

The Impact of Cultural Familiarity on Learning Foreign Language among Advanced Students in Ukraine¹

Vladimir Nikolaevich Rogatin², Rinat Ahmetgalievich Nabiev³, & Elena Sergeevna Rogatina³

Abstract

The paper is concerned with the contribution and incorporation of the teaching of culture into the foreign language classroom. More specifically, some consideration will be given to the why and how of teaching culture. It will be demonstrated that teaching a foreign language is not tantamount to giving a homily on syntactic structures or learning new vocabulary and expressions, but mainly incorporates, or should incorporate, some cultural elements, which are intertwined with language itself. Furthermore, an attempt will be made to incorporate culture into the classroom by means of considering some techniques and methods currently used. The main premise of the paper is that effective communication is more than a matter of language proficiency and that, apart from enhancing and enriching communicative competence, cultural competence can also lead to empathy and respect toward different cultures as well as promote objectivity and cultural perspicacity.

Keywords: Culture; Cultural Familiarity; Ukraine; Learning Foreign Language.

1. Introduction

Foreign language learning is comprised of several components, including grammatical competence, communicative competence, language proficiency, as well as a change in attitudes towards one's own or another culture. For scholars and laymen alike, cultural competence, i.e., the knowledge of the conventions, customs, beliefs, and systems of meaning of another country, is indisputably an integral part of foreign language learning, and many teachers have seen it as their goal to

¹ Please cite this paper as follows:

Rogatin, V. N., Nabiev, R. A., & Rogatina, E. S. (2019). The impact of cultural familiarity on learning foreign language among advanced students in Ukraine. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10 (SP), 1337-1348.

² Kazan Federal University; Blaide@rambler.ru

³ Kazan Federal University

incorporate the teaching of culture into the foreign language curriculum. It could be maintained that the notion of communicative competence, which, in the past decade or so, has blazed a trail, so to speak, in foreign language teaching, emphasising the role of context and the circumstances under which language can be used accurately and appropriately, ‘fall[s] short of the mark when it comes to actually equipping students with the cognitive skills they need in a second-culture environment’ (Straub, 1999). In other words, since the wider context of language, that is, society and culture, has been reduced to a variable elusive of any definition—as many teachers and students incessantly talk about it without knowing what its exact meaning is—it stands to reason that the term communicative competence should become nothing more than an empty and meretricious word, resorted to if for no other reason than to make an “educational point.” In reality, what most teachers and students seem to lose sight of is the fact that ‘knowledge of the grammatical system of a language [grammatical competence] has to be complemented by understanding (sic) of culture-specific meanings [communicative or rather cultural competence]’ (Byram, Morgan et al., 1994, p. 4).

Of course, we are long past an era when first language acquisition and second or foreign language learning were cast in a “behaviouristic mould,” being the products of imitation and language “drills,” and language was thought of as a compendium of rules and strings of words and sentences used to form propositions about a state of affairs. In the last two decades, there has been a resurgence of interest in the study of language in relation to society, which has led to a shift of focus from behaviourism and positivism to constructivism to critical theory (Benson & Voller, 1997; Namaziandost, Hafezian, & Shafiee, 2018). Yet, there are still some deeply ingrained beliefs as to the nature of language learning and teaching—beliefs that determine methodology as well as the content of the foreign language curriculum—which have, gradually and insidiously, contrived to undermine the teaching of culture.

One of the misconceptions that have permeated foreign language teaching is the conviction that language is merely a code and, once mastered—mainly by dint of steeping oneself into grammatical rules and some aspects of the social context in which it is embedded—‘one language is essentially (albeit not easily) translatable into another’ (Kramsch, 1993). To a certain extent, this belief has been instrumental in promoting various approaches to foreign language teaching—pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and communicative—which have certainly endowed the study of language with a social “hue”; nevertheless, paying lip service to the social dynamics that undergird language without trying to identify and gain insights into the very fabric of society and culture that have come to charge language in many and varied ways can only cause misunderstanding and lead to cross-cultural miscommunication.

