

# THE INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY (IS) OF KOREAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAMS PROMOTING INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY

Kim, Ok-Soon•Dancel, Maria Aurea•Dancel, Ricky•

Baniasen, Jennifer•Carr, Aqeela•Doyle, Shane•

Laishramcha, Jinine•McLaughlin, Robert

## Abstract

This study measured the level of intercultural sensitivity depending on the respondents' year level, gender, major, and interaction experience with foreigners. A total of 403 respondents answered the Intercultural Sensitivity Survey (ISS), which was developed by Chen and Starosta. The purpose of this study is to provide a direction of English education in Korean society to enhance the competitiveness of a globalized manpower. Accordingly, no significant relationship was noted between their ISS and major as well as their interaction experience with foreigners. The researchers recommend that teachers, curriculum developers, academic administrators, and relevant stakeholders should revisit the thrust of English education in Korea in order to include in its focus the goal to increase the intercultural sensitivity of Korean students. Providing more opportunities for culture exchange and interaction is also recommended.

Key words: ESL education; intercultural sensitivity; university students; foreign professors

## I. Introduction

Globalization paves the way for people across cultures to explore opportunities for collaboration. With the increasing interactions of people from different cultures, many are challenged as to how to become equipped for culture exchange. Moreover, when immersed in a global society, people are compelled to become competitive in communicating their ideas and ensuring they have successful and meaningful interactions (Chen, 2010). More important than communication skills, however, is the ability of people to adjust and to become sensitive to the culture of their counterparts. In any given setting where diverse cultures interact, for instance, people become interwoven members of a pluralistic society. As Huang (2013) noted, "Since globalization makes people from diverse cultural backgrounds communicate effectively, being a global citizen has become the goal of our education." Landis and Bhagat (19% in Huang, 2013) further emphasized the importance of intercultural sensitivity in this era of globalization because it enables people to live and work with others from different cultures. A person with higher intercultural sensitivity is considered as highly global (needless to say, competitive) because he/she has a sophisticated and an in-depth understanding and recognition of cultural differences. It has likewise been reported that "individuals with global mindset not only have a well-developed ego and positive concept, but also possess a sensitive heart regarding cultural diversity" (Chen, 2005) and "better understand and respect others and themselves (Dong, Koper, & Collaco, 2008). Similarly, as Bennett and Bennett (2004, in dong, Koper & Collaco, 2008) purported, individuals with intercultural sensitivity tend to transform themselves from the ethnocentric stage to the ethno-relative stage. In ethnocentric stage, individuals view their own culture as central to reality. Then, after "avoiding cultural differences through denying its

existence, raising defense against the differences, and minimizing its importance“, individuals proceed to the ethno-relative stage. In this stage, they experience their own culture in the context of other cultures. It can be noted therefore that intercultural sensitivity does not simply concern itself to globalization, but equally important is its significance in globalization of individuals. When individuals develop strong self identification in their own culture, they have high intercultural sensitivity (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, in Dong, Koper & Collaco, 2008).

Considering the importance of intercultural sensitivity, it continues to attract the attention of companies, researchers, and educational institutions among others. In Korea, the society becomes increasingly diverse and multicultural brought about by intercultural marriages and an influx of foreign workers and international students. Although many Koreans consider themselves welcoming to people of other cultures, still several of them are unprepared to be immersed in a culturally diverse environment. In fact, some Koreans have either negative or indifferent opinions of migrants (UPI, 2015). The central Intelligence Agency (QA) (2017) notes that “Korea is one of the most, if not the most ethnically, homogenous country on earth.“ With this limited exposure to multiculturalism, young Koreans would have difficulty joining the global job market (QA, 2017). For those who have the means, therefore, studying abroad is an option to have an opportunity “To view the world through the eyes of others and become more culturally sensitive and aware“ (Hermesmeyer & Kessler, May 2017). Similarly, in the academe, although a number of foreigners are being hired to teach English, the main reason of Korean schools is to expose students to the accent, pronunciation, and intricacies of English language through the native speakers of English and not really to develop their intercultural sensitivity or even their awareness of other cultures. Ramirez (2013) reports,

“One of Korea’s earliest and most influential attempts to boost English education was to import it. The year was 1995, the president was democratic activist Kim Young-sam, and Korea’s emerging, outward-looking economy was in bloom with a 9.2 percent growth rate.

Politicians recognized English as the key to their country's successful globalization, and launched the English Program in Korea (EPHC) to invite native English speakers to teach in the country. Its official aims were to improve the English communication skills of teachers and students, improve the English education system, and increase Korean's cultural understanding of the world as well as foreigners' understanding of Korea."

At that time, 59 native English speakers from six countries— the U.S., Canada, the U.K., Ireland, Australia and New Zealand— were brought to Korea, and they were the first official native English teachers and holders of the E-2 teaching visa. Even up to the present, in job postings for English teachers, not only academic qualifications and professional experience are highlighted but the applicant's country of origin/ethnicity/race, age, gender, and accent. High preference is given to "white teachers" or native speakers of English, such as those coming from the USA, New Zealand, Canada, Australia, the UK, Ireland, and South Africa (Cale, Matador Network, 2015). Such troublesome phenomenon is not limited to teachers. For other migrant workers and even multicultural children, discrimination is likewise a persisting problem (Lee, UPI, 2015). While it may be true that "the educated population has been the engine for Korea's rapid economic growth, the government still acknowledges that graduates are not globally competitive" (Parry, October 2011). Indeed, Korean students are expected to become more sensitive to other cultures and thus be more competitive in the international job market.

The foregoing observations prompted the researchers to probe into the current level of intercultural sensitivity of Freshman University students. Through the data obtained in this paper, schools and the general Korean society will be provided with further understanding of the present status of the students who, in the future, would be in the frontline of various fields, such as business, communication, education, healthcare, IT, and engineering. Knowing that Korean education from elementary to high school focuses on preparing students for aptitude testing, their actual exposure to diverse cultures happens mostly in the university, specifically in

their English classes. It has been reported also that focus is devoted to education and exams, that typical high school and middle school students, for example, finish their official school day at 4 in the afternoon, but remain dragged for extensive hours in academies or in-school study halls, intensively studying Math, History, Korean, and English. Indeed, Korean students have limited experiences and training that are supposed to guide them on how to relate to other cultures. As education has over-emphasis on rote learning and relatively low levels of exposure to foreigners in everyday life (Ramirez, March 2013), the thrust of education, especially in English, needs to be revisited. This study may provide a benchmark for the development of curricula, activities, programs, and training that will enhance not merely the academic needs but also the intercultural sensitivity of students. In the long run, as Korea ventures toward globalization, this study intended to provide insights into the issues of cultural differences and varying communication styles as well as the current limitations of the students that need to be addressed.

Objectives: This study aimed to answer the question, “What is the level of intercultural sensitivity of Korean university students?” To answer this general question, the following specific objectives were intended.

