Communication Center Journal
Vol. 9, No. 1, 2023

Moving Towards Intercultural Communicative Competence and Intercultural Citizenship: Lessons from Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy for the Communication Center

Kristen Foltz
The University of Tampa

Alyssia Miller De Rutté
Colorado State University

Communication centers provide a wide range of services to their home institution and student population. These centers often focus on helping students with the oral components of their class assignments such as presentations (Yook, 2006). In practice, communication centers offer a huge assortment of services. LeFebvre and colleagues (2017, 2019) found that although the most common service offered by communication centers is public speaking consultations, often centers offer writing consultations and provide workshops to both the academic department and the community. Furthermore, communication centers also teach professional development (LaGrone & Mills, 2020). This can positively impact the consultants at the center as well as help clients develop skills such as interviewing or formal business presentations.

While situated on college campuses, many centers serve more than just students as they may be open to faculty and staff (Strawser et al., 2020). Communication centers' reach can extend off campus to include mentoring individuals in the community as well (Schwartzman et al., 2020). Therefore, communication centers should be mindful of the diversity of not only clients coming from the university but also those from neighboring communities. This diversity includes English language learners (ELLs).

There are immense benefits to working with a consultant at a communication center that applies to both ELLs and English primary language speakers. For example, scholars found students experienced a reduction in their public speaking anxiety after visiting a communication center (Stewart et al., 2021). Communication apprehension, which includes public speaking anxiety, is the term used to describe "an individual's level of fear or anxiety with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey & Richmond, 2006, p. 55). ELLs experience heightened communication anxiety due to fears related to their ability to effectively communicate in a foreign language in addition to anxiety surrounding a presentation (Khoshlessan & Das, 2017). Communication centers are a well-suited resource on a college campus to help students experiencing this type of communication anxiety.

Profiles of English Language Learners in the U.S.

According to the Open Doors Report on International Education Exchange, between 2013 and 2021, there has been an average of one million international students studying in the U.S. each year (2021c). On average, over 410,000 international students are undergraduates with over

80% being from countries where English is not the official or primary language (Institute on International Education, 2021a; 2021b; 2021c). While there is an English proficiency exam, known as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), that is required for study in U.S. institutions of higher education, many ELLs need additional English language support once in the U.S. (Bergey et al., 2018; Faria et al., 2019; Sheppard et al., 2015).

International students are not the only ones who are considered ELLs as immigrants are often ELLs. Some adult immigrants may have prior schooling, such as grade school, high school, university, or graduate school, in a language other than English and may be taking English Second Language (ESL) classes or content courses in English to further develop their linguistic skills and career goals. Children of immigrants typically fall into two profiles for the purposes of this paper. The first describes children or adolescents who were born in another country, who usually received some education in that country, and who then immigrated to the U.S. with their family where they continue their education in English. These ELLs are often referred to as Generation 1.5 students. The 1.5 is used to show the nature of being caught in the middle of two generations both culturally and linguistically (Alvarez et al., 2017). Generation 1.5 students usually exhibit high levels of oral proficiency in English but will struggle with different areas of written English (Bergey et al., 2018; Broeckelman-Post, 2019; Eckstein, 2018).

The second profile of children of immigrants is that of children or adolescents who were born in the U.S. to recent immigrants, and 88% of children of immigrant families are in this category (Minority Policy Institute, 2019). Furthermore, one in four children and adolescents under the age of 18 who were born in the U.S. have at least one parent who is an immigrant (Minority Policy Institute, 2019), and 77% of ELLs between the ages of 5 and 17 are U.S. born (Zong & Botolova, 2015).

Research has shown that ELLs have higher anxiety when speaking in English in general and especially in academic contexts due to communication apprehension, self-perceived English proficiency, a fear of negative judgments and evaluations, and a worry about mispronunciation (Bhatti et al., 2016; Fabre-Marchán et al., 2017; Foltz, 2017; Khan, 2015). However, public speaking instruction helps to improve oral communication skills and lower communication apprehension (Al-Tamimi, 2014). Due to the increasing ELLs in the U.S. in general as well as at U.S. institutions of higher education, it is important to explore best practices for communication center tutors when working with ELL clients.

This article explores best practices for communication center tutors working with ELL clients using elements from the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and language pedagogy. Communication centers can use this information to assess traditional tutoring models and examine how their center meets the needs of this student population. We argue for an organizational structure of support and inclusivity, which may be achieved with a stronger emphasis on intercultural competency and intercultural citizenship, including ways to address proficiency levels and practice cultural empathy.

Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy

One of the most common student goals when learning another language is to be able to communicate in that language (Magnan, 2012; Miller, 2019; 2020), and communication is one of the American Association on the Teaching of Foreign Languages" (ACTFL) World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (ACTFL, 2015). These standards, commonly referred to as the 5Cs, represent language learning goal areas and are Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons and Communities. Summaries for each of these goal areas are as follows:

- *Communication* entails communicating effectively in more than one language in a variety of situations and for multiple purposes. It includes interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational communication.
- *Cultures* stand for demonstrating and interacting with cultural competence and understanding and include relating both cultural practices and products to perspectives.
- *Connections* imply the ability to make connections to other disciplines to acquire both information and diverse perspectives while building, reinforcing, and expanding knowledge in other disciplines, developing critical thinking skills, and creatively solving problems to use the target language in academic and career situations.
- *Comparisons* include being able to act with cultural competence to develop insight into the nature of language and culture by making comparisons of the target language (or the language studied) to their own.
- *Communities* involve using linguistic and cultural competence to participate in multilingual communities both within and beyond the classroom and to encourage lifelong language learning while moving toward global citizenship (ACTFL, 2015).

Campus communication centers have a unique opportunity to help ELLs develop in these five areas especially as several of these goal areas are inherent to communication centers at U.S. universities already. The *Communication, Cultures,* and *Communities* standards, for example, are naturally enhanced because the language and cultural context of the communication center is most likely English. Since students are typically completing presentations or speeches for academic coursework, there is an innate link to the *Connections* standard. *Comparisons* can come as a result of further linguistic and cultural understanding of the target language to which communication centers can contribute. However, it is important to note that while communication centers have inherent links to these goal areas, that alone does not enhance the linguistic and cultural development of ELLs. As such, we argue that to best develop ELLs the focus of working with ELLs should be at the intersection of the 5Cs with a particular focus on intercultural communicative competence that advances the goal of intercultural citizenship. Moreover, it should be seen as a two-way street for ELLs and communication center tutors.

Intercultural Communicative Competence and Intercultural Citizenship

Byram's model of intercultural communicative competence (ICC) first published in 1997 and revised and revisited in 2021 was created for language pedagogy specialists and teachers as a way for "teaching and assessing aspects of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes learners need in order to act as 'intercultural speakers' of languages" (Wagner & Byram, 2017, p. 1), but this notion has now expanded beyond the second language classroom into wider settings in both education and the professions (Wagner & Byram, 2017). As such, it serves as an integral model for anyone who is working with ELLs or communication in general. ICC combines linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse competences with dimensions of intercultural competence. Byram (2021) defines linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse competences in the following way:

- *Linguistic competence:* the ability to apply knowledge of the rules of a standard version of the language to produce and interpret spoken and written language;
- *Sociolinguistic competence:* the ability to give to the language produced by an interlocutor - whether native speaker or not - meanings which are taken for granted by the interlocutor or which are negotiated and made explicit by the interlocutor;
- *Discourse competence:* the ability to use, discover and negotiate strategies for the production and interpretation of monologic or dialogic texts which follow the conventions of the culture of an interlocutor or are negotiated as intercultural texts for particular purposes. (p. 129).

The five dimensions of intercultural competence are *attitudes - curiosity and openness*, *knowledge*, *skills of interpreting/relating, skills of discovery/interaction*, and *cross-cultural awareness/political education*. Byram (2021) describes *attitudes - curiosity and openness* as a "readiness to suspend disbelief about other's cultures and belief about one's own" (p. 132) with the objectives of being willing to seek opportunities to engage with otherness and to question the values and presuppositions of one's own cultural practices and products; being ready to experience adaptation and interaction with another culture and to engage with conventions and rites of both verbal and non-verbal communication and interaction; and having an interest in discovering perspectives of both familiar and unfamiliar phenomena in one's own culture as well as other cultures.

Knowledge refers to both specific knowledge regarding social groups, products, and practices in one's own culture and the interlocutor's culture and general knowledge regarding interaction in society and in individuals. Objectives include knowing of or about historical and contemporary relationships; national memory, its events, and perspectives; the national definitions of geographical space and perceptions; socialization; social distinctions; institutions relating to daily life which influence conduct and relationships; social interactional processes;

means of achieving contact; and causes and processes that contribute to misunderstandings as they relate to one's own culture and the interlocutor's countries (Byram, 2021).

Skills of interpreting and relating describe one's "ability to interpret a document from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents from one's own" (Byram, 2021, p. 136). Objectives are an ability to "identify ethnocentric perspectives in a document or event and explain its origins; identify areas of misunderstanding and dysfunction in an interaction and explain them in terms of each of the cultural systems present; mediate between conflicting interpretations of phenomena" (Byram, 2021, p. 136).

