Utilizing the Project Method for Teaching Culture and Intercultural Competence

Sasha S. Euler

University of Trier, Germany

Culture is undoubtedly an essential component of contemporary foreign language teaching. Knowledge and skills in lexis, morphology, syntax, and phonology are not sufficient to facilitate effective international communication. Language is always language in context, and this context is significantly shaped by intercultural aspects, as clearly acknowledged by both the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR; Council of Europe, 2002) and the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (ACTFL, 2012). This is not only important for learners of languages of very different target cultures, but also plays a crucial role in the case of comparatively similar cultures like Germany and the USA. As Kramsch (1993) so fittingly put it, culture is "always in the background, right from day one, ready to unsettle the good language learner 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" (p. 1). In order to counteract this problem, explicitly addressing second language cultural aspects in addition to language skills is key, and an ideal way into it, as this article will show, is project work (Chlopek, 2008). This is especially true if students have access to a country where the target language is spoken.

Project work in a country where the target language is spoken, as the analysis in the last part of this article will demonstrate, provides students with the opportunity to experience aspects of the target culture firsthand instead of learning about it rather theoretically in their home country. This scenario not only allows for plenty of language use in real cultural contexts, but also provides a maximum of authentic listening comprehension training. However, it is generally true for project work, as defined in detail later in this article, that in addition to training language skills, this method also helps students develop problem-solving skills, organizational skills, creativity, imagination, research skills, and the ability to work effectively in teams. As a consequence, to utilize Ribe and Vidal's (1993) terminology, cultural projects are almost necessarily third generation projects. By their definition, first generation projects are predominantly aimed at developing *language skills*, while second generation projects are predominantly aimed at developing *cognitive skills*. Third generation projects, on the other hand, include both aims, but go beyond them by systematically contributing to *personality development* by means of enhancing awareness and initiating attitudinal changes – aspects highly crucial in order to develop intercultural competence. Cultural projects provide learners with a variety of sources for linguistic and cultural information, including newspapers, magazines, the internet, television (see Project 2), reports, and others. If conducted in a country where the target language is spoken, the possibly most important source is "Land und Leute," that is, students' immediately observable environment (see Project 1), people of the target culture and, an enormously helpful source, foreigners who have lived in the country for some time and have had a good amount of contact with locals (see Project 3).

This article aims to illustrate why the project method is particularly conducive to the purpose of teaching culture, especially if learners have immediate access to a country where the target language is spoken. Before specifically addressing ten aspects of the project method as relating to this aim, however, the article will provide a detailed picture of how "culture" can be best understood and pedagogically conceptualized for this purpose. Finally, this discussion will be illustrated with experiences from a summer course of American learners of German in Germany, including three explicit project outlines found in the Appendix.

Conceptualizing Culture

The term "culture" can be understood in a multitude of ways and there are numerous different perspectives from which culture can be approached in teaching. The model presented here is one that tends to be quite illuminating to learners and that lends itself to systematic teaching. Addressing culture in such a systematic manner is necessary because, as has been argued, communication in a foreign language always happens in a larger sociocultural context, so that developing "intercultural communicative competence" (ICC) (e.g., Alptekin, 2002) should be an essential part of second language teaching. Likewise, the Council of Europe (2002) specifically addresses this aspect of language education in the CEFR and argues that in addition to linguistic and communicative competence, it is also necessary to develop sociolinguistic competence, pragmatic competence, sociocultural knowledge, and an awareness of intercultural differences.

As a first step toward achieving this goal, it is necessary to differentiate between the everyday understanding of culture as being taught in areas like literature, philosophy, history, film, cuisine, or art, and a more sociopsychological understanding of culture (e.g., Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010) revealing what makes people "tick." This difference has been studied as "big-C culture" vs. "small/little-c culture" (e.g., Chlopek, 2008; Orlova, 2003). However, for teaching purposes, the alternative terms "surface culture" vs. "deep culture" ("Oberflächenkultur" vs. "Tiefenkultur") seem more appropriate owing to their inherently descriptive nature. This distinction can helpfully be illustrated with the idea of an iceberg, the major part of which being hidden below the surface (an analogy going back to Weaver, 1986). While an understanding of the literature and history of a country, being more easily accessible on the surface than sociopsychological aspects, is certainly of importance (again as explicitly referenced by both the CEFR and the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines), for intercultural communication the deeper, psychological aspects of culture have a significantly larger impact (e.g., Gumperz, 1992; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010), as will be demonstrated shortly. These aspects include attitudes, assumptions, beliefs, perceptions, norms and values, social relationships, customs, politeness conventions, patterns of interaction, discourse organization, use of time in communication, the conception of distance, the use of physical space, and body language. Orlova, for example, condenses such aspects of small-c culture into larger themes like "family values," from which individual aspects can be extracted like household chores, child raising, career, and family life (Orlova, 2003, p. 181).

