ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION STUDENTS' INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY IN CROSS CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING SUBJECT

FAUZIA ARIANTI, ESTI JUNINING , SUGENG SUSILO ADI

[1]MTs English Teacher at Kotabaru, South Kalimantan, [2]Department of Language Education, Faculty of Cultural Studies, Universitas Brawijaya, [3]Department of Language Education, Faculty of Cultural Studies, Universitas Brawijaya

[1]fauziaarianti@student.ub.ac.id, [2] esti@ub.ac.id, [3]*sugengadi@ub.ac.id*

Abstract

This study aims at describing the English Language Education students' intercultural sensitivity. Understanding cultural differences is one of the affective aspects in education. In English Language Education Program, Department of Language Education, Universitas Brawijaya, students are facilitated by learning the meaning of respecting cultural differences through the CCU subject course. It also tries to find out factor that affects the students' intercultural sensitivity level. This study used quantitative research design for measuring, assessing, and calculating the result based on numerical data. The questionnaires were distributed to 142 participants who from second, third, and fourth-year students and who have taken CCU course. The result of the study showed that 25% of students have ethnocentric level and 75% of ethno-relative level. The factor that affects both levels was the interaction engagement. The study showed that the students' sensitivity level of cultural differences is very sufficient. However, there are still 25% students have no posttive perceprion about cultural differences. Therefor, faculty members still need to give innovation to the introduction of culture such as giving them insight into Indonesian culture.

Keywords: *culture differences, intercultural sensitivity factors, intercultural sensitivity levels, CCU*

INTRODUCTION

Many people believe that culture is one of the most important components in learning a language. According to Tuncel and Paker (2018) said that "as language and culture have inextricable connection in a society, culture should not be ignored in second language teaching". People who study about the second language they also automatically involve in the study of second culture (Genc and Bada, 2005). The good combination of developing language in culture is when the target language learns about a new language while incorporating cultural elements in order to understand about cultural differences. Positive

outcome of a process for understanding and accepting cultural differences is called as intercultural sensitivity (IS).

Intercultural sensitivity becomes most important in all levels of the education, especially for those who will teach other languages. In this study, intercultural sensitivity has something to do with the closeness of the relationship between language and culture. It is a common belief that language and culture are intricately connected. According to Farooq et al. (2018) learning a language without culture is said to be turning a person who can speak a foreign language but they cannot understand about the social, culture, or philosophical aspect of their counterpart. Klinger et al. (2005) stated that culture as a system of shared beliefs, customs, behaviours and artefacts.

Regarding the discussion of several culture differences, including the CCU course is the best way to get accurate results for this study. Students who have taken the CCU course are automatically learned about; understanding other people's cultures, several factors that can lead stereotyping, how they should behave with people from different cultures, appreciate the different cultures around them, and for sure, they are must been accepting the differences opinion that happen around them. Based on the several benefits above, students are qualified to be a good subject in the study of intercultural sensitivity, and it showed how very important teaching about the CCU course in education world.

The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) was created by Bennett (1986; 1993b) as an explanation of how people construe cultural differences. The first three DMIS orientations which are Denial, Defense, and Minimization conceptualized as more ethnocentric, meaning that one's own culture is experienced as central to reality in some way. The second three DMIS orientations which are Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration defined as more ethnorelative, meaning that one's own culture is experienced in the context of other cultures. The more ethnocentric orientations can be seen as ways of avoiding cultural difference, either by denying its existence, by raising defenses against it, or by minimizing its importance. The more ethnorelative worldviews are ways of seeking cultural difference, either by accepting its importance, by adapting perspective to take it into account, or by integrating the whole concept into a definition of identity.

In conducting this study, the researcher wont to know the level of students' intercultural sensitivity and also several factors that can affect students' intercultural sensitivity as long as they get a cross cultural understanding (CCU) course. The researcher chose the second, third, and fourth -year English Language Education students of Universitas Brawijaya. It aimed to adjust the research with the object under study in order to get the appropriate results. The results obtained after collecting data from the intercultural sensitivity questionnaire which is adapted from Chen & Starosta (2000) and Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) which is adopted from Chen & Starosta (2000), and Bennett (1993) as a tool to measure students' level of intercultural sensitivity.

Cross Cultural Understanding Course

In learning any languages, beside learning to master the four skills namely, reading, listening, speaking and writing, learners are also expected to master about cross cultural understanding. They need to know how properly the culture of the country and the people where the language is formed. According to Jackson (2014) thought that CCU is assessable way to introduce for undergraduate students who are in the new area of

Intercultural Communication situation. It is important to know that learning about cultural differences in more specific explanation toward students was introduced at the level of university, especially in the 4th semester of the English language education study program at Faculty of Cultural Studies Universitas Brawijaya. Yulianti (2015) explains that fundamental of cross cultural understanding simply refers to the basic ability of people to recognize, interpret, and correctly react to people, incidences or situation that are open to misunderstanding due to cultural differences.

