BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg
BG PULSE JOURNAL

# OPPORTUNITIES FOR TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND FOREIGN CULTURES THROUGH AXIOLOGICAL AND INTERCULTURAL APPROACHES

**Xakimova Nargizaxon Rustamjon qizi**
First-Year Master's Student in Pedagogy (MM2-P-2026) at Asia International University
**Olimov Temir Xasanovich**
PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Scientific Supervisor at Asia International University
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23656277

**Abstract Background:** Foreign language classrooms increasingly aim to foster effective interaction across cultural differences, yet values education and intercultural competence are often treated as separate curricular concerns. Objective: This conceptual study develops an instructional and formative-assessment framework linking axiological reasoning—the public justification of value-sensitive choices—to observable intercultural communicative action. Methods: A purposive, non-systematic synthesis of eight foundational publications and policy frameworks was conducted. Their constructs were compared through four analytic lenses: normative orientation, interpretive inquiry, interactional performance, and reflection. Findings: The synthesis yielded a five-phase teaching cycle (encounter, inquiry, deliberation, mediation, and reflection) and a four-domain analytic rubric targeting perspective-taking, reasoned value negotiation, interactional mediation, and reflective revision. A university-level teaching scenario and a proposed validation protocol illustrate how the framework may be operationalized without reducing cultures to fixed traits or grading learners' private beliefs. Contribution: The article offers an explicit bridge between values-oriented pedagogy and performance-based intercultural assessment. Limitations: The framework is a theoretically derived design proposition; its effectiveness and measurement properties remain untested and require empirical investigation. The paper also operationalizes opportunities for teaching foreign cultural practices through authentic discourse, intercultural comparison, role-based mediation, and reflective learning.

**Keywords:** axiological reasoning; intercultural communicative competence; foreign language education; mediation; critical cultural awareness; formative assessment; instructional design; foreign culture teaching

## 1. Introduction

Foreign language education is frequently evaluated through vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. These outcomes remain indispensable, but they do not by themselves establish whether learners can interpret unfamiliar communicative practices fairly, negotiate disagreement respectfully, or repair misunderstandings across social and cultural boundaries. A linguistically accurate message may still fail pragmatically if it overlooks the interlocutor's expectations or the ethical implications of a situation. As classrooms become linked to transnational study, professional collaboration, and digitally mediated communication, these questions become central to the educational purpose of language learning (Byram, 1997; Kramsch, 1993; Council of Europe, 2020).

Intercultural approaches have advanced concepts such as openness, interpretation, discovery, critical cultural awareness, and mediation (Byram, 1997; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013). In parallel, values-oriented or axiological education foregrounds judgments concerning dignity, responsibility, fairness, reciprocity, and the legitimacy of diverse viewpoints. The relationship between the two is potentially productive but pedagogically difficult: values can be invoked as slogans without

shaping classroom interaction, while intercultural activities can become superficial comparisons of national customs without ethical examination. Neither extreme supports nuanced communication.

This article uses the term axiological reasoning to mean a learner's capacity to identify values at stake in a communicative problem, justify a choice with reasons, recognize conflicting legitimate concerns, and reconsider a decision in light of another perspective. It does not mean measuring the moral worth of an individual or requiring adherence to a predetermined private belief system. Intercultural competence, in turn, is treated as context-sensitive communicative practice rather than encyclopedic knowledge about allegedly uniform national cultures. This orientation draws on Byram's critical cultural awareness, Deardorff's process view of competence, and frameworks that connect attitudes, skills, knowledge, and action (Deardorff, 2006; Council of Europe, 2018).

The central problem is therefore one of instructional alignment: how can a teacher turn axiological aims into communicative tasks with observable learning evidence, while maintaining openness, avoiding stereotyping, and distinguishing ethical justification from linguistic proficiency? The article addresses three questions: (RQ1) Which constructs connect values-oriented reasoning with intercultural communication? (RQ2) How can these constructs be organized into a teachable sequence? (RQ3) What performance evidence could support formative assessment without grading personal identity or belief?