1. To determine the respondents’ demographic profile in terms of age, gender, year level, major, and previous interaction experience with foreigners.
2. To determine the respondents’ intercultural sensitivity with regard to the five focused dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Survey (ISS) developed by Chen and Starosta (2000), namely, Interaction Engagement (IEng), Respect for Cultural Differences (RCD), Interaction Confidence (IQ, Interaction Enjoyment (IEnj), and Interaction Attentiveness (IAtt).
3. To determine whether there is a significant difference between the students’ level of intercultural sensitivity based on ISS and their gender, major, and previous interaction experience with foreigners.

## II. Literature Review

### 1. Global Society

Being immersed into a different culture can be one of the most challenging experiences anyone could have. International migration, multiculturalism, and globalized economy are a trend in the modern world (Chen & Starosta, 1996, as cited in Balakrishnan, 2015). United Nations (2015) reported that the number of international migrants reached 244 million, a figure that shows a remarkable 41% increase compared to 2000. Even though this number includes almost 20 million refugees, it can be noted that the merging of diverse cultures in one country becomes a major concern not only at present but also in the coming years.

In Korea, 1.9 million foreign residents, of which the Chinese nationals are consistently increasing, are reported to be the current statistics (The Korea Times, May 2016). Moreover, Korean expatriates with foreign citizenship (F-4 visa holders) reached 17.2%, followed by 14.4% with working visits (H-2 visa holders), and 13.7% are foreigners with non-professional work permits. Compared to March 2013, a remarkable 1.2% increase, that is, 152,025 foreign spouses, was recorded as well. The number of foreign students showed similar trend that it increased by 14.4% (106,138).

Indeed, people, regardless of their country of origin and whether they like it or not, in one point or another, will be compelled to relate to a person from another culture. Given that the world becomes increasingly multicultural, being able to respect, accept, and adjust to a culture other than one's own becomes a necessity. Kofi Atta Annan, a Ghanaian diplomat who served as the seventh Secretary-General of the United Nations, perfectly expressed, "Tolerance, inter-cultural dialogue and respect for diversity are more essential than ever in a world where peoples are becoming more and more closely interconnected." Hence, encouraging local people to love their own culture while also embracing the diversity of the society and welcoming the

differences in terms of belief systems, communication styles, and cultural backgrounds promotes a positive atmosphere.

The question is, how to welcome another culture? Is it enough to become aware of another person's culture? Is it necessary to adopt a different culture? Such questions are the main concerns of researchers Chen and Starosta (1997) when they provided the world with their concept of intercultural awareness (the cognitive component), intercultural sensitivity (the affective component), and intercultural adroitness (the behavioral component). Intercultural Sensitivity is considered to be the crucial point because "by studying the affective component, it is presumed that intercultural awareness exists, and that intercultural behaviours result as an outcome"(Balakrishnan, 2015).

## **2. Intercultural Sensitivity**

In the past, studies conducted to identify people's ability to adapt to, lest to say accept, another culture had been more focused on determining their intercultural communication competence. As the two, namely, intercultural communication competence and intercultural sensitivity, are basically different yet somewhat related, a clear line needed to be drawn. Accordingly, intercultural communication competence, according to Morreale, Spitzberg, and Barge (2007) was clarified as "the knowledge, motivation, and skills for effective communication. This description of intercultural communication competence was then "confused, overlapped, and at least used indiscriminately with intercultural awareness, intercultural adroitness, and intercultural sensitivity" (Peng, 2006). Intercultural competence is the "mechanism through which individuals develop the potential to interact smoothly with diverse groups" (Fantini, 2000). It is not merely being interested in other cultures that makes people effective, but more importantly, they should demonstrate sensitivity, meaning their ability to recognize cultural differences and modify behavior so as to show respect for other cultures (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992). Therefore,

intercultural sensitivity is not an automatically integrated attitude because it is a developmental process, which is further elaborated by Bennett (1986). According to him, intercultural sensitivity has six developmental stages: denial, defense, minimizing, acceptance, adaptation, and integration of cultural difference. People who are sensitive to diverse cultures did not achieve such sensitivity overnight because they (either consciously or unconsciously) undergo the gradual process of solving cultural differences and then developing empathy in accepting and adapting cultural differences. In a different yet related view of Chen and Starosta (1997), intercultural sensitivity is only one of the three concepts of intercultural communication competence. This intercultural communication competence comprises intercultural awareness (cognitive aspect), intercultural sensitivity (affective aspect), and intercultural adroitness (the behavioral aspect). Furthermore, “intercultural sensitivity refers to the subjects’ active desire to motivate themselves to understand, appreciate, and accept differences among cultures” (Chen & Starosta, 1997). Chen and Starosta’s three concepts, intercultural sensitivity is prioritized because it is deemed fundamental. Accordingly, understanding first the affective component leads to recognizing intercultural awareness and then enacting on the outcome, the intercultural behavior. Furthermore, Chen and Starosta (1997) defined intercultural sensitivity as “an individual’s ability to develop a positive emotion towards understanding and appreciating cultural differences that promotes an appropriate and effective behaviour in intercultural communication.” Based on this definition, the Intercultural Sensitivity Survey (ISS) was developed.

### **3. Intercultural Sensitivity Survey (ISS)**

In 1990, Chen and Starosta conceptualized a model of intercultural communication competence, which comprises three conceptual dimensions, namely, intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity, and intercultural adroitness— all of which contains a set of different components. Intercultural awareness, a cognitive dimension, refers to a person’s ability to



understand and recognize similarities and differences of others' cultures. It encompasses two components, such as self-awareness and cultural awareness. The second dimension which is considered as the affective is intercultural sensitivity, which refers to "the emotional desire of a person to acknowledge, appreciate, and accept cultural differences." Intercultural sensitivity has six components, including "self-esteem, self-monitoring, empathy, open-mindedness, nonjudgmental, and social relaxation." Finally, the behavioral dimension is intercultural adroitness, which refers to "an individual's ability to reach communication goals while interacting with people from other cultures." This dimension has message skills, appropriate self-disclosure, behavioral flexibility, and interaction management as its components (Chen & Starosta, 1990, 1998, 1999, 2000). Upon clarifying their model on measuring the dimensions of intercultural communication competence, Chen and Starosta (2000) developed the instrument, that is, the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS), to explore first the concept of intercultural sensitivity.

The ISS has five underlying factors, namely, Interaction Engagement (IEng), Interaction Attentiveness (IAtt), Interaction Enjoyment (IEnj), Respect for Cultural Differences (RCD), and Interaction Confidence (IC) (Chen & Starosta, 2000). IEng refers to how involved people feel when they are in intercultural settings; IAtt refers to whether people feel they are able to discern cues from their interaction partner during an intercultural interaction. IEnj refers to whether people feel like they appreciate the intercultural interaction; RCD to whether individuals orient to and tolerate opinions of others from a different culture. Finally, IC refers to whether individuals feel comfortable and competent in an intercultural setting. In the 24-item questionnaire, items 2, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15, 18, 20, and 22 need to be reverse-coded before summing the 24 items. The first factor, IEng, is measured by items 1, 11, 13, 21, 22, 23, and 24; ROD by items are 2, 7, 8, 16, 18, and 20; IC by items are 3, 4, 5, 6, and 10; IEnj by items 9, 12, and 15; and IAtt by items 14, 17, and 19.

