

Southern Studies in Education

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION EDUCATION AND RESEARCH IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA

Edited by
Hamza R'boul



Intercultural Communication Education and Research in the Middle East and North Africa

Edited by Hamza R'boul

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

First published 2025
by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

and by Routledge
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2025 selection and editorial matter, Hamza R'boul; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Hamza R'boul to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

ISBN: 978-1-032-96298-6 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-032-96307-5 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-58899-3 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003588993

Typeset in Times New Roman
by SPi Technologies India Pvt Ltd (Straive)

5 (Re)locating Türkiye's Intercultural Stance through Juxtaposing Non-Western and Western Perspectives

Mehmet Galip Zorba

Türkiye's geopolitical location and historical-political past create a unique context in which the East and the West are juxtaposed. Türkiye has pursued engaging Westernization movements with its unique and Eastern cultural heritage since the Ottoman period. Accordingly, this chapter aims to (re)locate Türkiye's intercultural stance, focusing on intercultural communication education (ICE) in the Turkish context and discussing Türkiye's proximity and distance to non-Western and Western-centric perspectives on interculturality. In doing this, this chapter first draws a theoretical framework. Secondly, it briefly unpacks historical landmarks that have been molding ICE. Next, ICE practices and the research trends on interculturality are critically examined in line with national educational policies, national English curricula and academic studies to establish the conceptual benchmark of interculturality within the Turkish context. This chapter ends with significant implications for non-Western perspectives on interculturality, ICE practices and research in Türkiye.

Keywords

Intercultural communication education (ICE)
Non-Western perspective
Turkish context
Western perspective

Introduction

Within the social sciences landscape, culture has always been a highly intricate and sophisticated term and held particular significance as a central subject of study in various fields, ranging from sociology, anthropology and psychology to education, among many others. Its definitions and connotations have continued to evolve since it shifted from its original association with agricultural practices to become a term mainly encapsulating tangible and intangible ways a given society lives and conducts its activities. Despite that, culture remains "a complex whole," as Taylor underscored in 1871, beyond the debates on its applicability in the contemporary context, and this complexity is also

DOI: 10.4324/9781003588993-7

frequently reiterated in the literature (e.g., Dervin, 2016; Miike, 2017; R'boul, 2020). Considering how historical periods are characterized by specific political, technological and scientific events and developments that influence humanity, it becomes apparent that the 21st century stands out for such notable concepts as digitalization and globalization. These milestones have deeply permeated and reshaped lifestyles by removing spatial boundaries and fostering greater interconnectivity, making culture a fluid, dynamic and multifaceted phenomenon (Dugartsyrenova & Sardegna, 2019). This transformation has engendered multiple identities, multiculturalism, cultural shifts and hybridity, all of which are now sociocultural realities of today's societies (Tan, 2008). As such, intercultural interactions have become essential in various social domains of life in which individuals interact and communicate. Such interaction entails analyzing, interpreting and comprehending how others perceive reality, construct their identities, and express their cultural backgrounds (Perry & Southwell, 2011; Piątkowska, 2015) to facilitate tolerance, respect, equality and dialogue within societies and across the globe.

Given that modern education systems need to be aligned with global and social demands and needs, there has long been an effort to incorporate intercultural communication education (ICE) within national educational frameworks to equip students with the essential competencies to navigate in today's world. Due to the central position of interaction and communication in interculturality, ICE lends itself to foreign/second language education, particularly English language teaching (ELT), and thus is often integrated into educational systems through language programs. With its global status, the English language is the primary medium of communication that enables speakers of other languages to interact in various domains (e.g., educational, scientific, virtual academic). Therefore, communication in English between non-native speakers has been rapidly increasing (Lan, 2020; Lee, 2020), which, in theory, has culminated in diminishing the role of native speakerism in ELT pedagogy; yet, in practice, it is still prioritized and holds a "privileged" position in educational and scholarly settings (Choi, 2016; Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2021). In parallel, although the ramifications of such a paradigm shift led to a pendulum swing from Anglophone-centered cultural understanding to an intercultural one encompassing regional cultures, learners' own cultures and other cultures in ELT (Parks, 2020; Piątkowska, 2015), Western-centric roots of interculturality still influence ICE and ELT (Miike, 2017; R'boul, 2021a, 2021b).

Furthermore, recent theoretical and empirical research explains that scholarly discourses on interculturality are predominantly shaped and reshaped by a Western perspective, thereby empowering and maintaining Western-centric hegemony (Dalib et al., 2014; Miike, 2010, 2017; R'boul, 2021b), which has so far culminated in overlooking and downplaying intercultural realities that emerged in non-Western contexts such as the Middle East and North Africa (MENA). Given the pressing need to give voice to non-Western discourses and promote them, the MENA context is worth investigating as it offers untapped terrains for ICE. From this standpoint, Türkiye's geopolitical location and

historical-political past create a unique context in which the East and the West are juxtaposed in the sense that Türkiye has pursued engaging Westernization movements with its unique and Eastern cultural heritage since the Ottoman period.

With all these in mind, this chapter aims to (re)locate Türkiye's intercultural stance, focusing on the past and present of ICE in the Turkish context and highlighting the commonalities and differences between non-Western and Western-centric conceptualization of interculturality. In doing this, this chapter first draws a brief theoretical framework of non-Western and Western-centric interculturality. Secondly, it briefly discusses historical landmarks that have been molding intercultural education in Türkiye along with cultural and linguistic diversity and then critically examines the recent research to establish the conceptual benchmark of interculturality. Lastly, the practices of ICE are explored through national educational policies, curricula, and research on these issues.

Theoretical Framework

The notion of interculturality has been construed and modeled in different ways in an attempt to demarcate and delineate its "universal" and "ready-to-use" characteristics, principles and tenets. Despite the value of all such endeavors, given that culture (any given culture or culture as a standalone term) is a complex phenomenon, it is hard and also naïve to be in such attempts and propose frameworks and models, implying their validity and practicality in various cultural contexts like a panacea. If culture is complex, interculturality is a highly "complex and ideological construct" that entails being first approached from a dialogical viewpoint (Dervin & Simpson, 2021, p. 19). The complexity and ideology-based nature of interculturality rests on the notion of relativity (or cultural relativity). Dervin (2016) vividly exemplifies this relativity: "My intercultural may not mean the same as your intercultural. My intercultural might have different values and ideologies than your intercultural" (p. 2). In theory, ICE should be dedicated to teaching practical communication skills for better interaction with culturally and linguistically different individuals and providing guidance on addressing sensitive and intricate topics such as power imbalances related to knowledge, language and identity (R'boul, 2021b). From this stance, ICE is predicated upon and upholds the principle of the equal valuation of all cultural groups and communities; thus, it is globally acknowledged that it should promote mutual understanding, tolerance and respect for differences and work toward equality and dialogue through criticality.

