

THE ROLE OF NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKING TEACHERS IN  
PROMOTING INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY

A MASTER'S THESIS

BY

AYFER KÜLLÜ-SÜLÜ

THE PROGRAM OF  
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE  
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY  
ANKARA

JULY 2014



The Role of Native English Speaking Teachers in Promoting Intercultural Sensitivity

The Graduate School of Education  
of  
Bilkent University

by

Ayfer Küllü-Sülü

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

in

The Program of  
Teaching English as a Foreign Language  
Bilkent University  
Ankara

July 2014

To my beloved sister, Sema

BİLKENT UNIVERSITY  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

July 8, 2014

The examining committee appointed by The Graduate School of Education  
for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Ayfer Küllü-Sülü

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title: The Role of Native English Speaking Teachers in  
Promoting Intercultural Sensitivity

Thesis Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı  
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe  
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Asst. Prof. Dr. Patrick Hart  
Bilkent University, Faculty of Humanity and  
Letters

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

---

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı)  
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

---

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe )  
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

---

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Patrick Hart )  
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

---

(Prof. Dr. Margaret Sands)  
Director

## ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKING TEACHERS IN PROMOTING  
INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY

Ayfer Küllü-Sülü

M.A. Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı

July 8, 2014

This study investigated the role of native English speaking teachers (NESTs) in promoting intercultural sensitivity (IS), student ideas about the role of NESTs and non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) in terms of promoting IS and teaching target culture, and the effect of various other factors such as academic departments, gender, previous international experience, nationality, foreign languages and type of high school graduated from. The participants were 435 English preparatory class students from six different universities in Turkey, 196 being taught by only NNESTs while 239 being taught by both NESTs and NNESTs. A questionnaire was used to collect data which was composed of three parts: open-ended and multiple-choice questions to gather demographic information about the participants; an intercultural sensitivity scale, and a section with questions about the role of teachers in promoting IS. The analysis was done by grouping and comparing participants' IS scores according to whether they were educated by NESTs or

NNESTs, their academic departments, gender, previous international experience, nationality, foreign languages and high schools. Also, the participants' ideas about NESTs and NNESTs in terms of their effects on students' feelings about their own culture and other cultures, and teaching culture were investigated.

The findings indicated that even if there is not a statistically significant difference between total IS scores of students educated by NESTs and NNESTs, students feel that NESTs have a more positive effect on students' feelings towards other cultures. According to the findings, international experience and knowing a foreign language contribute to one's interaction confidence. Also, male students scored higher in interaction confidence while female students scored higher in interaction attentiveness. It was also found that students think family is the most effective element in forming students' opinions about other cultures.

The study contributes to the existing literature by having studied IS level differences between students taught exclusively by NNESTs and those who have had exposure to NESTs. The study also contributes to the intercultural communication literature by investigating various factors such as academic departments, gender, previous international experience, and the number of foreign languages known, which may have an effect on students' IS levels. Lastly, the present study offers some pedagogical implications that institutions teaching foreign languages, and language teachers (especially EFL teachers) can benefit from, and revise their culture teaching practices accordingly.

Key Words: Intercultural Sensitivity, Intercultural Communication Competence, NESTs, NNESTs, international experience, gender, foreign languages



## ÖZET

ANADİLİ İNGİLİZCE OLAN İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN  
KÜLTÜRLERARASI HASSASİYETİ ARTTIRMADAKİ ROLÜ

Ayfer Küllü-Sülü

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı

8 Temmuz, 2014

Bu çalışma, anadili İngilizce olan öğretmenlerin (NESTs) kültürlerarası hassasiyeti arttırmadaki rolü; öğrencilerin anadili İngilizce olan (NESTs) ve olmayan (NNESTs) İngilizce öğretmenlerinin kültürlerarası hassasiyeti arttırmadaki ve hedef kültürü öğretmedeki rolleri ile ilgili fikirleri; akademik bölüm, cinsiyet, geçmişteki kültürlerarası deneyimler, ulus, bilinen yabancı diller ve mezun olunan lise türü gibi çeşitli faktörlerin kültürlerarası hassasiyet üzerine olan etkileri konularına odaklanmaktadır. Çalışmaya Türkiye'deki altı farklı üniversiteden 435 İngilizce Hazırlık sınıfı öğrencisi katılmıştır. Katılımcıların 196'sı yalnızca anadili İngilizce olmayan öğretmenlerden eğitim alırken 239'u anadili İngilizce olan ve olmayan İngilizce öğretmenlerinden eğitim almıştır. Çalışmada üç bölümden oluşan bir anket kullanılmıştır: katılımcılarla ilgili demografik bilgileri içeren açık uçlu ve çoktan seçmeli sorular, kültürlerarası hassasiyet ölçeği ve öğretmenlerin kültürlerarası ölçeği arttırmadaki rolleri ile ilgili öğrencilerin fikirlerini içeren bir bölüm. Analiz yapılırken veriler, katılımcıların anadili İngilizce olan ve olmayan öğretmenlerden eğitim almaları, akademik bölümleri, cinsiyetleri, geçmişteki uluslararası

deneyimleri, ulusları, bildikleri yabancı diller ve mezun oldukları lise türüne göre gruplandırılıp karşılaştırılmıştır. Çalışmada katılımcıların anadili İngilizce olan ve olmayan öğretmenlerinin, öğrencilerin kendi kültürlerine ve diğer kültürlerle karşı hisleri üzerine etkileri ve kültür öğretimi ile ilgili fikirleri de incelenmiştir.

Bulgular, anadili İngilizce olan ve olmayan öğretmenlerden eğitim alan öğrencilerin kültürlerarası duyarlılık seviyeleri arasında önemli bir farklılık olmadığını, ancak öğrencilerin anadili İngilizce olan öğretmenlerin diğer kültürlerle karşı öğrenci hislerini daha olumlu yönde etkilediğine inandığını göstermiştir. Bulgulara göre uluslararası deneyim ve yabancı dil bilmek kişilerin iletişim kurarken kendilerine güvenmelerine katkı sağlamıştır. Ayrıca, erkek öğrenciler kendine güven noktasında yüksek puan alırken, kız öğrenciler ise iletişimde nezaket ve dikkat noktasında yüksek puan almıştır. Bir diğer bulguya göre ise öğrenciler “aile” faktörünün diğer kültürlerle ilgili fikirlerini en çok etkileyen etmen olduğunu düşünmektedirler.

Bu çalışma, yalnızca anadili İngilizce olmayan öğretmenlerden eğitim alan ve anadili İngilizce olan öğretmenlerden de eğitim alan öğrencilerin kültürlerarası duyarlılık seviyeleri arasındaki farklılıklara odaklanarak, varolan literature katkıda bulunmuştur. Çalışma ayrıca akademik bölüm, cinsiyet, geçmişteki uluslararası deneyimler, mensup olunan ulus, bilinen yabancı diller ve mezun olunan lise türü gibi çeşitli faktörlerin kültürlerarası duyarlılık üzerine etkilerini inceleyerek kültürlerarası iletişim literatürüne katkıda bulunmuştur. Son olarak, bu çalışma dil öğretimi ile ilgilenen kurumların, yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin, özellikle de yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğreten öğretmenlerin faydalanabileceği ve kültür öğretimini düzenleyebilecekleri pedagojik uygulamalar sunmuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Kültürlerarası Hassasiyet, Kültürlerarası İletişim  
Yeterliđi, anadili İngilizce olan öğretmenler (NESTs), anadili İngilizce olmayan  
öğretmenler (NNESTs), uluslararası deneyim, cinsiyet, yabancı diller

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank God for giving me the patience and strength to complete this work. I also owe a debt of gratitude to several individuals without whose helps it would have been impossible to complete this thesis.

It was an honor to have worked with the guidance of a wonderful teacher, Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Matthews-Aydınlı. Her support and guidance was invaluable in motivating me. She offered many constructive criticisms and feedback that helped solidify the thesis.

I would also like to thank Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe who has always provided me with her help whenever I needed it. Without her support, especially regarding the SPSS analysis, it would have been difficult to survive this challenging process.

I am also grateful to all my friends in the MA TEFL program, especially Saliha Toscu, Zeynep Aysan, and Seda Güven, who never gave up sparing their time and support whenever I needed them. Together, we turned this challenging process into unforgettable memories.

I owe much to my family, especially to my sister, Sema. Without her support and help, I would not be able to receive either bachelor's degree or Master's. She was the one who was always beside me throughout all my education life.

Last, but not least, I am grateful to my husband who has always assured me that I could write this thesis even at my most desperate moments. I would also like to thank my newborn baby. He endured the difficulties and stress of thesis writing process with me.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background of the Study.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Significance of the Study.....	7
Conclusion.....	8
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
Introduction.....	9
Communicative Approach in Language Teaching.....	9
Language, Communication and Culture.....	11
Language.....	12
Communication.....	12
Culture.....	13
The Role of Culture in Communication and in Foreign Language Teaching.....	13
Intercultural Communication Competence and Intercultural Sensitivity.....	15

Intercultural Communication Studies in Turkey.....	18
Native versus Non-Native Teacher in Promoting Intercultural Sensitivity .....	19
Various Factors Effecting Intercultural Communication Competence.....	23
Education.....	23
Gender.....	23
International Experience .....	24
Nationality.....	25
Conclusion.....	26
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	27
Introduction.....	27
Research Questions .....	27
Setting and Participants.....	28
Instruments.....	31
Section I: Demographic Information Questionnaire.....	32
Section II: Intercultural Sensitivity Questionnaire.....	32
Section III: Role of Teachers .....	34
Translation Process .....	34
Pilot Study.....	35
Data Collection Procedure .....	36
Data Analysis .....	37
Conclusion.....	38
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS.....	39
Introduction.....	39
Data Analysis Procedures .....	40
Results.....	42

Current IS Level of Students.....	42
The difference between the IS scores (and its sub-categories) of students educated by NESTs and NNESTs.....	43
Possible Relations Between Various Factors and Students' IS Levels.....	45
Students' Ideas About the Role of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of Promoting IS and Teaching Target Culture.....	58
Conclusion.....	66
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....	68
Introduction.....	68
Findings and Discussion.....	69
The Difference between IS Scores according to being Educated by NESTs and NNESTs.....	69
Various Factors and Students' IS Levels.....	72
Students' Ideas About the Role of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of Promoting IS and Teaching Target Culture.....	78
Various Factors that Effect Students' Opinions about Foreign Cultures.....	80
Pedagogical Implications.....	81
Limitations.....	84
Suggestions for Further Research.....	85
Conclusion.....	87
REFERENCES.....	89
APPENDICES.....	97

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	
1- Framework for communicative competence .....	10
2- Characteristics of the Study Participants .....	29
3- The Reliability of Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and Role of Teachers Questionnaire .....	36
4- Theoretical scores of IS Scale .....	41
5- Overall Mean Values for the IS Questionnaire Categories .....	43
6- Comparison of IS Scores of Students Educated by NESTs and NNESTs...	44
7- Comparison of IS Scores according to the Academic Department Enrolled in .....	46
8- Descriptive Statistics about Interaction Confidence Scores according to the Academic Department Enrolled in .....	47
9- Comparison of Interaction Confidence Scores according to the Academic Department Enrolled in .....	48
10-Comparison of IS Scores and Sub-categorical Scores according to Gender .....	50
11-Interaction Confidence Scores and Number of Foreign Languages Known .....	52
12-Comparison of IS Scores and Sub-categorical Scores according to Previous Communication Experiences with Foreigners in Turkey .....	53
13-IS Scores and Previous Overseas Experience .....	55
14-Length of Time Students Spent Abroad .....	56
15-IS Scores and Communication through Internet .....	57



16-Types of Websites Students Use for Communication with Foreign People .....	58
17-Students' Responses about NNETS' Role in Promoting IS .....	59
18-Students' Responses about NESTs' Role in Promoting IS .....	61
19-Student Opinions: Cultural/Intercultural Activities .....	63
20-Comparison of Students' Ideas about NNETS .....	64
21-Various Factors Affecting Student Opinions about Foreign Cultures .....	65

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

### **Introduction**

Communication among people from different cultures, or intercultural communication, goes back to the dawn of civilization, when people first formed tribal groups and started to interact with people from different tribes (Samovar et al., 2010). However, as an area of academic study, intercultural communication has a fairly short history (Xin, 2007). In contemporary society, as a result of globalization and immigration, communication among people from different cultures has become inevitable. Though people are biologically alike, they are mostly socially different as they come from different cultural backgrounds. Different cultural backgrounds and different languages have made it difficult for people to understand one another while communicating. These communication problems have led to the need to understand the reasons behind miscommunication between different cultures, which is referred to as intercultural miscommunication (Kryk, 2012). Intercultural communication competence, which aims to understand and reduce these communication problems, is defined as the “ability to manage various differences between communicators, cultural or otherwise, and the ability to deal with accompanying uncertainty and stress,” which allows “strangers to tolerate and appreciate their differences instead of responding to others with ‘intergroup posturing’” (Kim, 2001, p. 99). According to Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman (2003) intercultural sensitivity is a precursor to intercultural communication competence. Chen and Starosta (1997) define intercultural sensitivity as the “desire to motivate [oneself] to understand, appreciate, and accept differences among cultures, and to produce a positive outcome from intercultural interactions” (p.7). Research has shown that there is a relationship

between intercultural sensitivity and international experience, which is the communication experience between people from different cultures (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992; Christa Lee & Kroeger, 2001).

Intercultural sensitivity (IS) is becoming more and more important in the field of education, especially in foreign language teaching. For mutual understanding among people from different cultures, being interculturally sensitive and competent is one of the most crucial points. For this reason, promoting intercultural sensitivity in EFL teaching has gained importance. Including Native English Speaking Teachers (NESTs) in the foreign language teaching process is one of the methods that may serve to reduce communication problems among different nations.

The current study attempts to unveil the Intercultural Sensitivity (IS) level of EFL students in Turkish universities. By comparing IS scores of students who have been taught by Native English Speaking Teachers (NESTs) and those who have not, the study will try to find out whether being taught by NESTs plays a critical role in promoting intercultural sensitivity. The study will also investigate the participant students' attitudes towards the role of NESTs and NNESTs (non-Native English Speaking Teachers) in promoting intercultural sensitivity and teaching culture.

### **Background of the Study**

The cultural dimension of language teaching is far from new, dating back to the beginnings of modern language teaching in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and to the teaching of the classics far beyond that (Byram, 2000). Since the psychological, cultural and social rules which discipline the use of speech were introduced to the scene of foreign language teaching, teachers and language specialists such as Alptekin (2002), Atay (2005), Baker (2011), Byram and Kramsch (2008), Castro, Sercu and Garci'a (2004), Çalışkan (2009), and Gerritsen & Verckens (2006) have been seeking ways to

integrate culture into the language teaching process. These researchers' (Alptekin, 2002; Atay, 2005; Baker, 2011; Byram & Kramersch, 2008; Castro, Sercu & Garci'a, 2004;Çalışkan, 2009; Gerritsen &Verckens, 2006) view of language is inspired by an anthropological view, which suggests that “there is no culture without language, and there is no language without culture” (Byram & Risager, 1999, p.146).

Culture has been defined as “the deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relations, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions acquired by a group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving”(Porter & Samovar, 1994, p.11). In other words, culture is the collection of these features that distinguish the members of one group or society from another. These distinguishing features of culture have created the need for each individual from a different culture to understand one another and have caused the marriage of culture and communication. This marriage brought a new term to the field of language teaching: intercultural communication, which can be defined as, “the investigation of those elements of culture that most influence interaction when members of two different cultures come together in an interpersonal setting” (Porter & Samovar, 1994, p.7)

Many researchers (e.g., Adaskou, Britten & Fahsi, 1990; Atay, 2005; Broady 2004) have agreed that language learning is culture learning and that having a cultural component in language teaching can both promote international sensitivity in the era of globalization as well as deepen an understanding of one's own culture. For this reason, many scholars have sought ways of improving intercultural sensitivity and communication through integrating culture into the language teaching process (Akinyemi, 2005; Alptekin, 2002; Byram & Fleming, 1998; Byram & Zarate, 1997;

Kramsch, 1998; McKay, 2004; Tsou, 2005). One way of improving intercultural communication and sensitivity is to involve Native English Speaking Teachers (NESTs) into the language teaching process (Medgyes, 1994). Many schools, colleges and universities in Turkey hire NESTs either via hiring programs which are sponsored by Fulbright, the British Council, the Turkish Ministry of Education, or the Turkish Council of Higher Education, or on an individual basis. In addition to their classroom language teaching responsibilities, these NESTs are sometimes asked to provide feedback, or give formal presentations on topics related to the target culture. As an extracurricular activity, they are expected to lead programs in language labs, conduct English conversation clubs, tutor, participate in sports, language, and drama clubs, and volunteer at local organizations (“Fulbright ETA Program”, 2010). These activities serve the unspoken expectation that these NESTs will directly through instruction and indirectly through their presence help raise students’ intercultural sensitivity.

As far as intercultural communication and intercultural sensitivity research is concerned, there are a number of studies investigating NESTs’ roles in teaching culture (Adaskou et al., 1990; Akinyemi, 2005; Alptekin, 2002; Atay, 2005; Broady, 2004; Byram & Fleming, 1998; Byram and Zarate, 1997; Çalışkan, 2009; Kramsch, 1998; McKay, 2004; Tsou, 2005; Yılmaz, 2010). While some studies show an advantage for NESTs in teaching culture (Ailes et al., 2005; Chapman, 2010; Cheung, 2002; Jeon, 2010; Lee, 2000; Liang, 2002; Mahboob, 2004; Moussu&Braine, 2006; Rui-min, 2009; Uçkun&Buchanan, 2009), some others report being a NEST as a disadvantage in teaching culture as they are mono-cultural and may have difficulties in integrating students’ own culture and the target culture (Binns, 2007; Carmichael, 2002; Çelik, 2006). Hence, there are some inconsistencies

in the literature about the role or effect of NESTs in teaching culture. There is also no study attempting to measure whether having had exposure to NESTs seems to have an effect on students' IS level.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Since culture teaching, which is crucial for intercultural sensitivity, was introduced to the field of foreign language teaching, several studies have been carried out on the place of native speakers in teaching culture in language classes (Adaskou et al., 1990; Akinyemi, 2005; Alptekin, 2002; Atay, 2005; Broady, 2004; Byram & Fleming, 1998; Byram and Zarate, 1997; Çalışkan, 2009; Kramersch, 1998; McKay, 2004; Tsou, 2005; Yılmaz, 2010). While some studies regard being a native speaker teacher as a disadvantage in culture teaching as they are mostly mono-cultural (Binns, 2007; Carmichael, 2002; Çelik, 2006), most studies regard it as crucial for teaching culture (Ailes et al., 2005; Chapman, 2010; Cheung, 2002; Jeon, 2010; Lee, 2000; Liang, 2002; Mahboob, 2004; Moussu & Braine, 2006; Rui-min, 2009; Uçkun & Buchanan, 2009). However, there are not any studies focusing on the importance of NESTs in promoting intercultural communication competence and intercultural sensitivity in foreign language classes. Ailes et al.'s (2005) study on the foreign language teaching assistantship program (FLTA), a separate Fulbright program that sends trained EFL teachers to the U.S. to teach the teachers' own native language there, revealed that the program was helpful in promoting the ICC of the assistants who were acting as teachers. However, as the only focus of the study was the assistants themselves, there is still a need to discuss NESTs' roles in terms of their effects on the intercultural sensitivity of students.

