

## Original Paper

# Enhancing Cultural Intelligence and Interpersonal Communication: Multi-Authenticity Exposure in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Context

Anahid Bahrami<sup>1</sup> & Mehry Haddad Narafshan<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Foreign Languages, Kerman Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran

\* Mehry Haddad Narafshan, Department of Foreign Languages, Kerman Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran

Received: April 10, 2018

Accepted: May 20, 2018

Online Published: May 27, 2018

doi:10.22158/jecs.v2n2p87

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/jecs.v2n2p87>

### **Abstract**

*The current study focuses on authentic exposure, specifically whether multi-authentic tasks affect the nature of L2 learners' cultural intelligence and interpersonal communication in the English as a foreign language (EFL) context of Iran. To this end, sixty learners at an English language institute were assigned to control and experimental groups to carry out the M-A tasks. M-A was manipulated by assigning visual, aural, and printed tasks. Descriptive and inferential analyses of data, a comparison of the control and experimental groups over a four-month period, revealed that the implementation of authentic materials was successful in raising the cultural intelligence and interpersonal communication of EFL learners in the post-test. A subsequent ANOVA analysis showed that among M-A materials, visual was the most and aural was the least effective one increasing EFL learners' cultural intelligence. Moreover, the printed material was the most effective one to make a moderate change in interpersonal communication of the participants.*

### **Keywords**

*Authentic exposure, Cultural intelligence, EFL learners, interpersonal communication, Multi-Authenticity*

### **1. Introduction**

In today's globalized world, where people think and behave differently, individuals need to develop cultural intelligence (CQ) to act more effectively in diverse cultural settings (Kim, Yamaguchi, Kim, & Miyahara, 2015; Ward, Wilson, & Fischer, 2011). For this reason, cultural intelligence (CQ) has

attracted the attention of many scholars since globalization causes individuals to deal and interact with people from different cultural backgrounds (Zander, Mockaitis, & Butler, 2012). According to Ang et al. (2007), cultural intelligence focuses on the ability to behave properly in intercultural environments since cultural intelligent ones can understand the cultural differences and try to adapt themselves.

By the same token, one of the key factors to help learners respect a culturally different environment and adapt to it is CQ), and this is the reason why CQ studies constitute a step forward in cross-cultural research. Sharma and Hussain (2017) assert that CQ has become an essential skill for anyone to survive in diversities of intercultural situations. In effect, to avoid the potential consequences of the cultural gap in social interactions with people from different societies and cultures, CQ skills need to be applied (Ang, Van Dyne, & Rockstuhl, 2015; Earley, 2003). Some researchers, such as Thom and Inkson (2003) showed that cultural intelligence is best learned through experience since we are talking about some practical skills. For this reason, exposing the students to real life situations and challenges by presenting the authentic materials can increase their cultural intelligence.

Using authentic materials dates back to the onset of communicative movement in which there was an attempt to simulate real world features inside the classroom (Guariento & Morley, 2001; Lin, 2004). Richards (2001) states that the language which the learners are engaged with in the classroom must represent the language used in the real world preparing the students for real life skills and behaviors. And this sort of exposure seems to be emergent in EFL setting due to the lack of target language exposure. In like manner, the syllabus designers are advised to take into account the learners' social needs and provide them with the chance to be able to communicate the learned language in real social situations outside the school walls. Reading the references to authentic materials in English language teaching researches (Beresova, 2015; Grgurovic & Hegelheimer, 2007; Hayati & Mohmedi, 2011; Lee, 1995; Little, Devitt, & Singleton, 1998; Otte, 2006; Peacock, 1997; Thanajaro, 2000), it is clear that the authors who support the use of authentic materials have one idea in common: "exposure", or in other words, the benefits students get from being exposed to the language in authentic materials. Furthermore, Kilickaya (2004) states that nowadays there are a lot of voices suggesting that English language presented to the learners in the classroom should be authentic in order to enhance learners' practical learning process. The social success in interacting with neighbors, acquaintances, and people you meet in your daily life depends on your ability to understand and value the differences. Bambini (2009) argues simulation using authenticity imitates real-life situations and makes genuine phenomena and processes visible in fictional conditions. Research has indicated that simulation exercises improve students' interpersonal communication skills (Moule, 2008; Pearson & Mc Lafferty, 2011; Zavertrnik et al., 2010), cooperative skills, and interaction occurring between different professional groups (Berg et al., 2010; Brindley & Reynolds, 2011; Pearson & Mc Lafferty, 2011; Reese, 2010; Wagner et al., 2011). As has been noted, effective interaction is one of essential skills that language learners especially EFL ones need to learn. And high cultural intelligence containing the knowledge of intercultural diversities may help them to communicate more efficiently in the intended language. Keeping in view the overall

purpose of the present study to investigate the authentic exposure; the following research questions guided our study:

- 1) What effect do authentic materials have on learners' cultural intelligence?
- 2) How can authentic materials affect learners' cultural intelligence when the exposure has been multi-glossed?
- 3) What effect do authentic materials have on learners' interpersonal communication?
- 4) How can authentic materials affect learners' interpersonal communication when the exposure has been multi-glossed?