Despite such ostensible consensus on these issues, the scholarship of interculturality and ICE incorporates significant discrepancies between the "ideal" interculturality and interculturality in theory and practice. First, the scholarship on interculturality is heavily shaped and reshaped by the Western perspective. Such a scholarly hegemony paves the way for the lack of cultural-epistemological diversity in that non-Western perspectives are underrepresented, or worse, ignored, and non-Western voices are often pushed to

conform to Western-centric intercultural perspectives. R'boul's (2022a, 2022b) recent studies revealed that the national diversity and authorship affiliation of the published articles in the 2021 volumes of the five most prominent intercultural communication were predominantly Western (approximately 75% of authors were either from Europe or Anglosphere countries). Furthermore, the national diversity and affiliation of the editorial boards of those five major journals overwhelmingly reflected a Western dominance (more than 85% of editorial board members were either from Europe or Anglosphere countries). Given that these results reflect 2021 and such studies and journals also influence ICE practices in national education systems (e.g., curriculum development, material design, and instructional practices) across the globe, the hegemony constructed by Western perspectives is deeper and broader than these results indicate.

One of the significant ramifications of the Western hegemony on intercultural scholarship manifests itself in the criticality principle. As stated above, interculturality and ICE are innately critical, yet the dominance of Western perspectives leads to a selective or convenient criticality, reproducing linguistic, cultural and epistemic hierarchies instead of reducing them (R'boul, 2023a). Besides, such a limited criticality is also self-refuting for Western perspectives. For instance, Byram's intercultural communicative competence (ICC) model has substantially influenced European foreign language education (Young & Sachdev, 2011). Critical cultural awareness (CCA) has a distinctive role in Byram's model and is positioned at the center of ICC to emphasize the educational dimension and ensure that essential attention is paid to the notion of criticality (Porto et al., 2018). Even if ICC is mostly epitomized with knowledge, skills and attitudes, without CCA, these dimensions become impractical because "reactions to and rejections of other cultures" stem from "individuals' own beliefs, values, and behaviours" (Byram et al., 2001, pp. 6–7). Accordingly, being an intercultural speaker entails

> [t]he ability to identify and interpret explicit or implicit values in documents and events in one's own and other cultures. The ability to make an evaluative analysis of the documents and events based on a conscious process of reasoning. The ability to interact and mediate in intercultural exchanges on the basis of a reasoned analysis, negotiating where necessary, a degree of acceptance of them by drawing upon one's knowledge, skills and attitudes.
>
> (Byram, 2021, p. 140)

Additionally, decentering is another critical aspect of Byram's ICC model that can be deconstructed with regard to its Western-based logic. It encompasses curiosity, openness, and, more importantly, "readiness to suspend disbelief and judgement with respect to others' meanings, beliefs, values and behaviours," and "a willingness to suspend belief in one's own meanings, beliefs, values and behaviours, and to analyse them from the viewpoint of the others

with whom one is engaging" (Byram, 2021, p. 45). Therefore, considering such scholarly hegemony within Byram's CCA and decentering, it is hard to say that Western intercultural scholarship adequately reflects criticality as it tends to hear its own voice.

Furthermore, Western and non-Western perspectives on interculturality are derived from distinctive cultural mindsets. Western perspectives are heavily anchored in such core values as rationality, individual freedom, linear and binary reasoning, calculated self-interest, instrumental goals, material progress and a strong awareness of rights (Miike, 2007; Nisbett, 2003). Similarly, Haslett's (2020, p. 26) comparison of the Eastern and Western worldviews indicates that

> (1) Eastern perceptions of reality focus on direct, immediate perceptions, whereas Western views emphasize verbal symbols and conceptual processing; (2) Eastern views incorporate emotion and shared sentiment, whereas Western views emphasize rationality and de-emphasize emotions; (3) Eastern views emphasize unity and wholeness whereas Western views emphasize part-whole relationships and (4) Eastern views emphasize relationships and support of those relationships whereas Westerners emphasize the self, identity and the instrumentality of relationships with others.

Western models of interculturality are fraught with limitations as they are not adequately aligned with non-Western worldviews (Miike, 2010), whereas "many non-Western theories of communication are explicitly intracultural in nature and implicitly intercultural in scope" (Miike, 2017, p. 77). Considering these insights, Miike (2017) gleans non-Western intercultural communication theories from an Asiacentric perspective and underlines ontological, epistemological and axiological differences between Western and non-Western perspectives. Miike's (2017) key points and caveats can be more vividly reified through a simple analogy. Imagine you need a T-shirt and visit a store that claims to sell T-shirts suitable for all body types. You try on various T-shirts, but none of them fits you perfectly. Therefore, you end up purchasing the one closest to fitting you as you need one. In this case, your only option to have that T-shirt fit you perfectly is to have a body shape that matches the pattern of the T-shirt, namely changing your shape.

As this chapter focuses on (re)locating Türkiye's intercultural stance regarding Western and non-Western perspectives, non-Western intercultural perspective is regarded as teaching interculturality "otherwise" rather than aligning it with the "mainstream". In such a perspective, mainstream is associated with the Western perspective of interculturality, whereas otherwise encompasses "novel insights into theorising and teaching interculturality" (R'boul, 2023b, p. 222). From this perspective, Türkiye's intercultural stance is discussed in line with the proximity and distance of intercultural aspects to Western and non-Western perspectives in the research trend that our national literature recently presents and instances from ELT curricula and course materials.

