CALESS
International Journal of Current Approaches in Language, Education and Social Sciences
Uluslararası Dil, Eğitim ve Sosyal Bilimlerde Güncel Yaklaşımlar Dergisi
Международный журнал актуальных подходов в языке, образовании и общественных науках

A STUDY ON DEVELOPING INTERCULTURAL AWARENESS SCALE (ICAS) AND EXAMINING ELT STUDENTS' INTERCULTURAL AWARENESS

Fatma Özlem Saka[1] Burak Asma[2]

Keywords

Intercultural awareness
Culture
Scale development
ELT Students
Reliability

Article Info

Received: 01.06.2020

Accepted: 28.06.2020

Online Published: 01.07.2020

Abstract

This study aims to examine ELT students' intercultural awareness levels according to various variables. To attain this goal, a scale measuring intercultural awareness was developed in the first phase. The scale development process was carried out with data of 207 ELT students studying in a state university. After collecting the data, exploratory factor analysis was computed, and a 24-item scale was obtained as a result of the AFA. The developed scale was administered to a different group of students consisting of 182 students (Male=71, Female=111). The collected data were analysed considering the extraneous variables like gender, grade, presence abroad and the number of been abroad. Since the test of normality results pointed out the skew distribution among all the variables, comparisons were made through non-parametric analysis techniques. The results showed that the students' intercultural awareness did not significantly change according to their genders, grades, or the number of been abroad; however, their intercultural awareness significantly changed according to their presence abroad. According to the results, the students having been abroad had higher intercultural awareness compared to the ones who did not go abroad.

Cited as (APA): Saka, F.Ö., & Asma, B. (2020). A study on developing intercultural awareness scale (ICAS) and examining ELT students' intercultural awareness. *International Journal of Current Approaches in Language, Education and Social Sciences (CALESS)*, *2*(1), 445-461.

[1] Asst. Prof. Dr., Akdeniz University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Education, Antalya, Turkey, e-mail: ozlemsaka@akdeniz.edu.tr
[2] Res. Asst., Akdeniz University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Language Education, Antalya, Turkey, e-mail: burakasma@akdeniz.edu.tr

I. Introduction

Culture has an important place in foreign language teaching and learning since the earliest methods of this field. Sun (2013) states the relationship between culture and language as in the following: 'If there is no language, culture would not be known. If there is no culture, the language will be like water without a source or a tree without roots' (p.371). Kramsch (2003, p.3) says 'as words reflect attitudes, beliefs and points of view of the society, language expresses cultural reality'. In culture, products such as literature, music, art, folklore; beliefs, values, institutions and behaviours such as customs, habits, dress, foods and leisure that belong to that society take place (Tomalin & Stempleski, 1993). Cultural values are both reflected by and carried through language (Sun, 2013, p. 371). As culture manifests itself through language, mediated, interpreted and recorded (Kramsch, 1993, cited in Mountford & Wadham-Smith, 2000, p.82), while teaching a language, it should be kept in mind that language is used in a cultural context (Baker, 2012). Zhao (2011) finds a correlation between language and culture and states that language carries and reflects culture while culture greatly affects language. According to Mountford and Wadham- Smith (2000, p. 82) 'language education is as a process of acculturation'. Brown (1994, cited in Frank, 2013) thinks that acculturation has four stages starting with excitement for a new country, continuing with culture shock, recovery and ending with adaptation. During the foreign language learning period, learners do not lose their identity; on the contrary, learning culture of the target society develops them linguistically, cognitively and socially (Porto, 2000). Tolinson and Masuhama (2004, cited in Shemshadsara, 2012) believe that developing cultural awareness enables learners to broaden their minds, to increase tolerance, cultural empathy, and sensitivity.

In today's world, we live in a global environment, therefore intercultural contact has become a crucial factor (Zhao, 2011). As language learners meet people from other countries, cultural awareness comes into prominence (Zhu, 2011). Cultural awareness is a conscious understanding of the target culture's role in language learning and communication in both native and target languages (Baker, 2012). If a language learner is culturally empathic, he/ she becomes aware of the cultural values and beliefs of the people from the target culture without leaving his/her own culture (Zhu, 2011). According to Kramsch (1998, cited in Byram, 2000), the foreign language learner should be an intercultural speaker rather than being a poor imitation of the native speaker.

The CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) supports the idea that different languages and cultures should be protected and developed and barriers against the diversity should

be broken down through understanding and tolerance among the members of the European Union. With this objective, the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) expects language learners to develop intercultural awareness during their language learning process. Intercultural awareness is defined as knowledge, awareness and understanding the differences and similarities between the native culture and target culture (Council of Europe, 2001). Developing intercultural awareness and having intercultural empathy will minimize the psychological problems foreign language learners have when they face different cultures (Zhu, 2011). English language teaching classrooms are environments where teachers and language learners are busy with practising multilingual and multicultural issues, and this enables language learners to develop intercultural awareness (Baker, 2012).

Although intercultural awareness is an issue of great importance, there are only a few scales in the literature. The fact that the purposes of these scales are quite different requires an intercultural awareness scale to use in foreign language teaching. The scales that can be found in the literature are as follows:

The first example of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) was developed by Chen and Starosta (2000). After checking the related literature, they prepared 44 items and applied it. As a result of the analysis of the scale, they reached the final form with 24 items divided into five factors. This scale proved that it has strong reliability and appropriate concurrent validity.

In the second example, Fritz, Möllenberg and Chen (2002) tested Chen and Starosta's Intercultural Sensitivity Instrument by back-translating it into German and using it for students of business administration. They used confirmatory factor analysis and the result proved that the instrument worked in German context satisfactorily as well.

The third example is Cultural Awareness Scale (CAS) developed by Rew, Becker, Khosropour and Martinez (2003) to measure cultural awareness of nursing faculty and students. They developed their 37– item scale after completing a literature review on the issues such as cultural awareness, sensitivity and competence in nursing. The reliability coefficient of the scale is .91. Content validity of the items was checked by the experts in nursing and culture and content validity index was calculated .88 and one of the items was deleted from the scale. For construct validity, two applications (the one is for reliability, the one is for validity) were combined and Cronbach alpha for the combination was found .82. They concluded that CAS can be used for valid and reliable results for further studies.

In a similar study, Schim, Doorenbos, Miller, and Benkert (2003) designed a five-point Likert Cultural Competence Assessment Instrument to measure cultural competence levels between hospice nurses and workers. The researchers administered it to the health care team and analysed the collected data through a statistical programme. The EFA results revealed that it consisted of 25 items and 5 subscales, Cronbach's alpha overall was .92, and total variance explained was 46%. These results attested that the instrument is efficiently valid and reliable for future research.

Another scale developed in this field, the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES), belongs to Portalla and Chen (2010). Starting with 76 items related to the intercultural effectiveness, they concluded with 20 items and six factors. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of the scale is .85. The results of the application showed that the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale finds out people who have appropriate behaviours and adapt to different cultural situations.

Perng and Watson (2012) also developed a five-point Likert scale called "Nurse Cultural Competence Scale (NCCS)" to depict the picture of nurses' competences in their culture. They employed it to 172 on-the-job nursing students. The EFA analysis results showed that the scale had 20 items and four subscales as well as having well-constructed psychometric features such as reliability and validity.

İz and Temel (2017) used the Cultural Awareness Scale (CAS) developed by Rew et. al. (2003, cited in İz & Temel, 2017) for undergraduate nursing students in the Turkish context. They employed an independent back-translation technique. Their Turkish version has 36 items and five different subscales. It was a 7- point Likert scale ranging from 1 as strongly disagree to 7 as strongly agree. The internal consistency reliability of the total scale was found .91 for students and .82 for faculty members and this showed that it is highly reliable. The KMO value of the scale was .84. At the end of the research, they found out that the Turkish version of the Cultural Awareness Scale is a valid and reliable scale that can be used to achieve accurate results in healthcare issues.

Unlike other studies in the related literature, Briones, Tabernero, Tramontano, Caprara and Arenas (2009) centred upon self-efficacy aspect of cultural awareness. To assess adolescents' cultural self-efficacy, they developed a 33-item scale and administered it to 868 adolescents; however, as a result of the analysis, 8 items which had low factor loadings or cross-loaded were excluded from the scale. The final version of the scale consisted of 25 items and 5 subscales. It explained 58.96 % of the total variance. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability was 0.935 for the

entire scale. Following the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), the researchers computed Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and the results showed that it had adequate psychometric values.