#### 4. Related Studies

Research studies in the context of the academe and the actual workplace, since the early years the concept of intercultural sensitivity had come out until the recent years, are proof that attention should be exerted more to make the modern society inclusive and accepting. Similar observations on the increasing importance of cultural sensitivity can be noted on how many institutions, including the media, are considering the provision of training for their stakeholders and showing how the present society can be more accommodating to cultural diversity.

Moreover, educational institutions and researchers in other countries, such as in the US (Otten, 2003 as cited in Sakurauch, 2014; McMurray, 2007; Fritz, Mollenberg, Chen, 2002), Spain (Banos, 2006), Taiwan (Huang, 2013), and Turkey (Meydanlioglu, Arikan, & Gozum, 2015) to name a few, have become highly concerned whether students possess intercultural sensitivity. That is, if the students are sufficiently equipped and well-adjusted to a possibly culturally diverse workplace in the future.

In 2013, Huang conducted a survey among 358 participants from the Nursing Department and Department of Nutrition and Health Sciences in Taipei, Taiwan. This study probed into the participants' level of intercultural sensitivity in terms of the five dimensions and how such are affected by the participants' demographic factors. Results show that the participants scored highest on the dimension of "resped for the cultural differences" and lowest score on "interaction confidence". Moreover, "dedsion of studying abroad" and "experiences of living abroad" were indicated to have effectivdy predicted the partidpants' intercultural sensitivity.

Another noteworthy research, though conduded some several years ago, was that of McMurray (2007). Her research included undergraduate (N =2804) and graduate students (N = 231) of the College of Journalism and Communications at the University of Florida. In her paper, McMurray (2007) examined the potential disparities between the levels of intercultural

sensitivity among the groups of her participants, namely, international students, domestic students with international travel experience, and domestic students without international travel experience.

In Korea, extensive studies delving in intercultural sensitivity (Roh, 2014; Kim, Song, Moon, & Lee, 2013; Park, 2015; Jeon & Lee, 2012; Kim, 2008) have likewise been conducted. Indeed, the growing diversity of Korean society brought by cultural and racial integration from foreign migrant workers, international marriage women, ethnic Koreans from China, and North Korean migrants, migrants, and foreign workers calls for establishing multicultural education in Korean schools (Seak-Zoon, 2014; Yoon, Song, & Bae, 2008). In the country in recent years, several studies and initiatives have been done to promote multicultural education and determine intercultural sensitivity. However, most of these studies have been geared towards limited areas and levels. Despite the numerous initiatives, the South Korean society remains challenged given its strong homogeneity and sense of nationalism

One study delved into the attitude of South Koreans toward foreigners, minorities, and multiculturalism (Yoon, Song, & Bae, 2008), where the respondents are found to be “more open and tolerant toward foreigners and immigrants living in South Korea than previously believed.” Another is that of Roh (2014) which measured and analyzed the intercultural sensitivity of middle and high school students in Korea. In this study, variables, namely, gender, age, location, and level of multicultural experience were explored in order to determine the level of intercultural sensitivity of the students. Results obtained from 450 students in Seoul and Gyeonggi Province show that intercultural sensitivity is affected differentially by each variable. Roh also noted a high correlation between the students’ level of intercultural sensitivity and their level of multicultural experience. Jeon and Lee (2012) investigated the relationship between university students’ exposure to foreign culture and their levels of global competency. In this study, 121 students at ‘A’ university in Seoul completed the online survey. Frequency analysis,

correlation analysis, and independent-sample t-test showed that partial aspects of global competency had significant relationship with students' exposure to foreign culture. By contrast, the students' levels of global understanding and English proficiency were both positively related to students' exposure to foreign culture. Moreover, the study noted that the levels of intercultural sensitivity depended on the types of exposure the students have to foreign culture. Kim (2008) provided the status of pre-service teachers with regard to their readiness for the multicultural education in South Korea. In her study, she compared the intercultural sensitivity between the 301 South Korean and the 275 Chinese pre-service teachers who were enrolled in a teacher education program of a 4-year college. Results show that the pre-service teachers in Korea obtained slightly higher scores than those in China. Another was Yoon, Song, & Bae (2008)'s study, in which they conducted surveys that examined South Koreans' notions of national identity, attitudes toward foreigners and racial/ethnic minorities, and social distance feelings toward foreigners and minority groups. The study found out that South Koreans are more open and tolerant toward foreigners and immigrants, and perceive them as not a threat to South Korea in general.

### **III. Methodology**

#### **1. Respondents and Locale of the Study**

This research adopted convenience sampling method. Convenience sampling method is a set of techniques in which the respondents are selected by convenience due to their proximity, availability, accessibility, or other way that researcher decides. This method was adopted in the study because the students identified to participate in the study were under the tutelage of only one professor for their ESL Listening/Speaking and ESL Reading courses. Thus, the study included 27 out of the 98 ESL classes, that is, a total of 403 respondents. Additionally, this study

was conducted in a private-owned university (herein after referred to as S University) located in Gyeonggi Province. S University is a home to some 12,000 students, of which 93% is composed of undergraduate students and 7% is postgraduate. A total of 495 international students, 66 are in the graduate level and the rest is undergraduate students. S University is specifically chosen as the locale of the study considering its impressive ranking among universities in terms of its ration of foreign professors (Korea Joongang Daily, 2013). In addition, the English as a Second Language course of S University is a required course for all Freshman students. With this advantage, the S University is believed to have been providing ample opportunities for its students to be immersed in different cultures through these English classes.

## **2. Research Instrument**

Using the 24-item ISS developed by Chen and Starosta (2000), this study examined the intercultural sensitivity of university students in Korea. The ISS consists of five factors: IEng, RCD, IC, IEnj, and IAtt, and is based on a 5-point Likert scale, with choices 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=uncertain, 2=disagree, and 1=strongly disagree.

IEng is related to the respondents' feeling of participation in intercultural communication and how involved they feel when they are in intercultural settings. For RCD, 6 items probe into how respondents orient to or tolerate their counterparts' culture and opinion. Third, IC comprises how confident respondents are in the intercultural setting, such as whether they feel comfortable and competent. For IEnj, 3 items deal with participants' positive or negative reactions, that is, whether they feel like they appreciate the interaction with people from different cultures. Finally, IAtt is expressed in 3 items and is concerned with respondents' effort to understand what is going on and whether they feel they are able to discern cues from their interaction partner during an interaction.

Moreover, in the 24-item questionnaire, items 2, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15, 18, 20, and 22 were

reverse-coded before summing the 24 items.

