



International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching
Volume 7, Issue 2, June 2019, p. 358-379

Received	Reviewed	Published	Doi Number
12.04.2019	02.06.2019	30.06.2019	10.18298/ijlet.12379

A Study on Turkish as a Foreign Language Learners' Intercultural Communicative Competence of Turkish Culture in Turkey

Aihemaituoheti WUJIABUDULA ¹

ABSTRACT

This academic article attempted to identify Turkish as a Foreign Language Learners' Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) in terms of their age, gender, studying at State or Private Turkish language centres, mother tongue, years of learning Turkish language and TFL learners' overseas experiences. An Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Wang, 2016) was adopted. A total of 95 TFL students participated in our research. Mixed method approach was applied. Research findings revealed that participants showed a higher degree of ICC. There was no statistically significant difference found as to participants' ICC in terms of their gender, age, Turkish proficiency, mother tongue and overseas experience. "Years of learning Turkish" showed statistically significant differences between groups, which suggested that participants who have three to four years learning Turkish skill demonstrated the highest degree of ICC. All statistical findings are reported with tabulation, and pedagogical implications and discussion were reported.

Key Words: Turkish as a Foreign Language, Turkish Language Learners, Intercultural Communicative Competence.

1. Introduction

Language not only is the means of understanding each other between nations but also it is a culture transmitter and culture bearer (Ozbay, 2012). Learning a second or a foreign language(s) is also an ideal way to learn about the dissimilar culture(s) and perceive or comprehend the target culture(s) completely (Iscan, 2016).

In recent years, applied researchers and language practitioners have been trying to carry out investigations on four competencies which are namely listening, reading, speaking and writing in foreign or second language education. Intercultural communication competence has been one of the most attention-grabbing topics since Foreign Language Teaching is not merely focusing on four capabilities. Meanwhile, foreign culture is supposed to be included in language teaching and language learning process. It is because the first and foremost aim of acquiring a foreign language is to

¹ AIHEMAITUOHETI WUJIABUDULA, Uludag University, alanhoca@gmail.com.

communicate with people from different cultures or interact with the people whose language international students have tried to learn. Moreover, it remains to be seen hard to say that only speaking the target language may not be considered sufficient, however, understanding the local or cultural context when communicating in foreign languages is also regarded as one of the most vital factors in second or foreign language acquisition.

The significance of intercultural competence has become increasingly recognised by language practitioners and educators. Educators in the language teaching field firmly hold the opinion that language learners are supposed to be prepared to communicate in the world of multiculturalism. Therefore, during language teaching, intercultural-oriented courses should be designed to assist learners in acquiring the humanistic educational aims of intercultural competence. From these perspectives, it could be concluded that the importance of intercultural communication competence could not be underestimated.

Numerous cultural studies done by researchers have been mainly focusing on the students' intercultural communicative competence in English Language Education, there are a few, or even no reviews have been investigated over Turkish as a Foreign Language Students' intercultural communicative competence towards Turkish culture. Therefore, this study aims to examine international students ICC towards the Turkish culture and to compare their ICC regarding different parameters. It is believed that this study is supposed to fulfil the gap in the field of Turkish as a Foreign Language and Turkish Language Education.

In this study, first of all, the detailed literature review is provided, then the gap in Turkish as a Foreign Language research field as to intercultural communicative competence is discussed and research questions are given. Then methodology section, result, discussion and future implications are written before the reference section.

2. Literature Review

More recently, there has been world-wide recognition of the problems associated with integrating culture into language teaching and learning. It is important to draw a definition of intercultural competence before mentioning its' scope and its' key components. Over the past decades, innumerable terms and definitions have been proposed by numerous scholars and researchers. These researchers and scholars have conceptualized intercultural communicative competence as intercultural competence (Byram, 1997), intercultural awareness (Quinlisk, 2005), and intercultural sensitivity (Bennett, 1993). Among this conceptualization, intercultural competence or intercultural communicative competence has been widely accepted and used in foreign language teaching and learning (Byram, 1997; Sercu, 2006; Borghetti, 2013).

The roots and concept of intercultural communication competence could be tracked to the 1970s. Many scholars proposed various theories of definition in relation to intercultural communication competence (Hymes, 1972; Ruben, 1976; Hammer, Gudykunst, Wiseman, 1978). Abundant definitions could be found as to intercultural communicative competence (Hammer,1978; Fantini,2003; Moran,2001; Seiler&Bell,2002;). The definition of communicative competence was first addressed by Hymes (1972) who defined it as an intrinsic grammatical competence and the ability to employ grammar competence in a various communicative competence so that involving the sociolinguistic perspective into grammar

competence. Byram (1997) conclusively defined intercultural communication competence as a sociolinguistic competence which related to the influence of various situations when forming individual language choices, such as trying to establish a relationship between communication partners and their interaction when communicating in target cultural conditions. Therefore, it is important for the foreign language learner to develop intercultural awareness to develop or promote intercultural communicative competence (Leask, 2009).

Allwood (1985) also defined ICC as it is the pattern of exchanging information between individuals from the various cultural backgrounds, differentiated parameters of controlling and changing levels of awareness. Bennett (1986) defined ICC as the skills of understanding dissimilar ways and patterns of communication, for example, values and norms, verbal or non-verbal communication and the body languages of communicators. In this research article, intercultural communicative competence is accepted as our term, and Byram's definition is followed since it has been accepted widely.

What's known about the components of intercultural communicative comes from different scholars since defining ICC has been a difficult job to point-out as the only single definition. Numerous key components of ICC can be found in the literature (Wiseman, 2002; Bayram, 1997; Güven, 2015; Wang, 2016; H. Panggabean et al, 2013; Yang and Zhuang, 2007; Miguel Angel Candle-Mora, 2015; Morgan, 1940; Gao, 1998; Zaho et al, 2003; Byram & Morgan, 1994). Some key elements of intercultural communication competence consist of motivation, self- and other knowledge, and tolerance of uncertainty. When a second or a foreign language is being acquired, a learner is expected to communicate with people speaking different languages. Only being able to be competent in all four areas or competences namely listening, reading, speaking or writing are insufficient since the speakers of other languages have their values along with their different culture so that a language learner needs to develop a new competence named "Intercultural Competence".

In this article, we consider Wang and Zhou's as our components of ICC. Our questionnaire also approaches ICC components from five different factors. These factors comprise interaction engagement, respect cultural difference, interaction confidence, interaction enjoyment and interaction attentiveness (Wang & Zhou, 2016).