There are various initiatives in Turkey pushing more NESTs such as The Turkish Council of Higher Education, The Ministry of National Education, private courses and private colleges. Through this hiring, most of them aim not only to improve students' English language skills, but their intercultural sensitivity and cultural understanding as well. (Cüce, 2010; "Fulbright İşbirliği", n.d.; "Yurtdisinden İngilizce okutmanlar getirildi", 2010). However, there have not been any studies on the current IS level of Turkish EFL students who are educated by NESTs. There is also no information about student ideas on the role of NESTs in promoting IS and teaching culture. Hence, there is a need to investigate whether the hiring practices serve this aspect of their aim or not.

### **Research Questions**

1. What is the current IS level of Turkish EFL students?
  - 1.1. Is there a difference between the IS scores of students who have been educated by NESTs and those who have not?
  - 1.2. Do the IS levels of students differ according to
    - a. academic department enrolled in?
    - b. gender?
    - c. previous international experience?
    - d. nationality?
    - e. number of foreign languages known?
    - f. type of high school graduated from?
2. What are students' ideas about the role of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of promoting IS and teaching about the target culture?
  - 2.1. Do students' ideas differ according to whether they have been educated by NESTs or NNESTs?

3. Which factors do students feel have the greatest effect on their opinions about foreign cultures?

### **Significance of the Study**

The number of people learning English in the world is steadily increasing, and in many countries, most teachers are not native speakers of English. According to Canagarajah (1999), 80% of English language teachers worldwide are non-natives. However, in many countries such as Turkey, Japan, Saudi Arabia and China, growing numbers of native speakers of the language are being recruited to teach foreign languages. In Turkey, the aim of hiring native teachers is not only teaching the language, but also promoting the intercultural sensitivity of the learners and teaching them the target culture. Despite the emphasis placed on these NEST hiring practices, there have not been any studies focusing on native teachers' role in promoting learners' intercultural sensitivity. This study may contribute therefore to the literature on intercultural sensitivity by investigating and comparing the current IS levels of Turkish EFL students who have been educated by NESTs and NNESTs, and exploring whether differences exist between them. The study may also contribute to the NESTs and NNESTs literature as it may give ideas about their respective roles in teaching culture and promoting intercultural sensitivity.

At the local level, both NESTs and NNESTs who seek professional development regarding teaching culture can gain some insights from the findings and take them into consideration in their teaching practices as this study also investigates learners' opinions about what kinds of cultural or intercultural activities should be included inside or outside the classroom, and what they think effects their opinions about other cultures most. At the institutional level, the findings of this study may inform local university administrators or other institutions which hire NESTs about



the effectiveness of NESTs in fostering IS, and thus, may give ideas for new ways in which students and NESTs can interact more and further promote students' intercultural sensitivity.

### **Conclusion**

This chapter presented a brief overview of the issue of NESTs' role in promoting IS levels of Turkish university level EFL learners. Specifically, the chapter introduces the topic generally in the literature, presents the statement of the problem, research questions, and the significance of the study. The second chapter will review the related literature. The third chapter will outline the methodology of the study, including the setting and participants, instruments, data collection methods and procedures, and data analysis. The fourth chapter will present the data analysis, and finally, in the fifth chapter, the discussion of the findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research will be presented.

## CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

*“God gave to every people a cup, a cup of clay, and from this cup they drank life... They all dipped in the water, but their cups were different.” (Benedict, 2005, pp.21-22)*

### **Introduction**

In her description of culture, Benedict (2005) describes culture as a cup from which all people drank life. In this metaphor of culture as a cup, Benedict (2005) emphasizes the difference of each cup from one another, just as the difference of culture among different nations. Cultures are created through communication; that is, communication is the means of human interaction through which cultural characteristics— whether customs, roles, rules, rituals, laws, or other patterns—are created and shared (Porter & Samovar, 1994). As a conveyor of culture, language plays a key role in communication between different cultures.

This study aims to explore the differences between Native English Speaker Teacher (NESTs) and Non-Native English Speaker Teachers (non-NESTs) in terms of their role in promoting intercultural sensitivity, which is a prerequisite for intercultural communicative competence, in English as a foreign language learners. In this respect, this review of literature will cover the Communicative Approach in language teaching, the connection between language, communication and culture, the role of culture and intercultural communication and sensitivity in foreign language teaching, and lastly, the issue of NESTs versus NNESTs in promoting intercultural sensitivity.

### **Communicative Approach in Language Teaching**

The Communicative Approach was introduced to the field of foreign language teaching in the early 1970s as a consequence of the studies of experts working in the

Council of Europe (Al-Mutawa & Kailani, 1989). The experts encouraged all Europeans to reach a level of communication competence in some languages (Council of Europe, 1998) and regarded language as communication. However, the Communicative Approach can be traced back to 1960s, when Chomsky introduced the terms of competence and performance as an opposition to the audio-lingual method (Hedge, 2000). Later, Hymes (1972) developed these two notions, competence and performance, and came up with a new term, which was communicative competence. Communicative competence contains grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence (Canale, 1983). For each competence, Canale (1983) gives their descriptions in Table 1 below.

Table 1

*Framework for Communicative Competence (Canale, 1983, p.6)*

TYPE OF COMPETENCE	DEFINITION
Grammatical Competence	Refers to the extent that mastery of the language code has occurred, including vocabulary knowledge, word formation, syntax, pronunciation, spelling and linguistic semantics
Socio-linguistic Competence	Refers to mastery of the socio-cultural rules of use and rules of discourse; “the extent to which utterances are produced and understood <i>appropriately</i> depending on contextual factors” for example, the status of participants, the purpose of the communication and the conventions associated with the context

Table 1 Continued

<u>TYPE OF COMPETENCE</u>	<u>DEFINITION</u>
Discourse Competence	Refers to mastery of “how to combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve a unified spoken or written text” suitable to the genre; includes use of cohesion and coherence.
Strategic Competence	Refers to mastery of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies we employ during breakdown in communication or when we lack any of the competences to communicate effectively; also used to enhance the effectiveness of communication.

The communicative approach considers communicative competence essential for foreign language learners to be completely involved in the culture of the foreign language (Alptekin, 2002). As language, which enables us to communicate, is affected by the speaker’s culture, it is crucial to understand the relationship between language, communication and culture in a foreign language context.

### **Language, Communication and Culture**

In contemporary society, as a result of globalization and immigration, communication between people from different cultures has become compulsory. This compulsion has led to the need to learn foreign languages, each of which bears cultural elements in it. For this reason, Byram (1989) deals with the relationship between language and culture and the necessity to teach both in an integrated way. Before mentioning the relationship between language, communication and culture, it is important to know what these terms mean.

## **Language**

Samovar, Porter and McDaniel (2010) define language as “a set of shared symbols or signs that a cooperative group of people (a cultural group) has mutually agreed to use to create meaning” (p. 225). From a sociocultural perspective, language, which promotes the development of a person as a social and cultural being, is a tool for thinking and acting (Risager, 2007). According to Samovar et al. (2010), language is a tool that makes human beings different from other animal species by enabling them to exchange or write down abstract ideas, and thus permits them to convey culture from one generation to another. Salzmann (2007) also emphasizes the cultural side of language by saying, “Human culture in its great complexity could not have developed and is unthinkable without the aid of language” (p.49). According to him, language reflects what is regarded as significant in a culture and, in turn, culture forms language. Laopongharn and Sercombe (2009, p.63) share the same idea by stating that in foreign language education where language and culture seems separate and where language is not taught with culture, learners feel that they are not learning in the most effective way. This feeling comes from the fact that as learners learn about language, they learn about culture and as they learn to use a new language they learn to communicate with other individuals from a new culture (Byram, 1989).

## **Communication**

Keating (1994) describes communication as the competency of sharing your beliefs, values, opinions, and emotions. Among the principles of communication, Samovar et al. (2010) cite “being contextual,” as communication happens in certain situations which influence the way we talk to others and what we understand from their expressions. They claim that many of these contextual norms are directly related to the speaker’s culture, and the biggest element of the contextual nature of

communication is the cultural environment in which communication occurs (Samovar et al., 2010).

### **Culture**

Culture is described as “the deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relations, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions acquired by a group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving” (Porter & Samovar, 1994, p.11). While culture is composed of a countless number of elements (food, shelter, work, defense, social control, history, religion, values, etc.), the language element is directly related to foreign language learning. Understanding this element will enable us to appreciate the culture conveyed by language.

### **The Role of Culture in Communication and in Foreign Language Teaching**

Hall (1977) describes culture as communication and communication as culture by saying that culture is learnt via communication, and communication is a reflection of the speaker’s culture. Anthropologists also describe culture as communication (Hall, 1959). Culture was integrated into language teaching with the introduction of communicative language teaching (CLT). In this respect, CLT, which has communicative competence as its base, can be said to have its roots in anthropology (Hymes, 1972). Hymes (1972) describes communicative competence as the native speaker’s instinctive understanding of social and cultural rules and meanings that are present in their speech. However, despite his emphasis on the cultural dimension of communicative competence, CLT has had different inspirations such as speech act theory in the 1970s, discourse analysis in the 1980s, and task-based learning in the 1990s (Roberts, Byram, Barro, Jordan & Street, 2001). Thus, Roberts et al. (2001)

state that recent interest in the integration of culture into language teaching process can be regarded as a critique of CLT.

CLT focuses on using language appropriately rather than being competent in the social and cultural practices of a community (Roberts et al., 2001). However, we cannot say that CLT is isolated from culture pedagogy since most CLT textbooks involve cultural elements. What makes CLT different from the cultural approach is that the latter suggests a more explicit, systematic and more demanding cultural learning (Roberts et al., 2001). Risager (2007) states that language teaching has always had a cultural dimension in terms of content; however, it was not until the 1960s that culture pedagogy arose as an independent discipline. Risager (2007) investigates culture pedagogy at two levels: general level and pedagogical level. General level handles language theory and culture theory, which include theories related to the relationship between language and culture. According to this level, language and culture are inseparable. Pedagogical level deals with theories regarding language and culture learning and teaching. It supports that language and culture teaching should be integrated into each other.

Risager (2007) presents two opposite ideas on the connection between language and culture. One opinion regards language as closely related to culture while the other view sees language only as a communication tool which has nothing to do with culture; however, she states that both of these concepts are unsatisfactory. She adopts a cultural point of view in which language is emphasized as a never culture-free concept, so language teaching, as a whole, should contain some direct connection to the cultural system from which specific language is taken. The more learners learn about the language, the more they learn about the culture. From the

time they start to speak in the target language, they learn to interact with other people with different cultural backgrounds, which promotes understanding between cultures.

Byram and Grundy (2003) define culture in language teaching and learning as the culture related to the language being learnt. For this reason, culture in foreign language classes cannot be thought as far from real life. Risager (2007) suggests that language learners should be culturally competent; however, this competence does not mean being bicultural. It means being in tune with the idea of multiple identities and being aware of both their own identities and others' culturally constructed selves. They describe such learners as intercultural speakers.

Holme and Randal (2003) introduce a combination of five views for the role of culture according to language teachers in the communicative era: the communicative view, the classical curriculum view, the instrumental or culture-free language view, the deconstructionist view, and the competence view. The first three views support the notion that cultural elements are not needed for being successful in the target language, while the last two views regard language and culture as elements that are acquired in an active process, with one being crucial to understanding the other. Byram (1989) also supports the deconstructionist view and the competence view as he deals with the connection between language and culture, and the necessity to teach both in an integrated way. According to him, there are two facets of language teaching; one is the instilling of a useful skill, and the other is the encouraging of an open attitude and understanding of other cultures, which can also be described as intercultural communication competence.

### **Intercultural Communication Competence and Intercultural Sensitivity**

Intercultural communication goes back to the dawn of civilization, when first people formed tribal groups and started to interact with people from different tribes



(Samovar et al., 2010). Though people are biologically alike, they are mostly socially different as they come from different cultural backgrounds. In order for people from different cultures to communicate successfully, people need to be interculturally competent (Samovar et al., 2010).

According to Risager (2007), intercultural communication competence involves both linguistic and cultural competence. She presents eight subcompetences of intercultural communicative competence described by Byram and Zarate (1997). The first three elements of the intercultural speaker's competence are about *linguistic* knowledge:

1. Linguistic competence: the ability to apply knowledge of the rules of a standard version of the language to produce and interpret spoken and written language.
2. Sociolinguistic competence: the ability to give to the language produced by an interlocutor –whether native speaker or not- meanings which are taken for granted by the interlocutor or which are negotiated and made explicit with the interlocutor.
3. Discourse competence: the ability to use, discover and negotiate strategies for the production and interpretation of monologue or dialogue texts which follow the conventions of the culture of an interlocutor or are negotiated as intercultural texts for particular purposes. (p.224)

Risager (2007), then, presents the other five elements of intercultural communicative competence that are about *cultural* knowledge:

4. Attitudes: curiosity and openness, readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief about one's own.

5. Knowledge: of social groups and their products and practices in one's own and in one's own and in one's interlocutor's country, and of the general processes of societal and individual interaction.
6. Skills of interpreting and relating: ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents from one's own.
7. Skills of discovery and interaction: ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices and the ability to operate knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real time communication and interaction.
8. Critical cultural awareness/political education: an ability to evaluate critically and on the basis of explicit criteria perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and culture. (pp. 224-225)

Samovar et al. (2010) introduce five components of competence that influence intercultural communication competence (ICC). The first component is about motivation to communicate. It means that people want to communicate with people who are close to them both physically and emotionally. The second component is an appropriate fund of cultural knowledge that means being self-conscious and realizing the rules, norms and anticipations related to the culture of the people with whom you are communicating. The third one is appropriate communication skills. It is about being able to adapt to the rules of communication that are appropriate to the host culture. The fourth component of ICC is character. According to this component, if you are not perceived as a person of good character by the person you communicate with, you might not be successful in the communication. Knowing yourself and your prejudices is of great importance in becoming a competent intercultural communicator. The last component of ICC is Intercultural Sensitivity (IS), which is

basically described as being sensitive to one another and to the cultures represented in an interaction, and understanding others' world views (Samovar et al., 2010). As can be understood from the definition, intercultural sensitivity is essential in the assessment of ICC (Arévalo-Guerrero, 2009). For this reason, in this study, IS is used to assess the intercultural communication competence readiness of the participants. In a definition of IS, it is stated that intercultural sensitivity is "the quality of accommodating, understanding and appreciation of cultural differences, and to enhance one's self-awareness that leads to appropriate and effective behavior in intercultural communication" (Bennet, 1993; Chen and Starasto, 1998 as cited in Penbek et al., 2009). Zhao (2002) states that intercultural sensitivity is the key for intercultural effectiveness and cross-cultural adaptation. It is also stated that the more interculturally sensitive a person is, the more interculturally competent s/he can be (Penbek et al., 2009). Thus, these two concepts, ICC and IS, are interrelated and intertwined in this study. However, it is essential to clarify that ICC and IS are not the same concepts, and cannot be used interchangeably. As Arévalo-Guerrero (2009, p.58) defines, "ICC is the enactment of intercultural sensitivity", that is why we regard IS as a step for ICC and use an Intercultural Sensitivity Scale in this study.

### **Intercultural Communication Studies in Turkey**

Intercultural communication studies in Turkey mainly focuses on to what extent culture is taught in classes, and whether teachers feel confident enough in teaching culture. In her study on pre-service English teachers' ideas about culture and language teaching, Atay (2005) found that culture related objectives in the national curriculum are not fulfilled because of inappropriate coursebooks, teachers' being unaware of the importance of the cultural dimension in language learning, and lack of guidance and training for teachers on culture teaching. In another study on in-

service teachers, Atay et al. (2009) found that although teachers feel positive towards the role of culture in foreign language education, they usually do not integrate culture in their classroom practices. According to Atay et al. (2009) the reasons could be lack of training and opportunities for the integration of culture into language education. Ortactepe's (in press) study on EFL teachers' identity construction as teachers of intercultural competence concurs with Atay's (2005) and Atay et al.'s (2009) in the sense that they demonstrated the weakness of English language teaching in Turkey and the gap between the objectives related to culture stated in the national curriculum and the real practice in classrooms.

Since language is a crucial element of knowing other individuals, it is regarded as a way of promoting intercultural sensitivity. Thus, competency in a language helps understanding between people from different cultural backgrounds (Breidbach, 2003). Byram and Kramsch (2008) claim that culture is best taught by direct experience, which requires watching films or meeting native speakers of the target language. The presence of a native speaker, thus, seems important to teach the target culture and to promote intercultural sensitivity. However, there have been lots of discussions on whether native or non-native teachers are more effective in teaching the target culture and promoting intercultural sensitivity.

### **Native versus Non-Native Teacher in Promoting Intercultural Sensitivity**

Definition of native speaker and non-native speaker is a controversial issue among scholars. Though Medgyes (1996) and Davies (1991) mention these terms, they still avoid giving a definition. Another scholar, Cook (2002) opposes to the distinction between native and non-native speakers, and suggests a new term, L2 speaker, for these two concepts. Despite the ongoing debate over defining the terms of native/non-native speaker, this study will continue to use native/non-native

speakers since this term has been widely accepted by most people in the field.

Keeping these discussions in mind, a native speaker can be identified as “the person who has spoken a particular language by birth rather than learning it later” (Köksal, 2006, p.18).

The question of native versus non-native has primarily regarded linguistic competence. Many studies (Alseweed, 2012; Arva and Medgyes, 2000; Celik, 2006; Jeon, 2010; Köksal, 2006; Üstünoğlu, 2007) indicate that NESTs are regarded as superior by students, and for this reason, many institutions give importance to hiring native English teachers. However, some studies (Medgyes, 1996; Philipson, 1996; Widdowson, 1992) revealed that non-native teachers are better instructors and they can anticipate the difficulties their students may have in foreign language learning as they also had a language learning experience. In his study, Medgyes (1996) found that native speaker teachers are good examples in terms of language skills; however, they are not as good as non-native teachers in terms of teaching linguistic skills. In another study he found that native teachers are usually preferred for teaching pronunciation, speaking, vocabulary and cultural skills (Medgyes, 1994). Native English speaking teachers (NESTs) have been regarded as the authority in the language and superior to non-native English speaking teachers (non-NESTs) in terms of their language use (Shibata, 2010; Zacharias, 2011); however, in terms of language teaching, non-NESTS are sometimes considered better English teachers for two main reasons: first, they have the experience of learning a foreign language themselves, and second, they share the same mother tongue with the learners (Çelik, 2006; Medgyes, 1996).

There are different views on the role of NESTs in terms of the intercultural dimension of language teaching. Byram, Gribkova and Starkey (2002) claim that

being a NEST or a non-NEST does not make any difference for two main reasons. First, people who live in a country do not know or reflect any single culture of that country, as there are lots of cultures within one country. Second, while the acquisition of language is largely completed by the age of five, culture learning continues all through life. Byram et al. (2002) also state that in terms of the intercultural dimension, what makes a teacher good is not being native or non-native, but being able to see the relationship between their own culture and other cultures.

