Małgorzata Jedynak
ORCID: 0000-0002-2598-7599
University of Wrocław
malgorzata.jedynak@uwr.edu.pl

Intercultural Sensitivity and Adult Learners' Willingness to Communicate in English as a Foreign Language

Abstract: Intercultural sensitivity as coined by Bennett (2015) is a relatively new construct which refers to how an individual construes and makes sense of cultural differences. It is believed that it is not inborn and can be developed through intercultural experiences and formal instruction. Though the concept of intercultural sensitivity has been already investigated, particularly in relation to communication effectiveness; yet it has not been examined through the lens of the learner's willingness to communicate. Hence, the purpose of the research paper is to investigate intercultural sensitivity and its correlation with willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language. The author employed the quantitative methodology, administering the online intercultural sensitivity and willingness to communicate questionnaires to adult learners of English representing various L1 cultures. The insights from the study may equip us with new knowledge on increasing learners' willingness to communicate and as a result their engagement in communication in a language classroom.

Keywords: interculturality, intercultural sensitivity, intercultural communicative competence, willingness to communicate, L2 adult learners

Introduction

Effective communication with speakers from various cultural backgrounds is only possible when the learner is sensitive to or feels the target language culture and accepts differences between native and target language cultures. Intercultural sensitivity is particularly important nowadays in the times of a global mobility (e.g. student exchange programs) and migration movements. In a globally connected society, people need to comprehend information generated by speakers representing various cultures. According to *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence* (Deardorff 4), there is a need for hiring interculturally-competent employees equipped

with intercultural sensitivity, particularly in international companies. Such global business workers are efficient, flexible and effective in communication. This undoubtedly gives us pause to consider the enormous impact of developing intercultural sensitivity both in school and home context.

The relation between intercultural sensitivity and willingness to communicate is also a valid topic for a discussion, as intercultural communicative competence is one of the primary objectives of foreign language teaching stipulated in the Council of Europe recommendations for language education policies. The Council of Europe promotes interculturality through its cross-sectoral initiatives *Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters* or *Mirrors and Windows: An Intercultural Communication Textbook* written by Huber-Kriegler, Lázár and Strange.

In the last two decades, there have been some attempts to study not only the ways the learners respond to and integrate with target language speakers or cultures, but also to propose strategies aiming at improving intercultural communication. Yet, there has been no research into a relationship between learners' intercultural sensitivity and their willingness to communicate. It is generally acknowledged that the learner's personality traits, such as extroversion, or affective factors, such as high self-confidence and low anxiety, or other individual differences, such as high motivation and autonomy determine willingness to communicate and effective communication. It seems, however, that intercultural sensitivity may also correlate with willingness to communicate, since L2 learners sensitive to diversity and tolerant of ambiguity are generally perceived as the ones engaging more in communication.

Before the above-mentioned correlation is investigated, the reader will be presented with theoretical deliberations on the two main constructs in question, namely interculturality and interrelated intercultural sensitivity, and willingness to communicate.

1. Interculturality—Origin, Studies, Implementation in Language Classrooms

According to Romanowski (7–8), the origin of intercultural studies dates back to the 5th century BC and the journey made by Herodotus to Egypt and Persia. While travelling, he collected data on cross-cultural differences. However, it was only in the 20th century that researchers systematized the ways of investigating cultures and focused on investigating culture-related intricacies. Table 1 below depicts the overview of the most influential publications pertaining to interculturality. Needless to say, the overview presents the author's subjective viewpoint.

