

# Cultures & Languages across the Curriculum

## Strengthening Intercultural Competence & Advancing Internationalization

India C. Plough

### Introduction

The role of world languages in the internationalization of college campuses in the United States (U.S.) has become a recurring theme of discussions in academic, government, and private sectors. Topics have ranged from the lack of a common definition of internationalization (Edelstein, 2014) to a review of college curricula (e.g., Rifkin, 2012). Klee (2009) and Bettencourt (2011) have recently proposed a re-examination and renewal of an instructional approach introduced almost three decades ago, Cultures and Languages Across the Curriculum (CLAC).<sup>1</sup> While supporting the approach, each notes a number of issues that must be addressed for the successful implementation of a CLAC program.

In this article I take up two of these issues: the overall goal of CLAC programs and the related topic of the necessary conditions for rigorous and informative research of these programs. I begin with the premise that intercultural competence is an essential ingredient of internationalization and that intercultural competence must be developed in order for internationalization within the U.S. to advance. Furthermore, one critical factor in the development of intercultural competence is the knowledge of a world language.

First, I describe the current state of affairs in the teaching and learning of languages other than English in the U.S. Second, I highlight findings from a recent literature review on internationalization that bear directly on the development of CLAC programs and related research. Third, I present a typology of CLAC models created by Davies (2012) to exemplify

the diversity of programs and the issues this poses for the unification of the CLAC “movement” (<http://clacconsortium.org/>). Fourth, I maintain that situating CLAC programs within a theory of learning will strengthen research, promote cross-institutional collaboration, and lead to program improvement and possibly the growth of CLAC programs nationally. I suggest two conceptual frameworks within which CLAC programs might be situated: Linguaculture and a Sociocultural Theory of second language acquisition.

Finally, using the CLAC program in the Residential College in the Arts and Humanities (RCAH) at Michigan State University (MSU) as an example, I describe the application of three key components of these theories to the RCAH’s CLAC program.

### Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose?

(Jean-Baptiste Alphonse Karr, January, 1849)

The importance and benefits of knowledge of other cultures and of a language other than English (LOE) for national and individual well-being are indisputable. Yet, in 1979 the President’s Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies concluded that “Americans’ incompetence in foreign [sic] languages is nothing short of scandalous...” (cited in Panetta, 1999).

Three decades later at a Foreign Language Summit convened at the University of Maryland in 2010, U.S. Secretary of Education Duncan noted that “The United States is a long way from being [a] multilingual society...” At the same summit, CIA Director Panetta stated that “for the United States to get to where it needs to be will require a national commitment to strengthening America’s foreign [sic] language proficiency. A significant cultural change needs to occur. And that requires a transformation in attitude from everyone involved: individuals, government, schools and universities, and the private sector.”

Findings from recent national surveys indicate that we are still far from being a multilingual society. According to the 2006 and 2008 General Social Survey,<sup>2</sup> the proportion of speakers of languages other than English has remained relatively unchanged at approximately 25% for almost three decades. What is more, only 10% of respondents report that they speak an LOE ‘very well’ (Rivers & Robinson, 2012).

Not unrelated, trends in student enrollment in LOEs offered at institutions of higher education in the US do not fare any better. A 2013 survey (Goldberg, Looney, & Lusin, 2015) conducted by The Modern Language Association (MLA) showed a drop of 6.7% in language enrollments from 2009 to 2013. Additionally, when looking at LOE enrollment as a percentage of all students enrolled in college, this proportion has remained relatively constant at about 8% since 1977. However, some students are choosing to learn different languages; since 2009, the percentages have increased in American Sign Language, Chinese, Korean, and Portuguese while the numbers have either dropped or remained the same in ten of the 14 languages included in the survey.<sup>3</sup>

It is somewhat surprising that there is not a greater decline in enrollment given recent trends to remove languages from curricula (e.g., German at University of Maine) and to eliminate entire degree programs (e.g., French BA at South Carolina State University). Additionally, from 1994-95 to 2009-10, there was a decrease by almost 20% in the number of institutions that require the study of an LOE for the baccalaureate degree (Berman, 2011; Skorton & Altschuler, 2012). It is no wonder that we are seeing a “dearth of qualified [language] instructors” (Duncan, 2010) in K-12 schools. Finally, only ten states require the study of an LOE for graduation from high school.