## 2. Literature Review

Culture affects individuals' behavior and reaction in social interactions (De Mooij, 2011). Thus, individuals follow different ways of behaving and thinking based on the cultural norms and values of their home country (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Lin, Chen and Song (2012) mention that cross-cultural misunderstandings easily affect people who are not aware of cultural diversities. Therefore, an understanding of such differences plays an essential role in social interactions especially for ones with limited intercultural exposure. Studies on CQ have mostly centered on showing CQ importance and its dimensions in adapting to different cultures (Ljubica & Dulcic, 2012; Rohmetra & Arora, 2012). Some of these studies have investigated the personal characteristics of openness to experience, risk orientation and need for control (Engle & Nehrt, 2012), self-efficacy (MacNab & Worthley, 2012), language skills or living in culturally different environments (Triandis, 2008), parental and educational experiences (Shannon & Begley, 2008), or the personality of the individual (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006; Shaffer & Miller, 2008). However, according to literature very few studies have examined how CQ can be acquired especially in EFL contexts.

Foreign language researchers have long believed that language and culture should be integrated in the language classroom (Cummins, 1979; Prodromou, 1992). Part of the reason for this integration is the fact that culture is inseparable from language. In like manner, Omaggio (1984) points out many EFL students find it difficult to develop good language skills because of cultural problems. Brooks (1968) looking into the relationship between language and culture, states that "non-native speakers of a language cannot completely understand what the new language means to the native speaker until they understand the cultural meaning he attaches to the words and phrases he uses" (p. 206). By the same token, Shanahan (1997, p. 168) states that "cultural content provides exposure to living language that foreign language students lacks". The reason for the use of cultural content in classroom is the idea that this exposure will also increase learners' motivation (McKay, 2000).

In view of this issue, it is necessary to understand why and how some individuals act successfully in an intercultural environment, while others do not. Sharma and Hussain (2017) believe that CQ has become an important skill for anyone to survive in intercultural contexts. CQ refers to the skill to behave effectively in intercultural settings, and subsequently to understand how to respond to a new cultural

environment (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008). This definition of CQ highlights an individual's ability to understand the challenges of a wide range of intercultural contexts (Ang et al., 2015). CQ comprises four components (Ng & Earley, 2006; Van Dyne & Ang, 2005) of metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral. The metacognitive dimension is a higher-order cognitive process. It is the mental ability of the individual to notice and understand cultural knowledge (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Ang et al., 2007; Earley, Ang, & Tan, 2006). Individuals with a high metacognitive component are aware of cultural differences and the cultural beliefs of different environments (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Ang et al., 2007). The cognitive dimension is an individual's general knowledge and the structure of their cultural knowledge regarding the standards, practices and values of different cultures (Ang et al., 2007; Ng & Earley, 2006). Ones with a high cognitive component understand cross-cultural similarities and differences (Brislín, Worthley, & McNab, 2006). The motivational dimension refers to the individual's interest and intention to adapt to an unfamiliar cultural environment (Deci & Ryan, 1985). The motivational component is a source of action that activates the force necessary to function effectively in situations characterized by cultural diversity (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Ang et al., 2007; Earley et al., 2006). The behavioral dimension is defined as the individual's ability to perform appropriate and effective verbal and non-verbal actions when interacting with people from diverse cultures (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Ang et al., 2007). In intercultural interactions, both verbal and non-verbal behaviors are important as they make a major part of the meaning interpreted by the other (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008). Those with a high level of CQ show flexibility in their intercultural relations and interact competently with ones from different cultures (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Ang et al., 2007; Earley et al., 2006; Ng & Earley, 2006; Thomas, 2006). All things considered, to be culturally intelligent, a person must possess all four components of CQ (Earley & Peterson, 2004; Van Dyne, Ang, & Livermore, 2010). Additionally, some authors have highlighted the need for further research into CQ to better understand both its antecedents and consequences (Ang, Van Dyne, & Tan, 2011; Arora & Rohmetra, 2010).

In effect, there has been increasing theoretical and empirical interest in the study of intercultural experience (Carpenter, Sanders, & Gregersen, 2001). Many of these intercultural studies look at the results of international experience at both personal and professional level (Carpenter, 2002). Intercultural experience helps individuals to acquire knowledge, skills and behaviors that are essential for living and working in different cultural settings (Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Chua, 1988). Since there is no chance of such intercultural experience in EFL environments, authentic materials can be used to expose the learners to target culture norms and standards. Kelly, Offner and Vorland (2002) mention that authentic materials are useful means to bridge the gap between classroom and the real world environment. This is also mentioned by MacDonald et al. (2006) who state if there is a correspondence between the texts used by teachers in the classrooms and kinds of texts used in the real world, in this case, these texts can be regarded authentic.

To recognize better the complexity of authentic materials, McGrath (2002) asserts that there are eight

criteria to be considered when choosing appropriate authentic texts: relevance to course book and learners' needs, topic interest, cultural fitness, logistical considerations, cognitive demands, linguistic demands, quality and exploitability. Offner and Vorland (2002) define authentic materials as the designed materials for native speakers that can be used in classrooms to bridge the gap between the class and real life. In the same fashion, Genhard (1996) classifies authentic materials into three categories of multi authenticity. First, authentic aural materials like phone messages, radio broadcasts, and podcasts. Second, Authentic visual material like street signs, magazines, newspapers pictures, postcards and ATM screens. And third, Authentic printed materials like sports reports, newspapers, restaurant menus, train tickets, packing slips, and Web sites.