Pedagogically, it is important to note that while surface culture is based on information that can relatively easily be obtained through observation, conversation, and reading, aspects of deep culture are more difficult to study. This is especially so since, similar to the case of grammatical and phonological features, native speakers are very much unaware of their cultural "programming," which is also why intercultural communicative misunderstandings are often not perceived as, say, pragmatic errors in a learner's language use, but as genuine impoliteness.

Social interaction in a given society is significantly shaped by unconscious cultural beliefs be-
cause "linguistic and sociocultural knowledge interact in […] subtle and often unnoticed ways
[…] in verbal encounters to bring about communicative outcomes" (Gumperz, 1992, p. 302).
Expectations and interpretations of verbal and non-verbal behavior crucially depend on these
"hidden" convictions (Gumperz, 1992, p. 326). In the following, a few examples of various
aspects of deep culture are provided that can easily lead to intercultural misunderstandings.

- Intercultural pragmatics:
  The English "How are you?" is not much more than a greeting. A pragmatically correct
  reply should ideally carry the meaning of "fine." This can lead to very awkward moments
  with German native speakers for whom the direct translation of the question would signal
  a readiness to potentially listen to the misery of their lives.
- Sociocultural knowledge:
  Missing knowledge of social customs can easily lead to social or even legal offense, like
  the custom of not putting up the laundry on the balcony on Sundays in very Catholic
  regions of Germany, or, for Germans, not knowing that other countries have a speed
  limit on the highway even if there is no explicit sign indicating so.
- Conceptions of distance:
  People from different countries have very different ideas of what it means for a place to
  be "far away." In Scotland (only a small strip of which is densely populated), for example,
  a 2.5-hour drive from Aberdeen to the capital Edinburgh is typically considered an enor-
  mous journey only to be taken on special occasions. For a German person, 2.5 hours
  are a bit of a distance, but not that big of a deal. For Americans, living in an enormously
  wide country, a 2.5-hour trip tends to be rather negligible, however.
- Social relationships:
  Ferraro (2009) describes a situation in which an American manager supervised the build-
  ing of a hotel in Saudi Arabia. The manager observed some of the local workers to be
  lacking efficiency and used the time-tested American leadership style of addressing in-
  sufficiencies publicly so that all workers could learn from the mistakes made. The situa-
  tion, however, deteriorated because to the locals, to whom social interaction is very
  much based on maintaining face, this style caused psychological distress rather than fa-
  cilitating achievement motivation. While this leadership style may perhaps not be the
  accepted norm anymore, the concept of "face" has been shown to vary significantly
  from culture to culture (e.g., Spencer-Oatey, 2008).

In addition to such a thematic approach (as in "customs" or "social interaction"), deep culture
can also be usefully conceptualized by drawing on descriptions of characteristic values and
norms (see Schöb & Schöb, 2008 for a well-researched description of German culture utilizing
this approach). Such norms include aspects like "efficiency," "personal freedom," "rules and
order," or "environmental protection." At first glance, such characterizations may (intentionally
so) appear like stereotypes and clichés – of course cultural generalizations never apply to every-
one and, likewise, (personal) counterexamples do not invalidate the theory; Hofstede (2001)
referred to this as the "ecological fallacy" (p. 16) – but many things can be illustratively explained
and cognitively categorized when drawing on such norms. This can aid considerably in enabling
students to perceive random cultural conventions as being part of a larger, logical system, which
is key in building true intercultural understanding and, ideally, appreciation. A characteristic ex-
ample is the idea of personal freedom in Germany, which shows in aspects like having the
choice among many types of the same product in supermarkets, the relatively free choice of
courses in the German university system, having no speed limit on the highway, the rather strict
separation of work and personal time, and the comparatively open attitude toward nudism and

