

Designing A Sustainable Society Oriented Cultural Foreign Language Course: A Needs Analysis of Preservice English Teachers

Dr. Maren K. Hoffmann

Faculty of Education, University of Helsinki, Finland

Received: 08 January 2026 Accepted: 05 February 2026 Published: 01 March 2026

ABSTRACT

This study develops a sustainability-oriented, culture-integrated foreign language course design framework grounded in a needs analysis of preservice English teachers. Building on intercultural communicative competence and intercultural citizenship traditions in language education, the article argues that sustainability is not an “add-on topic” but a meaning-making domain that reconfigures what counts as communicative competence, cultural understanding, and ethical participation in multilingual societies (Byram, 1997; Byram, 2008; Baker, 2012; Adami, 2025). Conceptually, the study links education for sustainable development, ecological literacy, and critical pedagogy to the cultural and intercultural goals of ELT, proposing that preservice teachers’ course needs emerge at the intersection of three pressures: (1) curriculum demands to address global and local sustainability challenges, (2) learners’ lived cultural contexts and identity negotiation, and (3) the professional requirement to teach language as social action rather than only linguistic form (Andersson et al., 2013; Burmeister et al., 2013; Capra, 2007; Focho, 2010; Freire, 2016). Methodologically, the article outlines a qualitative needs analysis approach using interview and reflective narrative protocols complemented by document analysis of course requirements and artifacts. Thematic analysis procedures guide interpretation, enabling identification of preservice teachers’ perceived gaps in intercultural pedagogy, sustainability literacy, and pedagogical language for facilitating difficult conversations around crisis, responsibility, and justice (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Charalambous et al., 2025). Results are presented as a descriptive synthesis of likely needs patterns and course design implications drawn strictly from the provided research base, emphasizing culturally specific teaching realities, embodied and affective intercultural communication, service-learning potentials, readability demands for accessible materials, and project-based global issues pedagogy (Anas et al., 2025; Carstensen, 2025; Chung, 2025; Cates & Jacobs, 2006; DuBay, 2004; Flesch, 1948). The article concludes with a course architecture that aligns intercultural citizenship aims with sustainability education through critical literacy, locally situated cultural inquiry, and reflective assessment practices suitable for teacher education programs (Balıkcıoğlu Akkuş & Uysal, 2024; Arıkan & Zorba, 2024).

Keywords: Needs analysis; preservice English teachers; intercultural citizenship; sustainability education; ecological literacy; critical pedagogy; cultural ELT.

INTRODUCTION

Foreign language education has long been tasked with more than grammar and vocabulary; it is an educational space where learners encounter difference, negotiate

identity, and develop capacities to communicate in culturally complex environments (Byram, 1997; Baker, 2012). Over the last decades, scholarship has increasingly reframed “culture in ELT” from static national content

toward dynamic intercultural awareness—an orientation that treats communication as interpretive work across shifting contexts, norms, and power relations (Baker, 2012; Alptekin, 2002). Within this trajectory, teacher education faces a widening challenge: preparing preservice English teachers not only to teach language forms but also to facilitate meaning-making and participation in a world marked by ecological strain, social inequity, and contested understandings of responsibility (Andersson et al., 2013; Capra, 2007).

The premise of sustainability-oriented language education is not that language classes should become environmental science courses. Rather, sustainability functions as a real-world domain of discourse and civic engagement where learners must interpret diverse perspectives, evaluate claims, navigate emotional responses, and collaborate across difference to address shared problems (Focho, 2010; Cates & Jacobs, 2006). These competencies align strongly with intercultural communicative competence and intercultural citizenship frameworks, which emphasize critical cultural understanding, ethical relationality, and reflective participation (Byram, 1997; Byram, 2008). When sustainability is treated as a meaning-making domain, language education becomes a site for developing interpretive and deliberative skills: how to read texts and contexts, how to recognize competing values, how to communicate respectfully amid disagreement, and how to translate global goals into local practices (Freire, 2016; Arıkan & Zorba, 2024).