Skills of discovery and interaction describe the ability to acquire intercultural knowledge of cultural practices and to operate knowledge, attitudes, and skills in real-time communications and interactions. The objectives are to be able to elicit information regarding concepts and values of documents or events from an interlocutor and to develop a way to apply a system of explanation to other phenomena; to identify significant cultural references and to elicit their significance and connotations; to identify similar and dissimilar processes regarding both verbal and non-verbal interactions while negotiating their appropriate usage; to use an appropriate combination of knowledge, skills, and attitudes to interact with interlocutors while considering familiarity in one's own country with the degree of difference in another and for mediation; to identify both contemporary and past relationships between one's own and another culture; and to identify and use public and private institutions to make contact with other countries and cultures (Byram, 2021).

Cross-cultural awareness/political education refers to "an ability to evaluate, critically and on the basis of an explicit, systematic process of reasoning, values present in one's own and other cultures and countries" (Byram, 2021, p. 139). Its objectives include an ability to identify and interpret explicit or implicit values in one's own and other cultures regarding documents or events; to analyze and evaluate documents and events based on a conscious process of reasoning; and to interact and mediate intercultural exchanges using analysis and negotiation from one's knowledge, skills, and attitudes. (Byram, 2021).

Further developing the notion of ICC is the theory of intercultural citizenship as described by Wagner and Byram (2017). Intercultural citizenship stems from the fact that "many, if not most, countries are populated by multiple cultural groups and their members identify with different groups as well as the country as a whole" (Wagner & Byram, 2017, p. 3). As such, intercultural citizenship posits that while learning active citizenship in one's own country, learners also acquire the knowledge and skills to act in a multicultural and international community that has more than one set of values, beliefs, and behaviors (Wagner & Byram, 2017).

In 2008, Byram proposed a model of intercultural citizenship education, which used ICC as a base but goes beyond by saying that intercultural citizenship education involves:

- causing/facilitating intercultural citizenship experience, which includes activities of working with others to achieve an agreed end;

- analysis and reflection on the experience and the possibility of further social and/or political activity;
- thereby creating learning that is cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral change in the individual;
- and a change in self-perception, in relationships with people of different social groups (Wagner & Byram, 2017, pp. 3-4).

While intercultural citizenship stems from ICC, which includes language learning as a key tenet, intercultural citizenship does not "exclude disciplines other than language education from participating" (Wagner & Byram, 2017, p. 4). Intercultural competence is needed even when there is a shared language because people have different cultural, regional, and/or national contexts with a shared language.

Using this information as a theoretical framework, the authors have identified best practices to support ELL students in communication centers. These practices should help communication center consultants serve the specific needs of this unique student population.

Best Practices for Working with ELL Students

Best Practice #1: Educate Consultants on Intercultural Communicative Competence and Intercultural Citizenship

The most essential best practice is that of intercultural competence training and is not one that only applies to situations with ELLs. Communication center consultants must be aware of the complexities involved in ICC as each component is often present in formal speech as well as day-to-day interactions. Consultants should be able to articulate the differences between linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse competence as these can play a role in the type of feedback that is given to an ELL. Consultants also should be able to apply the five components of the model of intercultural competence to situations they may see in the center, and they should be able to apply these dimensions to others and to themselves. It is very important to remember that this is not a one-way street. Developing ICC and intercultural citizenship comes from collaboration and inclusion. The five dimensions to understand are attitudes, knowledge, skills of interpreting/relating, skills of discovery/interaction, and cross-cultural awareness/political education.

Also, remember that, especially when working with ELLs, a consultant is also working on building both their own and the student client's intercultural citizenship, and communication centers can play a vital role in this development. Communication centers are facilitating intercultural citizenship experiences by having consultants and clients from diverse backgrounds, languages, cultures, etc. Now, the next step is to enhance these interactions. An intercultural experience is said to have activities where people are working together to achieve an agreed end. This is a natural occurrence in a communication center. After meetings and interactions, both the client and the consultant should reflect on the experience in which the individuals examine the experience and think of the possibility of further social activity. This process of reflection can aid

in the mutual creation of learning that contributes to individual change that is cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral, and maybe more importantly, can contribute to a change in self-perception when it comes to relationships with people of different social groups.

Directors of communication centers should make it a goal to receive ICC training themselves and also implement this type of training for their consultants. It should not be a one-time occurrence, however. It does not have to be put solely on communication center directors. Bring in experts in the field for workshops, attend conferences and other professional development activities that discuss ICC and intercultural citizenship, and look for ways to improve understanding and interactions in an increasing multicultural and international community.