Some researchers, however, argue that non-NESTs are better intercultural interpreters as they are bicultural. For example, Medgyes (1999) states that bilinguals are the best ambassadors between peoples and cultures, and this makes them better intercultural interpreters. Çelik (2006) supports this view by saying that while native teachers seem to have an advantage as they are equipped with the cultural background knowledge of English, they are less successful in integrating the culture of the target community as they are often mono-cultural. Non-native teachers, however, do have the advantage of seeing a culture from a distance.

However, Senyshyn and Chamberlin-Quinlisk (2009) claim that the problem of many language learners is that they do not have enough opportunity to interact with native speakers to gain linguistic and cultural competency. A study on the perceptions of non-native students in a graduate TESOL program on being a non-NEST revealed that non-NESTs do not feel themselves comfortable with teaching communication skills (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). Additionally, Holtzer's (2003) study indicated that communication between a language learner and a native speaker might have some positive effects on the communicative, cultural and affective side of the interaction especially when the language is used in natural contexts. Another positive effect of this interaction is anticipated to be the

competency in using the foreign language to communicate. As Samovar et al. (2010) indicated in their study, motivation to communicate, character, and appropriate communication skills are among the requirements of becoming a competent intercultural communicator. In this respect, native speakers could be regarded as better in promoting intercultural communication skills of students. In a study carried out by Shimizu (1995) on Japanese students' perceptions about native and non-native teachers, the researcher found that students regarded their Japanese teachers as gloomy, dead, lifeless, serious and sometimes boring while native teachers were considered more friendly. Makarova and Ryan (1997) also found that good communication skills and a sense of humor are among the criteria that students regarded as important in their teachers. The studies also indicated that foreign teachers are more careful about fulfilling student expectations that the lessons should not bore students. Another study indicated that native teachers have a clear advantage over non-native teachers in terms of cultural aspects of language teaching (Mattos, 1997). Medgyes (1994) states that NESTs provide more cultural information than non-NESTs in their teaching behavior.

According to Cook (2001), using only the target language in a language classroom in which students' and teacher's native language is the same is in a way denying students' bilingual identities. However, the presence of a native speaker to improve listening and speaking skills is needed for authentic language use. If the aim is to develop intercultural competence, both parties should be from the core of each culture (Byram et al., 2002). That is why some scholars regard the presence of a native speaker as crucial for promoting intercultural sensitivity.

### **Various Factors Effecting Intercultural Communication Competence**

Besides NESTs and language education, there are some other factors which are thought to have influence on foreign language learners' intercultural communication competence, and thus intercultural sensitivity. Some of these factors are education, gender, international experience, and nationality.

#### **Education**

According to Penbek et al. (2009), because of the tendency of globalization, university education should include providing students with a background of intercultural communication competence. In their study, Penbek et al.(2009) found that university education contributes to respect to different cultures if supported by international materials such as exchange programs and other non-academic programs which allow students to go abroad, and even internet. It was stated in Penbek et al. (2009) that IS score difference between sophomore and junior classes of some departments is recognizable, and this shows that education has an effect on intercultural sensitivity.

#### **Gender**

In the field of language, communication differences between genders were first studied in the 1970s. Lakoff (1973) was one of the scholars who investigated the issue of language and gender, and inspired many scholars to carry out more studies in this field. The studies revealed that boys' language tends to be more competitive and control-oriented while girls' language tends to be more cooperative and close (Xuemei, Jinling & Binhong, 2007). Another finding in the same study was that in societies where men have greater social power, male norms are dominant in interaction, and females, who are powerless, tend to be more linguistically polite than men. In her book *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in*



*Communication*, Deborah Tannen (1990, p.42) argues that "communication between men and women can be like cross cultural communication, prey to a clash of conversational styles." This could be because of the differences in men's and women's worldview. For communication between males and females, Xuemei et al. (2007) and Tannen (1990) state that it can be studied as if it were intercultural communication, since the two groups have different worldviews.

### **International Experience**

In Penbek et al.(2009) it is stated that students with previous international experience are more open minded and respectful to different cultures and that such experience also contributes to getting cultural information about different cultures. Another benefit of international experience is that students become more adaptable, open-minded, and respectful to other cultures when they experience and learn about another culture which contributes to intercultural communication (Shaftel et al., 2007). One of the ways for students to have intercultural experience is exchange programs. According to Malmberg (2003), exchange is a great opportunity for students to achieve cultural understanding. Ceseviciute and Minkute (2002, as cited in Stepanovienė, 2011) also state that one of the aims of student exchange programs is to enhance intercultural communication competence. According to some scholars, the Internet is also a way of gaining international experience (Marcoccia, 2012; Rirtchie, 2009; Simon, 1998).

**Internet.** According to Marcoccia (2012), the Internet can be used for intercultural communication (chat, discussion forums, email etc.). She states that the Internet can be used to foster intercultural communication in a foreign language learning situation or in a non-learning situation as well by enabling an open and respectful exchange of views between people from different cultures. When

intercultural encounter occurs in a site which does not have this specific purpose, the Internet can serve intercultural communication in an incidental way as well; discussion forums in international newspapers is an example of it. Ritchie (2009, p. 34) points out that 'online discussions offer language learners the possibility of using their language to socialize, collaborate, and create cross-cultural communities, while at the same time developing their language skills'. As for another benefit of the Internet, Simon (1998) states that 'skin colors and other biases based on visual factors play a less important role'. (as cited in Marcoccia, 2012, p.358).

Communication through the internet can be a less intimidating environment due to the absence of the non-verbal as well, and this may encourage the individuals or cultures which are less dominant to have a greater role in interaction (Warschauer, 1997, as cited in Marcoccia, 2012). According to Levy (1997) individuals who communicate through the Internet are the citizens of the same virtual community, and sharing more or less the same cultural codes contributes to intercultural communication.

Some scholars, however, view the Internet as an obstacle for intercultural communication since it lacks the social dimension of communication (Bazzanella & Baracco, 2003; Walter & Burgoon, 1992). Other scholars such as Herring (1999) and Marcoccia (2004) emphasize misunderstandings due to lack of simultaneous feedback and pragmatic aspects of messages. Another idea about the internet is that as internet-mediated communication lacks collective social control, it can promote aggressiveness and hostility between participants (Flanagin & O'Sullivan, 2003).

### **Nationality**

According to Blommaert (1998), different cultures are associated with different nationalities of known ethnic groups, and each ethnic group is labelled with their

identities. Blommaert (1998) states that nationality could be ‘a bad index of cultural identity’ since there are stereotypes for each nationality in people’s minds, and most people tend to generalize one man’s life into the whole culture of the nation the man belongs to. As a result of this, communication is affected from this prejudice.

Another thing that Blommaert (1998) emphasizes is that politics play a great role in effecting people’s ideas about one nation, which is reflected in communication as a result.

### **Conclusion**

There are two facets of language teaching, one is the instilling of a useful skill, and the other is the encouraging of an open attitude and understanding of other cultures. The studies mentioned in this chapter focused on the importance of promoting intercultural sensitivity, which is a prerequisite for intercultural communicative competence, in foreign language teaching. The question to ask at this point is whether NESTs make any difference in promoting intercultural sensitivity or not, and whether there are some other factors such as gender, education, international experience, and nationality which effect intercultural sensitivity. This study aims to answer these questions since, to the knowledge of the researcher, there is only limited research exploring these issues. The next chapter will present the methodology of the study – an introduction of the participants, instruments, procedures, data collection, and data analysis.

## CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

### Introduction

This research is a descriptive study, focusing on the role of native English speaking teachers (NESTs) in promoting intercultural sensitivity. The study addresses the following research questions:

### Research Questions

1. What is the current IS level of Turkish EFL students?
  - 1.1. Is there a difference between the IS scores of students who have been educated by NESTs and those who have not?
  - 1.2. Do the IS levels of students differ according to
    - a. academic department enrolled in?
    - b. gender?
    - c. previous international experience?
    - d. nationality?
    - e. number of foreign languages known?
    - f. type of high school graduated from?
2. What are students' ideas about the role of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of promoting IS and teaching about the target culture?
  - 2.1. Do students' ideas differ according to whether they have been educated by NESTs or NNESTs?
3. Which factors do students feel have the greatest effect on their opinions about foreign cultures?

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methodology used to investigate the intercultural sensitivity (IS) level of students in Turkish universities

and the effects of native English speaking teachers (NESTs) in promoting such students' IS levels.

The researcher used the survey method to get information from the participants on their levels of IS. The survey method was employed as it is a commonly used methodology in intercultural communication research (Frey, Botan, Friedman, & Kreps, 1991). The survey methodology usually requires identifying a population, selecting the participants, constructing survey questions, and collecting and analyzing the gathered information (Rubin, Rubin, & Piele, 1996). Each of these steps will be explained in the next parts of this chapter. The pilot study of the questionnaire and its findings are also presented in this chapter.

### **Setting and Participants**

This study was conducted in six universities from three different regions of Turkey. Participant universities were as follows: Osmangazi University (Eskisehir), Gazi University (Ankara), Konya Karatay University (Konya), Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University (Canakkale), Inonu University (Malatya), and Fatih University (Istanbul). The researcher selected the universities based on their willingness to participate in the study and on meeting the requirements of the research study. The requirements are that in three of the universities, students are totally taught by non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) while in the other three universities, speaking and listening courses (4 hours in a week) are given by native English teachers (NESTs). This choice of universities was made in an attempt to maximize the chances of getting a large enough sample of each –students who have not had exposure to NESTs, and students who have had exposure. Choosing some schools currently having NESTs and others that do not improved the chances of getting that mix. Also, one school in each group--schools with NESTs and schools without

NESTs--was a private institution, while the others were public. With this distinction, a more representative sample of the real mix of institutions in Turkey was aimed at. In this way, the data gained from the questionnaire, could be more generalizable to the broader Turkish higher education context.

The participants in this study were all chosen from the students being taught in A2 level classes according to Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). It was important that their level of English was similar since Risager (2007) suggests that linguistic competence is one of the elements of intercultural competence. From the six universities, a total of 487 English preparatory students were asked to answer the questionnaire administered. Because of invalid responding, fifty-two of the questionnaires applied were regarded as invalid. Hence, a total of 435 questionnaires were analysed for the study. Of the 435 participants, 196 were taught by only NNESTs while 239 were taught by both NESTs and NNESTs. The characteristics of the sample participating in the present study are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

*Characteristics of the Study Participants*

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Gender</b>	Male	230	53
	Female	205	47
<b>Age</b>	18-22	415	97
	23-27	20	3
<b>High School Type</b>	General High School	143	33
	Anatolian High School	163	38
	Technical/Vocational High School	28	7
	Anatolian Teacher Training High School	20	4

Table 2 Continued

	<b>Groups</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>High School Type</b>	Science High School	27	8
	Private High School	40	11
<b>Faculty</b>	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	122	29.5
	Faculty of Engineering	147	33.8
	Medical Faculty	69	16.1
	Faculty of Arts&Science	51	11
	Tourism and Hotel Management	24	5.4
	Faculty of Education	5	1.1
	Faculty of Dentistry	4	0.9
	Faculty of Law	11	2.4
	<b>Nationality</b>	Turkish	432
Other		3	0.6
<b>Native Language</b>	Turkish	423	97.2
	Kurdish	9	2.2
	Other	3	0.6
<b>Foreign Languages</b>	1	351	81.7
	2	70	15.3
	3+	14	3

The first five high schools in Table 2 are state schools. Among these schools, Anatolian and Science High Schools require passing a very competitive centralized multiple choice exam, and generally include intensive foreign language study, usually English, but in some cases German or French. Technical high schools provide specialized instruction to train students for certain professions, and foreign language courses are elective in these schools. Anatolian teacher training high

schools require a centralized test, and students in these schools get extra scores in the university entrance exam if they choose to continue their studies in education faculties. These high schools require intensive foreign language study, generally English. Private high schools are tuition-based high schools, and usually require intensive foreign language study. In some private schools, the medium of instruction is English. Thus, students in these schools generally become more competent in foreign languages compared to those in state schools.

As for the teachers, all the NESTs are English Teaching Assistants (ETAs), who are preselected by Turkish Higher Education Council (YÖK) and Turkish Fulbright Commission before being placed in the universities throughout Turkey. In addition to having Bachelor's or Master's degree level, the ETAs are chosen according to their being highly adaptable, open-minded, flexible and able to take initiative. They are also expected to be committed to teaching and learning about different cultures, and to be cultural interpreters of the United States. After the selection process, ETAs are required to attend an orientation and Turkish Language course in Turkey ("Fulbright U.S. Student Program", n.d.). It could be said that in addition to linguistic expectations, the hiring institutions have cultural expectations from ETAs as well. Because of these cultural expectations and having more or less the same cultural backgrounds, ETAs were chosen as NESTs for this study.

### **Instruments**

This study of intercultural sensitivity employed a survey method to collect data from students with different exposures to native English teachers. The researcher used a questionnaire to collect quantitative data. Using a questionnaire was advantageous as it enabled the researcher to have high accessibility. The questionnaire was composed of three parts: opened-ended and multiple-choice



questions to gather demographic information about the participants; an intercultural sensitivity scale, and a section with questions about the role of teachers in promoting IS (see Appendices A and B for Turkish and English versions of the questionnaire). All sections of the questionnaire were prepared in Turkish to eliminate miscomprehension problems.

### **Section I: Demographic Information Questionnaire**

The researcher developed the first section of the questionnaire, which covers 12 questions about the respondents. The first eight questions were designed to collect demographic information such as age, gender, nationality, native language, known foreign languages, high school type, and current department at university. The remaining four questions were asked to collect data regarding the participants' previous intercultural experiences such as visiting or living in a foreign country for some time, participating in activities where communication with foreign people is needed, and having foreign friends. The names of the participants were not asked to allow the participants to feel more comfortable in responding to the questionnaire.

### **Section II: Intercultural Sensitivity Questionnaire**

Ceseviciūtė and Minkutė-Henrickson (2002) emphasize the importance of intercultural sensitivity in intercultural communication competence (ICC) by stating that ICC is “the ability to exercise intercultural sensitivity, as well as efficiently interpret and form discourse in a foreign language in academic/ professional contexts of intercultural communication” (p. 51).

In this study, in order to determine students' levels of intercultural sensitivity, an intercultural sensitivity questionnaire that was developed by Chen and Starosta (2000) was used. This questionnaire was designed to develop an understanding of how competent different groups of respondents were in terms of intercultural

sensitivity. The questionnaire includes 24 items that investigate the participants' level of intercultural sensitivity based on their responses to statements on a 5-point scale (5= strongly agree, 1= strongly disagree). The statement items are divided into five factors: Interaction Engagement, Respect for Cultural Differences, Interaction Confidence, Interaction Enjoyment and Interaction Attentiveness. The first factor, Interaction Engagement, includes six items (a, k, m, y, z, and aa), which are related to participants' feeling of participation in intercultural communication. One item example is as follows: "I often show my culturally-distinct counterpart my understanding through verbal or nonverbal cues." The second factor, Respect for Culture Difference, includes six items (b, g, h, p, s, and u), which are about how participants orient to or tolerate their counterparts' culture and opinion. One example of this item is: "I respect the values of people from different cultures." The third factor, Interaction Confidence, has five items (c, d, e, f and j), which are concerned with how confident participants are in intercultural settings. An item example is as follows: "I find it very hard to talk in front of people from different cultures." The fourth factor, Interaction Enjoyment includes four items, (i, l, o, and v), which deal with participants' positive or negative reaction towards communicating with people from different cultures. An example of this item is: "I get upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures." The last factor, Interaction Attentiveness, has three items (n, r, and t), which are concerned with participants' effort to understand what is going on in intercultural interaction. One item example is: "I try to obtain as much information as I can when interacting with people from different cultures." Items b, d, g, i, l, o, s, u, and y were reverse-coded before summing the 24 items. After reverse-coding the indicated items, an average score was obtained for each participant.

### **Section III: Role of Teachers**

The third section of the questionnaire aimed to learn about students' ideas on NESTs' and NNESTs' roles in promoting intercultural sensitivity and in teaching culture. The questionnaire was developed by the researcher with the help of two experts. This section of the questionnaire includes 11 items. Items 1, 2, 5 and 6 are about the role of NESTs and NNESTs in students' perceptions about and feelings towards their own culture and foreign cultures; items 3, 4, 7, 8 and 9 investigate what NESTs' and NNESTs' students think about the time allocated to teaching culture in classes. All question responses are on a 4 or 5-point Likert scale. The 10<sup>th</sup> question is an open-ended question that investigates students' ideas about intercultural activities that should be included in or out of classes. The last question lists eight factors such as films, family, NESTs, NNESTs, and foreign friends that might effect the participants' ideas about other cultures. The participants were asked to rank these eight factors in order of effectiveness.

#### **Translation Process**

The 'Intercultural Sensitivity' questionnaire was originally created in English (Chen and Starosta, 2000). Since the participants of this study were not native speakers of English, the researcher and two other Turkish lecturers of English translated the IS questionnaire from English to Turkish. Another Turkish lecturer of English back-translated the questionnaire. Then, two experts, Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı and Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe –assistant professors at Bilkent University- and the researcher compared the back-translated questionnaires with the original one and made appropriate modifications to minimize any losses in meaning due to language nuances and translation.

### **Pilot Study**

Right after the translation process, in order to assure the content and face validity of the questionnaires, all the items were shown to several experts at Bilkent University and Inonu University. The questionnaires were revised according to the feedback received about the face and content validity of the questionnaires. After the revision process, all sections of the questionnaire were piloted with a group of 55 preparatory students at A2 level classes at Inonu University to see potential problems that could occur during the administration process and to test the questionnaire for its reliability. For reliability, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was used. At the first analysis, the researcher found the overall reliability level of the questionnaire as .69. Considering the problems during the administration process of the questionnaire and the reliability level's not being high enough, the researcher revised the formats of some sections and wordings of some items. Then, the questionnaire was administered to another group of 30 students at Inonu University English Preparatory Program. This time, the reliability level for the second section--Intercultural Sensitivity-- was .758. In the original IS questionnaire, which was in English, the alpha reliability coefficient was 0.88. For the third section, The Role of Teachers, the alpha reliability coefficient was .754. The Cronbach Alpha measure for the whole questionnaire was .737, which indicated that it had high internal consistency. The whole questionnaire in Turkish is shown in Appendix 1, and the English version is given in Appendix 2. The reliability of the questionnaires are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

*The Reliability of Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and Role of Teachers Questionnaire*

	<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>N of Items</b>
<b>The Whole Questionnaire</b>	.737	33
<b>Intercultural Sensitivity Scale</b>	.758	24
<b>Role of Teachers Questionnaire</b>	.754	10

**Data Collection Procedure**

After the questionnaires were approved, 11 universities, five of which had NESTs and six of which did not have NESTs, were contacted. The researcher chose the universities with NESTs on the criterion that in each university, four hours of speaking and listening courses in a week were given by NESTs, and other courses were given by NNESTs. For each university with NESTs, having the same amount of classes given by NESTs was important in order to eliminate any problems caused by unequal exposure time to NESTs. As for choosing the universities without NESTs, it was important that student backgrounds were similar to the backgrounds of those studying in the universities with NESTs. In all the universities chosen, most of the students graduated from state high schools where all the teachers are non-natives. It was an important criterion in order to eliminate the effect of previous exposure to NESTs. The data collection procedure varied depending on the universities. The researcher contacted the universities in advance to inform them about the study and to inquire about their interest in taking part in the research. In some cases, an interview or a meeting to discuss the details followed the initial contact. Research forms, questionnaires and other supporting research tools were

sent to the universities via e-mail. Among the 11 universities contacted, six of them agreed to take part in the study. Three of the participating universities had NESTs teaching four hours of speaking and listening course in a week; while the other three participating universities had only NNESTs teaching all courses in English preparatory classes. The researcher arranged a suitable time with the contact people for administrating the questionnaires in each university. The researcher herself went to these universities and administered the questionnaires to students in A2 level classes. A total of 487 students answered the questionnaires and 435 of them were regarded as valid.