**<Table 1> Item Specification of ISS**

Factors of Intercultural Sensitivity	Item Numbers
Interaction Engagement (IEng)	1, 11, 13, 21, 22, 23, 24
Interaction Attentiveness (IAtt)	14, 17, 19
Interaction Enjoyment (IEnj)	9, 12, 15
Respect for Cultural Differences (RCD)	2, 7, 8, 16, 18, 20
Interaction Confidence (IQ)	3, 4, 5, 6, 10

### **3. Data Gathering and Analysis**

The survey was conducted from early towards the end of the Finals period of the Fall Semester 2016 (between October and December 2016). That period was specifically chosen by the researchers considering that the students have already adjusted to their subjects specifically in English class. The ISS was personally conducted by the researchers, and initially, coordination was done with the respective professors of the ESL sections identified to participate in this study. After coordinating with the professors, the researchers went to the classes and explained to the students the objectives of the study.

The responses were tabulated for frequency using Microsoft Excel, and were subjected to treatment using SPSS Version 20. For the respondents' demographic profile, namely, gender, age, major, and interaction experience with foreigners, frequency counting and percentages were adopted; for the intercultural sensitivity of students as well as the five factors of IS, mean was used as it allowed the researchers to make use of all the data gathered.

On the other hand, to identify whether there is a significant difference between the respondents' level of IS and their gender, as well as their IS and whether they have or do not

have interaction exposure with foreigners, independent-samples t-test was employed. This treatment enables the researchers to compare two samples (in this case the respondents' gender and their level of IS, and the other the respondents' interaction exposure with foreigners and their level of IS) in terms of their means. Moreover, the result obtained from the independent samples t-test provides a clear presentation of how different the mean of one sample is from the mean of the other group, as well as whether such difference is statistically significant.

Meanwhile, one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the IS of different majors. One-way ANOVA compares the means between the groups (in this case the respondents' IS and their respective majors). It also enabled the researchers to note whether the means are statistically significantly different from each other.

## **IV. Results and Discussions**

### **1. Respondents' demographic profile**

<Table 2> shows that of the 403 respondents, a little more than half, namely 222 (55.1%) are male. Moreover, in terms of age, the highest percentage of respondents comprises the age bracket from 20 to 25 years. In Korea, this age range, specifically those in the early 20s, who are mostly fresh graduates from High School, consists of the freshman population in universities. In S University, these freshmen students are required to take a number of basic courses, such as ESL.

<Table 2> Age and gender of respondents

	PROFILE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
AGE	19 and Below	18	4.5
	20-25	378	93.8
	26-30	7	1.7
	Total	403	100
GENDER	Male	222	55.1
	Female	181	44.9
	Total	403	100

Furthermore, the respondents were also composed of students who are non-freshmen students, namely, 11 Second Year (27%), 11 Third Year (27%), and 13 Fourth Year (3.2%) (<Table 3>). These respondents are likely the students who are either taking FSL courses as a repeat course or who were not able to take FSL courses during their freshman year.



In terms of the respondents' field of study (major), majority (42.4%) is in the Business Department, followed by Engineering (14.6%), Natural Science (10.4%), IT (9.9%), and Music (8.4%). A smaller number of *respondents come from the Departments of PE, Medicine, and*

<Table 3> Year level and major of respondents

	PROFILE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
YEAR LEVEL	First Year	368	91.3
	Second Year	11	2.7
	Third Year	11	2.7
	Fourth Year	13	3.2
	Total	403	100
	Humanities	25	6.2
MAJOR	Business	171	42.4
	Natural Science	42	10.4
	Engineering	59	14.6
	IT	40	9.9
	PE, Medicine, & Welfare	19	4.7
	Fine Arts	13	3.2
	Music	34	8.4
	Total	403	100

Welfare (4.7%) and Fine Arts (3.2%) (Table 2.b).

<Table 4> illustrates that in terms of interaction exposure to and/or experience in communicating/interacting with foreigners, a substantial count of 330 respondents (81.9%) indicated that they have previous experience with people from another culture; whereas only 73 (18.1%) admitted they have none. Majority of the students clarified that their exposure to a foreign culture is due to a number of reasons. According to them, the opportunities to be with foreigners were through private English tutoring or in-school English conversation classes in

either Middle School or High School, overseas travel, having foreigner friends, and overseas study among others. Although the students admitted they had previous interaction experience with foreigners, especially those who had attended English academies and had in-school English conversation classes in the past, some of them claimed that they had relatively limited time in mingling with foreigners because of the class size in their school/academy. They further mentioned that getting to know deeply international people in Korea was limited because of the stringent target they had to achieve during their attendance in academies/school. Often, they are not given sufficient exposure with regard to the actual use of English and immersing themselves in the context of the English teacher's culture and background because of the fast phase of classes.

**<Table 4> Interaction experience with foreigners of respondents**

	PROFILE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
EXPERIENCE WITH FOREIGNERS	Yes	330	81.9
	No	73	18.1
	Total	403	100

## 2. Respondents' intercultural sensitivity

The respondents' level of intercultural sensitivity was determined in terms of the five focused dimensions of the Intercultural Sensitivity Survey (ISS) developed by Chen and Starosta (2000), namely, IEng, RCD, IC, IEnj, and IAtt.

### 1) Interaction Engagement (IEng)

In the ISS, this construct, IEng, measures individuals' feeling of participation in intercultural

communication or interaction (Chen & Starosta, 2000 as cited by McMurray, 2007; Cudureanu & Saini, 2012).

In this construct, the respondents “Agree” to items 13 (I am open-minded to people from different cultures), which obtained the highest mean (mean=4.01; sd=0.82), followed by item 21 (I often give positive responses to my culturally different counterpart during our interaction) (mean=3.90;sd=0.78). These two highest items in this construct are followed closely by items 1 (I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures) (mean=3.83; sd=0.95), 22 (I avoid those situations where I will have to deal with culturally-distinct persons) which has been reverse-coded (mean=3.52; sd=0.94), and 23 (I often show my culturally-distinct counterpart my understanding through verbal or nonverbal cues) (mean=3.80; sd=0.87). Having relatively high means, these items suggest that the respondents show an open-minded, genial, and welcoming attitude when they are involved in an intercultural situation

By contrast, the respondents are “Uncertain“ with regard to waiting before forming an impression of culturally-distinct counterparts (item 11, mean=3.37; sd=0.96) and having a feeling of enjoyment towards differences between them and their culturally-distinct counterpart (item 24, mean=3.25;sd=0.96). These results suggest that the respondents are somewhat uncertain in forming an impression, thus they either likely or unlikely to jump to any assumptions during their intercultural interaction. In addition, although the respondents, as mentioned earlier, enjoy interacting with people from another culture (item 1, mean=3.83; sd=0.95), they seem uncertain towards differences between them and their culturally-distinct counterparts (item 24). This feeling of uncertainty could be considered as a positive indication as the respondents are possibly looking beyond differences so they do not care whether their counterpart is from another culture. Overall, with the respondents obtaining fairly high mean (3.67; sd=0.90) in this construct of IEng, it can be concluded that they generally have the basic skills and confidence in intercultural interactions.