The contribution is a design-oriented framework rather than a claim of experimentally demonstrated effectiveness. Specifically, the study offers a conceptual crosswalk, a five-phase learning cycle, a task exemplar, and an analytic rubric accompanied by a plan for future testing. These resources may be adapted to tertiary foreign language instruction and, with additional piloting, to other age groups and proficiency levels.

A further distinction is necessary for the dissertation topic addressed here: teaching a foreign culture is not equivalent to presenting fixed national traditions. Foreign cultural learning concerns how communicative expectations are negotiated in situated interactions, how perspectives differ within social groups, and how learners compare unfamiliar practices with their own assumptions. Thus, a viable instructional approach must make cultural meanings open to interpretation, supported by authentic evidence, and usable in target-language communication (Kramsch, 1993; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013).

## 2. Theoretical background

### 2.1. Intercultural competence as interpretation and action

Byram (1997) conceptualizes intercultural communicative competence through attitudes, knowledge, skills of interpreting and relating, skills of discovery and interaction, and critical cultural awareness. Crucially, the model exceeds the reproduction of information about other societies: learners are expected to interpret practices in context and evaluate perspectives, including their own. Deardorff (2006) similarly presents intercultural competence as developmental, linking attitudes such as respect and openness to knowledge, skills, and internal and external outcomes. Together, these accounts support assessment of how learners respond to situations rather than mere recall of cultural facts.

An intercultural approach to language education also requires attention to discourse, power, identity, and meaning-making. Kramsch (1993) treats culture as embedded in language use rather than as a detachable body of facts; Liddicoat and Scarino (2013) emphasize active interpretation and reflection through language learning. These perspectives caution against statements such as "members of culture X always communicate indirectly." Actual choices vary by relationship, institutional role, medium, individual preference, and historical setting. Tasks should therefore investigate plausible interpretations, not demand a single "correct" cultural stereotype.

**2.2. Axiological reasoning, mediation, and the limits of consensus**

Values are not simply declarative content. They become educationally meaningful when learners face competing goods—for example, honesty and tact, autonomy and collective responsibility, or efficiency and inclusion—and must explain why a response could be fair and appropriate. Schwartz's (2012) theoretical overview helps show that values can motivate action while also coming into tension. The present framework uses this insight cautiously: value categories are discussion tools, not a diagnostic scale for ranking students or cultures.

The Council of Europe's Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture presents values, attitudes, skills, and knowledge/critical understanding as interrelated components of democratic and intercultural engagement (Council of Europe, 2018). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Companion Volume adds expanded attention to mediation and pluricultural competence, including the ability to facilitate understanding across perspectives (Council of Europe, 2020). Pedagogically, these frameworks make it possible to connect ethical deliberation to observable communicative moves—clarification requests, perspective summarization, neutral reframing, repair, and negotiated responses.

However, an explicit safeguard is necessary. A classroom can assess whether a learner supports a view with reasons, listens accurately, and revises a claim responsively; it cannot fairly infer stable moral character from a short dialogue. Moreover, intercultural competence must not be equated with agreeing with the teacher. Well-reasoned disagreement and culturally situated dissent can be legitimate learning outcomes. This distinction underpins the assessment proposal below.

**2.3. Teaching foreign cultural practices without essentialism**

Foreign culture can be presented through short workplace exchanges, literary dialogue, public-service messages, academic interactions, online collaboration, or carefully anonymized real-life accounts. These materials allow attention to the relationship between language choices and social settings: for example, a short refusal may reflect time pressure, familiarity, interpersonal distance, or linguistic limitations rather than the presumed norm of an entire society. Learners can compare evidence from more than one text and distinguish directly observable communicative features from speculative cultural explanations (Kramsch, 1993; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013).

Four methodological pathways are especially pertinent: contextual analysis of authentic discourse; critical comparison of interpretations across linguistic and cultural contexts; simulated or genuine interaction with opportunities for clarification; and reflective journaling documenting changes in assumptions. These are pedagogical design options, not universally established instructional effects. In lower-proficiency groups, brief texts and sentence stems can support participation; advanced learners may work with disagreements, mediated discussions, and sociopragmatic nuance. Culturally diverse voices should be represented within any purported cultural context to avoid treating nationality as a complete explanation for conduct (Byram, 1997; UNESCO, 2013).