sexuality. It is also possible to demonstrate that outsiders' perceptions (e.g., that Germans have little or no sense of humor) and the way things actually work in the country can be quite different (e.g., how humor operates in a given country and how outsiders would assess what they observe by drawing on their own standards and customs; see Kramsch, 1993). Finally, stressing ambivalences like "rules vs. personal freedom," "efficiency vs. strictly adhering to working times," or "environmental protection vs. love of cars" can be an extremely fruitful technique to show that culture, indeed, comes in many shades of gray.

Utilizing the Project Method for Teaching Culture

Project work has long enjoyed popularity in Germany and other countries, but it can be observed that most teachers are rather unaware of its exact methodological rationale and design. In the context of action-oriented learning and teaching (*handlungsorientiertes Lehren und Lernen*, see Finkbeiner, 2012), Gudjons (2008) developed "ten features of projects" (pp. 79-92), often drawing on the founding father of project work, John Dewey (1935). A multitude of current cognitive research could be listed to support these claims, but this would go beyond the purpose and scope of this article (see Euler, 2015 and Helmke, 2014, especially chapter 4 for cross-referencing). This section will take up these ten points and show how they can be utilized for the teaching of culture (examples are drawn from the project class briefly described below; see Appendix for the project sheets).

1. Situational [Content] Relevance

Dewey (1935) speaks of "situations" instead of content because in order to be able to authentically experience the content taught, it has to clearly resemble real-world situations. As a consequence, the content selected for project work is often highly interdisciplinary. In Dewey's words, a question draws meaningful content around itself like "a magnet" (p. 97). In order for this to work, the subject material needs to immediately relate to students' life experiences so that previous knowledge is activated and motivation is generated, but it also needs to expose students to new learning so that discoveries can be made. It has been shown that the concept of deep culture attracts a huge variety of aspects from different content areas, and especially if students have access to the target culture, situational relevance (understanding the world around us) and the possibility to make interesting discoveries (by observing and interacting with people of the target culture) is more than given.

2. Catching Students' Interests

In order for project work to be effective, students need to perceive some genuine interest in or need for the topic. This can be seen as analogous to the concept of task-based teaching in English language teaching: Individual bits of content become relevant and connected because they provide information necessary for the task (or project) to be completed (e.g., Bygate, Skehan, & Swain, 2001). However, teachers need to be aware of the fact that students may be utterly unaware of a certain topic – which is very much the case with small-c culture – so that it is necessary to first establish why this topic is of interest at all. This can be achieved through preparatory lessons in which the teacher can sensitize students for the topic through videos, anecdotes, or guided experiences in order to give the topic "subjective meaning" and to "structure and streamline" it (Duncker & Götz, 1984, p. 55). In the project work underlying this article, the actual projects, which students of course did autonomously, went hand in hand with preparatory lessons to cognitively prepare and motivationally fire up the students.

3. Relevance for Society

Dewey criticized project work as often being too trivial. Instead, it can and should address societal issues at large by leading to authentic insights and transferrable skills. It is fundamental that projects lead to some kind of thought-provoking or useful result. In teaching practice, this result typically takes the form of a physical or intellectual product, like clear insights that can be discussed or presentations or posters that can be prepared. Authentic insights can best be achieved through possibilities for social contact (e.g., with people of the target culture), cooperation (e.g., with team members), and confrontation (e.g., with values of another culture) as well as through difficulties owing to the complexity of reality, like trying to systematize observations as illustrated in the previous section. Clearly, a topic like deep culture intrinsically has a high level of complexity, necessitating social contact but also provoking confrontation. Furthermore, aside physical results as part of the methodological realization, ICC is definitely an intellectual result of relevance for society at large.

4. Goal-Oriented Planning

As projects should lead to a specific result or outcome, it is important for teachers and students to discuss together specific steps, deadlines, and activities to be performed as well as to schedule and distribute tasks in order to create a final product that matches project needs with individual student interests and abilities.

