



Castledown

 OPEN ACCESS

Intercultural Communication Education

ISSN 2209-1041

<https://www.castledown.com/journals/ice/>

Intercultural Communication Education, 8(3), 102589 (2025)

<https://doi.org/10.29140/ice.v8n3.102589>

Examining Intercultural Communication Education in EFL Programmes: The Case of Yemeni Universities



ABDULLAH AL-ERYANI 

Thamar University, Yemen

abderian2002@gmail.com

Abstract

In foreign language (FL) education, it is now emphasised that learners' needs are not limited to knowledge and skills in the grammar of the language but also the aptitude to use the language in socially and culturally suitable ways in intercultural contexts. However, addressing intercultural communication (IC) in an FL context remains a challenging goal to achieve, especially given the need for innovation in curriculum design and pedagogical implementation. This paper examines the status quo of IC education in Yemen through scrutinising the curriculum of English language programmes in the higher education system. A corpus-based analysis was used to analyse the integration of IC in the course specifications of English as a foreign language (EFL) programmes. Additionally, a questionnaire was administered to delve into EFL faculty members' perceptions of the barriers to implementing IC education in the same context. The results revealed that IC is unproductively included, taught, and practiced in formal EFL education in Yemeni universities. The results also indicated that superficial exemplification of IC patterns, imbalance between linguistic and cultural dimensions, ineffective teaching methods, improper classroom practices, and lack of exposure to the target culture are the key impairments of IC education in the context of this study.

Keywords: Intercultural communication, EFL education, Yemeni universities, curriculum

Introduction

In the current era of globalisation, the interlocutors of diverse cultural identities are involved in intercultural communication (IC) settings, which requires the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in such situations (Deardorff, 2006). It also requires the recognition of potential obstacles

Copyright: © 2025 Abdullah Al-Eryani. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. **Data Availability Statement:** All relevant data are within this paper.

and hindrances to mutual understanding. As many scholars now acknowledge, IC is not limited to communication between people from different countries but can be conceptualised at a range of different scales, including institutions, communities, regions, and many others. Because of the dynamism of IC, Ahrndt (2020) upholds that it is a complicated, chaotic, and at times inconsistent notion and therefore “it is not always easy to conceptualize or study” (Ahrndt, 2020, p. 17). In the field of applied linguistics, IC has been described as “a peculiar communication situation: the varied language and discourse strategies people from different cultural backgrounds use in direct, face-to-face situations” (Müller-Jacquier 2004, p. 295). Meanwhile, Jack and Phipps (2005) describe IC as “a participatory set of actions in the world” or “dialogical and material exchanges between members of cultural groupings” (Jack & Phipps, 2005, p. 181). From a social and cross-cultural perspective, Berry et al. (2011, p. 471) define IC as “the exchange of information (verbally or nonverbally) between members of different cultural populations”. In speech communication studies, IC denotes any “interaction between people whose cultural perceptions and symbol systems are distinct enough to alter the communication event” (Samovar et al., 2010, p. 12). For Jandt (2010, p. 18), IC refers “not only to the communication between individuals of diverse cultural identities but also to the communication between diverse groups”. Thus, it can be said that the term IC can be interpreted at a fundamental level as exchanges between people from dissimilar backgrounds, as characterised by a wide range of factors, both visible and invisible.

To communicate effectively and appropriately in various cultural contexts, it is necessary to be responsive and adaptive towards the individuals that we encounter. Furthermore, as Holliday (2018) points out, there is a need to promote reflexive awareness of self and other in a crossing of boundaries, particularly by capitalising on the cultural dimensions as a resource for learning. In this sense, the field of foreign language (FL) education plays a significant role in the development of IC skills, particularly when IC goals are overtly amplified by institutions, such as by being explicitly incorporated into curriculum, classroom practice and teacher training (Garrett-Rucks, 2018). Though the acquisition of rule-like cultural knowledge is likely to be a dominant tendency within language teaching in many contexts (Kramsch, 2013), it has become increasingly important that “students’ performance in the target language is informed by a critical understanding of cultural variability in terms of how culture-specific conceptions of the social world influence communication patterns” (Koutlaki & Eslami, 2018, p. 102).

IC Education in Language Learning

In the era of globalisation and social distancing, IC education has been increasingly prioritised in many educational contexts, with many endeavours devoted to conceptualising and theorising it. From a professional perspective, IC education is defined as the “intentional and systematic effort to foster intercultural learning through curriculum design, including pre-departure, on-site, and re-entry activities, and/or course content emphasising subjective culture and intercultural interaction, and/or the guided facilitation of intercultural experience” (Bennett, 2008, p. 8). The Council of Europe (2016) upholds that IC education is crucial for building and sustaining the “values, attitudes, skills, knowledge and critical understanding which enable an individual to participate effectively and appropriately in a culture of democracy” (p. 11). Although IC education practices tend to be informed by research on a wide range of IC phenomena (Allen, 2021), Dervin and Tournebise (2013) maintain that “[t]he field as such is not unitary but complex, as it is represented by ‘multiple strands of research’ and practice worldwide” (Dervin & Tournebise, 2013, p. 533).

In describing the promotion of IC education, Diaz and Moore (2018) argue that there has been renewed interest over the last few decades in the design and implementation of IC as a key site for the development of the wide-ranging set of cognitive, affective, and behavioural skills that are valuable in dealing

with the increasing diversity of the world. To this end, the field of IC education focuses on exploring how language teaching may contribute to cultivating intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Byram, 2021; Liddicoat, 2021). Additionally, one of the main objectives of IC education within FL learning is exposing students to alternate worldviews, enabling them to interpret cultural information directly from original sources, and assisting them to build both linguistic and intercultural competence through participation and interaction in the FL classroom (Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013).

IC in the Yemeni EFL Education Context

In response to the trends of globalisation, Yemen has aspired to improve the level of human development with its strategic vision (2000–2025). The main goals of the strategic vision are to give special importance to training and education, to raise the standards of university education, to meet the requirements of society, and to be in line with developments in the fields of human and practical sciences (Ministry of Education, 2008). Hence, Yemeni people need to be empowered with the intercultural skills and abilities required for accessing new communities. This prevalent need has given prominence to the role of the English language in Yemen, in that it has been made a compulsory subject at primary, secondary, and higher education levels (Azman et al., 2013). Further, English language teaching in Yemen has undergone a series of dramatic changes and developments since its reunification in 1990 (Nabil & Patil, 2012).

