The Relationship Between Turkish Origin Students' Intercultural Sensitivity and Foreign Language Learning Attitudes

Türk Soylu Öğrencilerin Kültürlerarası Duyarlılıkları ile Yabancı Dil Öğrenme Tutumları Arasındaki İlişki

Gülnur AYDIN[1], **Nezir TEMUR**[2]

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of this research is to evaluate the relationship between Turkish origin students' intercultural sensitivity and their attitudes towards foreign language learning.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The research adopted a correlational research method. The participants of the study were 509 Turkish origin students studying at state universities in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan. Data were collected using *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning Scale*. The collected data were analyzed using the SPSS 26.0 statistical package program.

Findings: Based on the analyses conducted using the SPSS 26.0 statistical package program, it was identified that age and nationality were determinant demographic variables for the total scores of intercultural sensitivity, whereas gender, age, nationality, and the number of foreign languages known were determinant demographic variables for attitudes toward foreign language learning. The study found that as the levels of intercultural sensitivity increased, the attitudes towards foreign language learning developed positively, and the predictor that most influenced attitudes towards foreign language learning was "respect for cultural differences".

Highlights: Given the influence of intercultural sensitivity on language learning attitudes and, consequently, on individual motivation, it is crucial to re-examine the resources and methodologies required for its enhancement. Accordingly, intercultural education programs may be designed to foster and strengthen the intercultural sensitivity of students of Turkish origin.

Öz

Çalışmanın amacı: Bu araştırmanın amacı, Türk soylu öğrencilerin kültürlerarası duyarlılıkları ile yabancı dil öğrenmeye yönelik tutumları arasındaki ilişkiyi değerlendirmektir.

Materyal ve Yöntem: Araştırmada korelasyonel araştırma yöntemi benimsenmiştir. Katılımcılar, Azerbaycan, Kazakistan, Kırgızistan ve Özbekistan'daki devlet üniversitelerinde öğrenim gören toplam 509 Türk soylu öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Veriler, *Kültürlerarası Duyarlılık Ölçeği ve Yabancı Dil Öğrenmeye Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği* aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Elde edilen veriler, SPSS 26.0 istatistik paket programında analiz edilmiştir.

Bulgular: SPSS 26.0 istatistik paket programında yapılan analizler sonucunda kültürlerarası duyarlılık toplam puanları için yaş ve uyruğun; yabancı dil öğrenmeye yönelik tutumlar için cinsiyet, yaş, uyruk ve bilinen yabancı dil sayısının belirleyici demografik değişkenler olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Araştırmada kültürlerarası duyarlılık düzeyi arttıkça yabancı dil öğrenmeye yönelik tutumların olumlu yönde geliştiği, yabancı dil öğrenmeye yönelik tutumu en fazla etkileyen yordayıcının ise "kültürel farklılıklara saygı" olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Önemli Vurgular: Dil öğrenme tutumuna ve dolayısıyla da bireysel motivasyona etkisi düşünüldüğünde kültürlerarası duyarlılığın geliştirilmesi için gereksinim duyulan kaynak ve yöntemlerin gözden geçirilmesi büyük önem taşımaktadır. Bu doğrultuda, Türk soylu öğrencilerin kültürlerarası duyarlılığını geliştirmeyi ve güçlendirmeyi hedefleyen kültürlerarası eğitim programları tasarlanabilir.

[1] **Corresponded Author,** Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Institute of Graduate Education, Department of Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language, Ankara, Türkiye; https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0490-9580

[2] Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Education, Ankara, Türkiye; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8052-1927

INTRODUCTION

Globalisation has created a network that makes countries interdependent in many aspects such as communication, transport, economy, politics, education and has placed great importance on the ability to manage both national and international encounters/relationships. This ability, which focuses on the quality of contact with different cultures, refers to the ability to discover differences in interaction styles, world views, perspectives and behaviours, and to reflect these in one's own behaviour. This process, which Altmayer (2002) calls as learning *cultural patterns of interpretation*, makes the basis for communication and cooperation in today's world, where cultural diversity is commonplace, without the problem of adapting to the unusual. Therefore, the need to acquire abilities that require the restructuring of intercultural consciousness is increasing day by day.

The main function of language is to create a bond between individuals based on communication. Since the level of communicative competence will be decisive in the formation of this bond, what is included in the scope of communicative competence is an issue that needs to be taken into consideration. In the views put forward on this subject, communicative competence is explicitly and implicitly associated with knowledge of form and usage by emphasising its relationship with the social field. The process that starts with the individual's acquaintance with language exhibits a very comprehensive view that includes grammatical appropriateness focusing on structure, sociolinguistic appropriateness focusing on sociocultural context, strategic appropriateness focusing on usage and discourse (Bachman, 1990; Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983; Hymes, 1972). It is important to what extent successful communication in intercultural contact situations corresponds to these characteristics. These characteristics can also be considered as the basic indicators of a state of intercultural awareness that will build intercultural contact.

Intercultural consciousness goes beyond an understanding of diversity to include a commitment to ethical principles, patience, tolerance, flexibility and adaptability, and refers primarily to intercultural communicative competence to create a new understanding that supports the coexistence of cultural groups. Xin (2007) attributes the importance of communicative competence in today's world to its significance in the gradual globalisation and also points out that it has created a dynamic in language learning and teaching. This has led to changes in people's attitudes towards language learning in many parts of the world. In addition, culture, as one of the most important components of the communication process, has created paradigm shifts in language teaching approaches and it has often been stated by researchers that it should be an important part of planning the language teaching process (Aydın, 2021; Crawford-Lange & Lange, 1987).

It is stated that language learning improves cognitive and analytical abilities, increases awareness of one's own language and culture, strengthens global understanding, life skills, communication and relationships (Perić & Radić, 2021). With these characteristics, knowing a language (or languages) other than one's mother tongue is a symbol of power, equivalent to having many opportunities in different cultures. According to Kramsch (1998), culture is membership in a discourse community that shares a common social space, history and dreams. Knowledge of the background of the discourse, extra-linguistic indicators and social skills enable the language code to be analysed correctly. Thus, interpretation emerges and is constructed from social interactions (Kaufman, 2004; Nunan, 1992). Aidinlou and Kejal (2012) found that perceiving the sociocultural features of the target language contributes significantly to learning that language better, deciding where, how and when to use language structures, and saving learning time. The distance between the source language and the target language can be reduced by strengthening the cultural background. From this point of view, culture accompanying language learning can be seen as creating meaning and minimising the loss/distortion of meaning.

"Intercultural communication competence is an umbrella concept that covers intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence" (Su, 2018, p. 218). Intercultural awareness (cognitive) is the basis for intercultural sensitivity (emotional), which in turn forms intercultural competence (behavioural). The three of them are closely related but distinct concepts (Chen, 1997). Emotional enhancement of awareness is a prerequisite for achieving the goal of competence. The focus of this study is on "intercultural sensitivity", which is related to emotion. Accordingly, intercultural sensitivity is conceptualised as "the ability to develop positive emotions of understanding and appreciation that promote appropriate and effective behaviour in intercultural communication" (Chen, 1997, p. 5). Yuen and Grosman (2009, p. 350) also state that intercultural sensitivity is "the ability to interact with other cultures and to perceive one's role in another culture". In summary, intercultural sensitivity is about "breaking down conscious and unconscious prejudices against cultural differences; it is based on understanding through recognition, inclusion through trust, and equal opportunity through appreciation" (Aydın, 2020, p. 32).

Bennett (1986) modelled intercultural sensitivity developmentally around two contexts and six orientations as seen in the Table 1.

Table 1. Developmental intercultural sensitivity model

Denial	Defence	Minimization	Acceptance	Adaptation	Integration
Ethnocentric Phases			**Ethnorelativist Phases**		

Denial: The phase where there is little or no interest in cultural differences, where differences are not even recognised, and isolation is preferred

Defence: The phase where cultural differences are recognised but react negatively to them and conformity to one's own cultural norms is expected

Minimization: The phase in which, although there is a respect for cultural differences, one's own culture is seen as superior and therefore contact with the 'other' is kept to a minimum.

Acceptance: The phase where cultural differences are recognised, validated but not yet equal

Adaptation: The phase where adaptation to intercultural contexts is achieved while maintaining one's own cultural codes

Integration: The phase where being able to interact and cooperate with other cultures seeing one's own culture as of equal value with many other cultures; to assume roles in different cultures

"Ethnocentrism", which expresses the first context in the model, consists of phases of denial, defence and minimization. Individuals in ethnocentric phases place their own culture at the centre of their evaluation of other cultures and make judgements according to the standards of their own culture. The second context, "ethnorelativism", consists of the stages of acceptance, adaptation and integration. Individuals in ethnorelativist phases tend to interact with other cultures and experience their own culture in other cultural contexts. It is argued that as intercultural experience increases, so does sensitivity and thus intercultural competence. As can be understood, the model emphasises the creation of a broader understanding of differences and the construction of universal cultural intercultural consciousness (Aydın, 2020; Bennett, 1986; Hammer et al. 2003).

The components of intercultural sensitivity are listed as (1) self-esteem, (2) self-monitoring, (3) open-mindedness, (4) empathy, (5) interaction engagement, and (6) avoidance of judgement (Chen, 1997; Chen & Starosta, 2000). Sensitive individuals are expected to have internalised these components. To the extent that they have internalised them, they may be able to recognise and understand diversity, put themselves in the shoes of others, develop different perspectives, and have a high level of communicative competence in an effective context. This is essential for societies changing with the cultural diversity of today's world to easily overcome ethnocentrism and engaging with other cultures.