<Table 5> Respondents' interaction engagement

SCALE	5	4	3	2	1		NT	
ITEM	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	MEAN	LEVEL	SD
NO.								
1	107 51	159 (39.45)	103 (25.56)	28 (6.95)	6	3.83	Agree	0.95
11	41 (10.17)	152 (37.72)	135 (33.50)	64 (15.88)	11 (2.73)	3.37	Uncertain	0.96
13	114 (28.29)	201 (49.88)	71 (17.62)	14 (3.47)	3(0.74)	4.01	Agree	0.82
21	85 (21.09)	208 (51.61)	97 (24.07)	10 (2.48)	3 (0.74)	3.90		0.78
22	53 (13.15)	167 (41.44)	129 (32.01)	44 (10.92)	10 (2.48)	3.52	Agree	0.94
23	80 (19.85)	196 (48.64)	100 (24.81)	20 (4.96)	7 (1.74)	3.80	Agree	0.87
24	42 (10.42)	106 (26.30)	185 (45.91)	52 (12.90)	18 (4.47)	3.25	Uncertain	0.96
Ave	74.57 (18.50)	169.86 (42.15)	117.14 (29.07)	33.14	8.29 (2.06)	3.67	Agree	0.90

## 2) Respect for cultural differences (RCD)

This construct RCD measures the participants' orientation to or how they tolerate their counterparts' culture and opinion (Chen & Starosta, 2000 as cited by McMurray, 2007; Cudureanu & Saini, 2012). Moreover, this construct measures an individual's ability to realize, accept, and respect for others' cultural diversities in the communication (Wu, 2015). Among the six items in

this construct, four (items 2, 7, 18, and 20) were subjected to reverse-coding.

In this construct, item 8 (I respect the values of people from different cultures) (mean=4.59; sd=0.75) has the highest mean, which in descriptive statistics is indicated as “Strongly Agree“. This means that the respondents have high regard for the values of their counterparts. Other items in this construct are somewhat high as well. The respondents “Agree“ to other remaining items, namely, 16 (I respect the ways people from different cultures behave) (mean=4.39; sd=0.66) and the other reverse-coded items, 18 (I would not accept the opinions of people from different cultures) (mean=4.44; sd=0.82), 2 (I think people from other cultures are narrow-minded) (mean=4.34; sd=0.81), 20 (I think my culture is better than other cultures) (mean=4.12; sd=0.89), and 7 (I don’t like to be with people from different cultures) (mean=4.07; sd=0.92).

Majority of the participants are seemingly ready and willing to accept and respect their counterparts including their opinions and ideas. Such could further suggest that the respondents are not threatened by cultural differences.

<Table 6> Respondents' respect for cultural differences

SCALE	5	4	3	2	1	MEAN	AGREEMENT LEVEL	SD
ITEM NO	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)			
	206	141	48	3	5			
2	151.121	134.991	111.911	10.741	11.241	4.34	Agree	0.811
	145	176	54	22	6			
7	135.981	143.671	113.401	15.461	11.491	4.07	Agree	0.918
	273	108	12	5	5			
8	167.741	126.801	12.981	11.241	11.241	4.59	Strongly Agree	0.745
	190	188	20	4	1			
16	147.151	146.651	14.961	10.991	10.251	4.39	Agree	0.655
	231	140	17	7	8			
18	157.321	134.741	14.221	11.741	11.991	4.44	Agree	0.821
	163	146	76	16	2			
20	140.451	136.231	118.861	13.971	10.501	4.12	Agree	0.885
	201.33	149.83	37.83	9.5	4.5			
Ave	149.961	137.181	19.391	(2.361	11.121	4.33	Agree	0.806

### 3) Interaction Confidence (IC)

This construct measures the confidence of individuals when being immersed in intercultural setting/interactions (Chen & Starosta, 2000 as cited by McMurray, 2007; Cudureanu & Saini, 2012). This construct is measured by question items 3 (I am pretty sure of myself in interacting with people from different cultures.), 4 (I find it very hard to talk in front of people from different cultures.), 5 (I always know what to say when interacting with people from different cultures.), 6 (I can be as sociable as I want to be when interacting with people from different

cultures.), and 10 (I feel confident when interacting with people from different cultures.) As shown in the table below, the respondents “Agree” to item 6 (mean=3.64; sd=3.640), but are “Uncertain” in items 3 (mean=2.89; sd=1.025), 4 (mean=2.95; sd=1.080), 5 (mean=2.70; sd=0.930), and 10 (mean=2.95; sd=2.950). Given the respondents perception of themselves as having not sufficient skills in English language, they express uncertainty in interacting confidently with people from different cultures. Despite such lack of confidence and perceived readiness to interact, the respondents believe that they are sociable as needed when interacting with people from different cultures.

**<Table 7> Respondents’ interaction confidence**

SCALE							AGREEMENT	
ITEM	5	4	3	2	1	MEAN	LEVEL	SD
NO								
	30	70	162	109	32			
3	17.44 (3.47)	17.37 (12.90)	40.20 (43.67)	27.05 (30.52)	7.94 (9.43)	2.89	Uncertain	1.025
	30	109	101	137	26			
4	17.44 (3.47)	27.05 (12.90)	25.06 (43.67)	34.00 (30.52)	6.45 (9.43)	2.95	Uncertain	1.080
	14	52	176	123	38			
5	3.47 (3.47)	12.90 (12.90)	43.67 (43.67)	30.52 (30.52)	9.43 (9.43)	2.70	Uncertain	0.930
	79	161	115	36	12			
6	19.6 (3.47)	39.95 (12.90)	28.54 (43.67)	8.93 (30.52)	2.98 (9.43)	3.64	Agree	3.640
	23	92	154	108	26			
10	5.71 (3.47)	22.83 (12.90)	38.21 (43.67)	26.80 (30.52)	6.45 (9.43)	2.95	Uncertain	2.950
	35.2	96.8	141.6	102.6	26.8			
Ave	8.73 (3.47)	24.02 (12.90)	35.14 (43.67)	25.46 (30.52)	6.65 (9.43)	3.03	Uncertain	1.925

This result further suggests the common culture of Koreans that it is not common for them to start a conversation (much more interaction) with others, most especially with people from different cultures. Koreans are generally reserved and need to become more familiar with a setting and the people before they gain the confidence or even the initiative to interact. This “reserved” personality can be attributed to their fear to “lose face” or being in an awkward, compromising situation. Even in Kim’s paper which was completed many years ago in 1993, it explained Korean culture of ‘face-saving’ is intertwined with language behavior. Accordingly, Korean culture inhibits self-disclosure, and thus the language behavior of Koreans gives great importance and consideration on making sure that they “save their face. This sentiment implied by Kim’s paper in 1993 still exists at present despite the many efforts Koreans have exerted towards being immersed in intercultural interaction.