Although a lot of researchers argued that authentic materials have made a noticeable contribution in foreign language teaching and learning (Beresovaa, 2015; Bajramia & Ismailia, 2016; Gonz ález Otero, 2016; Styati, 2016; Castillo Losada, 2017), there are some scholars who argued against these materials as they believed educational materials should be simplified. For instance, Kilickaya (2004) claims that authentic materials add a burden on teachers, as they may contain difficult vocabulary and structures which need more effort to be simplified and explained to make them appropriate for their learners. In contrast, Maghsoudi (2014) concludes that authentic materials have benefits for EFL classrooms considering the lack of real opportunities that existed for learners to be encountered with while learning. Moreover, Zhafarghandi (2014) confirms that using authentic materials make students interested in language learning. The students' positive attitudes toward language learning were based on the advantages of authentic materials brought into instruction context.

Reviewing the literature, it can be found that the advantages of using authentic materials in teaching learners in EFL classrooms outweigh the disadvantages. Authentic English materials bring the real situations to the class that may differ among other cultures, and motivate students to learn and value the differences. Consequently, motivated learners who know the norms of a country will behave more appropriately in desired situations. For the reasons outlined above, the area of second or foreign language acquisition (S/FLA) would clearly benefit from the examination of multi authenticity exposure.

### **3. Theoretical Framework of the Study**

Based on the above literature, Lave' situated learning theory (1988) builds the foundation for utilizing authentic materials with language learners. Situated Learning Theory by Lave (1988), in contrast with most classroom learning activities that present theoretical knowledge which is out of the context, mentions that learning should be embedded within activity, context and culture. Lave and Wenger (1991) declare that learning should not be a de-contextualized transmission of theoretical knowledge from one individual to another, but a social process whereby knowledge is co-constructed. Hence, it focuses on the role of the context and situation in language learning and knowledge construction. In effect, learners become involved in a community of practice which embodies certain beliefs and

behaviors to be acquired. Utilizing Lave (1988) situated learning theory as the theoretical framework and incorporating multi-authentic materials, we postulate that foreign language learners in Iran, an EFL context, will experience a unique chance of change in their cultural intelligence and interpersonal communication after a period of M-A exposure.

#### **4. Method**

##### *4.1 Participants*

To test the hypotheses underpinning our research model, we collected data from 75 intermediate female (15-19 years old) EFL students in an English language institute in Rafsanjan. They were all judged to be at the intermediate level based on the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) they took at the beginning of the study. After administrating the OPT, a number of 15 students who couldn't get the desired score were omitted. Consequently, the number of students reduced to 60 intermediate students who were assigned to the three experimental and one control group (15 students in each group). The students were all informed of the research study on the first day of classes, and asked to complete the consent form only after being fully informed about the study.

##### *4.2 Instruments*

To assess the learners' cultural intelligence, we used the 20-item CQ questionnaire developed by Ang et al. (2007). This questionnaire includes five items for motivational CQ, six items for cognitive CQ, four items for metacognitive CQ and five items for behavioral CQ. A five-point Likert scale was used, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. A high score indicated that an individual could better understand new cultures, and behave appropriately and effectively in other cultures outside his or her own accustomed environment. The Cronbach's alpha reliability of the four dimensions of CQ in the present study ranged from 0.78 to 0.86.

The interpersonal communication scale was adopted from Steinwachs (2010). A total of 24 IC items were incorporated in this scale. All items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). And the Cronbach's alpha of the interpersonal questionnaire was 0.82 that showed the high internal consistency and reliability of the questionnaire. Both questionnaires were translated into Persian in order to avoid misunderstanding for the students, and back-translation was conducted to ensure reliability and validity. Before data collection began, a pilot study was undertaken to examine the appropriateness of the wording and the meaning of items in the questionnaire. For the pilot study, 10 students attending the classes of one of the authors of the present study were invited to answer the questionnaires, and these 10 pilot test samples were excluded from the final study.

##### *4.3 Research Procedure*

Participants completed the cultural intelligence and interpersonal communication questionnaire at the beginning and the end of their semester (four months). We collected data only from two time points because the study period was short. Over one semester (four months), the experimental groups were given daily tasks in addition to their assigned course book. During this period, the control group was

given instructional teacher-made tasks. Each task corresponded to the topic and language of one unit of the course book. Progress was evaluated by comparing the cultural intelligence and interpersonal communication of experimental and control groups. Following steps were implemented during the course in the experimental groups:

#### 4.3.1 Pre Exposure Stage

At the beginning of the activity, the teacher introduced the topic and gave the students clear instructions on what they had to do at the exposure stage. The students discussed the topic following different ways of behaving and thinking based on the cultural norms of their home country.

#### 4.3.2 Exposure Stage

This stage began by presenting the tasks. During this step, the teacher asked the learners just to watch or read the materials. The researcher used the aural materials like news and podcasts in A-authentic class, the visual materials like magazines or newspapers pictures and mute video clips in V-authentic class, and printed materials like newspaper and website texts were used in P-authentic class.

#### 4.3.3 Post Exposure Stage

The teacher encouraged the students to freely discover the similarities and differences between their own and other cultures. The students conversed about the changes that had taken place in their attitudes and beliefs, and these discoveries provided time for learners to consider, evaluate, and understand cross-cultural similarities and diversities.

## 5. Results

A basic quantitative research design was adopted to collect and analyse the data in the present study. First we present descriptive statistics of all the variables examined (Table 1).

