

How Do Language Learners Enact Interculturality in E-Communication Exchanges?



Colette Mrowa-Hopkins and Olga Sánchez Castro

Abstract E-communication offers considerable potential for learning about one's own and others' cultures and enhancing intercultural understanding. However, an in-depth analysis of variables related to openness to others, critical self-awareness and self-analysis, which are central to developing intercultural communicative competence (Byram 1997), cannot be easily tested (Dervin and Vlad 2010; Martin 2015; Zarate 2003). With this challenge in mind, our project engages language learners in three universities in Australia, Germany and Mexico in cross-cultural exchanges via Skype. Discourse analytical tools are used to document how learners talk about culture and for what purposes, with the aim to explore: (1) participants' willingness to engage in collaborative processing of cultural information; and (2) participants' online "intercultural dynamics" (Ogay 2000, p. 53). Arguments are made in support of a "developmental paradigm" (Hammer 2015) that shifts the intercultural lens beyond the individual's skills and traits to the process through which interculturality is constructed between interlocutors. By examining exchanges with a focus on features of dialogic interaction whereby students recontextualize their own knowledge with their interlocutor, this study illustrates how students mediate their own learning (Kohler 2015) and develop an awareness of their own attitudes.

Keywords E-communication · Cultural difference · Cultural relativity · Intercultural awareness · Discourse analysis · Collaborative processing · Intercultural dynamics · Dialogic interaction

C. Mrowa-Hopkins · O. Sánchez Castro (✉)
Flinders University, Bedford Park, SA, Australia
e-mail: colette.mrowa-hopkins@flinders.edu.au; olga.castro@flinders.edu.au

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020
J. Fornasiero et al. (eds.), *Intersections in Language Planning and Policy*,
Language Policy 23, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50925-5_19

1 Introduction

After decades of research on intercultural competence, the question we need to ask is: are we getting any clearer in our definition and assessment of knowledge and skills needed to become interculturally competent? In recent scholarly debates on what is required to become interculturally competent, concerns have been raised about relying on an outdated model based on the mainstream “cognitive/affective/behavioural” model (Martin 2015). Instead, arguments are being made in favour of a “developmental paradigm” that is grounded in the “dynamic interaction that arises between individuals” (Hammer 2015). Such a constructionist-grounded approach shifts the intercultural lens beyond the individual’s skills and traits to the process through which cultural meanings are discursively constructed in interaction (i.e., enacting interculturality). In other words, the measure of intercultural competence should be based on the experience of the individual’s engagement with cultural difference.

From a pedagogical perspective, how can we facilitate the development of intercultural competence for language learners? Many studies of intercultural language learning in online contexts initially focused on exchanges of cultural information in the belief that simple exposure to target language culture mediated by its target language speakers would contribute to intercultural awareness. However, according to Hammer (2015), examination of practical applications generally provides weak evidence of students becoming more effective at navigating the murky waters of cultural differences. More recent studies, for example, Ware (2013) and Tudini (2007), go beyond the raising of intercultural awareness to challenge students to reflect upon their own culture. They examine the role of dyadic construction of interculturality in the second language classroom in an attempt to identify key interactional features that promote intercultural negotiation.

The focus of this study is thus to report on the implementation of an online Skype exchange project which aims to promote intercultural learning and understanding between students across three universities located in Australia, Mexico and Germany. It examines students’ self-recorded exchanges and assesses them within the debate on the inclusion of interculturality in language learning and teaching. By analysing the negotiation of meaning that occurs between exchange partners, our study seeks to highlight the social nature of “intercultural mediation” (Liddicoat 2014; Kohler 2015), where rapport building, that is, the development of personal relationships between the participants, may have a significant impact on the negotiation of intercultural knowledge and attitudes.

Research has shown that e-communication tools have multiple advantages. Skype, in particular, provides an authentic frame for both language and culture learning (see Guth and Marini-Maio 2010; Liddicoat and Tudini 2013; Taillefer and Muñoz-Luna 2014; Tian and Wang 2010). It provides a synchronous vehicle for increased exposure to L2 input via native speaker encounters, combining both visual and audio information, essential for accurate encoding and decoding of messages. Skype also provides a cost-effective opportunity for intercultural exchanges,

exposing students, who may not otherwise have the opportunity, to sustained interaction with persons from other cultural groups. As our project aims to increase students' sensitivity to diverse cultural practices, and to develop a broader understanding of the conventions, values and belief systems that operate within their own and others' cultural domains, the use of Skype tools seems thus particularly suited to meet these objectives.