#### 4) Interaction Enjoyment (IEnj)

The items measuring the interaction enjoyment are mainly concerned with participants' positive or negative reaction towards communicating with people from different cultures (Chen & Starosta, 2000 as cited by McMurray, 2007; Cudureanu & Saini, 2012). All the three items for IEnj, namely, 9 (I get upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures.), 12 (I often get discouraged when I am with people from different cultures.), and 15 (I often feel useless when interacting with people from different cultures.) have been reverse-coded as they are stated in a negative form. Results show that the respondents are "uncertain" with regard to items 9 (mean=2.87; sd=1.023) and 12 (mean=3.27; sd=1.041), but "agree" to item 15 (mean=3.59; sd=1.119); with an overall mean=2.95 and sd=1.080. These numbers suggest that some respondents feel discouraged and upset when they are interacting with people from different cultures while others feel otherwise.

<Table 8> Respondents' interaction enjoyment

SCALE ITEM NO	5 (%)	4 (%)	3 (%)	2 (%)	1 (%)	MEAN	AGREEMENT LEVEL	SD
9	23 (5.71)	87 (21.59)	137 (34.00)	125 (31.02)	31 (7.69)	2.87	Uncertain	1.023
12	114 (28.29)	201 (49.88)	71 (17.62)	14 (3.47)	3 (0.74)	3.27	Uncertain	1.041
15	96 (23.82)	142 (35.24)	82 (20.35)	71 (17.62)	12 (2.98)	3.59	Agree	1.119
Ave	77.67 (19.27)	143.33 (35.57)	96.67 (23.99)	70 (17.37)	15.33 (3.80)	3.24	Uncertain	1.061

The result for item 15 suggests the respondents' perception of being a useful or valuable part of interaction with people from different cultures. As the interviews have generally shown, the students feel they are an important part of communication if their professors consider them and their English level in order for them to cope with the communication context. For learners of a

foreign language, the teacher's ability to accommodate students so they would feel they are important members of the interaction helps students to open up and be encouraged to learn more.

### **5) Interaction Attentiveness (IAtt)**

For the construct "interaction attentiveness", the participants' effort to understand the ongoing process of intercultural interactions is measured (Yu & Chen, 2008, as cited by Cudureanu & Saini, 2012; Chen & Starosta, 2000, as cited by McMurray, 2007). Gegala (1981) defines this construct, which is in almost the same context as Chen and Starosta's definition (2000), as the extent of participants' attention when they are interacting with others. Further remarkable was Gegala's (1981) note that attentiveness may not mean the same as perceptiveness. In his explanation, attentiveness is a cognitive skill and is related to awareness; whereas, perceptiveness refers to having knowledge of the meanings related to or may affect one's or another person's behavior. Thus, when a person is perceptive, he/she has higher skills of interpreting others and how others will interpret him/her. Moreover, attentiveness is one's involvement in the interaction, including whether he/she pays attention and participates while listening to the conversation. In ISS, interaction attentiveness is measured by items 14 (I am very observant when interacting with people from different cultures.), 17 (I try to obtain as much information as I can when interacting with people from different cultures.), and 19 (I am sensitive to my culturally-distinct counterpart's subtle meanings during our interaction.). Hence, this construct measures not merely attentiveness but perceptiveness altogether.

Results show how varied and diverse are the responses are. Respondents "agree" to item 14 (mean=3.66; sd=0.841), are "uncertain" in 17 (mean=3.41; sd=0.948), and "disagree" to item 19 (mean=2.42; sd=1.061). When interacting with people from different culture (in this case their ESL professor), the respondents are being observant, possibly noting and processing carefully

the English language and the meaning of their counterpart's verbal messages, including non-verbal messages. However, the respondents are "uncertain" with regard to obtaining as much information as they could during interaction. This could possibly due to the painstaking process of English study. Aside from listening and attempting to understand the sound of English of their counterparts, the students are simultaneously processing meaning in Korean, their native language. During this process, students build meaning using the web of words that are familiar to them and process how the meaning mates sense to them as well as in the interaction context they are in. Therefore, it is understandable that some respondents attempt to obtain as much information as they could while the others do not as they have likely considered the tediousness of the process. Meanwhile, the respondents "disagree" in being sensitive to the subtle meanings of their counterparts during their interaction. Such is possibly because of their focus on observing their counterparts as well as themselves during interaction.

**<Table 9> Respondents' interaction attentiveness**

SCALE	5	4	3	2	1	MEAN	AGREEMENT LEVEL	SD
ITEM NO	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)			
14	57 (14.14)	189 (46.901)	125 (31.021)	28 (6.951)	4 (0.991)	3.66	Agree	0.841
17	55 (13.65)	126 (31.271)	157 (38.961)	59 (14.641)	6 (1.491)	3.41	Uncertain	0.948
19	15 (3.721)	50 (12.411)	108 (26.801)	148 (36.721)	82 (20.351)	2.42	Disagree	1.061
Ave	42.33 (10.50)	121.67 (30.191)	130 (32.261)	78.33 (19.441)	30.67 (7.611)	3.16	Uncertain	0.950

## 6) Respondents' overall ISS

Among the five dimensions of intercultural sensitivity, the participants “Agree“ to both IEng and ROD (mean=4.33; sd=0.81), with the latter obtaining the highest mean. On the contrary, the respondents’ scores indicated “Uncertain“ in dimensions IC, IEnj, and IAtt, with the first one being the lowest (mean=3.03; sd=1.93). The total mean score of the respondents on the ISS is 3.56 (sd=0.923) with a descriptive value of “Agree“. Therefore, the respondents’ level of intercultural sensitivity is sufficient for them to handle their interaction with people from a different culture. However, as the results indicated IC to have the considerably lowest mean score, there is a strong need to enhance the respondents’ confidence and self-esteem so as to help them become more competitive and prepared in their intercultural interaction. Majority of the students still feel they lack the necessary skills in order to have a meaningful and successful interaction with foreigners.

<Table 10> Respondents’ ISS

SCALE/% DIMENSIONS	Mean	Agreement Level	SD
IEng	3.67	Agree	0.90
RCD	4.33	Agree	0.81
IC	3.03	Uncertain	1.93
IEnj	3.24	Uncertain	1.06
IAtt	3.53	Uncertain	1.26

### 3. Significant relationship between the respondents’ ISS and their demographic profile

#### 1) Respondents’ ISS and their gender

The scores of male (M=3.60, SD=0.42124) and of female (M=3.56, SD=0.44) t (401)=8.13, p = 0.42) respondents suggest that gender and intercultural sensitivity are not significantly related. In

particular, note among the five factors, the mean scores of male and female respondents have quite a noticeable, although not significant difference, in terms of IC in which the mean score of male respondents is 3.11 whereas that of female respondents at 2.92. In addition, both male and female respondents obtained high mean scores in RCD.