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables**

Time	Group Statistics	Control (N1 = 15)		Experimental 1 “aural Material” (N2 = 15)		Experimental 2 “printed Material” (N3 = 15)		Experimental 3 “Visual Material” (N3 = 15)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
pre-test	Variable								
	Cultural Intelligence	59.60	4.95	56.93	6.06	57.93	4.93	58.20	6.47
	Interpersonal Communication	70.87	13.03	69.93	13.01	74.73	12.38	67.87	10.91
post-test	Cultural Intelligence	61.60	6.22	64.20	5.57	69	3.44	72.13	5.34
	Interpersonal Communication	71.27	13.05	75.93	12.53	80.20	9.67	78.47	8.68

To identify whether a significant change occurred in the cultural intelligence of each group between the beginning and the end of the study, we conducted paired samples t-tests. The result of the paired samples t-test analysis (Table 2) did not show a significant difference of cultural intelligence in the mean scores for the beginning ( $M_1 = 59.60$ ,  $SD_1 = 4.95$ ) and end of the study for control group ( $M_2 = 61.60$ ,  $SD_2 = 6.22$ ),  $t = -1.76$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > 0.05$ . But the results strongly confirmed a significant difference in the mean scores for experimental groups, Aural authentic class in the beginning ( $M_1 = 56.93$ ,  $SD_1 = 6.06$ ), and end of the study ( $M_2 = 64.20$ ,  $SD_2 = 5.57$ ),  $t = -5.33$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $P < 0.01$ , and the effect size was  $ES = 1.25$  and  $r = 0.53$ . Printed authentic material in the beginning ( $M_1 = 57.93$ ,  $SD_1 = 4.93$ ), and end of the study ( $M_2 = 69$ ,  $SD_2 = 3.44$ ),  $t = -7.82$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $P < 0.01$ , and the effect size was  $ES = 2.64$  and  $r = 0.80$ . Visual authentic material in the beginning ( $M_1 = 58.20$ ,  $SD_1 = 6.47$ ), and end of the study ( $M_2 = 72.13$ ,  $SD_2 = 5.34$ ),  $t = -9.99$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $P < 0.01$ , and the effect size was  $ES = 2.36$  and  $r = 0.76$ .

To investigate the difference between cultural intelligence of experimental groups (Aural, Visual & Printed) and control group in the beginning of the study, (P-Value of Test of Homogeneity of Variances =  $0.3 > \alpha = 0.05$ ) One way ANOVA Test was used (Table 3). Regarding the result, ( $F = 0.57$ ,  $df_1 = 3$ ,  $df_2 = 56$ ) (P-Value = 0.6), it can be said that the cultural intelligence of experimental groups (Aural, Printed & Visual) and control group wasn't significantly different in the beginning of the study. To investigate the difference between cultural intelligence of experimental groups (Aural, Visual & Printed) and control group at the end of the study, (P-Value of Test of Homogeneity of Variances =  $0.1 > \alpha = 0.05$ ) One-way ANOVA Test was used (Table 3). Regarding the result, ( $F = 12.18$ ,  $df_1 = 3$ ,  $df_2 = 56$ ) (P-Value = 0.0005), it can be said that the cultural intelligence of experimental groups (Aural, Printed & Visual) and control group was significantly different at the end of the study.

To investigate the cultural intelligence differences between groups, Post Hoc Test (turkey HSD) (Table 4) was used. According to the results, the cultural intelligence in printed experimental group ( $\Delta M = -7.40$ , P-Value  $< 0.01$ ) and visual group ( $\Delta M = -10.53$ , P-Value  $< 0.01$ ) was different. Also the cultural intelligence between the experimental groups of aural and visual ( $\Delta M = -7.93$ , P-Value  $< 0.01$ ) was significantly different.

**Table 2. Paired-Samples T Test of Cultural Intelligence**

Time	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	T-Test	df	P-Value
<b>C-G</b>						
pre-test	15	59.60	4.95	-1.76	14	0.1
post-test	15	61.60	6.22			
<b>A-G</b>						
pre-test	15	56.93	6.06	-5.33	14	0.0005
post-test	15	64.20	5.57			
<b>P-G</b>						
	15	57.93	4.93	-7.82	14	0.0005



<b>pre-test</b>						
<b>post-test</b>	15	69.0	3.44			
<b>V-G</b>						
<b>pre-test</b>	15	58.20	6.47	-9.99	14	0.0005
<b>post-test</b>	15	72.13	5.34			

**Table 3. One-Way ANOVA Test of Cultural Intelligence**

Model (Pre)	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P-Value
Between Groups	372.32	3	124.11		
Within Groups	8557.33	56	152.81	0.81	0.5
Total	8929.65	59			
Between Groups	1006	3	335.33		
Within Groups	1541.73	56	27.53	12.18	0.0005
Total	2547.73	59			

**Table 4. Post Hoc Test of Cultural Intelligence**

Group	N	Mean	Mean Difference	P-Value
Control	15	61.60	-2.60	0.5
Aural	15	64.20		
Control	15	61.60	-10.53	0.0005
Visual	15	72.13		
Aural	15	64.20	-4.80	0.07
Printed	15	69.0		
Aural	15	64.20	-7.93	0.001
Visual	15	72.13		
Visual	15	72.13	3.13	0.4
Printed	15	69.0		