### **Data Analysis**

The data obtained from the questionnaires were analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The data were grouped and analyzed under topics relating to the research questions presented in the introduction to this chapter. Quantitative data analysis techniques were used to analyze the questionnaires. After entering all data into SPSS, some of the items were reverse coded and participants were grouped as being educated by NESTs or NNESTs. Then, for each participant, their total IS scores and their scores in the sub-categories of IS such as Interaction Engagement and Respect for Cultural Differences were calculated and entered separately into SPSS. First, descriptive statistics were used for the demographic information and to get a picture of students' IS levels. Then, an independent samples t-test was used to investigate the possible relation between students' IS levels and their being educated by NESTs or NNESTs. Then, in order to look for possible relations between various factors and students' IS levels, independent samples t-tests and a one-way ANOVA were used. In order to investigate and compare NESTs' and NNEST' students' ideas about the role of

NESTs and NNESTs in terms of promoting IS and teaching culture, descriptive statistics and independent samples t-tests were used. Lastly, for one open-ended question, responses were grouped according to common themes.

### **Conclusion**

This chapter outlined the research methodology used in the study. Specifically, this chapter included a description of the participants, the data collection procedure, and the research instruments, including the questionnaires, and the data analysis procedure. A total of 465 English Preparatory Class students took part in the study. The questionnaires examined participants' current IS levels, the participants' ideas on the role of NESTs and NNESTs in promoting IS level and teaching culture, and their ideas about the elements which effect their sense of a foreign culture. Data obtained from the questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively. The following chapter will introduce the results of these statistical analyses.

## CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

### Introduction

This study was designed to investigate the role of NESTs in promoting intercultural sensitivity of English preparatory school students at six different universities in Turkey. The study also investigated student ideas about the role of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of promoting IS and teaching target culture. Various factors such as gender, previous international experience, and academic departments enrolled in were also investigated in terms of affecting students' IS levels. The following research questions were addressed in the study:

1. What is the current IS level of Turkish EFL students?
  - 1.1. Is there a difference between the IS scores of students who have been educated by NESTs and those who have not?
  - 1.2. Do the IS levels of students differ according to
    - a. academic department enrolled in?
    - b. gender?
    - c. previous international experience?
    - d. nationality?
    - e. number of foreign languages known?
    - f. type of high school graduated from?
2. What are students' ideas about the role of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of promoting IS and teaching about the target culture?
  - 2.1. Do students' ideas differ according to whether they have been educated by NESTs or NNESTs?
3. Which factors do students feel have the greatest effect on their opinions about foreign cultures?



### **Data Analysis Procedures**

The research was conducted in English preparatory classes at six different universities in Turkey. In three of the universities, all classes were taught by non-native English teachers (NNESTs) while in the other three universities, speaking and listening classes, four hours a week, were taught by native English teachers (NESTs). One university in each group was a private university; the others were public universities. By including one private university to each group, the researcher aimed to have a more representative sample of the real mix of institutions in Turkey. A total of 435 questionnaires were analyzed for the study.

The data analysis was carried out in several steps. The first step was to enter the data into SPSS and categorize the variables as being educated by NESTs or non-NESTs. First, some of the data in the IS questionnaire were reverse-coded. Then the total score of students' IS level was computed and added to the SPSS file. Interaction Engagement, Respect for Cultural Differences, Interaction Confidence, Interaction Enjoyment and Interaction Attentiveness scores, which are parts of the IS questionnaire and which will be mentioned as sub-categories of IS henceforth, were also computed separately. Then theoretical scores of IS scale and its sub-categories, which were taken from Banos (2006), were presented in order to understand the scores obtained by the students. Banos (2006) states that the theoretical scores have been calculated from the number of items of each sub-category, as a reference of the minimum, maximum and medium scores (theoretical), scoring 1, 3 or 5 in all items, respectively. In her study, Banos (2006) uses 22 items of the IS scale. However, in this study 24 items of the scale are used, and thus, the theoretical scores here are not the same as the ones in Banos' study (2006) while the scoring ratio (scoring 1, 3 or 5 in all items) is the same. The theoretical scores are given in Table 4.

Table 4

*Theoretical Scores of IS Scale Based on Banos (2006).*

<u>Sub-Categories</u>	<u>Minimal Theoretical Score</u>	<u>Medium Theoretical Score</u>	<u>Maximal Theoretical Score</u>
Interaction Engagement	6	18	30
Respect for Cultural Differences	6	18	30
Interaction Enjoyment	4	12	20
Interaction Confidence	5	15	25
Interaction Attentiveness	3	9	15
<b>TOTAL SCALE</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>120</b>

In order to answer research question 1, the researcher conducted descriptive statistics and compared participants' total IS scores with the theoretical scores in Table 4 to learn about students' IS levels. Independent samples t-tests were used in order to answer research question 1.1. Total IS scores of the students educated by NESTs and the ones educated by NNESTs were compared to see if there is a statistically significant difference between their IS levels. For the research question 1.2, the researcher used different types of analyses. For 1.2.a, 1.2.c, 1.2.f, the researcher used a one-way ANOVA to find out whether there is a difference in students' IS levels according to their departments, previous international experiences, and the type of high schools they graduated from. The researcher did the same analysis for the sub-categories of the IS Scale as well. For research questions 1.2.b, 1.2.d, and 1.2.e, independent samples t-tests were used in order to

see whether the level of IS and its sub-categories differ according to students' gender, nationality, and the number of foreign languages they know. For research question 1 and its sub-questions, the researcher analyzed the scores of students educated by NESTs and the ones educated by NNESTs separately, and compared them to see whether there is a significant difference between them.

The researcher used descriptives in order to answer research question 2, which aimed to learn about students' ideas about the role NESTs and NNESTs in promoting IS and teaching culture. For research question 2.1., independent samples t-tests were used in order to compare NESTs' and NNEST's students' ideas about the role NESTs and NNESTs play in promoting IS and teaching culture.

For research question 3, the researcher used descriptive statistics to investigate students' feelings about the greatest factor that effects their opinions about foreign cultures. In order to compare NESTs' and NNESTs' students' answers, an independent samples t-test was carried out as well.

## **Results**

### **Current IS Level of Students**

This section presents detailed information about the results of research question 1 which is about the current IS level of Turkish EFL students. Both the overall mean scores and the sub-categorical mean scores were calculated for each participant along with their standard deviations (SD) (see Table 5).

Table 5

*Overall Mean Values for the IS Questionnaire Categories*

<b>Categories</b>	<b><math>\bar{x}</math></b>	<b>SD</b>
Total IS Score	76.97	5.10
Interaction Engagement	21.62	2.13
Respect for Cultural Differences	17.91	2.29
Interaction Enjoyment	9.21	1.98
Interaction Confidence	16.71	2.33
Interaction Attentiveness	11.50	1.76

Note.  $\bar{x}$ = mean scores of the participants; SD=standard deviation

According to the descriptive statistics, the overall mean score of all participants in the IS questionnaire was 76.97 which indicated that the participants' IS levels were above the average (theoretical medium score (tms) was 72).

Additionally, the mean scores of the participants in each sub-category were a)  $\bar{x}$ = 21.62 in Interaction Engagement (tms= 18), b)  $\bar{x}$ = 17.91 in Respect for Cultural Differences (tms= 18), c)  $\bar{x}$ = 9.21 in Interaction Enjoyment (tms= 12), d)  $\bar{x}$ = 16.71 in Interaction Confidence (tms= 15), and e)  $\bar{x}$ = 11.50 in Interaction Attentiveness (tms= 9). These categorical mean scores pointed out that participants had average scores in terms of Interaction Engagement, Respect for Cultural Differences, Interaction Confidence, and Interaction Attentiveness. They were only a little below the average in terms of their scores in Interaction Enjoyment.

### **The Difference between the IS Scores (and its sub-categories) of Students Educated by NESTs and NNESTs**

In order to answer research question 1.1, the IS scores of students who had been educated by NESTs and those who had not were compared by using an independent samples t-test. Both total IS mean scores and the sub-categorical mean

scores were compared (see Table 6).

Table 6

*Comparison of IS Scores of Students Educated by NESTs and NNESTs*

	<b>Item 1.9</b>	$\bar{x}$	<b>SD</b>	<b>T-test</b>		
				<b>df</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
Total IS Score	nest	76.59	4.62	432	-1.7	.088
	nnest	77.44	5.63			
Interaction Engagement	nest	21.82	2.14	432	2.1	.035*
	nnest	21.38	2.11			
Respect for Cultural Differences	nest	17.57	2.13	432	-3.4	.001**
	nnest	18.32	2.42			
Interaction Enjoyment	nest	9.10	1.87	432	-1.3	.174
	nnest	9.36	2.10			
Interaction Confidence	nest	16.63	2.33	432	-.70	.480
	nnest	16.79	2.32			
Interaction Attentiveness	nest	11.46	1.71	432	-.63	.524
	nnest	11.56	1.83			

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$

The number of students educated by NESTs was 239, and the ones who were not was 196. As Table 6 indicates, even if the total IS scores of students educated by NNESTs was a little higher than the ones educated by NESTs, there was not a statistically significant difference between their scores. The difference between some of the sub-categories of the IS questionnaire was small as well ( $\bar{x}$  interaction enjoyment = 9.10 (nests), 9.36 (nnests);  $\bar{x}$  interaction confidence = 16.63 (nests), 16.79 (nnests);  $\bar{x}$  interaction attentiveness = 11.46 (nests), 11.56 (nnests). However, the common point in each of these categories was that the scores of NNESTs' students was higher than the ones educated by NESTs even if the difference was not statistically significant. Another finding of this independent samples t-test was that

there was statistically significant difference between the students' scores educated by NESTs and NNESTs in terms of Interaction Engagement ( $p = .035$ ) and Respect for Cultural Differences ( $p = .001$ ). However, the score of students educated by NESTs was higher in the category of Interaction Engagement while the score of NNESTs' students was higher in Respect for Cultural Differences, which may indicate that being educated by NESTs or NNESTs does not make much difference in intercultural sensitivity.

### **Possible Relations Between Various Factors and Students' IS Levels**

The possible relations between various factors and students' IS levels sought to answer research question 1.2, in which the following factors were investigated: a) academic department enrolled in, b) gender, c) previous international experience, d) nationality, e) number of foreign languages known, and f) the type of highschool students graduated from. In order to answer research questions 1.2.a, 1.2.c, 1.2.f, a one-way ANOVA; for research questions 1.2.b, 1.2.d, and 1.2.e, an independent samples t-test was used.

**Academic departments enrolled in.** In order to answer research question 1.2.a, first, an overall comparison of the IS scores and the sub-categorical scores were made by using a one-way ANOVA (See Table 7).

Table 7

*Comparison of IS Scores according to the Academic Department Enrolled in*

		<i>Sum of</i> <i>Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean</i> <i>Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Total IS Score	Between Groups	127.678	7	18.240	.696	.675
	Within Groups	11186.092	427	26.197		
	Total	11313.770	434			
Interaction Engagement	Between Groups	29.397	7	4.200	.917	.493
	Within Groups	1954.773	427	4.578		
	Total	1984.170	434			
Respect for Cultural Differences	Between Groups	51.340	7	7.334	1.397	.205
	Within Groups	2242.163	427	5.251		
	Total	2293.503	434			
Interaction Enjoyment	Between Groups	11.198	7	1.600	.400	.902
	Within Groups	1707.055	427	3.998		
	Total	1718.253	434			
Interaction Confidence	Between Groups	86.155	7	12.308	2.297	.026*
	Within Groups	2287.629	427	5.357		
	Total	2373.784	434			
Interaction Attentiveness	Between Groups	37.033	7	5.290	1.709	.105
	Within Groups	1321.702	427	3.095		
	Total	1358.736	434			

\*  $p < 0.05$ 

As could be seen from the table, only in the sub-category of Interaction Confidence, there was a statistically significant difference ( $p = .026$ ) according to the academic department enrolled in. For this reason, descriptives and post hoc tests were done in order to see between which departments there was a statistically significant difference of Interaction Confidence score (See Table 8 and Table 9).

Table 8

*Descriptive Statistics about Interaction Confidence Scores according to the Academic Department Enrolled in*

<b>Departments</b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><math>\bar{x}</math></b>	<b><i>SD</i></b>
F.E.A.S.	122	17.02	2.25
Engineering	149	16.84	2.40
Medicine	69	15.78	1.96
Arts&Science	51	16.88	2.52
THM	24	17.08	2.87
Education	5	17.00	1.58
Dentistry	4	15.75	1.70
Law	11	16.18	1.72
TOTAL	435	16.71	2.33

Note. In the faculty name column, F.E.A.S. represents Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, and T.H.M. represents Tourism and Hotel Management.



Table 9

*Comparison of Interaction Confidence Scores according to the Academic Department Enrolled in*

<u>Faculty Name</u>		<u>Mean</u> <u>Difference</u>	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>p</u>
FEAS	Engineering	.17895	.28261	.998
	Medicine	1.24198*	.34865	.010*
	Arts&Sciences	.14224	.38596	1.000
	THM	-.05874	.51686	1.000
	Education	.02459	1.05613	1.000
	Dentistry	1.27459	1.17613	.960
	Law	.84277	.72867	.943
Engineering	FEAS	-.17895	.28261	.998
	Medicine	1.06303*	.33705	.036*
	Arts&Sciences	-.03672	.37550	1.000
	THM	-.23770	.50910	1.000
	Education	-.15436	1.05235	1.000
	Dentistry	1.09564	1.17274	.983
	Law	.66382	.72318	.984
Medicine	FEAS	-1.24198*	.34865	.010*
	Engineering	-1.06303*	.33705	.036*
	Arts&Science	-1.09974	.42742	.169
	THM	-1.30072	.54852	.258
	Education	-1.21739	1.07198	.949
	Dentistry	.03261	1.19038	1.000
	Law	-.39921	.75145	.999

\* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

It was seen from Table 9 that not all the groups had statistically significant difference in Interaction Confidence scores. Only the difference between the scores of students enrolled in Medicine Faculty and Faculty of Economic and

Administrative Sciences (FEAS) ( $p= .010$ ), and between the scores of Medicine Faculty and Engineering Faculty ( $p= .036$ ) was statistically important. As shown in Table 8, Interaction Confidence scores of Medicine Faculty students (15.78) were lower than the ones in FEAS (17.02) and Engineering Faculty (16.84). However, as the number of participants from the faculties of THM (24), Education (5), Dentistry (4), and Law (11) were few, it could not be said for sure that there was not a statistically significant score difference between them and other departments.

**Gender.** The comparison of gender sought to answer research question 1.2.b. An independent samples t-test was conducted to identify whether there was a statistically significant difference among students' IS scores and sub-categorical scores according to gender (See Table 10).

Table 10

*Comparison of IS Scores and Sub-categorical Scores according to Gender*

	<b>Item 1.6</b>	<b>N</b>	$\bar{x}$	<b>SD</b>	<b>T-test</b>		
					<b>df</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
Total IS Score	male	230	77.04	5.48	432	.286	.775
	female	204	76.90	4.66			
Interaction Engagement	male	230	21.55	2.34	432	-.75	.454
	female	204	21.71	1.87			
Respect for Cultural Differences	male	230	18.02	2.37	432	1.07	.284
	female	204	17.78	2.20			
Interaction Enjoyment	male	230	9.30	2.03	432	1.16	.246
	female	204	9.08	1.89			
Interaction Confidence	male	230	16.99	2.33	432	2.47	.014*
	female	204	16.44	2.28			
Interaction Attentiveness	male	230	11.16	1.90	432	-4.2	.000**
	female	204	11.88	1.52			

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$

As shown in Table 10, there was not a statistically significant difference between genders in terms of students' total IS scores. As for the sub-categorical scores, however, there was a statistically significant difference between genders in terms of Interaction Confidence ( $p = .014$ ) and Interaction Attentiveness ( $p = .00$ ) scores. It was seen that while male students had higher mean scores in Interaction Confidence ( $\bar{x}(M) = 16.99$ ;  $\bar{x}(FM) = 16.44$ ), female students got higher scores in Interaction Attentiveness ( $\bar{x}(FM) = 11.88$ ) than males ( $\bar{x}(M) = 11.16$ ). This could be because of the fact that in societies like Turkey, where males have greater social power, male norms become more dominant, and females, who have less power, tend to be more polite than males (Xuemei, Jinling & Binhong, 2007).

**Nationality and type of high schools students graduated from.** In order to answer research question 1.2.d, which was about a possible relation between nationality and IS score, first, descriptive statistics were applied. It was seen that only three out of 435 students were from a different nationality. Thus, the research question could not be answered because of insufficient sample size.

As for research question 1.2.f, which was about a possible relationship between type of high schools students graduated from and total IS scores, a one-way ANOVA was carried out. It was seen that there was not a statistically significant difference between them.

**Number of foreign languages known.** Regarding the responses for item 1.5, which aimed to answer research question 1.2.e, a one-way ANOVA test was applied. It was seen from the analysis that only in the category of Interaction Confidence, there was a statistically significant difference between students' score and the number of foreign languages known. For that reason only the results of Interaction Confidence are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

*Interaction Confidence Scores and Number of Foreign Languages Known*

<b>Item 1.5</b>		<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><i><math>\bar{x}</math></i></b>	<b><i>SD</i></b>
1 Language		351	21.57	2.10
2 Languages		69	21.76	2.21
3+ Languages		15	22.21	2.69
<b>Post Hoc Tests</b>		<b><i>Mean Dif.</i></b>	<b><i>S.E.</i></b>	<b><i>p</i></b>
1 Language	2 Languages	-.25	.30	.669
	3+ Languages	-2.31*	.62	.001*
2 Languages	1 Language	.25	.30	.669
	3+ Languages	2.05*	.67	.007*
3+ Languages	1 Language	2.31*	.62	.001*
	2 Languages	2.05*	.67	.007*

\* $p < 0.01$ 

As could be seen from the table, the mean scores of the participants increased in accordance with the number of foreign languages known ( $\bar{x}(1) = 21.57$ ;  $\bar{x}(2) = 21.76$ ;  $\bar{x}(3+) = 22.21$ ). The difference between the scores of students who know one language and three or more than three languages, and between the ones who know two languages and three or more than three languages was statistically significant respectively ( $p = .001$ ;  $p = .007$ ), which could mean that students become more interactionally confident as the number of foreign languages they know increases.