The late 1950s saw an interest in the study of the relation between interculturality and communication. Edward Hall's breakthrough publication *Culture is Communication* paved the way for using the newly-coined term *interculturality*. Hall

Table 1. The overview of the most influential publications on interculturality

Author	Publication	Achievements
Hall (1959)	*The Silent Language*	the term *interculturality* was coined
Rubin and Kealy (1979)	*Behavioral assessment of communication competency and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation*	— communication competence expanded to intercultural communication — developed indices for interpersonal communication skills
Byram (1989) Kramsch (1996)	*Cultural studies in Foreign Language Education* *The cultural component of language teaching*	— interculturality discussed in the context of FL learning
Byram, Gribkova, and Starkey (2002)	*Developing The Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching*	— multiple identities of interculturally competent speakers
Huber-Kriegler, Lázár and Strange (2003)	*Mirrors and windows: An intercultural communication textbook*	— intercultural sensitivity or awareness may be developed in a classroom
Tran and Seepho (2016)	*EFL Learners' Attitudes toward Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching and their Intercultural Communicative Competence Development*	— intercultural communicative competence belongs to the key 21st century competences

noticed that in cross-cultural exchanges communication, confusion may appear, and he thus called for further investigation into the issue.

It should be noticed that in the new post-war geo-political reality (migration movements, an influx of people from former colonies), the need to promote understanding diversity, both linguistic and cultural, was prioritized in the world. Researchers responded to the need by engaging in intercultural studies, in which they explored communication processes across various cultures. The extensive research over interculturality was launched in the late 1970s, with the work by Rubin and Kealy stressing the importance of effective communication and its determinants in multicultural settings (1979). The authors expanded the concept of communication competence to intercultural communication. Based on behavioural observations, they developed indices for interpersonal communication skills such as empathy, role behavior flexibility or respect. They also noticed that tolerance of ambiguity is a main trait which correlates positively with intercultural communicative competence and consequently guarantees successful communication.

Analysing the history of intercultural studies, one can observe that starting from the late 1980s researchers have made a shift in their studies from investigating the relation between interculturality and communication to examining interculturality

in the context of foreign language learning (e.g., Byram, 1989; Kramsch, 1996). As Kramsch (4) aptly notes, teaching a foreign language and culture in the past was understood differently than nowadays. In times when Latin, Hebrew or classical Greek were the dominant foreign languages, the relation between language and culture was perceived as *universal*. Learners were equipped with some tools to make an exploration of target language cultures. By reading literary works and translating them, learners were acquainted with universal cultural issues pertaining to religion, customs, traditions and world perception typical of ancient and medieval times people. In the second half of the 20th century, teaching language and teaching culture were separated. Kramsch (4) calls the link between language and culture *national*. In language coursebooks learners, who were educated elite, could find some culture clips with authentic texts and pictures, all of which represented elements of big C culture (e.g. traditions or history of a target language country). In the 1970s, the relation between language and culture became more local. Foreign languages were more accessible and small C culture elements were promoted (e.g. habits, customs) to facilitate everyday communication with a shop assistant, an employer or a neighbour.

Nowadays, in language education, one can observe a departure from teaching culture to teaching interculturality. This is reflected in a coursebook design and its content. In the past one could find culture clips attachments which usually included passages with culture facts and data such as, for example, the data on boarding schools across the UK. Yet, the passages did not develop understanding of the British culture nor competence in communication. When teaching culture gave way to intercultural components in the language classroom, the coursebook design changed. Since the use of language and culture were linked, there were no separate booklets or attachments with culture clips. Interculturality was incorporated in developing all language skills. Language learners would read and listen to the texts about boarding schools in the UK only to start *noticing*, *comparing*, *reflecting* and *interacting* on good and bad points of boarding schools across all cultures they know (Liddiecoat and Scarino 3).

The changes in a coursebook design and its content were largely impacted by a change in learning objectives; today foreign language education aims at developing communication and in order to maximise its effectiveness learners should know how to behave and interact with speakers from diverse cultural backgrounds. The objective of developing intercultural communicative competence is reflected in i) the national curricula for foreign language teaching and ii) the language syllabi designed for lower and higher education, which, as regulatory documents, provide specific guidelines for teachers. It needs to be stressed here that the two documents are embedded in the EU language education policies; they are aligned with the Common European Framework of Reference and are based on the Recommendation of the European Parliament for Key Competences for Lifelong Learning.

