



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

***INTERCULTURALITY AND DIDACTICS OF CULTURE  
IN UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE FRENCH PROGRAMMES  
IN TWO MALAYSIAN UNIVERSITIES***

**CHIN SIN ZI**

**FBMK 2014 45**



**INTERCULTURALITY AND DIDACTICS OF CULTURE  
IN UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE FRENCH PROGRAMMES  
IN TWO MALAYSIAN UNIVERSITIES**

**By**

**CHIN SIN ZI**

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies,  
Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts**

**October 2014**



All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia





Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts

**INTERCULTURALITY AND DIDACTICS OF CULTURE  
IN UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE FRENCH PROGRAMMES  
IN TWO MALAYSIAN UNIVERSITIES**

By

**CHIN SIN ZI**

**October 2014**

**Chair: Regis Machart, PhD**  
**Faculty: Modern Languages and Communication**

Many researchers refer to 'intercultural' as a macro phenomenon with a rather static approach to culture and neglect the importance of individual experience or subjectivity. As foreign language learners or instructors, one should not focus on solid culture, but regard liquid interculturality as the way for an individual to enter into a successful interpersonal communication with a speaker of another language. The standpoint of foreign language instructors on interculturality is very significant because they are the mediators between two languages (source and target languages) and the relationship between language instructors, learners and knowledge are interrelated. Therefore, the instructors' representations play a very important role in moving from a solid intercultural approach to that of liquid interculturality. In this research I examine the representations of interculturality among native and non-native language lecturers. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 12 lecturers teaching foreign languages in two local Malaysian universities. Participants were asked to define the interculturality and intercultural skills and how they plan to develop them among learners. The data show that there are no significant differences between the representations of interculturality between native and non-native language lecturers: they share the idea that a minimum knowledge is needed in order to communicate with native speakers. More differences can be noted in their definition of the concepts and on the way in which they attain their understanding of 'interculturality'.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia  
Sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sastera

**ANTARA BUDAYA DAN PENGAJIAN BUDAYA  
DALAM PROGRAM IJAZAH SARJANA MUDA BAHASA PERANCIS  
DI DUA UNIVERSITI DI MALAYSIA**

Oleh

**CHIN SIN ZI**

**Oktober 2014**

**Pengerusi: Regis Machart, PhD**  
**Fakulti: Bahasa Moden dan Komunikasi**

Ramai penyelidik merujuk 'antara budaya' sebagai suatu fenomena makro dengan pandangan agak statik terhadap budaya, lalu mengabaikan kepentingan pengalaman individu dan elemen subjektiviti. Sebagai pelajar atau pengajar bahasa asing, kita tidak seharusnya memberi tumpuan kepada budaya statik tetapi menganggap konsep antara budaya cair atau mudah-ubah sebagai satu kaedah bagi individu untuk mewujudkan komunikasi yang berkesan dengan seorang penutur yang berlainan bahasa. Sudut pandangan pengajar bahasa asing terhadap konsep antara budaya adalah sangat penting kerana mereka merupakan pengantara antara dua bahasa (bahasa sumber dan bahasa sasaran). Selain itu, perhubungan antara pengajar bahasa, pelajar dan pengetahuan adalah saling berkait. Maka, pendapat pengajar memainkan peranan yang amat penting dalam peralihan daripada suatu pendekatan konsep antara budaya yang statik kepada konsep antara budaya cair. Dalam kajian ini, saya menyelidiki pandangan tentang konsep dan kemahiran antara budaya dalam kalangan pensyarah yang merupakan penutur asli dan yang bukan penutur asli bahasa Perancis. Temu bual separa struktur telah dijalankan bersama 12 orang pensyarah yang mengajar bahasa asing di dua buah universiti awam di Malaysia. Para pensyarah penutur asli dan bukan penutur asli diminta untuk memberi definisi tentang konsep dan kemahiran antara budaya, serta rancangan mereka untuk membangunkan konsep dan kemahiran ini dalam kalangan pelajar. Data menunjukkan bahawa tiada perbezaan ketara antara pegangan konsep antara budaya dalam kalangan penutur asli dan bukan asli: mereka berkongsi pendapat bahawa hanya pengetahuan yang minimum terhadap konsep dan kemahiran antara budaya diperlukan untuk bertutur dengan penutur-penutur asli. Terdapat juga perbezaan dalam definisi mereka tentang konsep antara budaya dan proses untuk mencapai tahap pemahaman mereka tentang konsep antara budaya.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Madame Lim Sep Neo for her continuous support since the first day I entered Universiti Putra Malaysia. Thanks for her patience and enthusiasm, without her guidance and encouragement I would not have the chance to write this acknowledgement.

Secondly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my principal supervisor, Dr. Regis Machart. This thesis would not have been possible without his help and excellent guidance, not to mention his unsurpassed knowledge in the related fields.

Also, my sincere thanks goes to my fellow juniors as well: Wen See, Seen Sian, Tze Wei, Simone and Calvin who helped me while I was not around. I would like to thank my family members for supporting and encouraging me with their best wishes. My deepest appreciation to Yeow E-Lynn for her constructive feedbacks and suggestions.

Most importantly, I am particularly grateful to the one who is always by my side, Henry Wong for his generous support, caring and patience which gave me motivation to pursue my studies. Thanks to his useful advices while I was blocked in writing my thesis.

Last, but by no means least, I would like to thank Oceane, Jiabi, Xiaohui, Laura, Marion and Megan for giving me those memorable moments during my exchange programme. My thesis writing during that period would not end smoothly and delightedly without them.



Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

**Yap Ngee Tai, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

**Mohd Zariat Bin Abdul Rani, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Internal Examiner)

**Ain Nadzimah Binti Abdullah, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Internal Examiner)

**Fred Dervin, PhD**

Professor  
Department of Teacher Education  
University of Helsinki  
Finland  
(External Examiner)

---

(BUJANG BIN KIM HUAT, PhD)

Professor and Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
Date:

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

**Regis Machart, PhD**

Senior Lecturer  
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

**Lim Sep Neo**

Lecturer  
Faculty of Arts, Communication and Education  
Infrastructure University Kuala Lumpur  
(Member)

---

**NORITAH OMAR, PhD**

Associate Professor and Deputy Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 16 December 2014

## Declaration by Graduate Student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any other institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name and Matric No.: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee**

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) are adhered to.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of  
Chairman of  
Supervisory  
Committee: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of  
Member of  
Supervisory  
Committee: \_\_\_\_\_

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	i
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	ii
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	iii
<b>APPROVAL</b>	iv
<b>DECLARATION</b>	vi
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	xi
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	xii
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	xiii
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	xiv

## CHAPTER

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
1.1	Background of the Study	2
1.2	Statement of the Problem	3
1.3	Aim of Study	4
1.4	Research Questions	4
1.5	Significance of the Study	4
1.6	Limitation of this Study	5
<b>2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	7
2.1	The Traditional Representation of Culture	7
2.1.1	What is ‘Culture’?	7
2.1.2	The Relation between Language and Culture	9
2.1.3	Criticising the Solid Approach to ‘Culture’	10
2.2	Taking into Consideration Fluid Interculturality	11
2.2.1	Intercultural Communication: When Different Individuals Meet	12
2.2.2	Multicultural vs. Intercultural Education	14
2.2.3	Janusianism: The Unachieved Fluidity	15
2.3	The Nation and ‘Foreign’ Language Teaching	16
2.3.1	Imagining the Nation: Us vs. Them	17
2.3.2	The Evolution of Intercultural Competence	19
2.3.3	Lingua Francas: A Tool for Interculturality	20

<b>3</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1	Research Method and Design	23
3.2	Participants	24
3.3	Materials/Instruments	24
3.4	Data Collection	24
3.5	Coding	25
3.6	Data Analysis/Theoretical Framework	26
3.6.1	Discourse-Historical Approach	28
3.6.2	Theory of Enunciation [ <i>L'énunciation</i> ]	28
3.6.3	Mixed Intersubjectivity	29
<b>4</b>	<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1	Common (Mis-)Understandings on Interculturality	31
4.1.1	Confusing Interculturality with Culture	31
4.1.2	Mitigating or Intensifying Stereotypes?	34
4.2	The Relationship between Interculturality and Language	37
4.2.1	Intercultural vs. Linguistic skills	38
4.2.2	'Identification' <i>by</i> or <i>through</i> Language(s)?	40
4.3	Developing Intercultural skills	43
4.3.1	The Students' Supposed (In-)Adequate 'Intercultural' skills and Intercultural Competence	43
4.3.2	Evaluating Learners' Intercultural Skills and Teaching Interculturality	46
4.4	Delineating and Homogenising Subcategories	49
4.4.1	Teachers and Lecturers <i>vs.</i> Learners	49
4.4.2	The Supposed Professional Collusion	51
<b>5</b>	<b>SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH</b>	<b>55</b>
5.1	Summary	55
5.2	Conclusion	57
5.3	Implication of this Study	58
5.4	Recommendations for Future Research	58

<b>REFERENCES</b>	59
<b>APPENDICES</b>	73
1 Interview Guideline	73
2 Consent form	74
3 Duration of Interviews	75
4 Transcription Sample	76
<b>BIODATA OF STUDENT</b>	84
<b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>	85



## LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table		
3.5	Themes and Sub-themes after Thematic Categorisation	26





## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
3.6	The Three Dimensions of Discourse	27
3.6.2	The Fluidity of Shifter <i>we</i>	29



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AUM	Anxiety Uncertainty Management
CECR	<i>Cadre Européen Commun de Référence</i>
CEFR	Common European Framework for Languages
DEL	<i>Diplôme d'Étude en Langue Française</i> [Diploma in French Language Studies]
DHA	Discourse-Historical Approach
FLT	Foreign language teaching
IC	Intercultural competence
MI	Mixed Intersubjectivity
NL	Native language lecturer
NNL	Non-native language lecturer

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
1	Interview Guideline	73
2	Consent Form	74
3	Duration of Interviews	75
4	Transcription Sample	76



## CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

The different territories that constitute Malaysia were British colonies or protectorates until 1957 (or 1963 for East Malaysia). English was widely used amongst the colonists and for communication with the local elite (Asmah, 2009) and it was in the position of a second language in the pre- and post-independence era. The teaching of French was associated to a great extent with the presence of British schools in the peninsula and its imminent disappearance from Malaysian schools just before independence was linked to the incorporation of the (British) missionary institutions into the national education system. However, the language was later reintroduced in the 1980's in some boarding schools (Lim & Machart, 2013, p. 51) and in 2014, 63 Malaysian public schools offer French as an elective subject, while two public universities offer complete bachelor programmes in French, and many other higher education institutions has French as an option (Lim & Machart, 2013, p. 59).

The vast majority of Malaysians who learn a foreign/international language are at least bilingual (Malay/English) and many even often speak three (plus Mandarin or Tamil) or more languages. Yet, this plurilingual competence of the learners is most of the time being neglected by lecturers who only focus on the students' mother tongue ('ideally' homogenised despite the linguistic diversity) and the target language, often associated with one and only country, in our case, France. The learning of French is often related to the objective of having interactions with French tourists in Malaysia, or with native French speakers in France (the country of 'origin') to develop commercial ties. The tie between French language teaching and 'interculturality' is taken for granted, but the meaning of this 'interculturality' among lecturers still needs to be questioned.

The teaching of 'interculturality' or 'intercultural skills' has become a focal point of many foreign language instructors as shown in several researches on didactics of foreign languages (e.g. Byram, 1997; Kramsch, 1998; Corbett, 2003; Ware & Kramsch, 2005; Dervin, 2010a). However, 'interculturality' in foreign language classes is not interpreted in similar ways by these researchers: it covers what Dervin (2013a) calls "solid", "liquid" or "Janusian" approaches (p. 8). Thus, it is important in the field of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning to look at how lecturers understand and use this key concept, as *intercultural* appears as a "chameleon" concept (Earley & Peterson, 2004). The lecturers' diverse understandings of the term impact their pedagogical approaches; the way they teach 'interculturality' to learners is related to their representation of what constitutes a successful intercultural interaction and what they think learners need to know. The purpose of this study is to examine the discourse of lecturers of French, to see if there is a distancing from imagined cultures (Dervin, 2007a) and a 'source culture'/'target culture' dichotomy by including more fluidity in the linguistically and culturally diverse Malaysian context.