Best Practice #2: Train Consultants on ELL Specifics

Harrison (2021) found communication center consultants are driven by the desire to help others. Training better communication consultants provides consultants with the skills necessary to assist others and also benefits the communication center itself in terms of increased consultations or even more financial support allowing a center to grow (Brown, 2020). There is some specific information to keep in mind when working with ELLs that all communication center consultants should remember. ELLs often need additional English language support once in the U.S. (Bergey et al., 2018; Faria et al., 2019; Sheppard et al., 2015), and each ELL will have a different English proficiency level with different individual needs. ELLs may also be attending a communication center consultation because they were instructed to by a professor or they sought out additional help on their own. Whatever the case may be, remember that each person should be treated with respect and their individual needs should be addressed. Treat the clients as people and understand that individuals arrive at the communication center with differing abilities (Cuny, 2018).

Another thought to keep in mind is that ELLs often have higher anxiety levels because they are speaking in a language that is not their primary language. This anxiety is heightened in academic contexts, during test taking, and when giving speeches or presentations (Bhatti et al., 2016; Fabre-Marchán et al., 2017; Foltz, 2017; Khan, 2015), but research has shown that public speaking instruction helps ELLs improve their oral speaking skills and lower anxiety levels or communication apprehension (Al-Tamimi, 2014). First, know that there are different types of foreign language anxiety. Foreign language anxiety has been defined as "a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process" (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 128). There are three main components to foreign language anxiety: communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation. Communication apprehension, as discussed earlier, is a person's fear or anxiety that is associated with real or anticipated communication (McCroskey & Richmond, 2006), and self-perceived confidence of language proficiency contributes to communication apprehension, which means that if a student rates themselves as having a low

self-rating of English competency, then they are likely to have higher communication apprehension.

The other component relevant to communication centers is the fear of negative evaluation, which is defined as "apprehension about others' evaluations, distress over their negative evaluations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively" (Watson & Friend, 1969, p. 449). This component of foreign language anxiety comes mostly from the perceptions of others, which could be fellow students, teachers, or any other primary language speaker. Communication center consultants need to recognize that ELLs have heightened levels of foreign language anxiety, but consultants can help ELLs overcome these anxieties and fears, and these techniques are further explained in the following best practices.

Best Practice #3: Focus on Enhancing the Consultants' Interpersonal Skills

Communication centers should provide training or workshops to help consultants improve their interpersonal skills paying particular attention to verbal, nonverbal, and listening skills. What one says and how they say it are very important skills and come into play in communication centers when speaking with clients and giving feedback. Verbal communication in this setting should always be meaningful, responsive, and constructive (Hill et al., 2017; Lewis-Moreno, 2007; Ward & Schwartzman, 2009). Think about starting feedback by asking clients questions like "How do you think you did?", "What did you do well?", and "What do you think you can improve?" Make sure that the consultant points out what they think the client did well or what they liked from the speech or presentation. Feedback should be genuine, so make sure to pay attention during the session so that there is relevant feedback. When giving constructive feedback, it is important to remember that clients, and especially ELLs, can feel very vulnerable, and giving negative comments releases cortisol, the stress hormone, and has an effect on the brain for 26 or more hours (Glaser & Glaser, 2014). When giving feedback to ELLs, focus on the bigger picture, meaning think about content, coherence, visual aids, and patterns of errors and not all the smaller details like the mispronunciation of one word or pointing out every single error made (Allman, 2019; Bruce & Rafoth, 2004).

Another note for verbal communication is to check one's loudness. Sometimes individuals may speak louder when interacting with an ELL, and this should not be done. The goal is for clients to feel welcomed and invited into the center and not yelled at accidentally. Besides, speaking louder does not help someone understand what is being said in another language.

Spend time working with consultants on improving their nonverbal communication. For example, smiling and nodding can show a client the consultant is following along. This also provides encouragement to the ELL student to move forward with the tutoring process. This positive feedback may even increase a student's confidence in public speaking, especially if it is coming from a peer. It is important to note though that nonverbals differ across countries and cultures and what may be accepted in one may not be in another. For example, direct eye contact

can be seen as offensive in many cultures, while in other cultures, it is a sign of respect and engagement.