Western–Non-Western Dichotomy: A Brief Historical Overview

Türkiye's proximity and distance of intercultural aspects to Western and non-Western perspectives incorporates various political, economic and social layers intertwined in complex ways and rests in its history. As Dervin and Simpson (2021) accentuate, "the intercultural is always ideological and political" (p. 3) in that it emerges and exists within specific contexts formed by economic and political power dynamics along with contradictions. Despite this fact, however, as R'boul (2023a) enunciates, interculturality should be flattened to make it less polemic, ideological and political and more theoretical and practical in different educational settings in non-Western contexts. This section aligns with these two premises and, therefore, seeks to provide a brief overview of historical-political landmarks and ideologies that have significantly influenced Türkiye's political and cultural stance for decades without taking a critical or defensive position regarding any specific political ideology.

Türkiye's transcontinental location, bridging Europe and Asia, along with its geographical and cultural connections to the Middle East, places it strategically at the crossroads of these regions. However, in much of its modern history, Türkiye has often attempted to align itself with the Western world, particularly Europe, and developed strong ties with the United States while maintaining a more reserved approach in its interactions with the Muslim Middle East, despite its significant cultural heritage derived from the region (Atay, 2005). The Westernization movements cover approximately three centuries, beginning with reforms made in the Tulip Era (1718–1730) due to a paradigm shift from the magnificent Ottomans to European superiority in science and technology. Accordingly, although these movements initially incorporated mainly the material aspects of military and engineering technologies, the scope of the Westernization movement gradually expanded throughout the decline of the Ottoman Empire in the 18th and 19th centuries, resulting in profound changes in the legal, economic and social systems (Atay, 2005).

The period spanning from the first quarter of the 19th century to the early 20th century is recognized as the most intense phase of Westernization movements in the Ottoman Empire, commonly referred to as the Reform Period. In this period, the Ottoman Empire expedited its Westernization efforts while struggling with wars, territorial losses, economic challenges, and social and political upheavals. The fundamental aim of these movements was, in fact, to redress all these adversities and gain power to compete with the European states. To socially and militarily modernize the Empire, the Tanzimat Edict was first declared in 1839, ensuring all Ottoman citizens' security of life, honor and property regardless of religion or ethnic group (Aytekin, 2013). Secondly, the Imperial Reform Edict was declared in 1856, expanding the rights given to non-Muslims. Thus, this edict is often regarded as a consequence of the impact exerted by Britain and France, which supported the Ottoman Empire in its conflict with Russia during the Crimean War (1853–1856) and the Treaty of Paris (1856). Repercussions of this politically turbulent period were evident in society

and led to the emergence of two groups. First, the Young Ottomans appeared, mainly consisting of intellectuals such as journalists and mid-level bureaucrats (Atay & Ece, 2009). This group supported the Westernization process and reforms in line with Islamic principles; thus, debates in Ottoman society revolved around embracing modernity while preserving cultural identity (Zürcher, 1995). The initiatives of the Young Ottomans resulted in the promulgation of the First Constitution in 1876. The second reformist group that profoundly affected the political history of the Empire was the Young Turks. This group primarily consisted of the bureaucratic and military elites, educated in the modern, Western-style schools either within the borders of the Empire or in Europe (Göçek, 1993; Heper, 2000). The Young Turks supported secularization and constitutional monarchy as an indivisible whole, and due to their activities, the Second Constitutional Era began in 1908, after which, however, the dissolution of the Empire accelerated and in 1922, the Ottoman Empire officially ended.

Under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the Turkish Republic was established in 1923. Secularism was the primary building block of this new republic and became the cornerstone of Kemalist ideology. As Reagan (2018) articulates, "In the Turkish context, secularism does not entail an absolute separation of religion and state but rather requires that the state be actively neutral in matters of religion" (p. 144). Throughout the first decades, policies aiming to integrate a Western identity with the Turkish and Islamic identities were followed. The cultural Westernization movement was generally espoused in society. Türkiye's alliance with the West during World War II and the Cold War reinforced its political, economic and commercial ties with European states and the USA. In pursuing Türkiye's complete integration with the Western world, Türkiye became a member of the Council of Europe in 1950, NATO in 1952 and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 1961, and the official initiatives for Türkiye's EU membership began in 1963. All these significantly encouraged and promoted Western identity in Türkiye, particularly after 1980 (Atay & Ece, 2009). Ironically, however, cultural distinctions between predominantly Muslim-majority Türkiye and mostly Christian Europe are regarded as an overarching obstacle to Türkiye's integration into the EU. As Ahıska (2003) underlines, "Europe has been an object of desire as well as a source of frustration for Turkish national identity in a long and strained history" (p. 351). The rejection of Türkiye's self-consciously designed Western identity by Europe paved the way for a considerable decrease in the lure of Europe within conservative segments of Turkish society. In the last decade, secularization and the state's neutrality to religion have been blurred (Uzer, 2020), and polarization between conservatives and secularists has been deepening at the political and social levels (Yazan et al., 2023).

Cultural and Linguistic Diversity in Türkiye

Türkiye's demographic makeup portrays a Sunni-Muslim majority primarily speaking Turkish. However, there exist communities belonging to different ethnic or religious groups. Therefore, delving into the intricacies of Türkiye's

intercultural stance entails a brief description of its linguistic and cultural diversity. The present-day Türkiye encompasses a rich tapestry of cultural and linguistic diversity deeply rooted in the country's historical past and geographical location. Although this diversity has been a political and social fact within the country since the Ottoman period, capturing a thorough and up-to-date picture of this diversity presents a challenge due to the limited accessibility of scholarly resources and the absence of current official information on language groups (Brizić & Yağmur, 2008). This is simply because national censuses taken between 1927 and 1980 involved questions to document spoken languages and religious convictions, yet from the 1985 census, questions on language, ethnicity and religion were removed from its survey (Yağmur, 2001). Additionally, it is hard to capture a complete picture of minorities in Türkiye as these groups also branch off smaller communities, each marked by distinct religious, microethnic or other sociocultural nuances.