<Table 11.> Relationship between the respondents’ ISS and gender

	Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means				
	F	SIG.	T	DF	SIG. (2-TAILED)	MEAN DIFF.	
Mean	Equal variances assumed	.530	.467	.813	401	.417	.03519
	Equal Variances not assumed			.808	375.573	.419	.03519

<Table 12> Relationship between the five factors and gender

	IEng	RCD	IC	IEnj	IAtt
Male	3.65	4.31	3.11	3.33	3.15
Female	3.70	4.34	2.92	3.14	3.19

## 2) Respondents’ ISS and their major

Significant difference is noted between the intercultural sensitivity of the respondents and their majors [F(7, 395) = 2.14, p = 0.039]. Although post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the Humanities (M = 3.68, SD = .49) was not significantly different than that for the Business (M = 3.62, SD = 0.43), Natural Science (M = 3.40, SD =

0.49), Engineering (M = 3.54, SD = 0.34), It (M = 3.66, SD = 0.30), PE, Medicine, & Welfare (M = 3.66, SD = .32), Fine Arts (M = 3.69, SD = 0.33), and Music (M = 3.49, SD = 0.49), overall scores show otherwise.

<Table 13> Relationship between ISS and major

Mean					
	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIG.
Between Groups	2.741	7	.392	2.139	.039
Within Groups	72.308	395	.183		
Total	75.049	402			

The respondents' major vis-à-vis their mean scores are presented in <Table 14>. Data show that among the five factors and across all majors, factor IC is notably low although not statistically significant. In this section, notice that in IC, the respondents from the Natural Sciences incurred the lowest (mean score=2.80), followed by respondents from the IT and Fine Arts (mean score=2.98). In terms of factors IEng and RCD, respondents across majors obtained somewhat high mean scores, with respondents from Fine Arts obtaining the highest (mean score=4.51 and 3.98, respectively). In factor IAtt, respondents from the Engineering major incurred the lowest mean (2.97), whereas IT obtained the highest (3.26). Finally, for factor IEnj, respondents from the Engineering courses obtained the highest mean score (3.45), whereas those from PE, Medicine, & Welfare were remarkably lowest (2.84).

<Table 14> Relationship between five factors and major

	Eng	RCD	IC	IEnj	IAtt	Mean
Humanities	4.37	3.8	3.12	3.41	3.2	3.58
Business	4.37	3.71	3.11	3.25	3.18	3.52
Natural Science	4.15	3.39	2.80	3.1	3.22	3.33
Engineering	4.28	3.55	3.04	3.45	2.97	3.46
IT	4.41	3.76	2.98	3.28	3.26	3.54
PE, Medicine & Welfare	4.47	3.68	3.00	2.84	2.93	3.38
Fine Arts	4.51	3.98	2.98	3.05	3.36	3.58
Music	4.13	3.67	2.91	3.18	3.33	3.44

### 3) Respondents' ISS and their interaction experience with foreigners

Significant difference is indicated in the intercultural sensitivity of the respondents without experience with foreigners ( $M=3.42$ ,  $SD=0.45$ ) and those with interaction experience with foreigners ( $M=3.62$ ,  $SD=0.42$ );  $t(401)=3.51$ ,  $p = 0.001$ . Therefore, respondents who have experiences interacting with foreigners have higher intercultural sensitivity.

<Table 15> Relationship between ISS and interaction experience with foreigners

		Independent Samples Test					
		LEVENE'S TEST FOR EQUALITY OF VARIANCES			T-TEST FOR EQUALITY OF MEANS		
		F	SIG.	T	DF	SIG. (2-TAILED)	MEAN DIFF.
Experience with Foreigners	Equal variances assumed	.278	.599	-3.69	401	.000	-.20303
	Equal Variances not assumed			-3.507	100.959	.001	-.20303

Specifically for each factor of ISS, respondents who did not have interaction experience with foreigners scored significantly low in IC (2.78). However, this group of respondents scored higher (3.09) than those with interaction experience with foreigners (0.96) in the factor IAtt.

<Table 16> Relationship between five factors and interaction experience with foreigners

	IEng	RCD	IC	IEni	IAtt	Mean
With Interaction	3.70	4.36	3.08	3.3	0.96	3.08
Without Interaction	3.51	4.20	2.78	3.0	3.09	3.316



## V. Conclusion

### 1. Conclusions

1) Of the 403 respondents, 22 (5.1%) are male; and the highest percentage (93.8%) comprises the age bracket from 20 to 25 years. With regard to the respondents' field of study (major), majority (42.4%) are in the Business Department, followed by Engineering (14.6%), Natural Science (10.4%), IT (9.9%), and Music (8.4%). A smaller number of respondents come from the Departments of PE, Medicine, and Welfare (4.7%) and Fine Arts (3.2%). In terms of interaction exposure to and/or experience in communicating/interacting with foreigners, a substantial count of 330 respondents (81.9%) indicated that they have previous experience with people from another culture.

2) The respondents' level of intercultural sensitivity is in the borderline of "Agreeable" and "Uncertain" level. Therefore, the respondents can handle their interaction with people from a different culture with certain limitations, specifically in interaction confidence (IQ), interaction engagement (Ieng), and interaction attentiveness (IAtt). Moreover, as the respondents' incurred lowest mean in IC, they require assistance to become more confident, competitive, and prepared in their intercultural interaction so as to have a meaningful and successful interaction with foreigners.

3) There is no significant difference between the level of intercultural sensitivity of the respondents and their gender. However, significant difference is noted between the respondents' ISS and their major as well as their interaction experience with foreigners. Therefore, regardless of their gender, the respondents' level of intercultural sensitivity is due to their major and their interaction experience with foreigners. Students with ample interaction experience have higher level of intercultural sensitivity as compared to those who have limited experience or even to those who have no experience at all. It can be noted as well that those students who are given

opportunities for intercultural exchanges and interactions have higher level of intercultural sensitivity.

## **2. Recommendations**

1) Although the respondents' level of intercultural sensitivity is deemed to be sufficient, the lack of improvement in their level of intercultural sensitivity requires necessary consideration. Therefore, academicians in Korea need to revisit and revise the thrust and focus of their academic programs, especially the English classes. While it may be true that enhancing the communication skills of the students is the primary focus of any educational institution, curriculum developers, teachers, school administrators, and other stakeholders should equally prioritize developing the students' intercultural sensitivity. For several years, Korean students have been devoting much time and effort mastering the English language but they remain apprehensive and lacking in confidence and self-esteem because of the limited opportunities to use English in an actual interaction with foreigners. Thus, if students are provided with ample opportunities to use the language and become more exposed to diverse cultures, they will grow more confident in their communication interaction, thus making them more competitive, proficient, and highly motivated and, needless to say, prepared in their intercultural interaction.

