Localized practices of intercultural communication in EMI lectures: The impact of local cultural identity on academic meaning making processes.

Mª Ángeles Velilla-Sánchez
University of Zaragoza
mavelilla@unizar.es

1. Introduction

The contextual nature of intercultural communication, especially concerning speakers' pragmatic choices to negotiate meaning and cultural identity, has become more prominent in recent research. A wide variety of studies have shown that the accommodative processes are shaped by different situation-specific conventions and needs in different localized interactions (Pölzl & Seidlhofer 2006; Baker 2015). Notions such as 'trans-cultural flows' (Pennycook 2007) or 'translocal spaces' (Canagarajah 2013) derive from applied linguistics studies that reflect on the role of culture, context and community in intercultural communicative exchanges in which speakers '[move] between global, national, local, and individual orientations' (Baker 2009: 567). These studies describe language as a means dynamically embodied in the physical and social environs in which is used.

In academic contexts the English language is a key component for intercultural communication, since it is frequently the nexus for many academic stakeholders with different linguistic and socio-cultural backgrounds in many European universities where English is the lingua franca and most often the medium of instruction. Lo Bianco (2002: 21) suggests that this phenomenon has resulted in English attaining certain distance from its original native speakers with its cultural resonance, leading to 'localized practices of communication in which local standards function alongside more international ones'. As Mauranen (2006: 143) pointed out, 'it is virtually impossible to separate academic culture from local culture'. Cultural and linguistic contexts and social relations tend to influence and impact literacy practices (Coyle & Meyer 2021). This emphasizes the discursive requirements that the educational endeavour underpins, in which practitioners need to become intercultural citizens within a local, national but at the same time international community. As such, issues of identity, community and culture have long been concerns of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) researchers (Jenkins 2007). More precisely, previous research on ELF pragmatics has demonstrated that successful interactions among ELF

speakers are characterized by the use of pragmatic strategies to achieve communicative alignment, adaptation, local accommodation and attunement (Firth 1996). However, certain types of pragmatic strategies seem to be used more frequently than others depending on the context and/or settings (Velilla 2021).

To shed light on this issue, this chapter examines language practices that are used by non-native speakers of English to display identity and achieve successful communication in intercultural settings such as English-mediated lectures (henceforth EMI) in a Spanish university. More precisely, the research presented in this paper studies pragmatic strategies used by lecturers at the University of Zaragoza (Spain) to negotiate meaning, culture and identity in international academic contexts. It takes a socio-pragmatic approach to language and context, defining context as a socially constructed setting modified through and in interaction (Goodwin & Duranti 1992: 3). The current research pays special attention to the frame in which lectures take place (i.e., the cultural setting, the speech situation and the shared background assumptions interfering in each academic interaction) in order to observe how the participants' local culture and identity are reflected on the teaching discourse and meaning making processes. The particular EMI lectures analysed in the study belong to two teaching programs of different disciplinary areas. They are the BSc in Business Administration and Management in English and the MSc in Nanostructured Materials for Nanotechnology Applications. The research question that this research intends to answer is the following: does the local and national identity of the lecturers and students have an impact on their academic meaning making processes?

By answering this question this study aims to contribute to understanding the intercultural communicative dimension that participants in EMI scenarios create by means of bringing together their personal beliefs, experiences, social-cultural identity as well as the environment and, in turn, the way in which all these factors influence the teaching-learning scenarios.

2. Literature review

The increasing use of English as the medium of instruction in European universities is undeniable, as recent research has demonstrated (Dafouz &Smit 2020). Yet, local contextual factors contribute to a great deal of variation across different institutions and even academic disciplines (e.g., Kuteeva & Airey 2014). English-medium programmes usually take place in multilingual settings (e.g., Dafouz & Smit 2020; Kuteeva et al. 2020), where a plethora of linguistic and other semiotic resources are used to construct

meaning and, more precisely, to deal with the interplay between personal, community, and spatial factors (e.g., Canagarajah 2021). It is, therefore, relevant to balance the dichotomy 'language of communication' used for mere practical communicative purposes, and 'language of identification', i.e., a language used to be integrated into and identify with the respective speech community (Hüllen 1992: 314). Knapp (2008: 133) explains Hüllen's dichotomy arguing that 'language of communication' has to do with the referential function of language. This means sharing the information in an objective way, disregarding the stylistic or cultural features associated with language. On the other hand, 'language of identification' is related to the symbolic (i.e., identity bearing) function of any language.