Intercultural sensitivity has the potential to positively influence attitudes towards foreign language learning as it contributes to the creation of shared meanings, interpretations and symbols and to flexibility in the face of a foreign culture. It is therefore important to consider attitudes when examining the contributions of culture to the highly complex nature of language learning. Attitudes have emerged as one of the most important emotional variables in explaining language learning outcomes because of their influence on motivation (Pavlenko, 2005). Often emphasised in psycholinguistics and educational psychology, attitude is "an individual's evaluative response to a referent or object based on beliefs or opinions" (Gardner, 1985, p. 9). This response determines preferences and shapes feelings, thoughts and behaviours. Attitudes are shaped by elements such as past experiences, social, cultural and political realities, language status, expectations, feelings of security, and so on. These elements make it easier to understand the input and also indicate that there may be changes over time. Positive attitudes can become negative and negative attitudes can become positive. According to Wenden (1991), attitudes have three components: Firstly, beliefs and perceptions about objects and situations; secondly, evaluativeness towards liking or disliking objects or situations; and thirdly, guiding learning behaviours.

Attitudes towards foreign language learning, as an individual factor influencing success and efficiency, have been addressed in research, particularly in those dimensions that relate the meaning and value that second/foreign language learners attach to language to the socio-cultural context. Papapavlou (1998, p. 16) reviewed studies on attitudes towards languages and dialects and found that the studies focused on (a) attitudes towards the foreign language and their effects on learning, (b) attitudes towards neighbouring languages and their effects on lexical borrowing, (c) attitudes towards particular social groups and the variants they speak, and (d) attitudes towards particular ethnic groups or minorities and their languages. On the other hand, models of second language acquisition take into account the nature of attitudes that may explain differences in learning outcomes. Positive attitudes facilitate access to input to the language acquisition tool, leading to high language proficiency, whereas negative attitudes hinder input, making second language acquisition difficult with high anxiety (Pavlenko, 2005). Furthermore, Tódor and Dégi (2016) found that a generally positive attitude towards languages favours interlanguage relations and integrative, dynamic multilingual thinking.

Identifying attitudes is a precursor to identifying strategies and methods to increase achievement and confidence and to meet expectations. In this way, it is possible to bridge the gap between the learner and the teacher, as well as between the learner and the content. In this respect, it has become necessary to bring a new interdisciplinary perspective and dimension to cultural studies. This perspective to be developed will contribute significantly to the formation of basic premises that will shape mental and psychological language learning processes, such as first attitude and then intercultural sensitivity in second/foreign language learning. This is why, in recent years, there has been a growing tendency to approach and analyse the subject from different angles.

Wei (2019) argues that intercultural sensitivity is mainly influenced by individual situations, learning conditions, teaching materials and intercultural communication experiences. In support of this view, studies have highlighted the relationship between the subject and various predictors. Olson and Kroeger (2001) found a relationship between intercultural sensitivity and second language acquisition and experience abroad; Straffon (2003) found a relationship between intercultural sensitivity and length of attendance at an international school; Roh (2014) found a relationship between intercultural sensitivity and level of multicultural experience; Aydoğan and Akbarov (2014), between intercultural sensitivity and attitudes towards foreign language and foreign language use; Aydoğan and Akbarov (2015), between intercultural sensitivity and foreign language proficiency, verbal ability and verbal expressiveness; Genç and Boynukara (2017), between intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence; Abaslı and Polat (2019), between intercultural sensitivity and cultural intelligence; Çiloğlan and Bardakçı (2019) found a positive relationship between intercultural sensitivity and language proficiency; Tıkız-Ertürk et al. (2023) found a positive relationship between intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence. Engle and Engle (2004) found that study abroad develops language acquisition and intercultural sensitivity in similar ways and that there is a close relationship between the development of these

two key areas. Also, Williams (2005) found that the sensitivity of those who study abroad is significantly higher than that of those who do not and that exposure is the most important determinant of intercultural communication skills. Erdoğan and Okumuşlar (2020) found a negative relationship between intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism. In other words, as the level of intercultural sensitivity increases, ethnocentrism decreases. It is understood that similar results have been found in some studies that were not conducted using the relational method. For example, Penbek et al. (2012) found that intercultural sensitivity increased in parallel with the experience of participating in intercultural interactions, Laopongharn and Sercombe (2009) found that increased intercultural communication competence led to more competent language use, and Meydanlıoğlu et al. (2015) found that those who speak a foreign language and interact with different cultures have higher sensitivity; Chen and Hu (2023) found that experience abroad and grade level influence intercultural sensitivity; Çubukçu (2013) found that foreign language teacher candidates integrate language teaching objectives with culture teaching and prioritise attitudinal knowledge, tolerance and sempathy towards others.

On the other hand, there are some studies that consider the attitudes towards language learning in a relational way. Accordingly, a significant positive relationship has been found between attitudes towards language learning and academic achievement (Fakeye, 2010; İnal et al. 2005), foreign language learning strategies (Jabbari & Golkar, 2014; Saracaloğlu & Dinçer, 2017), language skill acquisition (Karatay & Kartallıoğlu, 2016), and learner autonomy (Süğümlü & Çinpolat, 2023). While a negative relationship was found between attitudes towards language learning and motivational barriers (İnalöz & Yılmaz, 2023) and success in using language skills (Karatay et al. 2018), no significant relationship was found with shyness level (Alavinia & Salmasi, 2012).

In general, the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and language learning attitude shows the limitation witnessed in the literature. However, Alisaari and Kilpi-Jakonen (2022) report that it is possible to positively influence linguistic and non-linguistic skills, including attitudes and sociolinguistic skills, by teaching intercultural competences. This suggests that a deep understanding of intercultural sensitivity can improve language learning attitudes. Ahnagari and Zamanian (2014) also reported that intercultural competence practices can increase positive attitudes towards both source and target cultures and also motivate learners to improve their language proficiency. On the other hand, the situation of Turkish origin students who came to Turkey for high school, undergraduate and graduate education for the first time within the scope of the *Big Student Project*[*] carried out by the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Turkey immediately after the dissolution of the Soviet Union has been the subject of many studies in various educational contexts, and the importance of providing support for language competence and cultural identity in guiding their education has been pointed out. In these studies, which are limited to linguistic frameworks such as linguistic correspondences and vocabulary, comparisons regarding the barriers in language learning processes have come to the fore. Today, both cultural and educational studies are carried out more intensively through projects and programmes produced by many institutions and organisations. As a matter of fact, linguistic and cultural belongings are the basis of developing sensitivity and attitudes towards different cultural contexts. However, the lack of such an evaluation in the related literature on Turkish origin students is seen as an important deficiency. It is thought that such a study may enable researchers, educators and policy makers to make purposeful interventions that can affect academic results and social welfare by determining a starting point. Accordingly, this study, which focuses on the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and language learning attitudes of Turkish origin students, seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. Does the intercultural sensitivity of Turkish origin students differ according to the demographic variables?
2. Does the attitudes of Turkish origin students towards foreign language learning differ according to the demographic variables?
3. Is there a significant relationship between Turkish origin students' intercultural sensitivity and their language learning attitudes?
4. Is there any effect of the Turkish origin students' intercultural sensitivity on their attitudes towards foreign language learning?

METHOD/MATERIALS

Study Model

In this study, the correlational research method was adopted to investigate the statistical relationship between intercultural sensitivity and language learning attitudes of Turkish origin students. "Correlational research is conducted either to explain the relationships between variables or to predict possible outcomes" (Fraenkel et al., 2012, p.332). For this purpose, data are collected from participants without interfering with the variables and it is accepted that the data reflect the natural relationships and degrees of relationship between the variables (Büyüköztürk et al. 2013; Fraenkel et al. 2012). In this type of research, statistical techniques such as correlation and regression are used to predict one variable from another.

---

[*] After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Turkey signed bilateral agreements with the Turkic republics and related communities to strengthen common historical and cultural ties. One of the most important projects in the field of education was the Great Student Project, which started in 1992 and continued until 2012. Thousands of students received higher education in Turkey on scholarships through the project, which aimed to raise a Turkish and pro-Turkish generation and spread Turkish language and culture.

Participants

Criterion sampling, one of the purposive sampling techniques, was used to identify the participants for the study. Criterion sampling is the inclusion of sources that have certain criteria and characteristics to meet the study objectives and can provide the richest data possible (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). In this direction, the participants of the study were determined according to the criteria of having a good command of Turkish, having an undergraduate or postgraduate education in the country of residence, and being 18 years or older. Demographic information about the participants is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of participants according to demographic variables

Variable	Group	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	335	65,8
	Male	174	34,2
Age	18-22 years	423	83,1
	23-26 years	42	8,3
	27 years and over	44	8,6
Nationality	Azerbaijan	115	22,6
	Kazakhstan	173	34
	Kyrgyzstan	114	22,4
	Uzbekistan	107	21
Level of Education	Undergraduate	437	85,9
	Postgraduate	72	14,1
Number of foreign languages known	Unspecified	86	16,9
	1 language	195	38,3
	2 languages	175	34,4
	3 languages or more	53	10,4
Total		509	100

65.8% of the participants were female, 34.2% were male; 83.1% were aged 18-22, 8.3% were aged 23-26 and 8.6% were aged 27 and over. In terms of nationality, they came from Kazakhstan (34%), Azerbaijan (22.6%), Kyrgyzstan (22.4%) and Uzbekistan (21%); 85.9% of them had undergraduate education and 14.1% had postgraduate education. Finally, as regards the number of languages spoken by the participants, they are divided into those who speak 1 language (38.3%), those who speak 2 languages (34.4%), those who speak 3 languages (10.4%); 16.9% of the participants did not specify the number of languages.