Despite these challenges, the overall panorama of cultural and linguistic diversity in present-day Türkiye manifests itself in two trajectories. The first trajectory encompasses ethnoreligious minorities. Officially, the state recognizes only four non-Muslim groups (i.e., Armenians, Jews, Rum Orthodox and Bulgarians) as minorities (Bayır, 2013). However, there exist different Islamic sects (e.g., Alevis, Bektashis, Caferis, Alawites) as well as other non-Muslim groups which are not officially recognized (e.g., Arabic Orthodox, Assyrians, Bahais, Druzes, Yezidis). In addition to the Turkish language, the great majority of officially recognized non-Muslim groups speak their native languages (i.e., Armenian, Greek, Ladino and Bulgarian), whereas groups belonging to different Islamic sects speak Turkish, Azerbaijani Turkish, Arabic or Kurdish (MRG, 2018). The second trajectory incorporates ethnolinguistic minorities whose diversity and population vary due to inconsistencies between the available sources of information. For instance, the 1965 census documented the existence of 34 languages spoken in Türkiye, whereas Eberhard et al. (2023) list 57 languages (apart from Turkish and Turkish sign language), encompassing both languages and dialects spoken by minority groups and immigrants (see Table 5.1). Of these languages, 39 are categorized as established and living, 1 is extinct, and 17 are unestablished languages spoken by immigrants or foreign workforces. Although Assyrian and Macedonian are labeled as "unestablished" languages, their statuses are debatable because their communities have been using these languages for decades in Türkiye (Arikan et al., 2017; Öktem, 2011). Among the languages presented in Table 5.1, English, French, German and Arabic are widely taught foreign languages across different educational levels. In contrast, Abaza, Adyghe, Albanian, Bosnian, Georgian, Kurdish, Laz and Zaza languages are offered as middle-school-level elective courses within the scope of the "living languages and dialects" curriculum.

Additionally, over the past decade, Türkiye has grappled with a substantial influx of refugees, including Syrians, Afghans, Iraqis, Iranians and Ukrainians; yet Syrian refugees have highly outnumbered refugees from other countries.

Table 5.1 Languages by number of users in Türkiye

Languages	*Users*	*Languages*	*Users*	*Languages*	*Users*
Abaza	13,200	Domari	ND	Pashto, Northern	28,000
Abkhaz	48,600	English	47,000	Persian, Iranian	129,000
Adygh	349,000	French	4,300	Pontic	5,000
Albanian, Gheg	ND	Georgian	167,000	Posha	ND
Albanian, Tosk	72,900	German	6,700	Romani, Balkan	72,900
Arabic, Levantine	4,250,000	Greek	4,000	Russian	7,500
Arabic, Mesopotamian Spoken	112,000	Hértevin	4	Serbian	5,000
Arabic, North Mesopotamian Spoken	574,000	Kabardian	1,170,000	Spanish	16,000
Arabic, Standard	686,000	Karakalpak	81,700	Syriac	ND
Armenian, Western	67,300	Kazakh	8,500	Tatar	28,700
Assyrian Neo-Aramaic	27,600	Kumyk	1,600	Turkmen	ND
Azerbaijani, South	596,000	Kurdish, Northern	9,000,000	Turoyo	16,600
Balkan Gagauz Turkish	460,000	Kyrgyz	ND	Ubykh	Extinct
Bosnian	112,000	Ladino	8,000	Urdu	24,300
Bulgarian, mainly Pomak	395,000	Laz	20,000	Uyghur	ND
Chechen	112,000	Lezgi	1,200	Uzbek, Southern	27,000
Chinese, Mandarin	42,000	Macedonian	35,000	Zaza	1,483,000
Crimean Tatar	110,000	Mardin Sign Language	40	Zazaki, Northern	203,000
Dari	63,500	Ossetic	41,000	Zazaki, Southern	1,280,000

Note: Languages are listed alphabetically. ND stands for no data available. Adapted from Eberhard et al. (2023).

Recent official figures indicate approximately 3.6 million registered Syrian refugees (UNHCR, 2023). This count increases when accounting for unregistered Syrians. Such a large number of refugees has altered the demographic makeup of Türkiye. In line with this, the education system also faces challenges in accommodating many school-aged refugees within state schools. In response to the urgent needs of Syrian refugees, Temporary Education Centers (TECs) were initially established within and outside refugee camps. These centers provide education in Arabic, aligned with the Syrian curriculum to prevent Syrian refugees from falling behind in their education (Alpaydın, 2017; Eren & Çavuşoğlu, 2023). As the status of refugees shifted from "guests" to "residents," the majority moved into the country from the refugee camps (Tuna & Karslı, 2017). Therefore, the functions of TECs ceased in 2019, leading Syrian children

to be placed in public schools. However, Turkish public schools were, and still are, ill-equipped for the integration of Syrian students due to two primary challenges. First, the monolingual nature of education in Türkiye poses a language barrier for Syrian refugees (Eren & Çavuşoğlu, 2023). Second, placing these students into appropriate grades presents challenges, as the interruption in education often results in Syrian students being assigned to lower grades, creating significant age differences within classrooms and complicating their integration (Çelik & Erdogan, 2017). Moreover, the absence of suitable curriculum and instructional materials for Syrian refugees, coupled with a shortage of teachers proficient in teaching refugees, is still exacerbating the integration of refugees into the education system (Aydin & Kaya, 2019; Karsli-Calamak & Kilinc, 2021).

Integrating such a large number of culturally and linguistically different students without a national dialogue and public consensus raises concerns about heightened social tensions between the local community and Syrian individuals within both the school environment and society (Eren & Çavuşoğlu, 2023; Sarı & Alkar, 2023) in that the experiences of refugees in schools are "very much determined by the way that refugees are thought about, and represented in the public culture and how these representations are taken up or contested in schools" (Hattam & Every, 2010, p. 409). As such, addressing these challenges entails a multifaceted approach, including implementing programs for pre-service and in-service teachers to instill them with culturally and linguistically responsive teaching principles (Kaygısız, 2023). It is crucial to recognize that such attempts also require incorporating principles of ICE simply because the potential outcomes of ICE go beyond the educational context, preparing individuals to navigate effectively in cultural settings outside of formal education. Therefore, while devising strategies to mitigate these challenges, awareness-raising training about intercultural communication skills should be conducted for all stakeholders from both cultural groups for a smooth and effective integration (Çelik et al., 2023).