This contradicts Pölzl's (2003: 5) description of English being used as a 'native - culture-free code' in lingua franca contact situations. As such, he argues that a language selected for communication only expresses a communicative and primarily referential function, i.e., the culture associated with this natural language use and its user and, therefore, the identity bearing function of language is not triggered by its users. Yet, different intensities of this relationship can occur, as Fishman points out: 'language is related to identity to some people most of the time, to some people some of the time, and to some people even all of the time' (Hornberger & Pütz 2006: 15). A large and growing body of literature has investigated the interaction between identity, culture and language in education (Canagarajah 2013; Cogo 2016; Baker & Fang 2020; Kuteeva et al. 2020; Wilkinson & Gabriels 2021). The discursive approach that this study takes as its starting point sees cultural identity as produced within social interaction following Pennycook's perspective whereby 'language use is an act of identity which calls that language into being' (Pennycook 2007: 57). In other words, both language and identity are produced in certain communicative contexts where different cultural frames are dynamically drawn in the same conversation, as it may be the local, the national and the global contexts (Baker 2020). This is explained by Costa (2022: 118), when referring to the speakers 'sense of spatial sensitivity and ability to consider different context levels, which is common to both intercultural citizens and ELF users'. These types of speakers can certainly be encountered taking part in EMI programs implemented at universities where English is not the primary language of the student and the teaching population (Jenkins & Mauranen 2019; De Costa et al. 2021), as it is the case of the participants in the current study.

The ELF paradigm has recently become more cognizant of the influence of context on social interaction, especially concerning speakers' pragmatic choices. This implies a collaborative behaviour by which speakers may not only ensure understanding between interlocutors, but also accept and build on the participants' contributions, while at the same time creating a sense of in-group belonging (Cogo 2010: 302). In line with this, research has extensively paid attention to the strategic use that ELF users make of their multilingual resources in different ways and for various purposes. ELF speakers exploit their non-nativeness, drawing on their multilingual resources by means of using code-switching, i.e., 'including stretches of discourse ranging from single words to whole chunks and even complete turns in the speakers L1/L2/L3, etc.' (Velilla 2021) or, as Garcia puts it, translanguaging, i.e., 'multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds'. (García 2009:45). The ELF users' inherent multilingual backgrounds bring in multiple possibilities of dealing with language, which may or not generate effective communication (Hülmbauer 2007). These practices may be interpreted in ENL terms as deviation from standardized norms or ineffective communication. However, in Vettorel's words, in ELF terms they are interpreted as a result of 'speakers bringing into the communicative act practices from their L1, or of other languages in their repertoires as well of other communication strategies such as […] mixing moves which are all enacted to pragmatic functional ends" (Vettorel 2014: 187). This is aligned with the current necessary development of relevant literacies or 'pluriliteracies' by the educational community, most often in more than one language, that enable them 'to understand and develop ways in which cultural and linguistic contexts and social relations influence and impact literacy practices' (Coyle & Meyer 2021: 37).

In educational contexts such as EMI settings concepts such as code-switching or translanguaging are most often intertwined with the use of multimodal resources available, including the physical environments in which interactions take place. In other words, verbal interaction might be complemented with other semiotic modes. Lin (2019) defines this process as 'trans-semiotizing', understanding language as entangled with many other semiotics (e.g., visuals, gestures or body movement) by which participants engage in knowledge development and construction since communication is nowadays more than printed and oral texts. This is strictly related to the concept of 'multiliteracies' referring to the 'reconceptualization of literacy as a multidimensional set of competencies and social practices in response to the increasing complexity and multimodal nature of

texts' (Serafini 2014: 26). Thus, 21st century instruction needs to prepare primarily lecturers and then students to appreciate and face the complex nature of communication and to create meaning by means of using all the available verbal and non-verbal modes.

3. Methodology and research context

This study draws on a 14-hour-corpus of digital recordings of 12 EMI lectures in the BSc in Business Administration and Management and in the MSc in Nanostructured Materials for Nanotechnology Applications, being all considered ELF teaching and learning scenarios. These lectures, taking place at the University of Zaragoza, involve 6 Spanish lecturers and around 30 Spanish and international students per group. Lectures in the corpus range from 50 minutes to 2 hours long. The programs in which the lectures were recorded are among the few English-mediated programs at the University of Zaragoza. The nature of the interactions are English-mediated lectures in two faculties in which lessons are commonly performed in the national language (Spanish) by the same lecturers in different programs. In fact, the BSc in Business Administration is simultaneously taught in Spanish and English by the same lecturers in different groups. Most of the participants (students and lecturers) share a Spanish linguistic and cultural background. In the BSc corpus, international students approximately amount to 13% of the students in total while in MSc corpus 16% of the students present in the lectures recorded were from different countries worldwide. That is to say, the external setting in which interaction takes place (i.e., a university located in north-east of Spain) sets some preliminaries to the nature of the interactions that can be expected in this context. It can be assumed that the specifics of the moment-to-moment of these English-mediated lectures may bring into communicative practices from their L1, which provide context to the discourse being unfold.