### 1.1 Background of the Study

Malaysia is a multilingual nation located in Southeast Asia where four major languages (Malay, Mandarin, Tamil and English) and many vernacular languages (Iban, Dusun, Bajau, Hokkien, Hakka, Cantonese, Punjabi, etc.) are used dynamically. Of the 137 living languages spoken in the country (Lewis, Gary, & Charles, 2013), Malay has been declared the sole official and national language after a transitional period of 10 years following independence in 1957 (Ain Nadzimah & Chan, 2003, p. 102). This language is used in most official situations: parliamentary debates, official letters, official ceremonies, etc. However, Malaysians may also use other languages in other situations, and some primary schools use Tamil or Mandarin as a medium of instruction (Machart & Lim, 2013a). The language of the former colonial rulers, English, is also widely used and sociolinguists estimate that it is used daily by 25% of urban Malaysians (McArthur, 2002, p. 325) even in official contexts (Ozog, 1990, p. 312).

English is considered as an asset because of its position as the world's major lingua franca in international business (Rogerson-Revell, 2007); it may be taken for granted in the country where it is considered "a second language" (Asmah, 2009) but its place in education (e.g. as the medium of instruction for science and mathematics) has often been debated in recent years (Ain Nadzimah & Chan, 2003; Kärchner-Ober, 2007) and its use is still being questioned especially among Malay speakers (e.g. Hafriza, 2006; Airil, 2013). Yet, English is rarely associated with UK (or USA, Australia and New Zealand) and its representations among Malaysians tend to confirm that it is perceived as a lingua franca with few connections with the places where the language was originally spoken as the mother tongue (Machart, Lim, & Lim, 2010).

Besides these languages, the government also encourages the learning and teaching of foreign languages. The Ministry of Higher Education acknowledged the importance of foreign language learning in the *National Higher Education Strategic Plan Beyond 2020* (Ministry of Higher Education of Malaysia, 2007), in which it is stated that "proficiency in the third language is vital for developing human capital that drives the K-economy as well as gears the country towards competitive innovation in the international arena" (p. 62). In order to promote better human development, the Malaysian government has decided to develop foreign language learning because "a nation whose citizens are proficient in foreign languages is bound to have the distinct advantage of being better-placed to have access to foreign technology that is crucial to nation building" (Zubairi & Sarudin, 2009, p. 74). This move is associated with the increasing internationalisation of Malaysian higher education; in 2010, 79,200 Malaysians were studying abroad, mainly in Australia and UK, and increasingly also in Egypt, France, Germany or Japan (Ministry of Higher Education of Malaysia, 2011) where they study in Arabic, French, German and Japanese respectively.

On 7 July 2004, "foreign languages" have been relabelled "international languages" by the Ministry of Education at a meeting held by the Curriculum Development Centre (KPM, 2004). By including these languages in the curriculum, the Malaysian government is

targeting internationalisation and the learning of ‘international’ languages has been extended to government day schools in order to broaden the offer of ‘foreign’ languages among citizens.

Foreign language teaching officially started in some privileged secondary schools (where Japanese, Arabic, French and Mandarin are taught as an elective subject) in the 1980’s. In 1998 and 2001 respectively, two public universities i.e. Universiti Malaya and Universiti Putra Malaysia started a degree programme in French (Machart & Lim, 2009). These two universities are the only institutions that offer a degree programme in French and together they enrol approximately thirty students every year. In 2013, thirteen French language lecturers (four native and nine non-native speakers) were involved in these two programmes. They become a major source of representations of the French language and intercultural skills in French for students: most of these students do not have any prior knowledge about this language and they spend more than ten hours per week with their lecturers since the first semester. Thus, it can be supposed that the lecturers’ representations and their approach to interculturality would affect the students’ knowledge about linguistic and intercultural skills (Beacco, 2007).

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

The implement of foreign language teaching and learning has started in the late 70s in Malaysia and its importance is acknowledged by the Ministry of Higher Education in the *National Higher Education Strategic Plan Beyond 2020* (Ministry of Higher Education of Malaysia, 2007). Many future foreign language instructors were sent abroad to be trained in order to have a better implementation on this plan. Foreign languages were offered in order to, among others, broaden business opportunities and foreign policies. Intercultural interactions are thus important but no studies on interculturality involving foreign language lecturers in Malaysia have been done so far.

In 2014 some foreign languages, in particular French, are offered in complete foreign language bachelor programmes in two public universities, as an elective subject in 63 Malaysian public schools and also as an option in many higher education institutions (Lim & Machart, 2013, p. 59). In the process of learning a new language, the relationship between language instructors, learners and knowledge become interrelated (Houssaye, 1982) and lectures and tutorials are the main channels for these students to acquire intercultural competence, besides the Internet which is used in French most of the time under the instructions of the lecturer. However, it appears that the understanding of *interculturality* among lecturers differ largely from the acceptance of the term amongst post-modern researchers such as Abdallah-Pretceille (2001; 2005), Holliday (2010) or Dervin (2006). Most of the time, *interculturality* is treated as communication between representatives of a nation, referred to as “Methodological Nationalism” (Dervin, 2013a), rather than interactions between individuals (who may or may not share a common language). With this representation on interculturality, does the teaching of intercultural skills reveal an acceptance of the fluid “Humanism of the Diverse” (Abdallah-Pretceille,

2005, 2012) or does it convey more or less strong, culture-bound, potentially discriminatory power relations?

### **1.3 Aim of Study**

This study aims to understand better the discourse of lecturers on interculturality and the potential implications in the didactics of foreign languages and social interactions between native and non-native speakers.

Firstly, I will analyse the different understandings of the concept of *interculturality* by the native and non-native language lecturers of the two B.A. French programmes in Malaysia in relation to their previous experience.