5. Self-Organization and Responsibility

Despite the need for planning, it is imperative in project work that teachers not determine sequence, subject matter, and methods for students to follow step by step, even though it is very much appropriate for teachers to provide suggestions for how to tackle the topic in a useful manner. This balance can be achieved through "pedagogical roadmaps" (Messner in Gudjons, 2008, p. 84), that is, project sheets as found in the Appendix, which students will then adapt and modify in accordance with their own goals and interests (e.g., what specifically to observe or ask; see Project 3). Students may, for example, be a lot more interested in areas like sports, history, or the media than the teacher may predict. This possibility for selection and adaptation increases personal investment as students are now personally responsible for the project.

6. Involving Various Senses

In order to guarantee active engagement with the topic, students need to be able to activate as many senses as possible and have a spectrum of different activities at their disposal. This can be realized through the creation of documentaries or films, or through exploring people's views and opinions. Documenting experiences and insights is an excellent way of dealing with the topic of culture, for instance through pictures of buildings, interesting products and objects, or scenes (like standing in line; see Project 1). Through analyzing media (Project 2) or interviews (Project 3) it is also very easy to explore people's views, which can, for example, be presented through PowerPoint presentations, videos, or journal entries.

7. Social Learning

Project work is a social learning process, which necessitates that students coordinate groups, mediate interests, show consideration, cooperate, and interact. In the projects illustrated in this article, it was important for the students to ensure that there is a common concept leading to a certain product while ensuring that at the same time everybody can follow their interests without simply ending up with specific duties. This allows for autonomy within the group(s) while still maintaining project coherence.

8. Product Orientation

It has already been mentioned that the creation of some kind of product is an essential part of project methodology. If creating an actual physical product is not useful, participants can also document their experiences, insights, and views in other forms. So-called "inner products" (Wöll, 1998, p. 142) can comprise changes in attitudes, new insights or skills, and even modifications of learners' value systems (e.g., genuine acceptance of differences in norms across cultures). This system is effective because knowledge obtained through project work has a quality quite different from the rather receptive knowledge often gained through more traditional instruction. The concept of the inner product seems extremely fruitful for cultural projects because emerging intellectually, and perhaps even physically, in a new culture with the aim of achieving ICC will almost necessarily lead to an extension of participants' belief and value systems.

9. Interdisciplinarity

It has been said with Dewey that in project work questions draw meaningful content around themselves like a magnet, which means that different fields and content areas inform the answer to the question. If the workings of a community's small-c culture are taken as the question, it is obvious how a wide spectrum of content will emerge, drawing on a variety of different fields and subjects (like products in supermarkets, film and ad making, rules and laws, sociopolitical issues like environmental protection, family values, etc.). This is one of the reasons why project work can be so motivating and why it allows so well for personalization and student investment.

10. Complementary Instruction

It needs to be stressed, as has been indicated, that it is always useful to complement project work with classroom instruction, since not everything can be explored fully autonomously and since learners may be so unaware of certain contents (again, as is very much true of the sociopsychological workings of a community's culture) that they are simply off a student's radar. Complementary instruction makes it possible to share extra information to correct conclusions drawn from observation (e.g., "Germans use handshakes for greetings" – while among friends people actually hug each other) and to provide a systematic framework from which to understand experiences by putting them into a larger context. After all, learners may not always be able to evaluate experiences critically (e.g., the cultural ambivalences mentioned above) and to make the correct connections between individual pieces of information.

Supplementary lessons can be taught before, during, and/or after the project phase. Before the projects they are useful for establishing a common basis and for allowing students to develop specific interests. During the projects the teacher can supplement information or facilitate critical examination of student experiences in order to guide further exploration, while after the projects contents can be enhanced and linked. From a more cognitive perspective, working with subject material after students have had authentic experiences working with it during their project work will provide a cognitive window of opportunity for true long-term learning and for the creation of transferrable and applicable knowledge (see Euler, 2014). Indeed, this is the kind of knowledge necessary for the development of true competence (e.g., Gudjons, 2008; Städeli, Grassi, Rhiner, & Obrist, 2013).

Experiences with a Summer Course in Germany

This section briefly illustrates the methodological considerations above, looking at the experiences of American undergraduate students who participated in an intermediate-level sum-

mer course in Germany. The course consisted of regular language instruction plus six contact sessions over three weeks on "project work on culture," the latter taught by the author.

