

Croatian Journal of Education
Vol.18; No.3/2016, pages: 837-857
Preliminary communication
Paper submitted: 18th February 2015
Paper accepted: 19th May 2015
doi: 10.15516/cje.v18i3.1751

Intercultural Sensitivity of Teachers

Dijana Drandić

Academy of Music, Juraj Dobrila University of Pula

Abstract

The aim of the empirical research, conducted in the primary schools in the city of Pula and described in the current paper, was to examine (1) whether or not the teachers were interculturally sensitive and, if yes, to what extent, and (2) whether or not the teachers' intercultural sensitivity was affected by the factors, such as: their professional qualifications (class teaching – subject teaching), gender (male – female), school location (central or branch school) and years of service (up to 10 years, 11-20 years, and more than 20 years). The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale – ISS by Chen and Starosta (2000) was used as a measuring instrument here. This scale measures the intercultural sensitivity by focusing on 24 dependent items (variables/statements) linked to 4 independent variables and, thus, defining examinees. The results, obtained through the frequency analysis and the Chi-square test, as well as through the analysis of some statistically relevant figures (significance level 5%), suggest that – in terms of intercultural sensitivity – no statistically relevant difference subsists between the teachers. The participants proved to be interculturally sensitive; their professional qualifications, gender, school location and years of service did not affect their intercultural sensitivity level. Moreover, the research was also used to check the validity and reliability of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale within the context of the Croatian educational system.

Key words: *interaction between culturally diverse individuals; intercultural competence; student; teacher.*

Introduction

Given the fact that the intercultural education is a process of which the objective is to provide equal educational opportunities, regardless of the race, nationality, language, ethnicity, class, gender, physical or cultural differences, it is subject to a continuous change and constant learning about co-existence, cooperation, tolerance

and equality. Besides all this, in the learning process students should not be separated from their own cultural and ethnic origins. Nonetheless, teachers should make them aware that they do share lives with the members of other cultures characterised by features and lifestyles which differ one from another (Mesić, 2008, p. 147). Therefore, the intercultural approach to education is focused on learning, comprehension and acceptance of the values of different cultures, since, as stated in Čačić-Kumpes (2004), each single culture has its respectable peculiarities which are a priori equally valuable and do not endanger each other in any way. The intercultural education is essentially an education that embraces all the differences, contributing thus to equality and justice, also preparing students for life in a multicultural and democratic society.

Nieto (2005) claims that schools are the places where education and democracy take place for the benefit of students with no regard to differences among them. Creating a new model with highly qualified teachers is becoming first of all a necessity, and an intellectual and a political issue that is closely related to social justice and equality. Those highly qualified teachers should be able to educate some *new majority*, represented, for example, by racial and ethnic minorities, immigrants, emigrants, and marginalised students with different origins. Additionally, Nieto (2005) assumes that addressing students and their families with negative perceptions, moralising approaches, prejudices and racist attitudes should be overcome by the constant professional development of teachers, referred to by Nieto as “the enthusiasts of lifelong learning”. Gundara (2000) introduces the term intercultural science into the education plan, and determines it as a science about the others, and different individuals, about strengthening positive relationships, overcoming barriers and the right of each individual to be different and not discriminated. That kind of intercultural education, claims Gundara (2000), aims at creating community, tolerance, reciprocity, equality, inter-dependence and solidarity alongside with the continuous education and development of teachers.

In fact, “interculturalism is not a new culture which, performing as a global one, would manage to replace old ethnic and national cultures, and least of all their languages with a new global one. It is not a new race, a new ethos, a new class, elite or a new Brahmins caste. It is rather a form of augmented comprehension and communication skills between irreducible differences,” explains Katunarić (1994, p. 147). Moreover, according to Piršl (2007), the implementation of intercultural education for teachers requires the development of both professional and intercultural competences which cover three significant dimensions:

- 1) the communication-behavioural dimension through skills development;
- 2) the emotional dimension through attitude development;
- 3) the cognitive dimension through knowledge development.

Whilst Deardorff (2008) defines intercultural competences as effective interactions and appropriate behaviour skills based on opinions, intercultural knowledge,

capabilities and reflection, Taylor (1994), on the other hand, considers all skills and capabilities needed for living and working in a culturally different environment, as well as the capability to adjust applying an inclusive and interactive perspective to differences, integral elements of the intercultural competence.

Communication barriers are often the consequence of knowledge deficit about different cultures, but they also occur due to scarcely developed intercultural communication skills. Stephan and Stephan (2002) and Gudykunst (2002) propose that the lack of these skills often leads to reciprocal misunderstanding and wrong interpretation, followed by insecurity and anxiety, resulting finally in avoiding communication with culturally different individuals. Martin and Hammer (1989) cite three specific behavioural categories: the non-verbal behaviour or eye-contact, the verbal behaviour or two-way information exchange, and the conversational behaviour or questioning. All three categories are significant in building intercultural and cross-cultural interactions. Indeed, according to Drandić (2012), both verbal and non-verbal communication patterns could be a useful source of intercultural understanding between students and teachers' cultural differences. Gollnick and Chinn (2008) and Lynch (1999) underline that teachers should be particularly interculturally sensitive when involved in the non-verbal communication because of some non-verbal circumstances that may occur, in which they cannot precisely decode the meaning due to the cultural origin of the person who receives or carries the non-verbal message. By contrast, Chen and Starosta (1996, 2004) claim that an interculturally competent individual is the one who succeeds in the communicative transformation from a monocultural into the state of a multicultural person. The authors suggest that an individual is not only expected to raise the awareness towards culturally different groups but s/he is also expected to acquire new skills. The latter is necessary for the interaction between differences to occur, with a special regard to the effectiveness and appropriateness of such relations. Chen and Starosta (1996, 2000) have developed a model of intercultural communicative competences which, according to them, spurs the interactive capabilities such as acceptance, respect, acknowledgement, tolerance and integration of cultural differences. That kind of model of intercultural communicative competences, created by Chen and Starosta, is defined by three perspectives:

- 1) the affective or intercultural sensitivity;
- 2) the cognitive or intercultural awareness;
- 3) the behavioural or intercultural adroitness.