The recommendation identifies eight main competences, among which are interpersonal skills and the ability to adopt new competences, cultural awareness and expression, and active citizenship. In line with the recommendation, plurilingual and pluricultural competence—a prerequisite for active citizenship—should be developed in a variety of contexts, including schools. This can be achieved by the implementation of interdisciplinary and transdiciplinary approaches aimed at increasing intercultural sensitivity and awareness. It is also stressed that language learners do not learn only at school, but also in out-of-school contexts, and they continue learning throughout their lives. Being pluringual and pluricultural, such learners are more tolerant of ambiguity, show a more critical approach to cultural stereotypes, and demonstrate respect and curiosity for socio-cultural and geographical aspects of other cultures, and consequently, they are prepared for EU active citizenship (cf. Council Recommendation of 22 May 2018). In the process of developing the learner's intercultural communicative competence, national differences should be de-emphasised and "social diversity and cultural pluralism that exists within one and the same nation … due to differences in ethnicity, social class and gender" should be promoted (Kramsch 5).

Tran and Seepho (1) underline the importance of developing intercultural communicative competence in a language classroom, regarding it as one of the key 21st century competences. The authors also report on interesting study findings on the effectiveness of the teaching intercultural component. It was observed that the learners participating in the study changed their attitudes and behaviours towards the target language culture. What is more, they discovered that introducing intercultural component in classes helped learners understand more their own culture and made them more sensitive to cultural differences (28–31). Among the benefits of implementing an intercultural component into language teaching, there are i) setting new learning objectives, ii) understanding new values or iii) developing self-identity (Lussier). With regard to self-identity, Byram, Gribkova, and Starkey (9) make a point that interculturally-competent speakers are like mediators, rejecting stereotypes and developing multiple identities. Interculturally-sensitive learners respect their interlocutors and put an emphasis on discovering their personalities.

The aforementioned authors made an attempt to systematise the features of such interculturally-competent learners. Apart from intercultural attitude, they should also demonstrate intercultural knowledge, intercultural skills and critical cultural awareness.

Huber-Kriegler, Lázár and Strange (8), in their publication *Mirrors and Windows: An Intercultural Communication Textbook*, note that the aim of developing intercultural sensitivity or awareness "is not to have all the answers but to enjoy the fascinating views you might catch from your mirror and the many windows into the world". The authors elucidate that the mirror refers to the learner's own culture, whereas the windows are the metaphor for all other cultures.

2. Defining Intercultural Sensitivity and Intercultural Sensitivity Model

Intercultural sensitivity is sometimes equalized with intercultural awareness. Yet, the two terms denote different states. According to the European Commission document *Sensitivity and Awareness of Cultural and Other Forms of Diversity* by Rodrigues and Leralt, the latter refers to the knowledge that allows the learners understanding individuals from cultures other than their own. It involves "the recognition of one's biases, prejudices, and assumptions about individuals who are different" (16) and makes the learners appreciate the dangers of ethnocentricity. Cultural awareness is "the first step to developing cultural competence and must therefore be supplemented by cultural knowledge" (16) However, the degree of awareness the learners develop about their own cultural background and cultural identity depends largely on their individual emotional predisposition and readiness for in-depth exploration and self-examination of various cultures. Thus, we may treat intercultural sensitivity more as a multi-complex personality construct which is not stable but dynamic and can be developed throughout life. As Bennett (519–520) notes aptly, intercultural sensitivity refers to the ways "an individual construes or makes sense of cultural differences and the experience of difference based on those constructions". The author claims that higher levels of intercultural sensitivity entail greater empathy, tolerance and understanding of other people's cultures. Such a definition was used for the first time in his Development Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), which comprises six stages of sensitivity and interrelated cultural experiences and differences. The DMIS has its foundations in constructivism and the philosophical study of phenomenology, which investigates the structures of experience and consciousness. Drawing on the constructivist approach, the DMIS has an insight into learners' reality—a source of experience through which they perceive culture. The phenomenological perspective is, in turn, useful to elicit from learners when and in what circumstances (in what group, country) they experience culture. Bennett makes an interesting point, namely that immersion in the target language culture does not guarantee that the learner will be able to experience full acculturation. Much depends on the learner's intercultural sensitivity, which is believed to be a feature that can be acquired throughout life and is not something that is inborn.