Numerous terminologies have been found in literature due to the different focus, attitudes and skills to be assessed (Kim, 1993; Chen & Starosta, 2000). Even ICC has been named differently by many applied researchers and scholars. Chen, Scarosta (1996) categorised ICC as intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity and Intercultural adroitness. Arasaratnam (2005) also identified the model which consists of empathy, experience, motivation, positive attitude towards other culture and listening. Matveev (2004) looked at the model from organisational perspective, these are respectively: practical communication skills, cultural awareness and understanding, being open-mind, having attitude without judgment and personal competence and intelligence. Brunt and Thornton (2010) also conceptualised some significant factors of intercultural communication competence such as appropriateness, effectiveness, anxiety and uncertainty reduction, adaptation, face to face honouring and protection (Suchankova, 2014).

Kim's "Integrative Model" also came into literature in 1993. Chen and Starosta (2000) developed a 24-item "Intercultural Sensitivity Model". Wang and Zhou adapted Chen and Starosta (2000) model to validate the short form of intercultural sensitivity scale. In our research paper, Wang and Zhou's

Intercultural Sensitivity Scale has used to elicit foreign language learners' intercultural communication competence (Wang Zhou, 2016).

In the literature, most of the studies have concentrated on the importance of culture regarding Turkish as a foreign language teaching and learning. However, a few reviews have been found on intercultural communicative competence in related literature. Bölükbaş and Keskin (2016) postulated in their academic research that it poses some problem when intercultural competence is not taken into account in Turkish as foreign or second language education. It concluded that delivering culture factors to Turkish language learners makes a significant contribution when teaching Turkish as a foreign or second language (İşcan, 2016).

Wu and Peng (2013) also performed a study over Chinese university students' ICC level; the results suggested that students are aware of the inadequacy of their knowledge of dissimilar/foreign culture; however, students frequently do not motivate themselves to take action to adapt their behaviour to communicate with people from different cultures.

Pozzo (2014) also conducted a study regarding assessing medical students' intercultural communication competence; the findings pointed out that a high level of institutional commitment is a driving force to promote students' intercultural communicative competence. (Pozzo, 2014).

Almarza et al. researched profiling the intercultural competence of university students at the beginning of their Erasmus placement. The findings of this study revealed that students show a positive attitude towards the host country at the beginning of their Erasmus, even though prejudices still pose the educational obstacles for the students and their host and home countries (Almarza, Martinez, Llavador, 2015).

Penbek and Yurdakul et al. also researched if students from different departments show a difference in terms of intercultural communicative competence. It found that students develop sufficient intercultural sensitivity and they equip themselves with the awareness of respecting people from other culture when departments offer educational support by international materials such as exchange programs and language courses (Penbek, Yurdakul, Cerit, 2009).

Hasmanoglu (2011) also tested if students' ICC fostered when students have overseas experiences, and the research indicated that there is a positive correlation between students' overseas experience and their ICC. From this research, it can be said that students' intercultural communicative competence improves when they obtain being the overseas experience.

Çangal (2012) also suggested that teaching culture in Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language has a vital role in Turkish as foreign language acquisition. The study also further indicated that language teachers are the ambassador of the culture, using folk songs or traditional music in Turkish language education has a potential benefit to improve the students' ICC.

Another study carried out by Abdollahi-Guilani (2012) indicated that teaching intercultural competence in foreign language classrooms has a significant effect on students. Wujiabudula. A (2018) also investigated foreign language learners' production of conventional expressions for the linguistic context of the target culture, the academic research also indicated that only teaching four primary competence

of foreign language is not sufficient, teaching sociolinguistic factors such as cultural competence are also indispensable for developing students' cultural ability in foreign language learning process (Wujiabudula, 2018).

Uzun (2007) also researched to investigate students' ICC, and he found that there is no difference in participants' ICC towards American and British culture in terms of participants' gender. Çalışkan also carried out a similar study; however, the study suggested the opposite result which stated that female participants are more likely to intend to acquire cultural competence. Prodromou (1992) also investigated if participants language proficiency showed the difference when it came to learning culture and their cultural competence. The study showed that students' tendency towards learning culture significantly increase when their proficiency improved in the foreign language they tended to gain.

Recently, there has been broad interest in intercultural communicative competence. Most of the applied researchers and scholars have been focusing on evaluating the attitudes of participants towards intercultural communicative competence. Even though studies regarding the intercultural competence have been widely discussed in the literature, however, fewer investigations have been carried out to identify foreign language learners' intercultural communication competence, especially in the field of Turkish as a Foreign Language Teaching. This research has tended to focus on, first of all, eliciting TFL students' intercultural communication competence, then comparing their competence of intercultural communication in terms of university type, gender, Turkish language proficiency and years of learning Turkish, participant's native tongue and being abroad experience etc.

According to an extensive literature review, our research attempted to answer these following research questions, which focused on finding the overall degree of participants' intercultural communicative competence and comparing participants ICC in terms of age, gender, native tongue, the types of university they go to, their overseas experience, years of learning Turkish knowledge and their Turkish proficiency.

Research Questions:

Quantitative Research Questions:

1. What is the participants' overall degree of intercultural communicative competence?
 - a. Does participants' ICC differ in terms of their gender, mother tongue, language course type (TÖMER), overseas experience?
 - b. Does participants' ICC show differences according to their age, Turkish proficiency and their years of learning Turkish?

Qualitative Research Questions:

1. How confident or engaged you feel when you interact with Turkish people? Why?
2. How do you show respect to the Turkish culture during the interaction with Turkish people? Why?
3. How enjoyable you feel when you interact with people from Turkish culture? Why?
4. How observant you are when you interact with culturally-distinct Turkish people? Why?

3. Methodology

3.1. Participate Selection & Research Instrument

The target participants of this research article are TFL students from public and private university Turkish language centres (TÖMER) in Turkey. This is due to the fact that TFL students are directly exposed to Turkish language and Turkish culture. From this perspective, it is concluded that Turkish language Center (TÖMER) students are the appropriate group for measuring their ICC towards Turkish Culture. Meanwhile, TÖMER students are easy to reach in terms of researching this field. The samplings represented the target participants were contacted by random sampling method. An online Google Form was generated to reach the target population easily. In this research, there are total of 95 participants from both public and private universities' Turkish language teaching centre. The participants have a similar educational background, currently being in TÖMER or having experience in learning Turkish, they had received at least from elementary Turkish Language education to advanced level of learning Turkish language experience.