Given the fact that the affective perspective is focused on the change of feelings, as a result of positive emotions before, during and after the intercultural interaction, Chen and Starosta (2000) have concluded that the intercultural sensitivity is a personal capability to develop positive emotions through comprehension and acceptance of cultural differences in order to obtain the best possible intercultural communication.

Research Methodology

Subject of the Research

Teachers' intercultural sensitivity seen as an affective dimension of the intercultural communication competence, according to Chen and Starosta (1996, 1998), determines the intercultural awareness through the comprehension of cultural differences and intercultural adroitness, displayed in the achievement of the intercultural interaction. Moreover, Chen and Starosta (1998, p. 231) underline that the intercultural sensitivity represents an "active willingness to motivate oneself with the aim to understand, appreciate and accept the differences through cultures". According to Le Roux (2002), when considering the intercultural approach to education, it is important to emphasise that a successful education is not only a question of teaching and curriculum content, but includes many different values, assumptions, feelings, perceptions and reciprocal relations through communication freed from any kind of barriers.

Research Aim

Assuming that teachers' intercultural sensitivity is a relevant element of their overall intercultural competence, the aim of the research was to examine:

- 1) whether class-teachers and subject-teachers are interculturally sensitive and, if yes, to what extent;
- 2) whether the intercultural sensitivity of the teaching staff is affected by the factors, such as: their professional qualifications (class teaching – subject teaching), gender (male – female), school location (central or branch school) and years of service (up to 10 years, 11-20 years and more than 20 years).

According to the research carried out, and the results obtained from examining the teachers' intercultural sensitivity, the hypotheses built in the research will be supported or rejected, the structure of teachers' intercultural sensitivity will be determined and the validity and reliability of the *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale* in our country will be assessed.

Research Hypotheses

According to the subject of the research, four hypotheses were suggested as follows:

- H1: Intercultural sensitivity differences do exist between the teaching staff and they are affected by the professional qualification.
- H2: Intercultural sensitivity differences do exist between the teaching staff and they are affected by gender.
- H3: Intercultural sensitivity differences do exist between the teaching staff and they are affected by school location.
- H4: Intercultural sensitivity differences do exist between the teaching staff and they are affected by the years of service in school.

Research Instrument

Table 1
Items for Intercultural Sensitivity Measure (Chen & Starosta, 2000)

Ordinal Number	Items
1	I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.
2	I think people from other cultures are narrow-minded.
3	I am pretty sure of myself in interacting with people from different cultures.
4	I find it very hard to talk in front of people from different cultures.
5	I always know what to say when interacting with people from different cultures.
6	I can be as sociable as I want to be when interacting with people from different cultures.
7	I don't like to be with people from different cultures.
8	I respect the values of people from different cultures.
9	I get upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures.
10	I feel confident when interacting with people from different cultures.
11	I tend to wait before forming an impression of culturally-distinct counterparts.
12	I often get discouraged when I am with people from different cultures.
13	I am open-minded to people from different cultures.
14	I am very observant when interacting with people from different cultures.
15	I often feel useless when interacting with people from different cultures.
16	I respect the ways people from different cultures behave.
17	I try to obtain as much information as I can when interacting with people from different cultures.
18	I would not accept the opinions of people from different cultures.
19	I am sensitive to my culturally-distinct counterpart's unclear meanings during our interaction.
20	I think my culture is better than other cultures.
21	I often give positive responses to my culturally different counterpart during our interaction.
22	I avoid those situations where I will have to deal with culturally-distinct persons.
23	I often show my culturally-distinct counterpart my understanding through verbal or nonverbal cues.
24	I have a feeling of enjoyment towards differences between my culturally -distinct counterpart and me.

The *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale* (ISS), developed by Chen and Starosta (1996, 2000), was used for the purpose of studying the level of teachers' intercultural sensitivity. The Scale measured the intercultural sensitivity through 24 dependent variables/statements which defined the teachers' intercultural sensitivity (Table 1). Each of the 24 items was rated on a five-point Likert-type scale in which: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree. Apart from the *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale*, the social and demographic component was added to determine the participants':

- 1) professional qualifications: class teacher – subject teacher,
- 2) gender: male – female,
- 3) school location: central – branch school,
- 4) years of service:
 - i up to 10 years,
 - ii from 11 to 20 years,
 - iii more than 20 years.

Research Sample

The research was carried out in April 2010 on the sample of teachers from 11 primary schools active on the Pula territory. According to the evidence provided by the Social Affairs Department of the City of Pula, 388 class and subject teachers, employed with 11 primary schools, were included in our research. Considering the size of the city, as well as the needs of parents and children, teaching is organised and performed not only in the central school, but also in branch schools and departments.

Following the information received from the head-masters in the selected schools, the *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale* was administered to the teaching staff. Out of the total number of 388 primary school teachers, the questionnaire was filled in and sent back by 276 teachers, which was the representative sample of 71.13% (of the total number in 11 primary schools selected to participate in the research).

Therefore, the research included 276 teachers, 41.7% of them being class teachers and 58.3% of them being subject teachers. Considering the total number of participants, 88% of them were female teachers. Most of the teachers worked in a central school, while one third had less than 10 years of service, less than a half of the teachers involved had 20 years or more of service and every third teacher was in the category of 11 to 20 years of service (Table 2).