The reports cited above, among others,

India C. Plough is an assistant professor and director of the Language Proficiency Program in the Residential College in the Arts and Humanities at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

include substantive arguments for the importance of the knowledge of world languages and cultures in today's globalized world. To give just one example, Rifkin (2012) convincingly shows how "the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century*...constitute a remarkably accurate reflection of the Essential Learning Outcomes established through the Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities" (2007, p. 54).

Of particular relevance to the current discussion, Rifkin highlights the University of Rhode Island's dual degree International Engineering Program, which contains a CLAC component. This program represents a perfect combination of the LEAP integrative learning outcome and the Connections Standard, "Students reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through the foreign [sic] language."

In principle, there is unanimous agreement that knowledge of world languages and cultures can significantly improve our students' ability to thrive, both professionally and personally, in today's globalized society. Yet, in practice, solutions<sup>4</sup> to challenges (e.g., lack of financial support) continue to be debated and remain elusive.

### Internationalization

Perhaps the increased attention on the need for the internationalization of every sector of U.S. society will lead to a renewed commitment for making the knowledge of world languages and cultures a priority. In fact, in a *Modern Language Journal Perspectives* issue (2009), "The Role of Foreign Language Departments in Internationalizing the Curriculum," Klee states that CLAC programs were initiated (and some were federally funded) in the 1980s in response to the need for the internationalization of college campuses. Before discussing CLAC initiatives, I outline relevant findings from a recent comprehensive literature review of international programs and curricula.

As part of the larger Research Universities Going Global project, Edelstein (2014) discovered significant gaps in our understanding of internationalization. The majority of research in this field is concentrated into two main areas, one of which is study abroad (which includes the acquisition of a world language and intercultural relations); the other is the international student experience. Edelstein notes that "there is a lack of consensus

about the goals, nature and importance of the international dimensions of higher education..." (p. 7).

For example, the acquisition or knowledge of a world language is not necessarily included as a research variable in studies that focus on functioning in cross-cultural or multicultural contexts. As stated previously, I suggest that intercultural competence is an essential ingredient of internationalization and that intercultural competence must be developed in order for internationalization to progress. Furthermore, one critical factor in the development of intercultural competence is the knowledge of a world language. However, it seems that rather than acknowledging and addressing the absence of a critical component of the construct (internationalization), studies are designed so that language is simply eliminated as a defining feature.

Edelstein also discovered

... great variation in the extent to which curricular and pedagogical approaches and learning objectives are clearly defined and stated...[and called for] researchers and practitioners [to] strive to develop some degree of common language and common concepts that can serve to develop more opportunities for finding relationships and links between the broad range of disciplines, theories, and methods that are present in the field. (2014, pp. 7-8)

This call could very easily be issued to practitioners of a CLAC approach to world language education, to which I now turn.

### Cultures and Languages across the Curriculum

Differing accounts of the impetus for the creation of CLAC programs exist. The origin of the approach has been traced to the 1970s as part of other across-the-curriculum pedagogical initiatives (<http://clac-consortium.org/>) and, as mentioned, to the 1980s in response to the need for the internationalization of college campuses (Klee, 2009).

There also seems to be lack of consensus on an exact definition of CLAC. It has been referred to as "a curricular application of content-based instruction [CBI]" (Kecht & von Hammerstein, 2000, p. xxi), and yet, the CLAC Consortium contends that CLAC is not synonymous with CBI. Because CLAC has not been explicitly distinguished from pedagogical approaches that are historically rooted in world language instruction, programs are often criticized for

not focusing more on developing students' language skills (Klee, 2009).