In the DMIS by Bennett (520–521), two main categories of intercultural sensitivity development may be distinguished, namely *ethnocentric* and *ethnorelative*, each of them comprising three stages. In the former, learners consider their own culture as a reference point and compare it to other cultures, whereas in the latter, learners treat their own culture as one of many, and all behaviours are interpreted according to a particular context. Within the ethnocentric stage, one can distinguish:

— *denial of difference* (the learner does not realise the existence of other cultures or lives in complete isolation or intentionally separates from other cultures),

— *defence against difference* (the learner thinks in the us–them category, treating another culture as a threat to their identity),

— *minimisation of difference* (the learner has awareness of other cultures but, at some point, trivialises the contrast between them and his/her own culture).

Within the ethnorelative stage, three substages can be distinguished:

— *acceptance of difference* (the learner develops the acceptance of different cultures, wants to learn more about them through real life experience and considers them equal to his/her own without making any comparisons),

— *adaptation of difference* (the learner adapts behaviours and habits of the culture he/she learns about, which facilitate efficient communication; the learners is guided by empathy and pluralism),

— *integration of difference* (the learner already possesses the necessary knowledge about cultural differences, behaviours, and rules and does not identify with only one way of thinking) (Bennett 521).

As one can see intercultural sensitivity is a very complex and multi-faceted construct; thus there is no way of measuring it. McMurray (23–24) discusses four ways of measuring the construct:

— *the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)* by Hammer and Bennett

— *the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI)* by Kelley and Meyers

— *the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ISCI) by* Bhawuk and Brislin

— *the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS)* by Guo-Ming Chen and Starosta

The IDI is a very complex, fifty pages long inventory. Though it has high reliability, the researcher decided not to use it for the purpose of conducting her study due to the fact that i) it is too long, which might discourage respondents from participating in the study, ii) it was used in the context of human resources management for staff training and not in the context of FL learning, iii) the results should be interpreted only by a trained specialist and could not be analysed by the Researcher, who is a teacher trainer and a linguist.

The CCAI, in turn, is a tool for self-assessment of cross-cultural adaptability. It is based on the premise that every learner adapting a new culture should experience similar emotions reflecting flexibility/openness, emotional resilience, perpetual acuity and personal autonomy. The inventory was not used in the study presented in the paper, as several studies did not prove its reliability (cf. McMurray 27).

The ISCI is a detailed 46-item inventory based on a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from very strongly agree to very strongly disagree. The inventory was developed by the scholars in order to find an instrument to measure intercultural sensitivity and prove its reliability. Since confusing results were reported in multiple studies, the researcher decided not to use the scale (cf. McMurray 28).

The last method of measuring intercultural sensitivity combines the elements of behavioural skills models and cross-cultural attitudes. The ISS is based on a 24-item questionnaire examining a variety of IS correlates such as interaction engagement, respects for cultural differences, interaction confidence, interaction enjoyment or interaction attentiveness. The authors of the ISS also make a point that the questionnaire provides an insight into correlates of intercultural communication such as self-esteem, open-mindedness, empathy, interaction, involvement and suspending judgment (Chen and Starosta, 2000: 14). As the method was reported to have high reliability in several studies (cf. McMurray 28), the researcher decided to employ it for her study.

3. Willingness to Communicate

MacIntyre et al. (1998: 547) defined willingness to communicate (WTC) as "a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2". WTC is a particularly important construct in the era of globalization, when the need to communicate effectively in L2 is prioritized. It was originally conceptualized as a personality trait by McCroskey and Baer (1985), who found that individuals develop a personality orientation towards oral communication in L1. Research was done to investigate whether L1 WTC transfers to the L2 context. MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei and Noels (1998: 546) established that L1 WTC is not simply manifested in L2 WTC.