Paired samples t-test was conducted to compare the control and experimental groups' interpersonal communication at the beginning and end of the study to ensure the groups were at a comparable level. The result of the paired samples t-test analysis did not show a significant difference of interpersonal communication in the mean scores at the beginning ( $M_1 = 70.87$ ,  $SD_1 = 13.03$ ) and end of study for control group ( $M_2 = 71.27$ ,  $SD_2 = 13.05$ ),  $t = -0.43$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > 0.05$ . But the results strongly confirmed a significant difference in the mean scores for experimental groups, Aural authentic class at the beginning ( $M_1 = 69.93$ ,  $SD_1 = 13.01$ ), and end of the study ( $M_2 = 75.93$ ,  $SD_2 = 12.53$ ),  $t = -4.88$ ,  $df = 14$ .  $P < 0.01$ , and the effect size was  $ES = 0.47$  and  $r = 0.23$ . Printed authentic material at the beginning ( $M_1 = 74.73$ ,  $SD_1 = 12.38$ ), and end of the study ( $M_2 = 80.20$ ,  $SD_2 = 9.67$ ),  $t = -2.08$ ,  $df = 14$ .  $P > 0.05$ , and the effect size was  $ES = 2.64$  and  $r = 0.80$ . Visual authentic material at the beginning ( $M_1 = 67.87$ ,  $SD_1 = 10.91$ ), and end of the study ( $M_2 = 78.47$ ,  $SD_2 = 8.68$ ),  $t = -5.74$ ,  $df = 14$ .  $P < 0.01$ , and

the effect size was  $ES = 1.08$  and  $r = 0.48$ .

To investigate the difference between Interpersonal Communication of experimental groups (Aural, Visual & Printed) and control group at the beginning of the study, (P-Value of Test of Homogeneity of Variances =  $0.8 > \alpha = 0.05$ ), One-way ANOVA Test was used (Table 6). Regarding the result, ( $F = 0.81$ ,  $df_1 = 3$ ,  $df_2 = 56$ ) (P-Value = 0.5), it can be said that the interpersonal communication of experimental groups (Aural, Printed & Visual) and control group wasn't significantly different at the beginning of the study. To investigate the difference between Interpersonal Communication of experimental groups (Aural, Visual & Printed) and control group at the end of the study, (P-Value of Test of Homogeneity of Variances =  $0.3 > \alpha = 0.05$ ), One way ANOVA Test was used (Table 6). Regarding the result, ( $F = 1.83$ ,  $df_1 = 3$ ,  $df_2 = 56$ ) (P-Value = 0.2), it can be said that the interpersonal communication of experimental groups (Aural, Printed & Visual) and control group wasn't significantly different at the end of the study showing a moderate change of interpersonal communication for experimental groups.

**Table 5. Paired-Samples T Test of Interpersonal Communication**

Time	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	T-Test	df	P-Value
<b>CG</b>						
<b>pre-test</b>	15	70.87	13.03	-0.43	14	0.7
<b>post-test</b>	15	71.27	13.05			
<b>CG</b>						
<b>pre-test</b>	15	70.87	13.03	-0.43	14	0.7
<b>post-test</b>	15	71.27	13.05			
<b>A.G</b>						
<b>pre-test</b>	15	69.93	13.01	-4.88	14	0.0005
<b>post-test</b>	15	75.93	12.53			
<b>P-G</b>						
<b>pre-test</b>	15	74.73	12.38	-2.08	14	0.06
<b>post-test</b>	15	80.20	9.			
<b>CG</b>						
<b>pre-test</b>	15	67.87	10.47	-5.74	14	0.0005
<b>post-test</b>	15	78.47	8.68			

**Table 6. One-Way ANOVA Test of Interpersonal Communication**

Model (Pre)	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P-Value
Between Groups	372.32	3	124.11		
Within Groups	8557.33	56	152.81	0.81	0.5
Total	8929.65	59			
Between Groups	678.93	3	226.31		
Within Groups	6946	56	124.04	1.83	0.02
Total	7624.93	59			

## 6. Discussion

As mentioned earlier, the present study investigated the effectiveness of implementing a multi-authentic model in EFL classes. Regarding the first and second research questions—What effect do authentic materials have on learners' cultural intelligence/How can authentic materials affect learners' cultural intelligence when the exposure has been multi-glossed—the results in Tables 1-4 contributed to shed some light that using the M-authentic materials can boost cultural intelligence of EFL learners. The positive improvement in the cultural intelligence of the experimental groups in this study supports findings in Garcia (1991) and Sherman (2003), according to which learners' cultural knowledge significantly improves after being exposed to authentic input which is a window into other cultures. Teaching culture in EFL classrooms helps the learners achieve a better understanding of the English language and also motivates them toward learning and using the language in social interactions. It means through using authentic materials, the learners will not encounter only the artificial language of the classroom but also the real world language. A subsequent ANOVA analysis revealed that among the M-authentic materials, visual was the most and aural was the least effective one increasing EFL learners' cultural intelligence. The present study illustrated that the use of pictures helps students to see clearly the cultural aspects found in the countries of the target language since the visual cues found in pictures are greatly informative and enhance EFL learners' cultural comprehension.

Regarding the third and fourth research questions—What effect do authentic materials have on learners' interpersonal communication/How can authentic materials affect learners' interpersonal communication when the exposure has been multi-glossed—survey findings in Tables 1-5-6 showed moderate effects on interpersonal communication of EFL learners. Teaching culture guarantees a successful cultural communication in real social situations and this happens when learners are exposed to authentic materials that are organized for native speakers. The present study in line with some other studies (Nuttall, 1996; Vale, 1999; Guariento & Morley, 2001; Moule, 2008; Zaverjnik et al., 2010; Berg et al., 2010; Reese, 2010; Brindley & Reynolds, 2011; Pearson & Mc Lafferty, 2011; Reising et al., 2011; Wagner et al., 2011) found that using authentic materials was moderately effective to increase EFL learners' interpersonal communication. Moreover, the printed material was the most effective one to make a moderate change in the interpersonal communication of the participants.