At any rate, foreign language learning is foreign culture learning, and, in one form or another, culture has, even implicitly, been taught in the foreign language

classroom—if for different reasons. What is debatable, though, is what is meant by the term “culture” and how the latter is integrated into language learning and teaching. Kramersch’s keen observation should not go unnoticed:

Culture in language learning is not an expendable fifth skill, tacked on, so to speak, to the teaching of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. It is always in the background, right from day one, ready to unsettle the good language learners when they expect it least, making evident the limitations of their hard-won communicative competence, challenging their ability to make sense of the world around them. (Kramersch, 1993; Namaziandost, Sabzevari, & Hashemifardnia, 2018). The teaching of culture is not akin to the transmission of information regarding the people of the target community or country—even though knowledge about (let alone experience of) the “target group” is an important ingredient (see Nostrand, 1967, p. 118). It would be nothing short of ludicrous to assert that culture is merely a repository of facts and experiences to which one can have recourse, if need be. Furthermore, what Kramersch herself seems to insinuate is that to learn a foreign language is not merely to learn how to communicate but also to discover how much leeway the target language allows learners to manipulate grammatical forms, sounds, and meanings, and to reflect upon, or even flout, socially accepted norms at work both in their own or the target culture (Namaziandost, Shatalebi, & Nasri, 2019).

There is definitely more than meets the eye, and the present paper has the aim of unravelling the “mystery,” shedding some light on the role of teaching culture in fostering cross-cultural understanding which transcends the boundaries of linguistic forms—while enriching and giving far deeper meaning to what is dubbed “communicative competence”—and runs counter to a solipsistic world view. I would like to show that the teaching of culture has enjoyed far less “adulation” than it merits, and consider ways of incorporating it not only into the foreign language curriculum but also into learners’ repertoire and outlook on life. The main premise of this paper is that we cannot go about teaching a foreign language without at least offering some insights into its speakers’ culture. By the same token, we cannot go about fostering “communicative competence” without taking into account the different views and perspectives of people in different cultures which may enhance or even inhibit communication. After all, communication requires understanding, and understanding requires stepping into the shoes of the foreigner and sifting her cultural baggage, while always ‘putting [the target] culture in relation with one’s own’ (Kramersch, 1993, p. 205). Moreover, we should be cognisant of the fact that ‘[i]f we teach language without teaching at the same time the culture in which it operates, we are teaching meaningless symbols or symbols to which the student attaches the wrong meaning...’ (Politzer, 1959, pp. 100-101).

The relation between culture and religion is an old and still on-going debate. Ever since Aristotle used the term *ethnos* to identify the groups of people living outside of the Greek polis, indicating them as primitive, people belonging to different

cultures and religions could be labelled as 'outsiders, uncultured and irreligious' (MacKay, 2000; Sepehri, Hajijalili, & Namaziandost, 2019). During the Enlightenment period, Europeans took over this notion of Aristotle to label all non-Europeans as 'uncivilised' (MacKay, 2000). The Enlightenment implication that all reality can be classified resulted in nations and people being hierarchically categorised. This classification was based on perceived natural mental, physical and spiritual abilities. The result was according to MacKay (2000) that 'group identity was essentially defined in terms of race'. David Chidester (1996) alludes to this when he describes the European attitude towards the natural inhabitants encountered at the Cape Colony during the 16th and 17th century as being 'less than human'. This remained the dominant discourse between cultures and different religions in South Africa, culminating in the Apartheid laws.

2. Methods

As part of the study, we focused on the constructivist structuralism of P. Bourdieu. Accordingly, the methodology of P. Bourdieu was transferred by us to the religious field and emerging projects of the new religiosity of Ukrainians, since it is religious systems that are used by individuals as certain attitudes that generate and organize the practices of individuals. This methodology allowed us to study the nature of social practices in the context of the integrated accounting of the religious factors of social life in Ukraine. Habitus is a system of strong acquired predispositions that are further used by individuals as initial attitudes that generate and organize the practices of individuals (Bourdieu, 1993).

3. Results and Discussion

To begin with, language is a social institution, both shaping and shaped by society at large, or in particular the 'cultural niches' (Eleanor Armour-Thomas & Sharon-ann Gopaul-McNicol, 1998) in which it plays an important role. Thus, if our premise is that language is, or should be, understood as cultural practice, then ineluctably we must also grapple with the notion of culture in relation to language. Language is not an 'autonomous construct' (Fairclough, 1989: vi) but social practice both creating and created by 'the structures and forces of [the] social institutions within which we live and function' (ibid.). Certainly, language cannot exist in a vacuum; one could make so bold as to maintain that there is a kind of "transfusion" at work between language and culture. Amongst those who have dilated upon the affinity between language and culture, it is Duranti who succinctly encapsulates how these two interpenetrate:

To be part of a culture means to share the propositional knowledge and the rules of inference necessary to understand whether certain propositions are true

(given certain premises). To the propositional knowledge, one might add the procedural knowledge to carry out tasks such as cooking, weaving, farming, fishing, giving a formal speech, answering the phone, asking for a favor, writing a letter for a job application (Duranti, 1997, pp. 28-29).