Table 2

Research sample / independent variables

		Research sample					
Professional qualifications		Gender		School location		Years of service	
Class teacher	115 (41.7%)	Male	33 (12%)	Central school	255 (92.4%)	Up to 10	84 (30.4%)
						From 11 to 20	81 (29.4%)
Subject teacher	161 (58.3%)	Female	243 (88%)	Branch school	21 (7.6%)	More than 20	111 (40.2%)
276		276		276		276	

Results and Discussion

After the frequency analysis, the Chi-square test was calculated for each pair of statements. The tables were drawn up to present the pairs of statements (one dependent and one independent statement), as well as the Chi-square test and the correlation coefficient C.

Each of 24 statements was paired up with four independent variables:

- a) professional qualifications (class teacher, subject teacher),
- b) gender (male, female),
- c) school location (central, branch school),
- d) years of service (up to 10 years, from 11 to 20 years, and more than 20 years).

Determining the intercultural sensitivity of teachers, on the basis of the previous procedure and the frequency analysis findings for each single independent variable, and the correlation with 24 dependent variables, it can be concluded that class teachers and subject teachers, of both genders, working both in central and branch schools, and having different teaching experience in terms of the years spent in service enjoy the interaction with people from other cultures. In fact, the obtained results, except in one school, were arranged in two groups, "uncertain" and "agree/strongly agree", which led us to the conclusion that both class teachers and subject teachers enjoy the interaction with people from other cultures, and that only one of all the teachers involved in the study, a female class teacher working in a central school with up to 10 years of service answered using point 1 on the scale, "strongly disagree/disagree", thus representing a negligible number.

Moreover, the calculated arithmetic means suited the whole sample of participants (N=276) for the total of 24 statements (Table 3). Although the teachers graded their opinions, used to measure the intercultural sensitivity, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), the outcomes ranged from 1.58 to 4.58. It can be, therefore, concluded that some differences appeared within the range of the arithmetic means of teachers' intercultural sensitivity. It is evident that the teachers agreed with statement no. 8 the most (M=4.58): "I respect the values of people from different cultures", showing thus a high average respect of different cultures. The teachers showed the lowest agreement with statement no. 7: "I don't like to be with people from different cultures", i.e. the lowest average result on the *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale* (M=1,58). The outcomes brought us to the conclusion that the teachers ranked higher those statements in which the fundamental intercultural values were described, as well as those that expressed positive opinions towards different cultures and a mutual interaction without prejudices. On the other hand, the average lower results referred mostly to the statements that described the avoidance of the contact with other cultures, discouragement, and emphasis on their own culture to the detriment of another and/or different culture.

The teachers' answers regarding the 24 statements, that were correlated with the independent variable *professional qualifications (class teacher - subject teacher)*, suggested the following: the Chi-square test did not prove the existence of a statistically significant correlation, except for item no. 22. (Table 4). A slight but statistically significant correlation was identified between this item and the teachers' professional qualifications ($\chi^2 = 7.734$; $df=2$; $p<0.05$, $C= 0.165$). Based on the findings, H1 was rejected: the intercultural sensitivity differences between class teachers and subject teachers do exist, with a margin of error lower than 5%.

Table 3
 Arithmetic means for the items of the whole research sample

Item Number	Items	Min	Max	M
1	I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.	1	5	4.23
2	I think people from other cultures are narrow-minded.	1	5	1.76
3	I am pretty sure of myself in interacting with people from different cultures.	1	5	3.88
4	I find it very hard to talk in front of people from different cultures.	1	5	2.07
5	I always know what to say when interacting with people from different cultures.	1	5	3.40
6	I can be as sociable as I want to be when interacting with people from different cultures.	1	5	4.08
7	I don't like to be with people from different cultures.	1	5	1.58
8	I respect the values of people from different cultures.	1	5	4.58
9	I get upset easily when interacting with people from different cultures.	1	5	1.77
10	I feel confident when interacting with people from different cultures.	1	5	3.82
11	I tend to wait before forming an impression of culturally-distinct counterparts.	1	5	3.95
12	I often get discouraged when I am with people from different cultures.	1	5	1.74
13	I am open-minded to people from different cultures.	1	5	4.20
14	I am very observant when interacting with people from different cultures.	1	5	3.93
15	I often feel useless when interacting with people from different cultures.	1	5	1.93
16	I respect the ways people from different cultures behave.	1	5	4.16
17	I try to obtain as much information as I can when interacting with people from different cultures.	1	5	4.16
18	I would not accept the opinions of people from different cultures.	1	5	1.89
19	I am sensitive to my culturally-distinct counterpart's unclear meanings during our interaction.	1	5	2.87
20	I think my culture is better than other cultures.	1	5	1.86
21	I often give positive responses to my culturally different counterpart during our interaction.	1	5	3.58
22	I avoid those situations where I will have to deal with culturally-distinct persons.	1	5	1.86
23	I often show my culturally-distinct counterpart my understanding through verbal or nonverbal cues.	1	5	3.91
24	I have a feeling of enjoyment towards differences between my culturally –distinct counterpart and me.	1	5	3.72

Table 4

Teachers' professional qualifications: results of the Chi-square test and correlation coefficient measurements

Variable	Pearson Chi-square			Symmetric Measures
	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)	Contingency Coefficient
22	7.734	2	.021	.165

The Chi-square test did not prove a statistically significant correlation, no significant difference was found in the teachers' answers based on their gender and dependent variables. According to the findings, H2 was also rejected: the intercultural sensitivity differences between the teachers do exist and they are affected by gender with a margin of error lower than 5%.