However, CLAC programs reject "any claim that [they] advance the students' language capability" (Adams, 2000, p.18) and, as is formalized on the CLAC Consortium website, the primary goal of CLAC programs is to provide students with increased opportunities "to apply their knowledge of languages in a variety of curricular contexts, not just within the traditional language classroom." The reasoning is that students' motivation to improve their proficiency will increase as a result of meaningful content-focused interaction in a world language and that this will lead them to continue to use the language beyond the educational setting. CLAC programs are not designed to replace 'traditional' language classes. In fact, they can only be effective if implemented in conjunction with these classes. Furthermore, collaboration between departments of world languages and CLAC programs (if housed in different units) will only strengthen both and provide our students with a greater diversity of experiences in world languages and cultures.

The distinguishing feature of any CLAC program is that it is customized to the institution. There is not a fixed structure or a single formula that can be used in creating a program. CLAC programs that are successful are built on a thorough knowledge of one's particular context and on existing institutional strengths (NAFSA Webinar, 2012). For example, who are the stakeholders? What is the interest level among them for a CLAC initiative? What resources are available? The customization of the CLAC approach has led to the formation of different models at different institutions.

Davies (2012) has created a typology of the different programs:

- ◆ **Linked:** Two disciplinary courses with two faculty working together to offer one course in English and one in an LOE (e.g., FLAC at St. Olaf University); or, optional modules to disciplinary courses taught in English (e.g., LAC at University of Richmond).
- ◆ **Immersion:** Standalone disciplinary courses taught in an LOE (e.g., LAC at Trinity University).
- ◆ **Infused:** Faculty incorporate an LOE into a disciplinary course (e.g., LAC at Baldwin-Wallace University); or, language faculty offer sections in different disciplinary areas (e.g., LAC at Skidmore College).
- ◆ **Empowered:** Large disciplinary

courses offer recitation sections in a number of LOEs (e.g., LxC at Binghamton University).

◆ Dual Degree: Coordinated Content-Based Instruction containing CLAC experiences and leading to full immersion (e.g., International Engineering Program at the University of Rhode Island).

To this typology, I add the CLAC program in the RCAH at MSU, which can be characterized as ‘linked’ but is distinct from others in this category. Integrated Language Options (ILOs), the core elements of the RCAH’s CLAC program, are project-based, non-credit bearing, weekly immersion experiences.

The topic of an ILO is student-initiated, stemming from a question or theme that originates in an RCAH course and in this sense can be considered ‘linked.’ Because ILOs are thematically based and work with materials that are separate from the RCAH course, students are not required to be enrolled in the particular RCAH course or courses that generated the ILO. Our undergraduates collaborate with classmates, with graduate student fellows who are native or near-native speakers of languages other than English, and often with community partners, to investigate an issue. I return to the RCAH’s CLAC program in the “Application” section.

In addition to the range of models, CLAC programs may be housed in various academic units at different institutions (e.g., Departments of Foreign Languages and Literatures; Offices of International Programs) and may be facilitated by faculty, (under)graduate students, and/or academic staff. This contextualization of the CLAC approach is one of its greatest strengths and at the same time one of its greatest weaknesses.

Byrnes (2000) asked if the replacement of CLAC programs with content- or standards-based instruction in the mid to late 90s was in part because CLAC programs “were so dependent on local conditions and so uniquely tied to a particular ... context that they could at best occupy a curricular niche, a space that would gradually diminish in importance” (p. 152).

This localization should not prevent the application of research conducted at one institution to a program at another institution. For a field to progress and improve, research studies across institutions must build on each other. Even if the institutional goals or curricular objectives are not the same, comparisons can still be made

between programs that are based on the same theoretical foundations or the same methodological principles. However, this can only be achieved if those theories and principles have been articulated. With several exceptions (e.g., Byrnes, 2000; Fendt, 2000; Jurasek, 2000), the CLAC literature consists of program descriptions only. The sharing of best practices is certainly necessary and beneficial. Additionally, this is not to say that CLAC practitioners are not working within a particular educational framework or frameworks. However, this must be documented in the literature. Furthermore, research studies grounded in theory can potentially inform other disciplines (e.g., education, psychology) based on that theory. It should be highlighted that these shortcomings clearly are not unique to CLAC programs (e.g., Edelstein summarized above).