This is a qualitative study based on recording and transcription of the oral naturally-occurring discourse produced mainly by the lecturer, even though interaction lecturer-students takes place. The analysis focuses on features of the talk itself that 'invoke particular background assumptions relevant to the organization of subsequent interaction' (Goodwin & Duranti 1992: 3). Most precisely, the analysis has looked upon 'contextualization cues', defined by Auer as 'an array of devices used in the situated production and interpretation of language [which] do not have referential (decontextualized) meaning but are related to a process of inferencing, which is itself dependent on the context of its occurrence'. In this case three of them have being

considered: (i) the use of code-switching (ii) the topics brought in during the interactions and (iii) the use of local terminology or phraseology which is culturally related to the physical and social environs. According to Auer (2007 [1995]) by means of these cues, interlocutors may alter some aspects of the context, resulting in a different interpretation of the larger activity participants are engaged in. These contextualization cues have been analysed in light of relevant factors that surround the event being examined and provides resources for its appropriate interpretation. They are the larger activity participants are engaged in (the lecture genre), the small-scale activity (or speech act), the mood in which this activity is performed, the topics, the participants' roles and the relationship between a speaker and the information being conveyed via language (modality).

The study also draws on semi-structured interviews to obtain the participants' perspectives in order to understand how contextual aspects influence pragmatic choices such as language alternation practices of the speakers. As such different question were posed regarding background information of the lecturers and the lectures recorded or the pragmatic strategies used in the meaning-making process to gain effectiveness in communication. Finally, a corpus of 12 PowerPoint presentations used in the same EMI lectures recorded was compiled and analysed with the purpose of establishing the interaction between different semiotic-pragmatic choices made during the lecture to orchestrate meaning. Thus, the external physical and social environment, the internal academic setting where the lectures were performed as well as the participants' moment-by-moment emic orientations have been considered. The way in which talk itself both invokes context and provides context for other talk has been analysed in light of three particular loci of occurrence or contextual frames which are required for the correct interpretation of certain utterance(s) or interactive exchanges:

- A Spanish tertiary academic setting – the University of Zaragoza: this frame refers to situated production and interpretation of language embodied in the physical and social environ of academic English-mediated lectures taking place in a Spanish university and, more precisely, in two different faculties: the Faculty of Economics and the Faculty of Science.

- Spain as the country in which the university is located: this frame refers to situated production and interpretation of language in relation to the speaker's and great part of the students' nationality and culture while embodied in a lingua franca situation in

which English is the vehicle for instruction, but Spanish is the local and national official language.

- Aragon as the Autonomous Community where the university is located in Spain: this frame refers to situated production and interpretation of language in relation to the speaker's and great part of the students' local Aragonese culture within the Spanish national territory.

The examples included in this paper belong mostly to lectures recorded in the Marketing subject of the BSc in Business administration and Management. That is why the topics of the examples extracted from the transcriptions concern marketing related concepts such as 'purchase intentions'. The mood in which the recorded lectures are performed is a relaxed, practice-oriented atmosphere. The excepts are mostly focused on exemplifications, digressions and side topics in which cultural, identity-bearing cues are visible. The participants' roles can be described as the lecturers being the main speaker, and students being the recipient. Nevertheless, some interaction between the lectures and the students takes place. The social relationship between the speaker and the recipients is closer in the bachelor's degree since more interaction and humour is present.

4. Results

4.1 Spanish academic culture

As Canagarajah (2013: 175) explains translinguals 'start their communication from the contexts they are located in, and the language resources and values that they bring with them'. As such, the first contextual frame which has been observed as having an impact in the lecturers meaning making process is that of EMI lectures taking place in a Spanish university – the University of Zaragoza – in which Spanish is the dominant language. In these academic events participants use English as their medium of instruction but the lecturer and most of the students usually communicate in a country in which English is not used in daily life, nor frequently used in other academic events.

Two different excepts have been selected to illustrate this cultural-linguistic association. In *Excepts 1* and *2* the academic setting of the Economics faculty provides the social and spatial framework within which the encounters are situated. As a result, participants code-switch to Spanish when they are referring to something they are used to naming in their first language as a usual practice since it is common in their academic

lives. In both examples the lecturers' aim is exemplifying or explaining aspects related to the faculty's facilities such as the faculty library or the lecturer's office. In this case, the mere fact of changing abruptly the code (or code-switching) was considered enough to prompt an inference concerning language pragmatic choices and has been, therefore, considered a contextualization cue.

