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1. Introduction

Intercultural approach to language teaching stresses the interface between language and culture promoting learners’ ability to engage in cross-cultural communication where they may encounter not only linguistic, but above all, cultural obstacles (Byram 2006). The main purpose of this stance is therefore to prepare foreign language learners to communicate in a multicultural and multilingual world. Intercultural language learning and teaching defines a shift in the practice of foreign language teaching from focusing on only language skills and elements of language to emphasising the importance and interdependence of four components of linguistic competence, that is, language learning, language awareness, cultural awareness and cultural experience (Byram 1990). In this paradigm language learning is viewed as developing learners’ communicative skills as understood in terms of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) with some focus on building learners’ declarative knowledge about the structures of the target language. The aim of language teaching is to provide students with experience of language (i.e. is authentic materials) that will lead to the mastery of communicative skills and awareness of language as a social concept. However, it has to be clearly stated that despite its pragmatic focus, CLT promotes the development of social and cultural competence in the target language through the focus on language fluency and accuracy, the aspects which are necessary but not sufficient in order to become a competent foreign language user. Learners can benefit from language
awareness as it allows them to understand the interface between language and culture. Cultural awareness is similar in purpose to language awareness as it is associated with the relationship between language and culture but additionally cultural awareness focuses on non-linguistic aspects of culture and marks the change from monocultural to intercultural competence. Cultural experience, on the other hand, brings together the learning of the culture and language. However, this component is to be understood as direct experience of the culture through contact with native speakers rather than a tool for transforming declarative knowledge of the culture into linguistic skills (Byram 1990: 19-28).

Traditionally five types of intercultural communicative competence are distinguished by Byram (2006: 11-12):

1. knowledge (savoir): of social groups and their products and practices in one's own and in one's interlocutor's country, and of the general processes of societal and individual interaction,
2. skills of interpreting and relating (savoir comprendre): ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents or events from one's own,
3. skills of discovery and interaction (savoir apprendre/fair): ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices and the ability to operate knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction,
4. critical cultural awareness (savoir s'engager): an ability to evaluate, critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices and products in one's own and other cultures and countries,
5. linguistic competence.

Apart from the types of intercultural competence, 3 stages of intercultural learning have been distinguished (Meyer 1990, Kordes 1990): monocultural, intercultural and transcultural. At the monocultural level learners demonstrate behavioural and thinking patterns typical of their own culture when engaging in cross-cultural communication. Learners’ perception of other cultures is based on stereotypical thinking. At the intercultural stage learners are familiar with facts about the target language culture and are fully aware of the differences between their own and the target language culture. In Byram’s (2006) words at this level learners possess the ability to mediate between cultures. However, learners have not yet mastered the ability of problem-solving. At the transcultural level learners are able to evaluate their beliefs of their own culture and the target language culture and are able to adopt their behaviour and customs to intercultural standards (Meyer 1990: 142-143).

2. The procedure of the study

In order to compare and contrast foreign language learners’ self-evaluation of their intercultural competence and their linguistic performance, a study was carried out among learners of English as a foreign language. The study consisted
of a questionnaire that the subjects were asked to fill in and a short writing task. The subjects were given 30 minutes to complete both the questionnaire and the writing task. The concept of the study (i.e. the procedure and the technique) was adopted from Meyer (1990) and the results were analysed taking into consideration Byram's (2006) types of intercultural competence and Meyer's and Kordes’ (1990) stages of intercultural learning.

2.1. The questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix 1) contained 18 statements which related to Byram's (2006: 11-12) five types of intercultural competence in the following way:

- statements 1, 4, 8, and 11 related to the subjects’ perception of their knowledge of cultural facts about the target language culture;
- statements 2, 5, 9, and 10 pertained to the subjects’ perception of their skills of interpreting and relating;
- statements 13, 14, 15, and 16 concerned the subjects' perception of their skills of discovery and interaction;
- statements 3, 12, 17, and 18 pertained to the subjects’ perception of their critical cultural awareness, and
- statements 6 and 7 referred to the subjects’ perception of their linguistic competence in English.