ICE in Practice

In the Turkish context, education has historically served as a means to disseminate and instill the notions of the Westernization movement within society. During the Ottoman and Republic periods, the Westernization movement's impetus led to the establishment of various public schools (vocational, military and general education) and foreign schools modeled on Western educational principles, and many educators from the West (Europe and the USA) worked as instructors and experts ostensibly ameliorating the education system (Büyükdüvenci, 1994). In line with this, foreign language education emerged as a paramount necessity for fostering integration with the West and evolved into a foundational element of ICE in the Turkish context. While French predominantly held sway as the primary foreign language during the early Republic period until the 1950s, English gradually gained prominence in the Turkish education system post-1950, and its priority continued to strengthen, particularly from the 1980s onward, ultimately becoming the

predominant foreign language in the national education system (Dogançay-Aktuna, 1998).

In Türkiye, the educational system is marked by a significant degree of centralization under the oversight and regulation of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE), which is responsible for managing preschool, primary, secondary and high school education across the nation. Therefore, in all public schools, curricula set by the MoNE for all courses at all levels are followed through coursebooks and other instructional materials, either designed by the divisions affiliated with the MoNE or private publishing houses under the auspices of the MoNE (Kırkgöz et al., 2016). The educational system is built upon the principle of compulsory education for all children and operates on the 4+4+4 system, in which students undergo four years of primary, secondary and high school education.

The centralization of education plays a crucial role in Türkiye's intercultural stance, particularly its proximity and distance to Western and non-Western perspectives. From the Kachruian perspective, Türkiye is in the expanding circle, emphasizing that English is learned as a foreign language, is primarily used in cross-cultural contexts and holds a significant position in education, international communication and business (Kırkgöz, 2008; Özmen et al., 2018). As stated before, teaching English in such a context entails incorporating students' culture and other cultures rather than focusing on Anglocentric cultural elements. Currently, there are two EFL curricula, one for primary and secondary schools (hereafter PSEC) and the other for high schools (hereafter HSEC), and both provide valuable insights into a unique and contextual mixture of Western and non-Western perspectives on interculturality in Türkiye's case.

Curricular changes in Türkiye are made recognizing the differences between Western-origin innovations in ELT originating from different cultural and educational contexts and contextual realities across the country, and thus, such changes aim to build "meaningful bridges between the culture of the innovation and the existing local professional culture to achieve cultural continuity and help teachers make the transition" (Kırkgöz, 2008, p. 1861). PSEC and HSEC are heavily anchored in the principles of communicative proficiency suggested in *the Common European Framework of References* (CEFR) to develop students who have acquired the necessary competence in English at an international level (MoNE, 2018a, 2018b) in that form-focused and grammar-based language teaching has been considered a major problem of ELT in the Turkish context. Therefore, Western-origin principles were adopted to provide solutions for contextual problems. In doing this, English is considered an international language. Despite the emphasis on international communication, PSEC implies native speaker-centered language use and involves blurry lines of demarcation between native speakerism and English as an international language. For instance, "authentic communicative environments," "authentic use of the language," "authentic materials" and "authentic sources" (MoNE, 2018a, pp. 3–4) are highlighted while clarifying major philosophy and the

general objectives of the curriculum, and to what precisely the word "authentic" refers is not delineated. This is critical because the word "authentic" is often associated with native speakers or the target community (Choi, 2016). Additionally, the emphasis placed on "students listen and speak just as they would in a target language community" (MoNE, 2018a, p. 12) and categorizing cultures as the target, home and international cultures also imply that priority is given to Anglo-centric perspectives. Similar problems are also evident in HSEC, as exemplified below.

> Materials/Tasks are authentic in design and content as much as possible … are supported with multimedia and instructional technology tools as much as possible to immerse students in authentic use of language … to assess authentic use of language with an emphasis on tools such as portfolios, projects, and/or communicative activities more than traditional assessment tools such as multiple choice, true/false, and/or fill-in-the-blanks.
>
> (MoNE, 2018b, p. 10)

The ambiguity in positioning native speakerism in PSEC and HSEC mainly stems from adopting the CEFR while designing the curricula, as the previous version of the CEFR is criticized for its seemingly outdated positioning of the native speaker, and the revised companion volumes do not involve the term 'native speakers' (Schneider, 2020). Despite that, PSEC and HSEC are still based on the 2001 version of the CEFR.

Several other issues with the CEFR highlight the potential risks associated with basing an entire national language teaching framework on a document subject to interpretation and revision. The applicability of the CEFR in non-Western contexts remains a contentious subject (Nguyen & Hamid, 2021), whereas, even within Europe, criticisms have arisen, including the complexity and length of the CEFR posing challenges for practitioners' comprehension and implementation (Alderson, 2007) and descriptors developed from language teachers' perspectives rather than empirical learner data (Hynninen, 2014). Studies from the Turkish context also reveal findings in line with these criticisms and indicate that teachers of English have a problematic understanding of the CEFR (Yakışık & Gürocak, 2018), frequently use traditional pen-and-paper exams involving multiple choice and fill-in-the-blanks questions rather than the assessment tools and methods suggested in the CEFR (Çimen, 2022; Mede & Atay, 2017).

Additionally, PSEC and HSEC strongly emphasize developing students' intercultural competence and appreciation for cultural diversity in a positive, non-threatening and unbiased manner in line with the CEFR (MoNE, 2018a, 2018b). In parallel, universal and local values critical for individuals and societies are also integrated into the curricula. This standpoint in the curricula aligns with Western and non-Western perspectives on interculturality. However, classifying cultures into target, home, and international categories is

the ramification of the Western perspective and carries the inherent risk of perpetuating the dominance of Western culture and the underrepresentation of non-Western cultures in coursebooks. In other words, this categorization downplays non-Western cultures and oversimplifies cultural diversity by grouping non-Anglophone-Western cultures (e.g., Spanish, German and French) under the umbrella of international cultures. Empirical studies have attested to this shortcoming and reveal that English coursebooks prepared by local authors primarily center around the target culture, and cultural elements are often presented in fragments and in a restricted way (Zorba & Çakır, 2019). They have also showcased that the international scope of English and its uses and users are neglected (Guerra et al., 2022), and more importantly, the rejection of English-speaking/Western cultures appears as one of the critical reasons for students' failure to develop proficiency in English (Çelik & Bayraktar Çepni, 2020). Imbuing students with such an intercultural understanding paves the way for the lack of nuanced understanding of interculturality and perpetuates the binary framework of nationality and foreignness rather than teaching them the complexity of interculturality and its other principles (Zorba, 2023).