In an attempt to make one small step toward addressing these issues, I suggest two frameworks within which CLAC programs might be situated, both of which interface quite well with each other, and with the CLAC approach, in theory and in practice. The first articulates a conceptual relationship between language and culture—Linguaculture (Risager, 2013); the second grounds language acquisition in a theory of “human consciousness” (Lantolf, 2011, p. 24)—Sociocultural Theory (SCT).<sup>5</sup>

### Linguaculture

RCAH’s CLAC program is built on the concept of linguaculture as developed by Risager (2005, 2006, 2010). As Risager explains, theorizing that language and culture are *inseparable* stresses that language is culture-bound; this, in turn may easily lead to “a conception of a closed universe of language, people, nation, culture, history, mentality, and land” (2005, p.189). However, theorizing that language and culture are *separable* treats language as a code and returns us to linguistic structuralism of the beginning of the 20th century. The concept of linguaculture assumes that language and culture are simultaneously separable and inseparable.

In examining the relationship between language and culture, Risager distinguishes between a generic sense and a differential sense. In the generic sense, “one can view language and culture as psychological/cognitive phenomena which, to some extent or other, have certain species-specific (neuro-)physiological prerequisites, or one can view language and culture as a social phenomena that have developed as

part of the social life of the human species” (2006, p. 3-4). At the generic level, language and culture cannot be separated.

Risager’s differential sense embodies the idea that there are specific forms of linguistic knowledge and linguistic practice that relate to a language or a language variety; additionally, there are specific forms of cultural knowledge and cultural practice, including “different meanings and meaningful forms relating to sign systems as pictures, fashion, food ... different norms and values, symbols, ideas and ideologies” (2005, p. 190). It is in a differential sense that one can discuss the cultural practices that are related to Language X or the cultural practices related to Language Y, etc.

Risager (2005) proposes that linguaculture provides a useful framework in the analysis of the associations between language, culture, and society in today’s globalized world. Linguaculture consists of three interrelated dimensions: the semantic-pragmatic dimension, the poetic dimension, and the identity dimension. As language users enter new (transnational) social networks and move across cultural contexts and discourse communities, they carry their linguacultures with them. Further, discourse, while having a linguistic form, is not necessarily bound to a specific language so that discourses of ideologies, for example, flow from language to language. Dynamic interactions of “disconnections and reconnections, of disembedding and reembedding, of processes of cultural influence, domination, and integration” (p. 193) are created.

Risager goes on to argue that “...we need a redefinition of language and culture pedagogy that transcends the national paradigm and introduces a dynamic transnational and global perspective, including multilingual awareness, centering on the study of meaning as it is produced in the interface of linguaculture and discourse” (p. 195).

Risager has enumerated four implications of this conceptualization on the pedagogy of language and culture. First, in today’s electronically-connected and physically mobile society, a particular language is no longer limited to or necessarily associated with a specific geographic region. The situations in which a language is used and the roles that that language plays in those situations have increased exponentially. The area of study must now include this worldwide network.

Second, a particular language may be a first, second, third, etc. language for speakers of that language. The linguacultures of

these individuals influence the language and vice versa. The languages that our students are pursuing are no longer necessarily the language of the native speaker.

Third, as mentioned, a particular discourse is not bound to a specific language and the study of “a specific language is not confined to ... specific thematic areas (disciplinary fields)... [Additionally,] a language community is never a closed discourse community...” (2005, p. 194).

Finally, and perhaps of most relevance to CLAC programs, world language studies should integrate language, discourse, and “the (rest of)” culture and society. I return to this idea in the “Application” section.