(1)
Lecturer 3: So, it's much easier to read this graph, it's much easier, because the more to the left is my library the better, the more to the rig- to the right the worse, OK? So, my aim, the aim of my library is to go (.) to stay as close to the left as possible and for example the library of ehh <L1Sp> facultad </L1Sp> [faculty] is the less comfortable.
(2)
Lecturer 2: My name is C. I am assistant professor of the Marketing department and e:h here e:h you have my contact information, OK? My office is e:h here in the first in the first floor, OK? You go to the old part of the building a:h you turn to the left, there is the <L1Sp> aula doce </L1Sp> [room 12].

These excerpts reveal how the expressive function of language permeates the lecturers' discourse. The terms *facultad* [faculty] and *aula doce* [room 12] are considered 'common repertoire of resources' within the academic community (Cogo 2016: 12). It seems that among primarily Spanish native speakers it is to some extent natural to use the Spanish terms rather than translating them into English since meaning-making is completely ensured, as most of the participants share the language and the lingua-cultural academic referents.

In the same contextual framework, the analysis shows that the lecturers also use their multilingual resources in the PowerPoint presentation slides they use for the lecturing task. The analysis has revealed the presence of various languages, primarily English, but also Spanish or Portuguese. The PowerPoint presentations dataset was used to examine how code-switching is also used in certain slides as a strategy to facilitate understanding and the teaching-learning task in these particular EMI settings. Previous studies have brought to light the usefulness of combining multilingual and multimodal communicative resources in academic contexts (He et al. 2016: 44), provided their relevance at a particular higher education site according to the respective disciplinary specifics and expectations (e.g., the language in which lecturers and/or researchers usually write and read). This research supports this view as it has revealed that, although most of the slides in the presentations are written in English, some materials have been reused from the slides used in the Spanish-medium group lectures in the BSc in Business Administration and Management. The use of Spanish in this kind of written material is accepted and ordinary by some lecturers but avoided by others.

For instance, a lecturer teaching in the Business Administration degree seems to feel comfortable with the combination of the two languages and even remarked the inclusion of some Spanish-written contents on the slides in the flow of the corresponding explanations. This is the case in *Excerpt 3*, in which the lecturer is using several semiotic resources to co-construct meaning and understanding, i.e., the lecturer literally translated and trans-semiotized to explain a subject related matter such as rating scales (e*scala de likert* [likert scale][1]) when using a PowerPoint presentation slide. He translated the different scales that can be observed in *Figure 1* (*completamente de acuerdo* [completly agree], *de acuerdo* [agree], *ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo* [not agree nor disagree], *en desacuerdo* [disagree], *completamente en desacuerdo* [completly disagree]).

(3)
Lecturer 1: Two advanced methods (1) there are many advanced methods from itemized rating scales. The first is Likert scales. I want to, I want to measure the agreement or disagreement with some statements related to certain stimulus, a:m I think you have the example in Spanish here in the slides. I want to know you attitude, your opinion about the use of the bicycle as the vehicle to go to school, to the faculty, OK? So, I ask you to tell me your level of agreement or disagreement. Completely agree, agree, not agree nor disagree, disagree, completely disagree with the following statements. If you see e:h there are: I've written just opinions about the use of the bicycle. Maybe you agree with me, maybe you disagree with me, maybe I disagree with those statements, OK?

ESCALA DE LIKERT

La **Universidad de Zaragoza** desea promocionar el uso de la **bicicleta** como vehículo de desplazamiento de los miembros de la comunidad universitaria, a través de una campaña que facilite su compra.
El encargado de la misma desea conocer cuál es la **actitud** de los potenciales destinatarios de la campaña, por lo que os agradeceríamos nos respondierais cuál es vuestra **posición** con respecto a las siguientes afirmaciones referidas al uso de la bicicleta como medio de desplazamiento:

	Completamente de acuerdo (+2)	De acuerdo (+1)	Ni de acuerdo, ni en desacuerdo (0)	En desacuerdo (-1)	Completamente en desacuerdo (-2)
Al mismo tiempo que vas a clase, haces deporte					
Te evitas problemas de atascos					
En invierno pasas frío					
No tienes problemas de aparcar					
Es peligroso en ciudad, por los coches					
Es una forma de hacer amigos					
Es un medio lento					
No puedes transportar cosas fácilmente					
Te ensucias con la cadena					
Es ridículo si vas bien vestido					

Figure 1. Marketing research. Topic: Measurement.

[The University of Zaragoza wishes to promote the use of the bicycle as a vehicle for commuting by members of the university community through a campaign that facilitates its purchase. The person in charge of it wants to know what the attitude of the main recipients of the campaign is, so we would appreciate it if you could answer us what your position is with respect to the following statements regarding the use of the bicycle as a means of travel.]

---

[1] All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

As the particular lecturer in this excerpt explained during the interview, the presence of some contents in Spanish in some of the slides was a matter of reusing the teaching materials of the Spanish-medium group in the English-medium one. This lecturer acknowledged forgetting to translate that specific slide into English, yet he confirmed that it posed no problem since students could follow the explanations despite the use of Spanish in the presentation slide.