This reorientation demands careful curriculum design. Teacher education programs must decide what preservice teachers need to learn to enact sustainability-oriented cultural language education effectively, particularly when they will teach in culturally specific contexts where norms and constraints vary (Anas et al., 2025). A needs analysis is therefore not merely a technical step; it is a conceptual stance that begins from the realities, uncertainties, and professional trajectories of future teachers (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Needs analysis asks: what knowledge, skills, dispositions, and resources are required for preservice teachers to design culturally meaningful tasks that engage sustainability without reducing culture to stereotypes or sustainability to slogans (Baker, 2012; Duailibi, 2006)? What forms of intercultural competence are most relevant when the communicative situation includes crisis discourse, environmental anxiety, or ethical conflict (Charalambous et al., 2025; Adami, 2025)?

The present study is framed around the title's core commitment: designing a sustainable society oriented cultural foreign language course grounded in a needs analysis of preservice English teachers. The theme merges three scholarly streams contained in the reference base. The first stream concerns intercultural communicative competence and its evolution toward intercultural awareness and citizenship, emphasizing that language education is inseparable from cultural interpretation and ethical participation (Alptekin, 2002; Byram, 1997; Byram, 2008; Baker, 2012). The second stream concerns education for sustainable development and ecological literacy, which conceptualize sustainability as an educational outcome involving systems thinking, values, and practical agency (Andersson et al., 2013; Burmeister et al., 2013; Capra, 2007; Duailibi, 2006). The third stream emphasizes critical pedagogy, critical literacy, and contextualized teacher experiences, suggesting that teacher preparation must equip educators to read the world, not only read texts, and to facilitate dialogue amid inequality and crisis (Freire, 2016; Balıkcıoğlu Akkuş & Uysal, 2024; Anas et al., 2025).

Despite the conceptual fit among these streams, the practical integration remains challenging. Intercultural competence in ELT has sometimes been implemented as “cultural knowledge” lists or generalized communicative strategies that underplay local realities and power dynamics (Alptekin, 2002; Baker, 2012). Sustainability education in teacher training may focus on awareness or attitudinal change without equipping future teachers with pedagogical tools to design language tasks that link sustainability themes to communicative goals (Andersson et al., 2013; Burmeister et al., 2013). Critical pedagogy provides robust normative direction, but it requires concrete curricular structures so that teachers can translate critique into classroom action without becoming abstract or confrontational in ways that alienate learners (Freire, 2016; Cates & Jacobs, 2006).

The literature suggests a gap at the intersection of these domains: we lack sufficiently specified course design frameworks that begin with preservice teachers' needs and translate them into actionable curricular components for sustainability-oriented cultural foreign language education (Arıkan & Zorba, 2024; Balıkcıoğlu Akkuş & Uysal, 2024; Byram, 2008). Document analysis of syllabi in related contexts indicates that intercultural competency integration is often uneven, implying that teacher preparation and curriculum design require more coherent

planning (Boonteerarak et al., 2025). Moreover, recent intercultural communication scholarship emphasizes meaning-making beyond verbal discourse, including affect, embodiment, and materiality—dimensions that are crucial when discussing sustainability crises yet are rarely operationalized in language teacher education (Adami, 2025; Charalambous et al., 2025).

This article therefore addresses the following guiding questions:

How can a needs analysis for preservice English teachers be conceptualized so that it captures sustainability literacy, intercultural meaning-making, and critical pedagogical readiness as integrated needs rather than separate checklists (Byram, 2008; Capra, 2007; Freire, 2016)?

What needs patterns are likely to emerge when preservice teachers are asked to design culturally situated, sustainability-oriented language learning experiences, particularly given differences in beliefs and self-efficacy observed between preservice and in-service teachers (Biçer & Yıldırım, 2023)?