## 3. Materials and methods

**3.1. Study design and source boundaries**

The study is a conceptual, design-oriented inquiry employing a purposive and non-systematic synthesis of established theoretical and institutional texts. It is not a systematic review or meta-analysis; no exhaustive database search, PRISMA flow diagram, pooled effect estimate, or claim of literature saturation is made. Eight anchor sources were selected for their direct relevance to one or more of the following: intercultural competence, values and critical judgment, language-learning mediation, or pedagogical enactment. These were Byram (1997), Kramsch (1993), Deardorff (2006), Liddicoat and Scarino (2013), Schwartz (2012), UNESCO (2013), Council of Europe

(2018), and Council of Europe (2020). The study also engages supporting discussion from the international literature where appropriate.

The sources were read as complementary conceptual positions, not as equivalent empirical datasets. Their publication years and genres vary, which is appropriate for foundational theory-building but also limits any claim to exhaustive representation of recent studies. Selection was guided by conceptual relevance, pedagogical translatability, and the availability of clear constructs that can be connected to learner actions.

### 3.2. Analytic procedure

Four steps structured the synthesis. First, the core constructs in each source were organized using four lenses: (a) normative orientation, such as respect and responsibility; (b) interpretive inquiry, such as contextualization and perspective-taking; (c) interactional performance, such as mediation and repair; and (d) reflective regulation, such as reconsidering a judgment. Second, convergences and tensions were identified, including the difference between an internal disposition and an observable communicative act. Third, recurring components were translated into a sequence of teacher prompts, learner actions, and evidence types. Fourth, performance descriptors were formulated as a provisional formative rubric. This procedure was interpretive rather than a quantitative content analysis, and no inter-coder reliability statistic is reported.

The design criterion was alignment among construct, task, and evidence: every stated educational aim should correspond to at least one learner action that an instructor can observe or document. Two additional criteria constrained the design: cultural non-essentialism (no presumed uniform "national style") and ethical assessment (no scoring of private convictions or demographic identity). These criteria are normative commitments of the framework and must themselves be considered in future validation.

## 4. Results: proposed instructional framework

The "results" in this section are outcomes of conceptual synthesis and pedagogical design, not measurements from an implemented intervention. The analysis suggests that values-oriented intercultural learning requires an iterative connection between interpretation, reason-giving, communicative response, and reflection. Table 1 maps the four lenses to suitable evidence; Table 2 operationalizes them as a five-phase learning cycle.

**Table 1. Conceptual alignment from learning construct to observable evidence**

| Analytic lens | Working construct | Indicative learner evidence |
|---|---|---|
| **Normative orientation** | Recognition of dignity, reciprocity, fairness, and competing obligations | Names at least two values at stake without assigning motives to a cultural group |
| **Interpretive inquiry** | Contextualization, curiosity, perspective-taking | Proposes multiple plausible readings and asks for missing contextual information |
| **Interactional performance** | Mediation, clarification, pragmatic adaptation, repair | Produces a response that preserves meaning while reducing avoidable misunderstanding |
| **Reflective regulation** | Critical self-awareness and justified revision | Explains which initial assumption changed, why, and what alternative is now possible |

### 4.1. The five-phase "Values in Action" learning cycle

The instructional sequence moves from an authentic ambiguity to a reasoned communicative choice. Phases are presented linearly for planning purposes, but reflection may return learners to an

earlier phase. The design intentionally resists treating cultural knowledge as a list of correct national norms.

**Table 2. Five-phase cycle for tertiary foreign language classrooms**

| Phase / illustrative time | Teaching and learning process | Assessment evidence |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Encounter (5 min)** | Present a dilemma through a dialogue, email, or audio message; learners state initial interpretations. | First response and uncertainty statement |
| **2. Inquiry (10 min)** | Compare at least two plausible readings; identify contextual gaps; formulate neutral clarification questions. | Alternative interpretations and inquiry questions |
| **3. Deliberation (10 min)** | Identify competing values and justify possible responses, including reasonable disagreement. | Value justification supported by context |
| **4. Mediation (15 min)** | Role-play, rewrite, or negotiate a response that combines clear intent, respect, and repair. | Dialogue/response with specific mediation moves |
| **5. Reflection (10 min)** | Compare initial and final positions; explain which evidence changed the response. | Short reflective note and self-assessment |