There are 45 (47.4%) female and 50(52.6%) male participants. All participants are foreigners, or they have been receiving Turkish language training in TÖMER in Turkey. And most of the participants are non-Turkish 86.3%, and 13.7% participants are Turkic nationalities such as Uyghur, Azeri whose languages are closely related to Turkish language or from the same language system. Majority of participants speak Turkish at the advanced level (32.2%), following this elementary Turkish language speakers follow the advanced level speakers by 31%. The majority of participants are from public university Turkish language courses (52), and 42 participants have been studying Turkish in Private Turkish Language Courses.

Wang' (2016)15-item ICC Scale questionnaire which has a significant level of reliability and validity was applied to measure participants' intercultural communicative competence. The questionnaire is in English language. The ICC Scale consisted of 5 factors, respectively, interaction engagement, respect for cultural difference, interaction confidence, interaction enjoyment, interaction effectiveness. Every five factors contain three questions to measure factors as mentioned above about intercultural communicative competence.

Participants' demographic information was asked on the first page of the questionnaire. Name and surname section were kept as optional, and other demographic information was also required to fill in, such as age, gender, language course types, native tongue, Turkish proficiency, years of learning Turkish and overseas experience since these are the sub- research questions in our academic research.

In terms of scale, Likert's five scale questionnaire was employed. In the questionnaire, 1 stands for "strongly disagree", 2 represents "disagree", 3 means "neutral", 4 represents "agree" and 5 represents "strongly agree". After collecting quantitative data, five volunteer participants were interviewed to obtain the participants' insights towards Turkish culture and intercultural communicative competence. A note-taking method is used to collect interviewees' answers, and then it is employed in the result section of our academic research.

The questionnaire used in this research has been tested and used many academic researchers to identify students' intercultural communicative competence. The scale has the high reliability according to Wang

(2016), and the same scale was implemented by many researchers and reported to be with the high reliability (Altan, 2018; Wujiabudula, 2018).

3.2. Data Collection and Data Analysis

Data collection procedure consists of 2 stages. First of all, a Google Form questionnaire was generated, and this online form was shared on Turkey Scholarship Accepted Students Face book page because Turkey Scholarship Accepted Students are expected to have at least one-year Turkish Language Training before students mentioned above start their undergraduate or graduate studies at universities in Turkey. Also, the link of the online form was sent to the researcher's non-Turkish acquaintances via social media apps such as WhatsApp or Gmail accounts. There is a total of 80 participants replied the online questionnaire. Because of the insufficient number of participants, 15 questionnaires were collected from foreign or Erasmus students at one of the private universities in Istanbul.

The second stage of data collection was about interviewing volunteer participants. The number of participants who accepted the interview is 5; the participants are from foreign countries, such as Iran, South Korea, Syria, The United States of America and 3 participants are Uyghur. All the answers from participants are taken notes and provided in the result section. At the final stage, total of 95 questionnaires were collected to be analysed statistically. SPSS 21 Version was employed to analyse descriptive to obtain the participant's demographic information.

At the stage of data analyses, normal distribution of data was tested, and the Test of normality was applied to the data. From the Shapiro-Wilk test result, it can be suggested that our data were normally distributed (Sig=0.470, $P > 0.05$). Confirmatory Factor analysis was applied to measure if the factors are same with the original scale since the scale employed in this academic research was adapted from Wang's (2016) intercultural communicative competence. Factor analysis results can be shown below:

To carry out Factor Analysis, first of all, it is suggested to test KMO and Bartlett's test. From the test, it can be said that KMO value is 0.773 (Sig= 0.000, $P < 0.05$) which suggests it is appropriate to implement factor analysis to our data. The confirmatory factor analysis was implemented; the results are shown as below:

From table 1, it can be clearly postulated that our data only produced four factors which are interaction engagement, respect cultural difference, interaction enjoyment, and interaction attentiveness. In the original scale which developed by Wang (2016), there are total of five factors whereas, in our research, Question No.3 was categorised in the list of Factor 5. In factor analysis, there must be at least two items under one factor, so factor 5 was eliminated from the data analysis. These factors in our research match the original scale factors; these are respectively, Respect for other cultures, Interaction Enjoyment, Interaction Attentiveness. But interaction engagement and confidence factor were classified in Factor1, so Factor one is called Intercultural engagement and confidence.

Table 1. Factor Analysis Results

Factor / items	Number of Items	Scale Format	Cronbach'sAlpha
	14	LRFa	0.766
Interaction Engagement	5	LRFa	.812
Q1	.750		
Q2	.806		
Q7	.626		
Q8	.690		
Q9	.780		
Respect Cultural Difference	3	LRFa	.714
Q4	.766		
Q5	.600		
Q6	.695		
Interaction Enjoyment	3	LRFa	.840
Q10	.846		
Q11	.796		
Q12	.730		
Interaction Attentiveness	3	LRFa	.705
Q13	.694		
Q14	.836		
Q15	.648		

Note:LRFa (Likert Response Format, five points: 1=Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree)

To investigate the participants' overall degree of intercultural communicative competence, frequency and descriptive statics were utilised and mean, Max., Min, and S.d were found to explore their level of intercultural communicative competence.

With regarding answering the sub-research questions, One-way ANOVA was implemented to identify if the participants' intercultural communicative competence differs in terms of Age, Turkish language proficiency, years of learning Turkish experience since our data demonstrates the normal distribution. Independent-Sample T-test was employed to investigate the participants' ICC on the subject of Gender, Native Tongue, State or Private language course participants attend and their overseas experience. The last stage of the data collection and analyses encompass the classification of findings and conclusion, and findings are tabulated, and the results of this research were provided.

Quantitative Phase:

The results and findings of this research will be presented in the quantitative and qualitative form. In this section, first of all, descriptive statics of participants' demographic information was provided. Then all the research questions were answered based on the statics tabulation and results obtained from SPSS version 21.

3.3. Findings and Results

Descriptive Statistics of Participants' Demographic Information

There are total of 95 participants who answered our research questionnaire. There are total of 50 (52.6%) male participants and 45 (47.7%) female participants. When it comes to the ages of participants, there are 3 (3.2%) participants who are under the age of 18, 34 (35.8%) participants are between the age of 18 to 25, 33 (34.75) participants' ages range from 25 to 30, and participants whose age over 30 are 25 (26.3%).