Following the further analysis of the teachers' answers on the 24-item questionnaire, that were put into a correlation with *school location (central school – branch school)*, even before confirming or rejecting H3, it can be said that the Chi-square test did not prove a statistically significant correlation, in other words, the teachers' answers did not differ significantly from the answers we could have expected when the school location factor was taken into account; the contingency coefficient also showed that there was no correlation between the independent variable "school location" and dependent variables, except for item no. 18 ($\chi^2 = 10.928$; $df=2$; $p<0.05$, $C= 0.195$) (Table 5). Therefore, the research outcome led us to the conclusion that H3 should be rejected: the intercultural sensitivity differences between the teachers do exist and they are affected by school location with a margin of error lower than 5%.

Table 5

School location: results of the Chi-square test and correlation coefficient measurements

Variable	Pearson Chi-square			Symmetric Measures
	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)	Contingency Coefficient
18	10.928	2	.004	.195

The teachers' answers on the 24-item questionnaire, put into a correlation with the independent variable *years of service* led to the following conclusion: the Chi-square test was performed on 21 answers and did not show any statistically significant correlation, and the teachers' answers did not differ significantly when it came to their years of service at school, except for three statements, as follows: item no. 18 ($\chi^2 = 14.491$; $df=4$; $p<0.05$, $C= 0.223$), item no. 19 ($\chi^2 = 14.560$; $df=4$; $p<0.05$, $C= 0.224$) and item no. 22 ($\chi^2 = 14.404$; $df=4$; $p<0.05$; $C= 0.223$) (Table 6). Since all other variables did not show any evident significance, the lack of arguments prevented us from supporting the fourth hypothesis (H 4). Indeed, no more than four variables revealed statistically significant differences, only in the sample group of teachers with more than 20 years of service in education. However, this was not sufficient to confirm the hypothesis,

which can be easily explained by the finding that the teachers with more than 20 years of service in school more often chose the answer “I agree/strongly agree” in case of the above-mentioned statements. Finally, the findings led to the conclusion that H4 should be rejected: the intercultural sensitivity differences between the teachers do exist and they are affected by the years of service.

Table 6
Years of service in education: results of the Chi-square test and correlation coefficient measurements

Variable	Pearson Chi-square			Symmetric Measures
	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)	Contingency Coefficient
18	14.491	4	.006	.223
19	14.560	4	.006	.224
22	14.404	4	.006	.223

Reliability and Validity of the Instruments

In order to measure the reliability of the *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale*, the values of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient were calculated. The instrument should have satisfactory reliability if the measured α coefficient is bigger than or equal to .70. The coefficient value we obtained for the whole scale was $\alpha = .844$, which indicated good reliability and adequacy for various samples. However, in order to better evaluate the reliability of the instrument, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated for every single statement. Since we did not notice that any of the coefficients was higher than the total coefficient for the whole scale, we kept all statements.

We also tested the assumptions of data adequacy for the factor analysis with the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure ($k=.860$) and the Bartlett test of sphericity ($\chi^2=1974.551$, $p<0.01$); both of them showed the adequacy of matrix factorisation, but we gave scope for further research on the intercultural sensitivity of teachers.

Conclusion

The current research results obtained through the frequency analysis and the Chi-square test, as well as through the control of statistically significant results (at the level of 5%) suggested that the null-hypothesis, according to which the statistically significant difference in the intercultural sensitivity between the teachers did not exist, was completely supported. It was analysed and confirmed that the teachers were interculturally sensitive, and no difference in the intercultural sensitivity was found in relation to the teachers’ professional qualifications (class teaching – subject teaching), gender (male – female), school location (central or branch school) and years of service in education (up to 10 years, 11-20 years, and more than 20 years).

The intercultural sensitivity of teachers represents their capability to develop positive emotions, most of all through the understanding and acceptance of cultural differences, and for that reason, it is necessary to pursue on their continuous education at all levels.

Moreover, the education of teachers in the field of intercultural education should be focused on the development and encouragement of the intercultural competences, and especially their intercultural sensitivity, employing a series of interaction-oriented skills, such as acceptance, respect, recognition, tolerance and integration of cultural differences (Drandić, 2014). The theoreticians of intercultural education, who deal with the intercultural competences of teachers, stress the importance of preparing schools and teachers for the cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity of pupils on the basis of the respect for human dignity and diversity. A part of that process relates to the removal of obstacles in the intercultural communication. The mastery of intercultural competences, such as openness, flexibility, tolerance, empathy and interaction, enables teachers to become aware of these barriers and to remove them. In order to enable teachers to promote the intercultural contents, values and skills, it is important to spur them towards the introduction of new contents, methods and teaching strategies. The aim is to foster the development of students' intercultural competences, especially the intercultural sensitivity as a relevant emotional competence, on which the quality of mutual interaction and positive environment in the classroom depends.

The findings of the research on the teachers' intercultural sensitivity, achieved through the *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale*, confirmed the appropriateness of the instrument on the sample of primary school class-teachers and subject-teachers, but they also left enough room for carrying out further research on the teachers' intercultural sensitivity on all other educational levels. Moreover, the research was also used to check the validity and reliability of the *Intercultural Sensitivity Scale* within the context of the Croatian educational system.

References

- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1996). Intercultural communication competence: A synthesis. In B. Burlinson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook*, 19 (pp. 353-383). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23808985.1996.11678935>
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). A review of the concept of intercultural awareness. *Human Communication*, 2, 27-54.
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (2000). The development and validation of the international communication sensitivity scale. *Human Communication*, 3, 2-14.
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (2004). Communication among cultural diversities: A Dialogue. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*, 27, 3-16.

