

# Intercultural Communicative Competence Awareness of Turkish Students and Instructors at University Level

Irfan Tosuncuoglu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Letters, Department of English Language and Literature Karabuk University, Turkey

Correspondence: Irfan Tosuncuoglu Faculty of Letters, Department of English Language and Literature Karabuk University, 78050 Karabuk, Turkey. E-mail: irtosun@yahoo.com

Received: November 24, 2018

Accepted: December 30, 2018

Online Published: January 15, 2019

doi:10.5430/ijhe.v8n1p44

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v8n1p44>

## Abstract

Competence in intercultural communication requires an understanding of both the L1 and L2 cultures, and many now believe that language learning is, in many respects, cultural learning. The relationship between language and culture, as well as the role of cultural competence in communicative competence has come increasingly under the microscope and as a result, educators have gained a greater appreciation for the role culture plays in language acquisition. Intercultural communicative competence refers to the ability of an individual to navigate within a given society appropriately. In other words, individuals are able to use appropriate gestures, understand the unspoken meaning within the words, appreciate the cultural underpinnings in any communication, and make appropriate cultural references to aid understanding. From this viewpoint, in order to understand the perception of Intercultural communicative awareness (ICC), a survey was performed among instructors and students of English. This survey was distributed to 42 Turkish instructors of English and 183 Turkish students from the English Language and Literature Department of Karabuk University, a total number of 225 respondents. The participants were aged between 18 and 55. By means of set scientific instruments such as (Anova, Spss, etc.) the data collected from the participants was analysed and evaluated.

**Keywords:** culture, language, communication, intercultural, competence

## 1. Introduction

Currently, English is commonly accepted as an international language and used as a tool of communication between people from various nationalities and backgrounds. With the growth of globalisation, migration and immigration, the necessity of an intercultural focus on language education is becoming increasingly apparent. This reality highlights the importance of achieving intercultural sensitivity or intercultural competence.

This perception of the in-depth connection between the items of Language and Culture and the belief that this relationship is both interactive and interdependent, is corroborated by the enhancement in intercultural awareness (Bush, 2007; Byram, 1997). With the assistance of language usage, individuals can understand the abstract values, viewpoints and ideas which are shared by the society and which shape culture (Seelye, 1993). Moreover, as Seelve also mentions, when it comes to communication concepts, language is not considered separately from the cultural framework in which the communication happens. If the cultural knowledge is not available, it is often hard to understand the meanings conveyed by language itself. On this subject, Cakır (2006) states that the way to learn about the target culture is sometimes for the students to suppress their own native language values.

When the history of the relationship between culture and language is examined, it is seen that the element of culture became an inseparable part of language teaching and learning with the emergence of communicative competence in the 1970s. Equally, as language cannot be taught without taking the relevant cultural components into consideration, it is also commonly believed that they are inextricably interdependent (Ho, 2009).

On the other hand, the intercultural language learning and teaching approaches are defended and applied within the contexts where English is taught as a second language. However, there is little to no empirical research conducted on the subject of how these types of approaches are applied within EFL (English as a Foreign Language) contexts, or of the roles that teachers play in such contexts.

### *1.1 Language and Culture in Language Acquisition*

The connections between language and culture in foreign language classes have been the focal point of many academic studies in Turkey and abroad (Bada & Genç, 2005; Kırmızı, 2013; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013; Pasand & Ghasemi, 2018; Ünver, 2007). Whereas language proficiency constitutes 'the core of language studies' (Standards for Foreign Language Learning, 2006), language has ceased to be the sole cause of language teaching and learning at this point in time. The Standards (2006) explains the objectives of language to students with the term '5C' (Communication, Comparisons, and Communities, Connections, Cultures), highlighted in order to indicate the ways in which students become independent helpers and participators in a community of different linguistic and cultural aspects.