How can course design translate these needs into a coherent structure of outcomes, content, pedagogy, materials, and assessment that aligns intercultural citizenship with sustainability education in teacher preparation (Arıkan & Zorba, 2024; Balıkcıoğlu Akkuş & Uysal, 2024; Cates & Jacobs, 2006)?

METHODOLOGY

This study is designed as a qualitative, theory-driven needs analysis framework suitable for teacher education contexts. The approach is grounded in the premise that “needs” are not only skill deficits; they are relational and contextual requirements emerging from the realities preservice teachers anticipate and the professional identities they are forming (Anas et al., 2025; Biçer & Yıldırım, 2023). Because sustainability-oriented intercultural education involves values, discourse, and affective dimensions, a purely survey-based model risks capturing preferences without revealing deeper constraints and meaning-making processes (Charalambous et al., 2025; Adami, 2025). Accordingly, the methodology privileges qualitative data that can surface how preservice teachers interpret their professional responsibilities, perceive cultural complexity, and understand sustainability as an educational domain (Byram, 2008; Andersson et al.,

2013).

Needs analysis design and data sources. A robust needs analysis for this course context can be built from three complementary sources. First, reflective narratives from preservice teachers can reveal how they understand culture and sustainability in relation to language teaching and to their lived contexts (Anas et al., 2025). Narratives are particularly appropriate because intercultural experiences are often episodic, emotionally inflected, and context-bound; narrative methods can capture the interpretive work teachers do when they face cultural difference or classroom dilemmas (Anas et al., 2025; Charalambous et al., 2025). Second, semi-structured interviews can elicit preservice teachers’ perceived gaps in knowledge and confidence across intercultural pedagogy, sustainability content, and task design, enabling exploration of perceived self-efficacy differences that have been documented between preservice and in-service teachers (Biçer & Yıldırım, 2023). Third, document analysis of existing course syllabi, program standards, and institutional expectations can help locate preservice teachers’ needs within curricular constraints, echoing approaches used to examine how intercultural competence is integrated (or not) in course design (Boonteerarak et al., 2025).

Analytic procedure. Thematic analysis is suitable for translating qualitative needs data into course design implications because it enables systematic identification of patterns across narratives and interviews while preserving contextual nuance (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In a course-design needs analysis, themes are not merely descriptive; they function as design requirements. For example, a theme such as “uncertainty about facilitating conflictual discussions” implies a requirement for dialogic pedagogy training and classroom discourse strategies grounded in intercultural and critical frameworks (Freire, 2016; Byram, 1997; Charalambous et al., 2025). Similarly, a theme such as “difficulty selecting accessible sustainability texts” implies a requirement for readability knowledge and material adaptation tools (DuBay, 2004; Flesch, 1948).

Conceptual coding frame. To ensure alignment with the reference base, the thematic analysis can be guided by sensitizing concepts derived from the literature. These include intercultural communicative competence dimensions (knowledge, skills, attitudes) (Byram, 1997), intercultural awareness beyond static cultural facts (Baker, 2012), culture as meaning-making that includes sharing and non-sharing (Adami, 2025), non-verbal and embodied

intercultural communication (Charalambous et al., 2025), culturally specific ELT contexts (Anas et al., 2025), sustainability education effects and teacher learning trajectories (Andersson et al., 2013), ecological literacy concepts (Capra, 2007; Duailibi, 2006), and critical pedagogy's emphasis on indignation as ethical response and on reading the world critically (Freire, 2016).

Ethical and pedagogical considerations. A needs analysis for sustainability-oriented cultural education must remain attentive to sensitivity: sustainability topics can involve crisis narratives, fear, guilt, or political disagreement, and preservice teachers may require guidance to navigate these ethically (Charalambous et al., 2025; Freire, 2016). The method therefore treats emotional and embodied responses as legitimate data, consistent with scholarship emphasizing affect and materiality in intercultural communication (Charalambous et al., 2025). In addition, since the course targets teacher development, reflective prompts can connect personal experiences to professional action, aligning with critical literacy journeys documented among preservice teachers (Balıkcıoğlu Akkuş & Uysal, 2024).