Listening is a vital skill for communication center consultants and may require staff to be trained on actively listening (Yook, 2006). Yook (2006) also argues listening is a valuable tool a center can use to assess its success. This includes empathetic listening such that judgment is withheld and clients feel understood (Wilde et al., 2006). To better understand the skill level of staff, there are self-assessments available that consultants could take as part of their initial hiring or orientation (Wilde et al., 2006). From there, the communication center director could craft specialized activities to develop these skills with communication center consultants by running simulations or performing role play activities where consultants work on reflecting statements made by a client.

Simulations are a great way to show cross-cultural and intercultural communication and interaction. A few examples include *Bafá Bafá* (Shirts, 1977), *Barnga: A Simulation Game on Cultural Clashes* (2011), and the Toothpick Activity (Saphiere et al., 2005). Note these examples should be conducted by a trained facilitator.

Best Practice #4: Set the Stage for Success: The Communication Center at Large

Ladva (2020) starts an article with the title "Is the Communication Center Racist?" and while this article discusses black linguistic justice and anti-racism, these concepts can be applied to ELLs. Ladva states:

> In *How to Be an Anti-Racist*, Kendi (2019) argues that 'there is no such thing as a non-racist or race-neutral policy. Every policy in every institution in every community in every nation is producing or sustaining either racial inequity or equity between racial groups' (p. 18). If he is right, then communication centers in particular, and speaking pedagogy in general, must confront the possibility that, in the absence of an explicitly anti-racist agenda, they are racist.

Directors of communication centers need to understand the importance of creating a space within its four walls that is a "comfortable environment where learning is at its peak and all who enter feel appreciated" (Wilde et al., 2006, p. 70). For ELLs, this may require specialized attention to the center's environment as well as how peers are assigned. The communication center should be a safe space where respect is paramount and everyone's ideas should be heard and considered (Tonkins, 2018).

An ELL may prefer one-on-one peer tutoring or work in small groups due to anxiety stemming from communicating with someone with advanced English language skills (Thompson & Lee, 2012). Strawser and colleagues (2020) suggest their own best practices to reach an international student population that includes offering remote or virtual sessions that may help reduce nerves during the session. The pandemic forced many institutions to move online, and therefore, offering Zoom sessions to ELL students may help them feel more at ease with the peer tutoring process. Providing virtual reality programs have been shown to give students who tend to shy away from speaking and participating in class an opportunity to practice the target

language and overcome some of their own fears by creating a safe environment (Berti, 2019; Lege et al., 2020; Symonenko et al., 2020; York et al., 2021).

Furthermore, communication center directors are encouraged to hire consultants from diverse backgrounds both in terms of their nationality, ethnicity, and academic programs. ELLs may be more comfortable seeing consultants that represent a wide range of ethnicities and backgrounds. Additionally, a business major may be more comfortable working with a consultant that has studied that discipline, for example.

Best Practice #5: How to Structure a Tutoring Session

Some best practices for structuring a tutoring session are as follows:

1. Start the session by learning the student's name with the correct pronunciation. Names and identity are intricately tied to each other and calling someone by a name with a wrong pronunciation adds to a feeling of "otherness" and disrespect (Aldrin, 2016; Law & Eckes, 2010).
2. Continue the session with a short period of "get-to-know-you" with particular emphasis on each other's home countries and cultures to help build a relationship between the tutor and the student (Ward & Schwartzman, 2009). That way the encounter does not feel transactional while at the same time building cultural empathy and developing intercultural communicative competence and citizenship. Remember that tutors should also be learning during these exchanges and asking simple "get-to-know-you" style questions, while remaining open and curious, can help in that area. This period of time also allows tutors to hear their student speak in a natural, more relaxed way and can help ease the student's anxiety.
3. Ask the student why they are visiting the communication center. This will help the consultant learn more about their assignment and the type of content that would be most appropriate to include.
4. Ask the student what they want out of their appointment at the communication center. Set goals with the student to ensure that their individual needs are addressed and so that both the client and consultant are on the same page.
5. If it appears the client has communication apprehension, the consultant should take time to explain that what they are feeling is natural and that most people feel some type of nerves when speaking. The consultant can even reference some of the research they learned during their training to provide more concrete information to the client.
6. Talk about the content of the assignment. If students are having difficulty selecting a topic, stress the importance of choosing a topic about which the speaker is excited and enthusiastic. Topic selection can also aid in lowering anxiety levels because the student will want to talk about that specific content and focus less on their nerves.