The previous excerpts have a relevant accommodative pragmatic aspect in common. This is the 'let-it-pass' (Kirkpatrick 2007) attitude of the students who did not ask for a translation into English or asked for clarification. There was a general understanding atmosphere in which both students and lecturers seem to feel comfortable with the use of Spanish in the written content of the presentation, since the lectures analysed are undeniably taking place in a rather monolingual context, despite the presence of international students. In other words, even though English is the medium of instruction in this academic context, both lecturers and most of the students have a good command or share the Spanish language as their L1.

Hence, lecturers use Spanish as part of their multilingual resources to make themselves understood in an EMI classroom. The role of translanguaging and trans-semiotizing in these content-based classroom is that of providing resources for classroom participants to co-construct meaning and understanding during a 'spatially oriented meaning making activity' (Lin 2019: 20). As Hyland (2002: 1091) states, 'academic writing is not just about conveying an ideational "content", it is also about the representation of self'. In this case, the academic practice of the lecturers using their first language and their vehicular language for instruction in different semiotic modes (in the inclusion of written content in Spanish in their presentations) reveals their view of languages as vehicles to display their linguistic identity and convey meaning, which in turn demonstrates the intrinsic ELF character of these lectures.

4.2 Spanish national culture

The analysis of the corpus also demonstrates the relationship of the lecturers' language choices in connection with the socio-cultural context in which the interactions take place. The following examples demonstrate how the appropriate understanding of a conversational exchange requires background knowledge or (assumed) shared background that extends far beyond the local talk and its immediate setting.

This is the case in *Excerpt 4*, which belongs to a Marketing Research lesson and the topic revolves around alcohol consumption as a social practice in Spain in contrast to

the same practice in USA. In this excerpt the referential function of language is also used to exemplify and explain. Yet, the expressive function of language invokes the Spanish cultural social behavior when it comes to drinking alcoholic drinks. In other words, in order to understand the idea being conveyed/explained by the lecturer in this except participants required certain shared background assumptions. In this excerpt 'drinking outside' means drinking 'in bars, restaurants or pubs' as a social practice. Miscommunication takes place regarding the phraseology used because of its imagery and its connotative potential presumably assumed by the Spanish students present in the lecture but not shared with, at least, an international student who asks for clarification. The non-understanding episode is solved by means of using pragmatic strategies such as clarification request (see line 3), reformulation (see lines 4 and 5) and self-repetition (see line 5).

(4)
1   Lecturer 1: So, drinking in Spain is mainly social. If you go to a bar, you go to a restaurant, you go to a pub, okay, you may drink, but it's not so frequent in Spain to drink at home. Right? Yeah, older people, but not so common for young people. But in USA it is, right? So, most of the consumption of alcoholic drinks in USA are inside home. Not outside. So, it's not a social it is not a social drink. But it's individual, right? So, it is interesting to see this. Okay so=
2   International student: =I thought it was illegal, because it's illegal to drink alcohol=
3   Lecturer 1:   =Sorry?
4   International student: I mean, it also has something to do with the fact that it's illegal to drink alcohol in public?
5   Lecturer 1: Alcohol in public? No, what I mean by this, I refer to bars. Not in the street, right? Not in the street, no no.

Similarly, in *Except 5* Spanish terminology provides the cultural cue. This excerpt demonstrates that most frequently the main guarantee for translinguals to achieve understanding, even if they start with their own codes, is their openness to negotiate meaning. In other words, in this teaching-learning context 'content area meaning […] emerges as responses in dialogue' (Barwell 2016: 117). This is a practical session in which the lecturer expected students to be open to co-constructing meaning. In this example, the lecturer is problematizing the Spanish term 'regular' (not very good or of very good quality) to define a certain amount when it is used to rate a particular aspect in a rating scale. It can be seen as an instance of language-related mockery. The lecturer is highlighting and prompting two international students (Nicolas and Linus) to use a Spanish term to rate a service in order to evoke the students' laughter when comparing it to its lexical approximation in English (e.g., *regular* standing in Spanish for no good nor bad vs. *regular* standing in English for usual, normal, conventional or standard).

(5)

1   Lecturer 2: Evaluate the following elements of the service, very good, good, <L1SP> regular </l1Sp> or bad (.)

2   Linus: mm no=

3   Lecturer 2:   =no, how many positives?

4   Linus: Two

5   Lecturer 2: How many negatives?

6   Linus: one

7   Lecturer 2: one? <L1Sp> regular </L1Sp> is not good, nor bad. In Spanish <L1Sp> regular </L1Sp> What do you understand in Spanish by <L1Sp> regular </L1Sp> Nicolas? Linus? Is something that is not good, not bad? or is it something that is close to the not good not bad but above?