- Čačić-Kumpes, J. (2004). Politike reguliranja kulturne i etničke različitosti: o pojmovima i njihovoj upotrebi. *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 20(2-3), 143-159.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2008). Intercultural competence: A Definition, Model and Implications for Education Abroad. In V. Savicki (Ed.), *Developing Intercultural Competence and Transformation: Theory, Research, and Application in International Education* (pp. 32-52). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Drandić, D. (2012). Interkulturalne kompetencije nastavnika i barijere u interkulturalnoj komunikaciji. In K. Posavec, & M. Sablić (Eds.), *Pedagogija i kultura – Interkulturalna pedagogija: prema novim razvojjima znanosti o odgoju* (pp. 83-92). Zagreb: Hrvatsko pedagoškijsko društvo.
- Drandić, D. (2013). Intercultural Education in the Croatian Context: Roma Inclusion in the Adult Education System. In M. Bartulović, L. Bash, & V. Spajić-Vrkaš (Eds.), *IAIE Zagreb 2013: Unity and Disunity, Connections and Separations: Intercultural education as a movement for promoting multiple identities, social inclusion and transformation*. Conference proceedings (pp. 259-266). Zagreb: Interkultura/IAIE.
- Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. C. (2008). *Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gundara, J. (2000). *Interculturalism, Education and Inclusion*. London: Paul Chapman Educational Publishing.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (2002). Intercultural Communication Theories. In W.B. Gudykunst, & B. Mody (Eds.), *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 183-205). London: Sage Publications.
- Katunarić, V. (1994). *Labirint evolucije*. Zareb: Zavod za sociologiju/Filozofski fakultet.
- Le Roux, J. (2002). Effective educators are culturally competent communicators. *Intercultural Education*, 13(1), 37-48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675980120112922>
- Lynch, E. W. (1999). Developing cross-cultural competence. In E. W. Lynch, & M. J. Hanson (Eds.), *Developing Cross-cultural Competence. A guide for working with children and their families*, 2nd edition (pp. 65-87). Baltimore, MD/London: Paul H. Brookes.
- Martin, J. N., & Hammer, M. R. (1989). Behavioral categories of intercultural communication competence: Everyday communicators' perceptions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13, 303–332. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(89\)90015-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(89)90015-1)
- Mesić, M. (2008). Intercultural Education for Multicultural Society. *AEMI Journal*, 6, 136-147 /online/. Retrieved on 10th February 2014 from http://aemi.eu/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/vol_6_7.pdf.
- Nieto, S. (2005). Schools for a New Majority: The Role of Teacher Education in Hard Times. *The New Educator*, 1(1), 27-43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15476880490447797>
- Piršl, E. (2007). Interkulturalna osjetljivost kao dio pedagoške kompetencije. In V. Previšić, N. N. Šoljan, & N. Hrvatić (Eds.), *Pedagogija prema cjeloživotnom obrazovanju i društvu znanja* (pp. 275-291). Zagreb: Hrvatsko pedagoškijsko društvo.
- Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (2002). Cognition and Affect in Cross-Cultural Relations. In W. B. Gudykunst, & B. Mody (Eds.), *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 127-142). London: Sage Publications.

Taylor, E. W. (1994). Intercultural competency: A transformative learning process. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 44(3), 154-174. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/074171369404400303>

Dijana Drandić

Academy of Music

Juraj Dobrila University of Pula

Rovinjska 14, 52100 Pula, Croatia

dijana.drantic@ymail.com

Interkulturalna osjetljivost nastavnika

Sažetak

Cilj empirijskog istraživanja u ovom radu bio je, na primjeru osnovnih škola grada Pule, ispitati: jesu li i u kojoj mjeri nastavnici interkulturalno osjetljivi te postoje li razlike u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti između nastavnika s obzirom na stručnu spremu (razredna nastava – predmetna nastava), spol (muški – ženski), položaj škole (centralna škola – područna škola) i godine staža provedene u nastavi (do 10 godina, od 11 do 20 godina i više od 20 godina). U istraživanju smo se koristili instrumentom Intercultural Sensitivity Scale – ISS autora Chen i Starosta. Skala mjeri interkulturalnu osjetljivost putem 24 zavisne varijable/tvrđnje kojima su pridružene 4 nezavisne varijable koje definiraju ispitanike. Na temelju rezultata istraživanja dobivenih frekvencijskom analizom i hi-kvadrat testom, zatim pregledom statistički značajnih rezultata (na razini signifikantnosti 5 %) možemo zaključiti da ne postoji statistički značajna razlika u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti među nastavnicima. Ispitali smo i utvrdili da su nastavnici interkulturalno osjetljivi, nije utvrđena razlika s obzirom na stručnu spremu, spol, status škole i godine staža provedene u nastavi. Naše istraživanje je, nadalje, poslužilo i za provjeru valjanosti i pouzdanosti Skale interkulturalne osjetljivosti u kontekstu hrvatskog odgojno-obrazovnog sustava.

Ključne riječi: interakcija kulturno različitih; interkulturalna kompetencija; nastavnik; učenik.

Uvod

Polazi se od činjenice da je interkulturalno obrazovanje proces koji ima za cilj osigurati jednake mogućnosti u učenju svima bez obzira na rasne, nacionalne, etničke, klasne, spolne, fizičke, jezične ili kulturne razlike, da je podložno stalnim promjenama i kontinuiranom učenju (su)životu, suradnji, toleranciji i ravnopravnosti. Uza sve to, u procesu obrazovanja učenici se ne bi smjeli udaljiti od vlastitog kulturnog i etničkog porijekla, ali ih nastavnici trebaju učiniti svjesnima da dijele život s pripadnicima drugih kultura koji imaju druga obilježja i način života različit od njihova (Mesić, 2008, str. 147). Stoga je interkulturalni pristup obrazovanju usmjeren na učenje, razumijevanje i prihvaćanje vrijednosti iz različitih kultura, gdje prema Čačić-Kumpes (2004) svaka kultura posjeduje svoje osobitosti dostojne poštovanja, a priori jednako vrijedne i koje ničim ne ugrožavaju jedna drugu. Jer interkulturalno obrazovanje u

svojoj biti i jest obrazovanje koje prihvaća različitosti čime pridonosi osiguravanju jednakosti i pravednosti, pripremajući sve učenike na život u višekulturnom demokratskom društvu.

