 16–31.

Kramsch, C. (2002). In search of the intercultural. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6.2, 275–285.

Kramsch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *The Modern Process Journal* 90.2, 249–252.

Liddicoat, A. J., L. Papademetre, A. Scarino & M. Kohler (2003). *Report on intercultural process*

learning. Canberra: Department of Education, Science & Training [now Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations]. http:// www1. curriculum. edu. au/nalsas/pdf/intercultural.pdf.

Liddicoat, A. J. & A. Scarino (forthcoming). Eliciting the intercultural in foreign process education. In L. Sercu & A. Paran (eds.), *Testing the untestable in process and education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. http://journals.cambridge.org Downloaded: 06 Jun 2009 IP address: 82.48.230.137

Lovat, T. J. & D. L. Smith (2003). *Curriculum: Action on reflection* (4th edn.). Tuggerah, N.S.W.: Social Science Press.

McNamara, T. (1996). *Measuring second process performance*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.

McNamara, T. (2001). Process learning as social practice: Challenges for research. *Process Testing* 18.4, 333–349.

McNamara, T. (2003). Tearing us apart again:The paradigm war and the search for validity. *EUROSLA Yearbook* 3, 229–238.

McNamara, T. & C. Roever (2006). *Process testing: The social dimension*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd edn.). New York: American Council on Education & Macmillan, 13–103.

Moss, P. A. (1996). Enlarging the dialogue in educational measurement: Voices from interpretive research traditions. *Educational Researcher* 25.1, 20–28 & 43.

Moss, P. A. (2008). Sociocultural implications for Learning I: Classroom learning. In Moss et al. (eds.). 222–258.

Moss, P. A., D. C. Pullin, J. P. Gee, H. H. Haertel & L. J. Young (eds.) (2008). *Learning, equity and opportunity to learn*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Papademetre, L. & A. Scarino (forthcoming). Reflections on practice: Given a set of principles for intercultural teaching and learning, what are the implications for processes pedagogy? *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*.

Risager, K. (2007). *Process and culture pedagogy: From a national to a transnational paradigm*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sadler, D. R. (1987). Specifying and promulgating achievement standards. *Oxford Review of Education* 13, 191–209.

Sadler, D. R. (forthcoming). Indeterminacy in the use of preset criteria for learning and grading, *Learning and Evaluation in Higher Education*. http://www.informaworld. com/smpp/content?file.txt; doi:10.1080/02602930801956059.

Sercu, L. (2004) Assessing intercultural competence: A framework for systematic test development in foreign process education and beyond. *Intercultural Education* 15.1, 73–89.

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher* 27.2, 4–13.

Shepard, L. (2000). The role of learning in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher* 29.7, 4–14.

Van Ek, J. A. (1986). *Objectives for modern process learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.