WTC was discussed for the first time in relation to L2 learning and teaching by MacIntyre and Charos (1996), who established a strong correlation between L2 WTC, anxiety, and competence. In 1999, MacIntyre, Babin, and Clement's findings proved that WTC impact both L1 and L2 communication. As Katsaris (4) notes, in the last two decades L2 WTC has been investigated in the context of i) biological, ii) psychological, and iii) educational factors. With regard to biological factors, Lu and Hsu showed that L2 WTC increases with age, both for males and females; however, Donovan and MacIntyre reported the opposite results. As to psychological factors, researchers (Baker and MacIntyre; MacIntyre et al., 2001) discovered that perceived communication competence and L2 anxiety were strong determinants of L2 WTC. Research findings also indicate a positive impact of social support on L2 learners' motivation, which in turn gives rise to higher L2 WTC (Vatankhah and Tanbakooei). Educational factors, in turn, were examined by Yashima in the context of Japanese EFL learners, who found that learners' attitude towards English and their language proficiency significantly impact L2 WTC. Interesting insights were also provided by MacIntyre et al. (2003), who proved that immersion Canadian students display higher L2 WTC than non-immersion students. In the review of literature on situational determinants of L2 WTC, Zhang et al. discuss such variables as classroom climate, teaching style, familiarity with peers, topic

and type of speaking activity. It should be noticed that all these factors are perceived subjectively by L2 learners, which in consequence may give rise to either positive or negative affective states.

An interesting study of L2 WTC in the context of Polish learners of English was conducted by Pawlak and Mystkowska-Wiertelak (2015), who used a dynamic systems approach. The researchers found that L2 WTC fluctuates depending on a number of factors, such as the time provided to plan for the oral activity, the topic which is discussed, familiarity with the interlocutor, the opportunity to voice personal views and ideas, and the level of mastery of the relevant vocabulary.

To this point, we can say that L2 WTC is a very complex construct dependent on multiple situational factors and the interaction between the learner's personality and contextual factors. Needless to say, language teachers can substantially influence the learner's L2 WTC by implementing classroom practices which encourage students to communication.

3. Research Description

The main objective of the study presented in the paper was to investigate the relation between intercultural sensitivity (IC) and willingness to communicate in English (L2 WTC). The researcher put forward the main research question, namely what is dependence between the two constructs in question? In order to achieve the research aim, the H0 and one alternate hypothesis H1 were developed (H0—there is no relationship between IC and L2 WTC; H1—there is some relationship between IC and L2 WTC).

Some variables in the study were controlled so as to minimise their effect on the IC–L2 WTC relationship. One such controlled variable was the study participants' age (age range from 19–24), as the researcher believes that tolerance of ambiguity and L2 culture experiences increase with age. Another control variable was the subjects' proficiency level (all study participants screened for the study declared B2+ and C1 proficiency level), since willingness to engage in communication may depend on the speaker's linguistic repertoire, particularly mastery of relevant vocabulary and grammar structures. The researcher also controlled the subjects' multilingual background. The learners who declared having been raised in bilingual/multilingual families, worked in international companies or spent more than three months residing in other countries were excluded from the study, as the researcher believes that a massive exposure to a variety of languages fosters openness to other cultures and consequently increases intercultural sensitivity. The study participants were not screened for nationality. The researcher's stance is that including in the sample diverse L1s will yield more reliable IC data, as learners representing the same L1 may be under a similar social influence, i.e. more ethnocentric or ethnorelative attitudes are promoted in some communities or countries.

The subjects employed for the study were 78 adult learners of English (60 males and 18 females), aged 19–24, all of whom were undergraduate and graduate students. Sixteen subjects declared they were working. All study participants reported having been exposed to formal English language instruction without any immersion or informal learning in a naturalistic setting experience. The nationality distribution in the sample was the following: Polish (27 participants, 34%), Ukrainian (17 participant, 21.5%), German (11 participants, 13.9%), Russian (9 participants, 11.4%), Belarusian (8 participant, 10.12%), Chinese (3 participants, 3.8%), Korean (2 participants, 2.5%), Spanish (1 participant, 1.2 %).