Data Collection

The intercultural sensitivity scale developed by Chen and Starosta (2000) and adapted into Turkish by Küllü-Sülü (2014) and the attitudes towards foreign language learning scale developed by Koç and Yastıbaş (2022) were used to collect the study data. Before using the scales, written permission was obtained from the corresponding authors. Then, both scales were transferred to the online environment and presented to the participants with a link address. Participants who had access to the link were first informed about the study and, after agreeing to participate voluntarily, responded to the relevant scales.

The *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale* was developed as a five-point likert scale with 24 items. The scale includes items such as "I enjoy communicating with people from other cultures", "I respect the values of people from different cultures", "I think my culture is better than other cultures", and so on. The scale has a minimum score of 24 and a maximum score of 120. A high score indicates a high level of sensitivity. In addition, 9 items in the scale (2, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15, 18, 20, 22) are reverse scored. According to the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) results, the scale consists of five sub-dimensions. These dimensions are "interaction engagement" (7 items), "respect for cultural differences" (6 items), "interaction confidence" (5 items), "interaction enjoyment" (3 items) and "interaction attentiveness" (3 items). This scale, originally in English, was translated back and forth from English to Turkish and from Turkish to English in order to minimise losses by consulting experts and to ensure content and face validity. Then, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of the whole scale was calculated as .758 (Küllü-Sülü, 2014). In the English version of the scale, this coefficient was found to be .86, and it was found that the five-factor structure explained 37.3% of the variance (Chen & Starosta, 2000).

The *Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning Scale* was developed as a 34-item five-point Likert scale. The scale includes items such as "I enjoy learning a foreign language.", "I enjoy learning a foreign language.", "I enjoy reading sources written in a foreign language." and so on. The scale has a minimum score of 34 and a maximum score of 170. While a low score indicates a positive attitudes, a high score indicates a negative attitudes. In addition, 13 items of the scale (7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 14, 17, 24, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33) are reverse scored. The calculated Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin coefficient and the Barlett sphericity test value of the scale indicated that the scale was suitable for exploratory factor analysis (EFA). According to the EFA results, the scale consisted of five sub-dimensions. The sub-dimensions of the scale are "emotions towards foreign language learning" (10 items), "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning" (8 items), "using a foreign language for social media" (6 items), "importance given to learning

a foreign language" (5 items) and "thoughts towards foreign language lessons" (5 items). The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the scale were .883, .867, .889, .804, .749 and .934 for the whole scale. The obtained scale explains 59.099% of the total variance (Koç & Yastıbaş, 2022).

In this study, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .79 for the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and .92 for the Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning Scale. This means that the reliability of both scales is high.

Data Analysis

The SPSS 26.0 statistical package was used to analyse the data collected online as part of the study. There were no participants who gave the same answer to all items in both scales. During the analyses, normality was checked according to the skewness and kurtosis coefficients for the scales and sub-dimensions. If these values are between ±1, the distribution of scores is normal. For the extreme values of the scale scores, the z-standard value should be calculated and this value should be outside the range of ±3.30 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). As the skewness and kurtosis values for the sub-dimensions "interaction participation" and "interaction enjoyment" of the intercultural sensitivity scale and the sub-dimension "importance given to foreign language learning" of the attitudes towards foreign language learning scale were outside the range of ±1, the z values of these measures were calculated. The z-value of 12 participants was found to be outside the ±3 range and was not included in the analysis.

Frequency and percentage distributions of demographic variables and descriptive statistics of the scales are presented in the study. The Pearson correlation method was used for the relationship between the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and its sub-dimensions and the Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning Scale and its sub-dimensions. It was found that all scores were continuous and normally distributed, and the number of data (N>30) was large. Turgut and Baykul (2021) state that if the correlation coefficient is greater than 0.70, there is a high correlation, if it is between 0.40-0.70, there is a medium correlation, and if it is less than 0.40, there is a weak correlation.

The effect of levels of intercultural sensitivity on attitudes towards foreign language learning was analysed using multiple linear regression analysis. Tolerance and VIF values were checked for the problem of multicollinearity, which is an important assumption for this method, and no multicollinearity problem was found. As all scale scores were normally distributed and the number of data in each group was sufficient (N>30), the independent groups t-test and the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) method were used as parametric methods. The independent groups t-test method is used to compare continuous and normally distributed measurements of two groups while ANOVA is used to compare more than two groups (Pallant, 2007). The LSD multiple comparison method was used for significant differences as a result of ANOVA and comparisons were made at the p<.05 significance level for statistical analyses.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics relating to the scales scores

Scales	Scale Sub-dimensions	Lowest	Highest	Mean	sd	Skewness	Kurtosis
Intercultural Sensitivity Scale	Interaction engagement	16	35	25,87	3,09	-0,119	0,503
	Respect for cultural differences	13	30	23,61	3,29	-0,195	-0,227
	Interaction confidence	7	25	18,53	3,13	-0,247	0,249
	Interaction enjoyment	7	15	12,57	1,70	-0,42	-0,075
	Interaction attentiveness	4	15	10,51	1,73	-0,147	0,445
	Total sensitivity	65	118	91,08	8,96	-0,061	0,141
Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning Scale	Emotions	10	40	22,57	5,80	0,242	-0,132
	Negative thoughts	8	33	14,07	4,69	0,92	0,835
	Social media	6	28	13,50	4,11	0,221	-0,039
	Importance given	5	18	8,53	2,78	0,674	0,14
	Thoughts about lessons	5	23	10,88	3,11	0,137	-0,092
	Total attitudes	34	120	69,56	16,34	0,177	-0,342

The total and sub-dimenions scores for the scales used were obtained by summing the items. The total score of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale ranged from 65 to 118 and the mean score was 91.08. The mean scores for the sub-dimensions of the same scale were obtained as "interaction engagement" (X=25.37), "respect for cultural differences" (X=23.61), "interaction confidence" (X=18.53), "interaction enjoyment" (X=12.57) and "interaction attentiveness" (X=10.51). The total score of the Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning Scale ranged from 34 to 120 and the mean score was 69.56. The means for the sub-dimensions of the same scale were obtained as "emotions towards foreign language learning" (X=22.57), "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning" (X=14.07), "using a foreign language for social media" (X=13.50), "thoughts towards foreign language lessons" (X=10.88) and "importance given to learning a foreign language" (X=8.53). As the skewness and kurtosis values for both scales and sub-dimensions are between ±1, the distribution of the scores is normal.

FINDINGS

Firstly, the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and attitudes towards foreign language learning of Turkish origin students and demographic variables was examined. The findings regarding the comparison of Intercultural Sensitivity Scale scores according to demographic variables are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Comparison of intercultural sensitivity scale scores according to demographic variables

Variable	Group	N	Int. eng.	Respect cult. dif.	Int. conf.	Int. enjoy.	Int. attent.	Total sens.
			X±sd	X±sd	X±sd	X±sd	X±sd	X±sd
Gender	Female	335	25,9±3,1	23,9±3,1	18,4±3,1	12,6±1,7	10,4±1,7	91,3±8,6
	Male	174	25,8±3,2	23,1±3,5	18,7±3,1	12,5±1,7	10,7±1,8	90,7±9,7
	t		0,537	2,708	-1,136	0,813	-1,373	0,664
	p		0,592	0,007*	0,256	0,416	0,17	0,507
Age	18-22 years old (a)	149	25,6±3,1	23,3±3,2	18,3±3,1	12,5±1,7	10,4±1,7	90,2±8,8
	23-26 years old (b)		26,4±2,6	24±3,6	19,1±2,6	12,8±1,5	10,7±1,9	93±8,3
	27 years and over (c)	151	27,6±2,6	25,7±2,9	20,2±3	13,3±1,3	11,2±2,1	97,9±7,7
	Test statistic		8,486	10,805	7,893	5,274	4,887	16,973
	p		,000*	,000*	,000*	0,005*	0,008*	,000*
	Difference**		c>a	c>a,b	c>a	c>a	c>a	c>b>a
Nationality	Azerbaijan (a)	115	26,9±2,7	25,3±2,8	19±3,4	12,9±1,6	11,1±1,9	95,2±8,5
	Kazakhstan (b)	173	25,4±3	22,6±3,5	18,7±3	12,4±1,8	10,3±1,6	89,4±8,8
	Kyrgyzstan (c)	114	25,7±3,2	23,6±2,6	17,7±3,4	12,4±1,6	10,2±1,6	89,7±8,3
	Uzbekistan (d)	107	25,7±3,4	23,3±3,4	18,6±2,7	12,7±1,7	10,6±1,7	91±9,1
	F		5,598	17,023	3,491	3,207	6,708	11,853
	p		0,001*	,000*	0,016*	0,023*	,000*	,000*
	Difference**		a>b,c,d	a>b,c,d; c>b	a,b,d>c	a>b,c	a>b,c,d	a>b,c,d
Level of Education	Undergraduate	437	25,8±3,1	23,6±3,3	18,5±3,1	12,6±1,7	10,4±1,7	90,9±9
	Graduate	72	26,2±3,3	23,6±3,3	18,8±3,2	12,4±1,5	11,1±1,8	92,2±8,9
	t		-0,912	-0,089	-0,77	0,664	-3,21	-1,107
	p		0,362	0,929	0,442	0,507	0,001*	0,269
Number of Foreign Languages Known	Unspecified (a)	79	25,5±3	23,6±3,5	17,9±3,3	12,6±1,8	10,6±1,8	90,2±9,7
	1 language (b)	97	25,8±3,1	23,8±3,1	18,3±3,1	12,7±1,6	10,6±1,7	91,2±8,6
	2 languages (c)	76	25,9±3,1	23,4±3,4	18,7±3,1	12,4±1,7	10,3±1,7	90,7±9
	3 languages and over (d)	48	26,6±3,2	23,5±3,4	19,8±2,8	12,8±1,9	10,9±1,6	93,6±8,6
	F		1,393	0,393	4,88	1,077	1,974	1,856
	p		0,244	0,758	0,002*	0,358	0,117	0,136
	Difference**				d>a,b,c; c>a			

*$p<.05$; **LSD multiple comparison; X=Average; sd=standard deviation

According to the gender of the participants, a significant difference was obtained only between the scores of the "respect for cultural differences" sub-dimension of intercultural sensitivity, and the "respect for cultural differences" sub-dimension average of the women was higher than that of the men ($p<.05$).