## 7. Conclusion

This study has investigated whether the use of M-A materials can contribute to improve EFL learners' cultural intelligence and can positively impact on learners' interpersonal communication. Evidence from this study revealed that authentic materials increased the cultural intelligence and interpersonal communication of the learners. The current study, following Maghsoudi (2014), shows that authentic materials have benefits for EFL classrooms considering the lack of real life opportunities that exist for learners to be encountered with while learning. Moreover, teaching culture ensures a successful interpersonal communication in real situations and this happens when learners acquire social life skills.

Hence, individuals need to develop cultural intelligence (CQ) to behave more effectively in new cultural settings (Kim, Yamaguchi, Kim, & Miyahara, 2015; Ward, Wilson, & Fischer, 2011). The statistics in this study show that the learners get something outside the controlled language learning environment since authentic materials bridge the gap between the classroom and the world outside. The results of this study offer significant insights into how multiple authenticity exposure can increase EFL learners' CQ and IC. In today's globalized world, geographical location is no longer a barrier for people from different cultures to interact with one another. In addition, the emergence of information technology emphasizes the significance of CQ in ELT especially in EFL environments.

Although this study successfully investigated the demanded topic, the findings should be viewed in light of its limitations. According to the rules and regulations of the institute, it wasn't possible for the researcher to choose all students randomly as the study participants. Additionally, some students were biased towards learning English culture and persuading them to cooperate with the teacher was not ethical. Accessing and finding right authentic materials with the same subject and the same level for some topics was not appropriately conducted. The findings of this study are limited to self-report instruments. In order to measure CQ and IC more accurately, interviews and observations need to be included as well. As this is one of the few empirical studies to examine the multi-authenticity exposure, a great deal of future research is necessary to determine if the findings of this study will be sustained. This study offers initial evidence that the multi-authenticity exposure do indeed enhance the cultural intelligence and interpersonal communication of learners and provides a starting point for further research on cultural intelligence and interpersonal communication within the EFL contexts. Future studies should also test the generalizability of the effects among other populations.

## References

- Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2015). Cultural intelligence: Origins, conceptualization, evolution and methodological diversity. In *Handbook of Advances in Culture and Psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 273-323). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook on cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement and applications*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(1), 100-123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275267>
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K., Templer, K. J., & Tay, C. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3, 335-371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x>
- Arora, P., & Rohmetra, N. (2010). Cultural Intelligence: Leveraging Differences to Bridge the Gap in the International Hospitality Industry. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 6(5),

216-234.

- Bajramia, L., & Ismailia, M. (2016). The Role of Video Materials in EFL Classrooms. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 23(2), 502-506. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.068>
- Bambini, D. (2009). Outcomes of clinical simulation for novice nursing students: Communication, confidence, clinical judgment. *Nurs Educ Perspect*, 30(2), 79-82.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy and health behavior. In A. Baum, S. Newman, J. Wienman, R. West, & C. McManus (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of psychology, health and medicine* (pp. 160-162). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beresova, J. (2015). Authentic Materials—Enhancing Language Acquisition and Cultural Awareness. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 195-204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.028>
- Berg, B. (2010). Technology-enabled interprofessional education for nursing and medical students: A pilot study. *J. Interprof. Care*, 24, 601-604. <https://doi.org/10.3109/13561820903373194>
- Brindley, P. G., & Reynolds, S. F. (2011). Improving verbal communication in critical care medicine. *J Crit Care*, 26(2), 155-159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2011.03.004>
- Brislin, R., Worthley, R., & MacNab, B. (2006). Cultural intelligence: Understanding behaviors that serve people's goals. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 40-55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275262>
- Brooks, W. D., & Heath, R. W. (1993). *Speech Communication*. Published by William C. Brown.
- Burleson, B. R. (2010). The nature of interpersonal communication. A message-centered approach. *The handbook of communication science* (2nd ed., pp. 145-164). Los Angeles, CA.
- Carpenter, M. A. (2002). Top management team compensation: The missing link between CEO pay and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23, 367-375. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.228>
- Carpenter, M. A., Sanders, W. G., & Gregersen, H. B. (2001). Bundling human capital with organizational context: The impact of international assignment experience on multinational firm performance and CEO pay. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 493-511.
- Castillo Losada, C. A., Insuasty, E. A., & Jaime Osorio, M. F. (2017). The impact of authentic materials and tasks on students' communicative competence at a Colombian language school. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 19(1), 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v19n1.56763>
- Chen, X., Liu, D., & Portnoy, R. (2012). A multilevel investigation of motivational Cultural Intelligence, organizational diversity climate and cultural sales: Evidence from U.S. real estate firms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 93-106. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024697>
- Clark, R., & Lyons, C. (1989). *Graphics for learning*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Cronin, M., & Myers, S. (1997). The effects of visuals versus no visuals on learning outcomes from Interactive multimedia instruction. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 8(2), 46-71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02948602>
- Crozet, C., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2000). Teaching culture as an integrated part of language: Implications