Secondly, I will study how they intend to develop their learners' intercultural competence in relation to their theoretical background and if they adopt an intercultural approach independent of cultural artefacts or even the "intercultural without culture" (Dervin, 2014).

### **1.4 Research questions**

The representations and approaches to interculturality among the language lecturers who were teaching in the French B.A programmes in 2013 have been examined. Besides that, the power relation between the participants and the interviewer is also one of the focal points in this study because of its implication on participants' responses. The research questions are as follows:

- 1) What does interculturality mean to the French language lecturers of the two B.A French programmes in Malaysia?
- 2) Do native and non-native lecturers share the same representations of and approaches to interculturality?
- 3) Are French language lecturers' representations *of* and approaches *to* interculturality intensifying or mitigating stereotypes?
- 4) How do French language lecturers plan to develop intercultural competences or skills among learners?

### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

This study aims to be a hint for language lecturers to realise the importance of interaction between interlocutors who do not necessarily share the same mother tongue. In addition, this study also intends to be a guide for foreign language lecturers in Malaysia to have greater understanding on interculturality in order to move away from native speakerism (where the native speaker is considered as superior) (Holliday, 2006) and solid, culturalist approaches which impede real, interpersonal interactions (Abdallah-Preteceille, 2012).



Almost all the lecturers teaching in BA French programmes in Malaysia (92%) participated in this study. This research can thus be considered as significant for this particular group of lecturers teaching the language. French language lecturers represent the biggest group of what the Curriculum Development Centre (KPM, 2004) labelled as “international language” instructors in Malaysia who are involved in a BA programme (before German) and the participants train all the undergraduate students in French in Malaysia.

### **1.6 Limitation of this Study**

This small scale study involves the only two public universities in Malaysia which offer BA programmes in French. Due to the fact that Universiti Malaya and Universiti Putra Malaysia are currently the only universities authorised by the Malaysian government to offer these programmes, these two universities become the sole representatives of French language teaching and learning at degree level in Malaysia.

Apart from that, the interviewer’s status as a master student and a former student of one of these programmes needs to be taken into consideration as this status is ambiguous. Most of the interviewees chose to reply the questions during the interviews using a teaching technique rather than merely sharing information.

However, this limitation has become one of the research angles worth examining due to the power relationship between the interviewer and interviewees. The discourse of the participants has been analysed to stress their desire to demonstrate their power (e.g. their wider knowledge or the power linked to their academic/administrative status).





## REFERENCES

- Abdallah-Pretceille, M. (2001). Intercultural Communication: Elements for a Curricular Approach. In M. Kelly, I. Elliott, & L. Fant (Eds.), *Third Level, Third Space: Intercultural Communication and Language in European Higher Education* (pp. 131-155). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Abdallah-Pretceille, M. (2005). Pour un humanisme du divers. *Vie sociale et traitements*, 3(87), 34-41.
- Abdallah-Pretceille, M. (2004). The Religious Dimension of Intercultural Education: Challenges and Realities. In Council of Europe. *The Religious Dimension of Intercultural Education*. Conference Proceedings Oslo, Norway, 6 to 8 June 2004, Strasbourg: Council of Europe publishing, pp. 51-59.
- Abdallah-Pretceille, M. (2011). *L'éducation interculturelle*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Abdallah-Pretceille, M. (2012). Towards a Humanism of the Diverse. *International Journal of Education for Diversities*, 1, 133-136.
- Ain Nadzimah, A., & Chan, S. H. (2003). Gaining Linguistic Capital through a Bilingual Language Policy Innovation. *South Asian Language Review*, 13(1&2), 100-117.
- Airil Haimi, M. A. (2013). Language Use and Identity Construction in a 'Micro-Community' of Malay Undergraduates. In R. Machart, C.B. Lim, S.N. Lim and E. Yamato (Eds.), *Intersecting Identities and Interculturality: Discourse and Practice*, (pp. 91-110). Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A., Farmer, A. K., & Harnish, R. M. (2001). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Allwood, J. (1985). Intercultural Communication. *Papers in Anthropological Linguistics*, 12. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from [http://uuee.org/Intercultural\\_Communication.pdf](http://uuee.org/Intercultural_Communication.pdf)
- Allwood, J., & Kos-Dienes, D. (2010). La suédois lingua franca au travail. In F. Dervin, *Lingua francas: La véhicularité linguistique pour vivre, travailler et étudier* (pp. 137-150). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Anfara, V. A., Brown, K. M., & Mangione, T. L. (2002). Qualitative Analysis on Stage: Making the Research Process More Public. *Educational Researcher*, 31(7), 28-38.
- Arber, R. (2008). Interrogating "Imagined" Communities: Exploring the Impact of International Students in Local Schools. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 11(4), 387-404.

- Asmah, H. O. (2009). Language Planning and Image Building: The Case of Malay in Malaysia. *International Journal of The Sociology of Language*, 130(1), 49-66.
- Augé, M. (2010). *Pour une ethnographie des mondes contemporains*. Paris: Champs Essais.
- Barker, C., & Galasiński, D. (2001). *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity*. London: Sage.
- Batalha, L., Akrami, N., & Ekehammar, B. (2007). Outgroup Favoritism: The Role of Power Perception, Gender, and Conservatism. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 13(4), 38-49.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beacco, J.-C. (2007). *L'approche par compétences dans l'enseignement des langues: Enseigner à partir du Cadre Européen Commun de Référence pour les Langues*. Paris: Didier.
- Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2009). Global Generations and the Trap of Methodological Nationalism: For a Cosmopolitan Turn in the Sociology of Youth and Generation. *European Sociological Review*, 25(1), 25-36.
- Behrent, S. (2010). Langue véhiculaire et langue cible commune: La communication interalloglotte. In F. Dervin (Ed.), *Lingua francas: La véhicularité linguistique pour vivre, travailler et étudier* (pp. 49-67). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Bennett, M. J. (1998). Intercultural Communication: A Current Perspective. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication: Selected Readings* (pp. 191-214). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Berry, J. W. (2008). Globalisation and Acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32(4), 328-336.
- Beyer, P., & Beaman, L. G. (2007). *Religion, Globalization and Culture*. Leiden: Brill.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Blitvich, P. G.-C. (2009). Impoliteness and Identity in the American News Media: The "Culture Wars". *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 5(2), 273-303.
- Boldry, J. G., & Kashy, D. A. (1999). Intergroup Perception in Naturally Occurring Groups of Differential Status: A Social Relations Perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(6), 1200.
- Brander, P., Cardenas, C., Abad, J. D., Gomes, R., & Taylor, M. (2004). *Kit pédagogique "tous différents-tous égaux": Idées, ressources, méthodes et activités pour l'éducation interculturelle informelle avec des adultes et des jeunes*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