Clearly, everyday language is “tinged” with cultural bits and pieces—a fact most people seem to ignore. By the very act of talking, we assume social and cultural roles, which are so deeply entrenched in our thought processes as to go unnoticed. Interestingly, ‘culture defines not only what its members should think or learn but also what they should ignore or treat as irrelevant’ (Eleanor Armour-Thomas & Sharon-ann Gopaul-McNicol, 1998: 56). That language has a setting, in that the people who speak it belong to a race or races and are incumbents of particular cultural roles, is blatantly obvious. ‘Language does not exist apart from culture, that is, from the socially inherited assemblage of practices and beliefs that determines the texture of our lives’ (Sapir, 1970, p. 207). In a sense, it is ‘a key to the cultural past of a society’ (Salzmann, 1998, p. 41), ‘a guide to “social reality”’ (Sapir, 1929, p. 209, cited in Salzmann, 1998, p. 41).

Nineteenth-century sociologists, such as Durkheim, were well aware of, and expatiated upon, the interdependence of language and culture. For Durkheim (1912 [1947]), children master their mother tongue by dint of making hypotheses as to the possible circumstances under which it can be used, and by learning probabilities. For example, a child sees a canary and is culturally conditioned to associate certain features and attributes of the bird with the actual word canary. And most importantly, the extent to which the child will internalise the relationship (or lack thereof) between the word canary and its referent in the world is contingent upon ‘social adulation’ (Landar, 1965, p. 225). If he is taken for a walk and sees a sparrow and says, “canary,” he will be corrected, learning that ‘competence counts’ (ibid.). In other words, ‘[s]ocioculturally structured associations have to be internalized’ (ibid.)—and, as often as not, these associations vary from culture to culture. Rather than getting bogged down in a ‘linguistic relativity’ debate, the tenets of which are widely known, some consideration should be given to the claim that ‘language is not merely the external covering of a thought; it is also its internal framework. It does not confine itself to expressing this thought after it has once been formed; it also aids in making it’ (Durkheim, 1912 [1947]).

Fairly recently, many ethnographers such as Buttjes (1990), and Poyatos, (1985) have attempted to show that ‘language and culture are from the start inseparably connected’ (Buttjes, 1990: 55, cited in Lessard-Clouston, 1997). More specifically, he summarises the reasons why this should be the case: language acquisition does not follow a universal sequence, but differs across cultures; the process of becoming a competent member of society is realized through exchanges of language in particular social situations;

Every society orchestrates the ways in which children participate in particular situations, and this, in turn, affects the form, the function and the content of children's utterances; caregivers' primary concern is not with grammatical input, but with the transmission of sociocultural knowledge; the native learner, in addition to language, acquires also the paralinguistic patterns and the kinesics of his or her culture.

The implications of Buttjes' findings for the teaching of culture are evident. Language teaching is culture teaching and teachers do their students a great disservice in placing emphasis on the former, to the detriment of the latter. As Buttjes (1990, pp. 55-56) notes, 'language teachers need to go beyond monitoring linguistic production in the classroom and become aware of the complex and numerous processes of intercultural mediation that any foreign language learner undergoes...'. To hark back to the relationship between language and culture; Samovar, Porter, & Jain (1981, p. 24) observe:

Culture and communication are inseparable because culture not only dictates who talks to whom, about what, and how the communication proceeds, it also helps to determine how people encode messages, the meanings they have for messages, and the conditions and circumstances under which various messages may or may not be sent, noticed, or interpreted... Culture...is the foundation of communication.

Moreover, given Duranti's (1997, p. 24) definition of culture as 'something learned, transmitted, passed down from one generation to the next, through human actions, often in the form of face-to-face interaction, and, of course, through linguistic communication', it is patently obvious that language, albeit a subpart of culture, plays a pivotal role. Bourdieu has emphasised the importance of language not as an autonomous construct but as a system determined by various socio-political processes. For him, a language exists as a linguistic habitus, as a set of practices that imply not only a particular system of words and grammatical rules, but also an often forgotten or hidden struggle over the symbolic power of a particular way of communicating, with particular systems of classification, address and reference forms, specialized lexicons, and metaphors (for politics, medicine, ethics) (Bourdieu, 1982, p. 31, cited in Duranti, 1997, p. 45).

