work. They argued in favour of an approach to professional communication which is based on sociolinguistic principles and on fostering reflection on the part of students.

C. K. Jung (University of Warwick) looked at the Engineering laboratory reports in both the professional and academic contexts. He explored the very different consequences of failure in academic and professional contexts. Jo Angouri (University of the West of England) & Stephanie Schnurr (Hong Kong University) looked at models of interactive decision-making presented in materials for learners of Business English. They contrasted the relatively unproblematic representations found in such materials with data from decision-making interactions collected in workplace contexts.

There were two poster presentations. Olga Zayts (Hong Kong University) & Stephanie Schnurr's poster presentation was titled 'Organisations here are just not interested in this. Or are they: Negotiating ways of giving feedback to professionals in Hong Kong'. Veronika Koller's (Lancaster University) poster was titled 'Connecting academic and professional discourses in an undergraduate course on corporate communication'.

Post-conference dissemination

Many details of the plenaries and papers given at the seminar, including video extracts from plenary speeches and presenters' powerpoint slides, can be found at the PAD seminar webpage:
http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/al/research/groups/pad/events/baal_cup_2009/.

Sue Wharton & Steve Mann
University of Warwick, UK
s.m.wharton@warwick.ac.uk
steve.mann@warwick.ac.uk

Lang. Teach. (2010), **43:2**, 232–235 © Cambridge University Press 2010
doi:10.1017/S0261444809990395

Key Themes in Intercultural Communication Pedagogy

University of Sheffield, UK; 9–10 July 2009

The seminar, organised by Jane Woodin, Gibson Ferguson, Valerie Hobbs and Lesley Walker (School of Modern Languages & Linguistics and School of English, University of Sheffield), aimed to bring together those working in intercultural communication (IC) pedagogy largely – though not exclusively – in the higher education sector. It drew inspiration from the growing number of courses with an intercultural element, from stand-alone modules and training courses to Master's degrees.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809990395 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As a starting point, the seminar proposed some questions which had arisen from the BAAL 2008 Conference colloquium 'Discourses communication and interculturality':

- What contribution can a discourse approach make to the learning/teaching of IC?
- How far is IC necessarily interdisciplinary in nature? And what are the implications for teaching/learning?
- How can the mismatch between textbook accounts of intercultural encounters and the reality of such encounters be best developed from an educational perspective?
- Within SLA, how easily does an intercultural approach sit with syllabi whose main focus is on language learning?

There were 27 seminar participants, with teachers and researchers from a variety of pedagogical contexts, both from the UK and elsewhere. It was well-attended by postgraduate students, two of whom gave papers. Participants came from the Universities of Aveiro (Portugal), Balamand (Lebanon), Birmingham, Durham, Huddersfield, Melbourne (Australia), Manchester, Newcastle, Nottingham Trent, the Open University, Sheffield, Warwick and Westminster, and Cambridge University Press.

There were two keynote speeches, seven 40-minute presentations and 3–4 hours of discussion over the two days either in plenary or in small groups to allow for plenty of engagement with the seminar content. Cambridge University Press also arranged a 'vox pop' for their new Applied Linguistics website.

Helen Spencer-Oatey's (University of Warwick) keynote speech, 'Developing "global people": Insights from international partnerships', on the first day, described experiences from setting up the eChina–UK programme, and the main issues which this long-term collaborative project needed to face. This included communicating about the project itself, such as goal priorities, communication mechanisms, identifying common ground and building relationships. Identified as fundamental to any intercultural project with international partners was the need to plan for the establishment of shared knowledge within the project planning itself.

Tony Young (University of Newcastle) reported on the results of research into intercultural communicative competence and English language teachers' beliefs and practice in three countries, raising the issue that while teachers – both native and non-native English speakers – enthusiastically welcomed an intercultural approach, they found obstacles to its practical integration into their teaching. Richard Fay (University of Manchester) offered a reflexive account of the difficulties of setting up intercultural courses with either a lack of institutional support or over-interference in the content of courses in an institutional attempt to 'internationalise' the curriculum.

Jane Woodin (University of Sheffield) provided evidence from research into tandem learners' identification of their language learning partner as native or non-native speakers, using this to raise some issues relating to the implications of a shift from a native-speaker role model to that of the intercultural speaker. Sonia Galluci (University of Birmingham) focused on the Year Abroad experience and in particular the role that emotions play in sojourners' intercultural sensitivity development and attitude to difference, arguing for the importance of considering emotional development.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809990395 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mike Byram's (University of Durham) keynote speech, 'Intercultural communication pedagogy as training and education', on the second day, focused on teaching courses in 'intercultural communication' in institutions such as universities and suggested we consider how the teaching of IC relates to the general purposes and aims of formal institutions of education such as universities who, because of their funding and relationship to the state, have a responsibility to society as well as having their own autonomy and freedom to educate as they consider appropriate. He considered the concepts of '*Bildung* and Liberal education', 'criticality', 'education for citizenship' and 'training and education' and the dichotomy between them with reference to the teaching of IC.