A statistically significant difference was found between the total intercultural sensitivity scores and all sub-dimension scores according to the age of the participants ($p>.05$). Accordingly, the mean scores of the participants aged 27 years and above for the sub-dimensions of "interaction engagement", "interaction confidence", "interaction enjoyment" and "interaction attentiveness" were higher than those of the participants aged 18-22 years. In addition, the mean scores of participants aged 27 and over on "respect for cultural differences" are higher than those of participants aged 18-22 and 23-26. Finally, the total mean score for intercultural sensitivity of the participants aged 27 years and over was higher than that of the participants aged 23-26 years and 18-22 years, and the total mean score of the participants aged 23-26 years was higher than that of the participants aged 18-22 years.

There was a statistically significant difference between the total intercultural sensitivity scores and all sub-dimension scores according to the nationality of the participants ($p>.05$). For all ANOVA results, the source of the difference was compared with LSD post hoc method. The mean of "interaction engagement", "respect for cultural differences", "interaction attentiveness" sub-dimensions and total sensitivity score of the participants from Azerbaijan is higher than all participants from other nationalities. In addition, the mean score of "respect for cultural differences" of Kyrgyzstan national participants was higher than Kazakhstan national participants. The mean score of "interaction confidence" of Kyrgyzstan national participants is lower than all participants of other nationalities. The mean score of "interaction enjoyment" of the participants from Azerbaijan was higher than the participants from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan.

According to the education level of the participants, there is a significant difference only between the "interaction attentiveness" sub-dimension scores ($p<.05$) and the mean score of the "interaction attentiveness" sub-dimension of the participants at the graduate level was higher than the participants at the undergraduate level.

According to the number of foreign languages learnt, there is a significant difference only between the "interaction confidence" sub-dimension scores ($p<.05$). The mean score of the participants who know 3 or more languages is higher than the participants

who know 2 languages, 1 language and the participants who do not specify; the mean score of the participants who know 2 languages is higher than the participants who do not specify.

The findings regarding the comparison of Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning Scale scores according to demographic variables are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of attitudes scores towards foreign language learning scale according to demographic variables

Variable	Group	N	Emotions	Negative thoughts	Social media	Attention given	Thoughts about lessons	Total attitudes
			X±sd	X±sd	X±sd	X±sd	X±sd	X±sd
Gender	Female	161	22,3±5,6	13,7±4,4	13,3±4,1	8,3±2,6	10,6±3,1	68,3±15,4
	Male	139	23,1±6,2	14,8±5,1	13,8±4,2	9±3	11,4±3,2	72±17,8
	t		-1,52	-2,476	-1,209	-2,47	-2,674	-2,486
	p		0,129	0,014*	0,227	0,014*	0,008*	0,013*
Age	18-22 years old (a)	149	23±5,6	14,4±4,7	13,7±4	8,7±2,8	11,2±3	71±15,9
	23-26 years old (b)		20,8±6,1	13,6±4,6	12,7±3,8	8±3,3	10,1±3,2	65,3±17,3
	27 years and over (c)	151	20±6,8	11,8±4,1	12,2±4,7	7,3±2,1	8,8±2,9	60±16,3
	Test statistic		7,646	6,576	3,546	6,193	13,833	10,949
	p		0,001*	0,002*	0,03*	0,002*	0*	0*
	Difference**		a>b,c	a>c	a>c	a>c	a>b>c	a>b,c
Nationality	Azerbaijan (a)	115	22,8±6,6	12,1±3,9	13,3±4,4	7,9±2,6	10,3±3,5	66,2±17,5
	Kazakhstan (b)	173	22,8±5,5	14,7±4,7	13,8±3,8	8,8±2,8	11,7±2,9	71,9±15,8
	Kyrgyzstan (c)	114	23,4±5,5	14,8±4,4	14±4,3	9±2,6	10,8±2,8	72±15,5
	Uzbekistan (d)	107	21,1±5,4	14,4±5,2	12,7±4	8,3±2,9	10,3±3	66,8±16
	F		3,419	9,769	2,428	4,532	7,615	4,751
	p		0,017*	0*	0,065	0,004*	0*	0,003*
	Difference**		a,b,c>d	a<b,c,d		b,c>a; c>d	b>a,c,d	b,c>a,d
Level of Education	Graduate	437	22,7±5,7	14,1±4,7	13,5±4,2	8,6±2,8	11±3,1	69,8±16,3
	Undergraduate	72	22±6,1	14,2±4,9	13,6±3,9	8,4±2,8	10,2±3	68,3±16,7
	t		0,884	-0,214	-0,157	0,525	2,113	0,702
	p		0,377	0,83	0,876	0,6	0,035*	0,483
Number of foreign languages known	Unspecified (a)	79	24,3±6,1	14,7±4,9	15±4,5	9±3	11,4±3,5	74,3±17,6
	1 language (b)	97	22,8±5,8	14,1±4,7	13,4±4,2	8,4±2,9	10,7±3,1	69,3±16,6
	2 languages (c)	76	22,4±5,4	14,1±4,6	13,2±3,7	8,6±2,6	10,9±2,8	69,1±14,9
	3 languages and over (d)	48	19,7±5,5	13,1±4,6	12,7±4	8,1±2,5	10,7±3,5	64,2±16,3
	F		7,341	1,275	4,788	1,421	1,012	4,453
	p		0*	0,282	0,003*	0,236	0,387	0,004*
	Difference**		a>b,c>d		a>b,c,d			a>b,c>d

*p<.05; **LSD multiple comparison; X=Average; sd=standard deviation*

A significant difference was found between the participants' overall attitudes scores towards foreign language learning and the sub-dimension scores of "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning" and "thoughts towards foreign language lessons" according to their gender (p<.05) is higher. This finding means that women's attitudes towards foreign language learning are more positive in terms of overall attitudes scores and related sub-dimensions.

A statistically significant difference was found between the total scores of the participants' attitudes towards foreign language learning and all subscale scores according to their ages (p>.05). The total scores of the participants aged 18-22 and above in terms of attitudes towards foreign language learning and the mean scores of the "emotions towards foreign language learning" subscale were higher than the participants aged 23 and above. In this case, it is understood that the general attitudes of the participants aged 23 and over towards foreign language learning and their attitudes towards the sub-dimension of "emotions towards foreign language learning" are more positive. The mean scores of the participants between the ages of 18-22 on the sub-dimensions of "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning", "using foreign language for social media" and "importance given to learning a foreign language" are higher than the participants aged 27 and above. In other words, the attitudes of the participants aged 27 and above in the related sub-dimensions are more positive than the participants aged 18-22. Finally, the mean scores of the participants between the ages of 18-22 on the sub-dimension "thoughts about foreign language lessons" were higher than those of the participants aged 23 and above, and the mean scores of the participants between the ages of 23-26 were higher than those of the participants aged 27 and above. This finding shows that the attitudes in the relevant sub-dimension become more positive as the age of the participants increases.

There was a statistically significant difference between the total scores of participants' attitudes towards foreign language learning and all sub-dimension scores except "using foreign language for social media" according to their nationality (p>.05). For all ANOVA results, the source of the difference was compared using the LSD post hoc method. The mean score of the participants

from Uzbekistan in the subscale "emotions towards foreign language learning" was lower than all participants from other nationalities. This finding means that the attitudes of the participants from Uzbekistan are more positive than the others in this sub-dimension. The mean score of the participants from Azerbaijan on the sub-dimension "negative thoughts about learning a foreign language" is lower than that of the participants from other nationalities. According to this finding, the attitudes of the participants from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan are more positive than those of the participants from Azerbaijan. The mean scores of the participants from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan on the sub-dimension "importance given to foreign language learning" are higher than those of the participants from Azerbaijan, and the mean scores of the participants from Kyrgyzstan are higher than those of the participants from Uzbekistan. In other words, the attitudes of the participants from Azerbaijan are more positive than the attitudes of the participants from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan; the attitudes of the participants from Uzbekistan are more positive than the attitudes of the participants from Kyrgyzstan. The mean score of the participants from Kazakhstan in the sub-dimension "thoughts about foreign language lessons" is higher than that of the participants from other nationalities. Similarly, the attitudes of the participants from Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan are more positive in this dimension than those of the participants from Kazakhstan. Finally, the total mean scores of the participants from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan were higher than the participants from Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan. Therefore, the attitudes of the participants from Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan are more positive than those of the participants from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan.

According to the level of education of the participants, there is only a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the scores of the sub-dimension "attitudes towards foreign language lessons", and the mean score of the participants at the undergraduate level is higher than that of the participants at the graduate level. This finding shows that the attitudes of the participants at the graduate level are more positive in the relevant sub-dimension.