- for the aims, approaches and pedagogies of language teaching. In C. Crozet, & A. Liddicoat (Eds.), *Teaching languages, teaching cultures*. Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Reviews of Educational Research*, 49(2), 222-251. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543049002222>
- De Mooij, M. (2011). *Consumer behavior and culture: Consequences for global marketing and advertising* (p. 400). USA, UK: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Earley, P. C., & Peterson, R. S. (2004). The elusive cultural chameleon: Cultural intelligence as a new approach to intercultural training for the global manager. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3, 100-115. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2004.12436826>
- Earley, P. C., Ang, S., & Tan, J. S. (2006). *CQ: Developing cultural intelligence at work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Business Books.
- Engle, R., & Nehrt, C. C. (2012). Antecedents of cultural intelligence: The role of risk, control, and openness in France and the United States. *Journal of Management Policy & Practice*, 13, 35-47.
- Garcia, E. (1991). Education of linguistically and culturally diverse students: Effective instructional practices. *National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning*.
- Genhard, J. G. (1996). *Teaching English as a foreign language: A teacher self-development and methodology*. Ann arbor: the university of Michigan press.
- Gibson, E. J., & Levin, H. (1975). *The psychology of reading*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- González Otero, R. (2016). Innovative resources based on ICTs and authentic materials to improve EFL students' communicative needs. In A. Pareja-Lora, C. Calle-Martínez, & P. Rodríguez-Arancón (Eds.), *New perspectives on teaching and working with languages in the digital era* (pp. 83-93).
- Grgurovic, M., & Hegelheimer, V. (2007). Help options and multimedia listening: Students' use of subtitles and the transcript. *Language Learning & Technology*.
- Guariento, W., & Morley, J. (2001). Text and Task Authenticity in the EFL Classroom in *ELT Journal*, 55(4), 347-353.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Ting-Toomey, S., & Chua, E. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Guest, D. (2002). Human Resource Management, Corporate Performance and Employee Well-being: Building the Worker into HRM. *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44(3), 335-358. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1472-9296.00053>
- Hayati, A., & Mohmedi, F. (2011). A comparative study of using bilingual and monolingual dictionaries in reading comprehension of intermediate EFL students. *Desalin Water Treatment*, 47(1-3), 322-333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19443994.2012.696429>

- Hofstede, G. H., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Huff, K. (2013). Language, cultural intelligence, and expatriate success. *Management Research Review* (advance online publication).
- Kelly, C., Kelly L., Offner, M., & Vorland, B. (2002). Effective ways to use authentic materials with ESL/EFL students. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 8(11).
- Khodadady, & Hassanzade, S. (2014). Cognitive styles and performance on schema-based cloze multiple choice item tests: A fairness issue. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(3).
- Kilickaya, F. (2004). Authentic materials and culture content in EFL classrooms. *The Internet ELT Journal*, 10(7).
- Kim, E. J., Yamaguchi, A., Kim, M. S., & Miyahara, A. (2015). Effects of taking conflict personally on conflict management styles across cultures. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 72(2015), 143-149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.08.004>
- Lee, J. F. (1995). Authenticity revisited: Text authenticity and learner authenticity. *ELT Journal*, 49(4), 325-328. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.4.323>
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2004). Intercultural language teaching: Principles for practice. *The New Zealand Language Teacher*, 30, 17-23.
- Liddicoat, A. J., Papademetre, L., Scarino, A., & Kohler, M. (2003). *Report on intercultural language learning*. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training.
- Lin, S. M. (2004). *Use of Mixture models in MALDI-TOF proteomic data for peak registration*. In Proceedings of the CBGI.
- Lin, Y. C., Chen, A. S., & Song, Y. C. (2012). Does your intelligence help to survive in a foreign jungle? The effects of cultural intelligence and emotional intelligence on cross-cultural adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36(4), 541-552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2012.03.001>
- Little, D., Devitt, S., & Singleton, D. (1998). *Authentic texts in Foreign language teaching, Theory and Practice, Dublin, Authentic*.
- Livermore, D. (2011). *The cultural intelligence difference: Master the one skill you can't do without in today's global economy*. AMACOM Div American Management Association.
- Ljubica, J., & Dulcic, D. (2012). The role of cultural intelligence (CQ) in the strategy D.M. Fr ás-Jamilena et al. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, formulation process: Application to the hotel industry. *Annals and Proceedings of DAAAM International*, 23, 1.
- MacDonald, M. N., Badger, R., & Dasli, M. (2006). Authenticity, culture and language learning. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 6(3&4), 226-250. <https://doi.org/10.2167/laic252.0>
- MacNab, B. R., & Worthley, R. (2012). Individual characteristics as predictors of cultural intelligence development: The relevance of self-efficacy. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36(1), 62-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.12.001>

