

Pilar Rodríguez Arancón

HOW TO DEVELOP AND EVALUATE
INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE
IN A BLENDED LEARNING
ENVIRONMENT

Editorial Sínderesis

2023

Colección
'Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación (ETI)'
Serie Manuales

Editor Jefe
Patrick Zabalbeascoa Terrán
Universitat Pompeu Fabra

Consejo Editorial

Leo Tak-hung Chan <i>Lingnan University</i>	Daniel Gallego Hernández <i>Universidad de Alicante</i>
Bettina Kluge <i>Universität Hildesheim</i>	Raquel Lázaro Gutiérrez <i>Universidad de Alcalá de Henares</i>
E. Macarena Pradas Macías <i>Universidad de Granada</i>	Míriam Seghiri Domínguez <i>Universidad de Málaga</i>

Pilar Rodríguez Arancón

HOW TO DEVELOP AND EVALUATE
INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE
IN A BLENDED LEARNING
ENVIRONMENT

‘Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación (ETI)’

Serie Manuales

1ª edición, 2023

Editorial Sindéresis

Venancio Martín, 45 – 28038 Madrid, España

Rua Diogo Botelho, 1327 – 4169-004 Porto, Portugal

info@editorialsinderesis.com

www.editorialsinderesis.com

ISBN: 978-84-19199-66-9

Depósito legal: M-8138-2023

Produce: Óscar Alba Ramos

Impreso en España / Printed in Spain

© Pilar Rodríguez Arancón

© Editorial Sindéresis

Reservados todos los derechos. De acuerdo con lo dispuesto en el Código Penal, podrán ser castigados con penas de multa y privación de libertad quienes, sin la preceptiva autorización, reproduzcan o plagien, en todo o en parte, una obra literaria, artística o científica, fijada en cualquier tipo de soporte.

*“The person who learns language without learning
culture risks becoming a fluent fool”
(J. Bennet, M. Bennet and W. Allen, 2003: 237)*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	10
LIST OF TABLES	14
LIST OF FIGURES.....	16
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	21
1.1 General introduction.....	21
1.2 Justification for the research	31
1.3 Research objectives	37
1.4 Research methodology.....	38
1.5 Research structure.....	40
CHAPTER 2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	43
2.1 Introduction.....	43
2.2 Concept and definition of culture	43
2.3 Analysis of the study of culture	44
2.4 Evolution of the study of intercultural communication.....	47
2.5 Sociological approaches to the study of interculture.....	50
2.5.1 Cultural Factors Theory	51
2.5.2 Cultural Dimensions Theory	58
2.5.3 The Theory of Interpersonal Behaviour	64
2.5.4 The Model of National Cultural Differences and Dilemma Theory.....	68
2.5.5 The Theory of Value Orientations	73

2.6 A linguistic approach to the study of culture: Systemic Functional Linguistics	80
2.6.1 Theoretical underpinnings.....	83
2.6.2 Parameters of context and culture description.....	94
2.7 The use of technologies in the L2 learning process	118
2.7.1 Blended Learning.....	122
CHAPTER 3. THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN SECOND LANGUAGE POLICY, TEACHING AND LEARNING OBJECTS.....	
3.1 Introduction.....	129
3.2 The role of intercultural teaching in linguistic policy	129
3.2.1 Linguistic policy in Australia, Japan and the USA.....	132
3.2.2 Linguistic policy in Australia	133
3.2.3 Linguistic policy in Japan	134
3.2.4 Linguistic policy in the United States.....	135
3.2.5 The evolution of European linguistic policy.....	138
3.3 Analysis of the study of culture in the main theories of L2 teaching approaches	152
3.3.1 The traditional approach to teaching culture, or pre-culture in L2	154
3.3.2 The Culture studies approach.....	160
3.3.3 The Culture as practices approach.....	163
3.3.4 Intercultural language teaching.....	168
3.4 Preliminary considerations for ILT design	171
3.4.1 The teaching of a <i>linguaculture</i>	178
3.4.2 The comparison between first and target languages and cultures	181
3.4.3 Intercultural exploration.....	182