7. Build up to a larger presentation by scaffolding sections and breaking a speech assignment into smaller segments so that the student can focus more easily. This could be done in one visit to the communication center or through several visits if time permits. Additionally, the tutor can set some smaller and more obtainable goals that would allow an ELL to move forward while feeling a sense of achievement along the way.
8. Practice. Have the student do a practice presentation or practice a smaller part of the assignment. Practicing can help lower communication apprehension (Al-Tamimi, 2014; Davis et al., 2020).
9. If students are worried about their clarity or pronunciation, prompt them to focus on the content, organization, and visual aids rather than their accent or pronunciation. Help the student build out stronger visual aids as a way to clarify what they are saying, which can help in case the audience misunderstands a word or phrase. Remind students that more communication occurs nonverbally than verbally (Mehrabian, 1972) and that breathing can help relieve anxiety in public speaking (Howe & Dwyer, 2007).
10. At the end of the session, both the tutor and the student should reflect on their experience to further push the notion of mutual and intercultural learning. This will help both of them understand the benefits of working together and hopefully, also enhance their interpersonal skills.

Best Practice #6: Hold Workshops for ELL Students Including IC and ICC

Many communication centers already offer workshops to their campus and/or community (LeFebvre et al., 2017, 2019). We suggest offering a skills workshop specifically designed for the ELL population. This would allow communication centers to teach skills and even strategies to help ELLs overcome foreign language anxiety and develop ICC and intercultural citizenship. Furthermore, ELLs may be more comfortable attending a workshop with other ELLs who have similar fears, anxieties, or other needs. These workshops will directly help ELLs by providing them with the tools necessary to succeed in communication.

Best Practice #7: Revisit the Goals and Mission of the Communication Center

If a communication center does not have a written mission statement or list of goals, perhaps it is time to draft some. Alternatively, it is a good idea to review these documents annually to make sure they are up to date and aligned with their university policy or national standards for communication centers. Drafting or editing mission statements or list of goals can even be a positive team-building exercise. For example, the communication consultants can come together and review these documents and make suggestions. They could anonymously write down their ideas and goals for review by the larger group.

The director may wish to review and include language from the National Association of Communication Center's statement of inclusion (Carpenter et al., 2019). Reviewing this

document with their consultants will also reinforce some of the principles of inclusivity and overall goals of the center. There should be a statement or goal regarding helping clients from different backgrounds, individuals with varying degrees of language proficiency, and individuals with high levels of communication apprehension.

Moving Forward

Before the COVID-19 pandemic, international student enrollment at universities in the United States was over one million (Moody, 2021). Although the pandemic may have slowed the influx of international students into U.S. colleges (Institute on International Education, 2021c), future enrollment rates will paint a better picture of whether the population will rise (Moody, 2021). Regardless, communication centers should be prepared to continue working with ELLs as they represent a special body of students that could benefit from more specialized services provided by communication centers especially as they relate to oral communication skills and ICC.

While the recommendations noted above are not exhaustive, the authors suggest centers revisit existing practices to ensure consultants are best prepared for working with ELLs. This includes advanced training in ICC, intercultural citizenship, language learning and pedagogy, and interpersonal skills. Another key component is examining the environment of the communication center itself to ensure diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts are at the forefront. With proper support, communication consultants can achieve intercultural communicative competence and intercultural citizenship that will benefit not only themselves but also their clients.

References

ACTFL. (2015). ACTFL standards. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Retrieved from: http://www.actfl.org/publications/all/world-readiness-standards-learning-languages.

Al-Tamimi, N.O. (2014). Public speaking instruction: A bridge to improve English speaking competence and reducing communication apprehension. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication, 2*(4), 45-68.

Aldrin, E. (2016). Names and identity. In C. Hough (Ed.) *The Oxford handbook of names and naming* (pp. 382-394). Oxford University Press.

Allman, B. (2019). Effective and appropriate feedback for English learners. In B. Allman (Ed.) *Principles of language acquisition.* EdTech Books.

Alvarez, S., Gilliland, B., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., McBee Orzulak, M. J., & Pella, S. (2017). Statement of terminology and glossary. *National Council of Teachers of English. https://ncte.org/blog/2017/09/esl-ell-generation-1-5-why-are-these-terms-important/*

Bergey, R., Movit, M., Simpson Baird, A., & Faria, A. (2018). Serving English language learners in higher education: Unlocking potential. *American Institutes for Research.*

Berti, M. (2019). Italian open education: Virtual reality immersions for the language classroom. *New case studies of openness in and beyond the language classroom*, 37-47.

Bhatti, N., Memon, S., Pathan, H. (2016). Investigating the perceptions of Pakistani English language learners on language learning anxiety in EFL classroom. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 7*(5), 23-34.

Broeckelman-Post, M. A. (2019). Context matters: Multilingual learners on public speaking courses. *Communication Teacher, 33*(1), 63-79.