As can be seen from the information given here, Intercultural Awareness Scales in the literature are developed and carried out mostly for the students of nursing faculties, where the students can have communication with people from different countries in their workplaces. On the other hand, there is no scale available on intercultural issues for students of foreign language teaching departments although improving intercultural awareness is an objective for language learners during their foreign language learning period. The fact that the scales for nursing students are not appropriate for foreign language learners requires developing an Intercultural Awareness Scale to find out if ELT students have increased their intercultural awareness or not.

Considering the relevant literature, the present study aimed at developing an intercultural awareness scale which will fill in the gap in this area and utilise from this scale to determine intercultural awareness levels of ELT students.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

This study adopted the relational survey design of the general survey models. The survey model is all the processes that describe a situation as it exists in the past or present and is applied to realize learning and develop desired behaviours in the individual. In the general survey model, the researchers examine all the universe, a group of samples and samples taken from the entire universe to reach a general judgment about the universe of many elements (Karasar, 2014).

2.1. Students

The students of the study consist of 389 (148=Male, 241=Female) undergraduate students who are studying in the Department of Foreign Language Education at a state university in southern Turkey. The students were chosen through the convenience sampling method, which is a specific type of data collected from the population who are available to take part in the study and are easily reachable (Dörnyei, 2007). Even though there are varying views regarding sampling size to conduct factor analysis in scale construction studies, the sampling sizes that cover fivefold of the number of the items in the scale is commonly accepted (Suhr, 2006). Considering this information, the researchers initially administered the scale to 207

students. The data of 207 students were used in the scale development process. After completing this process, the scale was administered to 182 students and the students' intercultural awareness levels were examined according to their genders, grades, presence in abroad and the number of been abroad.

2.2. ICAS (Intercultural Awareness Scale) Development Process

The researchers initiated the scale development process with a comprehensible literature review in the related area. They created a question pool consisting of potential items. The number of items was reduced in line with the objectives of the scale. The draft form consisted of 29 items. The prepared items were asked for field experts' review. To attain this goal, the form was sent to two experts in measurement and evaluation and two experts in the related field. According to the feedbacks, five items, most of the experts achieved a consensus on removing, were excluded from the scale. The scale took its final form as a 5-point Likert with 27 items. The prepared scale was administered to the research group. The students scored the statements from 5 (Completely agree) to 1 (Completely disagree). Concerning the previous studies in the literature, it is generally convenient to rate the statements in such a way that positive items score more (Tavşancıl, 2014).

2.3. Data Analysis

The collected data were analysed through Quantitative Data Analysis Software (SPSS). The exploratory factor analysis was performed to determine to construct validity of the scale. To obtain information about the item discrimination values, total item correlation was checked. Besides, multicollinearity analysis was computed to test the inter-item correlation matrix. The internal consistency reliability was explored through Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient.

2.4. Measurement Tool

The present scale was developed to examine intercultural awareness status of the students. It is a 5-point Likert with 24 items. After administering the scale to the research group, the statements were scored by taking into consideration positive and negative expressions. The scale also comprises extraneous variables such as gender, grade, experience abroad and the number of being abroad. These variables help the researchers analyse potential relationships between students' demographic information and the scale items, and they can be extended according to the purpose of the study in further research.

2.4.1. Exploratory Factor Analysis

The construct validity evidence of the Intercultural Awareness Scale was provided by computing exploratory factor analysis and checking item-total correlation values for each item. The principal component analysis method was used to interpret the collected data. The scores obtained from administering the scale range from 24 to 120 for each student. By interpreting the scale, it can be said that the more the students have higher scores, the higher intercultural awareness ratio they are supposed to have.

Before computing the exploratory factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and Bartlett Sphericity test results were taken into account to test sampling adequacy. The analysis results indicated that the KMO test value was .90. The values which have higher than .90 are considerably convenient for factor analysis (Tavşancıl, 2014). Besides, Bartlett T-test results state that the range of the data is near-normal, and the data are appropriate for factor analysis. According to the findings, Bartlett T-test value was found meaningful (x2= 1897-776; p <.000).