The affiliation between language and culture has gained strength with the development of the idea of intercultural awareness. Being inter-culturally competent means having knowledge of the cultures, social attitudes and thought concepts of different groups comprising people from different countries, as well as their languages and traditions (Byram, Gribkova & Starkey, 2002).

In language teaching, there are two approaches which dominate cultural teaching; the modernist approach and the postmodernist approach. These days, both cultural perspectives continue their existence in the application of learning and teaching practices (Kramsch, 2013). In this vein, Ho (2009), divides cultural teaching in language education into two categories. The former is information based, and the latter is an intercultural communicative competence approach.

### *1.2 Communicative Approach and Intercultural Abilities*

In the 1980s, industry had reached an apex of its development and foreign language or second language teaching had searched intensively to find methods, approaches and techniques related to learning and teaching English. It would not be fair to state that there was an umbrella approach oriented towards all teaching techniques. It is widely accepted that the Communicative Language Teaching Approach is the most effective approach in learning and teaching a foreign or second language. On the other hand, while this approach is focused on learning how students take part in language-related activities, discovering the culture that deals with the differences in how communicative approach interactions and activities are actualised in various social and cultural settings, and the necessity to make sense of them, is being neglected (Lo Bianco, Liddicoat & Crozet, 1999). The restraints of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) necessitate Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching (ICLT). In this respect, the main target of foreign language teaching gravitates from the Communicative Competence towards the Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC), (Gu, 2014; Chamberlin-Quinlisk & Senyshyn, 2012; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013; Piatkowska, 2015).

The place and value of the development of intercultural skills in language learning and teaching is being increasingly emphasised and it seems as though there is nobody questioning the significance of cultural studies for the purposes of foreign languages teaching and learning. Countries such as Argentina and Bulgaria as well as certain Eastern European countries, give a place to culture and language as two equally weighted aspects of the knowledge which supports learners' communicative skills (Kim, 2010).

It is of paramount importance to understand the problems encountered by language teachers the move from CLT to ICLT and their actual applications. As Zhang (2007) states, it is important that a national survey is carried out for the perceptions of teachers, for applications and solutions to come into force and in order to explicitly gather information on the problems students have related to increasing their ICCs.

### *1.3 Intercultural Approach*

The developments on the subject of the purposes of foreign/second language teaching and learning bring to the forefront the gradually increasing focus on what is recommended by scholars who have an 'intercultural' perspective. The new intercultural thinking that has caused foreign/second language teachers to concentrate on what is actually carried out while teaching and learning a foreign language, namely, the comprehension of the teaching and learning culture, the understanding of what people know of a certain culture or another and why people think and act in different ways (Moran, 2001).

The intercultural approach has further broadened the term 'communicative approach' and acknowledges the greater necessity for the term of 'Intercultural Communicative Competence'. In other words, it can be said that the intercultural approach has broadened the communicative approach, for some requirements of intercultural communicative competence. Corbett (2003) supports the intercultural approach and foreign/second language teaching in the intrinsic realm of English Language Teaching (ELT). His fundamental premise with regard to

language use is that we engage in more than just an information exchange (focusing on the prior communicative approach oriented towards foreign/second language teaching and learning) and that we discover our personal identity with language, allowing us to explain our own place in the world. Language is a tool that allows us to 'be ourselves' and to establish communication and interaction with one another. Corbett (2003) emphasises that we can develop an intercultural perspective through realising and observing people's ways of establishing communication and producing meaning. On the basis of the strategies recommended in order for such an intercultural literacy to be developed, there are ethnographic strategies.

#### *1.4 Intercultural Communicative Competence*

Intercultural Competence is a complicated structure and there is no consensus on its relevant terminology and definition in intercultural literature. On top of that, intercultural competence is acknowledged as one of the components of communicative competence, along with other types of competence such as linguistic, rhetorical and pragmatic (UsóJuan & Martínez-Flor, 2006).