According to the number of foreign languages known, there is a significant difference between the total scores of attitudes towards foreign language learning and the sub-dimension scores of "emotions towards foreign language learning" and "using foreign language for social media" ($p < .05$). The mean scores of the participants who did not indicate the number of foreign languages were higher than those who indicated that they knew 1 or more languages, and the mean scores of the participants who knew 1 and 2 languages were higher than those who knew 3 languages. This finding shows that the attitudes of the participants who knew 3 languages were more positive in terms of general attitudes and the sub-dimension "emotions towards foreign language learning". Finally, the mean score of the participants who did not indicate the number of foreign languages in the sub-dimension "using foreign language for social media" was higher than the mean score of the participants who knew 1 or more foreign languages. In other words, the participants who indicated that they have at least one or more foreign languages have more positive attitudes than the participants who did not indicate any foreign languages.

Following the demographic evaluations, it was analysed whether there was a statistically significant relationship between intercultural sensitivity and attitudes towards foreign language learning among Turkish origin students. In this context, the relationship between the total scores and the sub-dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning Scale was analysed using the Pearson correlation method (see Table 6).

Table 6. Pearson correlation table between scale scores

	Emotions	Negative thouhgts	Social media	Attention given	Thoughts about lessons	Total attitudes
Interaction engagement	-,401**	-,422**	-,365**	-,511**	-,354**	-,509**
Respect for cultural differences	-,376**	-,554**	-,291**	-,459**	-,415**	-,523**
Interaction confidence	-,424**	-,299**	-,327**	-,323**	-,309**	-,432**
Interaction enjoyment	-,403**	-,460**	-,300**	-,411**	-,344**	-,486**
Interaction attentiveness	-,170**	-,170**	-,136**	-,314**	-,129**	-,221**
Total sensitivity	-,534**	-,574**	-,430**	-,596**	-,473**	-,654**

$**p < .01; *p < .05$

A statistically significant and negative relationship was found between the total score and sub-dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the total score and all sub-dimensions of the Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning Scale ($p < .01$). In other words, as intercultural sensitivity total scores increase, attitudes towards foreign language learning scores decrease or as sensitivity total scores decrease, attitudes towards foreign language learning scores increase. However, while evaluating the negative relationship here, it should be noted that a low score on the attitudes scale indicates a positive attitude and a high score indicates a negative attitude. Therefore, students' high intercultural sensitivity means that their attitudes towards foreign language learning are positive. The relationship between total sensitivity scores and total attitudes towards foreign language learning scores was -0.654, and the relationship between the attitude scale sub-dimensions was between -0.430 and -0.596. The relationship between the sub-dimension of "interaction engagement" and total scores of attitudes towards language learning was -0.509 and the relationship between the sub-dimensions of the attitudes scale was between -0.354 and -0.511. The relationship between the sub-dimension of "respect for cultural differences" and total scores of attitudes towards foreign language learning was -0.523 and the relationship between the sub-dimensions of the attitudes scale was between -0.291 and -0.554; the relationship between the sub-dimension of "interaction confidence" and total scores of attitudes towards foreign language learning was -0.432 and the relationship between the sub-dimensions of the attitudes scale was between -0.291 and -0.554; the relationship between the sub-dimension of "interaction confidence" and total scores of attitudes towards foreign language

learning was -0.432 and the relationship between the sub-dimensions of the attitudes scale was -0.432. 432 and the relationship between the attitudes scale sub-dimensions was between -0.299 and -0.424; the relationship between the "interaction enjoyment" sub-dimension and the total scores of attitudes towards foreign language learning was -0.486 and the relationship between the attitudes scale sub-dimensions was between -0.300 and -0.460. Finally, the relationship between the "interaction attentiveness" sub-dimension and the total scores of attitudes towards foreign language learning was -0.221 and the relationship between the attitudes scale sub-dimensions was between -0.129 and -0.314.

In this study, the effect of Turkish origin students' intercultural sensitivity on their attitudes towards foreign language learning was analysed using the multiple linear regression analysis method. This method analyses the effect of more than one independent variable or predictor on the dependent variable. For regression analysis, the dependent variable should be continuous and normally distributed, and there should be no problem of multicollinearity between the independent variables. Accordingly, all tolerance values are expected to be greater than 0.10 and VIF values are expected to be less than 10 (Pallant, 2007). Since the tolerance values are between 0.663-0.883 and the VIF values are between 1.132-1.539, there is no multicollinearity problem.

Table 7. Regression table for the effect of intercultural sensitivity on attitudes towards foreign language learning

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables	B	S.H.	β	t	p	ANOVA	R²
Total attitudes	Fixed	178,178	5,727		31,111	,000	$F_{(5,503)}$=80.043; p<.001	0.443
	Interaction engagement	-1,198	0,216	-0,227	-5,548	,000		
	Respect for cultural differences	-1,417	0,194	-0,285	-7,314	,000		
	Interaction confidence	-0,901	0,2	-0,172	-4,494	,000		
	Interaction enjoyment	-1,91	0,383	-0,199	-4,993	,000		
	Interaction attentiveness	-0,329	0,334	-0,035	-0,987	0,324		
Emotions towards foreign language learning	Fixed	53,269	2,279		23,376	,000	$F_{(5,503)}$=42.915; p<.001	0.299
	Interaction engagement	-0,307	0,086	-0,164	-3,568	,000		
	Respect for cultural differences	-0,292	0,077	-0,165	-3,784	,000		
	Interaction confidence	-0,446	0,08	-0,241	-5,593	,000		
	Interaction enjoyment	-0,562	0,152	-0,165	-3,691	,000		
	Interaction attentiveness	-0,052	0,133	-0,016	-0,392	0,695		
Negative thoughts towards foreign language learning	Fixed	41,955	1,721		24,38	,000	$F_{(5,503)}$=64.232; p<.001	0.390
	Interaction engagement	-0,222	0,065	-0,147	-3,425	0,001		
	Respect for cultural differences	-0,544	0,058	-0,381	-9,35	,000		
	Interaction confidence	-0,057	0,06	-0,038	-0,943	0,346		
	Interaction enjoyment	-0,614	0,115	-0,223	-5,345	,000		
	Interaction attentiveness	-0,048	0,1	-0,018	-0,483	0,629		
Using foreign language for social media	Fixed	31,146	1,733		17,974	,000	$F_{(5,503)}$=24.261; p<.001	0.194
	Interaction engagement	-0,279	0,065	-0,21	-4,276	,000		
	Respect for cultural differences	-0,137	0,059	-0,109	-2,332	0,02		
	Interaction confidence	-0,225	0,061	-0,171	-3,708	,000		
	Interaction enjoyment	-0,241	0,116	-0,100	-2,081	0,038		
	Interaction attentiveness	0	0,101	0	0,004	0,997		
Importance given to foreign language learning	Fixed	26,241	1,029		25,505	,000	$F_{(5,503)}$=60.851; p<.001	0.377
	Interaction engagement	-0,249	0,039	-0,277	-6,413	,000		
	Respect for cultural differences	-0,191	0,035	-0,226	-5,486	,000		
	Interaction confidence	-0,044	0,036	-0,05	-1,226	0,221		
	Interaction enjoyment	-0,271	0,069	-0,166	-3,94	,000		
	Interaction attentiveness	-0,242	0,06	-0,151	-4,031	,000		
Thoughts about foreign language lessons	Fixed	25,567	1,272		20,096	,000	$F_{(5,503)}$=32.068; p<.001	0.242
	Interaction engagement	-0,141	0,048	-0,14	-2,942	0,003		
	Respect for cultural differences	-0,253	0,043	-0,268	-5,888	,000		
	Interaction confidence	-0,129	0,045	-0,13	-2,893	0,004		
	Interaction enjoyment	-0,222	0,085	-0,121	-2,614	0,009		
	Interaction attentiveness	0,012	0,074	0,007	0,166	0,868		

All multiple linear regression models regarding the effect of the sub-dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale on the overall score of the Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning Scale ($F_{(5,503)}$=80.043, p<.001), the scores in the sub-dimensions of "emotions towards foreign language learning" ($F_{(5,503)}$=42.915, p<.001), "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning" ($F_{(5,503)}$=64.232, p<.001), "using a foreign language for social media" ($F_{(5,503)}$=24.261, p<.001), "importance given to learning a foreign language" ($F_{(5,503)}$=60.851, p<.001) and "thoughts towards foreign language lessons" ($F_{(5,503)}$=32.068, p<.001) were statistically significant. The R² value shows the variance explained in the dependent variable (Pallant, 2007). According to this, 44.3% of the total scores of attitudes towards foreign language learning, 29.9% of the scores of "emotions towards foreign language learning", 39% of the scores of "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning", 19.4% of the scores of "using a foreign language for social media", 37.7% of the scores of "importance given to foreign language learning" and 24.2% of the scores of "thoughts towards foreign language lessons" are explained by the sub-dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale.

The sub-dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale "interaction engagement" (B=-1.198, t=-5.548, p<.05), "respect for cultural differences" (B=-1.417, t=-7.314, p<.05), "interaction confidence" (B=-0.901, t=-4.494, p<.001) and "interaction

enjoyment" (B=-1.91, t=-4.493, p<.001) were found to be significant predictors of general attitudes towards foreign language learning scores. The effect of these sub-dimension scores obtained as significant predictors on the participants' general attitudes towards foreign language learning is negative. The β coefficient indicates the order of importance of the independent variables in the model. Among these significant predictors, the sub-dimension with the highest effect was "respect for cultural differences", while the one with the lowest effect was "interaction confidence". The sub-dimension "interaction attentiveness" was not a significant predictor of general attitudes towards foreign language learning (p>.05).