Research Trend on ICE in Türkiye

Although ICE is mainly associated with and actualized through foreign language teaching, particularly ELT, in Türkiye, interculturality as a subject of study in the research trend on ELT is relatively under-researched (Gürsoy & Özcan, 2021; Özmen et al., 2016). Additionally, the research trend on this issue had repercussions in line with the current ICE practices. However, the lack of comprehensive review and meta-analysis studies makes it difficult to capture a detailed portrait of the research trends on ICE. At this juncture, Aslım Yetiş's (2020) study offers a comprehensive examination of this issue within Turkish postgraduate education spanning the years 2001 to 2019 and provides valuable insights into the research trend on this issue along with its shortcomings. In summary, her findings reveal that, first, in the great majority of the postgraduate theses, interculturality as a subject matter is studied in the context of Western languages (English, German and French), and more importantly, it is studied with little attention and relation to the Turkish language and other non-Western languages. Second, these postgraduate theses mainly center around exploring attitudes, opinions or perceptions toward intercultural communication skills, coursebook analysis and developing intercultural communication, with a notable scarcity of theses dedicated to designing an intercultural communication training model or syllabus. Lastly, many of these theses revolve around interculturality in higher education, involving academic staff, university students and pre-service teachers as research participants, and only six theses focus on primary, secondary and high school students. These results are critical because postgraduate students often tend to conduct more comprehensive studies on their topics in their future research.

Despite exceptions, this overall picture reflects the research trend on ICE within the Turkish context. Needless to say, various contextual realities play a critical role in this. For instance, the research trend on ICE revolves around exploring attitudes, opinions or perceptions in higher education contexts because there is no fixed curriculum for departments, unlike primary and secondary education. Therefore, each university's faculties and departments may incorporate different contexts for ICE. Besides, Turkish universities are within the scope of Erasmus Programs, and thus, every year, thousands of university students enroll in various European universities as exchange students. That is why there are studies focusing on these students' experiences and needs. For instance, Çiftçi and Daloğlu (2021) designed an intercultural induction program to prepare language teacher candidates for short-term study abroad. Although it is not an empirical study, it is significant because interculturality is conceptualized in a reflexive way "regarding unequal power relations, conflicts, and structural inequalities existing among people" (p. 176). Regarding the popularity of coursebook analysis studies, as stated before, coursebooks are either designed by the MoNE or private publishing houses and revised every few years. Studying coursebooks concerning intercultural issues is practical and maintains its currency as a research area.

Considering all these insights, concerning the conceptual and theoretical benchmark of interculturality from Western and non-Western perspectives, theoretical underpinnings of interculturality in the Turkish research trends are often linked to Western models (e.g., Byram's model or CEFR's model) due to the intertwined relationship between ICE and ELT. In line with R'boul's (2022a, 2022b) findings, the author's concerns about receiving acknowledgment in the national and international scholarly milieu may have also contributed to this situation.

Conclusion

In an attempt to (re)locate Türkiye's intercultural stance, this chapter first drew a theoretical framework, then discussed Türkiye's historical-political past, cultural and linguistic diversity, current ICE practices and the research trends on this issue in terms of proximity and distance to Western and non-Western perspectives. Considering the issues discussed in this chapter, the overview of historical-political landmarks showed that Türkiye has long been oscillating between the Western dream and its Eastern roots and attempting to amalgamate the Westernization principles with its intertwined Eastern roots and Turkish identities. Therefore, this long-lasting Westernization process led to its self-consciously designed Western identity, which has so far not been politically acknowledged by the West.

In line with the issues discussed, this chapter suggests implications for non-Western perspectives on interculturality, ICE practices and research in Türkiye. Despite the growing body of literature on non-Western perspectives, there is still a need for more theoretical and empirical studies because theories entail

empirical data, and empirical studies cater to and improve theories. Given the relative nature of interculturality, it is hard to design a non-Western intercultural model for all. However, studies on this issue should delineate the main principles of ICE and suggest viable and concrete practical applications rather than solely focusing on power relations, hierarchies and hegemonies. As such, studies addressing contextual realities in the MENA or any other non-Western contexts would also contribute to improving theories and practices of interculturality.

As for the implications for ICE practices in Türkiye, prescribing a certain way would be unwise and cast aspersion due to the various sociocultural, socioeconomic and political dynamics influencing ICE practices. However, considering these realities, finding ways to teach interculturality "otherwise" in Türkiye should be prioritized rather than aligning with the mainstream or Western-centric approach. A way of teaching interculturality otherwise would be integrating interculturality into some other appropriate courses in the national education system, moving beyond a reliance on ELT. Undoubtedly, this suggestion entails a theoretical harmony or coherence on interculturality in the Turkish context, which can only be achieved through academic studies. Therefore, there is a need for studies focusing on developing theories that shed light on Türkiye's own interculturality and lay a foundation for its own ICE, with importance assigned to the practical outcomes of those theories. In doing this, the first step would be investigating the intricacies of ICE in Türkiye from theories of non-Western perspectives on interculturality since such an approach may provide the necessary criticality to detect dysfunctional parts of the Western perspectives within the Turkish context.

References

Ahıska, M. (2003). Occidentalism: The historical fantasy of the modern. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, *102*(2–3), 351–379. https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-102-2-3-351

Alderson, J. C. (2007). The CEFR and the need for more research. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*(4), 659–663. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00627_4.x

Alpaydın, Y. (2017). An analysis of educational policies for school-aged Syrian refugees in Turkey. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, *5*(9), 36–44.