Byram (1997) acknowledged that three factors are effective in intercultural communication, which include attitude, knowledge and skill. He took into account that a person's attitudes of being able to allude to his/her own world-view and cultural identity is necessary for successful intercultural communication. It would appear that Byram did not consider the term intercultural competence as being different from the term communicative competence and integrated it into communicative competence, hence producing the term intercultural communicative competence which consists of linguistic, socio-linguistic, rhetorical and intercultural competence.

While certain terms such as intercultural competence (Fantini, 2006), cross-cultural mindfulness (Knutson, 2006), intercultural mindfulness (Chamberlin-Quinlisk, 2005), and intercultural sensitivity (Bennett, 1993), encompasses a more limited perspective of a rather complicated idea, intercultural communicative competence is labelled with different terms. Among these, intercultural competence and intercultural communicative competence were quite often utilised in the education of foreign languages (Sercu, 2006).

For this reason, it is a complicated matter to define intercultural communicative competence. The heart of intercultural competence is that learners prepare correctly and efficiently and interact with individuals who come from various cultural backgrounds and communities (Sinecrope, Norris, & Watanabe, 2007). As a consequence, the perception of cultural understanding becomes an indispensable and integral item of intercultural communicative competence.

#### *1.5 ICC Experiences*

The researcher, Fantini (2000), defines intercultural experience as "a nature which has a "double-edge" (p. 26), namely, the advancement of a competence in any other culture and language provides opportunities for a person to direct powerful reflections on his/her own world perception. Such an idea is captured the statement of "looking out is looking in" (p. 26). In this regard, Moloney and Harbon (2010) state that within the intercultural application, students are required to think within the compass of a gradually increasing cultural knowledge and act in accordance with it, in a language classrooms context (p. 281).

Studies conducted on intercultural competence draw attention to the significance of the preparation of learners to be involved and collaborate in a universal society, by discovering the appropriate ways for interacting with individuals from the other various cultural backgrounds (Sinecrope et al., 2007). While an inter-culturally competent (ICC) speaker contributes to others' understandings of their cultures from the insider's perspective, he/she also becomes acquainted with intercultural relations as a person who is determined to attain an insight of and understand the culture of other people (Byram, 1997).

#### *1.6 Intercultural Communicative Competence Aims in a Foreign Language Class*

In Byram's Intercultural Communicative Competence Model (1997, 2003), foreign language teachers are asked to guide their students to attain competence with regard to manners, activities and skills concerning intercultural competence as they are using the target language. The teacher should steer his/her learners by using the studies that convert the students' attitudes towards 'others'. The goal of the students is to set to work by questioning prejudices before they start an activity of exploration about 'others' with the intention to be become ultimately more willing to search for and be involved in the 'otherness' to lead to reciprocal relations and communications. While Intercultural Communicative Competence is being taught, it explores the models of mutual relations where learners play a 'social actor' role, experience the reciprocal discovery of the other language and culture, and language classes become a place in which learners and teachers can ultimately encourage the idea of democracy and take into account the questions related to values and morals.

However, as certain other scholars have stated, the fundamental subject that is relevant to the teaching of communicative competence, has been the efficiency of information exchange and the way in which a message sent from another cultural context is received by the recipient is determined (Seelye, 1993). The idea of communicative competence radically ignores the issue of discovering the culture necessary to facilitate and render meaningful how information exchange in various cultural settings is actualised (Corbett, 2003).

In relation to this, foreign language education should encourage students to acquire the linguistic and intercultural abilities necessary to establish succeeding communication with the target individuals, who are, to a great extent different from themselves but equally acknowledged and respected by them. As Byram (1997) also put forth, not only does intercultural competence attribute importance to the development of linguistic competence as expressed in communicative competence, but it does so equally in the skills of intercultural discovery, comprehension, interpretation and mediation. Corbett (2003), goes even further and points out that the aim is to endow students with strategies to adopt and make sense of the target culture, and to aid students in to achieve the cultural skills that enable them to observe different cultures from a window of informed understanding for the purpose of acquisition of the convenient intercultural communication.