The sub-dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale "interaction engagement" (B=-0.307, t=-3.568, p<.05), "respect for cultural differences" (B=-0.292, t=-3.784, p<.05), "interaction confidence" (B=-0.446, t=-5.593, p<.001) and "interaction enjoyment" (B=-0.562, t=-3.961, p<.001) were found to be significant predictors of the "emotions towards foreign language learning" sub-dimension scores. The effect of these sub-dimension scores obtained as significant predictors on participants' "emotions towards foreign language learning" is negative. Among these significant predictors, the sub-dimension with the highest effect was "interaction confidence" and the one with the lowest effect was "interaction engagement". The sub-dimension "interaction attentiveness" was not a significant predictor for the sub-dimension "emotions towards foreign language learning" (p>.05).

The sub-dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale "interaction engagement" (B=-0.222, t=-3.425, p<.05), "respect for cultural differences" (B=-0.544, t=-9.35, p<.05) and "interaction enjoyment" (B=-0.614, t=-5.345, p<.001) were found to be significant predictors of the sub-dimension scores of "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning". The effect of these sub-dimension scores obtained as significant predictors of participants' "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning" is negative. Among these significant predictors, the sub-dimension with the highest effect was "respect for cultural differences", while the sub-dimension with the lowest effect was "interaction engagement". The sub-dimensions "interaction confidence" and "interaction attentiveness" were not significant predictors of the sub-dimension "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning" (p>.05).

The sub-dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale "interaction engagement" (B=-0.279, t=-4.276, p<.05), "respect for cultural differences" (B=-0.137, t=-2.332, p<.05), "interaction confidence" (B=-0.225, t=-3.708, p<.001) and "interaction enjoyment" (B=-0.241, t=-2.081, p<.05) were found to be significant predictors of the sub-dimension scores of "using foreign language for social media". The effect of these sub-dimension scores obtained as significant predictors of "using foreign language for social media" is negative. Among these significant predictors, the sub-dimension with the highest effect was "interaction engagement", while the least effective was "interaction enjoyment". The sub-dimension "interaction attentiveness" was not a significant predictor of "using foreign language for social media" (p>.05).

The sub-dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale "interaction engagement" (B=-0.249, t=-6.413, p<.05), "respect for cultural differences" (B=-0.191, t=-5.486, p<.05), "interaction enjoyment" (B=-0.271, t=-3.94, p<.001) and "interaction attentiveness" (B=-0.242, t=-4.031, p<.05) were found to be significant predictors of the "importance given to foreign language learning" sub-dimension scores. The effect of these sub-dimension scores obtained as significant predictors on the "importance given to foreign language learning" by the participants is negative. Among these significant predictors, the sub-dimension with the highest effect was "interaction engagement", while the least effective was "interaction attentiveness". The sub-dimension "interaction confidence" was not a significant predictor for the sub-dimension "importance given to foreign language learning" (p>.05).

The sub-dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale "interaction engagement" (B=-0.141, t=-2.942, p<.05), "respect for cultural differences" (B=-0.253, t=-5.888, p<.05), "interaction confidence" (B=-0.129, t=-2.893, p<.01) and "interaction enjoyment" (B=-0.222, t=-2.614, p<.05) were found to be significant predictors of the "thoughts about foreign language lessons" sub-dimension scores. The effect of these sub-dimension scores obtained as significant predictors on participants' "thoughts towards foreign language lessons" is negative. Among these significant predictors, the sub-dimension with the highest effect was "respect for cultural differences", while the least effective was "interaction enjoyment". The sub-dimension "interaction attentiveness" was not a significant predictor for the sub-dimension "thoughts about foreign language lessons" (p>.05).

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this study focusing on Turkish origin students, their intercultural sensitivity and attitudes towards foreign language learning were firstly analysed in terms of demographic variables. It was found that gender had no effect on the overall intercultural sensitivity scores and that there was a difference in favour of women only in the "respect for cultural differences" sub-dimension. This result is in line with studies showing that gender is not a determining variable for intercultural sensitivity (Abaslı & Polat, 2019; Çiloğlan & Bardakçı, 2019; Erdoğan & Okumuşlar, 2020; Meydanlıoğlu et al. 2015; Hammer et al. 2003; Tıkız-Ertürk et al. 2023; Yılmaz & Göçen, 2013). There are also different gender-related findings in the literature. For example, in some studies, women (Holm et al. 2009; Mellizo, 2017; Petrovic & Zlatkovic, 2009) and in some other studies, men (Ghamarnia et al. 2016) were found to have higher total intercultural sensitivity scores. Furthermore, Meydanlıoğlu et al. (2015) found a significant difference in the "interaction confidence" and "interaction enjoyment" sub-dimensions, Chen and Hu (2023) found a significant difference in favour of men in the "interaction confidence" sub-dimension, and Boudouaia et al. (2022) found a significant difference in favour of women in the "interaction enjoyment" sub-dimension. In addition, Erdoğan and Okumuşlar (2020) found a significant difference in favour of men on ethnocentrism. Boudouaia et al. (2022) state that considering the role of gender can provide a basis

for analysing the strengths and weaknesses of men and women in teaching. When the gender variable was examined within the framework of attitudes towards foreign language learning, it was determined that women had more positive attitudes in the total attitudes scores and the sub-dimensions of "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning" and "thoughts towards foreign language lessons". This result is similar to the results of some studies (İnal et al. 2005; Karahan, 2007), while it differs from the studies that reveal that gender is not effective in attitude (Alavinia & Salmasi, 2012; Fakeye, 2010; Saracaloğlu & Dinçer, 2017; Yaprak & Uslu-Üstten, 2021). Edlund et al. (2007, pp. 56-60) state that women and men have different tendencies in terms of the way they use linguistic knowledge, communicate and utilise language styles. Ellis (1994) explains that women have a more positive attitudes towards second language learning because they are more open to different language forms.

According to the age variable, a significant difference was found in the overall intercultural sensitivity scores and all sub-dimension scores in favour of participants aged 27 and over. In addition, it is a very important finding that the overall level of sensitivity increases in parallel with age. Erdoğan and Okumuşlar (2020) also found that age created a significant difference in intercultural sensitivity levels. However, there are also studies in the literature that revealed that age has no effect on intercultural sensitivity (Abaslı & Polat, 2019; Genç & Boynukara 2017; Ghamarnia et al. 2016; Hammer et al. 2003; Tıkız-Ertürk et al. 2023). When the effect of the age variable on attitudes towards foreign language learning was assessed, a significant difference was found between the overall attitudes scores and all the sub-dimension scores. Participants aged 23 and over had more positive attitudes towards foreign language learning in general and in the sub-dimension of "emotions towards foreign language learning"; participants aged 27 and over had more positive attitudes towards the sub-dimensions of "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning", "using a foreign language for social media" and "importance given to foreign language learning". For the sub-dimension "thoughts about foreign language lessons", attitudes became more positive with increasing age. These findings suggest that attitudes towards language learning develop largely in parallel with age. In support of this, Saville-Troike (2012) states that although it is accepted that children are more successful language learners due to their ability to create and act in acquisition contexts, adults tend to understand second/foreign languages better because they have more analytical skills, learning capacity, pragmatic skills, mother tongue knowledge and real world knowledge. However, Karahan (2007) states that the attitudes of those who learn the language at an earlier age are more positive than those who learn it at a later age, while Yaprak and Uslu-Üstten (2021) found that age has no effect on attitude.

According to the nationality variable, a significant difference in favour of Azerbaijan was found in the overall intercultural sensitivity scores and in all sub-dimension scores. It is suggested that the main reason for the higher scores of the Azerbaijani participants may be related to the fact that the data collection instruments were in Turkish. Although the participants from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan know Turkish, they are not as dominant in Turkish as the participants from Azerbaijan. Contrary to this study, nationality was found to have no significant effect on the level of intercultural sensitivity (Abaslı & Polat, 2019; Erdoğan & Okumuşlar, 2020). Ghamarnia et al. (2016) also found no significant relationship between ethnicity and intercultural sensitivity. On the other hand, Erdoğan and Okumuşlar (2020) found that the intercultural sensitivity of students from Europe and students from Asia and Africa were similar while the level of Turkish students was lower. When analysing the effect of the nationality variable on attitudes towards foreign language learning, a significant difference was found in the overall attitudes scores and in all sub-dimensions except "using foreign language for social media". In the sub-dimensions with significant differences, the countries with more positive attitudes differ. Nationality is a concept that reflects linguistic and cultural belonging. Therefore, closeness or distance to the target language can shape attitudes and affect performance. What they understand by foreign language learning, which language(s) they consider to be foreign and their self-reports may explain the lack of significance between the overall attitudes scores. For example, if the participants answered the scales with Russian in mind, the Russian influence in the Turkish communities may lead to more common attitudes in the countries covered, resulting in no difference in the overall attitudes scores.

According to the variable level of education, only the scores of the sub-dimension "interaction attentiveness" were significantly higher in favour of the participants with postgraduate education. Considering that the level of education develops perceptions, opinions and perspectives, it is expected to be a determinant of intercultural sensitivity. However, contrary to expectations, the results of this study are consistent with studies that show that the level of education is not a determinant for intercultural sensitivity (Abaslı & Polat, 2019; Bayles, 2009; Boudouaia et al. 2022). Nevertheless, it can be said that the "interaction attentiveness" sub-dimension, which focuses on obtaining more information and more details, contributed to the confirmation of the expectation, albeit slightly. When the educational level variable was examined in relation to attitudes towards foreign language learning, it was found that it did not affect the overall attitudes scores; there was only a difference in favour of graduate students in the sub-dimension "thoughts about foreign language lessons". It is thought that attitudes towards foreign language learning are directly related to educational level. While it is expected that increased awareness might have an effect on attitudes towards learning a new language and attitudes towards learning that language, it is noteworthy that the research result does not confirm this.