3.4.4 An analysis of printed L2 materials from an intercultural perspective	184
CHAPTER 4. THE DESIGN OF AN INTERCULTURAL BLENDED LEARNING COURSE: THE CASE OF I-AGENT.....	193
4.1 Introduction.....	193
4.2 Objectives and methodological structure	195
4.2.1 Topics in I-AGENT	200
4.2.2 Characteristics of the software	203
4.2.3 Sequence of activities in the course	205
4.3 Cultural theories influencing I-AGENT.....	212
4.4 The intercultural activities of the course.....	222
4.5 A sample unit of the intercultural activities of I-AGENT.....	237
4.6 Assessment of intercultural competence awareness.....	254
4.6.1 Rubrics.....	257
4.6.2 A proposal to assess intercultural competence.....	260
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH.....	273
REFERENCES	297

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

3Cs	Cross-Cultural Competence
A	Agentive Role
AC	Achievement
ACTFL	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
ALTE	<i>Association of Language Testers in Europe</i>
AI	Artificial Intelligence
AILA	International Association of Applied Linguistics
ATLAS	Applying Technology to Languages
AUS	Australia
BEC	Benevolence-Caring
BED	Benevolence-Dependability
BL	Blended Learning
C	Channel
CALL	Computer Assisted Language Learning
CCAI	Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory
CDCS	European Committee for Social Cohesion
CEFR	<i>Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment</i>
CLIL	Context and Language Integrated Learning
CLSL	Centre for Language in Social Life
CMM	Computer-Mediated Communication
COI	Conformity-Interpersonal
COR	Conformity-Rules
CSCL	Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning
D	Social Distance

DTCA	Direct-To-Consumer Advertising
E	Medium
e.g.	Exempli gratia (for example)
ECML	European Centre for Modern Languages
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
ELF	English as a Lingua Franca
ELP	English Language Portfolio
ESP	English for Specific Purposes
EU	European Union
ET AL.	Et alii (and others)
FAC	Conservation of Face
FRA	France
FSI	Foreign Language Institute
G	Goal Orientation
GBR	Great Britain
GDP	Gross Domestic Power
H	Social Hierarchy
HU	Humility
I-AGENT	Intelligent Adaptive Generic English Tutor
IBM	International Business Machines
ICALL	Intelligent Computer Assisted Language Learning
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
i.e.	<i>it est</i>
ID or IDV	Individualism vs. Collectivism
IDI	Intercultural Development Inventory
ILT	Intercultural Language Teaching
INCA	Intercultural Competence Assessment

IRIC	Institute for Research on Intercultural Cooperation
IT	Information Technology
IVR	Indulgence vs. Self-restraint
JPN	Japan
L	Action with Symbols
L1	Mother Tongue or First Language
L2	Second Language
LAMS	Learning Activity Management Systems
LSP	Language for Specific Purposes
LTO	Long-Term Orientation
M	Material Action
MAS	Masculinity vs. Femininity
MCEETYA	Ministerial Council for Education Employment and Training
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology
MOODLE	Modular Object-Oriented Dynamic Learning Environment
N	Network Morphology
NALF	<i>The National Assessment Framework for Languages</i>
OWL	Web Ontology Language
PAK	Pakistan
p.	Page
Per. com.	Personal Communication
p.p.	Pages
PD or PDI	Power Distance
POD	Power-Dominance
POR	Power-Resources
R	Role of Language
S	Sphere of Action

SDA	Self-Direction of Action
SDT	Self-Direction of Thought
SEP	Security-Personal
SES	Security-Societal
SFL	Systemic Functional Linguistics
SPA	Spain
ST	Stimulation
SVS	Schwartz's Value Survey
SWI	Switzerland
TR	Tradition
UA or UAI	Uncertainty Avoidance
UK	United Kingdom
UNC	Universalism-Concern
UNED	Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNN	Universalism-Nature
UNT	Universalism-Tolerance
US or USA	United States of America
VEN	Venezuela
vs.	Versus
ZPD	Zone of Proximal Development