- Brewer, M., & Brown, R. (1998). Intergroup Relations. In G. Lindzey, D. Gilbert, & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 554-594). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987 [1978]). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Reprinted from: Questions and Politeness. Strategies in Social Interaction. E. Goody (Ed.), 56–324. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Byram, M., & Feng, A. (2004). Culture and Language Learning: Teaching, Research and Scholarship. *Language Teaching*, 37(3), 149-168.
- Byram, M., & Zarate, G. (1995). *Young People Facing Difference. Some Proposals for Teachers*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Byram, M., & Zarate, G. (1997). *The Sociocultural and Intercultural Dimension of Language Learning and Teaching*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Calvet, L.-J. (1999). *Pour une écologie des langues du monde*. Paris: Plon.
- Carlo, M. (di) (1998). *L'interculturel*. Paris: Clé International.
- Chartrand, T. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). The Chameleon Effect: The Perception–Behavior Link and Social Interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(6), 893-910.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Christiansen, M. H., & Kirby, S. (2003). Language Evolution: Consensus and Controversies. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7(7), 300-307.
- Cooper, P. J. (2002). *By Order of the President: The Use and Abuse of Executive Direct Action*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Corbett, J. (2003). *An Intercultural Approach to English Language Teaching*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Coulmas, F. (2013). *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speakers' Choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daedlow, K., Beckmann, V., & Arlinghaus, R. (2011). Assessing an Adaptive Cycle in a Social System under External Pressure to Change: The Importance of Intergroup Relations in Recreational Fisheries Governance. *Ecology and Society*, 16(2):3. Retrieved May 23, 2014, from <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol16/iss2/art3/>
- Dakhli, J. (2010). Histoire de la lingua franca. In F. Dervin (Ed.), *Lingua francas: La véhicularité linguistique pour vivre, travailler et étudier* (pp. 21-25). Paris: L'Harmattan.

- 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.
- Delpit, L., & Dowdy, J. K. (2002). *The Skin That We Speak: Thoughts on Language and Culture in the Classroom*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (2003). *Performance Ethnography: Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (2011). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dervin, F. (2006). *Quality in Intercultural Education: the Development of Proteophilic Competence*. European Union Education 2010: Regional Event for Vienna, Lower Austria and Burgenland. BM: BWK, City School Board for Vienna, 75-87.
- Dervin, F. (2007a). Podcasting and Intercultural Imagination: Othering and Self-solidifying around Tapas and Siesta. *Cultura, language y representación. Revista de Estudios Culturales de la Universitat Jaume I*, 4, 67-91.
- Dervin, F. (2007b). Dissociation and “Complex” Interculturality. In *Research Papers International Nordic-Baltic Conference of the World Federation of Language Teacher Associations (FIPLV) Innovations in Language Teaching and Learning in the Multicultural Context*. Riga, 15-16 June, 2007. Riga: SIA “Izglītības solī”, 59-64.
- Dervin, F. (2008). *Métamorphoses identitaires en situation de mobilité*. Turku: Turku University Press.
- Dervin, F. (2010a). Assessing Intercultural Competence in Language Learning and Teaching: a Critical Review of Current Efforts. In F. Dervin, & E. Suomela-Salmi (Eds.), *New Approaches to Assessment in Higher Education* (pp. 157-173). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Dervin, F. (2010b). Solidification et métamorphoses identitaires d'un couple mixte en Finlande. In F. Dervin (Ed.), *Lingua francas: La véhicularité linguistique pour vivre, travailler et étudier* (pp. 81-103). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Dervin, F. (2011). A plea for Change in Research on Intercultural Discourses: A ‘liquid’ Approach to the Study of the Acculturation of Chinese Students. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 6(1), 37-52.
- Dervin, F. (2012). *Impostures interculturelles*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Dervin, F. (2013a). Researching Identity and Interculturality: Moving Away from Methodological Nationalism for Good? In R. Machart, C.B. Lim, S. N. Lim, & E. Yamato (Eds.), *Intersecting Identities and Interculturality: Discourse and Practice* (pp. 8-21). Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Dervin, F. (2013b). *A Plea for Lingua Francas in Language Learning and Teaching*. Retrieved August 10, 2013, from <http://users.utu.fi/freder/linguafranca.pdf>



- Dervin, F. (2014). Towards Post-intercultural Teacher Education: Analysing 'Extreme' Intercultural Dialogue to Reconstruct Interculturality. *European Journal of Teacher Education*. Retrieved July 20, 2014, from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/02619768.2014.902441>
- Dervin, F., & Dirba, M. (2006). On Liquid Interculturality. Finnish and Latvian student teachers' perceptions of intercultural competence. In Pietilä, P., Lintunen, P. & Järvinen, H.-M. (Eds). *Language Learners of Today*. Jyväskylä: Finnish Association of Applied Linguistics (AFinLA), 64. 257-273.
- Dervin, F., & Fracchiolla, B. (2010). Computer-mediated Communication in French as a Lingua Franca. In F. Dervin (Ed.), *Lingua francas: la véhicularité linguistique pour vivre, travailler et étudier* (pp. 191-212). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Dirba, M. (2004). Introducing Intercultural Learning Course in Teacher Education. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the International 10th Anniversary Conference "Language and Identity", (pp. 55-60). Riga: Public Service Language Centre.
- Douglas, M. (1970). *Natural Symbols*. London: Cresset.
- Earley, P., & R. Peterson (2004). The Elusive Cultural Chameleon: Cultural Intelligence as a New Approach to Intercultural Training for the Global Manager. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(1), 100-115.
- Edensor, T. (2002). *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*. Oxford: Berg.
- Edwards, J. (2009). *Language and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrenreich, B. (1992). Cultural Baggage. *The New York Times Magazine*, (18). p. 16. Retrieved March 12, 2014 from <http://www.nytimes.com/1992/04/05/magazine/hers-cultural-baggage.html>
- Elder, C., & Davies, A. (2006). Assessing English as a Lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 282-301.
- Emmerson, S. (2000). *Music, Electronic Media, and Culture*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Fairclough, N. (1985). Critical and Descriptive Goals in Discourse Analysis. *Journal of pragmatics*, 9(6), 739-763.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Faist, T. (2000). Transnationalization in International Migration: Implications for the Study of Citizenship and Culture. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23(2), 189-222.
- Fan, Y. (2006). Branding the Nation: What is Being Branded? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12(1), 5-14.
- Filippakou, O., & Tapper, T. (2010). The State and the Quality Agenda: A Theoretical Approach. *Higher Education Policy*, 23(4), 475-491.
- Firth, A. (1996). The Discursive Accomplishment of Normality: On "Lingua Franca" English and Conversation Analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(2), 237-259.