2 The Project Rationale

Initially, this pilot project set out to explore traces of evidence of cultural learning in undergraduate students' Skype interactions. However, as the project was developing, we became increasingly aware that "evidence" might not be the right word for what we were hoping to find. According to Dervin and Vlad (2010), a "culturalist" approach, which seeks to document the development of intercultural (Belz and Kiginger 2002) or pragmatic (Belz 2003) competencies along the model proposed by Byram (1997), reduces the other to national or cultural characteristics. Rather, these authors advocate examining how multiple cultures and identities are co-constructed and used to define oneself in interaction. The cultural content of learners' exchanges cannot be taken as proof, or evidence of culture learning, and is therefore not as important as how they mediate the multidimensional aspects of culture in interaction. Our analysis and reflections are therefore anchored in a discursive approach, applying Levy's (2007) multidimensional understanding of culture to the analysis of "cultural related episodes". Zakir et al. define these "as any part of a dialogue produced in the teletandem sessions in which the students focus on any interest, explanation or inquisitiveness about their own culture or the partner's" (2016, p. 26).

Our approach uses the five dimensions of culture as described by Levy (2007) because they broaden the understanding of culture as: (a) *elemental*; (b) *relative*; (c) *group membership*; (d) *contested* and (e) *individual (variable and multiple)*. According to Levy:

Culture as elemental refers to one's cultural orientation, values and beliefs system that are taken for granted and seem mostly unproblematic. It colours our understanding and interpretation of other groups' cultural experiences.

Culture as relative refers to recognizing one's own and others' cultural practices and comparing or contrasting them. This view often leads to generalizations.

Culture as group membership refers to group identification (e.g., age, religion, language, etc.). This is quite noticeable when interlocutors are drawn to one another on account of their perceived shared belonging to a particular social group.

Culture as contested may be associated with "culture shock" at both an individual level and a broader societal level, where one's core beliefs and values may be challenged. In our data this manifests itself through the types of questions and responses that reflect inquisitiveness about cultural groups or practices.

Culture as individual (i.e., variable and multiple) in which culture is interpreted as a variable and subjective concept. This is revealed when intercultural partners share individual experiences that are "subject to individual interpretation." (Levy 2007, p. 111)

It is important to keep in mind, as Levy (2007) explains, that “the concept of culture is essentially holistic in nature and each dimension overlaps and builds upon the one before” (cited in Zakir et al. 2016, p. 23).

3 Organization of the Project

The corpus used in this study is part of a larger study that ran across several semesters in 2014 and 2015. It involved pairing two cohorts of Flinders University undergraduate students with overseas students. The first cohort were intermediate-level Spanish language learners (Group 1/SPAN) who spoke English as their first language and were paired with advanced-level English language learners at Universidad Panamericana in Mexico. The second cohort of Flinders University students were enrolled in “Intercultural Communication” (Group 2/LING), spoke English as their first language and were paired with advanced-level English language learners at Universität Paderborn in Germany. We chose to focus on overseas students who had advanced levels of English so that language difficulties would be minimal.

Participants were requested to email each other to arrange a first meeting over Skype, to introduce themselves, and subsequently to meet in pairs on at least three separate occasions via Skype at their chosen location. Participants were informed that they would be expected to audio-record their conversations for a minimum of three 15-minute sessions over a 12-week semester, and to hand up the self-recorded conversations for analysis by the researchers. All recordings of exchanges were conducted on a voluntary basis and the only incentive offered to students was the benefit they would derive from participating in such a project. In total, five pairs of students completed the project in Semester 2 2015. Their recordings constitute the data for this report.

Lead questions on cultural themes were suggested by the instructors and were provided to all exchange partners. These were selected based on their relevance to everyday encounters. The proposed themes sought to promote mutual give and take between the participants and provided prompts for exchanges on cultural knowledge, negotiating one’s understanding and interpretation. General themes selected for the intercultural exchanges included: (a) social conventions in everyday situations; (b) young people’s social life; (c) cultural celebrations; (d) attitudes towards different cultural groups and minorities; (e) conflict in relationships; and (f) social issues (e.g., same sex marriage; euthanasia; binge drinking; the environment; etc.) (See Appendix A).