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Number of hours of study per level.	31
Table 2: Citation counts for intercultural scholars.....	37
Table 3: Most important differences between high-and low-context cultures.	54
Table 4: Time in monochronic and polychronic cultural contexts.	57
Table 5: A comparative of the six Cultural Dimension Theory values in nine countries.....	62
Table 6: Percentage of respondents who believe it is worth trying to control nature.....	72
Table 7: Definitions of types of values.....	78
Table 8: Simplified version of the Social Hierarchy network.....	98
Table 9: Simplified version of the Agentive Role network.....	100
Table 10: Simplified version of the Social Distance network.	102
Table 11: Simplified version of the Network Morphology.	104
Table 12: Simplified version of the Specialised and Quotidian networks.	107
Table 13: Simplified version of the Material Action network.....	108
Table 14: Simplified version of the Actions with Symbols network.....	109
Table 15: Simplified version of the Goal Orientation network.....	111
Table 16: Simplified version of the Role of Language: Constitutive, Supported and Ancillary networks.	113
Table 17: Simplified version of the Channel network.....	115
Table 18: Medium.....	117
Table 19. ALTE Work typical abilities following the levels of the CEFR.....	146

Table 20. Self-evaluation grid of the CEFR.....	151
Table 21: Types of knowledge involved in ILT.	174
Table 22: Dimensions of interculture.	184
Table 23. Example of intercultural language teaching exploration.	190
Table 24. Basic scoring rubric.....	258
Table 25. Main features for intercultural competence rubrics.....	267
Table 26: Sociolinguistic appropriateness in the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001).	268
Table 27: Proposed rubric for the assessment of intercultural competence...	269

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Languages currently spoken in Russia.	23
Figure 2: Ways in which Europeans learn L2s. Eurobarometer 386 (2012).....	30
Figure 3: Kachru’s Three Circles of English.	32
Figure 4: Map of European ethnic groups and relations.	34
Figure 5: National GPA.....	35
Figure 6: The 3 Cs: Cross-cultural Competence. Image used by the U.S. Army Research Institute based on Abbe et al., 2007, and adopted by the U.S. Military Academy’s Center for Languages, Cultures, and Regional Studies.....	49
Figure 7: Hall’s global model of “culture as communication”. El lenguaje silencioso (1989: 106).....	52
Figure 8: Countries in a low to high-context continuum.....	53
Figure 9: Personal space, based on Hall’s four levels of social distance (Cherry, K., 2013).....	56
Figure 10: The original four cultural dimensions in relation to six countries	59
Figure 11: Hofstede’s five cultural dimensions.....	60
Figure 12: Triandis’s Theory of Interpersonal Behaviour (1994).....	65
Figure 13: Trompenaar’s Model of Culture, Riding the Waves of Culture (1993).....	69
Figure 14: Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s Areas of Culture (1997).....	69

Figure 15: The seven dimensions of culture (Trompenars and Hampden-Turner, 1997)..... 70

Figure 16: An example of Neutral vs. Emotional dimension scores in eleven countries. 71

Figure 17: Cultural value orientations: Theoretical structure (Schwartz, 2002). 75

Figure 18: Schwartz’s Value Inventory featuring 10 values, based on Schwartz, 1992..... 77

Figure 19: Schwartz’s Value Inventory featuring 19 values, based on Schwartz et al., 2012. 77

Figure 20: A simplified lexicogrammar system for the English language. 85

Figure 21: Independence of metafunctions. Available at:..... 87

Figure 22: Types of processes. Cover of Introduction to Functional Grammar (Halliday, 1994) (2nd edition). 88

Figure 23: SFL model of language in context. 90

Figure 24: Symbols for the selection of items in networks (Butt, 2003: 9). 95

Figure 25: Domains of contrast (Butt, 2003: 10)..... 96

Figure 26: Tenor network (Butt, 2003: 12)..... 98

Figure 27: Simplified version of the Social Hierarchy network. Adapted from Butt (2003: 13)..... 98