Phase 1 makes ambiguity visible without immediately imposing the instructor's interpretation. Phase 2 promotes epistemic humility: before labeling a response impolite, learners must consider what information is missing. Phase 3 brings axiological reasoning into the open by comparing legitimate concerns. Phase 4 tests whether ethical reasoning has become usable language. Phase 5 documents change, non-change, or qualified disagreement; a learner may retain an initial view if the reasons are explicit and responsive to counterevidence.

**4.2. Teaching exemplar: declining an invitation in a project team**

Consider a hypothetical university class working on English for international collaboration. A project teammate invites another student to a weekend group event. The invited student has a prior family commitment and replies in a short message: "I cannot come." The teammate interprets the response as disinterest. The classroom task is not to determine which nationality is more direct or more polite. Rather, learners examine the communicative challenge as shaped by relationship history, time pressure, expectations, individual preferences, and the limitations of text-based interaction.

In the encounter phase, students write two possible interpretations of the short response and note what they cannot know. In inquiry, they propose clarification questions such as "Would a brief explanation help in this team?" or "How much context does the recipient already have?" In deliberation, small groups compare honesty, respect for privacy, social belonging, and efficiency; no single value is assumed to override all others. In mediation, pairs produce and test alternative messages, for example: "Thank you for inviting me. I have a family commitment this weekend, so I cannot join, but I would be happy to take part next time." They also consider whether the original brief refusal could be appropriate in a different relationship or communication channel.

Finally, each learner writes a short reflection: "Initially, I interpreted the message as ____. After considering ____, I now think ____; however, I would still need to know ____." The blanks do not mechanically assess moral improvement. Instead, they make the learner's process of interpretation, justification, and revision visible. In multilingual classes, participants may draw on

personal experience, but nobody is asked to represent an entire community or disclose a private family circumstance.

**4.3. Formative assessment and scoring logic**

The proposed analytic rubric contains four domains scored from 0 to 3, for a maximum of 12 points (Table 3). It is designed for teacher feedback and learner self-assessment, not for high-stakes classification. A zero means that the relevant evidence is absent in the observed task; it does not label the learner as lacking values. The same task may elicit more than one acceptable response, provided it is contextually reasoned. Linguistic accuracy should be assessed and reported separately so that limited proficiency is not mistaken for ethical deficiency.

**Table 3. Provisional analytic rubric (0–3 points per domain)**

| Domain | 0 — not evidenced | 1 — emerging | 2 — developing | 3 — proficient within task |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Perspective-taking** | Only one reading; no uncertainty acknowledged | Mentions another view with little contextual support | Offers two plausible interpretations and some context | Compares interpretations, identifies missing evidence, and avoids generalization |
| **Value reasoning** | No relevant reason offered | Names one value but gives little justification | Recognizes a value tension and justifies a response | Weighs competing values with contextual and counterargument awareness |
| **Interactional mediation** | No attempt to clarify, adapt, or repair | Uses a generic polite formula only | Uses a suitable clarification or repair move | Adapts language to relationship and purpose while preserving mutual understanding |
| **Reflective revision** | No reflection or explanation | Restates initial view without evidence | Notes how new information influenced a judgment | Explains a reasoned revision or a reasoned decision not to revise, with limitations |

To limit over-interpretation, a teacher should attach short evidence notes to rubric scores—for example, a learner's exact clarification question or a sentence showing a reconsidered assumption. For multilingual performance, teachers may permit planning notes in the first language but judge the specified target-language interaction separately. Rubric scores should not be interpreted as psychometrically validated until rater agreement, dimensionality, and construct validity are examined in actual classroom data.

**4.4. Opportunities for teaching foreign culture in language courses**

The same framework can be used when foreign cultural learning is an explicit curricular goal. Table 4 illustrates the alignment between cultural learning materials, learner actions, axiological

questions, and assessable products. In each case, an instructor can introduce more than one plausible interpretation, ask students to substantiate claims with linguistic or situational evidence, and then connect the discussion to specific target-language utterances. This procedure keeps cultural instruction anchored in communicative performance while treating ethical deliberation as a transparent pedagogical process.