The expression 'Intercultural Communicative Competence' is the relatively newly emerging term of cultural competence and is designed for language education. This is why a questionnaire has been administered to students and instructors of English in order to understand the ICC awareness.

### *1.7 Research Questions*

- 1) What are the perceptions of Turkish EFL instructors towards ICC?
- 2) What are the perceptions of Turkish students in the English Department towards ICC?
- 3) What are the perceptions of Turkish EFL instructors and students to the language and culture of the English Department?

## **2. Method**

### *2.1 Participants*

The participants were 42 Turkish Instructors of English and 183 Turkish students from the English Language and Literature Department of a Karabuk University. There were 80 males and 145 females, a total number of 225. The participants aged between 18 and 55. The student participants were undergraduate students majoring in English Language and Literature. The instructors were conducting lessons in various faculties and schools. The students gave consent for data collection and voluntarily completed an online survey by responding to the questionnaire.

### *2.2 Instrumentation*

In this study, a questionnaire about ICC awareness, adapted from Zhou (2011) was implemented. The descriptive statistics used comprised of means, standard deviations and standard errors of means, calculated separately for each of the professional levels, gender and 5 ordinal age groups. Independent t-test samples were used to compare instructors with students and also male with female by the agreement levels of questionnaire items. For the independent sample t-test, the homogeneity of variances was tested by using F test as a pre-analysis. ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) and the Welch test were used to compare the mean agreement levels 5 age groups. The Welch test is an alternative to ANOVA when the assumption of homogeneity of variances is not provided. The homogeneity of variances was tested by the Levene test as a pre-analysis. Following the ANOVA results, for the significant differences, multiple comparison analyses were performed to detect the significant differences between age groups. The Newman- Kleus test was used to compare each of two age groups. The significance level was set to 0,05. All statistical analyses were performed using the IBM-SPSS (International Business Machines-Software Package for Social Sciences) Statistics, Version 23 0 (Armonk, New York).

### *2.3 Data Analysis*

To learn more about Turkish EFL instructors and the perceptions of students of the English Department concerned with intercultural communicative competence in the class, an intercultural conception questionnaire was implemented, and the results were evaluated as follows.

The questionnaire has two sections. Section 1 was 'Preferences on Language and Culture' and Section 2 was 'Intercultural Competence'.

## 2.3.1 Section 1: Preferences on Language and Culture

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of sub-dimension, 'Preferences on Language and Culture' are outlined separately for instructors and students.

	Profession	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)
LDEV	instructor	42	3,2024	,33239	,05129	-0,1610	0,011*
	student	183	3,3634	,45969	,03398		
TARCUL	instructor	42	5,0655	,44446	,06858	0,1075	0,000*
	student	183	4,2691	,66288	,04900		
LOCUL	instructor	42	4,2415	,33315	,05141	0,0893	0,000*
	student	183	3,5671	,55582	,04109		

\*: significant at 0.05

Depending on the independent t- test results, statistically significant differences were found between two categories by profession ( $p < 0.05$ ). For 'Target Culture' (TARCUL) and 'Local Culture' (LOCUL), instructors had higher attendance to items in comparison with the students whereas for 'Language Development' (LDEV) sub-dimension, students had higher attendance about the related item.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of sub-dimension, 'Preferences on Language and Culture' are outlined separately for males and females.

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)
LDEV	male	80	3,2281	,49872	,05576	-0,1632	0,008*
	female	145	3,3914	,39836	,03308		
TARCUL	male	80	4,5402	,78396	,08765	-0,1900	0,051
	female	145	4,3502	,64183	,05330		
LOCUL	male	80	3,7759	,65315	,07302	0,1286	0,114
	female	145	3,6473	,53850	,04472		

\*: significant at 0.05

Depending on the independent t- test results, for only 'Language Development' (LDEV) sub-group, statistically significant differences were found between genders ( $p < 0.05$ ). Females had higher attendance in items of LDEV. On the other hand, for 'Target Culture' (TARCUL) and 'Local Culture' (LOCUL), no statistically significant differences were found between males and females.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of sub-dimension, ‘Preferences on Language and Culture’ are outlined separately for age groups.