The statements in the questionnaire were adopted from Byram, Gribkova and Starkey (2002: 30-32). The subjects’ task was to read the statements and indicate how true they were about them by putting a number between 1 and 5 as follows:

1 – never true of me,
2 – generally not true of me,
3 – somewhat true of me,
4 – generally true of me, and
5 – always true of me.

The aim of this questionnaire was to gather information about the learners’ self-awareness and self-evaluation of their intercultural competence. The data collected in this way were further used to confront how the subjects perceive their intercultural competence against how in fact this competence is expressed in real language usage.

2.2. The writing task

The subjects were asked to write a short dialogue between an American professor and a Polish student who is accused of plagiarism in his/her essay. The main purpose of this task was to examine if the learners would be able to express differences in the
approach to the problem of plagiarism in Poland and the United States, especially the changing attitude to the problem in the Polish culture. Whereas in the United States the attitude to cheating and plagiarism has always been very strict and students who commit it could even be expelled from a university, in Poland the attitude has been changing. Some years ago cheating was regarded by students as common sense and they were rarely punished for such a behaviour. However, the attitude now has changed and universities try to fight cheating severely.

3. Data analysis

The data obtained by means of the two tools presented above were subjected to a qualitative analysis in order to provide an in-depth interpretation of the findings of the study. The reason why a more detailed statistical analysis was not performed was a small number of students (41) who took part in the research. Therefore, the analysis of the findings took more of a form of a case study. The procedure for the analysis of the results was the following. First, the dialogues written by the students were analysed and on this basis the subjects were grouped according to three stages of the development of intercultural competence, that is, monocultural, intercultural, and transcultural (Meyer’s and Kordes’ 1990). Then, the results of the questionnaire in each group were examined by means of Byram’s (2006) five types of intercultural competence.

4. The subjects

The subjects of the study were 41 first-year students of English philology at the Department of English at Nicolaus Copernicus University in Poland. They were all native speakers of Polish. Their level of advancement in English as a foreign language could be classified as B1 according to the language levels of the Common European Framework of Reference. This judgment is based on the fact that the students passed their final exam (which represents that level) in English at the end of secondary school. However, the students’ level could be in fact higher as they had almost completed their first year of English philology at the university (which means they had completed their course in practical English that comprises four types of classes: conversation, writing, practical English grammar usage, and phonetics; each class lasts 60 hours per academic year), and were preparing to take their final exam in practical English which is at the advanced level and consists of three parts, that is, a grammar test, writing an essay and an oral exam. All the students had been learning English for at least 10 years. It should also be stressed that these students’ cultural awareness could be higher in comparison to other learners of English for two reasons. First of all, they chose to study English philology so it can be assumed that they are interested not only in English speaking countries’
culture but also in cultural aspects in general. Second, they were required to take a course in British literature after their first year of study at the university, which additionally broadened their knowledge of British culture.

5. Results of the study and discussion

Before discussing the relationship between the students’ perception of their intercultural competence and their actual language performance in the writing assignment, it is worth mentioning that all students (41) taking part in the research completed the questionnaire, however, only 32 of them wrote the dialogue, which is quite surprising. It could be concluded that the possible reason why some students failed to complete this assignment was inadequate language skills, but these students’ level of English as a foreign language was sufficient enough to do such a task. Therefore, the possible interpretation of this fact may be that these 9 students were unwilling to participate. As a result, only the results obtained by those 32 students who completed the writing assignment were taken into consideration in the discussion section. Appendix 2 presents the results of the questionnaire with reference to five types of intercultural competence and three stages of development of intercultural competence.

5.1. Monocultural stage

16 students displayed in their writing assignment the monocultural stage. These students’ dialogues did not express either any cultural similarities or differences in the way the problem of plagiarism has been treated in American and Polish culture or changes that have taken place over years in the approach to the issue of plagiarism in Poland. Furthermore, the dialogues these students wrote were written only from one side, that is, usually the student who admits to copying other authors’ work but does not understand the seriousness of the act.