Table 1. *Intercultural Awareness Scale Factor Analysis Results*

Component Matrix Factor Loadings		Corrected Item-Total Correlation
Items	**Factor 1**	
I4	.75	.69
I1	.74	.68
I3	.73	.67
I21	.69	.63
I16	.67	.63
I25	.67	.61
I2	.67	.59
I11	.66	.60
I9	.63	.57
I8	.61	.55
I5	.57	.52
I12	.57	.53
I17	.57	.51
I7	.55	.49
I15	.53	.49
I24	.51	.47

I26	.49	.44
I6	.49	.43
I18	.46	.42
I10	.46	.41
I23	.44	.39
I14	.41	.36
I20	.40	.36
I27	0.34	0.29

In the Exploratory Factor Analysis, it was observed that factor loadings of the items 13, 19, and 22 were below .30. Along with this situation, all the items were checked if there was any overlapping item. The items with low factor loadings were excluded from the analysis and the factor analysis was recomputed. The analysis results revealed that the scale had a single-factor structure with 24 items. The factor loadings varied from .34 to .75. The total variance explained was 33.888 %. Büyüköztürk (2016) points out that it is acceptable for a single-factor scale to explain 30 % or more of the total variance.

After the factor analysis, the multicollinearity analysis was performed. The analysis results showed that inter-item correlation coefficients ranged from .019 to .63.

Table 2. *Intercultural Awareness Scale (ICAS) Descriptive Statistics (Mean-Standard Deviation, t [lower 27%-upper 27%])*

Item No	X	S	t (lower 27%-upper 27%)
I1	4.603	.580	-14.47
I2	4.700	.546	-8.50
I3	4.519	.620	-13.24
I4	4.601	.596	-11.74
I5	4.325	.779	-12.02
I6	3.753	1.053	-7.61
I7	4.640	.580	-7.44
I8	4.487	.645	-8.44
I9	4.739	.530	-7.89
I10	4.623	.609	-7.03
I11	4.507	.660	-11.80
I12	3.917	.787	-8.69
I14	4.254	.790	-10.07
I15	4.391	.862	-10.53

I16	4.455	.617	-11.54
I17	4.292	.770	-9.13
I18	4.472	.655	-9.02
I20	4.088	.777	-6.08
I21	4.595	.554	-14.48
I23	4.058	.828	-8.19
I24	4.175	.674	-8.61
I25	4.590	.528	-11.42
I26	4.230	.744	-7.10
I27	4.357	.826	-4.39

As a result of analysing the item mean scores of the lower 27% and upper 27% groups based on the total scores of the test using the independent t-test, the significance of differences can be evaluated as a measure of the internal consistency of the test.

2.4.2. Reliability

Table 3. *Intercultural Awareness Scale Cronbach Alpha (α) Reliability Analysis Results*

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.901	24

The internal consistency reliability of the scale was explored through Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient. The analysis results revealed that the scale had a considerably high Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient (α=.901). Although there is not a common consensus on alpha value, the values ranging from .70 to .95 are considered as acceptable (Tavakol &Dennick, 2011).

Table 4. *Intercultural Awareness Scale Spearman-Brown Split-half Reliability Results*

Cronbach's Alpha	**Part 1**	**Value**	**.835**
		N of Items	12[a]
	Part 2	Value	.80
		N of Items	12[b]
	Total N of Items		24
Correlation Between Forms			.83
Spearman-Brown			.90

Coefficient

a. The items are: I1,I3,I5,I7,I9,I11,I15,I17,I21,I23,I25,I27

b. The items are: I2,I4,I6,I8,I10,I12,I14,I16,I18,I20,I24,I26

The reliability coefficient which is obtained by splitting a test into two parts is called parallel forms (Equivalent forms) reliability (Tabachnich & Fidel,2007). This analysis gives an index for equivalence of two halves of the test. Spearman-Brown Split-half reliability analysis was performed by ranking the items as odd or even numbers. As stated in Table 4, the correlation between two forms was found .83 and the Spearman-Brown coefficient value was .90. The results dedicate that the scale has high-reliability values in both Cronbach's alpha and Spearman-Brown Split-half reliability.