- Forman, J., & Damschroder, L. (2008). Qualitative Content Analysis. In L. Jacoby, & L. A. Siminoff (Eds.), *Empirical Research for Bioethics: A Primer* (pp. 39-62). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Fought, C. (2006). *Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Franck, T. (1990). *The Power of Legitimacy among Nations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fuchs, D., & Klingemann, H.-D. (1995). Citizens and the State: A Changing Relationship? In H.-D. Klingemann, & D. Fuchs (Eds.), *Citizens and the State* (pp. 1-23). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fuchs, S. (2001). *Against Essentialism: A Theory of Culture and Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Galloway, V. (1981). Communicating in a Cultural Context: The Global Perspective. In *Proceedings of the 1981 Summer Cross-Cultural Workshop for Foreign Language Teachers*. Columbia, SC: South Carolina State Department of Education.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gilroy, P. (1990). The End of Anti-Racism. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 17(1), 71-83.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Les rites d'interaction*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.
- Greece, M. (1990). *Nationalism and Nationality*. Athens: Sage-ELIAMEP (Hellenic Foundation for Defense and Foreign Policy).
- Grillo, R. D. (2003). Cultural Essentialism and Cultural Anxiety. *Anthropological Theory*, 3(2), 157-173.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1998). Applying Anxiety/Uncertainty Management (AUM) Theory to Intercultural Adjustment Training. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22, 227-250.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Mody, B. (2002). *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gullestrup, H. (2009). The Complexity of Intercultural communication in Cross-Cultural Management. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 6, 3-21.
- Gunawardena, C. N., Wilson, P. L., & Nolla, A. C. (2003). Culture and Online Education. In M. G. Moore, & W. G. Anderson (Eds.), *Handbook of Distance Education* (pp. 753-775). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1992). Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1), 6-23.
- Hafriza, B. (2006). *Language and Social Behaviour: Voices from the Malay World*. Bangi: National University of Malaysia Press.

- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup Bias. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 575-604.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1990). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT journal*, 60(4), 385-387.
- Holliday, A. (2010). *Intercultural Communication and Ideology*. London: Sage.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1997). Active Interviewing. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice* (pp. 113-129). London: Sage.
- Hottola, P. (2004). Culture Confusion: Intercultural Adaptation in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 447-466.
- Houssaye, J. (1982). *Le triangle pédagogique*. Retrieved November 6, 2013, from <http://shsapp.univrouen.fr/civiic/archives/LE%20TRIANGLE%20PEDAGOGIQUE.pdf>
- Hymes, D. (1971). *On Communicative Competence* (Vol. 35). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current Perspectives on Teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *Tesol Quarterly*, 40, 157-181.
- Ji, L., Zhang, Z., & Nisbett, R. E. (2004). Is It Culture or Is It Language? Examination of Language Effects in Cross-Cultural Research on Categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(1), 57-65.
- Jiang, W. (2000). The Relationship between Culture and Language. *ELT Journal*, 54(4), 328-334.
- Johnson, K. (2001). *An Introduction to Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Department of Information of Malaysia (2011). *Dasar-dasar Kerajaan Dalam Membentuk Perpaduan*. Retrieved May 8, 2014, from <http://pmr.penerangan.gov.my/index.php/nkra/11743-dasar-dasar-kerajaan-dalam-membentuk-perpaduan.html>
- Kanno, Y., & Norton, B. (2003). Imagined Communities and Educational Possibilities: Introduction. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(4), 241-249.