***Previous international experience.*** In order to answer research question 1.2.c, which was about the possible relation between IS scores and previous international experience, items 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, and 1.12 in the questionnaire were analyzed by using an independent samples t-test, descriptive statistics and a one-way ANOVA test. Previous international experience was investigated under three titles:

participants' communication experiences with foreign people in their own country, which is Turkey in our context, in foreign countries, and through the internet.

*Previous communication experiences with foreigners in students' own countries.* The results of item 1.9, which was about the previous communication experiences with foreigners students had in their own countries, Turkey in our context, before, are presented in Table 12. In Table 12, an independent samples t-test was used in order to see whether there is statistically significant difference between students' scores who had previous experience and those who did not.

Table 12

*Comparison of IS Scores and Sub-categorical Scores according to Previous Communication Experiences with Foreigners in Turkey*

	<b>Item 1.9</b>	<b>N</b>	$\bar{x}$	<b>SD</b>	<b>T-test</b>		
					<b>df</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
Total IS Score	yes	228	77.24	4.85	433	-1.13	.258
	no	207	76.68	5.36			
Interaction Engagement	yes	228	21.93	1.97	433	-3.26	.001*
	no	207	21.27	2.26			
Respect for Cultural Differences	yes	228	17.46	2.15	433	4.28	.000*
	no	207	18.39	2.35			
Interaction Enjoyment	yes	228	8.94	1.89	433	3.00	.003*
	no	207	9.51	2.05			
Interaction Confidence	yes	228	17.28	2.26	433	-5.46	.000*
	no	207	16.09	2.26			
Interaction Attentiveness	yes	228	11.60	1.69	433	-1.17	.240
	no	207	11.40	1.84			

\*  $p < 0.01$

As shown in Table 12, of 435 participants, 228 had previous communication experiences with foreigners in participants' country. It can be said that the difference between the total IS scores of the students who had previous communication

experiences with foreigners and who did not was low ( $\bar{x}$  yes = 77.04,  $\bar{x}$  no = 76.68); that is, even though the scores of participants with previous experience were a little higher than the ones without, the difference was not statistically significant ( $p = .258$ ). Since the differences in their total IS scores were not statistically significant, a follow up analysis was run in order to reveal if there was a significant difference in participants' scores of the sub-categories of IS.

As Table 12 indicates, four of the sub-categories had statistically significant difference, which were Interaction Engagement ( $p = .001$ ), Respect for Cultural Differences ( $p = .000$ ), Interaction Enjoyment ( $p = .003$ ), and Interaction Confidence ( $p = .000$ ). It was also seen that Interaction Engagement and Interaction Confidence scores of the participants with previous communication experience were higher than the ones without ( $\bar{x}$  yes = 21.93,  $\bar{x}$  no = 21.27;  $\bar{x}$  yes = 17.28,  $\bar{x}$  no = 16.09); while Respect for Cultural Differences and Interaction Enjoyment scores of these students were lower ( $\bar{x}$  yes = 17.46,  $\bar{x}$  no = 18.39;  $\bar{x}$  yes = 8.94,  $\bar{x}$  no = 9.51).

***Overseas experience.*** In order to see the possible relation between students' IS levels and their previous overseas experience, item 1.10 was analyzed by using an independent samples t-test (Table 13).

Table 13

*IS Scores and Previous Overseas Experience*

	<b>Item 1.10</b>	<b>N</b>	<b><math>\bar{x}</math></b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>T-test</b>		
					<b>df</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
Total IS Score	yes	58	76.98	4.69	433	-.009	.993
	no	377	76.97	5.17			
Interaction Engagement	yes	58	21.51	2.06	433	.404	.686
	no	377	21.63	2.15			
Respect for Cultural Differences	yes	58	17.62	2.05	433	1.03	.303
	no	377	17.95	2.33			
Interaction Enjoyment	yes	58	8.70	1.58	433	2.11	.035*
	no	377	9.29	2.03			
Interaction Confidence	yes	58	17.31	2.25	433	-2.07	.039*
	no	377	16.62	2.34			
Interaction Attentiveness	yes	58	11.82	1.74	433	-1.49	.137
	no	377	11.45	1.76			

\*  $p < 0.05$ 

As could be seen from the table, there was not an equal number of participants from each group (Nyes = 58, Nno = 377), so before talking about the analysis, it should be stated that having an unequal number of participants may have effected the results. The analysis of the relationship between previous overseas experiences and students' total IS levels reveals that there was not a statistically significant relationship between these variables ( $p = .99$ ). It was seen that in two of the sub-categories, Interaction Enjoyment and Interaction Confidence, there was a statistically significant relationship ( $p < 0.05$ ) between students' scores and their previous overseas experience. However, even if it was presumed that students with overseas experience would score higher, Interaction Enjoyment ( $\bar{x}$  yes = 8.70,  $\bar{x}$  no = 9.29), Interaction Engagement ( $\bar{x}$  yes = 21.51,  $\bar{x}$  no = 21.63), and Respect for



Cultural Differences ( $\bar{x}$  yes = 17.62,  $\bar{x}$  no = 17.95) scores of the participants with overseas experience were lower than the ones without.

In order to see the length of time students with overseas experience spent abroad, descriptive statistics were carried out as well (Table 14).

Table 14

*Length of Time Students Spent Abroad*

<b><u>Time Spent Abroad</u></b>	<b><u>Number</u></b>	<b><u>Valid Percent</u></b>
Less than 6 months	45	9.9
6 moths – 1 year	5	1.1
1 – 2 years	4	.9
More than 2 years	4	.9
Total	58	12.8

Table 14 indicates that most of the students spent less than 6 months abroad (N= 45), which could be thought as a short time for effecting students IS scores.

***Communication with foreign people through internet.*** In addition to other usages such as searching for information, the internet is used as a way of communication as well. By analyzing item 1.11, which was about using the internet in order to communicate with people from different nationalities, it was aimed to find out whether this type of communication affected students' IS scores or not. An independent samples t-test was run to reveal whether communication through internet has an effect on the scores of the participants (Table 15).

Table 15

*IS Scores and Communication through the Internet*

	<b>Item 1.11</b>	<b>N</b>	$\bar{x}$	<b>SD</b>	<b>T-test</b>		
					<b>df</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
Total IS Score	yes	304	77.20	5.13	433	-1.41	.158
	no	131	76.45	5.02			
Interaction Engagement	yes	304	21.70	2.15	433	-1.25	.211
	no	131	21.42	2.08			
Respect for Cultural Differences	yes	304	17.84	2.26	433	.852	.395
	no	131	18.05	2.38			
Interaction Enjoyment	yes	304	9.02	1.92	433	3.15	.002*
	no	131	9.64	2.06			
Interaction Confidence	yes	304	17.04	2.34	433	-4.48	.000*
	no	131	15.96	2.16			
Interaction Attentiveness	yes	304	11.58	1.80	433	-1.37	.170
	no	131	11.32	1.68			

\*  $p < 0.01$ 

It was seen from Table 15 that even if the mean score difference in total IS score was not statistically significant, students who communicated with foreign people through internet scored higher than the ones who did not ( $\bar{x}$  yes = 77.20,  $\bar{x}$  no = 76.45), which means that, though slightly, the internet has a positive effect on students' IS levels. As for the sub-categories, it was seen that the mean score difference in Interaction Enjoyment and Interaction Confidence was statistically significant ( $p < 0.01$ ). The participants who had communicated with foreign people through internet before scored lower in Interaction Enjoyment while they scored higher in Interaction Confidence. In other words, communication through internet may promote its users' interaction confidence while it may decrease interaction enjoyment.

In order to find out what kinds of websites or blogs students use for communication, descriptive statistics were used (Table 16).

Table 16

*Types of Websites Students Use for Communication with Foreign People*

<u>Websites</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Social Networking Sites	167	38.4
Online Games	26	6.0
Chat Rooms	24	5.5
Blogs and Forums	15	3.4
More than two of the above	72	16.6
Total	304	69.9

Table 16 indicates that most of the participants (38.4%) used social networking sites in order to communicate with people from different nationalities. It was also seen that 16.6 percent of the participants used more than two different websites in order to communicate with people from different nationalities, which means that websites are popular among the participants.

**Students' Ideas About the Role of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of Promoting IS and Teaching Target Culture**

In order to answer research question 2, which was about participants' opinions about NESTs' and NNESTs' role in promoting IS and teaching culture, the researcher used descriptive statistics. All participants were asked to answer items 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4, which were about students' ideas about NNESTs' role, since they were all taught by NNESTs (Table 15). However, only students taught by NESTs, were asked to answer items 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9, which were about the

role of NESTs, since they had the experience of being educated by NESTs. Two hundred and twenty four of the responses were regarded as valid (Table 16). For the item 3.10, which was an open-ended question investigating students' responses about cultural/intercultural activities they think should be included in or out of class, student responses were grouped according to common themes.

Table 17 presents the frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations of items 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4. All the participants, 239 educated by both NESTs and NNESTs and 196 educated by only NNESTs, were asked to indicate what they think about NNESTs' role in promoting IS and teaching culture on a five point Likert scale for items 3.1, 3.2, 3.3; and on a four point Likert scale for item 3.4.

Table 17

*Students' Responses about NNESTs' Role in Promoting IS*

Items	None		little		Somewhat		Much		A great deal		$\bar{x}$	SD
	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F		
3.1. Feelings for own culture	11.1	48	14.3	62	43.6	189	22.6	98	8.3	36	3.0	1.0
3.2. Feelings for other cultures	8.1	35	17.7	77	43.8	190	27.6	120	2.8	12	2.9	.94
3.3. Time allocated to culture	9.0	39	32.5	141	44.2	192	12.9	56	1.4	6	2.6	.86
	Yes		Little		Undecided		No					
	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	$\bar{x}$	SD		
3.4. Is time allocated to teaching culture enough?	17.1	74	34.8	151	25.1	109	23.0	100	2.5	1.0		

As shown in Table 17, the categories that attained the highest percentages in items 3.1 and 3.2 were somewhat (43.6%; 43.8%) and much (22.6%; 27.6%) with mean scores of 3.0 and 2.9 respectively, which means that most of the participants think that NNESTs somewhat or much affected their opinions and feelings about

students' own culture and other cultures. As for the time allocated to teaching culture in classes, the majority of students chose the categories of little (32.5%) and somewhat (44.2%).

Regarding the responses for item 3.4, whether the time allocated to teaching culture is enough or not, quite a few number of students thought that NNESTs leave enough time for teaching culture (17.1%). According to the majority of the participants NNESTs leave less than enough time (34.8%) or not enough time (23%) for teaching culture ( $\bar{x}= 2.5$ ).

Table 18 presents the frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations of items 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9. Students who were educated by both NESTs and NNESTs, the number of which is 239, were asked to indicate what they think about NESTs' role in promoting IS and teaching culture on a five point Likert scale for items 3.5, 3.6, 3.7; and on a four point Likert scale for items 3.8 and 3.9.

Table 18

*Students' Responses about NESTs' Role in Promoting IS*

<b>Items</b>	<b>None</b>		<b>Little</b>		<b>Somewhat</b>		<b>Much</b>		<b>A great deal</b>		$\bar{x}$	<b><i>SD</i></b>
	<b>%</b>	<b><i>F</i></b>	<b>%</b>	<b><i>F</i></b>	<b>%</b>	<b><i>F</i></b>	<b>%</b>	<b><i>F</i></b>	<b>%</b>	<b><i>F</i></b>		
3.5. Feelings for own culture	15.7	35	24.7	55	35.0	78	21.5	48	3.1	7	2.7	1.0
3.6. Feelings for other cultures	4.9	11	16.5	37	34.4	77	33.9	76	10.3	23	3.2	1.0
3.7. Time allocated to culture	8.9	20	31.7	72	43.3	97	12.9	29	2.7	6	2.6	.90
	<b>Yes</b>		<b>Little</b>		<b>Undecided</b>		<b>No</b>					
	<b>%</b>	<b><i>F</i></b>	<b>%</b>	<b><i>F</i></b>	<b>%</b>	<b><i>F</i></b>	<b>%</b>	<b><i>F</i></b>	$\bar{x}$	<b><i>SD</i></b>		
3.8. Is time allocated to teaching culture enough?	19.6	44	33.0	74	22.3	50	25.0	56	2.5	1.0		
3.9. Positive effect of NESTs on Ss' attitudes towards other cultures	47.1	104	8.1	18	15.8	35	29.0	64	2.2	1.3		

When students' responses about NESTs' role in promoting IS were investigated, it was seen that there were no items which were clustered in the 'a great deal' category of the scale. The majority of the participants chose the category of somewhat (35%) for item 3.5, which was about NESTs' role in affecting students' opinions and feelings about students' own culture. As for item 3.6, which was about NESTs' role in effecting students' opinions and feelings about other cultures, the highest percentages were in the categories of somewhat (34.4%) and much (33.9) with a mean score of 3.2. It could be said from these findings that the majority of the respondents feel NESTs are effective in students' opinions about their own cultures and other cultures. Regarding the responses for item 3.7, the time NESTs leave for teaching culture, the highest percentages were clustered in the categories of little (31.7) and somewhat (43.3) with a mean score of 2.6.

As for item 3.8, which was about students' ideas on the sufficiency of time NESTs allocate to teaching culture, the mean score was 2.5, which was the same as NNESTs' score for the same item (item 3.4,  $\bar{x}$  = 2.5). The category with the highest percentage in item 3.8 was little (33%). In other words, the plurality of the respondents felt that NESTs do not leave enough time for teaching culture. According to the results of item 3.9, which investigated the question of whether NESTs effected students' attitudes towards other cultures positively or not, the category of yes got the highest percentage (47.1%). The category with the second highest percentage was no (29%). The mean score of the item was 2.2. Judging from these results, it could be said that the majority of the respondents felt fairly positive towards NESTs in terms of their effect on students' attitudes towards other cultures.

Item 3.10, which was an open-ended question, asked student opinions about cultural/intercultural activities that should be included in or out of class. A total of

104 students answered the question and their responses were grouped according to the common themes. Six different themes were identified: conferences or lectures in which people from different nationalities introduce their culture; trips to foreign countries or exchange programs; meeting foreign people on the internet or face to face; doing activities like games, sports, and song contests with foreign students at school; having foreign classmates and NESTs; and lastly, activities like watching movies or documentaries about different cultures (Table 19).

Table 19

*Student Opinions: Cultural/Intercultural Activities*

<b>Themes</b>	<b>Number</b>
Conferences or Lectures	18
Trips to Foreign Countries or Exchange Programs	45
Meeting with Foreign People on the Internet or face to face	10
Games, Sports, Contests	11
Foreign Classmates and NESTs	8
Movies or Documentaries about Different Cultures	12
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>104</b>

As could be seen from the table, the plurality of the respondents prefer overseas experience as an intercultural experience (N= 45).

**Student ideas about NNESTs according to being educated by NESTs or NNESTs.** In order to answer research question 2.1, which was about the difference between students' ideas according to their being educated by NESTs or NNESTs, an independent samples t-test was carried out. The aim was to compare NESTs' and NNESTs' students' responses to items 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4, which were about NNESTs' role in promoting IS and teaching culture (Table 20). As the students who



were educated only by NNESTs did not respond to items from 3.5 to 3.9, questions about NESTs, the comparison could be done only for NNESTs.

Table 20

*Comparison of Students' Ideas about NNESTs*

		$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
3.1. feelings for own culture	nest	2.8	1.05	431	-4.8	.00**
	nnest	3.2	1.02			
3.2. feelings for other culture	nest	2.8	.95	431	-4.0	.00**
	nnest	3.1	.88			
3.3. time allocated to culture	nest	2.5	.90	431	-2.1	.03*
	nnest	2.7	.80			
3.4. Is time allocated to teaching culture enough?	nest	2.4	1.00	431	-1.2	.216
	nnest	2.6	1.05			

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$

Regarding the responses to items 3.1 and 3.2, which were about NNESTs' role in affecting students' feelings and opinions towards their own culture and other cultures, students who were educated only by NNESTs gave higher scores to NNESTs than the ones educated by both NESTs and NNESTs ( $p < 0.01$ ). In other words, students educated by only NNESTs felt more positive towards NNESTs in terms of their effect on students' feelings for their own culture and other cultures. As for item 3.3, it was seen that there was a statistically significant difference between the answers ( $p < 0.05$ ). Students educated by NESTs gave lower scores for the time NNESTs allocate to teaching culture than the students educated by only NNESTs ( $\bar{x}$  (NEST) = 2.5;  $\bar{x}$  (NNEST) = 2.7). Overall, these results show that students educated only by NNESTs feel more positive about NNESTs than the students educated by both NESTs and NNESTs.

### Various Factors that Effect Students' Opinions about Foreign Cultures

In order to answer research question 3, the factors students feel have the greatest effect on their opinions about foreign cultures were investigated. Participants were asked to rank 8 items in order of their effectiveness on their opinions about a foreign culture by ranking them from 1 to 8 (Table 21). The last item, 3.11h, was 'other', for which students were asked to write any other factors affecting their opinion. Descriptive statistics was used in order to analyze the data.

Table 21

*Various Factors Affecting Student Opinions about Foreign Cultures*

<b>Factors</b>	<b><i>N</i></b>	<b><math>\bar{x}</math></b>	<b><i>SD</i></b>
Family	402	5.19	2.43
NNESTs	406	4.24	1.89
Other	35	4.07	3.17
TV	403	4.04	1.96
NESTs	266	3.32	1.87
Internet	401	3.19	1.82
Foreign Friends	395	2.89	1.97
Movies	410	2.64	1.84

As could be seen from the table, the number of the respondents was not equal for each factor since not all the factors were experienced by the same number of participants. So, the mean scores here in table 21 were given just to see what score each factor got out of 8, not to compare the factors with one another. As shown in the table, the category of family ranked the highest ( $\bar{x}= 5.19$ ) while the category of movies ranked the lowest ( $\bar{x}= 2.64$ ), meaning that family is the most effective factor on students' opinions about foreign cultures. . The other categories which affected

the participants' opinions most were NNESTs ( $\bar{x}$ = 4.24) and TV ( $\bar{x}$ = 4.04). As for the category of *other*, there were three different factors students wrote for the factors affecting their opinions about other cultures: *books* (16 students), *trip to foreign countries* (11 students), and *music* (8 students).

Overall, these results indicate that the IS level of Turkish EFL students is above the average suggested in Banos (2006), and there is not a significant total IS score difference between the students educated by NESTs and NNESTs. However, in the subcategories of Interaction Engagement and Respect for Cultural Differences, there is a statistically significant difference between the students of NESTs and NNESTs. NESTs' students had a higher score of Interaction Engagement ( $\bar{x}$ (NESTs)= 21.82,  $\bar{x}$ (NNESTs)= 21.38), while NNESTs' group had a higher score of Respect for Cultural Differences ( $\bar{x}$ (NESTs)= 17.57,  $\bar{x}$ (NNESTs)= 18.32). As for other factors which may affect students' IS scores, it was seen that the academic departments students are enrolled in, gender, number of foreign languages known, and previous international experience do not have an effect on students' total IS scores; however, they affect some of the sub-categories of IS. Another finding was that the participants think both NESTs and NNESTs do not leave enough time for teaching culture; however, according to the participants, NESTs are more effective than NNESTs in affecting students' feelings and opinions towards other cultures, while NNESTs are more effective on students' feelings and opinions about their own culture.