5.1.1. Knowledge of facts about the target language culture

With reference to the first type of intercultural competence the results have shown that although some students clearly represent the monocultural level, their perception of their knowledge of cultural facts about the target language culture is quite positive as all of them stated that they are either generally familiar or always familiar with such facts. The same results were obtained regarding the statement examining the students’ contact with the target language culture through various media. Most respondents (12) also declared that they are generally or always aware of the aspects of life of social minority groups existing in the target language culture.
The lowest number of positive responses received the statement evaluating the respondents’ perception of their awareness of the aspects of life of people from the target language culture usually not presented in the media as only 10 students claimed that they are interested in such aspects. To sum up, these students judged all four aspects of knowledge of facts about the target language culture in a very optimistic way, which may speak to the fact that they are too self-confident about their cultural awareness as their self-evaluation in this respect does not match their ability to write a dialogue.

5.1.2. Skills of interpreting and relating

The respondents’ perception of their skills of relating and interpreting varies. All the students declared that they can find similarities and differences between their own and the target language culture and almost all of them (13 students) declared to be aware of the differences in the behaviour typical of their own and the target language culture. This might be interpreted as indicating that advanced students of English attach much importance to similarities and differences not only between their mother tongue and English but also in the two cultures representing these two languages. However, these findings are also surprising as the students did not manage to express such similarities or differences in the dialogues they wrote. Also noteworthy are the results obtained with reference to stereotypes since most subjects (15) think they are more aware of the stereotypes regarding cultures other than the target language culture than the stereotypes regarding the target language culture itself, which only half of the respondents declared to be aware of. It can therefore be assumed that these respondents are not so much interested in stereotypes regarding English speaking people as they are in stereotypes regarding other cultures or that they do not treat stereotypes as part of culture and consequently do not feel the need to be aware of them.

5.1.3. Skills of discovery and interaction

What catches the eye when looking at the results of the study is that despite the fact that the students who displayed the monocultural level did not suggest any solution to the problem posed in the task, all of them described themselves as being generally able to find solutions to problems arising from lack of understanding of the target language culture. The learners also judged their ability to find solutions to the problems arising from lack of understanding of cultures other than the target language culture in a similar way. With reference to this ability only 2 students responded that they definitely do not possess such an ability. These students perceive their ability to adopt appropriate behaviour, conventions and customs when talking to people of the target language culture also in a very optimistic way; 14 students declared that they are able to engage in interaction in this way. As the
results have revealed, the students were less certain about their ability to adopt appropriate behaviour, conventions and customs when talking to people of cultures other than the target language culture (4 of them described themselves as not being aware of this aspect of intercultural competence). A possible interpretation might be a suggestion that these students have had more experience in engaging in interaction with native speakers of English than with non-native speakers of that language. Still, there is a huge discrepancy between these students’ self-perception of their skills of interaction and discovery and their ability to express such skills in a communicative task, which may suggest that the students are not yet able to overcome cultural or linguistic barriers in communication.

5.1.4. Critical cultural awareness

As regards critical cultural awareness, which is at heart of intercultural communicative competence, the students rated themselves very highly also in this respect. Although the results obtained for the query regarding the respondents’ attitude to the target language culture are not surprising, the findings relating to the students’ ability to think critically about both their own culture and the culture of English speaking countries are thought-provoking. The results have shown that all the subjects have a positive attitude to the target language culture, which the researcher could expect in case of students of English philology. Moreover, the majority of students (15) described themselves as being able to look at the target language culture through the perspective of their own culture and able to look at their own culture through the perspective of the target language culture. The same number of students perceive themselves as being able to evaluate their beliefs about the target language culture and the beliefs people of the target language culture have about their culture. The statement referring to the learners’ ability to evaluate their beliefs about cultures other than the target language culture and the beliefs people of cultures other than the target language culture have about the students’ culture received the lowest number of positive responses (only 8), which may suggest that these students have not yet developed the ability to think critically about their own and other cultures. Bearing in mind the fact that these students failed to display any critical thinking in their dialogues, the results may constitute a sole piece of evidence that these students have not yet mastered the ability to divorce themselves from their own culture and look at their own culture through what Kramsch (1993) calls the third place.

5.1.5. Linguistic competence

The responses that the subjects gave to the statements that referred to the learners’ perception of their linguistic competence may appear quite surprising taking into consideration the fact that the dialogues these students wrote clearly have shown
that they are not able to overcome cultural differences between their own and the target language culture. Namely, the students’ responses for the query referring to their ability to interact with people of the target language culture indicate that they generally perceive themselves in a positive way with respect to this aspect of intercultural competence (15 students indicated that they possess such an ability). As far as the students’ ability to interact with people of cultures other than the target language culture is concerned, almost everybody, except 3 respondents, believe that they are able to engage in such an interaction. Again, these findings show huge contrast between the respondents’ self-evaluation of their linguistic competence and their linguistic performance, which in turn may indicate that these learners are not able to judge their linguistic abilities in English as a foreign language in an objective way.