Intercultural Sensitivity Scale

Chen and Starosta's model of IS includes 24 items and five factors: 1. Intercultural Engagement: focus on participants' feeling of participation in the intercultural communication; 2. Respect for Cultural Differences: to realize, accept, respect, and tolerate for others' cultural diversities in the communication; 3.Interaction Confidence: how confident the interlocutors perform during intercultural communication; 4.Interaction Enjoyment: the level of delight interlocutors feel in the intercultural communication; and 5. Interaction Attentiveness: the ability of receiving and responding to the messages properly during the intercultural communication. The concurrent validity of the ISS was evaluated against several valid instruments and the results turned out to be satisfactory (Chen and Starosta, 2000).

METHOD

This research used a survey method. The population was English Language Education Study Program. From the population, researchers determined to study the students who have taken CCU course as the target population. As suggested by Crasswell (2014) the minimal number of subjects is 100 for a descriptive study. In this study the researcher used purposive sampling or judgment sampling to choose the sample. According to Arikunto (2010:183), purposive sampling is the process of selecting sample by taking a subject that is not based on the level or area, but it is taken Based on the specific purpose. Due to the feasibility and accessibility, the questionnaires have been distributed to the 142 students.

There are procedures that need to be done to do this research. Based on Ary et al. (2010, p. 378), there are six steps to conduct survey research. The first step was planning. In this study, the researcher occurred with a research question which focused on intercultural sensitivity level in second, third, and fourth year students of English Language Education Department. The second step was defining the population. The researcher took students of English Language Education Department as the participant of the study. The consideration was because as students of English language education they have studied cross cultural understanding course and because of the feasibility and accessibility. Third, the researcher needed to have sample of the population. It would be 30 students from different years as the sample. Fourth, the researcher was constructing the instrument in the form of a questionnaire adapted from Chen et al. (2000). The questionnaire consisted of 24 items and those students were filling the questionnaires. After it has been filled, the researcher set the valid questionnaires to conduct the research. The fifth step was the researcher conducted the survey by distributing the questionnaires

to the respondents and asks them to fill the questionnaire based on their opinion. The last, the researcher was collecting the data and process it to make the result.

To know students' intercultural sensitivity level, researcher adapted a questionnaire from Chen & Starosta (2000). This questionnaire consisted of 24 questions and the questions are divided into 5 factors. The same questionnaire was analysed twice in order to know about students' intercultural sensitivity level and also the factor that affected of both levels.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Categorization of students' Intercultural Sensitivity Level

CATEGORY	Participant	Percentage (%)
Ethnocentrism	36	25%
Ethnorelativism	106	75%
TOTAL	142	100%

Based on the Table 1, the total number of ethnocentric level is 25% of the total participants and the total number of ethnorelative level is 75% from the total participants. In line, it can be concluded that the second, third, fourth-year students of English Language Education Department are dominated by ethnorelative level rather than ethnocentric level.

Table 2. The Ethnocentrism Level on Students' Intercultural Sensitivity

ETHNOCENTRISM	Question Number	Choice Yes	Mean	Total Mean Score %
	24	31	0.86	**68**
	22	5	0.14	22
	1	34	0.94	1
INTERACTION ENGAGEMENT	11	18	0.50	11
	21	33	0.92	21
	23	17	0.47	23
	13	33	0.92	13
	total	4.75		total
	16	34	0.94	**32**
	8	30	0.83	8
RESPECT OF CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	18	1	0.03	18
	2	2	0.06	2
	7	0	0	7
	20	3	0.08	20
	total	1.94		total
	3	21	0.58	**44**
	10	22	0.61	10
INTERACTION CONFIDENCE	5	10	0.28	5
	4	11	0.31	4
	6	15	0.42	6
	total	2.19		total
	12	6	0.17	**11**
INTERACTION ENJOYMENT	9	4	0.11	9
	15	2	0.06	15
	total	0.33		total
INTERACTION ATTENTIVENES	14	28	0.78	**58**
	7	29	0.81	7
	9	6	0.17	9
	total	1.75		total

Table 3. The Ethnorelativism on Students' Intercultural Sensitivity

ETHNORELATIVISM	Question Number	Choice Yes	Mean	Total Mean Score
	24	105	0.99	**86**
	22	57	0.54	22
	1	105	0.99	1
INTERACTION ENGAGEMENT	11	88	0.83	11
	21	102	0.96	21
	23	79	0.75	23
	13	103	0.97	13
	total	6.03		total
	16	105	0.99	**55**
	8	104	0.98	8
RESPECT OF CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	18	18	0.17	18
	2	31	0.29	2
	7	14	0.64	7
	20	22	0.21	20
	total	3.28		total
	3	95	0.90	**72**
	10	87	0.82	10
INTERACTION CONFIDENCE	5	73	0.69	5
	4	40	0.38	4
	6	89	0.84	6
	total	3.62		total
	12	29	0.27	**23**
INTERACTION ENJOYMENT	9	22	0.21	9
	15	22	0.21	15
	total	0.69		total
	14	99	0.93	**75**
INTERACTION ATTENTIVENES	7	103	7	103
	9	38	9	38
	total	2.26	total	2.26

According to the Table 2 and 3 above, the calculations of total scores were obtained from the total score of responses for each question number divided by 106 as the total of ethnorelative level. The mean scores were obtained by figuring up the total in each factor. In this level, the result showed that the top one factor that affected students at ethnocentric level was Interaction Engagement (86%).