8   Linus: no

9   Lecturer 2: No? it's bad, it's not good enough, it doesn't rich the minimum, OK? But the thing in English is not so, not good nor bad, OK? so we have two positives, one negative, one indifferent (.)

The fact that in this case English native speakers are not present seems to add a special flavor to the situation, which supports their group membership. The scene demonstrates how people signal their shared identity in lingua franca interactions by means of using discourse of 'Us' versus 'Them' in a 'third space phenomenon'. This can be described as an intermediate space between established norms, between communication and identification where users of ELF activate a number of linguistic and pragmatic strategies to construct and negotiate an identity of their own (Canagarajah 2007). In this excerpt three pragmatic strategies were visibly used to negotiate meaning: code-switching, defining (e.g., *regular* is not good, nor bad) and reformulation (e.g., it's bad, it's not good enough, it doesn't rich the minimum).

These excerpts demonstrate that these EMI lecturers use culture-specific Spanish expressions and transfer phraseological units associated with their own mother tongue into English to express their national identity. Hence, the information being conveyed via language has both a referential or instruction-oriented load and a symbolic and identity-bearing load. Such an interplay has implications for the speech communities that teachers construct in their classrooms and how their students are encouraged and helped to cope with such issues. This corpus shows a multicultural community of speakers comprised by lecturers who consciously use their multilingual resources, yet they comprehend students' reactions, misunderstandings and lack of knowledge about certain culturally dependent allusions and terminology and use pragmatic strategies to solve those culturally related mis/non-understandings.

4.3 Aragonese local culture

As already explained, context is subject to rapid changes made by the participants. It is the case in *Excerpt 6* in which a lecturer rapidly invokes the Aragonese local context, culture and identity. In this example the lecturer's scaffolding and exemplification

processes to support the student's learning have a great contextual loading as he/she uses specific references to the local festivities by means of code-switching (*fiestas del Pilar* [The Pilar festivities]) and by using specific examples of locally produced types of wines and wines brands (*Denominación de Origen Controlada Cariñena* and *Castillo de Paniza*) when explaining the concept of *purchase intentions*. The particular interview with this lecturer sheds light on this episode as he/she clarified that this particular exemplification was not prepared beforehand, and he/she was under the need of explicitness.

(6)
Lecturer 1: But for example (.) sh- should we offer this wine <FR> Château </FR> glamorous in this shiny glass cup or in this typical plastic glass of <L1sp> fiestas del Pilar </L1sp>? What should we do? Different glasses or the same glasses? If people see a label with glamour e:h maybe can think that this is not a real wine and we are talking about another thing. Or many people tend to think that you are trying to cheat, OK? We have two designs, here this is the bottle [drawing on the board] <Fr> Château du O'cule </Fr> <L1Sp> ¿vale? <L1Sp> and and <L1Sp> Castillo de Paniza </L1Sp>. Apart from this, we have to write some elements on the label, for example, if it's from Cariñena DOC <L1Sp> Denominación de Origen Controlada Cariñena <L1Sp>. And then we say that this wine is good to take with a red meat and with strong cheese. We want to know which is the best label in terms of sales, in terms of opinion about the quality of the wine, in terms of buying purchase intentions.

In this excerpt contextual and cultural cues can be observed as involving a process of inference, i.e., the lecturer is extensively relying on his/her students shared background assumptions when choosing those particular culturally loaded examples in the meaning making process when making allusions to Aragonese villages (e.g., *Cariñena*) and local products such as wine brands (*Castillo de Paniza, Denominación de Origen Controlada Cariñena*) which may not be familiar to all the students present in the class. In this case the intensity of the lecture's own local sociocultural background may be interfering in his/her teaching discourse, even leading to miscommunication as this lecture was deemed a cross-cultural setting. This means that the expressive function of language that allows the speaker to communicate a subjective or emotional reality prevails over the referential function, used to indicate or describe events and objects of objective reality (in this case, a particular concept within marketing subject: purchase intentions). This particular use of the exemplification strategy enacted to the pragmatic functional end of scaffolding subject contents may not result sensitive enough to the intercultural context. The linguistic units chosen by the lecturer may not be suitable to relate to all the interlocutors' understandings of the world (Davies 2003: 114) and therefore, the subject content.

5. Conclusion

In the current study, communication within EMI lectures has proved to rely on partially shared national/local, cultural and linguistic awareness to succeed in understanding certain notions and/or referents. In the settings where the EMI lecturers were recorded, where the majority of speakers have the same lingua-cultural background and the interaction is carried out in their home territory, it was expected that certain shared background assumptions affected the speakers' meaning making processes. As Blommaert et al. (2005: 198) suggest, the environment can affect the participants' capacity to make use of their linguistic resources and skills and impose on the participants specific requirements that they may fail to meet. This strategic use of the shared languages and background signals the participants' membership to the same lingua-cultural community of speakers and a local-contextual in-group solidarity (Cogo 2011).