5.2. Intercultural stage

To begin with, the results of the study have shown that only 7 students display the intercultural stage, which means that the dialogues written by them reflected cultural differences or rather nuances between Poland and the United States expressed in the professor’s threat to expel the student from the university. However, none of the students suggested any solution to the problem in their dialogues through negotiation or compromise that would stem from intercultural argumentation and allow the researcher to classify these students as representing the transcultural level of intercultural competence.

5.2.1. Knowledge of facts about the target language culture

The results for the statements examining three aspects of this competence (knowledge of cultural facts, awareness of both the aspects of life of social minority groups existing in the target language culture and aspects of the life of people of the target language culture not presented in the media) have indicated that all students thought that they possess such knowledge, which was predictable taking into consideration the fact that in the writing task these students managed to express changes in the approach to plagiarism in Polish culture and a very strict attitude to the problem in American culture.

5.2.2. Skills of interpreting and relating

The analysis of the results obtained in regards to three aspects (the ability to find similarities and differences between one’s own and the target language culture, awareness of the differences in the behaviour of people of the students’ culture
and the target language culture, knowledge of stereotypes regarding the target language culture and other cultures) of the learners’ skills of interpreting and relating has shown that the students judged their skills relating to all aspects of this type of competence highly as all of them put either the answer ‘always true of me’ or ‘generally true of me’ with reference to these skills. One may only wonder why these students are skillful with respect to this type of intercultural competence as opposed to the students who displayed the monocultural stage of intercultural competence. One of the plausible interpretations may be that these students have had more experience with the target language culture, which however was not examined in the present study.

5.2.3. Skills of discovery and interaction

As far as the students’ self-evaluation of their skills of discovery and interaction is concerned, the results have proved that the learners’ perception in this respect is also very optimistic in all aspects of this type of competence (the ability to adopt appropriate behaviour when talking to people of the target language culture or people of cultures other than the target language culture and the ability to find solutions to problems arising from lack of understanding of the target language culture or other cultures). The most frequently chosen answers to the statements were either ‘always true of me’ or ‘generally true of me’. One may thus conclude that with reference to this type of intercultural competence the students’ self-evaluation was appropriate to their linguistic performance in the writing task.

5.2.4. Critical cultural awareness

As the results of the questionnaire in Appendix 2 show, the students perceived their critical cultural awareness in a positive way. All the respondents viewed highly their attitude to the target language culture. Moreover, all of them declared that they are able to look at the target language culture through the perspective of their own culture. These students also positively assessed their ability to evaluate beliefs about the target language culture and other cultures as all of them gave either the answer ‘generally true of me’ or ‘always true of me’ with reference to this query.

5.2.5. Linguistic competence

Analysing the findings of the questionnaire as regards the students’ self-perception of the fifth type of intercultural competence, one may conclude that the participants’ responses indicate that the learners assessed their linguistic competence very highly. All of them declared that they have the ability to interact with people of the target language culture and people of cultures other than the target language
culture. Consequently, the students’ self-perception with reference to these skills are in line with their linguistic abilities expressed in the writing task.

5.3. Transcultural stage

Moving on to the last stage of intercultural development, the results of the research show that 9 students are at the transcultural level, which means their dialogues reflected not only the changes in the attitude to cheating in Poland but also the differences in the attitude to the concept of plagiarism in Poland and the United States. They also suggested a solution to the problem in the task based on both analytic analysis from the point of view of two cultures under consideration and negotiation between two sides, that is the professor and the student. This argumentation is the result of the ability to mediate between cultural aspects relating to the problem.