### Sociocultural Theory

The RCAH CLAC program also draws on applications of Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory (SCT) to the teaching and learning of world languages (Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Thorne, 2007). SCT assumes that mental functioning and cognitive development are social in origin. “... [Vygotsky] argued that our biologically determined mental systems...are reorganized into a new, uniquely human psychological system once humans encounter cultural artifacts, activities, and concepts...These artifacts empower humans with the capacity to mediate and thus intentionally control their biologically endowed mental functions...” (Lantolf, 2006, pp. 69-70).

Culturally constructed artifacts include physical tools such as books, computers, and weapons as well as symbolic tools such as language, numeric systems, music and art. Activities include things such as play, education, and work. Finally, concepts include religion and the understandings that communities create of the personal, the physical, and the social and mental worlds. These three factors function as an integrated whole so that, for example, play may incorporate computers; or, education may incorporate music.

SCT proposes two main processes: mediation and internalization. According to SCT, we do not interact directly with the social and physical world. Rather, all mental activity and all relationships (between people and between people and the physical world) are mediated by culturally constructed artifacts (e.g., language), activities, and concepts. Furthermore, these factors have been jointly constructed throughout history. Internalization is the process by which “the individual, through interaction with others, actively reconstructs external, shared operations

on the internal plane” (Fernyhough, 2008, p. 227).

A key mechanism of internalization is imitation, which is in no way connected to behaviorism. Rather, it is transformative cognitive activity. Often observed through private speech, imitation may not occur immediately after exposure to, for example, a second language. Rather, a delay of one day or more may take place. During this time language is being analyzed. Through internalization an individual’s relationship to the environment is reorganized, higher order mental functions develop, and learning takes place.

SCT differentiates between development in everyday, natural settings and development in educational settings. In natural settings,

... development [is] an unconscious, “spontaneous” process, whereby children are mediated into their culture by parents and other members of their social group. Through mediation, by and large a communicative process, children engage in the appropriate activities ... as defined by the culture and in so doing internalize the relevant ways of talking and thinking sanctioned by the community.... (Lantolf, 2011, p. 305)

According to Vygotsky,

Education may be defined as the artificial development of the child. Education is the artificial mastery of natural processes of development. Education not only influences certain processes of development, but restructures all functions of behavior in a most essential manner...development [in the educational setting] is ‘ideally’ at least conscious and intentional. (Vygotsky, 1997, p. 88 cited in Lantolf, 2011, pp. 305-306)

The last SCT concept summarized here is the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which refers to the space or distance between what an individual can do independently and what the individual can do with assistance or working collaboratively with others. The concept of the ZPD has proven to be particularly useful to educators. With an understanding of the developmental paths of students’ emerging abilities, teachers can target specific forms of development through the use of particular instructional tasks and strategies.

### Application

The faculty, staff, and students of the Residential College in the Arts and Humanities remain committed to creating a

signature program that makes the study of world cultures and use of world languages an essential part of the RCAH experience. The RCAH is a young undergraduate college, accepting its first students in 2007. With an enrollment of approximately 300 students, the major is built on four cornerstones: world history, art and culture, ethics, and engaged learning.

The RCAH degree requires proficiency in a language other than English. World languages are not formally taught in the RCAH; rather, world language instruction is housed in various departments across the University. Therefore, the CLAC program in the RCAH is designed as a complement to the traditional language course and provides our students with additional opportunities to strengthen and use their knowledge of a world language and culture.

As mentioned, the conceptual frameworks of Risager’s linguaculture and of Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory interface quite well with each other. Key constructs of both theories emphasize the integration of social, cultural as well as biological elements. In fact, Risager (2013) notes that linguists including Lantolf, who has worked extensively on theoretical issues of sociocultural theory and second language learning, are indeed working with linguaculture without using her terminology.