RESULTS

Because the article is grounded strictly in the provided references rather than a new empirical dataset collected here, the “results” are presented as a descriptive, research-based synthesis of needs patterns and design requirements that logically follow from the cited scholarship on preservice teacher learning, intercultural competence, sustainability education, and language pedagogy. The aim is to provide a publication-ready needs analysis framework and the kinds of findings such a framework yields when applied in preservice teacher education contexts (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Boonteerarak et al., 2025).

Need 1: Reframing culture from content to interpretive practice. A consistent implication across intercultural ELT scholarship is that culture cannot be reduced to national facts or etiquette rules; it operates as a dynamic interpretive process in which meaning is negotiated across contexts (Baker, 2012; Alptekin, 2002). Preservice teachers therefore require conceptual tools that move them from “cultural awareness” (knowing about difference) toward “intercultural awareness” (interpreting difference and positioning oneself ethically within it) (Baker, 2012). This need becomes more complex when sustainability is introduced, because sustainability discourse itself is culturally saturated: ideas of nature, development,

responsibility, and rights vary across communities and are embedded in historical and political contexts (Ducarme, 2021; Byrne, 2011). If preservice teachers treat sustainability content as universal and culture as decorative, they risk designing lessons that impose values rather than invite dialogue. A needs analysis is likely to reveal that many preservice teachers want clearer guidance on how to treat culture as interpretive work—how to design tasks where students analyze perspectives, compare narratives, and recognize that “sharing” meanings is not always possible or desirable (Adami, 2025; Baker, 2012).

Need 2: Expanding intercultural competence beyond verbal language. Traditional ELT often emphasizes verbal proficiency, but recent intercultural communication scholarship highlights affect, embodiment, and materiality as central to how people relate across difference, especially in times of crisis (Charalambous et al., 2025). Sustainability conversations frequently evoke emotions— anxiety, hope, anger, grief—and involve embodied experiences of place, consumption, and environmental change (Capra, 2007; Charalambous et al., 2025). Preservice teachers therefore need pedagogical language for facilitating classroom interactions where non-verbal cues, silence, discomfort, and emotional responses are treated as part of communication rather than as disruptions. A needs analysis is likely to identify discomfort with “difficult talk” and uncertainty about how to balance openness with classroom safety (Freire, 2016; Charalambous et al., 2025). This need points toward training in reflective dialogue, classroom norms for respectful disagreement, and activities that acknowledge affect without turning the lesson into therapy (Charalambous et al., 2025; Freire, 2016).

Need 3: Linking sustainability education outcomes to language learning outcomes. Teacher education students may value sustainability but struggle to design language tasks that genuinely integrate sustainability rather than merely adding topical texts (Andersson et al., 2013; Burmeister et al., 2013). Research on education for sustainable development in teacher education suggests that exposure can influence orientations, yet translating orientation into practice requires pedagogical frameworks (Andersson et al., 2013). In language education, global issues projects offer a pathway for integration by framing sustainability as a communicative project domain— students use language to research, collaborate, present, and advocate (Cates & Jacobs, 2006). A needs analysis will likely show that preservice teachers request practical

models: how to set language objectives (e.g., argumentation, narrative, mediation) alongside sustainability objectives (e.g., systems thinking, ethical reasoning) without diluting either (Cates & Jacobs, 2006; Focho, 2010).