4 Analysis and Discussion

Recorded data were transcribed and analysed by us to determine how the participants coming from different cultural backgrounds approached the cultural dimensions. Excerpts taken from our corpus will highlight key elements of the process of

enacting interculturality that we seek to document. We discuss, firstly, an excerpt from the Skype exchange between the Australian and German participants and, secondly, an excerpt from the Australian and Mexican participants. As we are about to see in the following excerpts, various dimensions of culture co-exist that we think are representative of participants' engagement in culture learning as they discursively co-construct meanings about culture.

4.1 Looking at Excerpt 1—B-K and Bel

In Group 2 (Skype session 2), we identified several topics involving cross-cultural comparisons of lifestyle, social practices, and social groups, thus signalling one's understanding of a foreign culture (see Excerpt 1 in Appendix B). In looking at how the partners process cultural information, the data provide evidence of the multidimensional aspects of culture as outlined by Levy. At the start of this session, both speakers briefly establish group similarities between young people across the two countries. B-K (the German student) is trying to open up the topic by alluding to differences based on observation of social groups (young people), but Bel (the Australian student) dismisses this by emphasizing the similarities rather than the differences between them. Culture can thus be seen as *group* membership, indicating the need to establish rapport between the interlocutors. The topic of youth culture, however, is not taken up because presumably it does not require deeper inquiry (youth culture being taken as *elemental*). Alternatively, it could be that Bel is deliberately trying to avoid disagreement and wishes to set off the discussion on consensual terms, the weather being generally considered culturally acceptable for the purpose of small talk. This is supported by other studies of telecollaborative communication. For example, Zakir et al. note

[...] that participants frequently try to find something in common with their partners abroad, especially with regard to social practices and lifestyles. This can be interpreted as a need, or willingness, to identify with one another in order to get "closer" and make the interaction more pleasant and friendly (2016, p. 24).

In turn 5 (T5), B-K reframes the topic by taking up the lead question suggested by the instructor, i.e., "knowledge about each other's country and culture". After a brief mention of the weather, B-K quickly raises issues of historical and political consequence for Australians (T11, T13, T15) by mentioning what she knows about Australia, i.e., mainly the Indigenous people and Australia's historical beginning as a penal colony. Feeling that the topic is too contentious, Bel manages to shift her understanding of culture onto safer ground by providing factual geographical information. In doing so, she adopts a didactic voice, mentioned by Liddicoat and Tudini (2013) in their study of chat interactions between native speakers and non-native speakers (NS/NNS). Bel also takes on the role of South Australian tourism advocate, stressing intra-cultural differences within Australia. For example, she emphasizes the distinctive features of South Australia in terms of accents, wineries, and evaluating the attraction of Melbourne vs. Adelaide. Later, in T44, she tentatively offers to talk about her knowledge of Germany in order to remain on the topic of

establishing solid cultural facts about the other's culture (T45), but her attempt is aborted by B-K who is not satisfied with the responses to her initial inquiry on Australian Indigenous groups. In T50, B-K is seeking to deepen her understanding of Indigenous Australians, and perhaps hopes that Bel can clarify the negative representation that her Australian friend, Alana, has reported to her about this group.

What has happened is that Bel is driven to a position which requires calling into question a dominant Australian historical and cultural narrative, which she outwardly rejects as a negative stereotype. Although she distances herself from this view—"...it's a very unusual topic in Australia because historically at school we haven't been taught much about what actually happened to the Indigenous Australians in the history" (T51)—, it is not clear which perspective Bel adopts on the historical events that shaped the cultural context of Australia. This would require her embracing varying viewpoints dealing with conflicting interpretations of events and forcing her to adopt, to quote Kramsch, "a didactic moral stance" (2013, p. 28). From this transcript then, we can clearly see elements of *contested culture within the larger national culture* as mentioned by Levy (2007), but unlike the other excerpts, there is little explicit marking of awareness of *cultural relativity*.

By contrast, focusing on another brief excerpt taken from an exchange between Din (Australian) and Jul (German), the following quote demonstrates the need to go beyond stereotypes and representations, and explores culture as a *relative* concept. In this excerpt, the students are talking about a cultural practice—food consumed at Christmas—as a marker of identity and discuss it as individual, variable and multiple.