In the research, two questionnaires were administered to the subjects: i) a modified version of Intercultural Sensitivity Scale by Chen and Starosta (vide Appendix 1), and ii) a modified version of Willingness to Communicate questionnaire by Hashimoto (vide Appendix 2). The IC instrument consisted of 20 questions and the L2 WTC instrument included 11 questions. The responses were provided based on a five-point-Likert scale (strongly agree-strongly disagree). The modifications that were introduced by the researcher were related to i) the elimination of four questions in the ISS which could be too difficult and confusing for the respondents at B2 proficiency level, and ii) introducing new wording in the WTC questionnaire; the context was narrowed down only to English language learning.

The research was conducted in an online setting. Prior to the questionnaire's launch, the potential subjects got access to the link on social media rooms specially designed to conduct surveys where they could read the eligibility requirements for the study. In this way, they were screened for the variables the researcher intended to control. Firstly, biodata was elicited, such as age, gender, and nationality. Then, the IC and L2 WTC questionnaires were made accessible to the study participants through a FORMS application link.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

The intention of the researcher was to support or refute H0 and H1 posed at the stage of research planning. To attain the goal and do computational correlational analysis, the subjects' individual responses to the questionnaire statements were not under scrutiny but their individual mean responses on IC and L2 WTC questionnaires and the mean of all responses provided on the two questionnaires. Mean responses on the IS questionnaire was 3.93 and mean responses on the L2 WTC questionnaire was 3.12. In order to show a relationship between the variables the Pearson moment product correlation coefficient (r) was calculated which measures both the strength and the direction of a linear relationship between IC and L2 WTC. The correlation coefficient $r_{xy} = 0.6$ which may be interpreted as a moderately

strong positive IC–L2 WTC dependence. The analysis of the data allows for noticing a trend line, indicating a strong relationship between the variables in question.

The available data allows us to refute H0 and support alternate hypothesis H1. It should be noticed, however, that the value of r only provides us with the information on a moderately strong dependence between IC and L2 WTC, yet it does not explain which of them has a greater impact on this dependence. It may be presumed that greater IC entails greater L2 WTC, and not vice versa. Yet, further analysis should be done to investigate the intricacies of IC–L2 WTC dependence.

Even if the findings are not as enlightening as one could expect, there is some IC–L2 WTC correlation; these findings should make us pause and look critically at classroom practices, which frequently do not focus on developing intercultural sensitivity related skills. If we want learners to demonstrate communicative skills, they first need to engage in any communication, and they will not do this if they are not ready emotionally to feel and understand the target language's culture. As was mentioned in the theoretical deliberations, intercultural sensitivity is a prerequisite for intercultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence. Hence, it seems justified to devote more time in language classrooms to developing intercultural sensitivity. This can be achieved, among others, by implementation of authentic language materials such as blogs, YouTube clips or participation in international exchange programs. Finally, FL teachers themselves can adopt materials to make them more sensitive to the local context and more challenging to engage students with diversity.

5. A Way Forward

Undoubtedly, the study presented in the paper has many limitations. The sample consisting of 78 respondents is too small to make generalisations about IC–L2 WTC dependence. The high frequency of positive responses (strongly agree and agree) provided by the subjects to the IC and L2 WTC questionnaire statements may require a modification of the already existing instruments. It should be also noticed that IC and L2 WTC are very dynamic constructs dependent on multiple situational and contextual factors which could not be controlled by the researcher, such as their personality, the time they spent abroad and encountered new cultures etc. Finally, the research outcomes may imply that learners' engagement in L2 communication, both in a classroom and out-of-classroom context, can be impacted by the teacher, who can introduce tasks and activities developing intercultural sensitivity. The practical tools developing IS (textbooks, games, readings) are provided on the official Council of Europe and ECML webpages.

References

Baker, S. C. and P. D. MacIntyre. 2000. "The Role of Gender and Immersion in Communication and Second Language Orientations." *Language Learning* 50.2. 311–341.