Figure 28: Simplified version of the Agentive Role network. Adapted from Butt (2003: 15)..... 100

Figure 29: Simplified version of the Social Distance network. Adapted from Butt (2003: 16)..... 101

Figure 30: Simplified version of the Network Morphology. Adapted from Butt (2003: 22)..... 103

Figure 31: Field Network (Butt, 2003: 24)..... 105

Figure 32: Sphere of Action (Butt, 2003: 25). 106

Figure 33: Simplified version of the Sphere of Action: Specialised and Quotidian networks. Adapted from Butt (2003: 25-27).....	106
Figure 34: Simplified version of the Material Action network. Adapted from Butt (2003: 28).....	108
Figure 35: Action with Symbols (Butt, 2003: 29).....	109
Figure 36: Simplified version of the Necessary Actions with Symbols network. Adapted from Butt (2003: 29-32).....	109
Figure 37: Simplified version of the Goal Orientation network. Adapted from Butt (2003: 35).....	110
Figure 38: Mode network (Butt, 2003: 37).	112
Figure 39: Role of Language (Butt, 2003: 38).....	112
Figure 40: Simplified version of Role of Language: Constitutive, Supported and Ancillary networks.	112
Figure 41: Channel 1 (Butt, 2003: 41).	114
Figure 42: Simplified version of the Channel 2 network. Adapted from Butt (2003: 43-46).....	115
Figure 43: Medium (Butt, 2003: 47).	117
Figure 44: A representation of Blended Learning.....	123
Figure 45: Students' opinions of ICT use.....	125
Figure 46: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (1996).....	136
Figure 47: ACTFL Performance Guidelines for K-12 Learners. (1998: 48).....	138
Figure 48: Europe, the 47 Member States. Council of Europe.....	139
Figure 49: CEFR: A descriptive outline (Piccardo et al., 2011: 55).	148
Figure 50: Individual and communicative competences in the CEFR.	150
Figure 51: Aspects of intercultural communicative competence.	171

Figure 52: The components of inter-(cultural) communicative competence (Alred et al., 2006: 118).....	176
Figure 53: Bloom’s taxonomy (1956) and Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001).....	177
Figure 54: The Cultural Iceberg (Weaver, 1993).....	180
Figure 55: Unit 3, in <i>Curso de Acceso a la Universidad: English for Adults</i> (2012), Burlington Books.....	185
Figure 56: “Starting off” section Unit 1 Complete First Certificate (2011), Cambridge University Press.....	186
Figure 57: Table for Two (2011) 2nd Term Project, page 143.....	188
Figure 58: Table for Two (2011). Unit 12 Table etiquette, pages 212-214.	189
Figure 59: Knowledge of English in Europe.....	198
Figure 60. I-AGENT, Unit 1: Looking for a job.....	202
Figure 61: An example of extra Lexicogrammar.....	208
Figure 62. Example of online culture content.....	211
Figure 63. Full sequence of I-AGENT. Based on Read et al., 2011.....	212
Figure 64: Realisation: strata, rank and metafunction.....	222
Figure 65: Points of articulation between culture and language. Adapted from Crozet and Liddicoat, 2000.....	225
Figure 66: From the intercultural section I-AGENT’s Unit 5 – Eating out, part one.....	241
Figure 67: From the intercultural section I-AGENT’s Unit 5 – Eating out, part two.....	244
Figure 68: From the intercultural section I-AGENT’s Unit 5 – Eating out, part three.....	245
Figure 69: From the intercultural section I-AGENT’s Unit 5 – Eating out, part four.....	249

Figure 70: From the intercultural section I-AGENT's Unit 5 – Eating out, part five..... 251

Figure 71: From the intercultural section I-AGENT's Unit 5 – Eating out, part one..... 253

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 General introduction

Language is, as it were, the external manifestation of the minds of peoples. Their language is their soul, and their soul is their language. How they combine with each other in one and precisely the same source is incomprehensible to us and remains inexplicably concealed from our perception (p. 24).