### **Conclusion**

In this chapter, the data obtained from a demographic information questionnaire, IS questionnaire, and role of teachers questionnaire, which were applied to 435 students from six different universities in Turkey, were analyzed and

presented. In the first part, the current IS mean scores and sub-categorical mean scores of 435 Turkish EFL students were presented, classified, and compared according to whether they were being educated by NESTs or NNESTs, academic department enrolled in, gender, previous international experience, nationality, number of foreign languages known, and type of highschool students graduated from. In the second part, NESTs' and NNESTs' students' ideas were investigated and compared in terms of the teacher's role in promoting IS and teaching culture. In the third part, various factors which students feel have an effect on their opinions about foreign cultures were presented.

In the next chapter, an overview of the study, the discussion of findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, suggestions for further research, and conclusion will be presented.

## CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

### Introduction

This study attempted to analyze whether EFL learners' Intercultural Sensitivity (IS) scores show any difference according to their being educated by NESTs or NNESTs, their gender, education (academic department enrolled in, type of high schools graduated from), international experience, nationality, and the number of foreign languages they know. Additionally, students' ideas about the place of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of promoting IS and teaching target culture were also investigated. In this respect, the study addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the current IS level of Turkish EFL students?
  - 1.1. Is there a difference between the IS scores of students who have been educated by NESTs and those who have not?
  - 1.2. Do the IS levels of students differ according to
    - a. academic department enrolled in?
    - b. gender?
    - c. previous international experience?
    - d. nationality?
    - e. number of foreign languages known?
    - f. type of high school graduated from?
2. What are students' ideas about the role of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of promoting IS and teaching about the target culture?
  - 2.1. Do students' ideas differ according to whether they have been educated by NESTs or NNESTs?

3. Which factors do students feel have the greatest effect on their opinions about foreign cultures?

The sample of this study comprised 435 students in six universities from three different regions of Turkey, 239 being educated by both NESTs and NNESTs, and 196 being educated only by NNESTs. Participant universities were as follows: Osmangazi University (Eskisehir), Gazi University (Ankara), Konya Karatay University (Konya), Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University (Canakkale), Inonu University (Malatya), and Fatih University (Istanbul). A questionnaire composed of three parts: demographic information about the participants; an intercultural sensitivity scale; and the role of teachers (see Appendices A and B for Turkish and English versions of the questionnaire) was used to collect data. The questionnaire was employed in line with the research questions above. The data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively by using descriptive statistics, independent- samples t tests, and a one way ANOVA. For the one open-ended question, the data were grouped according to the common themes, and analyzed accordingly.

In this chapter, the research findings will be discussed and evaluated in light of the research questions and the relevant literature. Within the scope of the chapter, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research will also be presented.

## **Findings and Discussion**

### **The Difference between IS Scores according to being Educated by NESTs and NNESTs**

The second section of the questionnaire, the IS Scale, aimed to investigate the participants' current IS scores and their scores in the sub-categories of IS, which

were Interaction Engagement, Respect for Cultural Differences, Interaction Enjoyment, Interaction Confidence, and Interaction Attentiveness. Even if the results were interpreted according to these sub-categories, it should be noted that due to the lack of detailed descriptions of these sub-categories, interpretation of differences based on the sub-categories was challenging to make.

The scores of the students were first grouped according to students' being educated by NESTs or NNESTs, then, the scores of these two groups were compared. There was a very small difference between the total IS scores of students educated by NESTs and those educated by NNESTs. Contrary to what might be expected however, NNESTs' students' scores were a little higher than NESTs' students' scores. In the literature on NESTs, some scholars such as Byram, Gribkova and Starkey (2002) state that with respect to teaching culture, there is in fact no difference between NESTs and NNESTs. According to them, rather than being a NEST or a NNEST, the ability of helping students see the relationship between their own culture and other cultures is what makes a teacher effective in promoting intercultural sensitivity. Other scholars such as Medgyes (1999) and Celik (2006) take an even stronger position, stating that even if NESTs have the superiority of having direct knowledge of at least one form of English speaking culture, NNESTs are better intercultural interpreters as they are themselves bicultural. Some studies, however, revealed that NNESTs do not feel comfortable with teaching communication skills (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999), and thus a native speaker might be more helpful to students when teaching the communicative, cultural and affective side of interaction, especially when the language is used in natural contexts (Holtzer, 2003). The findings of the present study, in terms of students' total IS scores, seem to be in line with studies such as Byram, Gribkova and Starkey's study

(2002) which shows no apparent effect of NESTs over NNESTs in promoting intercultural sensitivity.

As for the sub-categories of IS, it was seen that only in Interaction Engagement and Respect for Cultural Differences was there a statistically significant difference between NESTs' and NNESTs' students. NESTs' students scored higher in Interaction Engagement, while NNESTs' students scored higher in Respect for Cultural Differences. The reason why NESTs' students scored higher in Interaction Engagement, which means that NESTs' students feel more positive towards communication with people from different cultures, could be explained by the general psychology of intercultural communication. Even if individual differences play an important role in communication, people whose worldviews are constantly being updated by the new and exciting cultural differences with which they engage in their everyday lives tend to enjoy intercultural communication more (Matsumoto et al., 2005). In our case, as NESTs are from different cultures, this could have interested students and raised their curiosity about the foreign cultures NESTs belong to, and this may have made the students more motivated to communicate. However, it was interesting to find that NESTs' students scored lower on the Respect for Cultural Differences items, which is about how participants orient to or tolerate their counterparts' culture and opinion. This finding was unexpected since communication experiences with foreigners, who are NESTs in this case, is thought to promote one's tolerance towards foreign cultures and opinions (Penbek et al., 2009). One possible explanation could simply be the individual differences of NESTs. Since each student from the NESTs' group is educated by only one NEST, the cultural values and beliefs of only one person could be misleading for the students to have a general idea and manner about that culture.



To sum up, there were no significant findings in terms of total IS scores, but a slightly higher effect was found for the students of NNESTs. In the sub-category of Interaction Engagement, NESTs were found to have a significantly higher effect on students, which, as stated above, could be explained by the psychology of intercultural communication. Another significant finding was in the sub-category of Respect for Cultural Differences; NNESTs' students scored higher than NESTs' students, which could be explained by personal differences of NESTs. These results confirm the literature that being a NEST or a NNEST is not a very significant element in promoting students' IS levels. (e.g., Byram, Gribkova and Starkey, 2002).

### **Various Factors and Students' IS Levels**

**Gender.** According to the findings, the participants' total IS scores did not show any variance according to their gender. However, in the sub-categories of Interaction Confidence and Interaction Attentiveness, there was a statistically significant difference between these two groups. Male participants scored higher in Interaction Confidence while female participants scored higher in Interaction Attentiveness. These results are consistent with the literature which shows that boys' language is more competitive and control-oriented than girls' language while girls' language is more cooperative and close, and that in societies where males are socially more powerful, male norms are dominant in interaction, and thus, females, who are less powerful, are linguistically more polite than males (Xuemei, Jinling & Binhong, 2007). In Turkey, as men are mostly considered to have more social power than women, this could be the reason males scored higher in Interaction Confidence, which is about how confident participants are in intercultural settings, and why females scored higher in Interaction Attentiveness, which is about participants' effort to understand what is going on in intercultural interaction. According to the now well

accepted ideas on gender and communication, which is the dynamic approach, gender identity is created by society and is ever changing (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Rather than a simple opposition between genders, this approach focuses on the masculinity and femininity of speeches, which are affected by the society (West & Zimmerman, 1987). According to the dynamic approach, one of the features of masculine speech is independence and confidence, which is supported by this study as well. As for the features of feminine speech, seeking consensus and harmony, politeness, and being emotional are suggested. This view is also supported by this study since female students scored higher in Interaction Attentiveness, which is about observing before interaction, seeking harmony and being sensitive in interaction. Academic research on the differences between men and women in communication also supports the idea that men use language to obtain power and dominance, which is an indication of self-confidence, (Leaper, 1991; Maltz & Borker, 1982; Wood, 1996; Mason, 1994) while women use communication for creating and fostering an intimate bond with the other party (Gray, 1992; Tannen, 1990). In this study, as well, male students were found to be more confident in interaction while female students tended to be more sensitive and seek for harmony in interaction.

**Number of foreign languages known.** Regarding the relationship between participants' total IS scores and the number of foreign languages they know, it was found that there was no significant relationship between these variables. It was an unexpected result since Byram (1989) states that when learners learn a new language, they learn a new culture as well, and learning about a culture means learning about communication (Hall, 1977). The result could be because of the fact that the number of participants from each group was not equal; 351 students knew one foreign

language, 69 students knew two foreign languages, and 15 students knew three or more foreign languages. The only significant relationship was in the sub-category of Interaction Confidence. It was seen that students' interaction confidence scores got higher in line with the number of foreign languages they know, which could mean that learning a language makes one more confident in interaction. According to Byram (1989), as learners learn about language, they learn about culture and as they learn to use a new language they learn to communicate with other individuals from a new culture. Therefore, it is possible that the individuals who know more foreign languages communicate with more people from different cultures, and thus may feel more confident in interaction, and score higher in Interaction Confidence.

**Previous international experience.** In this study, previous international experience refers to participants' communication experiences with foreign people in three different contexts: in students' own countries, in foreign countries, and through the internet. According to the findings, of the 435 participants, 228 reported having had communication experiences with foreign people in Turkey; 58 having had overseas experience, and 304 participants having had communication experiences with foreigners through the internet. The findings will be interpreted according to these three sub-groups of participants.

In total IS score, the participants with previous international experience from each sub-group scored higher than the ones without any international experience, but the difference was not statistically significant. The relation's being somewhat weak may suggest that previous international experience is not the only variable involved in intercultural sensitivity, and there can be other variables interfering with the development of intercultural sensitivity. Even if the findings were not significant for total IS scores, in some sub-categories of IS, there were statistically significant

differences between student scores. In the sub-category of Interaction Engagement, for example, students with communication experiences with foreigners in Turkey scored higher than the ones with no communication experiences with foreigners in Turkey, which suggests that the ones with the experience feel more positive towards foreigners, and are less likely to jump to conclusions before listening to their counterparts. In a similar study carried out by Xinmin Hou (2010), the IS level of Chinese learners who had many chances to meet and communicate with people from different cultures were investigated, and it was found that the participants had high scores in Interaction Engagement. According to the writer, in addition to learning about other cultures by communicating with people from different cultures, Chinese learners learn about other cultures from books or other media. When communicating with foreigners, Chinese learners tend to wait in order to compare the cultural knowledge and stereotypes they have gained from books or other media with the real intercultural communication situation in which they interact with foreigners. Hou (2010) gives this attitude as the reason for students' high scores in Interaction Engagement, which would help them develop their general intercultural communication competence. The same attitude could be considered as the reason for Turkish learners' scoring high in Interaction Engagement, since before meeting with foreigners, Turkish learners also learn about other cultures from their families, books, TV, or other media. So, it is possible that they also tend to wait and listen to their counterparts before jumping to conclusions about them, and this attitude makes them feel positive and open-minded towards foreigners when communicating with them.

There were statistically significant differences between participants' scores in the sub-category of Respect for Cultural Differences as well. It was found that all

participants with previous international experience, either face to face in Turkey or abroad, or via the internet, had lower Respect for Cultural Differences scores than the participants without any kind of international experience. When the score difference between the participants was investigated, only the sub-group of participants who met physically with foreigners in Turkey were found to have significantly lower scores than the ones who had never met with foreigners in Turkey. This could have been caused by the limited number of foreigners students met in Turkey since Respect for Cultural Differences, which is the ability to tolerate different behaviours of people from other cultures, is expected to increase in line with the foreigners one meets (Penbek et al., 2009). It is possible that the limited number of foreigners students met in Turkey affected their ideas about all foreigners, and caused the students to have a general view of all foreigners, which seems to be a negative impression in this case. However, the sub-group of participants with overseas experience may have had the chance to meet more people from different cultures, which may have caused these students' Respect for Cultural Differences scores to be not significantly lower than the ones without any overseas experience. Another possible reason is that meeting with foreigners on your hometown might make one less tolerant of their differences. There is an underlying expectation that if someone travels to a foreign country, they should respect that place's expectations and customs. If we see differences in behaviors of foreigners in our homeland, we may find it more offensive than if we see those differences in their homeland, or if we simply don't see them at all, on the internet, or if we've never had any contact. When we come to the low score of the sub-group of participants with overseas experience-physically abroad, it could be caused by the limited time the participants spent abroad. Of these 58 students with overseas experience, 45 spent less than six months

abroad, which could be regarded as insufficient time for a person to learn the cultural dos and don'ts, which would help to generate respect and understanding between cultures.

In the sub-category of Interaction Enjoyment, all the participants who had not had any international communication experience scored higher than the participants with international experience, either via face to face communication in Turkey or abroad, or communication through the internet. The score difference was statistically significant in each group of the participants. This finding could be explained by the psychology that people may enjoy more the unfamiliar about which they do not have much knowledge, and thus wonder about it. In a similar study, Shaftel et al. (2007) compared two groups, one spending a four-week summer session abroad and the other spending a fourteen-week semester term. They investigated the impact of overseas experience on several dimensions of intercultural competence, including open-mindedness and emotional resilience, and found that even though the students spending one semester abroad were satisfied with the program, their enjoyment for communicating with people of different cultures dropped significantly. As for the group spending the summer abroad, their scores of enjoyment for international experiences were higher. However, all the students' intercultural adaptability and toleration of the unfamiliar improved. In the light of these findings, it could be said that up to a certain point, the enjoyment for international communication may hold. Then, as people spend even more time with foreigners, other factors such as familiarity, comfort speaking the other language, and common bonds, change and with that, the enjoyment level may start to increase.

The findings for Interaction Confidence are in line with the literature. Participants from each international experience group, those who communicated with

foreigners in Turkey, through the internet, and those with overseas experience, scored higher than the participants with no international experience. The results were statistically significant in each case. Dwyer and Peters (2004), and Shaftel et al. (2007) also found that people with international experience become more self-confident as they learn how to deal with ambiguous or stressful situations and unfamiliar environments, and they develop more confidence in the use of their second language (Noels, Pon & Clement, 1996).

As for Interaction Attentiveness, which is also called Interaction Involvement by Cegala (1981), and which is concerned with participants' effort to understand what is going on in intercultural interaction- in other words, the individuals' being aware of their own thoughts and feelings about messages from others, and responding to those messages in an effective, appropriate manner (Cegala, 1981)- even though the participants with international experience scored higher, the difference between them and those with no international experience was not statistically significant. This finding could be caused by the inadequate length of time students spent with people from different cultures. According to Ward (2001), one of the important elements in students' involvement in interaction with foreigners is the frequency of their involvement. The more time students spend with foreigners, the more willing they feel in Interaction Involvement.

### **Students' Ideas About the Role of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of Promoting IS and Teaching Target Culture**

When NESTs' and NNESTs' students' responses about their teachers' roles in promoting IS and teaching the target culture were investigated and compared, it was seen that students think NNESTs have a greater impact on their feelings for their own culture, while NESTs were found to have more impact on students' feelings for

other cultures. Although there was not a statistically significant difference between total IS scores of the students educated by NESTs and those educated by NNESTs, it was interesting to find that students feel NNESTs have more effect on their feelings for their own culture, while NESTs have more effect on students' feelings towards other cultures. This finding could be caused by the idea that communication between a language learner and a native speaker has positive impacts on the communicative, cultural and affective side of the interaction (Holtzer, 2003), which means that each group of teachers is thought to be better in impacting students' opinions about the native culture the teachers belong to. Mattos (1997) also states that native teachers have an advantage over non-native teachers in terms of cultural aspects of language teaching. Mahboob (2004), Moussu and Braine (2006), and Shen and Wu (2007) studied students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs, and found that the majority of the positive comments about NESTs were related to oral skills, vocabulary and culture. NNESTs, however, received negative comments about oral skills and culture. In our study as well, even if there was not a statistically significant difference between IS scores of students educated by NESTs and those educated by NNEST, students think NESTs are better teachers in terms of teaching target culture and affecting students' feelings towards other cultures. This could be caused by the idea that language is closely intertwined with culture (Moussu & Braine, 2006), and NESTs' familiarity with English or American culture could be thought as a distinct advantage by the students. The difference between students' reported impressions and the actual findings of this study is a powerful reminder to be conscious of methodology when interpreting findings. If a study is based on reported feelings, it is still meaningful, but in a very different way than a study based on an empirical testing of something.



As for the time allocated to teaching culture, NESTs and NNESTs got the same mean scores, which was 2.6 out of 5. This result shows that students think both NESTs and NNESTs leave more or less enough time for teaching culture. This assessment of students raises some doubts about whether adequate time is actually being spent on the teaching of culture. Even if this current study does not include any research on the real time teachers spend teaching culture, many studies demonstrated that teaching of culture in language classes is usually limited to the cultural contexts provided in coursebooks and is not adequate. (Atay, 2005; Atay et al., 2009; Ortactepe, in press). Many teachers include culture in the language teaching process only insofar as the coursebooks allow them to do so. This general lack of time spent on culture may be such a part of the educational culture that it extends beyond the teachers' own nativeness or non-nativeness, and might even go part way in explaining some of the findings, such as the total IS scores of NESTs' and NNESTs' students being not significantly different from each other.

When the participants were asked about cultural/intercultural activities that should be included in or out of class, nearly all the participants preferred out of class activities, which could be an indication of the idea that people feel more relaxed in communication when they are outside of the class, in a real-life environment. The plurality of the respondents preferred trips to foreign countries or exchange programs as intercultural activities.

### **Various Factors that Effect Students' Opinions about Foreign Cultures**

When the participants were asked to rank some other factors affecting their opinions about foreign cultures, the most popular answers were family, NNESTs, and TV. The reason for this finding could be their availability: that is, students are more familiar with their families, NNESTs, and TV, and they probably spend more

time with them, which in turn makes the students affected by them more. This finding may also imply that the factors which include aspects of the students' native culture alongside a foreign culture are regarded as more effective by the students. When students learn about a foreign culture from their families, NNESTs, or TV, the native culture of the students is also included in the learning process since the sources they are learning from, family, NNESTs, and TV, are native themselves.

### **Pedagogical Implications**

In this current study, it was seen that the NEST and NNEST distinction is not the key factor in promoting students' IS levels. Being a NNEST does not mean one cannot be an effective guide to IS while being a NEST does not guarantee one's effectiveness. However, this does not necessarily mean that hiring NESTs for promoting students' IS level is completely unnecessary. Even if there was not a significant difference between the IS scores of NESTs' and NNESTs' students, NESTs were found to be more helpful in the affective side of interaction and students think NESTs have more effect on their feelings towards other cultures. So, hiring NESTs to promote both communication skills and IS skills seems logical. However, it should be understood that hiring NESTs is not the solution itself. The literature has suggested that the key may actually be simply being conscious of the relationship between cultures. In order to guide teachers to see that relationship, appropriate training should be provided to both NESTs and NNESTs. Turkish universities, the institutions which most frequently hire NESTs in Turkey, and other institutions hiring NESTs, should provide training for in-coming NESTs to make them familiar with the student profile, the culture of the region and the country before hiring. The institutions should also be selective when hiring in terms of teachers' communication skills, since these were found to be important in promoting students' intercultural

sensitivity. As for the NNESTs, they should be educated about the target culture and other cultures in their pre-service or in-service teacher training programs. For this aim, the teachers could be sent abroad for a semester or more in order to see the difference between their culture and other cultures; if the hiring institutions have NESTs, NNESTs could be encouraged to cooperate with them, and the institutions could organize social activities in which NESTs and NNESTs participate.