Despite the considerable attention given to teaching/learning English as an FL (EFL) in Yemen, the intercultural aspect seems to be undervalued. According to Al-Dhuhra et al. (2021), it is believed that the graduates of EFL programmes face difficulties in using English for IC purposes when engaged in authentic communicative situations as a result of the lack of exposure to the cultural aspects of the target language. Ahmed et al. (2019) argue that EFL instructors in Yemeni universities do not integrate culture to the level that meets their perceptions of its significance for their learners, with most activities of IC being rarely or never used by language instructors in actual classroom practices. Moreover, Al-Ghbari (2016) maintains that some Yemeni EFL instructors have negative attitudes towards integrating culture into their EFL classes and consider integrating English culture into teaching a source of risk to students' native culture. For Nassar (2021), the system of teaching English in most Yemeni universities is more inclined towards structure-based principles than those of communicative language teaching, by which the “knowledge conveyed in the classroom is mainly about vocabulary and grammar (linguistic competence)” (Nassar, 2021, p. 52). In this regard, Al-Sanhani (2007) contends that teaching pragmatics, i.e. teaching students how to communicate cross-culturally, remains marginal in EFL instruction in Yemen in both the curricula and methods of teaching. According to Nassar (2021), the traditional methods used in teaching and learning EFL in the Yemeni classrooms make it difficult for the students to perceive and interpret the sociocultural aspects of the target language.

In a critical discourse analysis of proverbs published in *Yemen Times*, Abduljalil (2017) reports the exclusion of local identities and religious discourse, reflecting the marginalisation of local knowledge and agency in globalised forms of English discourse. In a related vein, Al-Nashmi and Syd Zin (2011) point out that satisfaction with communication among the academic staff in Yemeni universities varied significantly according to national culture, emphasising that navigating cross-cultural situations requires cultural insight, interpersonal skills, and trust-building ability. At a regional level, Alkharusi (2018) identifies some structural pitfalls of IC education in Arabic higher education, including in Yemen. These include the scarcity of IC-focused courses, the absence of graduate programmes in the field, reliance on Western materials, and a lack of professional associations for regional IC scholarship. More recently, Alrefaee and Mohammed (2025) document that many students in Yemen study English

primarily for certification or opportunities abroad rather than for intercultural engagement, highlighting a disconnect between educational policies and practice.

The literature above shows that little concern has been given to the intercultural dimension of EFL education in the Yemeni context, which will continue to impede students' ability to cope with the demands of globalisation and IC. Therefore, this paper responds to the need for research by reporting the findings from a study investigating the nature and range of the theoretical constructs and pedagogic structures of IC education in the formal education system in Yemen. Accordingly, two research questions were formulated:

1. How is IC represented as an aim, content, and practice in the course specification of Yemeni English language programmes?
2. What are Yemeni EFL faculty members' perceptions of teaching IC within English language programmes?

Conceptual Framework

This study is grounded in Byram's (2021) model of intercultural communicative competence, which provides a comprehensive lens for understanding the integration of IC in EFL programmes. This model is composed of two interrelated domains: communicative competence—including linguistic, socio-linguistic, and discourse competence—and intercultural competence, which encompasses attitudes, knowledge, skills, and critical cultural awareness. More specifically, intercultural competence is operationalised through five key dimensions:

1. Intercultural attitudes (curiosity, openness, readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures),
2. Knowledge (of social groups, cultural practices, and interaction processes),
3. Skills of interpreting and relating (ability to compare, mediate, and explain cultural phenomena),
4. Skills of discovery and interaction (ability to acquire new cultural knowledge through real-time interaction), and
5. Critical cultural awareness (ability to evaluate practices, perspectives, and products critically).

In the present study, Byram's (2021) model is used as the theoretical framework to analyse the state of IC education in Yemeni universities. The five major components of the questionnaire—programme plans, curriculum design, teaching methods, instructional traits, and attitudes towards the target culture—correspond directly to Byram's (2021) framework. For instance, programme plans and curriculum design reflect the extent to which knowledge and skills of interpreting/relating are embedded institutionally; teaching methods and instructional traits correspond to how these competences are enacted pedagogically; and teachers' and learners' attitudes align directly with the attitudinal and critical cultural awareness dimensions of intercultural communicative competence.

By adopting Byram's (2021) framework, the study is able to move beyond a descriptive account of IC education and situate the findings within an established theoretical model. This not only clarifies how IC is framed and operationalised in EFL contexts but also allows for a systematic analysis of the Yemeni case. This model has been widely applied in European contexts and underpins initiatives such as the CEFcult project and the Council of Europe's intercultural competence assessment (INCA) scales for assessing intercultural competence (Waliński, 2012), making it a widely recognised and practical framework for educational research.

Methodology

The study adopted a mixed-methods approach, combining linguistic analysis with quantitative analysis, to analyse the curriculum aims, content, and practices in English language programmes in Yemen. It involved two tools of data collection: a corpus-based analysis and a close-ended questionnaire. The corpus analysis was used to identify the theoretical constructs of IC in Yemeni English language programmes, whereas the questionnaire was utilised to obtain Yemeni EFL faculty members' reflective thoughts and experiences of teaching interculturality in the same programmes. This methodology helped in producing a multifaceted set of data and anchoring the findings in more robust explanations and interpretations.

Instruments

Corpus-based Analysis

Corpus linguistics involves the study of corpora to learn about how languages are used across contexts, languages, and cultures (Crosthwaite, 2023). In the field of first/second language education, corpus linguistics is employed to assist with the evaluation and creation of language learning and teaching materials (Crosthwaite et al., 2022). Intercultural education needs to not only be linked to planning policy but can also extend to the exchange of information and knowledge on content subjects across the curriculum.

In this study, a total of 46 course specifications were purposively selected for a corpus-based analysis to ensure both comprehensiveness and relevance. The selection spanned the four core areas of English studies—language skills, linguistics, literature, and translation—thereby capturing the full disciplinary range of EFL programmes in the Yemeni context. Moreover, only compulsory and foundational courses were included, as these are pivotal in shaping students' intercultural learning experiences and reflecting the programmes' institutional priorities.