Each tongue draws a circle about the people to whom it belongs, and it is possible to leave this circle only by entering that of other people. Learning a foreign language ought hence to be the conquest of a new standpoint in the previously prevailing cosmic attitude of the individual (p. 39).

Those two quotes from Humbolt (1971) illustrate this piece of research: the idea that language and culture are intrinsically linked, and that it is, therefore, essential to understand the culture of its people in order to speak a language adequately.

This reality is all the more remarkable as learning a second language is becoming a necessity for European citizens in the 21st century as Europe strives to find a common identity. In accordance with the principle of “unity in diversity”, the European Union (EU henceforth) promotes the diversity of its cultures, while “bringing the common cultural heritage¹ to the fore” (Article 151, Treaty Establishing the EU). In its Faro Convention (Article 7), the Council of Europe argued that cultural heritage² reinforces human development, as it is a fundamental element of dialogue between human groups and specifically between European societies:

¹ The Council of Europe defines *cultural heritage* as a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time (Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society opened for signature in Faro on 27 October 2005).

² The work is in keeping with the definition of *culture* previously accepted by UNESCO and the Council of Europe: “In its widest sense, culture may now be said to be the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group. It includes not only the arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs” (UNESCO, World Conference on Cultural Policies, 1982).

The Parties undertake [...] to [...] encourage reflection on the ethics and methods of presentation of the cultural heritage, as well as respect for diversity of interpretations; [...] establish processes for conciliation to deal equitably with situations where contradictory values are placed on the same cultural heritage by different communities; [...] develop knowledge of cultural heritage as a resource to facilitate peaceful coexistence by promoting trust and mutual understanding with a view to resolution and prevention of conflicts; [and] integrate these approaches into all aspects of lifelong education and training.

Thus, a double phenomenon, which obviously influences national linguistic policies, becomes apparent: on the one hand, the idea of European integration and the development of European identity are regarded as vital objectives; on the other hand, linguistic diversity is considered to be “one of the European Union’s defining features” and “respect for the diversity of the Union’s languages is a founding principle of the European Union” (Council of Europe, 2003: 12).

European identity is promoted in three fundamental aspects. Firstly, through social and economic cohesion, by counteracting social and economic differences (European Committee for Social Cohesion [CDCS], 2004). Secondly, via politics, by strengthening democratic participation at all levels, and ensuring more democracy at EU level in order to secure “stability, peace and social justice” (Jacobs and Maier, 1998: 10). And finally, through education and culture by strengthening the European dimension and emphasising the importance of language learning, as language is what enables interaction, human relations at the private and public levels, and cultural exchange. These three aspects can be seen as intertwined, as stated in *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004 – 2006* (Council of Europe, 2003: 24):

Building a common home in which to live, work and trade together means acquiring the skills to communicate with one another effectively and to understand one another better. Learning and speaking other languages encourages us to become more open to others, their cultures and outlooks. The ability to understand and communicate in other languages is a basic skill for European citizens.

The purpose behind this statement is not merely to gain a sense of political unity; it also indicates a deep understanding of languages as reflections of cultural

identity, vehicles of communication, and also of their learning process as an enrichment which goes further than a commendable academic achievement, as pointed out in the Bologna Declaration (European Commission, 1999: 7):

A Europe of Knowledge is now widely recognised as an irreplaceable factor for social and human growth and as an indispensable component to consolidate and enrich the European citizenship, capable of giving its citizens the necessary competences to face the challenges of the new millennium, together with an awareness of shared values and belonging to a common social and cultural space.