In terms of the language course types which participants attend, there are 52(54.7%) participants who have gone to state university language course (TÖMER) while 43(45.3%) participants who have attended private university language course (TÖMER). About participants' mother language, participants whose first language or their mother tongue is Turkic languages (Uyghur, Azeri.etc.) are 13 (13.7%) while the majority of participants' mother language is non-Turkish; the number of participants whose first language is not Turkish is 82 (86.3%).

It is also found from the descriptive statics that some participants also specified their first language. There are 3(3.3%) Uyghur participants who speak Uyghur Turkish which is in the same language system with modern Turkish (Turkey) as known as Altay Language System; 5(5.5%) participants' first language is Somali; the number of participants whose first language is Arabic is 6 (8.9%). There are also some participants their mother tongue is Romanian, Russian, Pashto, and Dutch which also appeared in our research with the small percentage (1.1%).

As for the Turkish proficiency of participants, the more substantial part of the participants has elementary and advanced proficiency in Turkish. There are 30 (31.6%) participants are elementary proficient Turkish language speaker, and 27 (28.4%) participants are the advanced speakers of the Turkish language. Pre-intermediate speakers follow third to the advanced Turkish speakers with the number of 15(15.8%); and the number of participants who speak Turkish with pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate proficiency is, respectively, 12 (12.6%) and 11(11.6%).

According to the descriptive statics of participants' years of learning Turkish, it can be clearly said that a large number of participants have learnt the Turkish language under a year, with the number of 60 (63.2%). Respectively, 14 (14.7%) participants have learnt Turkish five and more years; participants who have learnt Turkish from one to 2 years are 12(12.6%) while the minority of participants who learnt English as Foreign Language are just 9 (9.5%).

Following the participants' overseas experience, it can be stated that 75 (78.9%) participants have abroad experiencing whereas 20 (21.1%) participants replied they have no overseas experience.

Research Question 1:

What are the participants' overall degree of intercultural communicative competence?

To interpret participants' intercultural communicative competence, Frequency was used to find out the mean and standard deviation.

As can be seen from table 2 that Q1 demonstrates the highest mean (M=4.08) compared to other questions in factor 1. The question is 'I enjoy interacting with people Turkish culture'. It can also be seen that other items in factor that show a similar high mean. The second question asks the participants if they give positive responses to people from Turkish culture. This item also shows the high mean (M=3.85), Question No.7 asks participants' engagement when interacting with Turkish people; it also demonstrates the high mean (M=3.79),. Also, the other item 8 asks participants if they feel confident when interacting with people Turkish culture, it also has a high mean (M=3.85), and the last item in factor 1 asks participants if they feel sociable during the interaction, the last item also shows the high mean. According to Burry-Stock (1955), low mean is between 1.0 and 2.4, medium mean is between 2.5 and 3.4 and high mean is between 3.5 and 5 (Oxford & Burry-stock, 1995).

Table 2. Participants' responses for intercultural communicative competence scale.

Item	Mean	Std. D
Intercultural Engagement	19.20	3.97
Q1	4.08	.93
Q2	3.85	.96
Q7	3.79	.95
Q8	3.85	1.13
Q9	3.62	1.22
Respect Cultural Difference	10.98	3.08
Q4*	4.09	1.22
Q5*	3.72	1.29
Q6*	3.18	1.34
Interaction Enjoyment	10.79	3.40
Q10*	3.69	1.24
Q11*	3.53	1.34
Q12*	3.58	1.31
Interaction Attentiveness	10.59	2.89
Q13	3.45	1.24
Q14	3.26	1.27
Q15	3.89	1.12

* These questions are reverse coding questions.

From the frequency table for each question, it can also be said that almost 70 people strongly agree or agree to question 1, 63 people also assume they strongly agree or agree for question 2, the strongly agree or accept number for each item is also respectively, 62 for Q7, 69 for Q8 and 56 for Q9. It can be concluded that participants have very high intercultural engagement and confidence when they interact with people from Turkish culture. Also, factor 1 has the highest mean compared to other elements in the research. Turkish as a Foreign Language Learners has very high interaction engagement and confidence.

Concerning the Factor 2 questions, Q4 has the highest mean compared to other items. The question asks students if they like to be with Turkish people, almost 73 participants replied as 'agree' or 'strongly agree'. For question, the participants were asked if they accept the opinion of Turkish Culture, 3.72 mean

scores are actually regarded high, and more than 70 people agree or strongly agree for the question too. The last item in this factor asked participants if they think the people from Turkish are open-minded or not, it also shows medium-high range ($M=3.18$), 21 participants replied they have no idea, 45 participants agree or strongly agree that people from Turkish culture are not narrow-minded. From all statistics above, it can be concluded that participants have a high respect for people and culture of Turkey.

As for the items in factor 2; Q10, Q12 and Q13 show the similar medium-high mean score, these are respectively, 3.69, 3.53, and 3.58. Question 10 asked participants if they feel useless during the interaction with Turkish people, 68 people replied that they agree or strongly agree for the item, which means participants do not feel useless during the interaction. Only 7 participants answered that they feel incompetent in the interaction with Turkish people. Q 11 asked participants if they get upset quickly in the interaction with Turkish people, 53 participants replied as 'strongly agree' or 'agree'. For the last item in this factor, participants were asked if they feel discouraged when they interact with Turkish people, 3.58 also tells us that they may not feel depressed during the interaction. It can be summarized from the statistical means above that participants in this research show the highest interaction enjoyment with the people from Turkish Culture.

The last factor consists of 3 questions after the confirmatory factor analysis. Their items are Q13 ($M=3.45$), Q14 ($M=3.26$), Q15 ($M=3.89$). From these questions, the last question has the highest mean score. The question asks the participants if they try to obtain as much information as possible during the interaction, 63 participants expressed that they actively want to gain cultural information during the interaction. Twenty participants demonstrated that they feel indecisive. For question 13, it was asked that if the participants are observant when they talk or interact with Turkish people, 48 participants showed that they are observant when interacting, 23 participants feel undecided. Q14 inquired the participants' sensitivity towards the subtle meaning their Turkish counterparts use when interacting. Thirty-nine participants answered they feel sensitive. However, 30 participants feel indecisive. Overall, it can be drawn to the conclusion that participants feel very attentive when they interact with people from Turkish culture.

By way of conclusion, these findings as mentioned above support our research question, which participants show a high level of intercultural communicative competence. This is because all four factors found in confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated the high mean score in terms of interaction engagement ($M=19.20$), respect cultural difference ($M=10.98$), interaction enjoyment ($M=10.79$) and interaction attentiveness ($M=10.59$) which all composes intercultural communicative competence. Participant's responses to these factors show high mean so that it can be said participants have a high degree of intercultural communicative competence towards Turkish culture.