Arikan, A., Varli, O., & Kürüm, E. Y. (2017). A study of Assyrians' language use in Istanbul. *Sustainable Multilingualism*, *10*(1), 56–74. https://doi.org/10.1515/sm-2017-0003

Aslım Yetiş, V. (2020). Analysis of postgraduate theses on interculturality in the field of foreign language education in Turkey. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, *21*(2), 912–925. https://doi.org/10.17679/inuefd.686818

Atay, D. (2005). Reflections on the cultural dimension of language teaching. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *5*(3–4), 222–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708470508668897

Atay, D., & Ece, A. (2009). Multiple identities as reflected in English-Language education: The Turkish perspective. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *8*(1), 21–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348450802619961

Aydin, H., & Kaya, Y. (2019). Education for Syrian refugees: The new global issue facing teachers and principals in Turkey. *Educational Studies*, *55*(1), 46–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2018.1561454

Aytekin, A. E. (2013). Tax revolts during the Tanzimat Period (1839–1876) and before the Young Turk Revolution (1904–1908): Popular protest and state formation in the late Ottoman Empire. *The Journal of Policy History*, *25*(3), 308–333. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030613000134

Bayır, D. (2013). *Minorities and nationalism in Turkish law*. Ashgate Publishing Company

Brizić, K., & Yağmur, K. (2008). Mapping linguistic diversity in an emigration and immigration context: Case studies on Turkey and Austria. In M. Barni & G. Extra (Eds.), *Mapping linguistic diversity in multicultural contexts* (pp. 245–264). Mouton de Gruyter.

Büyükdüvenci, S. (1994). John Dewey's impact on Turkish education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *13*, 393–400. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01077691

Byram, M. (2021). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence: Revisited*. Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M., Nichols, A., & Stevens, D. (2001). *Developing intercultural competence in practice*. Multilingual Matters.

Çelik, C., & S. Erdogan. (2017). How to organise schools for integration of Syrian children in Turkey: Constructing inclusive and intercultural institutional habitus in Schools. MiReKoc Policy Brief Series. Retrieved on December 21, 2023, from https://mirekoc.ku.edu.tr/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/PB_Right-to-Education2.pdf

Çelik, S., & Bayraktar Çepni, S. (2020). Turkish university students' experience of learning English: Is English class a dark forest or a clear sky? *Novitas-ROYAL*, *14*(2), 97–118.

Çelik, S., Kardaş İşler, N., & Saka, D. (2023). Refugee education in Turkey: Barriers and suggested solutions. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, *31*(4), 687–705. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2021.1947878

Choi, L. J. (2016). Revisiting the issue of native speakerism: 'I don't want to speak like a native speaker of English'. *Language and Education*, *30*(1), 72–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2015.1089887

Çiftçi, E. Y., & Daloğlu, A. (2021). Short-term study abroad: Designing an intercultural induction program to prepare prospective language teachers. *Intercultural Education*, *32*(2), 175–193. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2020.1853064

Çimen, Ş. S. (2022). Exploring EFL assessment in Turkey: Curriculum and teacher practices. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, *9*(1). 531–550.

Dalib, S., Harun, M., & Yusoff, N. (2014). Reconceptualising intercultural competence: A phenomenological investigation of students' intercultural experiences. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *155*, 130–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.268

Dervin, F. (2016). *Interculturality in education: A theoretical and methodological toolbox*. Palgrave McMillan

Dervin, F., & Simpson, A. (2021). *Interculturality and the political within education*. Routledge.

Dogançay-Aktuna, S. (1998). The spread of English in Turkey and its current sociolinguist profile. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *19*(1), 24–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434639808666340

Dugartsyrenova, V. A., & Sardegna, V. G. (2019). Raising intercultural awareness through voice-based telecollaboration: perceptions, uses, and recommendations. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 13(3), 205–220. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1533017

Eberhard, D. M., Gary, F. S., & Charles, D. F. (Eds.). (2023). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. SIL International. Retrieved on December 21, 2023, from https://www.ethnologue.com/country/TR/

Eren, A., & Çavuşoğlu, Ç. (2023). Stigmatisation and othering: The case of Syrian students in Turkish schools. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *27*(13), 1434–1453. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1900422

Göçek, F. M. (1993). Ethnic segmentation, Western education, and political outcomes: Nineteenth-century Ottoman society. *Poetics Today*, *14*(3), 507–538. https://doi.org/10.2307/1773283

Guerra, L., Cavalheiro, L., Pereira, R., Kurt, Y., Oztekin, E., Candan, E., & Bayyurt, Y. (2022). Representations of the English as a lingua franca framework: Identifying ELF-aware activities in Portuguese and Turkish coursebooks. *RELC Journal*, *53*(1), 134–150. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220935478

Gürsoy, E., & Özcan, E. N. (2021). Finding and minding the gaps for language education in Turkey: A content analysis on doctoral dissertations in ELT programs from 2010–2020. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *17*(Special Issue 2), 830–847.

Haslett, B. B. (2020). A face model of intercultural communicative competence: Integrating non-Western and Western communication. *China Media Research*, *16*(2), 24–39.

Hattam, R., & Every, D. (2010). Teaching in fractured classrooms: Refugee education, public culture, community and ethics. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *13*(4) 409–424. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2010.488918

Heper, M. (2000). The Ottoman legacy and Turkish politics. *Journal of International Affairs*, *54*(1), 63–82.

Hynninen, N. (2014). The Common European Framework of Reference from the perspective of English as a lingua franca: What we can learn from a focus on language regulation. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *3*(2), 293–316. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2014-0018

Karsli-Calamak, E., & Kilinc, S. (2021). Becoming the teacher of a refugee child: Teachers' evolving experiences in Turkey. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *25*(2), 259–282. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1707307

Kaygısız, S. (2023). Teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students for the first time: A phenomenological inquiry into in-service teachers' perceptions, lived experiences, and pedagogies. *European Journal of Teacher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2023.2265546

Kiczkowiak, M., & Lowe, R. J. (2021). Native-speakerism in English language teaching: 'Native speakers' more likely to be invited as conference plenary speakers. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1974464

Kırkgöz, Y. (2008). A case study of teachers' implementation of curriculum innovation in English language teaching in Turkish primary education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*, 1859–1875. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.02.007

Kırkgöz, Y., Çelik, S., & Arikan, A. (2016). Laying the theoretical and practical foundations for a new elementary English curriculum in Turkey: A procedural analysis. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, *24*(3), 1199–1212.

Lan, S-W. (2020). Intercultural interaction in English: Taiwanese university students' investment and resistance in culturally mixed groups. *Sage Open*, *10*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020941863

Lee, J. W. (2020). The role of informal digital learning of English and a high-stakes English test on perceptions of English as an international language. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *36*(2), 155–168. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.5319

Mede, E. & Atay, D. (2017). English language teachers' assessment literacy: The Turkish context. *Dil Dergisi*, *168*(1), 43–60.