5.3.1. Knowledge of facts about the target language culture

In relation to the first type of intercultural competence all the students (9) thought that they are familiar with facts about the target language culture. Knowledge about the aspects of life of minority groups of the target language culture was also one of the types of competence which was judged very highly by the respondents as none of them answered that the statement is not true of them. The results have indicated that most students (8) who represent the transcultural stage notice the importance of developing their linguistic competence by keeping contact with the target language through various media. However, the results have also revealed that the respondents recognise the importance of only mainstream aspects of culture as less than half of them (4) indicated that they are interested in those aspects of the target language culture not presented in the media. This may suggest that teaching cultural awareness cannot be limited to focusing only on mainstream aspects of the target language culture and that foreign language learners’ attention should also be brought to divergent issues relating to foreign language culture.

5.3.2. Skills of discovery and interaction

The results for the statements checking the learners’ skills of interpreting and relating have displayed that they see themselves as being able to find similarities and differences between their own and the target language culture as all of the students stated that this statement is either always true or generally true of them. The results are thus not surprising taking into consideration the fact that these
students displayed this ability in the dialogues they wrote. The respondents also assessed very highly their awareness of the differences in the behaviour of people of their own and the target language culture as only one student stated that he or she is not aware of such differences. However, the results for the statements examining the respondents’ awareness of stereotypes appear to be surprising. Whereas all the students view themselves as being aware of the stereotypes regarding cultures other than the target language culture, the statement referring to the learners’ awareness of the stereotypes regarding the target language culture received 6 positive responses. One may only wonder why only 9 students out of 32 developed an ability to mediate between cultures (as expressed in the writing task) which goes beyond mere awareness of the similarities and differences between two cultures. Perhaps these students have had more experience of interaction with native speakers of English in comparison to other learners taking part in this study but that remains an empirical question which would have to be examined through another questionnaire.

5.3.3. Skill of interpreting and relating

The results obtained for the queries relating to skills of discovery and interaction indicate that the students have a good self-image with reference to this type of intercultural competence, which was also reflected in their dialogues as all of them suggested some solutions to the problem posed in the writing assignment. Namely, all the students declared that they are either generally able or always able to adopt appropriate behaviour, conventions and customs when talking to people of the target language culture and people of cultures other than the target language culture. The same number of students have a positive opinion about their ability to find solutions to problems arising from lack of understanding of the target language culture. Therefore, the learners’ positive self-image with reference to this skill was also in correspondence with their actual linguistic abilities since they were able both to mirror in their dialogues two different cultural perspectives of the problem of plagiarism and to find solutions to this problem. However, although these students have proved to be at the transcultural stage, two of them admitted that they are not able to find solutions to the problems arising from lack of understanding of cultures other than the target language culture, which may result from lack of either knowledge or direct experience of other cultures.

5.3.4. Critical cultural awareness

The learners’ responses to the queries relating to their abilities of critical cultural awareness which are at the core of intercultural competence have revealed that the respondents judged themselves in this respect in a positive way. All students
declared that they have a positive attitude to the target language culture. This finding is not striking in the case of these students since the two groups, that is, monocultural and intercultural students also display a very positive attitude to the target language culture. The respondents also pointed that they are able to evaluate their own beliefs about the target language culture and the beliefs people of the target language culture have about their culture. The learners also displayed a positive view of their ability to evaluate their own beliefs about cultures other than the target language culture and the beliefs people of cultures other than the target language culture have about the students’ culture. Moreover, almost all students, except one, perceived themselves as being able to look at their own culture through the perspective of the target language culture and at the target language culture through the perspective of their own culture. These findings are clearly a sole piece of evidence that these students are able to mediate between cultures and consequently have developed intercultural communicative competence. It is, however, worth considering why only 9 students have mastered the ability to think critically, which the dialogues they wrote proved. This may speak to the fact that emphasising cultural awareness through either explicit, implicit or consciousness-raising teaching is not sufficient in order to foster critical evaluation of people or the products of the target language culture, which is further supported by the results obtained by the monocultural students, who failed to display critical cultural awareness in the writing assignment. Clearly, in the case of the transcultural students there must have been some other factors unrevealed in this research which determined their ability of critical thinking. However, that remains an empirical question which has to be further investigated.