This “shared space” is now formed by 27 European countries and 23 official languages. In fact, the EU “is home to more than 60 indigenous regional or minority languages, spoken by around 40 million people. They include Catalan, Basque, Frisian, Saami, Welsh and Yiddish”.³ The EU’s policy also aims to protect and promote these minority languages, which in some instances are even at risk of extinction (CEFR, Council of Europe, 2001: 3). In Russia, for example, over 20 languages and hundreds of different dialects coexist, as shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1: Languages currently spoken in Russia. Available at:

<http://euroheritage.net/languagesofeurope.shtml>

Thus, the EU provides support for language learning, among other reasons, because:

³ http://europa.eu/pol/mult/index_en.htm

- It can help build a sense of community between individuals and nations.
- It is essential for living together in a multilingual and multicultural Europe.
- It encourages the movement of workers in an area without internal borders.
- Businesses need multilingual staff in order to trade effectively across Europe.
- The language industry (translation and interpretation, language teaching, language technologies, etc.) is one of the fastest growing areas of the economy.

Moreover, this idea that learning languages is highly useful in modern society seems to have permeated the thinking of the population in Europe, as the results of the *Eurobarometer 386*⁴ (2012) survey demonstrated. This survey was carried out by TNS Opinion & Social network in the 27 member states of the EU between 25th February and 11th March 2012, during which time 26,751 interviews took place. It was found then that 88% of Europeans considered knowing languages other than their mother tongue (L1 henceforth) very useful, and 98% believed that mastering another foreign language (L2 henceforth) was important for the future of their children. 44% of respondents claimed to be able to understand at least one L2 well enough to follow the news on radio or television, although they were less likely to use it to communicate online, just 39%. 54% said they were able to hold a conversation in at least one L2, 25% in two L2s and 10% in at least three. The most widely spoken L1 in Europe is German (16%), followed by Italian and English (13% each), French (12%) and Spanish (11%). In addition to their L1, the L2 most frequently known by Europeans is English (38%), followed by French (12%), German (11%), Spanish (7%) and Russian (5%). A surprising 54% of Spaniards said they were monolingual, a fact that is more outstanding as Spain is a country with extensive areas of bilingual communities, such as the Basque Country, Catalonia and Galicia. The most remarkable changes that can be observed when comparing these results with those of the previous *Eurobarometer* (2005) are an increase in the proportion of Europeans who regularly use an L2 on the Internet (up by 10%), and when watching films or television or listening to the radio (up by 8%).

⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf

Thus, although the importance of speaking an L2 seems to be obvious and accepted across all nationalities, not all European countries achieve the same goals in mastering one or more of them. Spain, in particular, presents a lower level of knowledge than many other European countries. This situation is changing for the better, as the *EF English Proficiency Index Reports* (2013: 1)⁵ pointed out, “Spanish adults are progressively improving their English, as attitudes towards English shift and economic pressure makes practical job skills more important”. This report compared the data gathered in its previous survey carried out from 2007 to 2009, where “Spain ranked last among all European countries in English proficiency” to that obtained in 2013 in which it was clear that “Spain has made progress, outpacing both France and Italy. In Europe, only Poland and Hungary have improved their English more than Spain during the past six years”. The latest report considered that the reasons for this change had been due to the widespread bilingual education programs in primary and pre-primary education levels as well as the number of students and professionals living overseas. This is obviously positive but, at the same time, accentuates the need for adults to improve their level of English, as there is an increasing tendency for citizens to move across national borders in order to study or work, which is also supported by the EU, as mentioned earlier.

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (henceforth CEFR) published by the Council of Europe in 2001 was the culmination of its efforts on linguistic policy since its foundation (Bárcena and Rodríguez-Arancón, 2008). It aims “to promote mutual understanding and tolerance, respect for identities and cultural diversity through more effective international communication” (p. 3). This belief in the promotion of intercultural competence through the teaching of languages at any age, which is therefore to be seen as a major contributor to intercultural harmony, carries consequences across the whole spectrum of the teaching and learning of foreign languages. As Crozet *et al.* (1999: 1) explained: “intercultural language teaching, the emerging new paradigm in foreign language education, represents the first significant shift in language teaching history towards the teaching of culture as an integral part of language.” Remarkably, this “new paradigm” had seemed obvious to Malinowski as early as 1923 (p. 307):

⁵ *EF English Proficiency Report* (2013). Available at:
http://media.ef.com/sitecore/_/_/~/_/media/efcom/epi/2014/pdf/spotlights/ef-epi-spain.pdf