- Kärchner-Ober, R. (2007). Dichotomie entre constitution d'un état de droit et mondialisation dans le contexte de la Malaisie : perspective sociolinguistique. *Droit et cultures*, 54 (2), 97-122. Retrieved March 12, 2013, from <http://droitcultures.revues.org/1836>
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (2009). *L' énonciation*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1999). *L'énonciation: De la subjectivité dans le langage*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (2005). Politeness in France: How to Buy Bread Politely. In L. Hickey & M. Stewart (Eds.), *Politeness in Europe* (pp. 29–57). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kitayama, S. (2002). Culture and Basic Psychological Processes--Toward a System View of Culture: Comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(1), 89-96.
- Knapp, M. L., & Daly, J. A. (2002). *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Knapp, M. L., Hall, J. A., & Horgan, T. G. (2014). *Nonverbal Communication in Human Interaction* (8th ed.). Wadsworth, OH: Cengage Learning.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- KPM, The Ministry of Education (2004). *Information Management Division*. Putrajaya: The Ministry of Education Malaysia.
- Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (2013). Culture in Foreign Language Teaching. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(1), 57-78.
- Krasner, I. (1999). The Role of Culture in Language Teaching. *Dialog on Language Instruction*, 13(1&2), 79-88.
- Kutler, S. (1997). *Abuse of Power*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Lacassagne, M. F., Salès-Wuillemin, É., Castel, P., & Jébrane, A. (2001). La catégorisation d'un exogroupe à travers une tâche d'association de mots. *Papers on Social Representations*, 10(7), 1-7.
- Lambert, W. E. (1984). Culture and Language as Factors in Learning and Education. In J. Mallea, & J. C. Young (Eds.), *Cultural Diversity and Canadian Education: Issues and Innovations* (pp. 233-264). Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Lee, M. N. (2000). Education in Malaysia. In N. P. Stromquist, & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation Across Cultures* (pp. 315-329). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Leonardelli, G. J., Pickett, C. L., & Brewer, M. B. (2010). Optimal Distinctiveness Theory: A Framework for Social Identity, Social Cognition, and Intergroup Relations. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 63-113.
- Lewis, M. P., Gary, F. S., & Charles, D. F. (Eds.). (2013). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International Publications. Retrieved April 11, 2013, from <http://www.ethnologue.com/statistics/country>
- Lim, S. N., & Machart, R. (2013). L'expansion du français en contexte multilingue 'saturé': Le cas de la Malaisie. *Synergies Chili*, 9, 51-61.
- Lin, A. M. (2008). *Problematizing Identity: Everyday Struggles in Language, Culture, and Education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lustig, M., & Koester, J. (1999). *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication across Cultures* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Machart, R., & Lim, S.N. (2013a). De la diversité des écoles à la diversité à l'école: L'école primaire malaisienne en questions. *Revue internationale d'éducation de Sèvres*, (63), 67-75.
- Machart, R., & Lim, S. N. (2013b). Identity And Language vs. Identification Through Language: A Historical Perspective. In R. Machart, C. B. Lim, S. N. Lim, & E. Yamato (Eds.), *Intersecting Identities and Interculturality: Discourse and Practice* (pp. 22-44). Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Machart, R., & Lim, S. N. (2013c). Mobilité académique et ajustement au contexte d'accueil: La fin du choc culturel ? In R. Machart, & F. Dervin (Eds), *Les mobilités et migrations académiques autrement : Nouveaux espaces, nouveaux enjeux, nouveaux besoins* (pp. 149-182). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Machart, R., & Lim, S. N. (2009). L'Acquisition de l'intonation française par les Malaisiens: Le français en L3 après l'anglais. In G. Forlot (Ed.), *L'anglais et le plurilinguisme* (pp. 141-156). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Machart, R., Lim, S.N., & Lim, C.B. (2010). Chinois de Malaisie et langues européennes, une question d'affinités. In F. Dervin (Ed.), *Lingua francas: La véhicularité linguistique pour vivre, travailler et étudier* (pp. 213-228). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Magilvy, J. (2003). Qualitative Designs. In K. Oman, M. Krugman, & R. Fink (Eds.), *Nursing Research Secrets* (pp. 123-128). Philadelphia, PA: Hanley & Belfus, Inc.
- Mantero, M. (2007). (Ed.). *Identity and Second Language Learning: Culture, Inquiry, and Dialogic Activity in Educational Contexts*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Mao, L. R. (1994). Beyond Politeness Theory: "Face" Revisited and Renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21(5), 451-486.

- Marx, H., & Moss, D. M. (2011). Please Mind the Culture Gap: Intercultural Development During a Teacher Education Study Abroad Program. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(1), 35-47.
- Mauranen, A. (2006). A Rich Domain of ELF-the ELFA Corpus of Academic Discourse. In A. Mauranen, & M. Metsä-Ketelä (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca* [Special issue]. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 145-159.
- Maynard, D. W., & Turowetz, J. (2013). Language Use and Social Interaction. In J. DeLamater & A. Ward, *Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research* (pp. 251-279). New York, NY: Springer.
- McArthur, T. (2002). *The Oxford Guide to World Englishes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Terracciano, A. (2005). Universal Features of Personality Traits from the Observer's Perspective: Data from 50 Cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 547-561.
- McNamara, C. (1999). *General Guidelines for Conducting Interviews*. Retrieved November 18, 2013, from Free Management Library: <http://managementhelp.org/businessresearch/interviews.htm>
- Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Nonverbal Communication*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Messick, D. M., & Mackie, D. M. (1989). Intergroup Relations. *Annual Reviews of Psychology*, 40, 45-81.
- Meunier, O. (2007). *Approches interculturelles en éducation*. Lyon: Institut National De Recherche Pédagogique.
- Meyer, J. W., & Jepperson, R. L. (2000). The 'Actors' of Modern Society: The Cultural Construction of Social Agency. *Sociological Theory*, 18(1), 100-120.
- Miller, S. L., Maner, J. K., & Becker, D. V. (2010). Self-protective Biases in Group Categorization: Threat Cues Shape the Psychological Boundary between "Us" and "Them". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(1), 62-77.
- Minahan, J. (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations: Ethnic and National Groups Around the World*. Westport, MA: Greenwood Press.
- Miyahara, A. (2004). Toward Theorizing Japanese Interpersonal Communication Competence from a Non-Western Perspective. In F. Edmund Jandt (Ed.), *Intercultural Communication: A Global Reader* (pp. 279-291). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ministry of Higher Education of Malaysia (2007). *The National Higher Education Strategic Plan Beyond 2020*. Putrajaya: The Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia Press.