3. Findings

In this part, findings obtained by using the scale were presented. The ICAS scale was administered to a different study group consisting of 182 students (Female=111, Male=71) and the students' intercultural awareness levels were compared according to their genders, grades, presence abroad and the number of been abroad.

Table 5. *Test of normality results by gender*

Test	Gender	K-S	Skewness	Z Score	Kurtosis	Decision
ICAS	Female	.007	-.496	-1.74	-.454	Skew
	Male	.008	-.555	-2.42	-.116	Distribution

Table 5 presents test of normality results by gender. As seen in the table, sub-levels of gender variable didn't meet at least two of the predetermined three criteria (the significance value of Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test is =p> 0.05, Z statistic is =p <1.96, Skewness-kurtosis value is within ± 1 tolerance limit). These findings indicate that non-parametric statistical analyses should be computed to make group comparisons. Since the variable "gender" had two sub-levels, Mann-Whitney U test was performed, and the findings were presented in Table 6.

Table 6. *Mann-Whitney U Test results by gender*

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
ICAS	Male	71	86.51	6142.00	3586.000	.306
	Female	111	94.69	10511.00		
	Total	182				

In Table 6, the students' Mann Whitney U Test results by gender were presented. According to the test results, it was found that the students' intercultural awareness levels did not significantly differ based on their genders ((U=3586.000, p>.05). Although there was a difference between the genders (F=94.69, M=86.51), it was not statistically meaningful.

Table 7. *Test of normality results by grade*

Test	Grade	K-S	Skewness	Z Score	Kurtosis	Decision
ICAS	2nd Grade	.200	-.304	-.98	-.665	Skew Distribution
	3rd Grade	.002	-.970	-3.17	.960	
	4th Grade	.014	-.460	-1.50	-.765	

Table 7 presents test of normality results by grade. According to the findings, sub-levels of grade variable didn't meet at least two of the predetermined three criteria (the significance value of Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test is =p> 0.05, Z statistic is =p <1.96, Skewness-kurtosis value is within ± 1 tolerance limit). These findings underline that non-parametric statistical analyses should be computed to make group comparisons. Since the variable "grade" had three sub-levels, Kruskal Wallis H test was performed, and the findings were presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *Kruskal Wallis H Test results by grade*

	Grade	N	Mean Rank	H	p
ICAS	2nd Grade	60	84.38	2.302	.316
	3rd Grade	61	98.89		
	4th Grade	61	91.12		
	Total	182			

In Table 8, the analysis results for the students' intercultural awareness levels in terms of their grades were given. The results showed that the students' intercultural awareness did not significantly change according to their grades (H=2.302, p>.05). When the findings were examined in detail, it was seen that 3rd-grade students had

the highest mean rank (X=98.89) among the groups. They were followed by 4th-grade (91.12) and 2nd-grade students (X=84.38). However, the difference between groups was not statistically meaningful.

Table 9. ***Test of normality results by been abroad status***

Test	Been Abroad	K-S	Skewness	Z Score	Kurtosis	Decision
ICAS	Yes	.001	-.889	-3.03	-131	Skew
	No	.005	-.630	-2.79	-.069	Distribution

In Table 9, test of normality results by been abroad status were presented. When the findings were examined in detail, it was revealed that sub-levels of been abroad status variable didn't meet at least two of the predetermined three criteria (the significance value of Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test is =p> 0.05, Z statistic is =p <1.96, Skewness-kurtosis value is within ± 1 tolerance limit), thus non-parametric statistical analyses should be computed to make group comparisons. Since the variable "been abroad status" had two sub-levels, Mann-Whitney U test was performed, and the findings were presented in Table 10.

Table 4.10. ***Mann-Whitney U Test results by been abroad status***

	Been Abroad	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
ICAS	Yes	67	106.44	7131.50	2851.500	.003
	No	115	82.80	9521.50		
	Total	182				

In Table 4.10, Mann Whitney U Test results by been abroad status were given. As seen in the table, the students' intercultural awareness levels significantly differed according to their status of been abroad (U=2851.500, p<.05). When the findings were examined in detail, it was seen that intercultural awareness levels of the students having been abroad (X=106.44) were greater than the one who have not been abroad (X=82.80). These findings can be interpreted that having been abroad is a significant factor in terms of intercultural awareness.