According to the explanation in the chapter two and finding, students' intercultural sensitivity levels were divided into two types, those are; ethnocentric and ethnorelative levels. Those two categories stated by Bennett (1993). He explained that those categories can be called as the major step of understanding people from different other cultures that must be have by some individuals to have more awareness and have ability to adjust and also integrate theirculturalnorms.

Based on both levels were designed by Bennett (1993), ethnocentric level were people who have their own standards in terms of interacting with people from different cultures and they were easy to judge something regardless of the reason. "Ethnorelative" is a word coined to express the opposite of ethnocentric; it refers to people who were comfortable

with many standards and customs and they can adapt to people's behaviour in different culture settings.

As can be seen in table 2, students with ethnocentric level were influenced by Interaction Engagement factor. It can be proven by the highest percentage of the mean score and the students showed a lack of enjoyment of cultural diversity around them. Then, table 4.3 showed the result of factors from ethnorelative level. The level was influenced by the same factor which is Interaction Engagement factor. In the results of this data, students who included as ethnorelative level are those who feel comfortable, enjoy and can accept the phenomenon of cultural differences.

This reasons was also proven by several questions in the intercultural sensitivity questionnaire which explained that they feeling enjoy when interacting with people from other cultures, greatly appreciated the differences around them, did not avoid when they were in a situation of cultural differences, being excited when they wanted to know and exchanged their knowledge about cultural differences perspective, lastly, they often gave a positive response to the counterparts during their interaction. Based on several shreds of evidence rather the Interaction Engagement factor was strongly matched and more suitable with students in ethnorelative level than students in ethnocentric level.

CONCLUSION

Based on the finding and discussion, it can be concluded that the intercultural are dominated by ethnorelative levels (75%) rather than ethnocentric levels (25%). The factors that were chosen by each level are Interaction Engagement factor. However, the Interaction Engagement factor was strongly matched and more suitable with students in ethnorelative level than students in ethnocentric level. In the results of this data, students who included as ethnorelative level are those who feel comfortable, enjoy and can accept the phenomenon of cultural differences.

For further researchers, the finding of this research can be useful for them who what to conduct survey study or other research studies on students' intercultural sensitivity perception. The future researcher can go deeper into aspects of intercultural education using a qualitative methodology with the aim of expanding the results of researcher's result. Further researchers also should be increase the number of participants in order to achieve greater representation. Considering to other characteristics background such us level of education proficiency, ages, and students' background is the best way to prove the next results. Therefore, future researcher should be more specific analysis.

References

Ary. D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education.* Wadsworth: Cengage Learning

Bennett, M. (1993). Towards ethno relativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M. J. (1986). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications* (pp. 27–70). New York: University Press of America. [E-Book]

Bennett, M. J. (1993b). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21–71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press [E-Book]

Creswell, J. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall. [E-Book]

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches (4th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [E-Book]

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson. [E-Book]

Chen, G.M., & Starosta, W. J. (2000). The development and validation of the intercultural communication sensitivity scale. *Human Communication, 3*, 1-15.

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1997). A review of the concept of intercultural sensitivity. *Human Communication*, 1, 1-16

Farooq, M. U., Soomro, A. F., Umer, M. (2018). English Language Teaching and Cultural Implication in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of English Linguistics, vol. 8(3).*

Gokmen, M. E. (2005). Yabanci dil ogretiminde kulturerarasi iletisimsel edinc. *Dil Dergisi, 128, 69-78* https://doi.org/10.1501/Dilder_0000000035.

Genc, B., Bada, E. (2005). Culture in Language Learning and Teaching. *The Reading Matrix*, *vol.5(1).*

Jackson, Jane. (2014). Introducing Language and Intercultural Communication. *Routledge of the Taylor & Francis Group* [E-Book]

Kitao, K. (1991). Teaching Culture in Foreign Language Instruction in the United States. *Doshisha Studies in English, Feb. 1991. No. 52-53. Pp. 285-306.* Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED330214.pdf.

Klinger, J., Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E., Harry, B., Zion, S., Tate, W., … Riley, D. (2005). Addressing the disproportionate representation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education through culturally responsive educational systems. *Education Policy Analysis Archieves, 13. 1-43.* https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v13n38.2005.

Kraemer, K, L. (1991). Paper Presented at The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Model

Tuncel. I., Paker. T. (2018). Effects of an Intercultural Communication Course in Developing Intercultural Sensitivity. *International Journal of Higher Education, vol.7, no.6.*

Yulianti, N. K. D., (2015). Cross Cultural Understanding in Language Learning. *ISI DENPASAR*. Retrieved from https://www.isi-dps.ac.id/artikel/crosscultural-understanding-in-language-learning