- Ministry of Higher Education of Malaysia (2011). *Chapter 6: Pelajar Malaysia di Luar Negara Malaysian Students Studying Abroad*, Putrajaya: Planning and Research Division, Retrieved March 20, 2013, from [http://www.mohe.gov.my/web\\_statistik/statistik2010/BAB6\\_PELAJAR\\_MALAY\\_SIA\\_DI\\_LUAR\\_NEGARA.pdf](http://www.mohe.gov.my/web_statistik/statistik2010/BAB6_PELAJAR_MALAY_SIA_DI_LUAR_NEGARA.pdf)
- Moran, P. R. (2001). *Teaching Culture: Perspectives in Practice*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Moran, R. T., Harris, P. R., & Moran, S. (2007). *Managing Cultural Differences*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Muijs, D. (2011). *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Nault, D. (2006). Going Global: Rethinking Culture Teaching in ELT Contexts. *Culture and Curriculum*, 19(3), 314-328.
- Norton, B. (2010). Language and Identity. In N. Hornberger, & S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Education* (pp. 349-369). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Nunan, D., & Choi, J. (2010). *Language and Culture: Reflective Narratives and the Emergence of Identity*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Oliveri, F. (2008). Policies for a Fair Multicultural Society. On the Use and Abuse of "Culture" in Relation to Migration Issues. In *Reconciling Migrants' Well-being and the Public Interest Welfare State, Firms and Citizenship in Transition* (pp. 23-55). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Otten, S., & Wentura, D. (2001). Self-Anchoring and In-Group Favoritism: An Individual Profiles Analysis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37(6), 525-532.
- Ozog, C. (1990). The English Language in Malaysia and Its Relationship with the National Language. In R. B. Baldauf, & A. Duke (Eds.), *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp. 305-318). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Park, B., & Rothbart, M. (1982). Perception of Out-Group Homogeneity and Levels of Social Categorization: Memory for the Subordinate Attributes of In-Group and Out-Group Members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(6), 1051-1068.
- Peng, Y. (2014). How Chinese Culture Goes to the World through Literary Translation. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(2), 343-347.
- Pennebaker, J. W., Mehl, M. R., & Niederhoffer, K. G. (2003). Psychological Aspects of Natural Language Use: Our Words, Our Selves. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54(1), 547-577.
- Perdue, C. W., Dovidio, J. F., Gurtman, M. B., & Tyler, R. B. (1990). Us and Them: Social Categorization and the Process of Intergroup Bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(3), 475-486.



- Privman, R., Hiltz, S. R., & Wang, Y. (2013). In-Group (Us) versus Out-Group (Them) Dynamics and Effectiveness in Partially Distributed Teams. *Professional Communication, IEEE Transactions*, 56(1), 33-49.
- Raday, F. (2003). Culture, Religion and Gender. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 1, 663-715.
- Rathje, S. (2007). Intercultural Competence: The Status and Future of a Controversial Concept. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 7(4), 254-266.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 2, 87-121.
- Renard, R., & Van Vlasselaer, J. J. (1976). *FL Teaching with an Integrated Methodology: The SGAV Methodology*. Paris: Didier.
- Rogerson-Revell, P. (2007). Using English for International Business: A European Case Study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(1), 103-120.
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.
- Sautman, B. (2003). "Cultural Genocide" and Tibet. *Texas International Law Journal*, 38(173), 173-248.
- Schmid, C. L. (2001). *The Politics of Language: Conflict, Identity, and Cultural Pluralism in Comparative Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmitt, D. P., Realo, A., Voracek, M., & Allik, J. (2008). Why Can't a Man Be More Like a Woman? Sex Differences in Big Five Personality Traits across 55 Cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(1), 168-182.
- Schwartz, S. J., Zamboanga, B. L., & Weisskirch, R. S. (2008). Broadening the Study of the Self: Integrating the Study of Personal Identity and Cultural Identity. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(2), 635-651.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1-23.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research Perspectives on Teaching English as a Lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209-239.
- Sercu, L. (2002). Autonomous Learning and the Acquisition of Intercultural Communicative Competence: Some Implications for Course Development. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 15(1), 61-74.
- Sercu, L. (2004). Assessing Intercultural Competence: A Framework for Systematic Test Development in Foreign Language Education and Beyond. *Intercultural Education*, 15(1), 73-89.
- Shehadeh, A. (2003). Learner Output, Hypothesis Testing, and Internalizing Linguistic Knowledge. *System*, 31(2), 155-171.

- Sherzer, J. (1987). Discourse-Centered Approach to Language and Culture. *American Anthropologist*, 89(2), 295-309.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London: Sage.
- Smith, A. D. (2010). *Nationalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- St Claire, B. A. (2005). *Carrying Cultural Baggage: The Contribution of Socio-cultural Anthropology to Cross-cultural Coaching*. Oxford: Oxford Brookes University.
- Stewart, E. C. (2012). Communicating Interculturally: Becoming Competent. In L. A. Samovar, R. E. Porter, & E. R. McDaniel (Eds.), *Intercultural Communication: A Reader* (13th Edition ed., pp. 422-472). Wadsworth, OH: Cengage Learning.
- Storch, N. (1997). The Editing Talk of Adult ESL Learners. *Language Awareness*, 6(4), 221-232.
- Tafarodi, R. W. (2013). *Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thiesse, A.-M. (2000). Des fictions créatrices: Les identités nationales. *Romantisme*, (110), 51-62.
- Thiesse, A.-M. (1999). *La création des identités nationales: Europe XVIIIe-XIXe siècle*. Paris: Le Seuil.
- Tournebise, C. (2012). The Place for a Renewed Interculturality in Finnish Higher Education. *International Journal of Education for Diversities*, 1, 103-116.
- Trochim, W. M., & Donnelly, J. P. (2008). *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*. Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog.
- Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a Cognitive Redefinition of the Social Group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations* (pp. 15-36). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1989). Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power. *Communication Yearbook*, 12, 18-59.
- Vásquez, O. A., Pease-Alvarez, L., & Shannon, S. M. (1994). *Pushing Boundaries: Language and Culture in a Mexicano Community*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ware, P. D., & Kramsch, C. (2005). Toward an Intercultural Stance: Teaching German and English through Telecollaboration. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(2), 190-205.
- Wessendorf, S. (2008). Culturalist Discourses on Inclusion and Exclusion: The Swiss Citizen Debate. *Social Anthropology*, 16(2), 187-202.

- Whorf, B. (1956). *Language, Thought and Reality*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Wimmer, A. (2014). Ethnic Boundary Making as Strategic Action: Reply to My Critics. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(5), 834-842.
- Wodak, R. (2001). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 63-93). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2001). Discourse and Racism. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 372-397). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Zangwill, I. (Performer). (1908). *The Melting Pot*. New York, NY: Comedy Theater.
- Zarate, G. (1995). Cultural Awareness and the Classification of Documents for the Description of Foreign Culture. *Language Learning Journal*, 11(1), 24-25.
- Zubairi, A. M., & Sarudin, I. H. (2009). Motivation to Learn a Foreign Language in Malaysia. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 9 (2), 73-87.