[...] we eat certain foods on certain days (.2) there are many families who eat certain things on Christmas...like fish probably. I think most people eat fish (.) **but my brother and I we don't like fish so there has never been fish at Christmas but maybe that's something I would introduce to my life if I were to live abroad.** I would suddenly adopt traditions that I didn't have when living in Germany because I live here and I know I am German but when I am abroad maybe I'll have to try harder to be some kind of German who lives abroad. I will maybe try to be more (..) person at first and then try to go out and learn new things new stuff (.) **That's interesting I haven't thought about that before.** (T495–504)

Interestingly, the German student becomes aware that if she were to travel or live abroad, she would enact a German cultural identity based on her family traditions.

4.2 Looking at Excerpt 2: Irene and Myra

In the following exchange between Irene (Australian) and Myra (Mexican), taken from Group 1 (Skype session 2), our analysis further reveals how the notion of *cultural relativity* is discursively constructed (See Excerpt 2 in Appendix B).

In T89, Myra asks Irene to provide information on how Adelaideans spend their public holidays and, in particular, Australia Day. This request is met with some hesitation from Irene as she states that Myra's question is a difficult one to answer and

presents the celebration of this public holiday as both a culture-relative and a culture-contested experience.

Culture as membership is shown in the way Irene explains which group, or members of the Adelaide community, she aligns with in the celebration of this holiday. We note that Irene displays membership to the non-Aboriginal community in T94, and recognizes Aboriginal people as part of the Australian population in T92, to which she also belongs. The dimension of *culture as relative* is also displayed in T92 as Irene explains that this holiday is experienced differently depending on the social group with which one aligns. That is, she identifies herself as a non-Aboriginal person, and at the same time she distances herself from white Australians who celebrate Australia Day.

Irene's personal interpretation of the celebration of this day is further developed in the conversation, and we can observe both dimensions of culture as *contested* and as *individual* in her discourse. While in T94, Irene states that, like most white Australians, she also spends the day drinking, having a barbecue and going to the beach, this membership dimension coexists with the identification of points of contestation towards cultural representations. Specifically, in turns 92, 94 and 96, Irene states that Australia Day is the day when Australia was invaded by the British. Hence, she argues, it is a very sad day for Aboriginal Australians. Indeed, Irene further states in T102, that she is embarrassed at the fact that Australia Day is celebrated, and that white Australians do not respect how Aboriginal Australians experience this celebration. Moreover, she interprets these differing perspectives as indexing division in Australian society between white and Indigenous people.

This triggers Myra's engagement with Irene's moral stance on whether Australia Day should be celebrated. First, in T101, Myra lets Irene know that, based on her own research into the issue, she is aware of social fragmentation in relation to this celebration. Given the timing of this exchange, which coincides with the Party for Freedom's attempt to mark the anniversary of the Cronulla riots in Sydney,¹ Myra may be aware of the tensions provoked by this event as reported in the media. Of course, she could simply be referring to her knowledge of social division in Australia in a more general sense. What we can ascertain, however, in T105, is that Myra attempts to connect with Irene's arguments. She requests confirmation as to whether, in celebrating Australia Day, the "social [groupings are] just like separate", that is, whether this celebration is politically positioned as a celebration for all Australians or, as Irene assertively states, Aboriginal people's opposition is ignored. Although they are both collaborating in establishing their knowledge of Australian culture, one notes an imbalance in the development of the participants' discourse, as Irene

¹The Cronulla riots refer to ten days of violent racial tension which occurred in the Sydney suburb of Cronulla beach between 4 and 13 December 2005. The events were sparked by a brawl between three off-duty life savers and a group of young men of Middle Eastern appearance. These dramatic events were reported widely across the Australian media and the plan by the Party for Freedom to organize a rally to mark the tenth anniversary of the Cronulla riots in December 2015 was thwarted by a federal court ruling. A documentary covering the events, *10 days that shocked the nation*, was made in 2016.

tends to take over and misses the opportunity to seek further elaboration on Myra's knowledge of social issues in Australia.

Overall, the dynamics observed in these exchanges point to the participants' willingness to engage in collaborative processing of cultural information. There is evidence of inquisitiveness in Myra's reflection, and of critical analysis in Irene's contributions. This analysis brings into the discussion a critical reflection on how the celebration of a public holiday reveals marked differences in perspectives and beliefs from different communities within a given national milieu.