Table 4.11. ***Test of normality results by the number of been abroad***

Test	N of Been Abroad	K-S	Skewness	Z Score	Kurtosis	Decision
ICAS	Never	-.620	-.455	-2.15	-2.81	Skew Distribution
	Once	-.372	-.454	-1.23	-.91	
	2-5 times	-.200	-.694	-1.60	-.434	

Table 4.11 presents test of normality results by the number of been abroad. As seen in the table, sub-levels of the number of been abroad variable didn't meet at least two of the predetermined three criteria (the significance value of Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test is =p> 0.05, Z statistic is =p <1.96, Skewness-kurtosis value is within ± 1 tolerance limit). These findings indicate that non-parametric statistical analyses should be computed to make group comparisons. Since the variable "the number of been abroad" had three sub-levels, Kruskal Wallis H Test was performed, and the findings were presented in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12. Kruskal Wallis H Test results by the number of been abroad

	N of been abroad	N	Mean Rank	H	p
ICAS	Never	120	86.74	2.997	.223
	Once	33	98.55		
	2-5 times	29	103.17		
	Total	182			

In Table 4.12, Kruskal Wallis H test results by the number of been abroad were presented. According to the findings, it was seen that the students' intercultural awareness levels did not change according to their presence abroad. Although the mean ranks of the groups regularly increased or decreased among the groups, the statistical findings showed that the increase or decrease did not significantly occur. When the groups were compared in terms of their mean ranks, it was revealed that the students having been abroad 2-5 times had the highest ratio (X=103.17); they were followed by the ones having not been abroad (X=98.5) and those who had been abroad once (X=86.74).

4. Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

Along with the developments in technology, the interaction among humans has enormously increased in the last years (Sutton, 2013). The people learnt other nations' languages and shared a lot in common. As they interacted with the others, they were also exposed to the culture of the hosting country and learnt about their lifestyles. Considering these rapid changes in humans' lives, the need to examine their intercultural awareness has aroused. To attain this goal, the present study highlighted the steps followed during the Intercultural Awareness Scale development research. As a result of the process, a 24-item Intercultural Awareness Scale (ICAS) was developed. The total variance explained is 33. 88 % and the factor loadings range from .34 to .75. As a result of item analysis based on internal consistency criteria, it can be inferred from the results that it is highly distinctive to measure the target attribute. Cronbach's alpha value was estimated at .901 for the entire scale. Since the reliability coefficient of .70 and above is accepted as reliable (Domino & Domino, 2006), it can be said that the reliability coefficients of the scale are sufficient. All the results attest that the scale has the prerequisite psychometric features for measuring intercultural awareness level of the students and it can be used in further research undoubtedly. Nevertheless, it is highly recommended the researchers to check reliability and validity on further research.

In the second phase of the research, the students' intercultural awareness levels were examined according to their demographic information. For this purpose, extraneous variables such as gender, grade, presence abroad and the number of been abroad were used and group comparisons were made. The results showed that the students' intercultural awareness levels did not change according to their genders, grades, or the number of been abroad. Although there were partial differences between groups, they were not significant statistically. Among the variables, the single variable having an impact on the intercultural awareness levels of the students was "experience in abroad". The research results revealed that the students who had been abroad had a higher level of intercultural awareness compared to those who did not have experience in abroad. This result can be also interpreted that the students' intercultural awareness can be promoted by providing them the opportunity to go abroad. By this way, the students can gain intercultural awareness and develop interculturality.

References

Baker, W. (2012). From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: culture in ELT. *ELT Journal*. 66(1), 62-70.

Büyüköztürk, S. (2016). *Sosyal Bilimler için Veri Analizi El Kitabı* (22nd ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Briones, E., Tabernero, C., Tramontano, C., Caprara, G. V., & Arenas, A. (2009). Development of a Cultural Self-efficacy Scale for Adolescents (CSES-A). *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33(4), 301-312.

Byram, M. (2000). *Intercultural communicative competence: the challenge for language teacher training*. In A. Mountford & N. Wadham-Smith (Eds). British Studies: Intercultural Perspective.