Project 1

The aim of Project 1 (see Appendix A) was to discover some aspects of German surface culture and to possibly draw conclusions on deep culture. Secondarily, this project opened possibilities for systematic extension of vocabulary. Duncker and Götz (1984) present metaphors for "forms of examining reality" that describe how a project can be carried out. Project 1 draws on their stamp collector versus journalist distinction. While the first collects, orders, and exhibits, the second goes beyond that and also explores backgrounds and context, researches new information, and documents findings. This model is relevant here because the task was to go beyond listing which kinds of products can be seen in the supermarket and to find out which things seem to be important for the German way of life. Likewise, with the observation skills of a journalist – to maintain the metaphor – some aspects of deep culture could be explored.

Based on notes and photos, students informally presented some interesting findings (as always, in German – all three projects were designed to be doable for intermediate-level learners). While the organization of stores was perceived to be very similar to the U.S. (as compared to, for example, Latin-American or Mediterranean countries), students found the variety of cheeses and cold cuts as well as the way beer is sold in large boxes (*Kästen*) notable. The students were also quite fascinated by the variety of ketchups and sauces, the variety of brands of the same product (like chocolate), and the fact that basil or lemon plants could be bought in the vegetables section. Going beyond observation, the variety of products was linked to the deep-cultural aspect of personal freedom. Students further observed the more reserved way of interaction and the different concept of personal space (very tight lines at checkout). A revealing point with regard to drawing conclusions on deep culture based on observation was students' impression that the German clerks were not being very helpful in providing suggestions (e.g., when asking for a recommendation at the cheese counter). This was an opportunity for the teacher to note that foreigners very often make this observation and that the key is to ask very precise questions, but that Germans, indeed, rarely simply volunteer information or recommendations.

Project 2

Project 2 (see Appendix B) aimed to allow students to explore deep-cultural aspects through TV programs and ads. This is useful because the way products are presented and which things are advertised hints at what seems important to Germans in life. It further makes it possible to gain some impressions of the German value system. Likewise, the students already observed during the first days in Germany how Germans seem to prefer factual and well-researched information (and fitting ways of presenting them), rather than the more drama and entertainment-oriented presentation style often found in the U.S.

Again drawing on Duncker and Götz (1984), two more ways of carrying out projects are those of the rummage sale stroller versus the archeologist, with the latter going beyond observation and superficial impressions and trying to "excavate" the cultural meaning of objects. This is particularly true here as it is not the aim of this project to engage in the superficial stimulation television provides, but to literally observe German media in order to identify points of cultural significance. An important secondary aim was for students to train their listening comprehension skills, for which this project was especially conducive, since it trained selective listening ("Can I use this show for the project?") as well as detailed listening ("How is the

information presented?") by requiring students to skim through TV shows and to select and analyze the ones they deemed to be of cultural significance.

For this project, students decided to create a PowerPoint presentation with screenshots in five rubrics: the news, ads, talk shows, "sexy shows," and sports (each typically with a particular program for illustration). This was a very effective way of tackling this project and is illustrative of how students used input sessions and project sheets for inspiration, but then made the topic their own. To take three examples, the participants noticed that the news are very objective (vs. suggesting what to find relevant), that "regular people" presented the news (vs. young and beautiful presenters), and that there is more oral commenting and fewer clips as compared to the U.S. Further, TV ads were perceived as fundamentally different. Participants described American TV ads as "entertainment shows," while in Germany only some information is presented briefly regarding what the product is for and how to acquire it. Finally, students observed significantly more nudism on German TV (e.g., exposed breasts, naked people from behind). The classroom discussion with the teacher led to the conclusion that in Germany there is a strict separation between what could be called natural nudism and sexual nudism. One student mentioned in this context the film *Nirgendwo in Afrika* as an example, in which a young girl is shown from behind as she gets out of the bathtub and walks through the room to get her clothes. In addition, it was observed that in films in which sexuality is explicitly presented, no censorship is employed, indicating that sexuality is simply used to enhance realism. As a general conclusion to this project, students noted that in comparison to the U.S., Germans seem to value directness over entertainment in the media, and possibly in general.