2) In learning a second/foreign language, more so in enhancing intercultural sensitivity of students, the larger community plays a vital role. A high exposure to the target language and to the community comprising diverse culture incurs high proficiency, communication confidence, and intercultural sensitivity in individuals. The respondents who do not or did not have any opportunity to mingle with a community using the English language and composed of diverse cultures seemed to have low English proficiency and low self-esteem. Hence, this paper recommends that the Korean society, through the programs the local and the greater government, should provide as much opportunities as possible for students to have

communication interaction with people from diverse cultures. Such programs and activities could be in the form of cultural immersion, language exchange programs, and cultural expositions. Although in many cases, these programs have been made available already, most of these cultural exchanges involve adults or professionals. Activities catering to younger generation, such as elementary school, middle school, high school, and university students are limited because the thrust of many schools is on preparing the students for their examinations such as Sineung or other knowledge/aptitude test.

3) Universities in Korea could also design community service programs that would enable their students to provide assistance or services to foreigners in the country. These community services can directly involve students and foreigners residing in Korea. This program will be beneficial specifically for students who do not have the financial means to travel overseas or to attend international exposure programs. Conducting such activities could likewise be considered by the universities as a marketing/ promotional strategy for them to invite more foreign students and even local students. In addition, activities like these could be an advantage for the university as they focus not solely in preparing their students for their future profession but also their competitiveness in the global market.

4) Related research studies are recommended so as to address areas that this study did not encompass. For one, the study did not probe into the difference between the level of intercultural sensitivity of Korean and of foreign students. Such study could be viable in providing actual data on how foreign students who decide to study in Korea are adjusting to Korean culture and how Korean students adjust to having foreign friends in their class. Similarly, a cross-sectional study comparing the intercultural sensitivity of students from two or more universities or even selected high schools in South Korea could provide a wider perspective of the majority of young Koreans. Another possible research is a longitudinal in nature in which the respondents' initial level of intercultural sensitivity is compared to their level after 4 or 5

years in the University. Finally, a study probing into the IS of the general youth is another point of interest. Conducting such study could provide insights into the status of the general youth's sensitivity to people from other cultures. Results that such study could obtain will enable to local government to design cultural immersion programs that will further promote young Koreans' sensitivity to other culture.

## ■ References

1. Ballard, Laura (2013). Student attitudes toward accentedness of native and non-native speaking English teachers. MSU Working Papers in SLS, 4.
2. Balakrishnan, Anjana (2015). Asking the Right Questions: Insights into Assessing Intercultural Sensitivity. (Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository). Paper 2863. The University of Western Ontario.
3. Banos, Ruth Vila (2006). University of Barcelona, Spain. Intercultural Communication Studies XV: 2. 2006.
4. Braine, George & Moussu, Lude (2006) The Attitudes of ESL Students Towards Normative English Language Teachers. TESL Reporter 39(1), 3347.
5. Fritz, Wolfgang, Mollenberg, Antje, & Chen, Guo-Mng (2002). Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity in Different Cultural Contexts. Intercultural Communication Studies, 11(2), 165-176.
6. Huang, Mei-Lan (2013). Research into the Assessment of the Intercultural Sensitivity Among University Students of Science and Technology. Sino-US English Teaching, 10(2), 110-116
7. Jenkins, J (2007). English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
8. Jenkins, J (2009). World Englishes. Routledge: London
9. Jeon, Jihyeon & Lee, Yura (2012). The Relationship between University Students' Exposure to Foreign Culture and Global Competency. The Journal of ASIA TEFL. 9(3), 157-187
10. Kim, Junghyun, Song, Jinsuk & Moon, Heekang; Lee, Myunghee (2013). Effects of Multicultural Society Recognition and Multicultural Education Experience on Cultural Sensitivity of Middle and High School Students in Daejeon: Focusing on the Mediating Role of Multicultural Education Needs Perception. Journal of the Korean Home Economics Association, Volume 51(1), 107-118.

11. Kim, Oksoon (2008). Comparison of Intercultural Sensitivity between Preservice Teachers in South Korea and China. *Comparative Education Research*. 18(1) 193-217 .
12. Meydanlioglu, Ayse, Arikan Fatma, Gozum Sebahat (2015). Cultural sensitivity levels of university students recdving education in health disdplines. *Advances in Health Sciences Education; Theory Practice.*, 20(5), 195-204.
13. McMurray, Alison A (2007). Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity of International and Domestic College Students: The Impact of International Travel. University of Florida. [http://ufddimages.uflib.ufl.edu/UF/EO/02/12/39/00001/mcmurray\\_a.pdf](http://ufddimages.uflib.ufl.edu/UF/EO/02/12/39/00001/mcmurray_a.pdf)
15. Park, Jungshuh (2015). Multicultural Experience and Intercultural Sensitivity among South Korean Adolescents. *Multicultural Education Review*. 5(2), 108-138.
16. Pilus, Zahariah (2013). Exploring ESL Learners' Attitudes Towards English Accents. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 21 (Spedai Issue of Studies in Language Teaching and Learning): 143-152. IDOSI Publications.
18. Pulla, Venkat (2016). *The Lhotsampa People of Bhutan: Resilence and Survival*. Paigrave Macmillan. Springer ePub.
19. Reid, Landon D (2010). The Role of Percdved Race and Gender in the Evaluation of College Teaching on RateMyProfessors.com. Colgate University. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* © 2010. National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education 2010, 3(3), 137-152.
21. Sakurauchi, Yoko Hwang (2014). Teaching and Learning for Intercultural Sensitivity: A Cross-Cultural Examination of American Domestic Students and Japanese Exchange Students. Portland State University. *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1643. 10.15760/etd.1642.

22. Seak-Zoon Roh (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
23. Yoon, Injin, Song, Youngho, Bae, Youngjoon (2008). South Koreans' Attitudes toward Foreigners, Minorities and Multiculturalism. (Paper prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Boston, MA)

## *About the Authors*



Dr. Kim, Ok-Soon is currently the Dean of the International College. She obtained her undergraduate degree in Education from Ewha Womans University, and pursued both her postgraduate degrees (Master's and Doctorate) in the Graduate School of the University of Southern California, where she specialized in Educational Technology and Educational Sociology/Comparative Education, respectively. Dr. Kim's research interests include society youth culture, education, multicultural education, and culture sensitivity among others.



Maria Aurea Dancel is from the Philippines. Her undergraduate and graduate degrees both focused on the teaching of English and Literature. To date, she is pursuing PhD in Linguistics at the University of Suwon where she is also affiliated with the International College as an Assistant Professor.



Jennifer Baniasen holds an undergraduate degree in Marketing and a graduate degree in Business Administration. She currently an Asst. Professor at the International college at the University of Suwon.





Aqeela Carr began her teaching career 10 years ago. She has taught in South Africa, The United Arab Emirates and South Korea. Her passion for people and education has led her to believe that teachers have to be lifelong learners and encourage students to be the same. Aqeela is passionate about technology in education and has been trained in Apple integrated education and educational apps in the classroom. She is highly proficient in creating educational content using the latest technologies. When preparing for her classes Aqeela keeps in mind a quote by George Evans, "Every student can learn, just not on the same day, or in the same way."



Shane Doyle Shane Doyle is from Ireland. He completed his Bachelor and Master's degree studies at the National University of Ireland where he majored in History and Geography and Geographical Analysis, respectively.