Need 4: Critical literacy and ethical positioning as professional competencies. Sustainability-oriented cultural education inevitably raises normative questions: What is a “sustainable society”? Who decides what counts as responsible behavior? How do power relations shape environmental harm and vulnerability? Critical pedagogy argues that education should not neutralize injustice; it should cultivate the capacity to question structures and to respond ethically (Freire, 2016). Studies of preservice teachers’ critical literacy journeys suggest that teacher education can build these capacities when it uses reflective, dialogic, and text-critical practices (Balıkcıoğlu Akkuş & Uysal, 2024). Similarly, integrating SDGs through literary texts indicates that cultural materials can be used to develop awareness and ethical reflection in preservice teachers (Arıkan & Zorba, 2024). Needs analysis findings are therefore likely to include a desire for structured support in critical literacy: how to select texts, how to ask questions that surface assumptions, and how to avoid moralizing while still engaging ethical stakes (Arıkan & Zorba, 2024; Freire, 2016).

Need 5: Contextualizing intercultural pedagogy to culturally specific teaching realities. ELT does not occur in a vacuum; teachers’ intercultural experiences and constraints shape what is feasible in classrooms (Anas et al., 2025). A narrative case study approach indicates that teachers negotiate interculturality within local institutional norms, learner expectations, and socio-political sensitivities (Anas et al., 2025). Therefore, preservice teachers need preparation that respects cultural specificity: rather than assuming a universal “best practice,” the course must train them to diagnose local contexts and adapt pedagogies accordingly (Alptekin, 2002; Anas et al., 2025). Needs analysis is likely to reveal anxiety about teaching “controversial” sustainability topics in settings where political discussion is restricted or where learners hold divergent beliefs about nature and development (Byrne, 2011; Ducarme, 2021). This implies that course design must include modules on pedagogical adaptation, stakeholder communication, and careful framing of sustainability as inquiry rather than indoctrination (Focho, 2010; Freire, 2016).

Need 6: Experiential and social learning structures for intercultural competence. Intercultural competence develops through interaction, reflection, and structured experience, not only through reading about culture (Byram, 1997; Baker, 2012). Ethnographic work on language socialization in conversation groups suggests that learning “beyond language” occurs through participation in communities of practice where norms are enacted and negotiated (Carstensen, 2025). Multinational service-learning programs similarly indicate potential for developing intercultural communication competence through real collaboration across contexts (Chung, 2025). Preservice teachers may therefore need design knowledge for experiential components: how to create conversation-group partnerships, service-learning tasks, or community engagement projects that remain pedagogically coherent and ethically safe (Carstensen, 2025; Chung, 2025).

Need 7: Materials selection, readability, and accessibility for sustainability texts. Sustainability content can be linguistically dense and conceptually abstract, posing challenges for language learners. Preservice teachers thus need tools for selecting and adapting materials at appropriate readability levels, ensuring accessibility without oversimplification (DuBay, 2004; Flesch, 1948). A needs analysis often identifies that novice teachers struggle with matching text difficulty to proficiency while maintaining thematic depth. Readability knowledge helps teachers make principled choices about text complexity and adaptation strategies, which is essential when engaging ethical and scientific discourses in language classrooms (DuBay, 2004; Flesch, 1948; Duailibi, 2006).

DISCUSSION

The results can be interpreted as evidence that sustainability-oriented cultural foreign language course design requires a layered conception of teacher needs. These needs are not isolated competencies; they are interdependent capacities that together enable preservice teachers to enact a pedagogy of intercultural citizenship oriented toward sustainable society goals (Byram, 2008; Andersson et al., 2013).

Intercultural citizenship as the integrative frame. Byram’s move from intercultural communicative competence to intercultural citizenship is crucial because it explicitly connects language education to participation and responsibility in communities (Byram, 2008). When sustainability becomes a thematic focus, citizenship is not

merely political membership; it is ecological and social participation—how people relate to others, to place, and to shared futures (Capra, 2007; Byrne, 2011). A course designed for preservice teachers must therefore support them in teaching language as social action: learners use language to deliberate, to negotiate shared meaning, and to imagine collective responses to problems (Focho, 2010; Cates & Jacobs, 2006). This interpretation justifies why needs analysis must extend beyond linguistic technique to include ethical facilitation, cultural interpretation, and material selection capacities (Byram, 2008; DuBay, 2004).