5 Final Words

The online exchanges between the two Flinders student groups and their overseas partners yielded rich and complex results, all of which would benefit from further exploration. Based on the limited data presented here, our analyses reveal that:

- (i). Overwhelmingly, exchange partners draw on cultural similarities to establish a rapport, preferring to align themselves with each other (as illustrated in Excerpt 1). A question that could be further investigated is whether establishing a rapport on the basis of finding common ground is simply due to a lack of familiarity between the participants or a reluctance to engage further in intercultural negotiation.
- (ii). Participants engage in identifying differences that they perceive at many levels, as if they were trying to establish their *otherness* (see the two Australian-German exchanges). We found examples (particularly in Excerpt 2) that illustrate how a reflective space is thus created, within which challenges to the participants' own world view shape their developing intercultural understanding.
- (iii). Micro analyses looking at explanatory sequences and reformulations still need to be carried out to reveal more about how cultural representations are negotiated in online exchanges and to ascertain the affordances that this medium provides in fostering the development of learners' critical understanding. Pragmatic differences could be highlighted along the lines provided by Liddicoat (2014). For example, "decentring" could be fostered if learners are guided to reflect on how pragmatic acts are linguistically and culturally enacted. Specifically, by adopting Eggins and Slade's (2004) systemic functional approach to analysing discourse, learners could be led into identifying speakers' differing roles in the construction of culture-related episodes. This approach may enable practitioners and learners to jointly uncover: a) speech functions selected in dialogic structure (i.e., how learners construct social interaction by using language to align themselves with others and to position themselves in the exchange activity); b) levels of discourse interactivity (i.e., the degree to which interaction is predicated on the incorporation of reference to interlocutors' content and acknowledgment of prior conversational contributions); and c) the precise discursive moves that exemplify intercultural

communicative competence and enable its further development (Ryshina-Pankova 2018, p. 219).

In summary, a close analysis of students' conversations indicates that online intercultural exchanges provide opportunities for students to co-construct cultural knowledge. In the excerpts that we have presented, interculturality is enacted as learners explore cultural representations based on self-reflection on both their own and other cultural perspectives, and as they draw from each other's personal experiences. By documenting aspects of learners' emerging awareness of their own and others' cultural practices and attitudes in a context of authenticity, this study contributes to the scholarship on interculturality and intercultural learning.

As stated earlier, in this project we are not concerned with making claims about the success or failure of intercultural competence in terms of pre-set goals. We believe that promoting critical understanding through authentic contact is ultimately crucial for developing intercultural awareness and cultural sensitivity amongst our students, given that "nowadays, focus is on connections not just differences; multi-layered affiliations, not unidimensional identities, contact rather than community" (Canagarajah 2011, p. 212).

The use of culture-related episodes can serve as a springboard for initiating critical reflection in the classroom prior to engaging in online exchanges, and for re-examining the data in follow-up sessions. Specifically, structured small group discussions on transcribed intercultural exchanges are likely to enable a collaborative exploration of the identified culture-related episodes. These can lead from the discovery of cultural knowledge to further questioning around the complexity of students' own perspectives and assumptions. We believe it is critical to create such opportunities for moving beyond the dichotomous discourse of uniformity and diversity.

Appendixes

Appendix A

Lead Questions to Serve as Prompts for Exploring Cultural Themes

1. Information gathering and description: conduct a brief conversation around each other's country location, place, region. What do you already know about each other's country? Reflect on what it means to be a German or an Australian person.
2. Describe a particular festival or celebration of historical significance for your own cultural identity.
3. Information gathering and reflection: What do young people do and where do they do it when they go out? In what ways is your social life similar to or different from that of your friends? What do you think of those similarities or differences?

4. What prejudices do you have about other people? What are they based on? Appearances? Behaviours? Where do you think they come from? Your family background? The media? How do you deal with stereotypes?
5. Explore a social issue (e.g., same sex marriage; euthanasia; binge drinking; the environment, etc.). Express your personal opinion.
6. Explore a particular everyday situation (e.g., gift giving; how to accept/refuse an invitation; a family meal; the use of space in your home/city/university; etc.). Can you draw similarities with /differences from your partner's cultural practices?
7. Explore personal relationships within different environments: dealing with conflict within the family environment; friendships; girls/boys; socializing; taboo topics?
8. Recall two or three occasions when you found a display of polite behaviour particularly striking and try to work out why this was. What do you think of the statement one often hears: "Everyone is rude these days"? Does it make any sense?