According to the variable of the number of foreign languages known, it was found that only among the scores of the sub-dimension "interaction confidence", those who know three languages and more have higher scores than the others, and those who know two languages have higher scores than those who do not specify a language. Knowing a foreign language is an important part of building social skills and self-confidence, and as it also means experiencing the culture to which that language belongs, it is expected to increase cultural sensitivity. The developmental nature of intercultural sensitivity also increases efficiency and self-

confidence in parallel with the frequency of communication (Bennett, 1986). The difference in "interaction confidence" is therefore normal. However, it is worth noting that the number of known foreign languages has no effect on the total score for sensitivity. This result is in line with Tıkız-Ertürk et al. (2023). On the other hand, Meydanlıoğlu et al. (2015) found that the total score of intercultural sensitivity and the subdimension scores of "respect for cultural differences", "interaction confidence" and "interaction enjoyment" were higher in the case of foreign language proficiency. Chen and Hu (2023) found that the mean sensitivity scores of students who passed the foreign language proficiency exam were higher than those of those who did not pass; a significant difference was found in the "interaction confidence" dimension. Olson and Kroeger (2001) also found that foreign language speakers have higher intercultural sensitivity. When the variable of the number of foreign languages learnt was evaluated according to the attitudes towards foreign language learning, it affected the total attitudes scores and the sub-dimension scores of "emotions towards foreign language learning" and "using foreign language for social media". In total attitudes scores and in the sub-dimension of "emotions towards foreign language learning", the attitudes of the participants who speak 3 languages are more positive. In the sub-dimension of "using foreign language for social media", it was determined that the attitudes of the participants who know at least one or more languages were more positive than those who did not specify a foreign language. This result shows that knowing a foreign language encourages positive attitudes towards learning another foreign language. Based on the literature, Papuc (2016) argued that language attitudes cannot be considered separately from language differences, and that they are formed according to language diversity; he explained that the relationship between language attitudes, language diversity and linguistic discrimination is socially shaped.

The relationship between the intercultural sensitivity of Turkish origin students and their attitudes towards foreign language learning is another issue of the research. As a result of the research, it was found that as intercultural sensitivity increases, attitudes towards foreign language learning develop positively. In other words, positive attitudes can be displayed to the extent that intercultural sensitivity is internalised. Given that intercultural sensitivity is related to the development of more complex and multiple perspectives, its relationship with attitudes towards language, which is an element of culture, is an expected finding and is consistent with the results of correlational studies in the literature. Engle and Engle (2004) and Olson and Kroeger (2001) found that sensitivity follows a linear development with second language acquisition. Aydoğan and Akbarov (2014) found that attitudes towards English and the use of English have statistically significant relationships with almost all subdimensions of the intercultural sensitivity scale. Çiloğlan and Bardakçı (2019) state that the higher the language proficiency score is, the higher the intercultural sensitivity becomes. Aydoğan and Akbarov (2015) found that participants who believed they had a high level of communication abilities, skills and competencies were more sensitive and flexible.

The study also examined the effect of the sub-dimensions of the *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale* on the total scores and all the sub-dimensions of the *Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Learning Scale*. According to the results, "respect for cultural differences" was the predictor with the highest effect on the total scores of attitudes towards foreign language learning. This means that participants who accept differences with other cultures and respect their views, values, behaviours and time spent with them develop more positive attitudes towards foreign language learning. The second predictor with the highest effect is "interaction engagement". It is understood that the participants' enjoyment of being together with different cultures, not being in a hurry to make an impression, being open-minded, giving positive reactions, not avoiding communication and showing their understanding through verbal and non-verbal messages are determinants of positive attitudes. "Interaction confidence" has the least effect on the overall scores for attitudes towards foreign language learning. Participants' reports of being confident with people from different cultures, knowing what to say, feeling comfortable and confident while speaking, and being able to interact as much as they want influenced their attitudes to be more positive. Wong (2015) states that interaction creates attitude change and increases language confidence. The fact that interaction confidence was the least effective predictor may be related to lack of experience or being influenced by prior learning/conditioning. Su (2018), who reached similar results in the opposite case of this study, examining the effect of intercultural sensitivity on attitudes towards language learning, found that attitudes towards language were a significant predictor of intercultural sensitivity in the dimensions of "interaction engagement", "respect for cultural differences" and "interaction confidence". On the other hand, "interaction attentiveness" was not found to be a significant predictor for total attitudes scores and almost all of the sub-dimensions. Insignificant interaction attentiveness means that during interaction with people from different cultures, the participants do not focus on the details of the messages, do not aim to obtain as much information as possible, and do not show sensitivity to unclear expressions. In addition, "interaction confidence" for the sub-dimension of "emotions towards foreign language learning"; "respect for cultural differences" for the sub-dimension of "negative thoughts towards foreign language learning"; "interaction engagement" for the sub-dimension of "using a foreign language for social media"; "interaction engagement" for the sub-dimension of "importance given to foreign language learning"; and finally "respect for cultural differences" for the sub-dimension of "thoughts towards foreign language lessons" were the predictors with the highest effect.

Like many other research, this one has some limitations. Although the countries evaluated within the scope of the research and the number of students sampled in these countries limit the generalisability of the research, it can be said that the results are statistically strong. In addition, the fact that there is no restriction as to the faculties in which the students in the study study at university can be seen as a feature that strengthens the sample from a certain point of view. The study can be repeated with a sample in which the demographic characteristics are more evenly distributed. Another limitation relates to the data collection instruments of the study. It should be taken into account that the research data are limited to the answers given to the items of two different scales, and that the *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale* is European-centred. Collecting the data with a scale that has been

prepared to be applied specifically to the Turkish world may provide more sensitivity to the results. Furthermore, the bias of reflecting what 'should be' rather than what is in quantitative self-report measures is open to criticism. More objective measures can be used in new research. Longitudinal and intervention studies can be conducted to understand the contribution of intercultural sensitivity to the individual and/or society and its reflection in communication processes. This will provide empirical evidence for the descriptive findings of this study.

The results of the study may be instructive for educational policy makers in the countries included in the study. Getting better results can be supported by the development of supporting policies. As found in this study, the resources and methods needed to develop intercultural sensitivity can be reconsidered, taking into account their impact on attitudes towards foreign language learning and thus on individual motivation. A country-specific intercultural education programme can be developed to increase the intercultural sensitivity of Turkish origin students. Intercultural sensitivity and attitudes towards foreign language learning can be investigated quantitatively or qualitatively in different geographies and samples and the predictor variables can be retested.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Funding

No financial support was received from any institution in this study.

Statements of publication ethics

We hereby declare that the study has not unethical issues and that research and publication ethics have been observed carefully.

Author contribution statements

The first author designed the study and developed the theory. The second author contributed by reviewing the work and providing ideas and guidance. The first author performed all the analyses and reported the results. Both authors discussed the results and contributed to the final manuscript.

Researchers' contribution rate

The study was conducted and reported by the first author, and the second author's suggestions and guidance were utilized at every stage of the process.

Ethics Committee Approval Information

This study was discussed at the meeting numbered 08 of the Ethics Commission of Gazi University Rectorate held on 18.04.2023 and it was unanimously decided that there was no ethical objection. Research approval was notified with the letter dated 08.05.2023 and numbered 651104 (Research Code No: 2023-599).

REFERENCES

Abaslı, K. ve Polat, Ş. (2019). Öğrencilerin kültürlerarası duyarlılık ve kültürel zekâya ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Anemon-Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(1), 193–202. https://doi.org/10.18506/anemon.419526

Ahnagari, S. & Zamanian, J. (2014). Intercultural communicative competence in foreign language classroom. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 4*(11), 9-16. https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v4-i11/1265

Aidinlou, N.A. & Kejal, D.A. (2012). Socio-cultural factors and teaching a foreign language. *International Journal of Social Science and Education, 2*(2), 139-143.

Alavinia, P. & Salmasi, M. (2012). On the correlation between Iranian EFL learners' shyness level and their attitudes toward language learning. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences, 2*(9), 91-102.

Alisaari, J. & Kilpi-Jakonen, E. (2022). Learning of intercultural competences and languages at school and their influence on global competences and immigrant-origin peers' sense of belonging. *Apples-Journal of Applied Language Studies*. *16*(2), 11-40. https://doi.org/10.47862/apples.111939

Altmayer, C. (2002). Kulturelle deutungsmuster in texten. Prinzipien und verfahren einer kulturwissenschaftlichen textanalyse im Fach Deutsch als Fremdsprache. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht, 6*(3), 1-25.

Aydın, G. (2020). Kültür öğretiminin temel kavramları. G. Aydın (Ed.) *Yabancı/ikinci dil öğretiminde kültür ve kültürel etkileşim* içinde (pp. 1-50). Pegem Akademi.

Aydın, G. (2021). Yabancı/ ikinci dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde kültür ve kültürel etkileşim. D. Köksal, Ö.G. Ulum, E. Duruk (Ed.). *Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi: Dil politikası-kültür-yöntem-teknoloji* içinde (ss. 133-156). Nobel Akademik.

Aydoğan, H. & Akbarov, A. (2014). Attitudes and intercultural sensitivity towards English language teaching. *The International Journal of Social Sciences, 20*, 50-61.

Aydoğan, H. & Akbarov, A. (2015). Linguo-intercultural sensitivity and its predictors in EFL in a Bosnian sample. *European Journal of Educational Research, 4*(4), 141-147. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.4.4.141

Bachman, L.F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford University Press.

Bayles, P. P. (2009). *Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of elementary teachers in bilingual schools in a Texas school district* (PhD Dissertation). University of Minnesota, US. (Online: https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/49152/Bayles_umn_0130E_10245.pdf;sequence=1 / 10.03.2024).