Research question a:

Does participants' ICC differ in terms of their gender, mother tongue, language course type (TÖMER), overseas experience?

To find out if participants' intercultural communicative competence differs in terms of their gender and mother tongue, language course types (TÖMER) and overseas experience, independent sample t-test was applied for finding the mean differences of intercultural communicative competence. Independent sample T-test was employed due to the normal distribution of the data ($\text{Sig.} = 0.470, P > 0.05$).

It can be seen from table 3 that no statistical differences were found as to participants' intercultural communicative competence in terms of their gender (Sig. =0.542, $P>0.05$), mother tongue (Sig.=0.093, $P>0.05$), language course (Sig.=0.487, $P>0.05$) and their overseas experience (Sig.=0.288, $P>0.05$). From these statistical findings, it can be concluded that participants' intercultural communicative competence statistically does not show any difference in terms of their gender, mother tongue, language courses and overseas experience.

Table 3. Independent Sample T-test results for Research Question a

ICC	Independent T-test				
	M	Std. D	df	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Gender					
Female	52.06	8.66	93	.612	.542
Male	51.04	7.68			
Mother Tongue					
Turkish (Turkic)	48.00	7.43	93	1.670	.093
Non-Turkish	52.08	8.14			
Language Course (TÖMER)					
State Tömer	52.05	8.19	93	0.698	.487
Private Tömer	50.88	8.10			
Overseas Experience					
Yes	51.98	8.27	93	1.069	.288
No	49.80	7.52			

Sig. <0.05

Research Questions b:

Does participants' ICC show differences according to their age, Turkish proficiency and their years of learning Turkish?

At this stage, it aims to find out if there is any statistical difference between the means of groups in terms of their age, Turkish language proficiency and their years of learning the Turkish language. Since our independent variable consists of more than two variables, One-way ANOVA was applied to the find the mean difference between groups mentioned above.

Table 4. One-way ANOVA Test Results for Research Question b

	Sum of squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
<i>Age</i>					
Between Groups	168.184	3	56.061	.843	.474
Within Groups	6053.501	91	66.522		
Total	6221.684	94			
<i>Turkish Proficiency</i>					
Between Groups	444.473	4	111.118	1.731	.150
Within Groups	5777.211	90	64.191		
Total	6221.684	94			
<i>Years of Learning Turkish</i>					
Between Groups	984.514	3	328.171	5.702	.001*
Within Groups	5237.170	91	57.551		
Total	6221.684	94			

*Sig. <0.05

It can be noticed clearly that participants' intercultural communicative competence shows no differences between group statistically when we take an age (Sig. =0.474, $P>0.05$) and Turkish proficiency (Sig. =0.150, $P>0.05$) into our consideration. In term of participants' age group, there is no statistical difference between different age group with regarding their intercultural communicative competence. As for participants' Turkish proficiency, it can also be concluded that between different proficiency groups, there is no statistical difference between groups in terms of participants' intercultural communicative competence (Sig. 0.150, $P>0.05$). It is fascinating to note that participants intercultural communicative competence differs in terms of their years of learning Turkish (Sig. =0.001, $P<0.05$). To find out the difference between specific groups Post-hoc test was applied to Years of Learning Turkish variable.

Table 5 shows the differences between specific groups. As can be seen from the table that the participants who have under a year learning Turkish and group with 3-4 years learning Turkish are statistically different from each other (Sig.= 0.000, $P<0.05$). The group with 1-2 years Turkish language learning (Sig. =0.022, $P<0.05$), 5 and more years of Turkish language learning group (Sig. =0.024, $P<0.05$) also show the difference between groups.

Table5. Post-hoc Tests for Years of Learning Turkish

Dependent Variable: ICC, Independent variable: Years of learning the Turkish language

Years of Learning	Years of learning	Mean Difference	Sig.
Under one year			
	3-4 years	11.2056	0.000*
1-2 years			
	3-4 years	9.8056	0.022*
3-4 years			
	Under one year	11.2056	0.000*
	1-2 years	9.8056	0.022*
	5 and more years	9.3651	0.024*
5 and more years			
	3-4 years	9.3651	0.024*

*Sig. <0.05

When analysing the results of the descriptive statistics, it can be also be seen that the group with 3 and 4 years of learning Turkish has the highest mean score (M=61.2222, Sd. =5.4031), the other groups are respectively: under a year (M=50.0167, Sd. =7.3334), 1-2 years learning Turkish (M=51.4167, Sd. = 8.4472), 5 and more learning Turkish language (M=51.8571, Sd. =8.9688). From the above statistics, it can conclude that the group with 3-4 years of learning Turkish experience has the highest level or degree of intercultural communicative competence compared to other groups.

Qualitative Phase:

In this section, all the answers from interview participants were analyzed and try to support the quantitative phase results according to the answers given to the four interview questions which generally try to identify interaction engagement (interview question 1), respect cultural difference (interview question 2.), interaction enjoyment (interview question 3.) and lastly interview question No.4 was asked to elicit participants opinions towards interaction attentiveness. There are total of 5 participants who were willing to participate in the interview. When choosing the participants for the interview, very close attention was paid to avoid duplication. The interview participants are from different countries possessing dissimilar culture. The participants are from the United States, Syria, Iran, Somalia and last participant is Uyghur.

Qualitative Research Question 1: How confident or engaged you feel when you interact with Turkish people? Why?

Generally, all participants expressed very positive responses towards intercultural engagement. Mostly 5 participants believe that they find themselves very confident when they interact with Turkish people. There is the participants' opinion towards intercultural involvement. The total number of 4 participants demonstrated considerable positive attitudes towards Turkish culture. For instance, Charlie said, "I feel enthusiastic during my interaction with Turkish people". And it is also interesting to note that there was one participant who is originally Turkic nationality, Uyghur, also expressed firm positive attitude towards Turkish culture and the participant believes that Turkish people in Turkey and other Turkish

nationalities are the same nation. All participants' confidence, enjoyment, and sureness and socializing characters from their answers support their own quantitative research result.

In our quantitative research results, the first factor ($M=19.20$, $Sd. =3.97$) holds the highest mean compared to other factors. The first question is whether participants enjoy interacting with Turkish people ($M=4.08$, $Sd. = 0.93$) also has a high mean; our participants' interview answers also supports our quantitative results. The other questions such as Q2 ($M=3.85$), Q7($M=3.79$), Q8 ($M=3.85$), Q9($M=3.62$) results also comply with our participant's interview answers because the participants feel confident, friendly and they are pretty sure of themselves during the interaction.