Project 3

Project 3 (see Appendix C), in which the students interviewed an American teacher of English who had been living in Germany for 13 years, served as a conclusion to the whole course and specifically tackled deep culture, allowing students to draw on their detailed understanding of the concept they had gained by then. This project followed Frey's (2012) foundation of project work quite to the letter, according to which "learners choose a topic of interest, agree on planned activities, develop the topic, and lead the consequentially extended activities to a useful outcome" (p. 14). The students worked with the topic "German (deep) culture," they agreed on a number of thematic areas as sub-topics, decided which introductory questions to ask to prime the interviewee, they developed the topic with a set of fruitful questions in a conducive sequence, and led it to a useful outcome. The outcome, in addition to the powerful "inner product" (Wöll, 1998), was a handout with cultural facts, organized by thematic areas (as discussed above), a video of the interview (which could be used for further analysis), and a final oral presentation, which was also recorded. Special thematic areas that students added to the project sheet provided in Appendix C were "sports and soccer mentality," "shopping," "family life," "attitude toward historic buildings," and the "rules vs. personal freedom ambivalence."

An especially interesting technique employed to conclude the interview was to show the interviewee Schöb and Schöb's (2008) "top 10 cliché classics" (p. 25) with the task to assess them for correctness based on his experience living in Germany. This led to an engaged discussion, illustrated with personal impressions and anecdotes. The list consists of (1) sense of duty, (2) flair for organization, (3) lack of humor, (4) sense of order, (5) punctuality, (6) subservience to authority, (7) efficiency, (8) industriousness, (9) reliability, and (10) Mr. know-it-all attitude. Interestingly, the interviewee perceived 1, 7, 8, and 9 to be equal to the U.S., rejected 3, 5, and 6, and agreed with 2, 4, and 10. Double-checking with several culturally educated Germans led to large agreement with the interviewee except for point 6, which some Germans admitted to be true (though this is also more positively perceived as trusting the country's rules and order).

Student Feedback

Students were asked to assess the course, the teacher's performance (with guiding questions), and to comment on the individual projects. All students had positive reactions to the course, they praised the proper balance between teacher guidance and student autonomy as well as the sessions analyzing and contextualizing the discoveries – two highly important methodological considerations in project work. Also, while some students said to have loved Project 3, others were especially enthusiastic about Projects 1 and 2. From the teacher's perspective, the students appeared extremely motivated and the depths of their analyses and reflections, as presented, very much seemed to point toward real intercultural competence (see Chlopek, 2008).

Conclusion

It was the aim of this article to offer pedagogically workable conceptualizations of the concept of culture and to show how they can be implemented in practice. Especially if students have access to a country where the target language is spoken, the project method arguably provides a multitude of opportunities to maximize student motivation and learning effectiveness, with the general aim of building true intercultural communicative competence. The trial course showed evidence that the pedagogical model discussed can, in fact, fulfill these goals. For future research it would be helpful to see how teaching deep culture through the project method can be realized in other local contexts and with other groups of students. Since developing intercultural competence is by now seen as one of the major goals of contemporary foreign language instruction, it is hoped that the conceptualization and methodology described here can aid teachers in achieving this goal in a both enjoyable and effective manner.

References

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal, 56*(1), 57-64.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (2012). *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012_FINAL.pdf

Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M. (2001). Introduction. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan & M. Swain (Eds.), *Task-Based Learning, Language Teaching, Learning and Assessment* (pp. 1-20). Harlow: Pearson.

Chlopek, Z. (2008). The intercultural approach to EFL teaching and learning. *English Teaching Forum, 46*(4), 10-27.

Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dewey, J. (1935). Ausweg aus dem pädagogischen Wirrwarr. In J. Dewey & W.H. Kilpatrick (Eds.), *Der Projekt-Plan: Grundlegung und Praxis* (pp. 85-101). Weimar: Böhlau.

Duncker, L., & Götz, B. (1984). *Projektunterricht als Beitrag zur inneren Schulreform*. Langenau-Ulm: Vaas.

Euler, S.S. (2014). From communicative to task-based pronunciation teaching: Utilizing the power of rhythm and connected speech. *Speak Out!, 51*, 5-15.