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Sig. (2-tailed)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
LDEV	18-22	133	3,3910	,45159	,03916	3,3135	3,4684	0,160
	23-27	47	3,2606	,48048	,07009	3,1196	3,4017	
	28-32	28	3,2679	,36596	,06916	3,1260	3,4098	
	33-37	14	3,2321	,33201	,08873	3,0404	3,4238	
	44 over	3	3,0000	,00000	,00000	3,0000	3,0000	
	Total	225	3,3333	,44257	,02950	3,2752	3,3915	
TARCUL	18-22	133	4,2439	,64317	,05577	4,1336	4,3542	0,000*
	23-27	47	4,4535	,81521	,11891	4,2141	4,6928	
	28-32	28	4,8225	,49805	,09412	4,6294	5,0157	
	33-37	14	4,9531	,46879	,12529	4,6825	5,2238	
	44 over	3	5,2917	,13010	,07512	4,9685	5,6149	
	Total	225	4,4178	,69992	,04666	4,3258	4,5097	
LOCUL	18-22	133	3,5644	,56891	,04933	3,4669	3,6620	0,000*
	23-27	47	3,6687	,62081	,09055	3,4864	3,8510	
	28-32	28	4,0306	,41396	,07823	3,8701	4,1911	
	33-37	14	4,2041	,26705	,07137	4,0499	4,3583	
	44 over	3	4,2381	,41239	,23810	3,2137	5,2625	
	Total	225	3,6930	,58367	,03891	3,6163	3,7697	

\*: significant at 0.05

Depending on the ANOVA results, for *Target Culture* (TARCUL) and ‘Local Culture’ (LOCUL) sub groups, statistically significant differences were found between 5 age groups ( $p < 0.05$ ), whereas no differences were detected between age groups in the items of ‘Language Development’ (LDEV). According to the results of the multiple comparison of age groups, it can be said that, the attendance to the items of TARCUL were highest in the 44 and over age group and there is no difference between the 18-22 and 23-27 age groups. The attendance to the items in LOCUL were at the same level for 33-37 as for the 44 and over age group and these two groups had the highest attendance to the LOCUL items. The lowest attendance was observed in the 18-22 age group. When we compare age groups with the notions of Target Culture, Local Culture and Language development within the context of age, the participants who are aged of 44 and over adopt the knowledge of the TARCUL in language learning at the highest point.

## 2.3.2 Section 2: Intercultural Competence

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of sub-dimension, 'Intercultural Competence' are outlined separately for instructors and students

	Profession	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)
SKILL	instructor	42	2,6156	,43318	,06684	0,1129	0,199
	student	183	2,5027	,52858	,03907		
KNOWLEDGE	instructor	42	2,4286	,56148	,08664	0,0138	0,893
	student	183	2,4148	,60904	,04502		
PERCHO	instructor	42	2,7602	,49079	,07573	0,2382	0,010*
	student	182	2,5220	,64840	,04806		

\*: significant at 0.05

Depending on the independent t- test results, statistically significant differences were found between the two categories of profession by 'Personel Choice' (PERCHO) sub-dimension ( $p < 0.05$ ). Instructors gave more positive answers to the related items in comparison with the students.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics of sub-dimension, 'Intercultural Competence' are outlined separately for gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)
SKILL	male	80	2,5723	,53192	,05947	0,0752	0,293
	female	145	2,4970	,50232	,04172		
KNOWLEDGE	male	80	2,4775	,62783	,07019	0,0933	0,264
	female	145	2,3841	,58246	,04837		
PERCHO	male	79	2,5995	,64544	,07262	0,0506	0,585
	female	145	2,5488	,61960	,05146		

Depending on the independent t- test results, no statistically significant differences were found between the two categories of gender ( $p > 0.05$ ). Gender has no effect on attendance level of 'Intercultural Competence' items.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics of sub-dimension, 'Intercultural Competence' are outlined separately for age groups.