It is also worth mentioning that Syrian participant also replied that she has been experiencing discrimination due to her refugee status in Turkey, sometimes she avoids the interaction with Turkish people. This statement also supports our quantitative data that Q9 has the lowest mean ($M=3.62$) compared to other questions in interaction engagement factor.

Qualitative Research Question 2: How do you show respect to the Turkish culture during the interaction with Turkish people? Why?

Speaking from participants' answers towards our interview Q2, all participants demonstrated strong and positive attitudes towards Turkish culture, in other words, strong intercultural communicative competence among participants was found after a semi-structural interview(s).

From all the replies from the participants, it can be concluded that qualitative results also confirm our quantitative findings. For instance, the Question 4 asks if participants like to be with people from Turkish culture. Almost 5 participants expressed the same believes towards being with Turkish people; these answers also conform to Q4 ($M=4.09$, $Sd. = 1.22$). In our research, also Q5 ($M=3.75$, $Sd. =1.29$) has a little, medium-high mean which is also supported by the participants' replies because some participants believe some Turkish people are narrow-minded or culturally some participants experience discrimination because of their nationality or appearance. Q6 ($M=3.18$, $Sd.=1.34$) is also by the results obtained from interview answers.

Qualitative Research Question 3: How enjoyable you feel when you interact with people from Turkish culture? Why?

This question aimed at eliciting participants' intercultural enjoyment and It can be suggested that our participants show not very strong opinions in terms of interaction enjoyment. However, sometimes he finds some sort of conversations less enjoyable because he may think he has not enough knowledge about the slangs or idiomatic meaning of some sentences or vocabulary.

These findings from the interview also support our statistical results. Q10, Q11, Q12 test the participants' interaction enjoyment and all three question under the factor as mentioned earlier show medium range of mean, respectively, Q10($M=3.69$), Q11 ($M=3.53$), Q12($M=3.58$). It can be said from interview questions that our participants also express the medium level of interaction enjoyment during the interaction with Turkish people.

Qualitative Research Question 4: How observant you are when you interact with culturally-distinct Turkish people? Why?

The interview research questions investigate the interaction attentiveness of participants towards Turkish culture. It can be seen clearly from our participants that they show a medium level of intercultural attentiveness when interacting with Turkish people. Q13, Q14, Q15 questions' mean in our quantitative research is also supported by our participants' answers. All participants almost expressed that they try to acquire as much information as possible about Turkish culture. They also stated that the interaction is more sensitive if the topics are as to politics or the country. One of the participants also mentioned that she loves this fantastic culture, tradition and customs even though there is a language barrier. These statements also support the mean score obtained from statistical analysis. For instance, Q13 (M=3.45, Sd. =1.24), Q14 (M=3.26, Sd. 1.27) and Q15 (M=3.89, Sd. =1.12) also comply with the participants' answers from our interviews.

In the following section, results are concluded. Qualitative phase and the quantitative phase of the findings are given and try to combine the two results as a whole. General statements towards both qualitative and quantitative research questions are provided before the discussion and future implications.

4. Conclusion

The initial purpose of the study to identify TFL (Turkish as a foreign language) learners' total degree or level of intercultural communicative competence. Moreover, then it further analyzed to investigate if there are any statistical mean differences of participants' ICC in terms of their gender, mother tongue, language course the participants attend and their overseas experience, as well their age, Turkish language proficiency, years of learning Turkish language experience. Therefore, a mixed method approach was chosen to support our statistical results with qualitative data which consist of our five volunteer participants' answers to our four different questions. Having a mixed method approach in this academic research enabled us to have a more reliable and in-depth understanding of participants' opinions of ICC towards Turkish culture. Random sampling was applied.

An ICC scale was prepared, which was in accordance with Wang's study (2016). This scale consisted of two parts, part 1 asked the participants demographic information, and there are 15 ICC scale items which respectively investigate participants' interaction engagement, respect cultural difference, interaction enjoyment, and interaction attentiveness and interaction confidence. After collecting quantitative data, five volunteers were chosen to perform semi-structural interview informally which required the participants to answer four questions related to factors mentioned above. After the process of data collection, all the data were entered to SPSS 21 to apply the statistical analysis as to our research questions.

Before any statics, confirmatory factor analysis was applied to reaffirm if our data produced the same number of factors or not. Our data generated four factors with 14 questions which represent the scale in this academic study.

Descriptive statistics revealed that there were 95 participants in our research. There are respectively, 50 males and 45 females. The majority of participants were between 18 and 25 years old. More than 86% of

those participants' mother tongue is not Turkish, and 13.7% of participants reported that their native language is Turkic languages such as Uyghur, Azeri...etc. The majority of respondents are elementary Turkish speakers (31.6%), 63.2% of participants have learnt Turkish under a year, and almost 79% of respondents have overseas experience according to our descriptive statistics.

To investigate the participants' overall degree of intercultural communicative competence, frequency of each question and means of each item was obtained from SPSS 21. From the frequency statistics, it can be clearly said that participants' overall degree of intercultural communicative competence is satisfactorily high which can be concluded from the means of each item. On our 15 item scale, the highest mean is 4.09 (Q4), other questions are respectively, Q1 (M=4.08, Sd. =0.93), Q2 (M=3.85, Sd. = 0.96), Q8 (M=3.85, Sd. =1.13) and lowest mean in our whole scale is 3.18 (16). According to the researcher Oxford & Burry-stock (1995), the low mean score represents the mean score between 1.0-2.4, medium mean is between 2.5 -3.4 and high mean is 3.5-5.0. According to our mean score from our frequency results, it can be said that most questions have a high or medium-high mean score. At the same time, the four factors also demonstrated high mean score. It can be concluded from statement mentioned above that participants hold a high degree or level of intercultural communicative competence towards Turkish culture.

Our findings of the degree of participants' intercultural communicative competence are consistent previous findings in the literature (Wang and Peng, 2013; Pozzo, 2014; Almarzo et al., 2015, Penbek&Yurdakul and Cerit, 2009; Himanoğlu, 2011 and Çangal, 2012; Güven, 2015; Dombi, 2016). Our findings are in the complete agreement with Pozzo et al. (2014) study; in her research a very high level of commitment towards ICC was found which comply with our findings in this study. Not only these quantitative studies comply with the findings, but also our qualitative results were also in line with the quantitative results.