Euler, S.S. (2015). The age of neuroeducation. *English Teaching Professional, 98*, 4-6.

Ferraro, G.P. (2009). *The Cultural Dimensions of International Business*. London: Pearson.

Finkbeiner, C. (2012). Handlungsorientierter Unterricht (Holistic and action-oriented learning and teaching). In M. Byram & A. Hu (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 292-296). New York: Routledge.

Frey, K. (2012). *Die Projektmethode. Der Weg zum bildenden Tun*. Weinheim/Basel: Beltz Verlag.

Gudjons, H. (2008). *Handlungsorientiert lehren und lernen: Schüleraktivierung. Selbsttätigkeit. Projektarbeit*. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.

Gumperz, J. (1992). Interviewing in intercultural situations. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work* (pp. 302-327). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Helmke, A. (2014). *Unterrichtsqualität und Lehrerprofessionalität*. Seelze-Velber: Klett Kallmeyer.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hofstede G., Hofstede, G.J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations. Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival*. Columbus: McGraw-Hill.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Orlova, N. (2003). Teaching American little-c culture to prospective teachers of English. In P. Drábek & J. Chovanec (Eds.), *Theory and Practice in English Studies. Vol. 1.* (pp. 179-183). Brno: Masaryk University.

Ribe, R., & Vidal, N. (1993). *Project Work: Step by Step*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Schöb, A., & Schöb, M. (2008). *Piefkes, Krauts und andere Deutsche. Was die Welt von uns hält*. München: Buchner.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (Ed.) (2008). *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory*. New York: Continuum.

Städeli, C., Grassi, A., Rhiner, K., & Obrist, W. (2013). *Kompetenzorientiert unterrichten*. Bern: hep Verlag.

Weaver, G.R. (1986). Understanding and coping with cross-cultural adjustment stress. In R.M. Paige (Ed.), *Cross-Cultural Orientation, New Conceptualizations and Applications* (pp. 111-145). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Wöll, G. (1998). *Handeln: Lernen durch Erfahrung. Handlungsorientierung und Projektunterricht*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider.

Appendix A. Projekt 1: Geschäfte, Waren, Shopping

Beobachtung 1: Supermarkt

Geht bis Montag in einen größeren deutschen Supermarkt (am besten Edeka/Herkules, Rewe oder Kaufland – nicht Aldi/Lidl/Netto da weniger Auswahl). Denkt über die folgenden Punkte nach und macht Notizen:

- Was kennt ihr nicht? (bestimmte Produkte)
- Was fällt euch besonders auf? (z.B. Ladenorganisation, Produktvielfalt +/- usw.)
- Gibt es Dinge, von denen ihr nicht gedacht hättet, dass es die hier auch gibt?
- Welche generellen Eindrücke bekommt ihr?

Beobachtung 2: Innenstadt

Geht nun in die Innenstadt und achtet dort auf Geschäfte, Restaurants usw.
Was fällt euch hier auf (wie oben)?

Nachbereitung

Beschreibt in Stichpunkten oder als Journaleintrag:

- Gibt es deutliche Unterschiede zu eurem Land?
- Was könnt ihr bei diesen Beobachtungen über Deutschland lernen?
- Sind euch Dinge über Verhaltensweisen der Leute aufgefallen?

Zur nächsten Stunde

Bringt Notizen, Fotos und, nach Möglichkeit, gekaufte Dinge (z.B. Geschenkartikel, direkt verzehrbare Lebensmittel) zur nächsten Stunde mit.
Stellt eure Erkenntnisse vor, z.B. in Form einer PowerPoint Präsentation oder weniger gesteuert z.B. als freies Gespräch anhand der Notizen und Fotos.

Zusatzaufgabe

Erstellt eine Mindmap zu einem bestimmten semantischen Feld (z.B. Wurstsorten [Hinweis: *Wurst = cold cuts* oder *sausages*], Obst & Gemüse, Kleidung, Sportequipment, Gebäude usw.)