Bennett, J. M. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*(2), 179-196. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(86)90005-2

Boudouaia, A., Htun, K., Al-Qadri, A., Saroh, Y. & Beddiaf, A. (2022). Intercultural sensitivity of English language teachers in Algeria. *Cogent Education* 9: 2042034, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2042034

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel F. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (15. Baskı). Pegem Akademi.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative pedagogy. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2–27). Longman.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to secondlanguage teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1

Chen, G.-M. (1997). *A review of the concept of intercultural sensitivity*. (Online: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED408634.pdf / 10.11.2023).

Chen, G.-M. & Starosta, W. J. (2000). The development and validation of the intercultural sensitivity scale. *Human Communication, 3*(1), 2-14.

Chen, H. & Hu, B. (2023). On the intercultural sensitivity of university students in multicultural regions: A case study in Macao. *Frontiers in Psychol*ogy, 14: 1090775, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1090775

Crawford-Lange, L.M. & Lange, D.L. (1987). Integrating language and culture: How to do it. *Theory Into Practice, 26*(4), 258–266. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405848709543284

Çiloğlan, F. & Bardakçı, M. (2019). The Relationship between intercultural sensitivity and English language achievement. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 15*(3), 1204-1214. https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.631563

Çubukçu, F. (2013). Pre-service English teachers' intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Human Sciences, 10*(1), 832-843.

Edlund A.-C., Erson E. & Milles K. (2007). *Språk och Kön*. Norstedts Akademiska Förlag.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Engle, L. & Engle, J. (2004). Assessing language acquisition and intercultural sensitivity development in relation to study abroad program design. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad 10*(1), 219–236. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v10i1.142

Erdoğan, İ. & Okumuşlar, M. (2020). Intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels of theology students in a Turkish university sample. *Religions*, *11*(5), 237. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11050237

Fakeye, D.O. (2010). Students' personal variables as correlates of academic achievement in English as a second language in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences, 22*(3), 205-211. https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2010.11892803

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E. ve Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th edt.). McGraw-Hill.

Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: the role of atttitudes and motivation.* Edward Arnold.

Genç, G. & Boynukara, E. (2017). Pre-Service EFL teachers' social intelligence and intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 4*(4), 232–239.

Ghamarnia, M., Soltani, A. & Rahimi, A. (2016). The interface between Iranian EFL teachers' intercultural sensitivity and their ethnic and demographic backgrounds. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 6*(1), 36-45. https://doi.org/10.18844/gjflt.v6i1.429

Hammer, M.R, Bennet, M.J. & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*(4), 421- 443. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00032-4

Holm, K., Nokelainen, P. and Tirri. K. (2009). Relationship of gender and academic achievement to Finnish students' ıntercultural sensitivity. *High Ability Studies 20*(2), 187–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/13598130903358543

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin Books.

İnal, S., Evin-Gencel, İ. ve Saracaloğlu, A.S. (2005). The relation between students' attitudes toward foreign language achievement. *Dil Dergisi, 130*, 38-52. https://doi.org/10.1501/Dilder_0000000045

İnalöz, A. B. ve Yılmaz, K. (2023). Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin Türkçe öğrenme tutumları ile Türkçe öğrenmeye yönelik motivasyon engelleri arasındaki ilişkiler. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 12*(1), 62-76. https://doi.org/10.33206/mjss.1101078

Jabbari, M. J. & Golkar, N. (2014). The relationships between EFL learners' language learning attitudes and language learning strategies, *International Journal of Linguistics, 6*(3),161-167. http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v6i3.5837

Karahan, F. (2007). Language attitudes of Turkish students towards the English language and its use in Turkish context. *Çankaya University Journal of Arts and Sciences, 1*(7), 73-87.

Karatay, H. ve Kartallıoğlu, N. (2016). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenme tutumu ile dil becerileri edimi arasındaki ilişki. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 16*(4), 203-214. https://doi.org/10.11616/basbed.vi.455421

Karatay, H., Güngör, H. ve Çangal, Ö. (2018). Bosna Hersekli öğrencilerin Türkçe öğrenme amacı, tutumu ve öğrenme becerileri. *Kesit Akademi Dergisi, 4* (16), 18-31.

Kaufman, D. (2004). Constructivist issues in language learning and teaching. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 2*4, 303-319. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000121

Koç, C. T. ve Yastıbaş, A. E. (2022). Yabancı diller yüksek okullarında eğitim gören öğrenciler için yabancı dil öğrenmeye yönelik tutum ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 42*(1), 873-896. https://doi.org/10.17152/gefad.1014605

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture.* Oxford University Press.

Küllü-Sülü, A. (2014). *The role of native English speaking teachers in promoting intercultural sensitivity* (Unpublished Master's Thesis) Bilkent University, Ankara.

Laopongharn, W. & Sercombe, P. (2009). What relevance does intercultural communication have to language education in Thailand? *ARECLS, 6*, 59- 83.

Mellizo, J. M. (2017). Exploring intercultural sensitivity in early adolescence: A mixed methods study. *Intercultural Education, 28*(6), 571–590. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2017.1392488

Meydanlıoğlu, A., Arıkan, F. ve Gözüm, S. (2015). Cultural sensitivity levels of university students receiving education in health disciplines. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 20*(5), 1195–1204. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-015-9595-z

Nunan, D. (1992). Sociocultural aspects of second language acquisition. *Cross Currents, 19*(1), 13-24.

Olson, C.L. & Kroeger, K.R. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5*(2), 116–137. https://doi.org/10.1177/102831530152003

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows* (3. Ed.). Open University Press.

Papapavlou, A.N. (1998). Attitudes toward the Greek Cypriot dialect: sociocultural implications. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 134*(1), 15-28. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1998.134.15

Papuc, R. D. (2016). Language variation, language attitudes and linguistic discrimination, *Essex Student Journal, 8*(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.5526/esj35

Pavlenko, A. (2005). *Emotions and multilingualism*. Cambridge University Press.

Penbek, Ş., Yurdakul-Şahin, D. ve Cerit, A. G. (2012). Intercultural communication competence: A study about the intercultural sensitivity of university students based on their education and international experiences. *International Journal of Logistics Systems and Management, 11*(2), 232-252. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJLSM.2012.045425

Perić, B. & Radıć, V. (2021). The importance of attitude in foreign language learning. *RIThink, 10*, 26-39.

Petrovic, D. & Zlatkovic, B. (2009). Intercultural sensitivity of future primary school teachers. In Popov, at all. (Eds.) *Comparative Education, Teacher Training, Education Policy, Social Inclusion and Child Psychology, 7,* 121–128.

Roh, S.-Z. (2014). A study on the factors affecting the intercultural sensitivity of middle and high school students in Korea. *Advanced Science and Technology Letters, 47*, 266–269. http://dx.doi.org/10.14257/astl.2014.47.61

Saracaloğlu, A. S. ve Dinçer, B. (2017). The relationship between university students' attitudes towards foreign language and foreign language learning strategies. *International Journal of Language Academy, 5*(4), 440-456. http://dx.doi.org/10.18033/ijla.3679

Saville-Troike, M. (2012). *Introducing second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Straffon, D. A. (2003). Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of high school students attending an international school. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations 27*(4), 487–501. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00035-X

Su, Y.-C. (2018). Assessing Taiwanese college students' intercultural sensitivity, EFL interests, attitudes toward native English speakers, ethnocentrism, and their interrelation. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 27*(3), 217–226. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-018-0380-7

Süğümlü, Ü. ve Çinpolat, E. (2023). Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin Türkçe öğrenme kaygıları ve tutumları ile özerk öğrenme becerileri: Açımlayıcı sıralı desen çalışması. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* (58), 2859-2878. https://doi.org/10.53444/deubefd.1331838

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.

Tıkız-Ertürk, G., Demiröz, H. ve Ata, M. (2023). Intercultural competence and intercultural sensitivity levels of EFL preparatory students: Insights from a Turkish context. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences, 22*(4), 1519-1537. https://doi.org/10.21547/jss.1310183

Tódor, E. M. & Dégi, Z. (2016). Language attitudes, language learning experiences and individual strategies what does school offer and what does it lack? *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica, 8*(2), 123-137. https://doi.org/10.1515/ausp-2016-0022

Turgut, M.F. ve Baykul, Y. (2021). *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme* (9. Baskı). Pegem Akademi.

Wei, Y. (2019). Investigation into intercultural sensitivity of college non-English majors. *Frontiers in Educational Research, 2*(6), 16–22. https://doi.org/10.25236/FER.020604

Wenden, A. L. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. Prentice Hall.

Williams, T. R. (2005). Exploring the impact of study abroad on students' intercultural communication skills: adaptability and sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 9*(4), 356–371. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315305277681

Wong, R. (2015). Impact of overseas immersion homestay experience on linguistic confidence and intercultural communication strategies. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, *15*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.36923/jicc.v15i1.691

Xin, Z. (2007). From communicative competence to communicative language teaching. *Sino-US English Teaching, 4*(9), 39-45.

Yaprak, E. ve Uslu-Üstten, A. (2021). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin Türkiye Türkçesine ilişkin tutumu: Gazi TÖMER örneği. *Uluslararası Türkoloji Araştırmaları ve İncelemeleri Dergisi, 6*(1), 27-36.

Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri.* Seçkin.

Yılmaz, F. ve Göçen, S. (2013). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının kültürlerarası duyarlılık hakkındaki görüşlerinin farklı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 6*(15), 374-392. https://doi.org/10.14520/adyusbd.649

Yuen, C.Y.M. & Grossman, D. L. (2009). The intercultural sensitivity of student teachers in three cities. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education 39*(3), 349–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920802281571