Brown, J. A., (2020). Communication consultant proficiency: Benefits of building better consultants. *Communication Center Journal*, *6*(1), 103-105. http://libjournal.uncg.edu/ccj/article/view/2065

Bruce, S. & Rafoth, B. (2004). *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors.* Boynton Cook.

Byram, M. (2021). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence.* (2nd ed.). Multilingual Matters.

Carpenter, R., Cuny, K., & Mabrey, P. E. (2019). *Statement on inclusion*. NACC - Statement on Inclusion. Retrieved October 14, 2022, from http://commcenters.org/journal/special-statement.

Cuny, K. (2018). A case study of outside events verses the thriving speaking center. *Communication Center Journal, 4*(1).

Davis, A., Linvill, D. L., Hodges, L. F., Da Costa, A. F., & Lee, A. (2020). Virtual reality versus face-to-face practice: A study into situational apprehension and performance. *Communication Education, 69*(1), 70-84.

Eckstein, G. (2018). Goals for a writing center tutorial: Differences between native, non-native, and Generation 1.5 writers. *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship, 42*(7-8), 17+.

Fabre-Marchán, P., Torres-Jala, G., Andrade-Dominguez, F., Ortiz-Zurita, M. J., Alvarez-Muñoz, P. (2017). A phenomenological study: The impacts of developing phonetic awareness through technological resources on English language learners' communicative competences. *English Language Teaching, 10*(12), 83-87.

Faria, A., Bergey, R., Simpson Baird, A., & Lishinski, A. (2019). Using technology to support English language learners in higher education: A study of Voxy's effect on English language proficiency. *American Institutes for Research*.

Foltz, K. (2017). English as a second language (ESL) and business communication: An exploration of student preferences for speech class demographics. *The Florida Communication Journal, 45*(1), 65-74.

Glaser, J. E. & Glaser, R. D. (2014). The neurochemistry of positive conversations. *The Harvard Business Review.* https://hbr.org/2014/06/the-neurochemistry-of-positive-conversations

Harrison, E.E., (2021). Motivational factors of communication center tutors. *Communication Center Journal, 7*(1), 73-82.

Hill, M. F., Ell, F., Grudnoff, L., Haigh, M., Cochran-Smith, M., Chang, W., & Ludlow, L. (2017). Assessment for equity: Learning how to use evidence to scaffold learning and improve teaching. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 24*(2), 185-204.

Horwitz, E., Horwitz, M., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125-132.

Howe, M. M. & Dwyer, K. K. (2007). The influence of diaphragmatic breathing to reduce situational anxiety or basic course students. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 19*(1), 104-137.

Institute of International Education. (2021a). International students by detailed academic level, 1990/00-2020/21. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from https://opendoorsdata.org/

Institute of International Education. (2021b). International students by place of origin and academic level, 2000/01 - 2020/21. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from https://opendoorsdata.org/.

Institute of International Education. (2021c). International student enrollment trends, 1948/49-2020/21. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from http://www.opendoorsdata.org.

Kendi, I. (2019). *How to be an antiracist.* One World.

Khan, S. M. (2015). Influence of speech anxiety on oral communication skills among ESL/EFL learners. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6*(6), 49-53.

Khoshlessen, R., & Das, K. (2017). Analyzing international students' study anxiety in higher education. *Journal of International Students*, *7*(2), 311-328.

Ladva, N. (2020). Is the communication center racist? An inquiry into black linguistic justice, anti-racism, and assimilation. *Communication Center Journal, 6*(1), 2-17.

LaGrone, T. & Mills, L. (2020). The communication center as a resource for professional development. *Communication Center Journal, 6*(1), 109-111.

Law, B. & Eckes, M. (2010). *The more-than-just-surviving handbook: ELL for every classroom*. Portage & Main Press.

LeFebvre, L., LeFebvre, L., & Anderson, D. (2019). Communication centers at colleges and universities: Transitioning from a course resource to an institutional resource. *Communication Teacher*, *33*(2), 179–188. https://doi-org.esearch.ut.edu/10.1080/17404622.2018.1536796

LeFebvre, L., LeFebvre, L. E., & Anderson, D. (2017). The communication center at U.S. colleges and universities: A descriptive overview II. *Communication Education*, *66*(4), 440–450. https://doi-org.esearch.ut.edu/10.1080/03634523.2017.1322211

Lege, R., Bonner, E., Frazier, E., & Pascucci, L. (2020). Pedagogical considerations for successful implementation of virtual reality in the language classroom. In *New technological applications for foreign and second language learning and teaching* (pp. 24-46). IGI Global.