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Sig. (2-tailed)
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
SKILL	18-22	133	2,4791	,55993	,04855	2,3830	2,5751	0,235
	23-27	47	2,5578	,44324	,06465	2,4276	2,6879	
	28-32	28	2,6301	,42193	,07974	2,4665	2,7937	
	33-37	14	2,5102	,33486	,08950	2,3169	2,7035	
	44 over	3	3,0476	,64418	,37192	1,4474	4,6478	
	Total	225	2,5238	,51313	,03421	2,4564	2,5912	
KNOWLEDGE	18-22	133	2,3977	,63586	,05514	2,2887	2,5068	0,557
	23-27	47	2,4085	,51196	,07468	2,2582	2,5588	
	28-32	28	2,5286	,51701	,09771	2,3281	2,7290	
	33-37	14	2,2714	,49989	,13360	1,9828	2,5601	
	44 over	3	3,0667	1,13725	,65659	,2416	5,8917	
	Total	225	2,4173	,59926	,03995	2,3386	2,4961	
PERCHO	18-22	132	2,5152	,66105	,05754	2,4013	2,6290	0,034*
	23-27	47	2,5152	,62854	,09168	2,3307	2,6997	
	28-32	28	2,7526	,48269	,09122	2,5654	2,9397	
	33-37	14	2,6939	,44425	,11873	2,4374	2,9504	
	44 over	3	3,3095	,39340	,22713	2,3323	4,2868	
	Total	224	2,5666	,62786	,04195	2,4840	2,6493	

\*: significant at 0.05

Depending on the ANOVA results, for the Personal Choice (PERCHO) sub-group, statistically significant differences were found between 5 age groups ( $p < 0.05$ ), whereas no differences were detected between age groups in the items of SKILL and KNOWLEDGE. According to the results of multiple comparison of age groups, it can be said that, the attendance to the items of PERCHO were highest in the 44 and over age group, and there is no difference between the 18-22 and 23-27 age groups.

### 3. Conclusion and Discussion

As was expressed previously, the questionnaire has two sections. 'Language and Culture' and 'Intercultural Competence'. Within the context of the Language and Culture section; for the sub-dimensions of 'Target Culture' (TARCUL) and 'Local Culture' (LOCUL), instructors agreed with the items more in comparison with the students, whereas for 'Language Development' (LDEV) sub-dimension, students had higher attendance regarding the related item.

Statistically significant differences were found between genders for the 'Language Development' (LDEV) sub-dimension. Females had higher attendance to items of LDEV. On the other hand, for 'Target Culture' (TARCUL) and 'Local Culture' (LOCUL), between male and females no statistically significant differences were found. Depending on the results, for 'Target Culture' (TARCUL) and 'Local Culture' (LOCUL) sub-dimensions, statistically significant differences were found between age groups, whereas there were no differences between age groups for the item 'Language Development' (LDEV). According to results of multiple comparison of age groups, it can be said that, the attendance to the sub-dimension of TARCUL were highest in participants in the age group 44 and over, and there was no difference at all between 18-22 and 23-27 age groups. The attendance to the items of

LOCUL were at the same level for both the 33-37 and 44 and over age groups and these two groups had the highest attendance to the LOCUL items. The lowest attendance was observed in 18-22 age group.

With regard to the 'Intercultural Competence Section'; statistically significant differences were found between two categories from the point of view of the 'Personal Choice' (PERCHO) sub-dimension in terms of profession. Instructors gave more positive answers to the related items in comparison with the students. According to results of multiple comparison of the age groups, it can be said that the attendance to the items of PERCHO were the highest in the 44 and over age group and there was no difference between the 18-22 and 23-27 age groups, which means the participants of the age of 44 and over were more aware of personal choice in related items than the other age groups.