Celia Thompson (University of Melbourne) considered the value of a dialogic approach to IC. She offered some examples of intercultural teaching/learning activities in the light of Bakhtin's concept of dialogism and post-structuralist theory. Adam Brandt (University of Newcastle) presented a microanalysis of skypecasts in an international discussion group to show how the relevance of interculturality in these interactions changed on an ongoing basis. His findings explored the ways in which cultural identities were drawn upon as interactional resources by interactants who contested, negotiated and co-constructed culture and cultural practices. Carmen Lucas (University of Aveiro) reported on research into early-years communication development and the implications for IC pedagogy. She argued that this vital point in children's lives is ripe for the development of intercultural competence and proposed that intercultural sense is created progressively and implicitly within children's identities, preserving their own identities at the same time.

Issues which were discussed in relation to the seminar questions led to the identification of two major foci within IC pedagogy: that of pedagogy itself and that of analysis of intercultural interactions, and in particular a consideration of what it is that makes an interaction intercultural in itself. There was also some discussion around theoretical positions in IC pedagogy, such as the replacement of the native speaker role model with that of the intercultural speaker, and the implications for pedagogic practice.

Questions were raised as to the need to define more clearly central concepts such as intercultural awareness, and the concept of criticality. It was acknowledged that IC pedagogy is a pedagogy for change within the person; with this was wide recognition of the need for framed and conceptualised experiential learning, and the need for a supported process-oriented approach to intercultural development. Ethnographic approaches were highlighted as relevant for this, as well as calls for working together more closely across the traditional training–education divide.

Discussions were also held around the need for clarification of key terminology within the IC field, and how it links to other research areas within applied linguistics such as second language acquisition. Further areas for research within the field were identified, among which were:

- further work on identification of establishing common ground in intercultural pedagogy, and on the implications of intercultural interaction research for the pedagogy of IC;
- comparative studies of intercultural pedagogy;
- continuing exploration of the relationship of the IC pedagogy to other more established areas within applied linguistics.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809990395 Published online by Cambridge University Press

One immediate outcome of the seminar was vociferous support for the suggestion by Tony Young to set up an Intercultural Communication SIG within BAAL; this is now underway.

Jane Woodin
School of Modern Languages and Linguistics
University of Sheffield, UK
J.Woodin@sheffield.ac.uk

Lang. Teach. (2010), **43:2**, 235–238 © Cambridge University Press 2010
doi:10.1017/S0261444809990401

Colloquium – Toward a Reconceptualization of 'Language' and 'Acquisition' in SLA Research

Held at the American Association for Applied Linguistics Annual Conference, Denver, CO, USA; 21 March 2009.

This all-day colloquium was part of an ongoing discussion of ways that methods and frameworks from micro-ethnography, Conversation Analysis (CA), and Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory are re-specifying 'language' and 'acquisition' from a socio-interactional view of SLA.

Socio-interactional perspectives offer methods for micro-analysis of language use, including an 'emic' perspective that grounds claims in the ways participants orient to language use events as they occur. 'Language' is analyzed as resources used to carry out pragmatic action. In exploring ways that the analysis of interaction can provide evidence of 'acquisition', socio-interactional researchers focus on changes in situated language use, within a local frame of single occasions or a longitudinal frame seeing change over time.

All eight papers reported on analysis of video-recorded interactions. Five analyzed data from classroom settings. Table 1 summarizes the papers.

Simona Pekarek Doehler (Université de Neuchâtel) investigated disagreement sequences in cross-sectional data of intermediate and advanced Swiss German learners of French (presentation title, 'Documenting L2 learning as language-in-action over time: Disagreement sequences in French L2'). Focusing on turn construction, the paper presented a taxonomy of disagreement sequences and showed clear differences in the two groups, with advanced learners using greater diversification of turn constructional practices related to preference organization, the range of responses used to align, in varying degrees, with or against a prior turn's interactional project. Findings demonstrate the value of a delimited 'actional microcosm' like disagreements to study development of language practices.

The paper by John Hellermann (Portland State University) presented a case study of one adult learner of English ('Inez') in classroom interaction in the USA ('From "other" to "self": Language learning seen in practices for repair'). The data were video recordings of learner–learner interactions in pair tasks. The analysis focused on how Inez initiated and carried out

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809990395 Published online by Cambridge University Press