5.3.5. Linguistic competence

The answers to the statements focusing on the respondents’ self-evaluation of their linguistic competence appear to be quite surprising as the students assessed higher their skills of engaging in an interaction with people of cultures other than the target language culture (9 students responded that they possess necessary skills) than their skills of engaging in an interaction with people of the target language culture (7 students declared that they are able to engage in such an interaction). As difficult as they are to interpret, these findings somehow contradict the results obtained for the statements investigating the learners’ self-perception of their skills of interpreting and relating. Perhaps the explanation lies in these students’ greater experience with interaction with non-native speakers of English than native speakers, but this is only an assumption.
6. Conclusions and implications for further research

The goal of the present research was to contribute to research in intercultural communicative competence, by providing empirical evidence with information obtained from students of English philology. The paper focused specifically on the link between students’ perception of their own intercultural competence and how this competence is expressed in language performance, the issue which has not been explored before in research. The results of the study may suggest that learners’ positive perception of their intercultural communicative competence is a result of foreign language teaching and teaching cultural awareness as the students who displayed the monocultural, intercultural and transcultural stages seem confident about all five aspects of intercultural competence. However, it can also be concluded that foreign language teaching and teaching cultural awareness do not necessarily lead to developing learners’ actual intercultural communicative competence since only 7 and 9 students displayed the intercultural and transcultural level respectively. Thus, it appears warranted to construct a study which would focus on the link between foreign language learners’ intercultural competence, foreign language teaching, teaching cultural awareness and students’ direct experience with the target language culture. It is surprising that 9 students failed to write any dialogue. The results have revealed that learners may perceive their intercultural competence in a positive way but still not be able to overcome cultural barriers in communication. The discrepancy between the monocultural and intercultural students’ self-evaluation of their intercultural competence and their performance in the communicative task is also striking. This may suggest that either linguistic and intercultural performance does not develop simultaneously or that the mere fact that a learner has achieved linguistic competence does not mean that his or her level of intercultural competence will also be high. The study, however, has not revealed why some students managed to reflect their intercultural competence in the writing task as the results of the questionnaire obtained by three groups of students representing three stages of intercultural learning are similar. Therefore, it may be concluded that intercultural communicative competence is not related to the perception of one’s own intercultural competence as only 9 students taking part in the study managed to integrate their linguistic skills and their cultural awareness in the communicative task. Perhaps the explanation may be that some students understand cultural awareness as the acquisition of cultural facts about the target language culture, and not as a tool for achieving linguistic skills necessary to engage in cross-cultural communication, which is quite surprising as one could expect that these students’ cultural awareness is higher taking into consideration that fact that they are students of English philology and should display a higher degree of cultural sensitiveness. One can thus come to a tentative conclusion that there is a need for a change in a foreign language curriculum that will focus learners’ attention on both linguistic dimensions of
cultural dimensions of language and will teach them how to apply this knowledge in cross-cultural communication.

It remains a question whether the above interpretation is justified. The research reported in this paper was a small-scale study with a small number of students. Undoubtedly, more research is needed that would not only involve a larger number of subjects representing various levels of language proficiency or experience with the target language culture but also would address the link between foreign language learners’ perception of their intercultural competence and their actual level of this competence, the relationship between students’ intercultural competence and language skills other than writing. Another essential aspect is a qualitative method of data analysis which was adopted in this study. Even though it enabled a deeper analysis of the issue investigated, a quantitative analysis would undoubtedly allow the researcher to provide more objective interpretation of the findings. The present study also did not reveal what exactly determines the development of critical cultural awareness in foreign language learners as only 9 students have mastered skills relating to this ability despite the fact that all 41 students who took part in this research were taught the target language and cultural awareness in the same way. Consequently, promising would be a study which would explore which methods, types of formal instruction, techniques and strategies employed in teaching cultural awareness are effective in this respect.