Course specifications were selected from three universities, one public and two private, to reflect both diversity and representativeness in the Yemeni higher education system. The public university represented the state-run model of EFL education; the private universities reflected the emerging perspectives of private-sector higher education. Taken together, these institutions provide a balanced sample across the public and private contexts, enabling broader generalisability of the findings.

The corpus consisted of course descriptions, intended learning outcomes, and course contents, which were deemed to be the most relevant elements for detecting intercultural orientations. The data were uploaded into AntConc 3.5.9 (Windows) and analysed using three tools: (a) frequency lists, (b) type–token ratio, and (c) concordances. These tools helped identify lexical patterns, recurring themes, and underlying orientations toward IC. Although the results of the corpus analysis provided quantitative evidence, they were qualitatively interpreted in light of the sociocultural and pedagogical context of Yemeni EFL education.

Questionnaire

To complement the findings obtained from the corpus analysis, which aimed to identify institutional and textual representations of IC, a close-ended questionnaire was constructed to capture the practical, context-specific perspectives of the faculty members, allowing the study to link theoretical intentions with pedagogical realities. This sequential approach enabled a comprehensive understanding of IC education in Yemeni EFL programmes and set the stage for a nuanced discussion of

the results. A close-ended questionnaire, composed of 26 items formulated by the researcher, was developed to elicit university EFL faculty members' reflections on the presence and practices of IC education in Yemeni EFL programmes. The construction of the questionnaire drew on prior studies on IC education and intercultural communicative competence (Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006; Sercu, 2004) and previous studies that assessed the integration of IC in language education (e.g., Garrett-Rucks, 2016; Young et al., 2009). In particular, the questionnaire items were tailored to address five thematic dimensions that are widely emphasised in IC literature: programme planning, curriculum design, teaching methods, instructional traits, and instructors' and learners' attitudes toward the target culture. These dimensions reflect areas that are widely recognised in the literature as central to embedding IC in EFL education.

To ensure content validity, the initial draft of the questionnaire was reviewed by three experts in applied linguistics and IC, who provided feedback on the clarity, relevance, and comprehensiveness of the items. A pilot study was then conducted with five faculty members from outside the main sample to check the wording, sequencing, and estimated completion time. On the basis of their feedback, minor modifications were made, primarily in terms of simplifying the wording and alignment with the local institutional terminology. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded a satisfactory internal consistency score ($\alpha = 0.82$).

Participants and Procedure

The final version of the questionnaire was administered to 28 faculty members of the English departments from six Yemeni universities. The participants were selected on a convenience and voluntary basis, and they represented diverse academic ranks and teaching experiences. Their demographic data included gender (16 males and 12 females), age range (35–60 years old), and qualification (Masters and PhD degrees). All participants were bilingual speakers of Arabic (their first language) and English (a second language), and the majority reported more than 10 years of teaching experience, which provided them with substantial expertise to reflect on the themes addressed in the questionnaire.

Regarding ethical considerations, the participants were provided with an information sheet explaining the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and the assurance of anonymity and confidentiality. Additionally, informed consent was obtained prior to participation, and institutional permission to conduct the study was secured from the relevant departments. The respondents completed the questionnaire individually in approximately 20 minutes, either in print form or electronically, depending on their preference.

Results and Discussion

This section presents the findings of the study, integrating insights from both the corpus-based analysis of course specifications and the faculty members' questionnaire. The corpus analysis provides a systematic examination of how IC is theoretically framed within English programmes' documents, including course descriptions, learning outcomes, and content outlines. To complement these textual insights, the close-ended questionnaire explores how IC education is perceived, contextualised, and enacted in actual classroom settings. By combining these two approaches, the study links institutional discourse with faculty interpretations, providing a comprehensive, multi-layered understanding of IC education in Yemeni EFL programmes. The findings are organised in two main parts: first, the results of the corpus analysis, followed by an analysis of the questionnaire responses, with each section further divided into focused subsections for clarity and coherence.

Corpus-based Analysis of Course Specifications

The first phase of the study involved a corpus-based analysis of 46 course specifications from Yemeni EFL programmes. The aim was to examine the theoretical foundations and institutional framing of IC in the curriculum. Course descriptions, intended learning outcomes, and content outlines were analysed to identify how IC-related concepts are represented. The corpus analysis used frequency lists, type–token ratios, and concordance tools using AntConc 3.5.9, which enables systematic identification of patterns, trends, and recurring key terms. The analysis focused on three central keywords (‘culture’, ‘intercultural’, and ‘communication’) and is organised into three subsections.

Frequency and Concordances of ‘culture’

An AntConc search was used to detect the occurrence frequency of the key word *culture* in course specifications subjected to the corpus-based analysis. The results in Table 1 demonstrate that the key word *culture* is mentioned 52 times only in the whole corpus, indicating the underestimated position of the cultural dimension in English language education in Yemeni EFL programmes.

Table 1 Occurrence Frequency of the Variant forms of ‘culture’

Keyword	Frequency
Culture	52
Cultures	17
Cultural	63
Total	132
Word type–token ratio	0.61

For a profound analysis of the weight of the cultural dimension in the examined corpus, the occurrences of the variant forms of the key word *culture* (i.e., *cultures* and *cultural*) were also detected. The results in Table 1 show that the overall incidences of *culture* and its variants in the entire corpus is only 132, with a word type–token ratio of 0.61%. Unfortunately, these results are in disharmony with the view that culture, which is a feature of language, is an integrated aspect of language teaching.

Concordances show words in the context of their occurrence and the sense that words often take, based on the kinds of words they are often grouped with. To penetrate the dialectic facet of interculturality in the corpus, the concordances of the word *culture* with *English* and its variants such as *American*, *target*, *foreign*, and *non-native* were searched. The AntConc concordance search yielded the results displayed in Table 2.