At any rate, to speak means to choose a particular way of entering the world and a particular way of sustaining relationships with those we come in contact with. It is often through language use that we, to a large extent, are members of a community of ideas and practices (ibid.). Thus, as a complex system of classification of experience and 'an important window on the universe of thoughts' (Duranti, 1997, p. 49); as a link between thought and behaviour; and as 'the prototypical tool for interacting with the world' (ibid.), language is intertwined with culture. In the past,

language and culture were lumped together as if they automatically implied each other. Wilhelm von Humboldt, an eminent diplomat and scholar, once wrote:

The spiritual traits and the structure of the language of a people are so intimately blended that, given either of the two, one should be able to derive the other from it to the fullest extent...Language is the outward manifestation of the spirit of people: their language is their spirit, and their spirit is their language; it is difficult to imagine any two things more identical (Humboldt, 1907, cited in Salzmann, 1998, p. 39).

On the other hand, Sapir (1921, p. 215) asserts that '[l]anguage, race, and culture are not necessarily correlated', only to admit later on that '[l]anguage and our thought-grooves are inextricably interrelated, are, in a sense, one and the same' (ibid., pp. 217-218), thus oscillating between a view of language and culture as being autonomous and separate from each other and one of linguistic determinism, whereby language affects and shapes human thought. According to his lights, '[c]ulture may be defined as what a society does and thinks. Language is a particular how of thought' (ibid., pp. 218). In addition, Hall (1981, p. 36) aligns himself with Humboldt and Bourdieu in dubbing language 'one of the dominant threads in all cultures'. In a similar vein, Bruner (1996, p. 3) says that '[a]lthough meanings are "in the mind," they have their origins and their significance in the culture in which they are created'. And he adds, 'human beings do not terminate at their own skins; they are expressions of a culture' (Bruner, 1990: 12). Furthermore, we could envision the possibility of 'certain linguistic features mak[ing] certain modes of perception more prevalent or more probable' (Henle, 1970, p. 18). Lexical and grammatical categories of a language have been assumed to determine how its speakers conceptualise the world around them. Consider the case of metaphors, 'which have been analyzed as providing conceptual schemata through which we understand the world' (Duranti, 1997, p. 64). For example, the metaphor UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING will generate such expressions as "I see what you mean. To get the whole picture, I'll tell you..." while the metaphor IDEAS ARE FOOD establishes similarities across two different domains (thinking and eating) and generates the expression "It gives me food for thought." What is more, culture seems to have a grammar of its own, which superimposes itself upon, and is reflected in, that of language. '[A] grammar of culture consists of rules for the generation of patterns of behaviour' (Howell & Vetter, 1976, p. 376). To achieve a deeper understanding of what the "grammar of culture" really consists in, we should adduce the following example (see Howell & Vetter, 1976, p. 374). When an American sees a bus coming, he almost always uses the present progressive ("the bus is coming"), in juxtaposition with a Japanese, who uses the present perfect ("the bus has come"). In this case, the difference between the two cultures lies in the 'conceptual organization of experience' (Henle, 1970, p. 3) which they choose, or rather are conditioned, to adhere to.

To date, the SILA project has exhausted itself; the Internet resource SILA is abandoned and not accessible. Actually, like all the groups created by SILA on social networks, they have not been updated for more than a year. This fact shows a change in benchmarks and a review of priorities by members of the SILA and Vadim Sidorov.

4. Conclusions

A question germane to our discussion is, how can we incorporate culture into the foreign language curriculum, with a view to fostering cultural awareness and communicating insight into the target civilisation? In the past, this has been attempted by dint of discoursing upon the geographical environment and historical or political development of the foreign culture, its institutions and customs, its literary achievements, even the minute details of the everyday life of its members. At other times, insights into the target community have taken the form of ‘lecturettes’ (see Rivers, 1968, p. 272) or a “homily” on such issues as marriage customs and ceremonies, festivals, Sunday excursions, and so forth, thus rendering the study of the foreign culture a tedious and unrewarding task. Admittedly, we cannot teach culture any more than we can teach anyone how to breathe. What we can do, though, is try to show the way, to teach about culture rather than to posit a specific way of seeing things--which is corollary and ancillary to cultural and linguistic imperialism. By bringing to the fore some elements of the target culture, and focusing on those characteristics and traits that are of importance to the members of the target community—refraining from taking an outsider’s view—teachers can make students aware that there are no such things as superior and inferior cultures and that there are differences among people within the target culture, as well. ‘[Teachers are] not in the classroom to confirm the prejudices of [their] students nor to attack their deeply held convictions’ (ibid., p. 271). Their task is to stimulate students’ interest in the target culture, and to help establish the foreign language classroom ‘not so much as a place where the language is taught, but as one where opportunities for learning of various kinds are provided through the interactions that take place between the participants’ (Ellis, 1992, p. 171, cited in Kramsch, 1993, p. 245).