Both Risager and Lantolf promote project-based learning, the methodology employed by the RCAH’s CLAC program. Risager argues for interdisciplinary approaches to intercultural learning and communication and suggests that project-based work, supplemented with course work, is one way to achieve this. For example,

A project work (in French) on problems of intercultural understanding raised by the use of children’s books, produced in France, in a small rural community in Burkina Faso, would perhaps illustrate the necessity of applying both linguistic, cultural and historical knowledge ... in order to understand the problems involved.” (Risager, 2005, p. 195)

Similarly, SCT proposes that collaboration with others precedes and influences development. Lantolf and Thorne (2007, p. 208) note that

...because SCT construes language as a cultural tool used to carry out concrete goal directed activities...evidence [of development]<sup>6</sup> must be sought in tasks in which language is a means to some concrete end...these may be tasks that are typical of instructional programs in

the classroom-setting such as project-based learning.

I offer here four short descriptions of ILO projects completed by students in the RCAH at MSU.<sup>7</sup> Three foundational components, which have their origins in Linguaculture and SCT, are present in every ILO.

First, ILOs involve project-based, goal-directed collaboration. Immersed in the world language, our students collaboratively explore topics with each other, with graduate student language fellows who are native or near-native speakers of the world language, and often with community partners. ILO projects are shared with the public at an end-of-the-semester showcase and placed on the RCAH website. However, products are only one piece of the picture.

Second and closely related to the first component, ILOs involve engagement. The examples below show how our students engage with social and cultural contexts in natural and educational settings. When students engage with an authentic task in an authentic context, what naturally arise are the demands of a group interacting with other individuals in the real world, which cannot be anticipated. Authenticity is also central to the CLAC approach. The first three examples of ILOs provided below originated from topics (poverty, justice) that were the focus of a civic engagement course and/or an engagement proseminar; the last grew out of a number of RCAH courses on world music.

Third, as with most if not all CLAC programs, ILOs contain an interdisciplinary component. Our graduate student fellows represent a wide range of fields, from engineering to journalism and medical anthropology. ILOs are significantly more enriching when the topics represent an intersection of RCAH students' queries/interests and graduate students' experiences/expertise. In this way, fellows serve as expert guides not only in terms of linguaculture but also in terms of discourse (i.e., thematic area or disciplinary field).

### 1. An ILO in Korean

An ILO in Korean culminated in a blog and a video of an interview. The RCAH student, the graduate student language fellow, and several people from the local Korean community explored how three different Korean movies—*Sunny*, *Welcome to Dongmakgol*, and *Miracle in Cell No. 7*—challenged and questioned the theme of war and created unique senses of peace. To understand the dynamic between war and peace, the students specifically chose

the topic of “family” and analyzed how families are continually constructed and reconstructed throughout periods of war.

### 2. An ILO in Spanish

An ILO in Spanish looked at issues of poverty in the Venezuelan context. Students discussed various manifestations and ramifications of poverty in Venezuela and compared them to the U.S. by reading first-hand accounts posted by Venezuelans on social media and current newspaper articles. Students also used this information as a springboard to their final projects: a poster presentation comparing U.S./Venezuelan with U.S./Iranian oil relations; a poster presentation on the ecological ramifications of illegal mining; and a sculpture depicting women's rights in Venezuela.

### 3. An ILO in French

An ILO in French tackled issues of transitional justice. Using podcasts and videos, students increased their understanding of world conflicts (e.g., Morocco, Algeria, Lebanon) as well as various models of transitional justice. Students conducted Skype interviews with French-speaking activists in Europe and northern Africa to gain a deeper appreciation for the critical issues surrounding this topic. The final project consisted of a Power Point presentation and a video documenting their Skype interviews.

### 4. An ILO in Turkish

An ILO in Turkish, culminating in a poster and a Prezi presentation, explored historical and contemporary Turkish music. Located as it is at the crossroads of Europe, the Middle East, and Central Asia, Turkish music blends elements from Arabic, Persian, Central Asian, Balkan, Greek, and Armenian musical traditions. The students listened to and discussed a variety of genres of Turkish music, ranging from Ottoman marches to Turkish rap, and researched the history of each style, who listens to it, and what social and cultural purposes it serves or has served.