Table 2 Concordances of ‘culture’

Concordance	Frequency
English <i>culture</i>	4
American <i>culture</i>	2
Target <i>culture</i>	1
Foreign <i>culture</i>	0
Non-native <i>culture</i>	0
Total	7

Although the word *culture* and its variant forms were used 132 times in the study corpus (see Table 1), the results in Table 2 reveal that the link between culture and the English language remains scarce. Table 2 discloses that the total number of occasions where *culture* comes in association with *English* was only seven. The connection between these patterns indicates the meagre attention given to making learners acquainted with the relevant grounds of interculturality in the relevant EFL programmes. It is worth mentioning that in the majority of cases where culture is mentioned in course specifications, it is introduced as a common concept in relation to translation competence, language learning, and literature.

The rare mention of ‘culture’ signifies the limited magnitude of IC in the examined corpus. This outcome concurs with Manzoor et al. (2019), who claim that both internationally distributed and locally produced EFL textbooks contained deficiencies in terms of cultural representation. According to Sedova (2017), people may learn to speak a language but if they are not instructed on how culture influences the whole process of communication, they may fail to achieve the desired results, especially in professional contexts. Without an adequate indication of the English culture, language instructors are more likely to work with representatives of their own culture. To dive into the minutiae of the target culture, they need textual resources to rely on. IC education requires persistent recognition of new cultural inputs alongside factual knowledge about the target culture. For Heizmann et al. (2018), the task of intercultural education is to accumulate knowledge about the culture of another nation, its ethnic communities, etc. Furthermore, Zueva and Kralova (2019) assume that the understanding of specific elements of a certain culture that can be partially connected with the language itself is of utmost importance.

Frequency and Concordances of ‘intercultural’

The inclusion of lexical entries about cultural diversity provides more plain clues to the actuality of IC education. In this regard, the occurrence of the keyword *intercultural* in the corpus was searched. The results itemised by AntConc, as shown in Table 2, reveal that the word *intercultural* is presented twice only in the whole corpus. Given the four mentions of the variant form of *intercultural* (i.e., *cross-cultural*), Table 3 reveals that the overall token ratio of the two patterns is 0.02%. These results indicate the programmes’ negligence in promoting interculturality in the process of EFL education.

Table 3 Occurrence Frequency of the Variant forms of ‘intercultural’

Keyword	Frequency
Intercultural	2
Cross-cultural	4
Total	6
Word type–token ratio	0.02

In a narrower context, the patterns of *intercultural* and *cross-cultural* were identified in six positions of concordance as shown in Table 4.

Table 4 Concordances of ‘Intercultural’ and ‘cross-cultural’

Intercultural	Cross-cultural
<i>Intercultural</i> communication	<i>Cross-cultural</i> communication
<i>Intercultural</i> competence	<i>Cross-cultural</i> communication
	<i>Cross-cultural</i> understanding
	<i>Cross-cultural</i> factors affecting interpreting and translation
Total 2	4

The results in Table 4 reveal that the keyword *intercultural* is used in association with ‘communication’ in one place, while in the second instance, it is connected with ‘competence’. Regarding the four concordances of the keyword *cross-cultural*, it comes in combination with ‘communication’ (twice) and in combination with ‘understanding’ and ‘factors affecting interpreting and translation’ (one mention each). These results indicate that despite the rare use of these patterns, they are largely projected towards promoting the values of IC. The scanty reference to ‘intercultural’ implies that IC gains are minimally documented as prominent ends in these programmes. Disinterest in intercultural issues hinders learners from increasing their awareness of cultural discrepancies and decreases their interest in engaging with complex and multiple identities.

Frequency and Concordances of ‘communication’

Another key point in examining the promotion of IC in Yemeni EFL programmes is the incidence of the keyword *communication* in course specifications. The occurrence frequency of this pattern was detected to probe the amount of communication-related entries and tasks counted in the whole corpus.

The results in Table 5 reveal that the word *communication* is introduced 48 times. To delve into the inclusive manifestation of communication in the corpus, the occurrences of the variant forms of *communication* (i.e. *communicative*, *interaction*, and *interactive*) were also searched and counted.

Table 5 Occurrence Frequency of the Variant forms of ‘communication’

Keyword	Frequency
Communication	48
Communicative	8
Interaction	1
Interactive	1
Total	58
Overall word type–token ratio	0.26

Table 5 displays that the key word *communication* and its variant forms are presented 58 times in the whole corpus, with an overall token ratio of 0.26%, revealing the low level of attention given to communication, which is a crucial component for the effective teaching and learning of IC.

To inspect the essence of IC in the EFL programmes, the conjunctions of the key term *communication* and any potential patterns of interculturality in the study corpus were detected.

Table 6 Concordances of ‘Communication’ and ‘intercultural’

Concordance	Frequency
<i>Communication</i> with people of different cultures	7
Intercultural <i>communication</i>	2
<i>Communication</i> in different cultures	1
Cross-cultural <i>communication</i>	2
Total	12

Out of the 58 mentions of ‘communication’ in the corpus, the concordances obtained by AntConc and summarised in Table 6 demonstrate that *communication* is grouped with *intercultural*, *different cultures*, and *cross-cultural* in 12 places only. The remaining 46 incidences of the keyword *communication* are associated either with linguistic skills or with other collective skills. These results show that the focus of language teaching in the examined Yemeni EFL programmes is on facilitating the interdependence of language and communication, with minor attention given to interculturality as an inseparable module of constructing relations between individuals and groups belonging to different cultures.

The minor mention of ‘communication’ indicates the adoption of grammar-based traditional methods of teaching. Without enough manifestation of the foundations of communication, learners will not be able to formulate their personal values with respect to different cultural perspectives and views.

Faculty Members’ Perceptions of IC Education in Yemeni EFL Programmes

Building on the insights gained from the corpus analysis, the second phase of the study applied a close-ended questionnaire to explore faculty members’ perceptions and experiences regarding IC education. The analysis of the questionnaire responses is organised into five subsections, corresponding to the thematic domains.

IC in Programme Plans

This subsection examines faculty members’ perceptions of how intercultural education is integrated into the overall design and objectives of English programmes, including the alignment of learning outcomes with IC competencies.