Culture, non-/sharing, and the politics of meaning. Adami's conceptualization of culture and interculturality as non-/sharing challenges simplistic pedagogies that assume intercultural communication always produces mutual understanding (Adami, 2025). Sustainability discourse often highlights precisely these limits: groups may not share assumptions about nature, rights, or development; in crisis contexts, communication may involve conflict, silence, or refusal (Ducarme, 2021; Charalambous et al., 2025). For teacher education, this means preservice teachers need to learn to design for partial understanding and for respectful disagreement, treating non-sharing as a legitimate intercultural outcome rather than a failure. Such an approach aligns with critical pedagogy's emphasis on confronting difficult realities without smoothing them over (Freire, 2016). It also reframes classroom success: not "agreement," but higher-quality dialogue, deeper interpretation, and increased capacity to listen and respond ethically (Byram, 1997; Charalambous et al., 2025).

Embodiment, affect, and sustainability talk. Contemporary intercultural communication scholarship insists that communication is not only verbal but also embodied and affective, especially in times framed as crisis (Charalambous et al., 2025). Sustainability topics are often experienced through bodily realities (heat, pollution, illness), moral emotions (fear, anger, grief), and material practices (consumption, waste, mobility) (Capra, 2007; Byrne, 2011). If teacher education ignores these dimensions, preservice teachers may respond to student emotion with avoidance or excessive control, weakening authentic engagement. Needs analysis therefore becomes a diagnostic of emotional readiness and facilitation skills, not merely of knowledge. This has practical implications: course design should include structured reflection, dialogue protocols, and role-play of challenging classroom scenarios, enabling preservice teachers to practice

maintaining respectful spaces while addressing real stakes (Freire, 2016; Charalambous et al., 2025).

From awareness to pedagogical agency. Research on teacher education and sustainability suggests that exposure can shift attitudes, but long-term impact depends on teachers' sense of agency and their ability to integrate sustainability into teaching practice (Andersson et al., 2013; Burmeister et al., 2013). In ELT, agency includes the ability to select texts, design tasks, and justify curricular choices to stakeholders. Studies of integrating SDGs through literary texts demonstrate one pathway: literature provides cultural depth, narrative complexity, and moral imagination while also supporting language development (Arıkan & Zorba, 2024). Critical literacy journeys of preservice teachers similarly show that teacher education can cultivate reflective, questioning stances that support pedagogical agency (Balıkcıoğlu Akkuş & Uysal, 2024). Interpreting the needs patterns through this lens suggests that the course must explicitly build design agency: preservice teachers should leave with reusable templates for unit planning, project design, and assessment aligned with intercultural and sustainability aims (Cates & Jacobs, 2006; Byram, 2008).

Contextual constraints and the ethics of localization. Anas and colleagues emphasize culturally specific ELT contexts and teachers' intercultural experiences, indicating that preservice teachers will encounter local norms that shape what can be said and how it can be said (Anas et al., 2025). This is particularly important for sustainability topics that can be politicized. A sustainable society oriented course must therefore train preservice teachers in localization: not merely translating materials, but interpreting local priorities, sensitivities, and linguistic resources. This aligns with Alptekin's critique of decontextualized competence models and with the call for competence grounded in local realities (Alptekin, 2002; Anas et al., 2025). Localization also involves ethical humility: acknowledging that sustainability problems and solutions are experienced unevenly, and that classrooms include diverse positionalities (Byrne, 2011; Ducarme, 2021).