## Conclusion

Increased intercultural awareness and an ability to participate in today's globalized society can be achieved with focused, thoroughly investigated curricular changes. When institutional programs situate their practices within a set of methodological principles, or, ideally, a theoretical framework, rigorous and

informative research can be conducted. I have suggested that internationalization depends on intercultural competence, that intercultural competence must be developed in order for internationalization to progress, and that knowledge of a world language cannot be ignored as a key factor in this process. When combined with ‘traditional’ language classes and/or disciplinary coursework, CLAC programs can make a significant impact toward internationalization.

Using the Cultures and Languages across the Curriculum model in the Residential College in the Arts and Humanities at Michigan State University, I have provided an example of an educational program that is grounded in theory. Integrated Language Options can serve as research venues to investigate concepts and processes proposed by Linguaculture and Sociocultural Theory, thus contributing to the wider academic community.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Noriko Iwashita at the University of Queensland, Dr. Suronda Gonzalez at Bingham University, and Dr. Deborah Crusan at Wright State University for valuable feedback and thoughtful discussions. All shortcomings remain my own.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> A consortium of universities practicing some form of this approach was established in 2005 at a conference at the University of Iowa. The increased emphasis on the cultural component of language resulted in the name of Cultures and Languages across the Curriculum (CLAC) Consortium. Of course, it is impractical for institutions to change the titles of already existing programs (e.g., LxC at University of Binghamton). In the current article, CLAC is used as the umbrella term for all programs.

<sup>2</sup> The GSS is conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. It is considered the single best source on societal trends, following “strict rules for national probability samples” (Rivers & Robinson 2012, p. 371). The results reported here consisted of 6,200 face-to-face interviews administered to adults age 18 and older.

<sup>3</sup> Languages included in the survey were American Sign Language, Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Latin, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish.

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World, the 2007 comprehensive report of the Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee. In this report, the committee presents issues in world language education in the US and makes specific recommendations for addressing “the current language crisis” (p. 1).

<sup>5</sup> A detailed discussion of specific areas of complementarity, and potential contradiction, go beyond the scope of the current article. Presented here are extremely abbreviated descriptions of these frameworks, limited to elements that are relevant to the current discussion.

<sup>6</sup> As highlighted earlier, in the absence of traditional language courses, CLAC programs cannot expect, or be expected, to lead to significant linguistic development.

<sup>7</sup> Descriptions of all ILOs can be found on the RCAH's website at <http://rcah.msu.edu/academics/language-proficiency/integrated-language-options>