Independent sample T-test was applied to measure if there is any statistical difference of participants' ICC in terms of their gender, native tongue, language course they attend and their overseas experience. Our dependent variable is the mean of the full scale, and independent variables are gender, native tongue, language course and overseas experience. Independent sample T-test results revealed that there is no statistically significant mean differences found in terms of participants' gender (Sig. = 0.542, $p>0.05$), mother tongue (Sig. =0.093, $p>0.05$), Language course (Sig. = 0.487, $p>0.05$) and overseas experience (sig. = 0.288, $p>0.05$).

Our findings substantiate the previous finding found in the literature (Uzun, 2007; Çalışkan, 2009). According to Uzun's study, no significant differences were identified as to participants' ICC in terms of gender. However, Çalışkan also observed from his survey that female participants showed a higher degree of the tendency towards learning ICC in foreign language education (2009). Almarzo et al. (2015) also concluded in their study that Erasmus students showed a very positive attitude towards the host culture at the beginning of their placement. In terms of mean score, even though the participants' who have overseas experience (M=52) showed higher than those who have not (M=50), there is no statistically significant difference found between the two groups ($P>0.05$).Güven (2015) also found that gender does not play a crucial role in terms of participants' ICC. Most of the studies found in the literature support our findings too.

Altan (2018) also reported in his study that there are no differences between males and females in terms of acquiring intercultural communicative competence. He further stated that gender does not influence participants' intercultural competence. This study also supports our findings in our research. Pembek et al. also researched as to ICC, and their research suggested that the participants' who have overseas experience show great respect to dissimilar culture (2009).

As for the participants' ICC in terms of their age, Turkish proficiency, years of learning Turkish, One-way ANOVA tests were implemented to figure out if there are a statistically significant mean difference among more than three groups. One-way ANOVA results demonstrated that the analysis did not show any statistically significant difference between different age groups (Sig. =0.474, $p>0.05$).

In terms of Turkish proficiency, there were no significant differences between different groups with different proficiency level (Sig. =0.150, $p>0.05$). It is interesting to note that statistically significant differences were found between groups' ICC in terms of participants' years of learning Turkish (Sig.=0.001, $p<0.05$). To test in which groups, there was a significant difference; post-hoc tests were applied. According to post-hoc tests, it can be said that there was a statistically significant difference between the group with "Under one year" learning Turkish experience and "3-4 years" of learning Turkish (Sig. =0.000, $P<0.05$). Statistically significant differences were found between group "1-2" and group "3-4" (Sig. =0.022, $p<0.05$), and between group "3-4" and "5 and more" group (Sig. =0.024, $p<0.05$). From post-hoc test and Tukey Test, it can be clearly said that the group with 3-4 years of learning Turkish experience possessed the highest level or degree of intercultural communicative competence ($M=61.222$, $Sd.= 5.4031$).

It is also important to note that Turkish proficiency between groups did not show a statistically significant difference in our study, which is also strengthened by the study (Güven, 2015) which stated that participants' proficiency does not affect participants' intercultural competence. However, Prodromou (1992) also investigated participants' ICC, and the study revealed that participants who had higher proficiency of the target language showed a higher degree of intercultural communicative competence. Even though adequate academic studies couldn't be found in literature, Güven's research is by the findings of the present study.

The preliminary purpose of our study was to identify Turkish as a Foreign Language Learners' intercultural communicative competence. The reason why this topic was chosen is that numerous academic researchers have been found related to investigating students' cultural competence or intercultural communicative competence in English as a second or foreign language context. There is no single study has been done as to foreign language learners' ICC in the specialisation of teaching Turkish as a second or foreign language context. Previous works have only focused on the theoretical explanation or investigation of learning dissimilar culture in TFL; the fundamental issue of identifying Turkish language learners' ICC has not been addressed so far. So, it is believed that researching Turkish learners' intercultural communicative competence has a scientific value not only to second language learners but also to the language practitioners in TFL. Therefore, it is believed that this academic article will fulfil the gap in the field of TFL.

Mixed-method approach was applied to obtain a more in-depth understanding of participants' intercultural competence and their views towards Turkish culture. Our data showed that the scale used

in this research demonstrated high reliability. Confirmatory factor analysis was implemented to confirm if our data produced the same items under the same factors. In the original scale, there were five factors which respectively represent interaction engagement, respect for other culture, interaction enjoyment, and interaction confidence and interaction attentiveness. However, in our study, only four factors were produced statistically by the application of confirmatory factor analysis. The quantitative data were normally distributed, and quasi-semi structured interviews with five volunteer participants were performed to strengthen and perform a profound explanation of results and findings. Due to the normal distribution of our data, Independent sample T-tests and one-way ANOVA Tests were applied. For the groups which revealed the differences significantly in our statistical analysis, Post-hoc and Tukey test was performed to identify precisely between which groups it demonstrated the significant differences. All the results are reported, and findings and conclusions were tabulated according to APA requirements.

Our study revealed that participants showed higher intercultural communicative competence towards Turkish culture, which can be concluded from both our quantitative and qualitative data analysis. The obtained results shared the number of similarities with researchers' findings in the areas of teaching English as second or foreign language learning (Wang and Peng, 2013; Pozzo, 2014; Almarzo et al, 2015, Penbek&Yurdakul and Cerit, 2009; Himanoğlu, 2011 and Çangal, 2012; Güven, 2015; Dombi, 2016). Qualitative data which consist of interview answers from 5 participants also further strengthened our quantitative results. Apart from the main research question, it was also found that the learners who have 3 or 4 years of learning Turkish experience demonstrate the highest ICC whereas no statistically significant differences were found in terms of participants' age, language proficiency, overseas experience...etc. Even though some findings in our research are consistent with the results of previous study (Wang and Peng, 2013; Pozzo, 2014; Almarzo et al., 2015, Penbek&Yurdakul and Cerit, 2009; Himanoğlu, 2011 and Çangal, 2012; Güven, 2015; Dombi, 2016), but some does not appear to corroborate some observation in the literature (Prodromou, 1992).

We acknowledge that our research has three potential limitations. Firstly, of course, the results from the present study are somewhat speculative and based on a small sampling, only including 95 participants. Increasing the sampling number and varying the participants chosen may yield more reliable and comprehensive degree for Turkish language learners' intercultural communicative competence. Moreover, equalising the number of participants for the future research may lead to more valid and reliable results for the future research this is because data distribution is normal. However, some participant numbers in some independent variables are not equal. Our second limitation of present research could be the participants were chosen, and subjects were reached from social media platforms, which means choosing more participants from different regions and including Turkish language Center (TÖMER) students into the sampling scope may yield the significant result of TFL learners' intercultural communicative competence.