Benett, M. J. 2015. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Intercultural Competence.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Bhawuk, D. and R. Brislin, 1992. "The Measurement of Intercultural Sensitivity Using the Concepts of Individualism and Collectivism." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 16.4. 413–436.

Byram, M. 1989. *Cultural Studies in Foreign Language Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Byram, M., B. Gribkova and H. Starkey. 2002. *Developing The Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Chen, G-M. and W. J. Starosta. 2000. "The Development and Validation of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale." *Human Communication* 3. 1–15.

Council of Europe. *Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters*. Retrieved from: https:// www.coe.int/en/web/portal/home. 21 June 2021.

Council of Europe. *Recommendation 2018/c 189/01 of 22 May 2018 on key competences for lifelong learning.* Retrieved from: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX: 32018H0604(01).

Deardorff, D. 2009. *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence.* SAGE.

Donovan, L. A., P. D. MacIntyre, 2004. "Age and Sex Differences in Willingness to Communicate, Communication Apprehension, and Self-Perceived Competence." *Communication Research Reports* 21.4. 420–427.

Hall, E. T. 1959, 1990. *The Silent Language*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Hammer, M. R., M. J. Bennett and R. Wiseman. 2009. "The Intercultural Development Inventory: A Measure of Intercultural Sensitivity." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 27. 421–423.

Hashimoto, Y. 2002. "Motivation and Willingness to Communicate as Predictors of Reported L2 Use: The Japanese ESL Context." *Second Language Studies* 20.2. 29–70.

Huber-Kriegler, M. L. Ildikó and J. Strange, 2003. *Mirrors and Windows: An Intercultural Communication Textbook.* Graz: Council of Europe Publishing.

Katsaris, T. 2019. "The Willingness to Communicate (WTC): Origins, Significance, and Propositions for the L2/FL classroom." *Journal of Applied Languages and Linguistics* 3.2. 31–42.

Kelley, C. and J. Meyers. 1995. *Cross-cultural Adaptability Inventory Manual*. Minneapolis, MN: NCS Pearson-Inc.

Kramsch, C. 1996. "The Cultural Component of Language Teaching." *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht* 1.2. 13.

Liddiecoat, A. J. and A. Scarino. 2013. *Intercultural Language Teaching and Learning*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Lu, Y. and C. F. Hsu. 2008. "Willingness to Communicate in Intercultural Interactions Between Chinese and Americans." *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 37.2. 75–88.

Lussier, D. 2007. "Theoretical Bases of a Conceptual Framework with Reference to Intercultural Cmmunicative Competence." *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 4. 309–332.

McCroskey, J. C. and J. E. Baer. 1985. "Willingness to Communicate: The Construct and its Measurement." Paper Presented at the Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Denver.

MacIntyre, P. D. and C. Charos. 1996. "Personality, Attitudes, and Affect as Predictors of Second Language Communication." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 15.1. 3–26.

—. R. Clément, Z., Dörnyei and K. A. Noels. 1998. "Conceptualizing Willingness to Communicate in a Second Language: A Situational Model of Second Language Confidence and Affiliation." *The Modern Language Journal* 82.4. 545–562.

—. P. A. Babin and R. Clément. 1999. "Willingness to Communicate: Antecedents and Cnsequences." *Communication Quarterly* 47.2. 215–229.

—. S. C. Baker, R. Clément and S. Conrod. 2001. "Willingness to Communicate, Social Support, and Language-learning Orientations of Immersion Students." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 23.3. 369–388.

—. S. C. Baker, R. Clément and L. Donovan. 2003. "Talking in Order to Learn: Willingness to Communicate and Intensive Language Programs." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 59.4. 589–608.

McMurray, A. A. 2007. *Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity of International and Domestic College Students: The Impact of International Travel.* Florida: University of Florida.

Pawlak, M. and A. Mystkowska-Wiertelak. 2015. "Investigating the dynamic nature of L2 willingness to communicate." *System — An International Journal of Educational Technology in Applied Linguistics* 50, 1–9.