Though not clearly found, the study raised doubts about the time NESTs and NNESTs allocate for teaching culture. In order to guarantee that enough attention is paid to culture, institutions can provide teachers with materials which include cultural activities, or can encourage NESTs and NNESTs to work together and prepare cultural materials for their students. Since students stated that they want intercultural activities to be done outside of the class mostly, activities such as cultural festivals, or culture days of different countries could be organized by the teachers, and each student could be asked to have a responsibility in the organization. In order to help teachers include culture in their teaching as much as possible, institutions could choose coursebooks which include different cultural contexts of other cultures and which enable the teachers to use cultural activities as much as possible.

It was seen that the participants who knew two foreign languages were more confident than those who knew one foreign language, and those knowing three or more foreign languages were more confident than those who knew two foreign languages. As students' interaction confidence levels get higher in line with the number of foreign languages they know, they should be encouraged to learn more than one foreign language. In order to do this, elective language courses could be provided in schools, and activities which raise students' curiosity about other foreign

languages could be organized by the institutions. Training could be provided to students to help them understand the value of language learning beyond just passing the preparatory class. In order to raise students' awareness of the broader benefits of language learning, preparatory classes could cooperate with the Career Development Centers of the universities and organize activities such as conferences or seminars.

Another finding of the study is related to gender and IS. While male students scored higher in Interaction Confidence--how confident participants feel in intercultural settings--female students scored higher in Interaction Attentiveness, participants' effort to understand what is going on in intercultural interaction. Teachers could make use of this finding by giving suitable roles to male and female students in role-play or drama activities, and thus help them feel more comfortable during their performances. Another implication of this finding is that since female students are found to be less confident, activities in which female students are more active could be chosen.

According to the findings, participants who have previous international experience are more confident than those who have no international experience. As being a confident person is important, especially when students are seeking employment, institutions should work more to promote the awareness of students and teachers about the possibilities for foreign experience, such as programs like Erasmus, Comenius, and Sokrates or other student exchange programs provided by the country.

When the students were asked to rank other factors affecting their opinions about foreign cultures, it was seen that factors such as family, NNESTs, and TV, which could be regarded as the factors that students are most familiar with, got the highest mean scores. This finding suggests that students think the factors that belong

to their own culture have more effect on their ideas about foreign cultures, which implies that besides NESTs, foreign friends, and overseas experience, the factors that belong to students' own cultures should be carefully investigated for intercultural education.

### **Limitations**

There are several limitations to this study, which suggest that the results should be interpreted cautiously. The participants are grouped as preparatory class students educated by only NNESTs and those educated by both NESTs and NNESTs. In the second group of participants, only speaking and listening courses, four hours a week, are taught by NESTs and each class has only one native teacher. It is possible that the effect of NESTs in promoting students' IS levels would be better understood if the students had more classes with NESTs and were educated by more than one NEST.

Additionally, there is a huge difference between the number of participants who know one foreign language, two foreign languages, and three or more than three foreign languages: in the last category, there were only 15 participants. This imbalanced distribution of participants may have influenced the results regarding the relationship between the number of foreign languages known and IS, and thus could be misleading. A separate study with a balanced distribution of participants from each group would be more helpful for understanding the relationship better.

Another limitation of the study is related to the academic departments students are enrolled in and their IS scores. Since all the participants were preparatory class students, that is, they have not yet actually begun studying in their departments, any findings suggesting differences according to academic discipline should be approached with caution.

### **Suggestions for Further Research**

Based on the findings and the limitations of this study, suggestions can be made for further research. Since the students' exposure time to NESTs is quite minimal in this study, the study can be replicated with one group having had more than just four hours a week with NESTs, and with more than one NEST teaching each class, compared with a group being educated by only NNESTs. Such a study would help us understand whether the frequency of exposure to NESTs makes a difference in students' IS levels. Additionally, being educated by more than one NEST would minimize the possible impact of students' feelings towards one person on the effect of NESTs on IS level of students in general.

Because of the lack of detailed information on the sub-categories of IS, it was difficult to make interpretation of the differences based on the sub-categories. Thus, there is a need for a future study which really pulls apart the differences among the sub-categories of IS. In addition to that, the possibility of other categories should also be considered for future research.

This study showed that students' IS levels increased in line with the number of foreign languages they know. However, this finding needs to be developed to see whether the score difference is really related to the number of foreign languages known or there are different reasons such as the nature of students' third or fourth languages, their proficiency level in each language, the frequency they use these languages in their daily lives etc. Therefore, a focused study on the relationship between languages learned and IS should be done for further research.

Because of students' comments regarding the amount of time teachers allocate for teaching culture, the study raised doubts about the real time allocated for teaching culture in classes. Additionally, to the researcher's knowledge, there have

not been any studies on the time teachers leave for teaching culture in Turkish schools. Therefore, a separate study focusing on this topic should be carried out.

When investigating the relationship between students' previous international experiences and their IS levels, the participants were grouped according to the types of international experiences: communication experiences with foreigners in Turkey, overseas experience, and communication experiences with foreigners through the internet. However, there is still a need to understand these three categories better by pulling them apart, and investigating their relationship to IS levels. Therefore, a quantitative study supported by qualitative data which looks in detail at the three types of experiences and their effect on IS levels should be carried out.

Various factors such as international experience, gender, academic department, and nationality were investigated for their effects on students' IS levels. In addition to these factors, social class could also be investigated in future research since it is regarded as a cultural phenomenon by many scholars (Holden, 2010; Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2011).

It was seen in the findings that family was the most popular answer among the items which students think affect their ideas about foreign cultures. Thus, the impact of family on intercultural communication competence could be investigated. Such a study could be done with observations and interviews. After identifying the students who think their families are the most effective element on their ideas about foreign cultures, factors such as students' relationship with their families, to what extent and how foreign cultures are mentioned in the family, and whether they have foreign relatives or relatives living in foreign countries should be investigated and observed. In this way, the impact of family would be better understood.

### **Conclusion**

The study suggested that being educated by NESTs or NNESTs does not have a significant effect on total IS scores of the students. NESTs and NNESTs should be able to see the relationship between students' native culture and the foreign culture, and should make use of the similarities and differences in order to be more effective in promoting students' intercultural sensitivity levels. However, students believe that NESTs contribute positively to their feelings towards foreign cultures while NNESTs have more effect on students' feelings towards other cultures. For this reason, the practice of hiring NESTs should continue, at least for affective reasons. However, both NESTs and NNESTs should be able to see the relationship between students' native culture and the foreign culture, should co-operate, and should make use of the similarities and differences in order to be more effective in promoting students' intercultural sensitivity levels. It was also found that students enjoy extracurricular cultural activities more, so teachers should give importance to out-of-class activities in order to teach foreign cultures and promote students' IS levels. According to the findings, knowing a foreign language and having international experience contributes to one's self-confidence in interaction. Therefore, learning foreign languages should be encouraged and students should be provided with opportunities for international experience. Also, in interaction confidence males outperform females while in interaction attentiveness, females outperform. It was also found that family, TV and NNESTs are regarded as the most effective influences on students' opinions about other cultures. By revealing the importance of some other factors such as the internet, family, and TV that have an effect on students' Intercultural Sensitivity levels, the study also gives ideas to EFL teachers and teaching institutions about the activities that should be included in or out of class while teaching a foreign language.



The study contributes to the existing literature by having studied IS level differences between students taught exclusively by NNESTs and those who have had exposure to NESTs. With results both confirming and contradicting the previous research, this study has a unique place in the NESTs and NNESTs literature, looking at the variation of scores according to five sub-categories of Intercultural Sensitivity; Interaction Engagement, Respect for Cultural Differences, Interaction Confidence, Interaction Enjoyment and Interaction Attentiveness. The study also contributes to the intercultural communication literature by investigating various factors such as academic departments, gender, previous international experience, and the number of foreign languages known, which may have an effect on students' IS levels, and its sub-categorical levels.

## REFERENCES

- Adaskou, K., Britten, D. & B. Fahsi. (1990). Design decisions on the cultural content of a secondary English course for Morocco. *ELT Journal*, 44(1), 3-10
- Akinyemi, A. (2005). Integrating culture and second language teaching through Yorùbá personal names. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(i), 115-126.
- Al-Mutawa, N. & Kailani, T. (1989). *Methods of teaching English to Arab students*. Longman Group Ltd.
- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communication competence. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 56(1), 57-64.
- Alseweed, M. A. (2012). University students' perceptions of the influence of native and non-native Teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 5(12), 42–54.
- Arévalo-Guerrero, E. (2009). *Assessing the development of learners' intercultural sensitivity and intercultural communicative competence: The intercultural Spanish course* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3359071)
- Árva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, 28(3), 355–372.
- Atay, D. (2005). Cultural dimension of language teaching. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 5(3&4), 222-236.
- Atay, D., Kurt, G., Çamlıbel, Z., Ersin, P., & Kaslıoğlu, Ö. (2009). The role of intercultural competence in foreign language teaching. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty O Education*, 10(3), 123–135.
- Baker, W. (2011). Intercultural awareness: Modelling an understanding of cultures in intercultural communication through English as a lingua franca. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(3), 197-214.

- Baños, R. V. (2006). Intercultural sensitivity of teenagers : A Study of *Communication Studies*, 15(2), 16–22.
- Bazzanella C., & Baracco, A. (2003). Misunderstanding in IRC (Internet Relay Chat). In M. Bondi & S. Stati (Eds.). *Dialogue analysis* (pp. 119-131). Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Benedict, R. (2005). *Patterns of culture*. New York: Mariner Books.
- Bennett, M.J. (1993). ‘Toward ethno relativism: development model of intercultural sensitivity’. In R. Paige (Ed.) *Education form intercultural experience* (pp. 27-71) YarmouthMe: Intercultural Press.
- Bhawuk, D.P.S., & Brislin, R.W. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 413-436. doi:10.1016/0147-1767(92)90031-O.
- Binns, K. (2007, January 19). Austrians pay a premium for native English speakers, *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/expat/4201735/Austrians-pay-a-premium-for-native-English-speakers.html>
- Blommaert, J. (1998). Different approaches to intercultural communication: A critical survey. In *Lernen und Arbeiten in einer international vernetzten und multikulturellen Gesellschaft*. Expertentagung Universität Bremen, Institut für Projektmanagement und Wirtschaftsinformatik (IPMI). Retrieved from <http://www.cie.ugent.be/CIE/blommaert1.htm>
- Breidbach, S. (2003). European communicative integration: the function of foreign language teaching for the development of a European public sphere. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Context and culture in Language teaching* (pp. 81-91). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Broady, E. (2004). Sameness and difference: The challenge of culture in language teaching. *Language Learning Journal*, 29, 68-72.
- Byram, K., & Kramsch, C. (2008). Why is it so difficult to teach language as culture? [Article]. *German Quarterly*, 81(1), 20-34.
- Byram, M. (1989). *Cultural studies in foreign language education*. Great Britain: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Byram, M. (2000). Assessing intercultural competence in language teaching. *Sprogforum* 6, no. 18: 8–13. Retrived from <http://inet.dpb.dpu.dk/infodok/sprogforum/Eudgiv.html>
- Byram, M. & Grundy, P. (2003). Introduction: Context and culture in language teaching and learning. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Context and culture in language teaching* (pp. 1-3). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. and Fleming, M., (1998). Approaches through ethnography: Learner perspectives. In M. Byram & M. Fleming (Eds). *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp. 11-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byram, M. and Zarate, G., (1997). Definitions, objectives and assessment of sociocultural competence. In M. Byram G. Zarate, & G. Neuner (Eds). *Sociocultural competence in language learning and teaching* (pp. 7-43). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Byram, M., & Risager, K. (1999). *Language teachers, politics and cultures*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M., Gribkova, B., & Starkey, H. (2002). *Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching: A practical introduction for teachers*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

- Byram, M., & Zarate., G. (1997). *The sociocultural and intercultural dimension of language learning and teaching*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Çalışkan, G. (2009). *Creating cultural awareness in language classrooms* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Revisiting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C., Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-27). London: Longman.
- Carmichael, S. (2002). An expose of what is an EFL teacher. *Asian EFL Journal*, 4(1), 212.
- Castro, P., Sercu, L., & Garcí'a, M. (2004). Integrating language-and-culture teaching: an investigation of Spanish teachers' perceptions of the objectives of foreign language education. *Intercultural Education*, 15(1), 91-104.
- Cegala, D.J. (1981). Interaction involvement: A cognitive dimension of communication competence. *Communication Education*, (30), 109-121.
- Çelik, S. (2006). A concise examination of the artificial battle between native and non-native speaker teachers. *Education Journal*, (2), 371-376.
- Cesevičiūtė, I., & Minkutė-Henrickson, R. (2002). Developing student's intercultural communicative competence: Towards effective university learning environments. *Socialiniai mokslai*, 4 (36), 48-56.
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1997). A review of the concept of intercultural sensitivity. *Human Communication*, 1(1), 1-16.
- Chen, G.M. & Starosta, W. J. (2000) The development and validation of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale. *Human Communication*, 3(1), 2-14.

- Chen, G.M., & Starosta, W.J. (1998). *Foundations of intercultural communication*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cheung, Y. L. (2002). *The attitude of university students in Hong Kong towards native and nonnative teachers of English* (Unpublished master's thesis). The Chinese University of Hong Kong. Hong Kong.
- Christa Lee, Olson, and Kroeger Kent R. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 5 (2), 116-137. Retrieved from <http://jsi.sagepub.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048>
- Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Cook, V. (2002). Language teaching methodology and the L2 user perspective. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Portraits of the L2 user* (pp. 327-343). Great Britain: Multilingual Matters.
- Council of Europe (1998). *Recommendation 98 (6) of the Committee of Ministers on Linguistic Diversity*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Cüce, M. (2010). YÖK'ten haberler ve projeler. *Bilisim Dergi*, 21. Retrieved from <http://www.bilisimdergi.com/YoKten-Haberler-ve-Projeler-21-4.html>
- Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dwyer, M., & Peters, C. (2004). The benefits of study abroad. *Transitions Abroad*, 27(5), 56-57.
- Fantini, A. E. (2005). *About intercultural communicative competence: A construct*. USA: School for International Training.
- Feng, R.-m. (2009). Fulbright foreign language teaching assistants acting as cultural ambassadors on the campus. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 6(3), 31-35.

- Flanagin, A., & O'Sullivan, P.B. (2003). Reconceptualizing 'flaming' and other problematic messages. *New Media & Society*, 5, 69-194.
- Frey, L.W., Botan, C.H., Friedman, P.G., & Kreps, G.L. (1991). *Investigating communication: An introduction to research methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: PrenticeHall.
- Fulbright English Teaching Assistantship (ETA) Program*, (2010). Retrieved from <http://fulbright.state.gov/uploads/4c/0a/4c0ac0cbd6cd72c20372d1b28d9b9805/Fulbright-ETA-Program.pdf>
- Fulbright İşbirliği*, (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.yok.gov.tr/content/view/907>
- Fulbright U.S. Student Program*, (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://us.fulbrightonline.org/countries/selectedcountry/turkey>
- Furnham, A. (1994). Communicating in foreign lands: the cause, consequences and cures of culture shock. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Culture and language learning in education* (pp. 91-106). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Gerritsen, M., & Verckens, J. P. (2006). Raising students' intercultural awareness and preparing them for intercultural business (communication) by e-mail. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 69 (1), 50-59.
- Gray, J. (1992). *Men are from Mars and women are from Venus: A practical guide for improving communication and getting what you want in your relationship*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Hall, E. (1959). *The silent language*. New York: Anchor Books/Doubleday.
- Hall, E. T. (1977). *Beyond culture*. New York: Anchor Doubleday.
- Hammer, M., Bennett, M., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 421-443.

- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Herring, S. (1996). Posting in a different voice: Gender and ethics in computer-mediated communication. In C. Ess (Ed.), *Philosophical perspectives on computer-mediated communication* (pp. 115-145). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Holden, J. (2010). *Culture and class*. UK: Countrepoint.
- Holme, R. (2003). Carrying a baby in the back: Teaching with an awareness of the cultural construction of language. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Context and culture in language teaching* (pp. 18-31). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Holtzer, G. (2003). Learning culture by communicating: native – non-native speaker telephone interactions. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Context and culture in language teaching* (pp. 43-50). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-93). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Jeon, I. (2010). Exploring the co-teaching practice of native and non-native English teachers in Korea. *English Teaching*, 65 (3), 43–68.
- Keating, C. F. (1994). World without words: Message from face and body. In W. J. Lonner & R. S. Malpass (Eds.), *Psychology and culture*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kim, Y.Y. (2001). *Becoming intercultural: An integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Köksal, K. (2006). *An investigation into students' perceptions of native English speaking teachers' and non-native English speaking teachers' performance and competencies in teaching English as a foreign language* (Unpublished master's thesis). Canakkale Onsekiz Mart Universitesi. Canakkale.



- Kramsch, C. (1998). The privilege of the intercultural speaker. In M. Byram & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp. 16-31). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kraus, M.W., Piff, P.K., & Keltner, D. (2011). Social class as culture: The convergence of resources and rank in the social realm. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20 (4), 246-250.
- Kryk, B. (2012). *Intercultural miscommunication past and present*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's. *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 2973, 292-305.
- Laopongharn, W., & Sercombe, P. (2009). What relevance does intercultural communication have to language education in Thailand? *ARECLS*, 6, 59-83.
- Leaper, C. (1991). Influence and involvement in children's discourse: Age, gender, and partner effects. *Child Development*, 62, 797-811.
- Lee, I. (2000). Can a nonnative English speaker be a good English teacher? *TESOL Matters*, 10 (1). 19.
- Liang, K. (2002). *English as a second language (ESL) students' attitudes towards nonnative English-speaking teachers' accentedness* (Unpublished master's theses). California State University, Los Angeles. In L. Moussu (2006) *Native and nonnative English-speaking english as a second language teachers: Student attitudes, teacher self-perceptions, and intensive English administrator beliefs and practices*. West Lafayette, IN: Dissertation.

- Mahboob, A. (2004). Native or nonnative: What do students enrolled in an intensive English program think? In moussu, I. (2006) *Native and nonnative English-speaking English as a second language teachers: Student attitudes, teacher self-perceptions, and intensive English administrator beliefs and practices*. West Lafayette, IN: Dissertation.
- Makarova, V., & Ryan, S. M. (1997). The language teacher through the students' looking glass and what you find there. *Speech Communication Education, 10*, 127-154.
- Malmberg, R. (2003). *Cultural diversity*. Helsinki: AFS Intercultural Programs.
- Maltz, D. and Borker, R. (1982). 'A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication'. In J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (pp. 196-216). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Marcoccia, M. (2012). The internet, intercultural communication and cultural variation. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 12*(4), 353–368.
- Mason, E. S. (1994). Gender differences in job satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 135*, 143-151.
- Matsumoto, D., Seung, H. Y., Satoko, H., & Galina, P. (2005). Validation of an individual-level measure of display rules: The display rule assessment inventory (DRAI). *Emotion, 5*, 23–40.
- Mattos, A.M. (1997). Native and non-native teacher: A matter to think over. *Forum, 35*(1), 38-39.
- McKay, S. L. (2004). Western culture and the teaching of English as an international language. *English Teaching Forum, 42*(2), 10-14.
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teachers*, London: Macmillian Publishers.