Nieto (2005) smatra da su škole mjesta obrazovanja i demokracije za sve učenike, bez obzira na bilo koju vrstu različitosti. Potreba stvaranja nekog novog modela učitelja u školama kao *visoko kvalificiranog nastavnika* koji bi trebao obrazovati sada neku *novu većinu* kao što su rasne i etničke manjine, doseljenici, iseljenici, marginalizirani studenti različitog porijekla, ponajprije je intelektualno i političko pitanje koje se odnosi na jednakost i društvenu pravdu. Uz to, tvrdi Nieto (2005), negativne percepcije, moraliziranje, predrasude i rasističke stavove prema učenicima i njihovim obiteljima treba nadvladati stalnim profesionalnim razvojem učitelja, nazivajući ih *entuzijastima cjeloživotnog učenja*. Gundara (2000) u obrazovanje uvodi termin *interkulturalno naukovanje* kojim objašnjava: učenje o drugima i drugačijima, jačanje pozitivnih odnosa, prevladavanje prepreka, pravo svakog pojedinca na različitost i nediskriminaciju. Takvo interkulturalno obrazovanje, tvrdi Gundara (2000), ima za cilj stvaranje zajedništva, tolerancije, uzajamnosti, ravnopravnosti, međuovisnosti i solidarnosti uz neprekidno osposobljavanje i poučavanje nastavnika.

Naime, „interkulturalizam nije uistinu nova kultura, koja bi, kao globalna, zamijenila stare etničke i nacionalne kulture, ponajmanje njihove jezike nekim novim svjetskim jezikom. To nije nova rasa, novi etos, nova klasa, nova elita ili nova brahmanska kasta. To je oblik uvećanog razumijevanja i vještina komuniciranja između nesvodljivih razlika“ naglašava Katunarić (1994, str. 147). Osim toga, prema Piršl (2007), u provođenju interkulturalnog obrazovanja za nastavnike uz stručne kompetencije važno je i razvijati interkulturalne kompetencije koje čine tri važne dimenzije:

- 1) komunikacijska – ponašajna dimenzija razvojem vještina
- 2) emocionalna dimenzija razvojem stavova
- 3) kognitivna dimenzija razvojem znanja

Dok Deardorff (2008) određuje interkulturalne kompetencije putem sposobnosti učinkovite interakcije i primjerenog ponašanja oslanjanjem na stavove, interkulturalna znanja, vještine i refleksija za Taylora (1994) su bitne sastavnice interkulturalne kompetencije vještine i sposobnosti potrebne za život i rad u kulturno različitim sredinama, kao i sposobnost prilagodbe uz inkluzivni i interaktivni pogled na svijet različitosti.

Komunikacijske barijere u često posljedica nedovoljnog poznavanja drugih kultura, ali i nerazvijenosti interkulturalnih komunikacijskih vještina, zbog čega dolazi do uzajamnog nerazumijevanja i pogrešne interpretacije, a potom i do nesigurnosti i tjeskobe, što u konačnici vodi izbjegavanju komunikacije s kulturno drugačijima, smatraju Stephan i Stephan (2002) i Gudykunst (2002). Autori Martin i Hammer (1989) navode tri specifične kategorije ponašanja: *neverbalno ponašanje* ili kontakt očima, *verbalno ponašanje* ili dijeljenje informacija obostrano, *ponašanje putem konverzacije* ili propitivanja. Sve tri kategorije važne su u interkulturalnim i kroskulturalnim interakcijama. Naime,

komunikacija, prema Drandić (2012), verbalna ili neverbalna, može biti koristan izvor interkulturalnog razumijevanja između kulturne različitosti učenika i nastavnika. Gollnick i Chinn (2008) i Lynch (1999) ističu da nastavnici u neverbalnoj komunikaciji trebaju biti posebno interkulturalno osjetljivi zbog nekih *neverbalnih situacija* u kojima nisu sigurni u točno značenje s obzirom na kulturno porijeklo primatelja ili prenositelja neverbalne poruke. Dok Chen i Starosta (1996, 2004) ističu da interkulturalno kompetentan postaje onaj koji uspije u komunikacijskoj transformaciji iz stadija monokulturne osobe prijeći u stadij multikulturalne osobe. To ujedno znači, tvrde autori, da se u novoj situaciji od pojedinaca ne očekuje da samo poveća svijest prema kulturno različitim, već i da steknu neke nove vještine potrebne da bi se mogla dogoditi interakcija različitosti s obzirom na učinkovitost i primjerenost takvih odnosa. Chen i Starosta (1996, 2000) razvili su model interkulturalnih komunikacijskih kompetencija koji, prema njima, potiče interaktivnu sposobnost prihvatanja, poštivanja, priznavanja, tolerancije i integriranja kulturnih razlika. Takav model interkulturalne komunikacijske kompetencije prema Chen i Starosta određuju tri perspektive:

- 1) afektivna ili interkulturalna osjetljivost
- 2) kognitivna ili interkulturalna svijest
- 3) bihevioralna (ponašajna) ili interkulturalna spretnost

Naime, polazeći od činjenice da je afektivna perspektiva usmjerena na promjene osjećaja koji su rezultat pozitivnih emocija prije, za vrijeme i nakon interkulturalne interakcije, interkulturalna osjetljivost, zaključuju Chen i Starosta (2000), jest osobna sposobnost razvoja pozitivnih emocija razumijevanjem i prihvaćanjem kulturnih razlika radi postizanja što bolje interkulturalne komunikacije.