Miike, Y. (2007). An Asiacentric reflection on Eurocentric bias in communication theory. *Communication Monographs*, *74*(2), 272–278. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750701390093

Miike, Y. (2010). An anatomy of Eurocentrism in communication scholarship: The role of Asiacentricity in de-westernising theory and research. *China Media Research*, *6*(1), 1–11.

Miike, Y. (2017). Non-Western theories of communication: Indigenous ideas and insights. In L. Chen (Ed.), *Intercultural communication* (pp. 67–97). De Gruyter.

Ministry of National Education (MoNE). (2018a). *English language curriculum for primary and secondary education*. MoNE.

Ministry of National Education (MoNE). (2018b). *English language curriculum for high schools*. MoNE.

Minority Rights Group (MRG). (2018). *Alevis*. https://minorityrights.org/minorities/alevis/

Nguyen, V. H. & Hamid, M. O. (2021) The CEFR as a national language policy in Vietnam: Insights from a sociogenetic analysis. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *42*(7), 650–662. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1715416

Nisbett, R. (2003). *The geography of thought*. Free Press.

Öktem, K. (2011). Between emigration, de-Islamization and the nation-state: Muslim communities in the Balkans today. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, *11*(2), 155–171. https://doi.org/10.1080/14683857.2011.587249

Özmen, K. S., Çakır, A., & Cephe, P. T. (2018). Conceptualisation of English culture and accent: Idealised English among teachers in the expanding circle. *The Asian EFL Journal*, *20*(3), 8–31.

Özmen, K. S., Cephe, P. T., & Kınık, B. (2016). Trends in doctoral research on English language teaching in Turkey. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *16*(5), 1737–1759. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2016.5.0069

Parks, E. (2020). The separation between language and content in modern language degrees: Implications for students' development of critical cultural awareness and criticality. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *20*(1), 22–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2019.1679161

Perry, L. B., & Southwell, L. (2011). Developing intercultural understanding and skills: Models and approaches. *Intercultural Education*, *22*(6), 453–466. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2011.644948

Piątkowska, K. (2015). From cultural knowledge to intercultural communicative competence: Changing perspectives on the role of culture in foreign language teaching. *Intercultural Education*, *26*(5), 397–408. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2015.1092674

Porto, M., Houghton, S. A., & Byram, M. (2018). Intercultural citizenship in the (foreign) language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, *22*(5), 484–498. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817718580

R'boul, H. (2020). Re-imagining intercultural communication dynamics in TESOL: culture/interculturality. *Journal for Multicultural Education*, *14*(2), 177–188. https://doi.org/10.1108/JME-03-2020-0016

R'boul, H. (2021a). Intercultural communication dialectics in English language teaching. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *9*(1), 30–42.

R'boul, H. (2021b). North/South imbalances in intercultural communication education. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *21*(2), 144–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2020.1866593

R'boul, H. (2022a). Postcolonial interventions in intercultural communication knowledge: Meta-intercultural ontologies, decolonial knowledges and epistemological polylogue. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *15*(1), 75–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2020.1829676

R'boul, H. (2022b). Epistemological plurality in intercultural communication knowledge. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *17*(2), 173–188.

R'boul, H. (2023a). Intercultivism and alternative knowledges in intercultural education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2023.2166018

R'boul, H. (2023b). Afterword: Theorising and teaching interculturality otherwise: What 'otherwise'? In F. Dervin, M. Yuan, & Sude (Eds), *Teaching interculturality 'otherwise'* (pp. 222–225). Routledge.

Reagan, T. (2018). *Non-Western educational traditions: Local approaches to thought and practice*. Routledge.

Sarı, A. Ç., & Alkar, Ö. Y. (2023). Randomised controlled trial of online empathy focused intercultural communication program for Turkish local society to increase their social acceptance towards refugees. *Current Psychology*, *42*, 15575–15588. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-02848-y

Schneider, S. (2020). A critical analysis of the role of intercultural communication in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) Companion Volume (2020). *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, *7*(2), 193–199. https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2020.1864112

Tan, J. P. L. (2008). Closing the gap: A multiliteracies approach to English language teaching for 'at-risk' students in Singapore. In A. Healy (Ed.), *Multiliteracies and diversity in education: New pedagogies for expanding landscapes* (pp. 144–167). Oxford University Press.

Tuna, M. E., & Karslı, E. (2017). An analysis of Turkey's policy on education of Syrian children. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting for the BRISMES: Movement and Migration in the Middle East: People and Ideas*, Flux, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, U.K., July 5–7.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2023). Registered Syrian refugees in Türkiye. Retrieved on December 25, 2023, from https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/113

Uzer, U. (2020). Conservative narrative: Contemporary neo-Ottomanist approaches in Turkish politics. *Middle East Critique*, *29*(3), 275–290. https://doi.org/10.1080/19436149.2020.1770444

Yağmur, K. (2001). Languages in Turkey. In G. Extra & D. Gorter (Eds.), *The other languages of Europe. Demographic, Sociolinguistic and Educational Perspectives* (pp. 407–426). Multilingual Matters.

Yakışık, B. Y., & Gürocak, F. Ü. (2018). A comparative study of perceptions about the 'Common European Framework of Reference' among EFL teachers working at state and private schools. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, *5*(2), 401–417.

Yazan, B., Turnbull, J., Uzum, B., & Akayoglu, A. (2023). Neo-nationalist discourses and teacher identity tensions in a telecollaboration for teachers of minoritized language learners in Türkiye. *TESOL Quarterly*, *57*(3), 775–803. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3245

Young, T. J., & Sachdev, I. (2011). Intercultural communicative competence: Exploring English language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Awareness*, *20*(2), 81–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2010.540328

Zorba, M. G. (2023). A text-based approach to developing EFL learners' intercultural awareness in higher education. *Turkish Journal of Education*, *12*(2), 106–121. https://doi.org/10.19128/turje.1186875

Zorba, M. G., & Çakır, A. (2019). A case study on intercultural awareness of lower secondary school students in Turkey. *Novitas-ROYAL*, *13*(1), 62–83.

Zürcher, E. J. (1995). *Turkey: A modern history*. I. B. Tauris.