Appendix B

Excerpt 1 Bel (Australian) and B-K (German)—Skype session 2, (Group 2/LING)

1.	B-K	It's not my first time to Australia actually (.) A couple of years ago I spent a semester abroad and I lived with an Australian girl. She was from Melbourne (.)
2.	Bel	ok. That's excellent (.)
3.	B-K	so I know there's a (xx) like a difference in life from observing young people in Australia and in Germany I think and other
4.	Bel	yeah yeah I guess there are different climates but other than that I think maybe socially it's kind of the same (.2) I don't know what questions you have but do you have something about broad themes? Is that similar to what we have?
5.	B-K	yah I have (.) knowledge about another country and culture (.) yeah (.) I think maybe we can talk about that today and then if you want
6.	Bel	yeah we can do that (.2) yeah ok (.) do you want to go first
7.	B-K	yeah I don't know yeah (.) should I tell you about what I know about Australia or=
8.	Bel	=yeah yeah
9.	B-K	ok where do I start then hum...I know it's really (x) the weather is nice
10.	Bel	((laughs))
11.	B-K	I know that you have (x) a lot of Indigenous people there
12.	Bel	yeah
13.	B-K	and I know like historical wise I know basically Australia used to be a prison I think
14.	Bel	oh yeah yeah (.)
15.	B-K	the early days I know that (.) basically until now
16.	Bel	yeah (.) do you know about South Australia?
17.	B-K	no not in particular no (.)
18.	Bel	ok (.) all right

(continued)

Excerpt 1 (continued)

19.	B-K	can you tell me something about it? Is it different from (the rest of) Australia
20.	Bel	yeah (.) we've got I think 7 states and territories so hum I don't know whether you've seen a map of Australia but it's divided into different areas
21.	B-K	yeah
22.	Bel	and culturally we are still fairly similar all the way around but our accents do change between some of the states
23.	B-K	ok
24.	Bel	which I don't know whether you'd recognise or not but I think some people like your friend from Melbourne would say things slightly different to the way I would say them (.) so they she might say /skæ:l/ and I say /sku:l/which is it's only a slight difference but yeah a few differences there and then as far as being warm and cold I guess I think it's a lot warmer than Germany is
25.	B-K	I think so too ((laughs))
26.	Bel	yeah (.) we do have where I am from in SA we do have 4 seasons. So we have winter as well. We don't get snow here (.) it's not cold enough (.) Very occasionally very rarely we might get one day where it might snow on a little mountain that we have but as soon as it hits the ground pretty much it melts so that's not nothing like Germany in that way yeah hum I guess SA is very well-known for wine for wine
27.	B-K	ok
28.	Bel	yeah so we've got lots of wine regions so if you go travelling you can see a lot of grapevines and hum yeah it's probably one of our big industries hum (.) and then other than that ((laughs)) we're always comparing SA to Melbourne or Adelaide to Melbourne
29.	B-K	ok
30.	Bel	hum (.) because Melbourne is much more fun than Adelaide (.) so
31.	B-K	ok
32.	Bel	((laughs)) we are getting there but we just don't have as much our population is not as big so yeah I guess
33.	B-K	(x)
34.	Bel	what's that sorry
35.	B-K	((repeats)) how far away is Melbourne from Adelaide?
36.	Bel	I can only tell you in hours ((laughs))
37.	B-K	how many hours (.)
38.	Bel	if you are driving it would take about 8 or 9 hours' drive I have a girlfriend who is from Germany as well she came to Australia I met up with her and we went for a for a holiday I guess from Melbourne back to Adelaide and we drove and it was funny because I discovered that she talked in kilometres and I talked in hours
39.	B-K	yeah
40.	Bel	and we were laughing about that all the time because I'd say how many hours it would take (.) and she'd be like "but how many kilometres is that?" She'd say that there is traffic so it would change so I'd say "I guess it does" but roughly yeah that kind of (.)
41.	B-K	yea (.) like 8 or 9 hours from Germany (.) no matter where you come from I think you basically left the country

(continued)

Excerpt 1 (continued)