Metodologija istraživanja

Predmet istraživanja

Interkulturalna osjetljivost nastavnika kao afektivna dimenzija interkulturalne komunikacijske kompetencije prema Chen i Starosta (1996, 1998) određuje interkulturalnu svijest preko razumijevanja kulturnih razlika, te interkulturalnu snalažljivost koja se očituje preko sposobnosti postizanja komunikacije u interkulturalnoj interakciji. Nadalje, Chen i Starosta (1998, str. 231) naglašavaju da interkulturalna osjetljivost predstavlja „aktivnu želju za motivacijom samoga sebe u cilju razumijevanja, cijenjenja i prihvaćanja različitosti kroz kulture“. U interkulturalnom pristupu obrazovanju važno je istaknuti, tvrdi Le Roux (2002), da uspješno obrazovanje nije samo pitanje nastave i sadržaja kurikula, već uključuje različite vrijednosti, pretpostavke, osjećaje, percepcije i međusobne odnose kroz komunikaciju oslobođenu bilo kakvih barijera.

Cilj istraživanja

Polazeći od shvaćanja da je interkulturalna osjetljivost nastavnika važan dio njihove ukupne interkulturalne kompetencije, ovaj rad imao je za cilj ispitati:

- 1) jesu li i u kojoj mjeri nastavnici razredne i predmetne nastave interkulturalno osjetljivi;
- 2) postoje li razlike u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti između nastavnika s obzirom na varijable: stručna sprema (razredna nastava – predmetna nastava), spol (muški – ženski), status škole (centralna škola – područna škola) i godine staža provedene u nastavi (do 10 godina, od 11 do 20 godina i više od 20 godina).

Prema provedenom istraživanju i dobivenim rezultatima istraživanja interkulturalne osjetljivosti nastavnika potvrdit ćemo ili odbaciti hipoteze postavljene u istraživanju, utvrditi strukturu interkulturalne osjetljivosti nastavnika te provjeriti valjanost i pouzdanost instrumenta Skale interkulturalne osjetljivosti kod nas.

Hipoteze istraživanja

S obzirom na postavljene predmet i cilj istraživanja odredili smo hipoteze:

- H1: Postoje razlike u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti između nastavnika s obzirom na stručnu spremu.
- H2: Postoje razlike u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti između nastavnika s obzirom na spol.
- H3: Postoje razlike u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti između nastavnika s obzirom na položaj škole.
- H4: Postoje razlike u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti između nastavnika s obzirom na godine staža provedene u nastavi.

Istraživački instrument

Tablica 1

Za naše istraživanje stupnja interkulturalne osjetljivosti nastavnika, koristili smo se Skalom interkulturalne osjetljivosti (*Intercultural Sensitivity Scale – ISS*) autora Chen i Starosta (1996, 2000). Skala mjeri interkulturalnu osjetljivost kroz 24 zavisne varijable/tvrđnje koje definiraju interkulturalnu osjetljivost nastavnika (Tablica 1). Svakoj varijabli/tvrđnji iz upitnika priložena je peterostupanjska skala procjene Likertova tipa: 1 = nimalo se ne slažem, 2 = ne slažem se, 3 = niti se slažem/niti se ne slažem, 4 = slažem se, 5 = potpuno se slažem. Skali interkulturalne osjetljivosti pridružene su i 4 nezavisne sociodemografske varijable koje definiraju ispitanike:

- a) stručna sprema: nastavnik razredne nastave – nastavnik predmetne nastave
- b) spol: muški – ženski
- c) status škole: centralna škola – područna škola
- d) godine staža:
 - iv → do 10 godina
 - v → od 11 do 20 godina
 - vi → više od 20 godina

Uzorak istraživanja

Istraživanje je provedeno među nastavnicima iz 11 osnovnih škola, koliko ih djeluje na području Grada Pule. Prema evidenciji Upravnog odjela za društvene djelatnosti Grada Pule, u 11 osnovnih škola koje su sudjelovale u našem istraživanju, a koje je provedeno tijekom mjeseca travnja 2010. godine, bilo je zaposleno ukupno 388 nastavnika razredne i predmetne nastave. Organizacija i izvođenje nastave provodi se osim u centralnoj školi i u područnim školama – odjeljenjima, s obzirom na raspršenost naselja i potrebe roditelja i djece.

Prema podacima ravnatelja o broju nastavnika koji rade u odabranim školama svim nastavnicima je dostavljena Skala interkulturalne osjetljivosti. Od ukupno 388 osnovnoškolskih nastavnika upitnik je ispunilo i vratilo 276 nastavnika, što predstavlja reprezentativan uzorak od 71,13 % od ukupnog broja nastavnika u 11 osnovnih škola koje su odabrane za istraživanje.

Istraživanje je obuhvatilo 276 nastavnika/ice od kojih je 41.7 % bilo nastavnika/ica razredne nastave, a nešto veći broj (58.3 %) nastavnika/ica predmetne nastave. Od ukupnog broja ispitanika bilo je više nastavnica (88 %). Većina nastavnika/ica radi u centralnoj školi, jedna trećina radi u nastavi manje od 10 godina, nešto malo manje od polovine ima nastavnički staž dulji od 20 godina, a svaki treći ima između 11 i 20 godina nastavničkog staža (Tablica 2.).

Tablica 2

Rezultati i rasprava

Nakon analize frekvencija izračunat je hi-kvadrat test za svaki odabrani par varijabli. Izradili smo tablice za parove varijabli (jedna zavisna i jedna nezavisna varijabla), te odredili hi-kvadrat test i koeficijent povezanosti C.