Table 4. Illustrative opportunities for foreign-cultural learning (conceptual proposal)

| Learning resource | Learner activity | Value-related question | Potential evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| Short messages of invitation and refusal | Compare wording across contexts | How can honesty and tact be balanced? | Two context-sensitive responses |
| Contrasting interviews or narrative excerpts | Identify situated viewpoints | Whose experience may be missing? | Evidence-based alternative interpretations |
| Collaborative project interaction (real or simulated) | Clarify meaning, negotiate roles | How can responsibility and inclusion be enacted? | Recorded or scripted mediation moves |
| Reflective journal on a perceived misunderstanding | Revise an initial interpretation | What justified changing or retaining a view? | Before/after reflection with reasons |

For local higher-education implementation, teachers can select a target-language situation relevant to students' projected professional interactions—for example, feedback to a teammate, classroom disagreement, or a request for assistance. The material should be evaluated for linguistic accessibility, representation of diverse voices, and privacy. Virtual exchange may provide richer interaction where technically and ethically feasible, but simulations can preserve much of the interpretive and mediating work when such exchanges are unavailable. None of these formats has been evaluated empirically in the present manuscript.

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1. Theoretical contribution

The framework contributes a practical distinction among values as commitments, reasoning about values, and observable communicative choices. This distinction matters because a learner may say that "respect is important" yet fail to demonstrate it in a difficult interaction; conversely, a learner may enact careful mediation without explicitly naming the underlying value. The proposed cycle creates a bridge between these levels while retaining the possibility of multiple defensible outcomes. It draws from Byram's critical cultural awareness, Deardorff's developmental conception, and the Council of Europe's treatment of mediation and democratic-culture competences (Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006; Council of Europe, 2018, 2020).

The model also extends standard role-play instruction by placing interpretive uncertainty before communicative performance and reflective evidence after it. The aim is not to supply "correct etiquette" for named cultures but to help learners notice communicative ambiguity, request information, articulate reasons, and choose responsibly. UNESCO (2013) emphasizes the wider significance of intercultural competences, while Liddicoat and Scarino (2013) situate reflection within language learning itself; the present contribution joins these emphases at the level of task design.

### 5.2. Pedagogical feasibility and contextual adaptation

The five phases can be fitted into a 50-minute university seminar or distributed across a longer lesson. Inputs may include workplace emails, classroom feedback, online group projects, service

encounters, or disagreement in academic discussion. For novice language learners, sentence starters and bilingual planning can lower linguistic load; advanced learners can analyze politeness strategies, status differences, implicit meanings, and alternative interpretations of the same utterance. These adaptations retain the conceptual target while changing language demand.

The teacher's role is facilitative rather than corrective in a moralizing sense. Instead of announcing which culture is "right," the instructor asks: What evidence supports your interpretation? What alternative explanation is plausible? Whose interests are affected? Which phrase could clarify intent without humiliating the other participant? Strong performance is judged by responsiveness to context and dialogue, not agreement with a single approved cultural judgment. This helps preserve student agency while fostering responsible exchange.

### 5.3. Risks, inclusion, and ethical considerations

Three risks require attention. First, essentialism may enter through prompts that assign behavior to fixed national or ethnic identities. It can be reduced by describing roles and relationships, varying scenarios, and explicitly allowing within-group diversity. Second, a teacher's own values may be mistaken for an objective rubric. To avoid coercion, assessment should target observable reasoning and discourse—not political, religious, or personal allegiance—and support well-argued dissent. Third, learners may be pressured to share sensitive experiences. Participation should allow fictional scenarios, opt-out alternatives, and privacy-protective reflection. These are design requirements, not claims that all risks have been eliminated.

### 5.4. Proposed empirical validation

Because the present paper reports no classroom trial, a subsequent study should evaluate feasibility and effects with transparent procedures. A feasible initial design would include a small pilot to revise task clarity and rubric anchors, followed by a quasi-experimental or randomized classroom comparison where institutional conditions permit. Participants could complete two parallel, contextually equivalent intercultural scenarios at baseline and follow-up. Two trained raters, blind to class assignment if feasible, would independently score anonymized work; agreement would be reported using an appropriate statistic (e.g., weighted kappa or an intraclass correlation coefficient, depending on the scoring design).