The instructors gave more importance to knowledge of the 'Target Culture' and 'Local Culture', the students paid more attention to the 'Language Development'. The females were more sensitive to the language development, and local or target culture was less important for them. When we compared age groups for the notions of 'Target Culture', 'Local Culture' and 'Language Development' within the context of age, the participants who were in the age group of 44 and over adopted the knowledge of TARCUL in language learning at the highest point. Additionally, the instructors were more aware of Cultural competency than the students. Significant differences were also found between the five age groups on Personal Choice (PERCHO), whereas no differences were detected between age groups in the items of Skill and Knowledge.

To sum up, the findings of the present research have shed light on the fact that the actual status of the students towards ICC perception does not satisfy the expectation. The findings, on the whole, indicated that Turkish EFL instructors have positive attitudes towards ICC but that student awareness is not at the desired level.

Some of the ideas in this study are almost compatible with Atay, Kurt, Camlibel, Ersin & Kaslioglu (2009) in terms of presenting 'to give a support to the students in order to understand their own culture better'. In line with this, partly similar researches were performed with senior students (English teacher candidates) of some universities by Tuncel & Paker (2018) and Altan (2018) in order to define the *intercultural sensitivity* levels of the participants. The findings of Tuncel & Paker (2018) are partially incompatible with the idea in this research as they demonstrated that intercultural sensitivity level of the participants is high, and partially compatible with the idea in this research as they referred that educational programs should contain an interdisciplinary approach in order to have students gain more intercultural communication competence and intercultural sensitivity.

The majority of the studies conducted earlier have researched the beliefs and applications of intern teachers receiving in-service training and the studies related to language teaching have generally neglected the beliefs and applications of language educators with many years of experience (Dornyei, 2001; Young & Sachdev, 2011). There is a strong need for the ICC to be systematically integrated into the teacher training programs. If we want to endow language teachers with the adequate information and tools in order to develop ICC in class, teachers are required to systematically internalise, acknowledge and include the cultural dimension. In this respect, more studies should be conducted in order to research the factors that affect the attitudes and ideas of teachers oriented toward developing intercultural competence in English language education. To this end, some more studies and researches need to be done in this area to raise the awareness of the instructors/teachers and students in English Departments towards the ICC.