One may also argue that the communicative task that the students were supposed to complete did not produce a real intercultural situation because, first of all, a dialogue is a speaking task rather than a writing one and, secondly, it did not take place in a real life situation but in a classroom environment. These arguments are sensible, however, these students were provided with a real cross-cultural problem which they can encounter when engaging in intercultural communication. Another argument defending the concept of the project is that the students, who were native speakers of Polish, were asked to act out as a Polish student, which means that they were supposed to play themselves in the dialogue. Secondly, the fact that at the same time they were asked to play the role of an American professor was to examine if they were able to divorce themselves from their mother tongue culture and look at it from the target language perspective, which is one of the skills essential in intercultural communicative competence.
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## Appendix 1

Below you will find statements about cultural awareness and learning cultural competence. Please read each statement and indicate how true these statements are about you by putting in the right column of the chart a number between 1 and 5 as follows:

1 – never true of me,
2 – generally not true of me,
3 – somewhat true of me,
4 – generally true of me,
5 – always true of me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with some facts about the target language culture (e.g. people’s everyday living, their values, beliefs, attitudes, and living conditions, history, geography, cuisine, literature of a country where the language is spoken, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to find similarities and differences between my own and the target language culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a positive attitude towards the people of the target language culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware about the aspects of life of social minority groups existing within the target language culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the differences in the behaviour typical of both my own culture and the people of the target language culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can interact (e.g. how to start, maintain and terminate a conversation) with people of the target language culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can interact (e.g. how to start, maintain and terminate a conversation) with people of other cultures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in contact with the target language culture and its people through watching TV, listening to the radio, reading newspapers and magazines in the target language, using the Internet and travelling to the target language countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the stereotypes regarding the target language culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the stereotypes regarding cultures other than the target language culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in those aspects of the life of people from the target language countries which are not usually presented in the media.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can look at the target language culture through the perspective of my own culture and at my own culture through the perspective of the target language culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I know how to adopt appropriate behaviour, conventions and customs when talking to people of the target language culture.

I know how to adopt appropriate behaviour, conventions and customs when talking to people of cultures other than the target language culture.

I can find solutions to problems arising from lack of understanding of the target language and its culture.

I can find solutions to problems arising from lack of understanding of aspects of cultures other than the target language culture.

I am able to evaluate both my beliefs about the target language culture and the beliefs the people of the target language culture have on my culture.

I am able to evaluate both my beliefs about cultures other than the target language culture and the beliefs other people have on my culture.
Appendix 2

The results of the questionnaire with reference to five types of intercultural competence and three stages of development of intercultural competence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Cultural Facts about the Target Language Culture</th>
<th>Monocultural Stage</th>
<th>Intercultural Stage</th>
<th>Transcultural Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of facts about the target language culture</td>
<td>5 8 3 0 0</td>
<td>3 2 2 0 0</td>
<td>1 3 5 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of life of social minority groups in the target language culture</td>
<td>0 3 9 4 0</td>
<td>2 1 4 0 0</td>
<td>1 5 3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping contact with the target language culture through various media</td>
<td>5 4 7 0 0</td>
<td>2 2 3 0 0</td>
<td>2 4 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in aspect of life of people of the target language culture not presented in the media</td>
<td>3 1 9 3 0</td>
<td>2 3 2 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 3 3 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills of Interpreting and Relating</th>
<th>Monocultural Stage</th>
<th>Intercultural Stage</th>
<th>Transcultural Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to find similarities between the students’ culture and the target language culture</td>
<td>5 7 4 0 0</td>
<td>2 0 2 3 0</td>
<td>1 5 3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of the differences in the behaviour typical of the students’ culture and the target language culture</td>
<td>8 8 0 0 0</td>
<td>2 2 3 0 0</td>
<td>1 4 3 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of the stereotypes about the target language culture</td>
<td>3 3 2 1 7</td>
<td>2 4 1 0 0</td>
<td>3 3 3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of the stereotypes about cultures other than the target language culture</td>
<td>1 11 3 1 0</td>
<td>1 5 1 0 0</td>
<td>1 3 5 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ability to adopt appropriate behaviour, conventions and customs when talking to people of the target language culture</td>
<td>ability to adopt appropriate behaviour, conventions and customs when talking to people of cultures other than the target language culture</td>
<td>ability to find solutions to problems arising from lack of understanding of the target language culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills of discovery and interaction</td>
<td>1 10 3 2 0 1 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 3 0 0</td>
<td>1 4 7 4 0 1 4 2 0 0 0 7 2 0 0</td>
<td>2 11 3 0 0 1 3 3 0 0 1 5 3 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Column 1 stands for the number of responses for ‘always true of me’, 2 for ‘generally true of me’, 3 for ‘somewhat true of me’, 4 for ‘generally not true of me’ and 5 for ‘never true of me’. 