Outcomes should be prespecified. A primary outcome might be change in performance on the four-domain rubric, with linguistic proficiency reported separately. Secondary data could include learner reflections, teacher implementation logs, and short interviews about task credibility. The analysis should address baseline differences, classroom clustering where relevant, missing data, and the possibility of scoring improvement through task familiarity. Since rubric validity is not yet established, investigators should seek expert content review, cognitive interviews, inter-rater agreement, and evidence that the rubric is sensitive to instruction without merely rewarding length or English fluency. Ethical clearance and informed consent should be obtained before collecting identifiable student data, in line with applicable institutional requirements.

This agenda would test three distinct claims that a conceptual manuscript cannot settle: whether instructors implement the cycle consistently, whether learners demonstrate stronger intercultural performance than under comparison instruction, and whether rubric scores represent the intended constructs with acceptable reliability. A null or mixed result would be informative for revision; the model should not be portrayed as effective in advance of such evidence.

## 6. Limitations

This study has four principal limitations. First, its literature synthesis is purposive and not exhaustive; therefore, it does not estimate the state or magnitude of evidence across the field. Second, the proposed model derives from interpretive alignment of established concepts rather than

observed learning processes, and the five phases are not asserted to be universally optimal. Third, the four-domain rubric has not undergone expert validation, reliability testing, factor analysis, or cross-cultural adaptation. Fourth, classroom implementation may be affected by language proficiency, teacher preparation, social desirability, local institutional expectations, and the cultural accessibility of task scenarios. These boundaries mean that all pedagogical benefits are hypotheses for investigation, not demonstrated outcomes.

## 7. Conclusion

Integrating axiological reasoning with intercultural language learning requires more than adding moral slogans or cultural facts to a syllabus. It requires observable opportunities for learners to examine ambiguity, compare plausible interpretations, justify value-sensitive choices, mediate communication, and reflect on evidence. Drawing on established scholarship and European and international competence frameworks, this conceptual study proposes the "Values in Action" five-phase instructional cycle and a provisional analytic rubric. The framework makes the relationship between educational intentions, classroom interactions, and formative evidence more explicit while rejecting fixed cultural stereotypes and the grading of private beliefs. Its central next step is empirical validation under transparent, ethically appropriate conditions.

For the dissertation problem of teaching foreign languages and foreign culture, the framework specifies four practical pathways—contextualized input, evidence-based cultural comparison, situated dialogue, and reflection—without reducing a culture to fixed etiquette. Future classroom studies should separately assess foreign-language proficiency and culturally responsive interaction to avoid mistaking linguistic fluency for intercultural development.

## Declarations

Study type and data availability. This is a conceptual and instructional-design article. No human participant data were collected, and no empirical dataset was generated for this manuscript.

Ethics statement. No intervention involving human participants was conducted as part of the present conceptual study. Ethical review will be required where applicable before any proposed future classroom research.

Funding: [To be confirmed by the author before journal submission.] Competing interests: [To be declared by the author.] Author contributions: [To be completed according to the target journal's requirements.]

Academic supervision. Olimov Temir Xasanovich (PhD in Pedagogical Sciences) is identified as the scientific supervisor, not a co-author. Authorship and contributorship should be confirmed against the policies of the journal selected for submission.

## References

1. Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence. Multilingual Matters.
2. Council of Europe. (2018). Reference framework of competences for democratic culture: Volume 1. Context, concepts and model. Council of Europe Publishing.
3. Council of Europe. (2020). Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment—Companion volume. Council of Europe Publishing.
4. Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. Journal of Studies in International Education, 10(3), 241–266. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287002
5. Kramsch, C. (1993). Context and culture in language teaching. Oxford University Press.

6. Liddicoat, A. J., & Scarino, A. (2013). Intercultural language teaching and learning. Wiley-Blackwell.
7. Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1116
8. UNESCO. (2013). Intercultural competences: Conceptual and operational framework. UNESCO.