Assessment and the risk of superficiality. A persistent risk in integrating sustainability into language education is superficial treatment—using sustainability as vocabulary themes rather than as critical inquiry and civic meaning-making (Focho, 2010; Cates & Jacobs, 2006). Document analyses of syllabi can reveal such uneven integration, indicating that explicit learning outcomes and assessment

criteria are needed for intercultural competence and sustainability literacy (Boonteerarak et al., 2025). Byram's assessment-oriented framing of intercultural competence provides tools for designing evaluation that goes beyond factual recall, focusing instead on interpretation, attitudes, and relational skills (Byram, 1997). In sustainability-oriented ELT, assessment must capture students' ability to engage with perspectives, justify positions, and communicate responsibly. Preservice teachers need explicit guidance to avoid grading beliefs and instead assess communicative and interpretive processes (Byram, 1997; Freire, 2016).

Limitations. The primary limitation of this article is that it develops a course design and needs analysis framework strictly from the provided references rather than from newly collected empirical data. While this allows theoretical rigor and alignment with established scholarship, it means that the "results" are presented as a descriptive synthesis of expected needs patterns grounded in the literature rather than as statistical findings. This is consistent with qualitative thematic approaches that prioritize interpretive depth and design translation (Braun & Clarke, 2006). A second limitation is that sustainability education and intercultural competence can be operationalized differently across institutions; therefore, local program requirements may necessitate adaptation of the proposed framework (Anas et al., 2025; Boonteerarak et al., 2025).

Future scope. Future research within this framework can implement the needs analysis empirically in a teacher education program, using narrative interviews and document analysis, then apply thematic analysis to derive institution-specific course designs (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Anas et al., 2025; Boonteerarak et al., 2025). Longitudinal follow-up could examine whether preservice teachers who complete such a course exhibit stronger readiness to integrate SDGs through literature, critical literacy practices, and global issues projects in practicum settings (Arıkan & Zorba, 2024; Balıkcıoğlu Akkuş & Uysal, 2024; Cates & Jacobs, 2006). Another future direction is studying experiential components—conversation groups and service-learning—by examining how participation shapes preservice teachers' intercultural facilitation skills and their ability to manage affective and embodied communication in sustainability discussions (Carstensen, 2025; Chung, 2025; Charalambous et al., 2025).

CONCLUSION

Designing a sustainable society oriented cultural foreign language course for preservice English teachers requires an integrated needs analysis that treats intercultural competence, sustainability literacy, and critical pedagogy as mutually constitutive. Intercultural communicative competence provides foundational categories for knowledge, skills, and attitudes, while intercultural citizenship clarifies the civic and ethical orientation necessary for sustainability education (Byram, 1997; Byram, 2008). Intercultural awareness approaches emphasize that culture in ELT is interpretive and dynamic, and recent work on non-/sharing and embodied meaning-making shows why sustainability communication cannot be reduced to verbal discourse alone (Baker, 2012; Adami, 2025; Charalambous et al., 2025).

The needs analysis framework proposed here suggests that preservice teachers are likely to require: conceptual reframing of culture, tools for facilitating affect-laden dialogue, practical strategies for aligning sustainability outcomes with language outcomes, critical literacy and ethical positioning skills, localized pedagogical adaptation capacities, experiential learning design knowledge, and material readability competence (DuBay, 2004; Flesch, 1948; Balıkcıoğlu Akkuş & Uysal, 2024; Arıkan & Zorba, 2024). These needs reflect the complexity of teaching language in a world where sustainability is not only a topic but a contested field of values and identities.

A coherent course built on these needs can position preservice English teachers as educators capable of connecting cultural inquiry to sustainable society goals through dialogic pedagogy, project-based global issues work, reflective practice, and ethically grounded assessment. Such a course does not promise simple solutions; it prepares teachers to navigate complexity with interpretive rigor and civic responsibility, aligning language education with the broader educational mandate of sustaining shared futures (Focho, 2010; Capra, 2007; Freire, 2016; Byram, 2008).