Table 7 *Faculty Members’ Perceptions of IC in Programme Plans*

Item	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Knowledge of IC is purposefully highlighted in the programme plan.	21.4	14.3	64.3	1.57	0.79
2. The programme plan promotes IC in its curriculum design.	21.4	7.1	71.4	1.50	0.72
3. IC is in the focus of the programme’s general objectives.	0	28.6	71.4	1.29	0.62
4. IC is in the focus of the programme’s intended learning outcomes.	7.1	14.3	78.6	1.29	0.70
5. The cultural dimension is adequately discussed in the programme plan.	21.4	7.1	71.4	1.50	0.72

The results in Table 7 show the disadvantageous position IC has in programme plan from the EFL faculty members’ points of view. It can be observed that for 64.3% of the participants, programme plans do not put emphasis on IC knowledge and 71.4% of them refuted the view that IC is promoted in the programme plans. Remarkably, with only a small proportion (28.6%) of neutral responses, neglect of IC in the programmes’ general objectives was reported by 71.4% of the participants. Furthermore, the majority of the respondents (78.6%) admitted that learners’ intercultural competence is not considered in the intended learning outcomes of EFL programmes. Neglect of the cultural dimensions in the programmes’ general framework was also acknowledged by 71.4% of the participants. Overall, faculty members reported the low integration of IC in programme planning (mean (M) = 1.43, standard

deviation (SD) = 0.61), indicating that IC is generally insufficiently emphasised in programmes' objectives and intended learning outcomes.

The outcomes above reveal that EFL education in the Yemeni context puts more emphasis on the structures and linguistic patterns of the language, in which IC is superficially concerned and is not at the centre of university EFL programmes. Contrastingly, Allen (2021) states that interculturality has become a priority for many universities that have faculties and programmes dedicated to IC education or that have integrated it in language education.

IC in Curriculum Design

The focus of this section is on the incorporation of IC content into course syllabi and materials, exploring the extent to which cultural knowledge and skills are explicitly addressed.

Table 8 *Faculty Members' Perceptions of IC in Curriculum Design*

Item	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	M	SD
6. Ample patterns of IC are introduced in teaching materials.	17.8	17.9	64.3	1.54	0.77
7. Sociocultural values of English society are integrated in the syllabus.	53.5	10.8	35.7	2.18	0.82
8. IC patterns are not limited to stereotypical icons of English culture.	0	21.4	78.6	1.21	0.55
9. Pedagogic theory helps develop learners' intercultural competence.	14.3	21.4	64.3	1.50	0.76
10. Textbooks are shaped by English culture-specific vocabulary.	35.7	14.3	50	1.86	0.87

In comparison with programme plans, the status of IC appears to be marginally better in curriculum design. Table 8 shows that a considerable portion of the participants (64.3%) refuted the sufficient inclusion of IC patterns in teaching materials and textbooks. On the contrary, 53.5% of the participants agreed that the socio-cultural values and tenets of the target community are included in the curriculum. However, in relation to IC patterns presented in the curriculum, the majority of the respondents (78.6%) agreed that they are limited to all-too-familiar stereotypical manifestations of the English culture. This indicates that the pattern seems to be more concerned about making language instructors deliver information by heart rather than encouraging them to process the textbook's contents. In addition, more than half of the participants (64.3%) disclosed the dearth of pedagogic injunctions necessary for developing learners' intercultural competence. Further, half of the participants (50%) were of the view that vocabulary in English textbooks is not steered towards enhancing the learners' awareness of culture diversity. In summary, the faculty members' responses suggest that IC is inconsistently integrated into the curriculum design ($M = 1.66$, $SD = 0.71$), with some inclusion of sociocultural content but limited attention to authentic intercultural patterns beyond stereotypes.

These outcomes show that the shallow representation of intercultural traits looks to be framed mainly in terms of stereotypical icons of English culture and places undue emphasis on exotic differences between communities. The absence of culturally oriented texts in the learning resources deprives learners of exposure to the demanding cultural inputs. These results are incompatible with Fardini's (2014) finding that FL teaching materials and contents should be used in order to make learners aware

of the intercultural context, encouraging them to compare and contrast foreign cultures with theirs. Diana et al. (2021) suggest that IC is a complex process of establishing, maintaining, and developing contact between people of different societies. The results also reveal that the principles of IC are likely to remain invisible in the curriculum design because they are not taught and learned in conjunction with language skills. In the same vein, Daraiseh (2018) concludes that since textbooks are the only resource in the EFL syllabus, the intercultural dimension is approached as an add-on activity, which has resulted in minimal recognition of intercultural competence and its models in EFL education.

IC in Teaching Methods

This subsection investigates the pedagogical strategies used by language instructors to facilitate intercultural learning, such as interactive activities, roleplays, and discussion of cultural differences.

Table 9 *Faculty Members' Perceptions of IC Education in Teaching Methods*

Item	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	M	SD
11. IC is addressed explicitly when teaching English.	14.3	28.6	57.1	1.57	0.74
12. Teaching practices promote learners' intercultural competency.	17.9	17.9	64.2	1.54	0.75
13. Learners are exposed to various modules of IC.	42.9	25	32.1	1.93	0.89
14. The components of intercultural competence are taught carefully.	14.3	17.9	67.8	1.46	0.73
15. In-class communication tasks boost learners' intercultural abilities.	21.5	7.1	71.4	1.50	0.78
16. Learners are examined on subtle nuances of IC.	14.3	14.3	71.4	1.43	0.73

Further signs of the adverse situation of IC education in Yemeni EFL programmes are in relation to the teaching methods, as shown in Table 9. To illustrate, it can be observed that for more than half of EFL faculty members participating in this study (57.1%), IC is not treated explicitly in the process of teaching English. Moreover, 64.2% of the participants agreed that the teaching practices followed in EFL programmes do not help promoting learners' intercultural competency. However, the way in which the available facets of IC teaching are practiced seems to be doubtful. While 42.8% of the respondents upheld that it is performed through exposing learners to various modules of IC, 32.1% of them disagreed with this view and 25% were neutral, which indicates that limited frameworks of IC may be applied. Showing the EFL faculty members' unawareness of their role in developing learners' knowledge, skills, and attitudes (i.e., demand for IC), the majority of the respondents (67.8%) admitted that these components are not inculcated methodically. In support of this viewpoint, the neglect of learners' intercultural abilities in classroom activities was admitted by 71.4% of the participants, indicating that the attention given to learners' linguistic competence outweigh the intercultural competence. Similarly, 71.4% of the participants endorsed that learners' potential understanding of the subtle nuances of IC is not subjected to assessment, which hinders feedback, resulting in the mishandling of intercultural learning. Collectively, faculty members' perceptions indicate that IC teaching methods are generally underdeveloped ($M = 1.57$, $SD = 0.66$), with only limited exposure to diverse IC modules and interactive practices.