- Medgyes, P. (1996). Native or non-native: who's worth more? In T. Hedge & N. Whitney (Eds.), *Power, pedagogy & practice* (pp. 31-42). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Medgyes, P. (1999). Language training: A neglected area in teacher education. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 177-196). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mok, W. (1994). Reflecting on reflections: A case study of experienced and inexperienced ESL teachers. *System*, 22 (1). 93-111.
- Moussu, L. and Braine, G. (2006). The attitudes of ESL students towards nonnative English language teachers. *TESOL Reporter*, 39 (1).33-47.
- Noels, K.A., Pon, G., & Clément, R. (1996). Language, identity and adjustment: The role of linguistic self-confidence in the acculturation process. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 15, 246-264.
- Ortactepe, D. (in press). EFL Teachers' identity (re)construction as teachers of intercultural competence: A language socialization approach. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*.
- Penbek, Ş., Yurdakul, D., & Cerit, A. G. (2009). Intercultural communication competence: A study about the intercultural sensitivity of university students based on their education and international experiences. *European and Mediterranean Conference on Information Systems 2009* (July 13-14, pp. 1-16).
- Phillipson, R. (1996). ELT: The native speaker's burden. In T. Hedge & N. Whitney (Eds.), *Power pedagogy and practice* (pp. 23-30). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Pica, T. & Long, M. H. (1986). The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In R. R. Day (Ed.) *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 85-98). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Porter, R. E., & Samovar, L. A. (1994). An Introduction to intercultural communication. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication* (pp. 4-26). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Reves, T. & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System*, 22 (3), 353-367.
- Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: From a national to a transnational paradigm*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ritchie, M. (2009). *Intercultural computer-mediated communication exchange and the development of sociolinguistic competence* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://dspace.library.uvic.ca:8080/bitstream/handle/1828/1368/Dissertation.MRitchie.Avril09.pdf?sequence=1>
- Roberts, C., Byram, M., Barro, A. & Street, B. (2001). Language learners as ethnographers. *Modern Languages in Practice*, M. Grenfell, (Ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Rubin, R.B., Rubin, A.M., & Piele, L.J. (1996). *Communication research: Strategies and sources*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Salzmann, Z. (2007). *Language, culture, and society: An introduction to linguistic anthropology*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Samimy, K. K. & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or non-native speaker: perceptions of "Non-Native" students in a graduate TESOL program. In G.

- Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 127-144). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Samovar, L.A., Porter, R.E., & McDaniel, E.R. (2010). *Communication between cultures*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Cengage Learning.
- Senyshyn, R. & Chamberlin-Quinlisk, C. (2009). Assessing effective partnerships in intercultural education: Transformative learning as a tool for evaluation. *Communication Teacher*, 23(4), 167-178.
- Shaftel, J., Shaftel, T., & Ahluwalia, R. (2007). International educational experience and intercultural competence. *International Journal of Business & Economics*, 6(1), 25-34.
- Shen, L., & Wu, H. (2007). On NESTs and Non-NESTs. *Chia-Nan Annual Bulletin*, 33, 371–382.
- Shibata, M. (2010). How Japanese teachers of English perceive non-native assistant English teachers. *System*, 38(1), 124-133.
- Shimizu, K. (1995). Japanese college student attitudes towards English teachers: A survey. *The Language Teacher*, 19(10), 5-11.
- Simons, G. (1998). Meeting the intercultural challenges of virtual work. *Language and Intercultural Learning*, 16(1), 13-15.
- Stepanovienė, A. (2011). Exchange students' experiences in intercultural communication. *Studies About Languages*, 18, 60-64.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in communication*. New York: William Morrow.
- Tsou, W. (2005). The effects of cultural instruction on foreign language learning. *RELC journal*, 36 (1), 39-57. Retrieved from <http://rel.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/36/1/39>

- Uçkun, B., & Buchanan, J. (2009). Investigation of cross-cultural communication between native English-speaking lecturers and their students in Turkish tertiary education. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(1), 101-129.
- Üstünlüoğlu, E. (2007). University students' perceptions of native and non-native teachers. *Teachers and Teaching*, 13(1), 63–79.
- Walther, J., & Burgoon, J. (1992). Relational communication in computer-mediated interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 19, 50-88.
- Ward, C. (2001). The A, B, Cs of acculturation. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), *The Handbook of Culture and Psychology* (pp. 411–445). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society* 1(2), 125-151.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1992). ELT and EL Teacher. *ELT Journal* 46(4), 333-339.
- Wong, C. (2009). Are native speakers “good” language instructors? A case study of untrained ESL tutors. *ARECLS*, 6(c), 122-140.
- Wood, J. T (1996). *Gendered lives: Communication, gender and culture*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Xin, H. (2007). Intercultural miscommunication: Causes and factors from ideological perspective. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 4(6), 54-57.
- Xinmin, H. (2010). An empirical study of Chinese Learners' intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3), 327-331.
- Xuemei, M., Jinling, L., & Binhong, W. (2007). The polite verbal behavior in cross-gender communication. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 16(2), 192–201.
- Retrieved from

[http://www.uri.edu/iaics/content/2007v16n2/15 Meng Xuemei, Jinling, Binhong.pdf](http://www.uri.edu/iaics/content/2007v16n2/15MengXuemeiJinlingBinhong.pdf)

*Yurtdisindan Ingilizce okutmanlar getirtildi*, (2010). Retrieved from

<http://www.ntvmsnbc.com/id/25131357>

Zacharias, N. T. (2011). An English teacher struggle to establish voice in the periphery. *K@ta*, 13(1), 64-77.

Zhao, C.M. (2002). *Intercultural competence: a quantitative study of significance of intercultural competence and the influence of college experiences on students' intercultural competence development* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg.

## APPENDICES

## Appendix 1: Kültürlerarası Hassasiyet Anketi (Türkçe)

## 1. BÖLÜM: KATILIMCILAR HAKKINDA

1. Üniversite:  
.....  
...
2. Fakülte/Bölüm:  
.....  
.....
3. Uyuşgunuz:  
 T.C.  Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz).....
4. Anadiliniz:  
.....  
.....
5. Konuştuğunuz diğer diller:  
.....  
.....
6. Cinsiyet:  
 Erkek  Kadın
7. Yaşınız: .....
8. Mezun Olduğunuz Lise :  
 Genel (Düz) Lise  
 Anadolu Lisesi  
 Meslek Lisesi  
 Anadolu Öğretmen Lisesi  
 Süper Lise  
 Fen Lisesi  
 Özel Lise  
 Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz).....  
.....

9. Kendi ülkenizde farklı kültürlerden insanlarla iletişime geçebileceğiniz etkinliklere katıldınız mı?  
 Evet  Hayır

Yukarıdaki soruya yanıtınız “Evet” ise, ne tür etkinliklere katıldığınızı lütfen belirtiniz.

- Turistik etkinlikler (otellerde, alışveriş merkezlerinde vs. rehber olarak çalışmak)
- Sosyal, sportif ya da akademik faaliyetler
- Kişisel ilişkiler
- Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) .....
10. Daha önce yurtdışında bulundunuz mu?  
 Evet  Hayır

Yukarıdaki soruya yanıtınız “Evet” ise yurtdışında bulunma sebebinizi ve ne kadar süre kaldığınızı belirtiniz.

11. İnternet yoluyla farklı kültürlerden insanlarla iletişime geçer misiniz?

Evet  Hayır

Yukarıdaki soruya yanıtınız “Evet” ise aşağıdakilerden hangisini/hangilerini kullandığınızı belirtiniz.



- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sohbet odaları  | (facebook/twitter                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Diğer (Lütfen |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Online oyunlar  | ...)                                      | belirtiniz)                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> E-posta         | <input type="checkbox"/> Bloglar          | .....                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sosyal paylaşım | <input type="checkbox"/> Forumlar         | ...                                    |
| siteleri                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Anlık mesajlaşma | .....                                  |
|  |   | ....                                   |

12. Yabancı bir öğretmenden dil eğitimi aldınız mı/alıyor musunuz?

- Evet       Hayır

Yukarıdaki soruya yanıtınız “Evet” ise ne kadar süreyle ve ne zaman aldığınızı belirtiniz.

.....  
 .....

## 2. BÖLÜM: KÜLTÜRLERARASI DUYARLILIK ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda kültürlerarası iletişimle ilgili bir dizi ifade bulunmaktadır. Doğru veya yanlış cevap yoktur. Lütfen hızlı bir şekilde okuyup, cümlelere katılıp katılmadığınızı veya ne ölçüde katıldığınızı belirten ilk izlenimlerinizi belirtiniz.

<p><b>Lütfen cevabınıza karşılık gelen numarayı cümlelerin önündeki boşluklara yazınız.</b></p>	<b>1 = kesinlikle hayır</b>
	<b>2 = hayır</b>
	<b>3 = kararsızım</b>
	<b>4 = evet</b>
	<b>5 = kesinlikle evet</b>

_____	a. Diğer kültürlerden olan insanlarla iletişim kurmaktan zevk alırım.
_____	b. Bence diğer kültürlerden olan insanlar dar görüşlüdür.
_____	c. Farklı kültürlerden insanlarla iletişim kurabilme konusunda kendime güvenirim.
_____	d. Farklı kültürlerden insanların önünde konuşmakta oldukça zorlanırım.
_____	e. Farklı kültürlerden insanlarla konuşurken ne söyleyeceğimi her zaman bilirim.
_____	f. Farklı kültürlerden insanlarla iletişim kurarken istediğim kadar sosyal olabilirim.
_____	g. Farklı kültürlerden insanlarla vakit geçirmeyi sevmem.
_____	h. Farklı kültürlerdeki insanların değerlerine saygı duyarım.
_____	i. Farklı kültürlerden insanlarla iletişim kurarken kendimi mutsuz hissederim.
_____	j. Farklı kültürlerden insanlarla iletişim kurarken kendime güvenirim.
_____	k. Kültürel anlamda farklı olan kişilerle ilgili bir izlenim edinmeden önce bekleme eğilimindeyimdir.
_____	l. Genelde farklı kültürlerden insanlarla iken cesaretim kırılır.
_____	m. Farklı kültürlerden insanlara karşı açık görüşlüyümdür.
_____	n. Farklı kültürlerden insanlarla iletişim kurarken onları çok gözlemlerim.
_____	o. Farklı kültürlerden insanlarla iletişim kurarken kendimi genelde faydasız hissederim.
_____	p. Farklı kültürlerden insanların davranış şekillerine saygı duyarım.
_____	r. Farklı kültürlerden insanlarla iletişim kurarken onların kültürleri hakkında elimden geldiğince çok bilgi edinmeye çalışırım.
_____	s. Farklı kültürlerden insanların fikirlerini kabul etmem.
_____	t. İletişim esnasında kültürel anlamda farklı olan kişilerin net olmayan ifadelerine karşı hassasım.
_____	u. Bence benim kültürüm diğer kültürlerden daha iyi.
_____	v. İletişim esnasında, kültür açısından farklı olan kişilere genelde olumlu yanıtlar veririm.
_____	y. Farklı kültürden kişilerle iletişim kurmamı gerektiren durumlardan kaçınırım.
_____	z. Kültürel anlamda farklı olan kişileri anlayıp anlamadığımı genellikle sözlü olarak veya vücut dili kullanarak gösteririm.
_____	aa. Kültürel anlamda farklı olan kişilerle aramdaki farklılıklar hoşuma gider.

### 3. BÖLÜM: ÖĞRETMENLERİN KÜLTÜRLERARASI DUYARLILIĞI ARTTIRMADAKİ ROLÜ

1. Sizce kendi kültürünüzle ilgili algınızda ve hislerinizde Türk İngilizce öğretmenlerinizin rolü ne kadar olmuştur?

Hiç Az Orta Fazla Çok fazla

2. Yabancı kültürlerle karşı hislerinizde Türk İngilizce öğretmenlerinizin etkisi ne kadar olmuştur?

Hiç Az Orta Fazla Çok fazla

3. Türk İngilizce öğretmenleriniz dersteki vaktin ne kadarını kültürel konulara ayırıyor?

Hiç Az Orta Fazla Çok fazla

4. Sizce Türk İngilizce öğretmenlerinizin kültürel konulara ayırdığı zaman yeterli mi?

Evet Biraz Kararsızım Hayır

**Yabancı öğretmenlerden dil eğitimi almış/alıyor iseniz 5-9 aralığındaki soruları yanıtlayınız.**

5. Sizce kendi kültürünüzle ilgili algınızda ve hislerinizde yabancı İngilizce öğretmenlerinizin rolü ne kadar olmuştur?

Hiç Az Orta Fazla Çok fazla

6. Diğer kültürlerle karşı hislerinizde yabancı İngilizce öğretmenlerinizin etkisi ne kadar olmuştur?

Hiç Az Orta Fazla Çok fazla

7. Yabancı İngilizce öğretmenleriniz dersteki vaktin ne kadarını kültürel konulara ayırıyor?

Hiç Az Orta Fazla Çok fazla

8. Sizce yabancı İngilizce öğretmenlerinizin kültürel konulara ayırdığı zaman yeterli mi?

Evet Biraz Kararsızım Hayır

9. Yabancı öğretmenlerden eğitim almış/alıyor olmanız yabancı kültürlerle karşı tutumunuzu olumlu yönde etkilemiş midir?

Evet Biraz Kararsızım Hayır

10. Derslerde veya ders dışında ne tür kültürel/kültürlerarası etkinliklere yer verilmesini istersiniz?

.....  
.....  
11. Aşağıda listelenmiş öğelerden hangisi/hangileri farklı kültürlerle ilgili algınızı etkiler? Lütfen öğeleri önem sırasına göre **1'den 8'e kadar sıralayarak** parantezleri doldurun.

**1= çok etkili, 2=etkili, 3= biraz etkili, ....., 8= en az etkili**

Filmler ( )                      Yabancı İngilizce öğretmenlerim ( )                      Türk İngilizce  
öğretmenlerim ( )                      Televizyon( )  
Ailem ( )                      Yabancı arkadaşlarım ( )                      İnternet ( )  
Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz ve önem sırasına göre numara veriniz) ( )  
.....

## Appendix 2: Intercultural Sensitivity Questionnaire (English)

## SECTION 1: ABOUT THE PARTICIPANTS

1. University:  
.....  
.....
2. Faculty/Department:  
.....  
.....
3. Nationality:  
 T.R.  Other .....
4. Native Language:  
.....  
.....
5. Foreign Languages:  
.....  
.....
6. Gender:  
 Male  Female
7. Age: .....
8. High school :  
 General High School  
 Anatolian High School  
 Vocational High School  
 Anatolian Teacher Training High School  
 Super High School  
 Science High School  
 Private High School  
 Other.....

9. Have you ever participated in activities in which you communicated with foreign people in your own country?  
 Yes  No

If your answer to the question above is “Yes”, please state what kind of activities you participated in.

- Touristic activities (e.g. working as a tourist guide at hotels or shopping centers etc.)
- Social, sportive or academic activities
- Personal relations
- Other .....

10. Have you ever been abroad?

Yes  No

If your answer is “Yes”, please state the reason and duration of your stay abroad.

.....  
.....

11. Have you ever communicated with foreign people through the internet?

Yes  No

If your answer is “Yes”, please choose the ones you used.

- Chat rooms  E-mail  Social Networking Sites
- Online games

- (facebook/twitter ...)
- Blogs
- Forums
- Instant Messaging
- Other .....
- .....

12. Have you ever been educated by a native English speaking teacher?

- Yes
- No

If your answer is “Yes”, please state how long and when a NEST educated you.

.....  
.....

## SECTION 2: INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY SCALE

Below are some statements about intercultural communication. There is no true or false answer. Please read the statements, and write to what extent you agree with the statements by writing numbers before each sentence.

**Please put the number corresponding to your answer in the blank before the statement.**

**1 = strongly disagree**

**2 = disagree**

**3 = uncertain**

**4 = agree**

**5 = strongly agree**

_____	a. I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.
_____	b. I think people from other cultures are narrow-minded.
_____	c. I am pretty sure of myself in interacting with people from different cultures.
_____	d. I find it very hard to talk in front of people from different cultures.
_____	e. I always know what to say when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____	f. I can be as sociable as I want to be when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____	g. I don't like to be with people from different cultures.
_____	h. I respect the values of people from different cultures.
_____	i. I get upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____	j. I feel confident when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____	k. I tend to wait before forming an impression of culturally-distinct counterparts.
_____	l. I often get discouraged when I am with people from different cultures.
_____	m. I am open-minded to people from different cultures.
_____	n. I am very observant when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____	o. I often feel useless when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____	p. I respect the ways people from different cultures behave.
_____	r. I try to obtain as much information as I can when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____	s. I would not accept the opinions of people from different cultures.
_____	t. I am sensitive to my culturally-distinct counterpart's unclear meanings during our interaction.
_____	u. I think my culture is better than other cultures.
_____	v. I often give positive responses to my culturally different counterpart during our interaction.
_____	y. I avoid those situations where I will have to deal with culturally-distinct persons.
_____	z. I often show my culturally-distinct counterpart my understanding through verbal or nonverbal cues.
_____	aa. I have a feeling of enjoyment towards differences between my culturally-distinct counterpart and me.

**SECTION 3: ROLE OF TEACHERS IN PROMOTING INTERCULTURAL  
SENSITIVITY**

1. How much do you think NNESTs affected your opinions and feelings about your own culture?

None      Little      Somewhat      A lot      Quite a lot

2. How much do you think NNESTs affected your opinions and feelings about other cultures?

None      Little      Somewhat      A lot      Quite a lot

3. How much time do NNESTs allocate for teaching culture in their classes?

None      Little      Somewhat      A lot      Quite a lot

4. Do you think the time NNESTs allocate for teaching culture is enough?

Yes                  Somewhat                  Not sure                  No

**If you have been/are being educated by NESTs, please answer the questions from 5 to 9.**

5. How much do you think NESTs affected your opinions and feelings about your own culture?

None      Little      Somewhat      A lot      Quite a lot

6. How much do you think NESTs affected your opinions and feelings about other cultures?

None      Little      Somewhat      A lot      Quite a lot

7. How much time do NESTs allocate for teaching culture in their classes?

None      Little      Somewhat      A lot      Quite a lot

8. Do you think the time NESTs allocate for teaching culture is enough?

Yes                  Somewhat                  Not sure                  No

9. Does having been/being educated by a NEST affect your attitudes towards other cultures positively?

Yes                  Somewhat                  Not sure                  No

10. What kinds of curricular or extracurricular cultural/intercultural activities do you want to be included in schools?

.....  
.....

11. From the items listed below, which one(s) affect your opinions about other cultures. Rank them in order of importance by giving numbers from 1 to 8.

**1= very effective, 2=effective, 3= somewhat effective, ....., 8= the least effective**



Movies ( )          NESTs ( )          NNESTs ( )          TV( )  
Family ( )          Foreign friends ( )          Internet ( )  
Other (Please state) ( ) .....