## References

- Adams, T.M. (2000). Languages across the Curriculum: Taking stock. In M-R. Kecht & K. von Hammerstein (Eds.), *Languages across the curriculum: Interdisciplinary structures and internationalized education* (pp. 15-38). Columbus, OH: National East Asian Languages Resource Center.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2007). *College learning for the new global century: A report from the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise*. Washington, DC: Association for American Colleges and Universities.
- Berman, R. A. (2011). *The real language crisis*. American Association of University Professors Report, September-October 2011.
- Bettencourt, M. (2011). Languages across the Curriculum: A response to internationalization in foreign language education. *Multicultural Education*, 19(1), 55-58.
- Byrnes, H. (2000). Languages across the curriculum—Interdepartmental curriculum construction: Issues and options. In M-R. Kecht & K. von Hammerstein (Eds.), *Languages across the curriculum: Interdisciplinary structures and internationalized education* (pp. 151-176). Columbus, OH: National East Asian Languages Resource Center.
- Byrnes, H. (2009). The role of foreign language departments in internationalizing the curriculum. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 607-609.
- Davies, D. (2012). How to design & implement a CLAC program that works for your campus. CLAC 2012 Conference, The University of Minnesota. Cited in What Does an Internationalized Curriculum Look Like? The Promise of Cultures and Languages across the Curriculum. NAFSA Webinar Handout (2013, February 27).
- Davies, D., Kwai, C.K., & Gonzales, S. (2013, February 27). *What does an internationalized curriculum look like? The promise of cultures and languages across the curriculum*. NAFSA Webinar.
- Duncan, A. (2010). *Education and language gap*. Remarks at the Foreign Language Summit, University of Maryland, December 8.
- Edelstein, R. (2014). *Globalization and student learning: A literature review and call for greater conceptual rigor and cross-institutional studies*. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.6.14. Center for Studies in Higher Education: University of California, Berkeley.
- Fendt, K. (2000). Contextualizing content: The potential of hypermedia for interdisciplinary language and culture learning. In M-R. Kecht & K. von Hammerstein (Eds.), *Languages across the curriculum: Interdisciplinary structures and internationalized education* (pp. 201-226). Columbus, OH: National East Asian Languages Resource Center.
- Fernyhough, C. (2008). Getting Vygotskian about theory of mind: Mediation, dialogue, and the development of social understanding. *Developmental Review*, 28, 225-262.
- Goldberg, D., Looney, D., & Lusin, N. (2015). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education Fall 2013*. Modern Language Association of America.
- Jurasek, R. (2000). Languages across the curriculum as meaning making: Triangulating the ways we understand field reading, classroom pedagogy, and learning outcomes. In M-R. Kecht & K. von Hammerstein (Eds.), *Languages across the curriculum: Interdisciplinary structures and internationalized education* (pp. 177-200). Columbus, OH: National East Asian Languages Resource Center.
- Kecht, M-R., & von Hammerstein, K. (Eds.), *Languages across the curriculum: Interdisciplinary structures and internationalized education* (pp. ix -xxxii). Columbus, OH: National East Asian Languages Resource Center.
- Klee, C. (2009). Internationalization and foreign languages: The resurgence of interest in languages across the curriculum. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 618-621.
- Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2006). Sociocultural theory and L2 state of the art. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 67-109.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2011). Integrating sociocultural theory and cognitive linguistics in the second language classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research on second language teaching and learning*, Vol. II. (pp. 303-318). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2011). The sociocultural approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second acquisition* (pp. 24-47). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2007). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. In B. van Patten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 201-224). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). *Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world*. Washington, DC: Modern Language Association.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (2006). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century*. Yonkers, NY: Author.
- Panetta, L. E. (1999). *Foreign language education: If 'scandaloUS' in the 20th century, what will it be in the 21st century?* Retrieved from <https://web.stanford.edu/dept/lc/language/about/conferencepapers/panettapaper.pdf>
- Rifkin, B. (2012). The World Language Curriculum at the Center of Postsecondary Education. *Liberal Education*, Summer 2012, 54-57.
- Risager, K. (2005). Linguaculture as a key concept in language and culture teaching. In Preisler, B., Fabricius, A., Haberland, H., Kjaerbeck, S. & Risager, K. (Eds.), *The consequences of mobility* (pp. 185-196). Department of Language and Culture, Roskilde University, Denmark.
- Risager, K. (2006). *Language and culture: Global flows and local complexity*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Risager, K. (2010). *The language teacher facing transnationality*. Retrieved from [http://in3.uoc.edu/opencms\\_in3/export/sites/in3/webs/projects/EUNOM/\\_resources/documents/Karen\\_Risager\\_The\\_Language\\_Teacher\\_Facing\\_Transnationality\\_posted.pdf](http://in3.uoc.edu/opencms_in3/export/sites/in3/webs/projects/EUNOM/_resources/documents/Karen_Risager_The_Language_Teacher_Facing_Transnationality_posted.pdf)
- Risager, K. (2013). Linguaculture. In C. A. Chappelle (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. London, UK: Blackwell.
- Rivers, W. P., & Robinson, J. P. (2012). The unchanging American capacity in languages other than English: Speaking and learning languages other than English, 2000–2008. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96, 369–379.
- Skorton, D., & Altschuler, G. (2012). America's foreign language deficit. *Forbes*, August 27.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky*. Volume 3. Problems of the theory and history of psychology. New York, NY: Plenum.