Looking at the results of the study, different contextualization cues have been observed as instruments by which participants rapidly invoke three different contextual frames within the talk of the moment: the academic frame, the national frame and the local frame. Firstly, the use of different languages, mainly by means of code-switching from English to Spanish, reveals how lecturers make use of all the linguistic resources available to convey meaning. Using the multilingual resources of the lecturers and, most importantly, the shared languages among the participants in an EMI lecture, contributes to gaining lexical richness and discourse flexibility when explaining concepts and to creating a good rapport among lecturers and students promoting intercultural engagement. This cultural impact is more noticeable in this study than in similar studies in other universities in which English is a dominant official language (Smit 2010; Björkman 2011). Secondly, the use of local terminology, the use of phraseology which is culturally related to the physical and social environs in which it is used or the culturally related topics brought in during the interactions are different resources or cues used to construct meaning thanks to its imagery and connotative potential. Therefore, the identity bearing or expressive function of language is actively triggered by some of the lecturers in this study despite the fact that these EMI lectures can be considered a 'third space' or an English as a lingua franca context. However, the cultural loading of such cues can lead to miscommunication in cross-cultural settings.

Negotiation of such cultural differences requires the acquisition of a set of interactional skills or 'pluriliteracies' such as accommodating to others and having sensitivity to context. This implies performing in dialogue in appropriate ways so as to

approach language choices from the perspective of communicators actively operating in the interculturally spheres they are embedded – in Jenkin's words the 'multi-competence of the community' (Jenkins 2015: 58). This involves being cautious about when and how to use other languages different form the vehicular one. Lecturers need to take into account the academic and linguistic backgrounds of the students, since it may be important to comprehend students' reactions, misunderstandings and lack of knowledge about certain terminology or references made. This study demonstrates that such accommodative processes involve the use of pragmatic strategies such as reformulation, defining, code-switching or clarification request to achieve comprehensibility by both the national and international students.

Therefore, following Block (2003: 64), we can argue that communication in the analysed EMI settings was referential but at the same time interactional/relational/ interpersonal 'at the service of the social construction of self-identity, group membership, solidarity, support, trust and so on'. This contributes to our understanding of what it means to teach and learn in intercultural settings such as EMI lectures, and our recognition of learning/teaching events as dynamically drawing on cultural frames in which language and identity are produced involving linguistic resources (e.g., in translanguaging) and repertoires of visuals (e.g., in trans-semiotizing), as such encompassing all the spoken and written verbal resources managed by the classroom participants. This includes familiar speech styles or expressions learnt before (Canagarajah 2013). This perspective re-emphasizes the current plurilingual didactics and dynamic views of multilingualism, thus calling for researchers to observe language through the lens of contextualization, existing multilingual constellations and multimodal intricacy.

6. References

Auer, P. (1995/2007) 'The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach'. In Lesley Milroy & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker two languages*, pp. 115–135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Reprinted in Wei, L. (ed.), *The bilingualism reader, 2nd edn.*, pp. 123–137. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Baker, W. (2009) 'The cultures of English as a lingua franca', *TESOL Quarterly,* 43 (4), 567–592.

—— (2015) 'Culture and complexity through English as a lingua franca: rethinking competences and pedagogy in ELT', *JELF* 4 (1), 9–30.

Baker, W. & Fan, G. (2020) '"So maybe I'm a global citizen': developing intercultural citizenship in English medium education', *Language, Culture and Curriculum,* 34 (1), 1–17.

Barwell, R. (2016) 'Formal and informal mathematical discourses: Bakhtin and Vygotsky, dialogue and dialectic', *Educational Studies in Mathematics,* 92 (3), 331–345.

Björkman, B. (2011a) Pragmatic Strategies in English as an Academic Lingua Franca: Ways of Achieving Communicative Effectiveness, *Journal of Pragmatics,* 43, 950–964.

Block, D. (2007) *Second language identities*. New York: Continuum.

Blommaert, J. Collins, J., & Slembrouck. S. (2005) 'Spaces of Multilingualism', *Language & Communication,* 25 (3), 197–216.

Cogo, A. (2010) 'Strategic use and Perceptions of English as a lingua franca', *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics,* 46 (3), 295–312.

—— (2016) 'Conceptualizing ELF as a translanguaging phenomenon: Covert and overt resources in a transnational workplace', *Waseda Working Papers in ELF,* 5, 61–77.