Appendix B. Projekt 2: TV und Werbung

Auf www.tvmovie.de, in gedruckten Fernsehzeitschriften und auf den Homepages von Sendern findet ihr welche Sendungen die verschiedenen Sender ausstrahlen. Die Sender RTL, RTL II und Pro7 sind sehr beliebte Privatsender, die auch von jungen Leuten oft geschaut werden. VOX ist ein sehr deutscher Sender, der für Alt wir Jung interessant sein kann. ARD und ZDF sind die offiziellen öffentlich-rechtlichen Sender und sehr viele andere sind die Dritten, d.h. lokale Sender (z.B. NDR, MDR, RP/SWR). Diese Sender werden von jungen Leuten eher wenig beachtet.

Beobachtung 1: Deutsche Fernsehprogramme
Schaut euch das Programm und (Teile von) ein paar Sendungen an (z.B. auch online auf der Homepage des Senders).
1) Fallen euch bestimmte Unterschiede zu eurem Land auf?
Zum Beispiel:
- Gibt es bestimmte Typen von Sendungen, die in Deutschland/in den USA viel öfter oder viel seltener vorkommen?
- Wie sind bestimmte Sendungen (z.B. Talkshows) anders?
- Gibt es generelle Auffälligkeiten?
2) Welche Programme scheinen die Deutschen anzusprechen?

Beobachtung 2: Werbung
Während ihr die 1. Beobachtung durchführt, schaut euch auch ein bisschen Werbung an (vielleicht auch auf YouTube unter „Werbung").
- Kann man hier etwas über deutsche Kultur lernen?
- Was wollen die Deutschen (laut Werbung)?
- Wie ist Werbung aufgebaut (vielleicht auch sprachlich)?
- Seht ihr Unterschiede zu eurem Land?

Nachbereitung
Beschreibt eure Erkenntnisse in Form eines Journaleintrags oder in Stichpunkten.

Zum letzten Tag des Projekts
Stellt euch vor, ein Professor für Medienwissenschaft in Deutschland würde euch bitten, eure Erkenntnisse in seinem Seminar „Interkulturelle Kompetenz in der Film- und Fernsehindustrie" zu präsentieren.
Deutsche Studenten sind sich ihrer eigenen Kultur nicht explizit bewusst und wissen nicht, was in anderen Ländern anders sein könnte. Eure Beobachtungen können dieses Problem adressieren.

Appendix C. Projekt 3: Interview eines Ausländers in Deutschland
Hintergrund des Interviews
Es ist fast unmöglich, Tiefenkulturaspekte von Leuten der Zielkultur zu erfragen, da sie sich ihrer Kultur oft nicht bewusst sind. Ausländer, die für einige Zeit im Land gelebt haben, können vergleichen und wissen somit oft mehr.

Möglicher Aufbau des Interviews
- Persönliche Informationen
- Warum Deutschland? Wie lange sind Sie schon hier?
- Haben Sie viel Kontakt mit Deutschen?
- Welche Aspekte der Oberflächenkultur sind interessant? Warum?
- Welche Aspekte der Oberflächenkultur gefallen Ihnen nicht? Warum?
- Am Anfang in Deutschland, wurden Stereotypen bestätigt?
- Gab es interkulturelle Missverständnisse? (ca. 2-3)
- Was sind die größten Unterschiede zum Ursprungsland? (small-c)
- Was charakterisiert die Deutschen?
- Top 10 Liste: Was ist Ihre Meinung dazu?
- Was fällt Ihnen zu den folgenden Wörtern ein (in Bezug auf deutsche Kultur): Umweltschutz, Effizienz, persönliche Freiheit usw.
- Gibt es Ambivalenzen?
- Nach X Jahren in Deutschland, was ist die beste und schlechteste Eigenschaft der deutschen Kultur?

Durchführung
- Am Anfang unbedingt klarstellen, wie viel Zeit man hat (Auswahl von Fragen, Zeitplanung während des Interviews).
- Am Anfang sollte man fragen, ob die Person einverstanden ist, dass man das Interview aufnimmt.
- Es muss klar sein, wer was fragt.
- Alle machen so viele Notizen wie möglich.

Nachbereitung
Bereitet einen mündlichen Vortrag vor, der das Interview mit 1) Einleitung, 2) Hauptteil mit Gliederungspunkten und 3) Schussteil zusammenfasst. Bereitet dazu ein Handout vor und erstellt ein paar Diskussionspunkte, die nach dem Bericht mit der Gruppe besprochen werden können.