These findings demonstrate that IC is not deliberately framed in language instructors' planning or in-class activities, with very little pedagogic theory to pave the way for feedback to emerge and help

learners achieve intercultural learning. This structure reflects the minimal identification and verification of IC as an essential goal of EFL education. The invariable use of textbook activities and language tasks primarily targets comprehension of factual knowledge presented in written and spoken texts, with no encouragement to interpret and negotiate the cultural meanings of the texts, which are issues that limit the potential for intercultural learning (McConachy, 2018). The traditionally dominating reproductive approaches adopted in the programmes concerned, which are heavily biased towards grammar and structure, result in an uneven correlation between the linguistic and cultural dimensions. Gómez-Rodríguez (2018) indicates that a further issue in FL education is a focus on the linguistic aspects of language learning, ignoring the cultural dimension, which promotes critical engagement with the cultural representations in the textbook itself.

IC in Instructional Traits

This part analyses instructional characteristics that promote intercultural understanding, including instructors' adaptability, feedback practices, and culturally responsive approaches.

Table 10 *Faculty Members' Perceptions of IC Education in Terms of Instructional Traits*

Item	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	M	SD
17. Learning English is basically viewed as a linguistic act.	71.4	17.9	10.7	2.61	0.73
18. IC receives enough interest in learners' research projects.	32.1	25	42.9	1.89	0.91
19. Language teaching is supported by authentic patterns of IC.	39.3	21.4	39.3	1.96	0.93
20. Learners are encouraged to critically examine cultural diversity.	39.3	10.7	50	1.89	0.92
21. Instructional traits allow learners to recognise and express cultural differences.	21.4	14.3	64.2	1.54	0.77

Regarding the manifestation of IC in instructional traits, the results in Table 10 show that a large proportion of the respondents (71.4%) agreed that learning English in Yemeni EFL programmes is mainly regarded as a linguistic act, which makes the learners' intercultural competence marginal. In a practical sense, the embodiment of IC in learners' research projects was acknowledged by only 32.1% of the participants, versus 42.8% who disagreed with it; the remaining 25% of responses were neutral. Expanding learners' knowledge of the sociocultural patterns of the English culture was a controversial issue among the participants, as the responses were distributed equally between agreement and disagreement (39.3% for each), whereas 21.4% of the responses went for neutral. This indicates the limited implementation of authentic patterns of IC in language teaching and the unsatisfactory exposure to the communicative norms of the target culture. On the other hand, half of the respondents (50%) disagreed with the view that learners are encouraged to practice observing, interpreting, and negotiating the cultural dissimilarities they encounter in the texts they study. This shows that learners' understanding of cultural variation is likely to be restricted to what the teaching materials impose on them. Taking culture as a dynamic entity, 64.2% of the respondents denied the efficacy of classroom procedures in creating the proper milieu for the expression and recognition of cultural differences. This suggests the lack of encouragement to take constant notice and make comparisons between pre-existing knowledge and newly encountered cultural input. Regarding the instructional traits, the outcomes unveil a pedagogical gap between the need to increase IC and classroom practices. To sum up, while

the faculty members recognise that English is often treated primarily as a linguistic act ($M = 2.61$, $SD = 0.73$), the development of IC through instructional traits is moderate and inconsistent across courses (overall $M = 1.96$, $SD = 0.77$).

As long as EFL classes are not perceived as a space to learn and negotiate about the target culture, learners cannot be sufficiently aware of and feel prepared for the challenges they may experience in intercultural encounters. According to the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (2018), the ability to successfully communicate with others includes not only linguistic knowledge but also interpersonal and sociocultural knowledge of the target language and its cultural practices. The methodological gap between theoretical advances and classroom practices may be bridged by the integration of service learning tasks that foster purposeful interaction between students and the wider community beyond the university (Blithe, 2016) or by classroom-based research (Diaz & Moore, 2018). Furthermore, it is important that students' performance in the target language is informed by a critical understanding of cultural variability in terms of how culture-specific conceptions influence communication patterns (Koutlaki & Eslami, 2018).

Faculty Members' and Learner's Attitudes Towards the Target Culture's Community

The final subsection addresses the perceptions of both instructors' and students' openness, curiosity, and attitudes toward the target culture, which are essential for developing intercultural competence.

Table 11 *Faculty Members' and Learners' Attitudes Towards the Target Cultures' Community*

Item	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	M	SD
22. Instructors have had experience in the target culture's community.	7.1	21.4	71.4	1.36	0.70
23. Instructors are prejudiced against English people and countries.	42.8	28.6	28.6	2.14	0.82
24. Learners have openness and sympathy for the English community.	39.3	17.9	42.9	2.00	0.88
25. Learners show harmony with the values of English culture.	53.6	25	21.4	2.32	0.86
26. Loyalty to native culture misleads learners' intercultural attitudes.	57.1	28.6	14.2	2.43	0.82

The last entry for examining the status of IC education from the EFL faculty members' perspectives is language instructors' and learners' attitudes towards the English culture and community. The results in Table 11 show that for the majority of the participants (71.4%), EFL instructors had never been in the target community, which might incapacitate their acquaintance with the actual nuances of IC. Moreover, 42.8% of the respondents agreed that language instructors are prejudiced against native English-speaking people and countries. Disregarding the causes and motives behind it, language instructors' intolerance of the target culture may impede motivation and learning in the classroom. In relation to learners' attitudes, sympathy for the English cultural community was admitted by 39.3% of the participants, but denied by 42.9% of them. However, 53.6% of the respondents acknowledged learners' understanding of cultural differences, suggesting their readiness to adapt and accept others' cultural values. On the other side, 57.1% of the participants deemed that learners' loyalty to the perspectives and values of their own culture misled their intercultural attitudes. Collectively, faculty members' and learners' attitudes toward the target culture community are generally moderate to positive

($M = 2.25$, $SD = 0.79$), though instructors' direct exposure to the target culture is limited, which may affect intercultural engagement.