Rodrigues, A. and O. Leralta. 2015. *Awareness of Cultural and Other Forms of Diversity* the European Commission document. Retrieved from: https://tinyurl.com/yc8mxar4.

Romanowski, P. 2017. *Intercultural Communicative Competence in English Language Teaching in Polish State Colleges*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ruben, B. D. and D. J. Kealey. 1979. "Behavioral Assessment of Communication Competency and the Prediction of Cross-cultural adaptation." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 3. 15–47.

Tran, T. Q. and S. Seepho. 2016. "EFL Learners' Attitudes toward Intercultural Communicative Language Teaching and their Intercultural Communicative Competence Development." *Journal of Studies in the English Language* 11. Retrieved from https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jsel/article/view/73301. 21 June 2021.

Vatankhah, M. and N. Tanbakooei. 2011. "The Role of Social Support on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation among Iranian EFL Learners." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 98. 1912–1918.

Yashima, T. 2002. "Willingness to Communicate in a Second Language: The Japanese EFL Context." *The Modern Language Journal* 86.1. 54–66.

Zhang, J., N. Beckmann and J. F. Beckmann, 2018. "To Talk or not to Talk: A Review of Situational Antecedents of Willingness to Communicate in the Second Language Classroom." *System* 72. 226–239.

Appendix 1. A Modified Version of Intercultural Sensitivity Scale by Chen and Starosta (2000)— the results

		strongly disagree	dis-agree	not sure	agree	strongly agree
1	I am patient when interacting with people from different cultures.	0	0	11	36	31
2	I respect the ways of behaviour presented by people from different cultures	0	31	10	7	30
3	I am self-confident in interacting with people from different cultures	1	8	12	37	20
4	I find it easy to talk in front of people from different cultures.	6	4	12	20	36
5	I know what to say when interacting with people from different cultures	3	4	7	37	27
6	I respect the values of people from different cultures.	3	5	17	15	38
7	I am very observant when interacting with people from different cultures.	0	3	13	42	20
8	I enjoy spending time and talking with people from different cultures.	0	0	0	38	40
9	I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.	0	7	2	38	31
10	I find other cultures as fascinating as mine.	0	9	15	42	12
11	I wait before I make an impression on people from different cultures.	2	16	5	27	28
12	I show people from different cultures my understanding through verbal or nonverbal cues.	6	2	23	8	39
13	I am open-minded to people from different cultures	3	3	0	41	31
14	I like to be with people from different cultures.	3	2	15	35	23
15	I feel useful when interacting with people from different cultures.	1	28	4	7	38
16	I can be as sociable as I want to when interacting with people from different cultures.	1	5	0	49	23

17	I am looking forward to interactions with people from different cultures	0	8	12	42	16
18	I understand subtle hints made by people from different cultures.	6	4	12	36	20
19	I do not get discouraged while talking to people from different cultures.	2	16	5	27	28
20	I accept the opinions of people from different cultures.	8	3	5	33	29

Appendix 2. A Modified Version of Willingness to Communicate questionnaire by Hashimoto (2002)— the results

		strongly disagree	dis-agree	not sure	agree	strongly agree
1	I like expressing my viewpoint in English when I am at a large meeting of friends.	1	3	12	31	31
2	I like engaging in a communication with a stranger on a bus in English.	3	7	15	32	20
3	I speak confidently in public to a group of strangers using English.	6	7	16	18	31
4	I like engaging in a conversation with an acquaintance in English while standing in a line.	2	9	10	37	20
5	I like engaging in a conversation in English with a salesperson in a store.	2	11	13	35	17
6	I like engaging in communication in English with an acquaintance in an elevator.	2	9	10	37	20
7	I like engaging in communication in English with a stranger in an elevator.	2	13	14	35	14
8	I like engaging in communication in English with a waiter/waitress in a restaurant.	0	5	19	39	15
9	I rate highly my interest in learning English.	1	3	9	47	18
10	I am not anxious when I speak English outside classroom.	4	15	18	30	11
11	I am not anxious when I speak English in a classroom.	8	14	14	15	27