According to Straub (1999), what educators should always have in mind when teaching culture is the need to raise their students’ awareness of their own culture, to provide them with some kind of metalanguage in order to talk about culture, and ‘to cultivate a degree of intellectual objectivity essential in cross-cultural analyses’ (ibid., p. 5). What is more, another objective permeating the teaching of culture is ‘to foster...understanding of the target culture from an insider’s perspective—an empathetic view that permits the student to accurately interpret foreign cultural behaviors’ (ibid.). Prior to considering some concrete techniques for

teaching culture in the foreign language classroom, it is useful to attempt an answer to the question posed at the beginning of this chapter by providing some guidelines for culture teaching (most of the discussion that ensues is mainly based on Lessard-Clouston, 1997).

First, culture teaching must be commensurate with the dynamic aspects of culture. As Lessard-Clouston (1997) notes,

Students will indeed need to develop knowledge of and about the L2 or FL culture, but this receptive aspect of cultural competence is not sufficient. Learners will also need to master some skills in culturally appropriate communication and behaviour for the target culture...Cultural awareness is necessary if students are to develop an understanding of the dynamic nature of the target culture, as well as their own culture.

Second, it is important to eschew what Lessard-Clouston (1997) calls ‘a laissez-faire approach’, when it comes to teaching methodology, and deal with culture teaching in a systematic and structured way. Third, evaluation of culture learning is a necessary component of the “foreign culture curriculum,” providing students with feedback and keeping teachers accountable in their teaching. A fourth point is made by Cruz, Bonissone, and Baff (1995) pertaining to the express need for linguistic and cultural competence as a means of achieving and negotiating nations’ political and economical identities in an ‘ever shrinking world’, as they put it.

Our world has changed, but in many ways our schools have not. Linguistic and cultural abilities are at the forefront of our ever-shrinking world. Yet we continue to shy away from addressing these very real global necessities. Just as no one superpower can dominate without censure from others, citizens must now begin to see their global responsibilities and must learn to move comfortably from one cultural environment to the next. Persuasion rather than armed coercion has become the way to do things politically and effective persuasion requires that one know the other party’s values and manner of establishing rapport. (ibid.) Apparently, culture can become a third (or second, for that matter) “superpower” dispensing justice and helping maintain stability and equilibrium if need be.

A cursory glance at most textbooks nowadays is ample to show what educators must first combat and eradicate: stereotypes. As Byram, Morgan et al. (1994, p. 41) observe, ‘[textbook writers] intuitively avoid bringing learners’ existing hetero-stereotypes into the open and hope that [their] negative overtones...will be...counteracted by presenting positive...images of the foreign country’. As a matter of fact, stereotypes are extremely tenacious, in so far as people from different cultures have their own schemata through which they conceptualise and understand the world, and to step into another culture is ‘to deny something within their own being’ (ibid., p. 43). In order to provide a different perspective on “the foreign culture,” teachers should use comparison, with a view to identifying common ground or even lacunae within or between cultures (see Ertelt-Vieth, 1990, 1991, cited in Byram, Morgan et

al., 1994, p. 43). Most certainly, learners will not relinquish their ‘cultural baggage’ (ibid.) and begin to see the world “in the French, English, or Japanese way,” so to speak. Nevertheless, they can acknowledge that any “intellectual antinomies” emanating from their exposure to the target culture are natural and by no means pernicious.