Given that Yemeni EFL instructors have not had the opportunity to be in the countries where English is spoken, they are likely to be apprehensive about teaching the sociocultural values of societies that they have not visited. Moreover, faculty members' ambivalent attitude towards native speakers of English and their societies could prove to be a hindrance to IC education. Their intolerance may lower their interest in incorporating intercultural issues within the linguistic practices implemented in learning the language. For Shannon (2020), if a person has a healthy curiosity towards intercultural encounters in order to learn more about themselves and others, then there is a foundation from which to build additional competence-relevant attitudes and skills. Contrariwise, the learners show positive attitudes towards intercultural learning, in terms of their sympathy for the English-speaking community and their readiness to be in harmony with differing cultural-specific values and principles. According to Shannon (2020), individuals who are intrinsically motivated toward IC may have a higher tolerance for uncertainty, in that their curiosity leads them to engage with others who are different because they find the self- and other-knowledge gained to be rewarding. Similarly, Ibrahim (2022) proposes that having perspective and empathy in line with attitudes of openness to intercultural learning, curiosity to learn about one's and others' cultures, and willingness to find value in and learn from cultural diversity are central in developing IC knowledge. However, learners' loyalty to the perspectives and values of their own culture, which might mislead their intercultural attitudes, seems to be rooted in the improper instructional practices taking place in EFL education in Yemeni universities, as argued by Al-Ghbari (2016).

Conclusion and Implications

This study investigated the place of IC education within English language classes at Yemeni higher education institutions. The findings demonstrated that the process of EFL education is not supported by adequate learning resources and practices that help learners recognise and understand principles of IC. The key defects of IC education perceived in the context of this study are the superficial representation of IC entries, an imbalance between the linguistic and cultural dimensions, ineffectual pedagogic practices, ineffective teaching methodologies, improper classroom practices, and a lack of exposure to and sympathy for the target culture's community. The use of limited and stereotypical patterns and modules of IC is another hindrance to assimilating cultural diversity and envisaging the proper ways of IC. Accordingly, it can be established that IC is unproductively included, instructed, and practiced in Yemeni EFL programmes. It can also be deduced that the presence of IC elements in EFL education in Yemeni universities is more likely based on of personal and national cultural experiences, with ignorance of the intersection between language and culture.

In accordance with the increasing virtual and physical mobility and the need for higher education institutions to produce interculturally competent graduates (Allen, 2021), programme designers, syllabus creators, and educators of EFL may benefit from this research through the following recommendations on how to teach IC deliberately. First, there is a need to create a solid base of academic knowledge of IC principles by enriching teaching materials with a wide variety of target culture-created resources and IC modules. Second, an integrative theory–practice methodology might be followed to enable learners to thoughtfully implement the intercultural knowledge they have learned. Third, to provide learners with enduring utility from their learning experience, teaching methods should be steered towards recognising and negotiating the principles and values of the target culture. Fourth, to create a supportive environment that helps in accommodating learners with cultural discrepancies, there is a need for IC patterns to be intensified in the classroom. Incorporating IC activities in classroom practices helps in recruiting learners' subjectivities and laying the foundation for the formation of personal

values with respect for different cultural perspectives and views. Fifth, controversial cultural concepts, such as discrimination and human rights, might be also subjects of discussion in IC activities. This process contributes to IC education by considering how these concepts are perceived and considered differently in the target community. Sixth, learner-centred autonomous learning styles can be adopted to process the transmitted linguistic and cultural information through interactive practices. Finally, and most importantly, all possible facets of language learning need to be contextualised in cultural contexts to prepare learners for intercultural encounters.

References

- Abduljalil, H. (2017). Human values in intercultural communication: CDA for discourse of proverbs in Yemen Times. *Ideology Journal*, 2(2), 34–52.
- Ahmed, S. T., Bushra, A. Q., & Pawar, S. V. (2019). Integrating culture into EFL teaching – A study of Yemeni EFL teachers' perceptions and actual practices. *Language in India*, 19(4), 333–348.
- Ahrndt, S. (2020). *Intercultural communication*. Open Educational Resources Collection 24. Retrieved September 23, 2025, from <https://irl.umsl.edu/oer/24>
- Al-Dhuhra, M. A., Annase, Kh., & Motair, A. A. (2021). Cultural communicative competence – The case of textbooks at Yemeni high school: An exploratory study. *Ibn Khaldoun Journal for Studies and Research*, 1(1), 261–276.
- Al-Ghbari, D. (2016). *Integrating pragmatic competence in teaching English to the students of Medicine at Taiz University* [Doctoral dissertation, Université De Strasbourg].
- Alkharusi, M. J. (2018). Intercultural communication study in the Middle East. *The International Encyclopedia of Intercultural Communication*, 2, 1156–1164.
- Allen, T. J. (2021). Exploring students' perceptions about intercultural communication education: Rethinking the design and facilitation of a course in Japan. *Intercultural Communication Education*, 4(3), 213–233. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ice.v4n3.475>
- Al-Nashmi, M. M., & Syd Zin, S. A. (2011). Variation in communication satisfaction of academic staff in universities in Yemen depending on national culture. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 18(1), 87–105. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13527601111104313>
- Alrefaee, Y., & Mohammed, O. S. (2025). English in Yemen. In K. Bolton (Ed.), *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of World Englishes* (pp. 1–12). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119518297.eowe00402>
- Al-Sanhani, H. (2007). *The effect of instruction on development the pragmatic competence of EFL Yemeni learners*. [Masters thesis, Sana'a University].
- Azman, H. Bhooth, A. M., & Ismail, K. (2013). Readers reading practices of EFL Yemeni students: Recommendations for the 21st century. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 13(3), 63–78.
- Bennett, J. M. (2008). On becoming a global soul: A path to engagement during study abroad. In V. Savicki (ed.) *Developing intercultural competence and transformation: Theory, research, and application in international education* (pp. 13–31). Stylus Publishing.
- Berry, J.W., Poortinga, Y.H., Breugelmans, S.M., Chasiotis, A., & Sam, D.L. (2011). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications*, 3rd edn. Cambridge University Press.
- Blithe, S. J. (2016). Teaching intercultural communication through service-learning. *Communication Teacher*, 30(3), 165–171.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (2021). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence—revisited*. Multilingual Matters.
- Council of Europe. (2016). *Competences for democratic culture: Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies*. Retrieved September 25, 2025, from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806ccc07>