Last but not least, according to the requirements from mixed method research in the literature, it can be learned that at least 8 or 15 per cent of participants could be interviewed. However, only 5 participants showed their consent to participate in our research interview. Even though the qualitative data from 5 participants could not generalise the whole participants' degree of ICC, a large corpus for qualitative data is needed to establish to give generalised outcomes of the related research in the future. Our results are promising and should be validated by large sample size.

Based on our findings and results from the present study, it can be concluded that his research raised a number of interesting difference of participants' ICC. By way of conclusion, this research may not generalize the English language learners' intercultural communicative competence as a whole, but it gives useful suggestions to Turkish language educators and language practitioners to engage in delivering more intercultural materials and knowledge by applying classroom activities which promote and enhance TFL learners' ICC. To this respect, it is suggested that Turkish language teachers not only emphasize on learners' four core competence; listening, reading, grammar and speaking, but also it could be essential to integrate intercultural course contents and workshops when giving Turkish language training to TFL Learners.

References

- Akalın, S. (2004). Considering Turkish Students' Communicative Competence in Teaching English Communicative Competence. *Atatürk University Journal of Graduate School of Social Science*, 4(2), 227-237.
- Akinson, D. (1999). TESOL and Culture. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(4), 625-654.
- Almazra, G., Martinez , R., & Llavador, F. (2017). Approaching Erasmus Students' Intercultural Communicative Competence Through Their Socialization Patterns. *Journal of English Studies*, 15, 89-106.
- Arasaratnam, L. (2009). The Development of A New Instrument of Intercultural Communication Competence. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 20, 1404-1634.
- Atay, D., Çamlıbel, Z., & Kaslıoğlu, Ö. (2009). The Role of Intercultural Competence in Foreign Language Teaching. *İnönü University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 10(3), 123-135.
- Atay, D., Kaslıoğlu, Ö., & Çamlıbel, Z. (n.d.). The Role of Intercultural Competence in Foreign Language Teaching . *İnönü University Journal of Faculty and Education*.
- Bloom, M., & Miranda, A. (2015). Intercultural Sensitivity Through Short-Term Study Abroad. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 15(4), 567-580.
- Brunnet-Thornton, J. (2010). *Interduction to Cross-Cultural Management (Vol. 202)*. Praha: VSE.
- Byram, M. (1989). *Cultural Studies in Foreign Language Education*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters .
- Byram, M. (1997). Assessment 2000: Towards A Pluralistic Approach to Assessment. *Multilingual Matters*, 109-110.
- Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and assessing intercultural communication competence. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence. *Multilingual Matters*, 109-110.
- Byram, M. (2008). *From Foreign Language Education to Education for Intercultural Citizenship: Essays and Reflections*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

-
- Candel-Mora, M. (2015). Attitudes Towards Intercultural Communicative Competence of English For Specific Purposes Students. *Social and Behavioral Science*, 76, 26-31.
- Cetinavci, C. (2012). Intercultural Communicative Competence in ELT. *Social and Behavioural Science*, 46, 3445-3449.
- Çalışkan, G. (2009). *Greating Cultural Awareness in Language Teaching* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Ankara: Hacettepe Univeristy.
- Gülcan, M. (2015). Turkish EFL teachers' and administrators' perceptions of short teacher training courses: The case of CELTA. Council of Higher Education Thesis Center.
- Güven, S. (2015). EFL Learners' Attitudes Towards Learning Intercultural Communicative Competence. . Ankara: Council of Higher Education Thesis Center.
- Genç, G. (2018). Are Turkish EFL Pre-service Teachers Ready to Manage Intercultural Challenges? . *Intercultural Education*, 185-202.
- Hammer, M. (2003). Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 421-443.
- Hammer, M., Bennett, M., & Wiseman, R. (1978). Dimentions of Intercultural Effectiveness: An Exploratory Study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 2(4), 382-393.
- Hismanoglu, M. (2011). An Investigation of ELT Students' Intercultural Communicative Competence in Relation to Linguistic Proficiency, Overseas Experience and Formal Instruction. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35, 805-817.
- İşcan, A. (2016). The Use of Turkish Films in Teaching Turkish As a Foreign Language: A Sample from Hababamsınıfı. *Participatory Educational Research (PER)*, 190-198.
- Nadeem, M., Mohammed, R., & Dalib, S. (2017). A Proposal Model of Intercultural Communicative Competence in Malaysian Context. *Intercultural Journal of Research and Review*, 2(2), 11-20.
- Özbay, M., & Barutçu, T. (2013). Dil Psikolojisi ve Türkçe Öğretimi. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11, 933-973.
- Panggabean, H., Murniati, J., & Tjitra, H. (2013). Profiling Intercultural Competence of Indonesians in Asia Workgroups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 37, 86-98.
- Penbek, Yurdakul, D., & Cerit, A. (2012). Intercultural Communication Competence: A study about the Intercultural Sensitivity of University Students Based on Their Education and International Experience. *International Journal of Logistics Systems and Management*, 11(2), 232-252.
- Peng, R., Wu, P., & Fan, W. (2015). A Comprehensive Evaluation of Chinese College Students' Intercultural Competence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 47, 143-457.
- Pozzo, M. (2014). Intercultural Communicative Competence and Medical Students from Haiti: The Case of the Faculty of Medical Sciences at National University of Rosario, Argentina. *Social and Behavioral Science*, 132, 708-714.
- Prodromou, L. (1992). What Culture? Which Culture? Cross-cultural in Language Learning. *ELT Journal*, 46(1), 39-50.

- Sercu, L. (2004). Assessing Intercultural Competence: A Framework for Systematic Test Development in Foreign Language Education and Beyond. *Intercultural Education*, 15(1), 73-89.
- Uzum, B. (2007). Analysis of Turkish Learners' Attitudes Towards English Language and English Speaking Societies (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Ankara: Middle East Technical University.
- Wang, J. (2017). Views and Attitudes of Intercultural Awareness in Chinese Teaching and Learning in Shanxi Provincial Universities Context. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(2), 418-430.
- Wang, W., & Zhou, M. (2016). Validation of the Short Forms of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS-15). *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 55, 1-7.
- Wujiabudula, A. (2018). An Investigation on Second Language Learners' Production of Conventional Expressions in L2 Pragmatics. *Advances in Language and Literacy Studies*, 9(5), 43-48.