42.	Bel	yeah (.) absolutely (.) especially if you are on the autobahn as well (.) you can be superfast and
43.	B-K	yeah
44.	Bel	yeah it wouldn't take long ((longer pause)) now I'll try to think of things I know about Germany
45.	B-K	maybe (but) I do have a lot of questions
46.	Bel	ok
47.	B-K	because it says " what knowledge of social groups exist in your country "
48.	Bel	yeah
49.	B-K	and Alana the girl from Melbourne she always talked about like the Indigenous people (.) they don't really -she said they are unemployed and that they are drunk and they take drugs and all that stuff
50.	Bel	ok (.) oh Gosh (.) Ok hum there is a stereotype that that happens and there's certainly people that might do that but it's not specifically indigenous people that are drunk and take drugs so hum we actually -there's a lot I guess if you think of (.) it's a very unusual topic in Australia because historically at school we haven't been taught much about what actually happened to the Indigenous Australians in the history and that's something that we are concentrating a lot more on now in primary schools and in high schools and educating people about what actually has happened in the past has been quite a terrible hum thing that's happened so there's definitely a lot of Indigenous people that still live try to live kind of traditionally to a degree in very rural areas of Australia but there's also a lot of Indigenous Australians that live in cities and they go to universities they go to school hum they play football they go out so they're kind of I think there's a very strong stereotype in Australia that Indigenous Australians are drunks and they don't go to school and they're uneducated but there's definitely a lot that's probably not so true if you know what I mean.

Excerpt 2 Irene (Australian) and Myra (Mexican)—Skype session 2, (Group 1/SPAN)

90.	Irene	on Australia Day? ((tapping)) wow: that is: a tough↑ question
91.	Myra	okay:
92.	Irene	depends who you are: um so like: I don't really celebrate Australia Day because it happens to be the day we were um: like invaded by the English so it is like- a really sad day for: like our Aboriginal Indigenous population
93.	Myra	um okay:
94.	Irene	and I am not like: I am not Aboriginal but I guess it is a bit- like: iffy about whether it is ok to like to celebrate that day most Australians um drink a lot of alcohol and like have a barbeque and go to the beach um
95.	Myra	uhu
96.	Irene	and I do that too but like I don't know I am kind of I am not into Australia Day because it's like it's quite a sad day it would be like celebrating when like (1.0) um: I don't know: I am trying to think of a comparable example- I don't know if I know one like:=
97.	Myra	=[yeah↑ I did- I did um:
98.	Irene	[I'm trying to think of any ideas
99.	Myra	Pt. how do you call it um: an <u>investigation</u> about it
100.	Irene	[oh↑ ok

(continued)

Excerpt 2 (continued)

101.	Myra	[and yeah↑ I- I: read about that (.) like there's: some people that are not happy about celebra:ting that idea (.) and that stuff:
102.	Irene	yeah:
103.	Myra	so yeah: hehe
104.	Irene	yeah ok↑ that's interesting because most Australians (.) like they don't like our Aboriginal population and the white population in Australia are like- really divided
105.	Myra	uhu
106.	Irene	so: most white Australians are like: I don't give a <u>shit</u> ((mocking tone)) you know?
107.	Myra	uhu uhu
108.	Irene	um: but like I guess: um so: I am not I am not that excited about Australia Day it's like oh: it's kind of an embarrassment- it is kind of an embarrassing day you know:
109.	Myra	hehe yeah↑ hehe
110.	Irene	yeah:
111.	Myra	so uh about what you <u>say</u> so the: social is just like: separate? or like:
112.	Irene	yeah like- everything↑ except well like- wow such a big↑ issue to talk about (.)
113.	Myra	hehe
114.	Irene	[well so: but it is a good one↑
115.	Myra	[hehe
116.	Irene	um: so a lot of our: like um Aboriginal population lives um: ok so Australia like- um: like is like in the middle it is like a desert right?
117.	Myra	uhu
118.	Irene	so nobody- nobody↑ <u>really</u> lives in the middle of Australia because there is- like there is no water there: so everyone lives (.) so most of the white people live like: around Australia like (.) in the capital cities so we don't really have lots of small country towns like- like Latin America has kind of so um: (.) you went off <u>blurry-</u>
119.	Myra	I'm blurry?
120.	Irene	can you hear me?
121.	Myra	yeah
122.	Irene	can you hear me?
123.	Myra	yeah
124.	Irene	[cool okay
125.	Myra	[yeah
126.	Irene	good↑ um: but lots of Aboriginal people live um: in like the desert <u>basically</u> in communities: um so: lots of white people have <u>never</u> met an Aborig- like an Indigenous Aboriginal person because: there is like: they live in the city and like most of Aboriginal people who <u>do</u> live in the city like live in the outskirts: like in the <u>poor</u> suburbs
127.	Myra	ok
128.	Irene	yeah: it is <u>really</u> divided and um: like there is a <u>lot of problems</u> with racism

Annotation Conventions

The following annotation conventions, adapted from Jefferson (2004), have been used in excerpts reproduced here to indicate intonation, stress, comments, timing, pauses, turn-taking and sounds. Numbers in the left-hand column indicate speaking turns. Pseudonyms are used to identify speakers and appear in the middle column.