- Crosthwaite, P. (2023). Corpus linguistics: Mixed methods research. In Chappelle, C. & M. Riazi (Eds.) *Wiley Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 2nd edn. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal20019>.
- Crosthwaite, P., Ningrum, S., & Schweinberger, M. (2022). Research trends in corpus linguistics: A bibliometric analysis of two decades of Scopus-indexed corpus linguistics research in Arts and Humanities. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 4(2), 31–52.
- Daraiseh, S. (2018). Intercultural competence among English learners at Yarmouk University, Jordan. *US-China Foreign Language*, 16(10), 503–514.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10(3), 241–266.
- Dervin, F., & Tournebise, C. (2013). Turbulence in intercultural communication education (ICE): Does it affect higher education? *Intercultural Education*, 24(6), 532–543. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2013.866935>
- Diana, A., Dmitriy, L., Zhannat, M., Aigerim, S., & Lyazzat, I. (2021). The linguistic components of intercultural communications on an example of a multicultural society: comparative studies of cultures. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 9(SPE3), e1114.
- Diaz, A. R., & Moore, P. J. (2018). (Re)imaging a course in intercultural communication for the 21st century. *Intercultural Communication Education*, 1(3), 84–99. <https://dx.doi.org/10.29140/ice.v1n3.84>
- Fardini, S. (2014). Designing intercultural materials for EFL teaching/learning to young learners using sociopragmatic perspectives [Conference session]. The 3rd UAD TEFL International Conference, Yogyakarta.
- Garrett-Rucks, P. (2016). *Intercultural competence in instructed language learning: Bridging theory and practice*. Information Age Publishing.
- Garrett-Rucks, P. (2018). Advancing intercultural learning in world language education: Recent developments in pre-service teacher education in the U.S. *Intercultural Communication Education*, 1(3), 110–122. <https://dx.doi.org/10.29140/ice.v1n3.114>
- Gómez-Rodríguez, L.F. (2018). Implementing critical thinking tasks to fostering English learners' intercultural communicative competence in a genre-based learning environment. *English Language Teaching*, 11(12), 154–165.
- Heizmann, H., Fee, A., & Gray, S. J. (2018). Intercultural knowledge sharing between expatriates and host-country nationals in Vietnam: A practice-based study of communicative relations and power dynamics. *Journal of International Management*, 24(1) 16–32.
- Holliday, A. (2018). Designing a course in intercultural education. *Intercultural Communication Education*, 1(1), 4–11. <https://dx.doi.org/10.29140/ice.v1n1.24>
- Ibrahim, H. B. (2022). Implementing backward design to foster intercultural communicative competence in textbook-based curricula: A proposed framework for English language practitioners. *Intercultural Communication Education*, 5(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ice.v5n1.638>
- Jack, G., & Phipps, A. (2005). *Tourism and intercultural exchange: Why tourism matters*. Channel View Publications.
- Jandt, F. (2010). *An introduction to intercultural communication: Identities in a global community*, 6th edn. Sage.
- Koutlaki, S. A., & Eslami, Z. R. (2018). Critical intercultural communication education: Cultural analysis and pedagogical applications. *Intercultural Communication Education*, 1(3), 100–109. <https://dx.doi.org/10.29140/ice.v1n3.110>
- Kramsch, C. (2013). Culture in foreign language teaching. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(1), 57–78.
- Liddicoat, A. (2021). Teaching languages from an intercultural perspective: Rethinking the nature of learning. In R. Arber, M. Weinmann & J. Blackmore (Eds.) *Rethinking languages education. Directions, challenges and innovations* (pp. 224–241). Routledge.

- Liddicoat, A. J., & Scarino, A. (2013). *Intercultural language teaching and learning*. Wiley and Sons.
- Manzoor, H., Asma, A., & Umrani, S. (2019). Intercultural communication at play in local English textbooks. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 13(2), 1–9.
- McConachy, T. (2018). *Developing intercultural perspectives on language use: Exploring pragmatics and culture in foreign language learning*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ministry of Education. (2008). *The development of education in the Republic of Yemen. The national report presented to the 48th session of the international conference on education, Geneva*. http://www.ibe.unesco.org/National_Reports/ICE.../yemen_NR08.pdf
- Müller-Jacquier, B. (2004). Intercultural communication. In M. Byram (Ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 295–297). Routledge.
- Nabil, A., & Patil, N. V. (2012). English language teaching in Yemen: Importance and challenges. *International Journal of Social Science Tomorrow*, 1(5), 1–8.
- Nassar, H. M. (2021). Reasons behind mis/understanding English conversational implicatures by university learners in Yemen. *Studies in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*, 2(1), 40–55. <https://doi.org/10.48185/spda.v2i1.291>
- Samovar, L.A., Porter, R.E., & McDaniel, E.R. (2010). *Communication between cultures*, 7th edn. Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Sedova, T.V. (2017). Integration of intercultural communication into teaching foreign languages as a factor of forming a successful professional, Theory and practice of teaching languages and cultures: Philosophical and methodological aspects [Conference presentation]. The II International Scientific and Practical Conference.
- Sercu, L. (2004). Assessing intercultural competence: A framework for systematic test development in FL education and beyond. *Intercultural Education*, 15(1), 73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1467598042000190004>
- Shannon, A. (2020). Intercultural communication. *Open Educational Resources Collection*, 24. <https://irl.umsl.edu/oer/24>
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity. (2018). *Teaching performance assessment*. Stanford University.
- Waliński, J. T. (2012). Enhancing intercultural communicative competence in an online collaborative assessment environment: CEFcult project. In P. Pęzik (Ed.) *Corpus data across languages and disciplines* (pp. 55–62). Peter Lang.
- Young, T. J., Sachdev, I., & Seedhouse, P. (2009). Teaching and learning culture on English language programmes: a critical review of the recent empirical literature. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 3(2), 149–169.
- Zueva, E.A., & Kralova, Z. (2019). Intercultural approach as a prerequisite for economics students to form an accurate professional thesaurus. *International Journal of Applied Exercise Physiology*, 8(2.1), 317–323.