Before venturing into unknown territories (Grove, 1982), learners must first become conversant with what it means to be part of a culture, their own culture. By exploring their own culture, i.e., by discussing the very values, expectations, traditions, customs, and rituals they unconsciously take part in, they are ready to reflect upon the values, expectations, and traditions of others ‘with a higher degree of intellectual objectivity’ (Straub, 1999). Depending on the age and level of the learners, this task can take many forms. For example, young beginners or intermediate students should be given the opportunity to enjoy certain activities that are part of their own tradition, such as national sports, social festivities, or songs, before setting about exploring those of the target culture. Here, we will only be concerned with the latter. ‘Beginning foreign language students want to feel, touch, smell, and see the foreign peoples and not just hear their language’ (Peck, 1998). At any rate, the foreign language classroom should become a ‘cultural island’ (Kramsch, 1993), where the accent will be on ‘cultural experience’ rather than ‘cultural awareness’ (see Byram, Morgan et al., 1994, pp. 55-60). From the first day, teachers are expected to bring in the class posters, pictures, maps, and other realia in order to help students develop ‘a mental image’ of the target culture (Peck, 1998). According to Peck (1998), an effective and stimulating activity is to send students on “cultural errands” (my term)—to supermarkets and department stores—and have them write down the names of imported goods. Moreover, teachers can also invite guest speakers, who will talk about their experiences of the foreign country.

Despite the different ideas in all the other religious projects described, certain similar views can be traced in them:

- Many of the listed systems receive support from foreign centres;
- All projects involve a certain opposition and confrontation with respect to Russia;
- The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate is directly seen as the main ideological adversary for them within Ukraine;
- Among the ideologists of these projects, nationalist discourse prevails over religious ideas, which allows them to interact with each other.

Thus, other religious projects reflect a different model of habitus, as a manifestation of the antipode. This model is more typical for the worldview of the Ukrainian diaspora living outside Ukraine during the Soviet period, and eventually having settled in the western regions of Ukraine.

Two individuals may have the same culture and yet practice different religious practices. Culture focuses on the human beings which is its social heritage, while religion is associated with the God or the Creator of the whole universe. Culture is concerned with the evolution of humans and their beliefs and practices.

The aspect of religion and culture is what shapes the lives of all humans, whether they are believers or not. Whole nations have dress codes to keep to their religious values. Government officials are elected upon their views of certain religious and culturist views such as abortion. Even wars between two stable governments can be initiated because of the differences in religious beliefs. The Hebrew religious culture is the most influential ancient culture to the modern world.

In summary, some of the common elements that make up individual cultures are symbols, language, values, and norms. A symbol is anything that is used to stand for something else. People who share a culture often attach a specific meaning to an object, gesture, sound, or image.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Benson, P. & Voller, P. (1997). *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology of politics*. Moscow: Socio – Logos.
- Byram, M., Morgan, C. & Colleagues. (1994). *Teaching and learning language and culture*. Great Britain: WBC.
- Chidester, D., (1996). *Savage systems: Colonialism and comparative religion in Southern Africa*. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1947). *The elementary forms of the religious life*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Grove, C. L. (1982). *Improving intercultural learning through the orientation of sojourners*. Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning. AFS International.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Landar, H. (1965). *Language and culture*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- MacKay, D.B. (2000). Ethnicity. In W. Braun & R.T. McCutcheon (eds.), *Guide to the study of religion* (pp. 96-109). London: Cassell.
- Namaziandost, E., Hafezian, M., & Shafiee, S. (2018). Exploring the association among working memory, anxiety and Iranian EFL learners' listening

- comprehension. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 3(20), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-018-0061-3>.
- Namaziandost, E., Sabzevari, A., & Hashemifardnia, A. (2018). The effect of cultural materials on listening comprehension among Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners: In reference to gender. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1560601>.
- Namaziandost, E., Shatalebi, V., & Nasri, M. (2019). The impact of cooperative learning on developing speaking ability and motivation toward learning English. *Journal of Language and Education*, 5(3), 83-101. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.9809>.
- Peck, D. (1998). *Teaching culture: Beyond language*. Yale: New Haven Teachers Institute.
- Politzer, R. (1959). Developing cultural understanding through foreign language study. *Report of the Fifth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Teaching* (pp. 99-105). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Poyatos, F. (1985). Encoding-decoding processes in intercultural verbal and nonverbal interaction. In R. Brunt & W. Enninger (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary perspectives at cross-cultural communication* (pp. 191- 210). Aachen: Rader.
- Rivers, W. M. (1968). *Teaching foreign-language skills*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Salzmann, Z. (1998). *Language, culture and society. An introduction to linguistic anthropology*. USA: Westview Press.
- Samovar, L., Porter, R. & Jain, N. (1981). *Understanding intercultural communication*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Sepehri, M., Hajijalili, M. & Namaziandost, E. (2019). Hedges and boosters in medical and engineering research articles: A comparative corpus-based study. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*. 9(4), 215-225.
- Straub, H. (1999). Designing a Cross-Cultural Course. *English Forum*, 37(3), 2-9.