:	Colon(s): Extended or stretched sound, syllable, or word
::	the sound is prolonged even more
—	Vocalic emphasis
?	Rising vocal pitch
↑ ↓	Pitch resets; marked rising and falling shifts in intonation
!	Animated speech tone
-	Halting, abrupt cut-off of sound or word
(())	Scenic details
(x)	Transcriber doubt
(.)	Micropause less than (0.2)
(1.2)	Longer pause
=	Latching of contiguous utterances
[Speech overlap
Haha	Relative open position of laughter, written down more or less the way it sounds
Hehe	Quiet laughter. Laughter is written down more or less the way it sounds
pt	Lip Smack: Often preceding an in-breath
Ah, eh, um	Fillers
Bold	Emphasis added by the transcribers

References

- Belz, J. A. (2003). Linguistic perspectives on the development of intercultural competence in telecollaboration. *Language Learning and Technology*, 7(2), 68–117.
- Belz, J., & Kiginger, C. (2002). The cross-linguistic development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning: Two case studies. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59(2), 189–214.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). From intercultural rhetoric to cosmopolitan practice: Addressing new challenges in lingua franca English. In D. Belcher & G. Nelson (Eds.), *Critical and corpus-based approaches to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 203–226). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Dervin, F., & Vlad, M. (2010). Pour une cyberanthropologie de la communication interculturelle—Analyse d'interactions en ligne entre étudiants finlandais et roumains. *Alsic*, 13. <https://alsic.revues.org/1678>.

- Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (2004). *Analysing casual conversation*. London: Equinox Publishing.
- Guth, S., & Marini-Maio, N. (2010). Close encounters of a new kind: The use of Skype and Wiki in telecollaboration. In S. Guth & F. Helm (Eds.), *Telecollaboration 2.0: Language, literacies, and intercultural learning in the 21st century* (pp. 413–426). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Hammer, M. R. (2015). The developmental paradigm for intercultural competence research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 48, 12–13.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcripts symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kohler, M. (2015). *Teachers as mediators in the foreign language classroom*. Bristol/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Kramsch, C. (2013). History and memory in the development of intercultural competence. In F. Sharifian & M. Jamarani (Eds.), *Language and intercultural communication in the new era* (pp. 23–38). London: Routledge.
- Levy, M. (2007). Culture, culture learning and new technologies: Towards a pedagogical framework. *Language Learning and Technology*, 11(2), 104–127.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Tudini, V. (2013). Expert-novice orientations. In F. Sharifian & M. Jamarani (Eds.), *Language and intercultural communication in the new era* (pp. 181–197). London: Routledge.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2014). Pragmatics and intercultural mediation in intercultural language learning. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 11(2), 259–277. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2014-0011>.
- Martin, J. N. (2015). Revisiting intercultural communication competence: Where to go from here. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 48, 6–8.
- Ogay, T. (2000). *De la compétence à la dynamique interculturelle*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2018). Discourse moves and intercultural communicative competence in telecollaborative chats. *Language Learning and Technology*, 22(1), 218–239.
- Taillefer, L., & Muñoz-Luna, R. (2014). Developing oral skills through Skype: A language project analysis. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 260–264.
- Tian, J., & Wang, Y. (2010). Taking language learning outside the classroom: Learners' perspectives of eTandem learning via Skype. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(3), 181–197.
- Tudini, V. (2007). Negotiation and intercultural learning in Italian native speaker chat rooms. *Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 577–601.
- Ware, P. (2013). Teaching comments: Intercultural communication skills in the digital age. *Intercultural Education*, 24(4), 315–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2013.809249>.
- Zakir, M. A., Funo, L. B. A., & Telles, J. A. (2016). Focusing on culture-related episodes in a teletandem interaction between a Brazilian and an American student. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(1), 21–33.
- Zarate, G. (2003). Identities and plurilingualism: Pre-conditions for recognition of intercultural competences. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Intercultural competence* (pp. 85–118). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Colette Mrowa-Hopkins is an Adjunct Senior Lecturer in the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences at Flinders University. Her research interests include interactional perspectives and discursive practices in intercultural communication with application to languages education.

Olga Sánchez Castro is a Lecturer in Spanish and Applied Linguistics at Flinders University. Her research interests are in second language acquisition, with a focus on the use of technology to enhance teaching and learning, and in e-learning and intercultural communication.