Chen, G.M., Starosta, W.J. (2000). The development and validation of the intercultural sensitivity scale. *Human Communication*, *3* (1), 3-14.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Domino, G., & Domino, M. L. (2006). *Psychological testing: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Frank, J. (2013). Raising cultural awareness in English language classroom. *English Teaching Forum,*(4), 2-11.

Fritz, W, Möllenberg, A, & Chen, G. M. (2002). Measuring intercultural sensitivity in different cultural contexts. Intercultural Communication Studies. 11(2), 165- 176.

İz, F.B., Temel, A.B. (2017). Cultural awareness scale: psychometric properties of the Turkish version. Collegian. 24, 499- 504.

Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (26.baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

Kramsch, C. (2003). *Language and Culture* (4th Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mountford, A, Wadham- Smith, N. (Eds) (2000). British Studies: Intercultural Perspective. Essex: Longman.

Perng, S. J. & Watson, R. (2012). Construct validation of the nurse cultural competence scale: A hierarchy of abilities. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 1678-1684.

Portalla, T., Chen, G.M. (2010). The development and validation of the intercultural effectiveness scale. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, *19* (3), 21- 37.

Porto, M. (2000). *Integrating the teaching of language and culture*. In A. Mountford & N. Wadham-Smith (Eds). British Studies: Intercultural Perspective.

Rew, L., Becker, H., Cookston, J.,khosropour, S. & Martinez, S. (2003). Measuring cultural awareness in nursing students. *Journal of Nursing Education*, *42* (6), 249- 257.

Schim, S. M., Doorenbos, A. Z., Miller, J., & Benkert, R. (2003). Development of a Cultural Competence Assessment Instrument. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, *11*(1), 29-40.

Shemshadsara, Z.G. (2012). Developing cultural awareness in foreign language teaching. *English Language Teaching*, *5* (3), 95-99.

Suhr, D. (2006). *Exploratory or Confirmatory Factor Analysis*. SAS Users Group International Conference. Cary: SAS Institute, Inc.

Sun, L. ((2013) Culture teaching in foreign language teaching. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3* (2), 371- 375.

Sutton, B. (2013). The Effects of Technology in Society and Education (Master's thesis, State University of New York), 1-66.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, Pearson Education, Inc.

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, (2), 53-55.

Tavşancıl, E. (2014). *Tutumların Ölçülmesi ve SPSS ile Veri Analizi* (5. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Tomalin, B, Stempleski, S. (1993). *Cultural Awareness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zhao, B. (2011). How to enhance culture teaching in English language classes. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *1*(7), 847- 850.

Zhu, H. (2011). From intercultural awareness to intercultural empathy. *English Language Teaching*, *4* (1), 116- 119.

Appendix A- Intercultural Awareness Scale (ICAS)

Dear participant,
This scale was prepared to find out intercultural awareness level of students. Your answers will be kept confidential and will be used solely for scientific purposes.
Thank you for your cooperation and interest.

Please rate the extent you agree or disagree with each statement below by marking the appropriate box on the scale.	**Completely Agree**	**Agree**	**Not Sure**	**Disagree**	**Completely Disagree**
I am interested in learning other cultures.					
It is enjoyable to have friends with different cultural backgrounds.					
I like discovering beliefs of other societies.					
I am open to experiencing other cultures.					
I am interested in learning the taboos of different cultures.					
I am interested in reading about the literature of different cultures/countries.					
I respect the cultural diversity of a society.					
I believe in the mutual understanding of different cultures.					
I respect other cultures.					
It is important to learn the culture of the language we are learning.					
It can be enjoyable to participate in intercultural activities.					
I can easily handle when there is a misunderstanding between me and people from other countries.					
I am aware of differences in the characteristics of different cultures.					
Learning about new cultures helps me improve my personality.					
I would like to explore the target culture.					
I love communicating with the foreign students at our university.					
I am aware of the differences between my culture and other cultures.					
I am interested in learning the local language of the host country.					
I believe cultural activities are great opportunities to learn about other cultures.					
I can easily adjust my behaviour if I stay abroad.					
I can tolerate different ways of behaviour of people from other cultures.					
I respect the values of people from different cultures.					
I feel confident when interacting with people from different countries.					
I wouldn't accept the opinions of people from different countries.					