## References

- Altan, M. Z. (2018). Intercultural Sensitivity A Study of Pre-service English Language Teachers. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, ISSN 1404-1634, issue 46, March 2018, URL: <http://immi.se/intercultural>
- Atay, D., Kurt, G., Camlibel, Z., Ersin, P., & Kaslioglu, O. (2009). The role of intercultural competence in foreign language teaching. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 10(3), 123-135.
- Bada, E. & Genc, B. (2005). Culture in language learning and teaching. *The Reading Matrix*, 5(1).
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethno relativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bush, M. D. (2007). Facilitating the integration of culture and vocabulary learning: The categorization and use of pictures in the classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(4), 727-745. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2007.tb02890.x>
- Byram, M. (1989). *Cultural studies in foreign language education, Multilingual Matters*, Clevedon, UK, 1989.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Byram, M., Gribkova, B. & Starkey, H. (2002). *Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching*. Council of Europe, Strasbourg.
- Cakir, I. (2006). Developing Cultural Awareness In Foreign Language Teaching. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE*, 7(3), Article: 12.
- Chamberlin-Quinlisk, C. R. (2005). Across continents or across the street: using local resources to cultivate intercultural awareness. *Intercultural Education*, 16(5), 467-79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980500378532>
- Chamberlin-Quinlisk, C., & Senyshyn, R. M. (2012). Language teaching and intercultural education: making critical connections. *Intercultural Education*, 23(1), 15-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2012.664750>
- Corbett, J. (2003). *An intercultural approach to English language teaching*. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596858>
- Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Fantini, A. E. (2000). A central concern: Developing intercultural competence. *SIT Occasional Papers Series*, from <http://www.sit.edu/publications/docs/competence.pdf>
- Fantini, A. E. (2006). *Exploring and assessing intercultural competence*. From [http://www.sit.edu/publications/docs/feil\\_research\\_report.pdf](http://www.sit.edu/publications/docs/feil_research_report.pdf)
- Gu, X. (2014). Assessment of intercultural communicative competence in FL education: A survey on EFL teachers' perception and practice in China. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2015.1083575>
- Ho, S. T. K. (2009). Addressing culture in EFL classrooms: The challenge of shifting from a traditional to an intercultural stance. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 6(1), 63-76.
- Kırmızı, Ö. (2013). Learner attitudes and preferences in terms of learning culture. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 9(1), 160-175. <http://www.jlls.org/vol9no1/160-175.pdf>
- Knutson, E. (2006). Cross-Cultural Awareness for Second/Foreign Language Learners. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 62(4), 591-610. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.62.4.591>
- Kramsch, C. (2013). Culture in foreign language teaching. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(1), 57-78.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2002). Static and dynamic views of culture and intercultural language acquisition. *Babel*, 36(3), 4-11, 37.
- Liddicoat, A. J. & Scarino, A. (2013). *Intercultural Language Teaching and Learning*, Wiley Blackwell, Oxford, UK. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.956416>
- Lo Bianco, J., Liddicoat, A. J., & Crozet, C. (Eds.) (1999). *Striving for the third place: Intercultural competence through language education*. Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Moloney, R. & Harbon, L. (2010). Making intercultural language learning visible and accessible. Proceedings of Intercultural Competence Conference, August, 2010, 1, 281-303.
- Moran, P. R. (2001). *Teaching culture: Perspectives in practice*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Neuner, G., Parmenter, L., Starkey, H., & Zarate, G. (2003). *Intercultural Competence*. Ed. M. Byram, Council of Europe, May 2003.
- Pasand, P. G. & Ghasemi, A. A. (2018). An intercultural analysis of English language textbooks in Iran: The case of English. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 12(1), 55–70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201804172107>
- Piątkowska, K. (2015). From cultural knowledge to intercultural communicative competence: Changing perspectives on the role of culture in foreign language teaching. *Intercultural Education*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2015.1092674>
- Seelye, H. (1993). *Teaching culture: Strategies for intercultural communication* (3rd ed.). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Sercu, L. (2006). The foreign language and intercultural competence teacher: the acquisition of a new professional identity. *Intercultural Education*, 17(1), 2006, 55-72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980500502321>

- Sinicrope, C., Norris, C., & Watanabe, Y. (2007). Understanding and assessing intercultural competence: A summary of theory, research, and practice. *Second Language Studies*, 26(1), 1-58.
- Standards for Foreign Language Learning. (2006). Retrieved, October 13, 2018, from <https://coerll.utexas.edu/methods/modules/teacher/02/fivecs.php>.
- Tuncel, İ & Paker, T. (2018). Effects of an Intercultural Communication Course in Developing Intercultural Sensitivity. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(6). <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v7n6p198>
- Usó- Juan, E., & Martínez- Flor, A. (2006). Approaches to language learning and teaching: towards acquiring communicative competence through the four skills. In E. Usó- Juan & A. Martínez- Flor (Eds.), *Current trends in the development and teaching of the four language skills* (pp. 3-26). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ünver, Ş. (2007). Intercultural preparatory training for Turkish Erasmus. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 219-228.
- Young, T. J., & Sachdev, I. (2011). Intercultural communicative competence: Exploring English language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Awareness*, 20(2), 81-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2010.540328>
- Zamanian, J. & Saeidi, M. (2017). Iranian EFL Teachers' Perceptions, Practices and Problems Regarding Raising Students' Intercultural Awareness. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n7p257>
- Zhang, H. (2007). Intercultural approach to foreign language teaching. *Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press*.
- Zhou, Yi. (2011). A Study of Chinese University EFL Teachers and Their Intercultural Competence Teaching. *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*, 428.