Coyle, D., & Meyer, O. (2021) *Beyond CLIL: Pluriliteracies Teaching for Deeper Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2007) 'Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition', *The Modern Language Journal* 91 (5), 923–939.

—— (2013) *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations.* London and New York: Routledge.

—— (2021) 'Materialising semiotic repertoires: Challenges in the interactional analysis of multilingual communication', *International Journal of Multilingualism,* 18 (2), 206–22.

De Costa, P., Green-Eneix, C. and Li, W. (2021) 'Problematizing language policy and practice in EMI and transnational higher education: Challenges and possibilities', *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics,* 44 (2), 115–128.

De Costa, P. (2022) 'Identity work and the symbolic power of language in the ELT classroom: advancing the intercultural citizenship and ELF agenda', *JELF,* 11 (1): 117–124

Davies, A. (2003) *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2020) *Road-mapping: English medium education in the internationalised university*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Fiedler, S, (2011) 'English as a lingua franca – a native- culture-free code? Language of communication vs. language of identification'. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 5 (3), 79–97.

Firth, A. (1996) 'The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis', *Journal of Pragmatics* 26 (2), 237–259.

García, O. (2009) *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Goodwin, C. & Duranti, A. (1992) *Rethinking Context: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

He, P., Lai, H. & Lin, A. M. Y. (2016) 'Translanguaging in a multimodal mathematics presentation'. In C. M. Mazak, & K. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N. & Pütz, M. (2006) 'An interview with Joshua Fishman'. In N. Hornberger & M. Pütz (eds.), *Language loyalty, language planning and language revitalization: Recent writings and reflections from Joshua A. Fishman* , pp. 1–28. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hüllen, W. (1992) 'Identifikationssprache und Kommunikationssprache. Über Probleme der Mehrsprachigkeit'. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 20 (3), 298–317.

Hyland, K. (2002) 'Authority and invisibility: authorial identity in academic writing', *Journal of Pragmatics* 34, 1091–1112.

Jenkins, J. (2007) *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

—— (2011) 'Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university', *Journal of Pragmatics,* 43 (4), 926–936.

—— (2014) *English as a lingua Franca in the International University: The politics of academic language policy.* Routledge: London and New York

—— (2015) 'Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca'. *Englishes in Practice,* 2 (3), 49–85.

Jenkins, J. & Mauranen A. (2019) *Linguistic diversity on the EMI campus*. New York: Routledge.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007) 'The communicative strategies in ASEAN speakers of English as a lingua franca'. In Prescott, D. (Ed.), *English in Southeast Asia: Varieties, Literacies and literatures* (pp. 118-137). Newcastle, England: Cambridge Scholars.

Knapp, K. (2008) 'Entretien avec Karlfried Knapp (Propos recueillis par Chantal Cali, Martin Stegu et Eva Vetter) [Interview with Karlfried Knapp (by Ch.C, M.S. and E.V.)]', *Synergies Europe* 3, 129–137.

Kuteeva, M. and Airey, J. (2014) 'Disciplinary differences in the use of English in higher education: Reflections on recent language policy developments', *Higher Education,* 67 (5), 533–549.

Kuteeva, M., Kaufhold, K., Hynninen, N. (Eds) (2020) *Language perceptions and practices in multilingual universities.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Lin, A. (2019) 'Theories of trans/languaging and trans-semiotizing: implications for contentbased education classroom', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 22 (1), 5–16.

Lo Bianco, J. (2002) 'Destitution, wealth and cultural contest: language and development connections'. In J. Lo Bianco (Ed.), *Voices from Phnom Penh Development & Languages: Global Influences & Local Effects*. Melbourne: Language Australia Ltd.

Mauranen, A. (2006) 'Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication', *International Journal of Sociology of Language,* 177, 123-150.

Pennycook, A (2007) *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London and New York: Routledge.

Pölzl, U. (2003) 'Signalling cultural identity: The use of L1/Ln in ELF', *Vienna English Working Papers,* 12, 3–23.

Pölzl, U., & Seidlhofer, B. (2006) 'In and on their own terms: the "habitat factor" in English as a Lingua Franca interactions', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 177, 151–176.

Serafini, F. (2014) *Reading the visual: An Introduction to teaching multimodal literacy*. New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Smit, U. (2010) *English as a Lingua Franca in Higher Education: A longitudinal Study of Classroom Discourse*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Velilla, M. (2021) *English as an Academic Lingua Franca in Spanish Tertiary Education: An Analysis of the Use of Pragmatic Strategies in English-Medium Lectures*. [Doctoral thesis, University of Zaragoza]. University of Zaragoza Research Commons.

Vettorel, P. (2014) *English as a lingua franca in wider networking. Bloging practices.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Wilkinson, R., & Gabriels, R. (2021) *The Englishization of Higher Education in Europe*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.