REFERENCES

1. Adami, E. (2025). Culture and interculturality as non-/sharing: Meaning-making beyond discourse. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 25(4), 462–480.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2025.2524699>
2. Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural

- communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56(1), 57–64. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.1.57>
3. Anas, I., Rahayu, De Vega, N., & Samsudin. (2025). Situating English language teaching in culturally specific contexts: A narrative case study into teachers' intercultural experiences. *Language and Intercultural Communication*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2025.2584150>
 4. Andersson, K., Jagers, S., Lindskog, A., & Martinsson, J. (2013). Learning for the future? Effects of education for sustainable development (ESD) on teacher education students. *Sustainability*, 5(12), 5135–5152. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su5125135>
 5. Arıkan, A., & Zorba, M. G. (2024). Raising pre-service English language teachers' awareness of sustainable development goals through literary texts. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 25(8), 1681–1695. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-06-2023-0256>
 6. Baker, W. (2012). From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: Culture in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 66, 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr017>
 7. Balıkcıoğlu Akkuş, G., & Uysal, H. H. (2024). Empowering tomorrow's educators: Critical literacy journeys of pre-service English teachers. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 8(4), 235–254. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202429986>
 8. Biçer, A., & Yıldırım, Ş. (2023). Comparison of epistemological beliefs, teaching-learning conceptions, and self-efficacy of pre-service and in-service EFL teachers. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 7(4), 414–438. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202322958>
 9. Boonteerarak, P., Khueansri, S., & Hkawng, Z. H. (2025). Integrating intercultural competency in English for general education in a Thai university: A document analysis of course syllabi. *Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 6(2), 297–309. <https://doi.org/10.62819/jel.2025.1175>
 10. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
 11. Burmeister, M., Schmidt-Jacob, S., & Eilks, I. (2013). German chemistry teachers' understanding of sustainability and education for sustainable development—An interview case study. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 14(2), 169–176. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C2RP20137B>
 12. Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence. *Multilingual Matters*.
 13. Byram, M. (2008). From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship: Essays and reflections. *Multilingual Matters*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690807>
 14. Byrne, J. (2011). The human relationship with nature: Rights of animals and plants in the urban context. In I. Douglas, D. Goode, M. C. Houck, & R. Wang (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of urban ecology* (pp. 63–73). Routledge.
 15. Capra, F. (2007). Sustainable living, ecological literacy, and the breath of life. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 12, 9–18.
 16. Carstensen, K. A. H. (2025). Learning beyond language: An ethnographic study of language socialization in English conversation groups. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 25(2), 292–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2024.2430467>
 17. Cates, K., & Jacobs, G. M. (2006). Global issues projects in the English language classroom. In G. H. Beckett & P. C. Miller (Eds.), *Project-based second and foreign language education: Past, present, and future* (pp. 167–180). Information Age Publishing.
 18. Charalambous, C., Zembylas, M., & Aristidou, X. (2025). Rethinking intercultural communication beyond verbal language: Affect, embodiment and materiality in times of 'crisis'. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 25(4), 431–441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2025.2552529>
 19. Chung, B. (2025). Developing intercultural communication competence through multinational

service-learning program. *ESP Review*, 7(2), 47–66.

20. Davis, R. D. (2013). A place for ecopedagogy in community literacy. *Community Literacy Journal*, 7(2), 77–91. <https://doi.org/10.25148/clj.7.2.009350>
21. Duailibi, M. (2006). Ecological literacy: What are we talking about? *Convergence*, 39(4), 65–68.
22. DuBay, W. H. (2004). The principles of readability (ED490073). ERIC.
23. Ducarme, F. (2021). What is nature? *Encyclopedia of the Environment*. <http://www.encyclopedie-environnement.org/?p=12392>
24. Flesch, R. (1948). A new readability yardstick. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 32(3), 221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0057532>
25. Focho, G. N. (2010). Language as tool for a global education: Bridging the gap between the traditional and a global curriculum. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching*, 3(1), 135–148.