- Maghsoudi, M. (2014). The affect of authentic vs. non-authentic materials on Iranian EFL learners' listening comprehension ability. *International journal of applied linguistics & English literature*.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials Evaluation Design for Language Teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mckay, S. (2000). Reading culture in TV commercials a semiotic analysis of a TV commercial for the purpose of teaching culture to foreign language students. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, 2(1).
- Morra, S. (1989). *Developmental differences in the use of verbatim versus spatial representations in the recall of spatial descriptions: A probabilistic model and an experimental analysis* (Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 37-55).
- Moule, P. (2008). Challenging the five-stage model for e-learning: A new approach. *ALT-J*, 15(1), 39-52.
- Myers, M. (1997). *Interpretive Research in Information Systems*. In J. Mingers, & F. Stowell (Eds.), *Information Systems: An Emerging Discipline* (pp. 239-266). McGraw-Hill, London.
- Ng, K. Y., & Earley, C. P. (2006). Culture and intelligence: Old constructs, new frontiers. *Group and Organization Management*, 31, 4-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275251>
- Ng, K. Y., Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Ryan, A. M. (2012). Cultural intelligence: A review, reflections and recommendations for future research. In A. M. Ryan, F. T. I. Leong, & F. L. Oswald (Eds.), *Conducting multinational research projects in organizational psychology*. Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association.
- Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching Reading Skills in a foreign language (New Edition)*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Omaggio, A. C. (1984). The proficiency oriented classroom. In T. V. Higgs (Ed.), *Teaching for proficiency: The organizing principle* (pp. 43-84). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Otte, J. (2006). *Real language to real people: A descriptive and exploratory case study of the outcomes of aural authentic texts on the listening comprehension of adult ESL students enrolled in an advanced ESL listening course*. Dissertation Abstracts International.
- Peacock, M. (1997). The effect of authentic materials on the motivation of EFL learners. *ELT Journal*, 51(2), 144-156. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/51.2.144>
- Pearson, E., & McLafferty, I. (2011). The use of simulation as a learning approach to nontechnical skills awareness in final year nurse students. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 11(6), 399-405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2011.03.023>
- Phillips, M. K., & Shettlesworth, C. C. (1978). How to arm your students: A consideration of two approaches to providing materials. In J. Swales (Ed.), *Episodes in ESP: A source and reference book on the development of English for science and technology* (pp. 105-111). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Piller, I. (2007). *Linguistics and Intercultural Communication*. Language and Linguistics Compass.



- Presbitero, A. (2016). Cultural intelligence (CQ) in virtual, cross-cultural interactions: Generalizability of measure and links to personality dimensions and task performance. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*.
- Prodromou, L. (1992). What culture? Which culture? Cross-cultural factors in language learning. *ELT Journal*, 46(1), 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.1.39>
- Reese, C. E. (2010). Learning together: Using simulations to develop collaboration. *Nurs. EDUC. Perspect*, 31(1), 33-37.
- Reising, D. L. (2011). *Instructor characteristics that promote quality clinical experiences*. Presented at the National League for Nursing Educational Summit, Orlando, FL.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Postscript: The ideology of TESOL*. Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rohmetra, N., & Arora, P. (2012). The interface between cultural intelligence and customer satisfaction: The hospitality “perspective”. *International Journal of Engineering and Industrial Management*, 4.
- Shaffer, M., & Miller, G. (2008). Cultural intelligence: A key success factor for expatriates. In S. Ang, & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook on cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement and applications* (pp. 107-125). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Shanahan, A. (1997). The challenge of assessing cultural understanding in the context of foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(1), 9-26.
- Shannon, L. M., & Begley, T. M. (2008). Antecedents of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. In S. Ang, & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.
- Sharma, N., & Hussain, D. (2017). Current status and future directions for cultural intelligence. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 46(1), 96-110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2016.1264444>
- Sherman, L. W. (2003). Misleading Evidence and Evidence-Led Policy: Making Social Science More Experimental. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 589, 6-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203256266>
- Styati, E. W. (2016). Digital Photographs as Authentic Materials in Teaching Writing. *The 4th International Conference on Language, Society and Culture in Asian Contexts, KnE Social Sciences*, 70-78.
- Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2006). Motivational cultural intelligence, realistic job preview, realistic living conditions preview, and cross-cultural adjustment. *Group & Organization Management*, 31, 154-173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275293>
- Thanajaro, M. (2000). *Using authentic materials to develop listening comprehension in the English as a foreign language classroom*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

- Thomas, D. (2006). Domain development of Cultural Intelligence: The importance of mindfulness, *Group and Organization Management*, 31(78), 78-99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275266>
- Thomas, D.C., & Inkson, K. (2006). People skills for a global workplace. *Consulting to Management*, 16(1), 5-9.
- Triandis, H. C. (2008). Cultural intelligence. In S. Ang, & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement and applications* (pp. xi–xiii). London: M.E. Sharpe.
- Vale, D. (1999). *Teaching Children English: A training course for teachers of English to children*. Cambridge University press.
- Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (2005). *Cultural Intelligence: An essential capability for individuals in contemporary organizations*. Singapore: Michigan State University and Nanyang Technological University.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Livermore, D. (2010). Cultural intelligence: A pathway for leading in a rapidly globalizing world. In K. Hannum, B. B. McFeeters, & L. Booyen (Eds.), *Leading across differences*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Vethamani, M. E., & Nair, P. (2009). Multiple Responses to Verbal Discourse in the Reading of Literary Texts. *International Education Studies Journal*, 2(4), 182-194. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v2n4p182>
- Wagner, J. (2011). Developing interprofessional communication skills. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 6, 97-101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2010.12.003>
- Ward, C., Fischer, R., Lam, F. S. Z., & Hall, L. (2009). The convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of scores on a self-report measure of cultural intelligence. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 69, 85-105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164408322001>
- Ward, C., Wilson, J., & Fischer, R. (2011). Assessing the predictive validity of cultural intelligence over time. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 138-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.03.032>
- Watson, G., Butterfield, J., Curran, R., & Craig, C. (2010). Do dynamic work instructions provide an advantage over static instructions in a small scale assembly task? *Learn Instruction*, 20(1), 84-93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.05.001>
- Zander, L., Mockaitis, A. I., & Butler, C. L. (2012). Leading global teams. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 592-603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2012.01.012>
- Zavertnik, J. E. (2010). Innovative Approaches to Teaching Communication Skills to Nursing Students. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 49(2), 65-71. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20090918-06>
- Zhafarghandi, A. M. (2014). A Survey of Iranian EFL Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions toward Authentic Listening Materials at University Level. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*.