Lewis-Moreno, B. (2007). Shared responsibility: Achieving success with English language learners. *Phi Delta Kappan, 88*(10), 772-775.

Magnan, S. S., Murphy, D., Sahakyan, N., & Kim, S. (2012). Student goals, expectations and the standards for foreign language learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(2), 170-192.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (2006). Understanding the audience: Students' communication traits. In T. P. Mottett, V. P. Richmond, & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives* (pp. 51–66). Allyn and Bacon.

Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Nonverbal communication*. Aldine Transaction.

Migration Policy Institute (2019). Children in U.S. immigrant families. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/charts/children-immigrant-families

Miller, A. (2019). Exploring achievement goal theory, ACTFL's 5Cs and the L2 classroom: What goals do students set? *Foreign Language Annals, 52*(2), 237-254.

Miller, A. (2020). Investigating the connection between achievement goal theory and goal setting theory: Does goal setting have an effect on achievement in the Spanish second language classroom? *Hispania, 103*(3), 387-402.

Moody, J. (2021, Nov. 15). *Declining international student numbers stabilize.* U.S. News and World Reports. ttps://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/articles/declining-international-student-numbers-stabilize

Saphiere, D. H., Mikk, B. K., Devries, B. I. (2005). *Communication highwire: Leveraging the power of diverse communication styles*. Intercultural Press.

Schwartzman, R., Forslund, E., Bolin, C., Thomas, A., Pettigrew, E., & Ray, R. (2020). Communication centers as wellsprings of community engagement and collaborative research. *College Student Journal, 54*(2)*,* 187-198.

Shirts, R. G. (1977). *BaFá BaFá*. Simulation Training System.

Sheppard, B., Rice, J., Rice, K., DeCoster, B., Drummond-Sardell, R., & Soelberg, N. (2015). Re-evaluating the speaking and listening demands of university classes for novice international students. *ORTESOL Journal*, *32*, 1-12.

Stewart, B., Broeckelman-Post, M., & Rossheim, C. (2021). Making a difference: A quantitative study of communication center and basic course impact on public-speaking anxiety, goal orientation, and motivation. *Communication Education, 70*(3). https://doi-org.esearch.ut.edu/10.1080/03634523.2021.1906923

Strawser, M., Apostel, S., Carpenter, R., Cuny, K., Dvorak, K., & Head, K. (2020). The centrality of the center: Best practices for engaging students on campus. *Communication Center Journal*, *6*(1), 94-102.

Symonenko, S., Zaitseva, N., Osadchyi, V., Osadcha, K., & Shmeltser, E. (2020). Virtual reality in foreign language training at higher educational institutions [Address]. Kryvyi Rih, Ukraine. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/47fa/f323b6cf1cf90a92b6f90e39e21981132904.pdf?_gl=1*41f5gq*_ga*MTQxNjc5MzA2NC4xNjg1NjU3NDk2*_ga_H7P4ZT52H5*MTY4NTY1NzQ5Ni4xLjEuMTY4NTY1NzcyMS41OS4wLjA.

Thiagarajan, S. & Thiagarajan, R. (2011). *Barnga: A simulation game on cultural clashes - 25th anniversary edition*. Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Thompson, A., & Lee, J. (2012). Anxiety and EFL: Does multilingualism matter? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(6), 1-20.

Tonkins, M. R. (2018). Safe space and brave space: Improving interpersonal relationships in the communication center. *Communication Center Journal, 4.*

Wagner, M. & Byram, M. (2017). Intercultural citizenship. In Y. Kim & K. L. McKay-Semmler (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of intercultural communication* (pp. 1-6). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. DOI: 10.1002/9781118783665.ieicc0043

Ward, K., & Schwartzman, R. (2009). Building interpersonal relationships as a key to effective speaking center consultations. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *36*(4), 363-372.

Watson, D. & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33*(4), 448-457.

Wilde, S., Cuny, K., & Vizzier, A. (2006). Peer-to-peer tutoring: A model for utilizing empathetic listening to build client relationships in the communication center. *International Journal of Listening, 20*(1), 70-75. https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2006.10499092.

Yook, E. (2006). Assessment as meta-listening at the communication center. *International Journal of Listening, 20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2006.10499091.

York, J., Shibata, K., Tokutake, H., & Nakayama, H. (2021). Effect of SCMC on foreign language anxiety and learning experience: A comparison of voice, video, and VR-based oral interaction. *ReCALL*, *33*(1), 49-70.

Zong, J. & Botolova, J. (2015). *The limited English proficiency population in the United States in 2013.* Migration Policy Institute. Washington, D.C.