Svaku od 24 zavisne varijable (tvrđnje) uparili smo sa sve četiri nezavisne varijable:

- a) stručna sprema (razredna nastava, predmetna nastava)
- b) spol (muški, ženski)
- c) status škole (centralna škola, područna škola)
- d) godine staža (do 10 godina, od 11 do 20 godina i više od 20 godina).

Na osnovi prethodne procedure i dobivenih rezultata frekvencijske analize za svaku pojedinu nezavisnu varijablu i povezanosti s 24 zavisne varijable, ispitujući interkulturalnu osjetljivost nastavnika/ica, možemo zaključiti: nastavnici razredne i predmetne nastave, oba spola, koji rade u centralnoj i područnoj školi, te imaju različite godine staža u obrazovanju, uživaju u interakciji s ljudima iz drugih kultura. Naime, dobili smo rezultate koji su, osim u slučaju jedne škole, raspoređeni u dvije skupine: „niti se slažem/niti se ne slažem“, i „slažem se/potpuno se slažem,“ što nas dovodi do zaključka da nastavnici bez obzira na to jesu li nastavnici predmetne nastave ili nastavnici razredne nastave uživaju u interakciji s ljudima iz drugih kultura, da je samo jedan nastavnik razredne nastave, ženskog spola koji radi u centralnoj školi i

ima do 10 godina staža na jedinici mjerne skale od ukupnog broja nastavnika koji su sudjelovali u istraživanju odgovorio stupnjem 1 „nimalo se ne slažem/ne slažem se“, što predstavlja zanemariv broj.

Slijede izračunate aritmetičke sredine odgovora na cijelom uzorku ispitanika (N=276) za sve 24 tvrdnje (Tablica 3). Budući da su nastavnici stupnjevali stavove koji mjere interkulturalnu osjetljivost na skali od 1 (nimalo se ne slažem) do 5 (potpuno se slažem), dobiveni rezultati nalaze se u rasponu od 1,58 do 4,58. Na osnovi toga možemo zaključiti da se u okviru dobivenih rezultata uočavaju razlike u rasponima između utvrđenih srednjih vrijednosti ispitivane interkulturalne osjetljivosti nastavnika. Vidljivo je da su nastavnici najveće slaganje (M=4,58) pokazali s tvrdnjom 8 „Poštujem vrijednosti ljudi iz drugih kultura“, što ukazuje na visoku prosječnu izraženost poštivanja drugih kultura. Najmanje slaganje nastavnici su pokazali prema tvrdnji 7 „Ne volim biti s ljudima iz drugih kultura“, jer je dobiveni rezultat na skali interkulturalne osjetljivosti u prosjeku najniži (M=1,58). Dobiveni rezultati navode nas na zaključak da su nastavnici najviše rangirali tvrdnje koje opisuju temeljne vrijednosti interkulturalizma, pozitivne stavove prema drugim kulturama i međusobnu interakciju bez predrasuda, a da se rezultati koji su u prosjeku najniži odnose na tvrdnje koje opisuju izbjegavanje susreta s drugim kulturama, malodušnosti i isticanje vlastite kulture u odnosu na druge i/ili drugačije kulture.

Tablica 3

Odgovori nastavnika na 24 varijable u odnosu na nezavisnu varijablu *stručna sprema* (nastavnik razredne nastave – nastavnik predmetne nastave) upućuju na zaključak: hi-kvadrat test nije pokazao statistički značajnu vezu, osim kod varijable 22. (Tablica 4). Utvrdili smo postojanje izrazito slabe povezanosti između te tvrdnje i stručne spreme nastavnika, što ukazuje na postojanje korelacije koja je mala, ali statistički značajna ($\chi^2 = 7,734$; $df=2$; $p<0,05$; $C=0,165$). Na osnovi dobivenih rezultata odbacujemo H1 koja glasi: Postoje razlike u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti između nastavnika razredne nastave i nastavnika predmetne nastave, s faktorom pogreške manjim od 5 % .

Tablica 4

Hi-kvadrat test nije pokazao statistički značajnu vezu, ne uočavamo značajnu razliku u odgovorima nastavnika prema spolu i zavisnim varijablama. Na temelju dobivenih rezultata odbacujemo H2 koja glasi: Postoje razlike u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti između nastavnika s obzirom na spol, s faktorom pogreške manjim od 5 %.

Daljnjom analizom odgovora nastavnika na 24 tvrdnje koje smo stavili u odnos prema *statusu škole* (centralna škola – područna škola) kao nezavisne varijable, prije prihvaćanja ili odbacivanja H3, upućuju na zaključak: hi-kvadrat test nije pokazao statistički značajnu vezu, odnosno ne razlikuju se značajno odgovori nastavnika prema statusu škole od onih koje bismo očekivali, a koeficijent kontingencije je pokazao da nema povezanosti između nezavisne varijable status škole i zavisnih varijabli, osim

(Tablica 5) kod varijable 18. ($\chi^2 = 10,928$; $df=2$; $p<0,05$, $C=0,195$). Stoga nas rezultat istraživanja upućuje na zaključak da se H3 koja glasi: Postoje razlike u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti između nastavnika s obzirom na status škole, može odbaciti s faktorom pogreške manjim od 5 %.

Tablica 5

Stavovi nastavnika u odnosu na nezavisnu varijablu *godine staža* prema 24 zavisne varijable navode nas na zaključak: kod 21 varijable hi-kvadrat test nije pokazao statistički značajnu vezu, ne razlikuju se značajno odgovori nastavnika prema godinama staža, osim (Tablica 6) kod tri tvrdnje i to: tvrdnje 18. ($\chi^2 = 14,491$; $df=4$; $p<0,05$, $C= 0,223$), tvrdnje 19. ($\chi^2 = 14,560$; $df=4$; $p<0,05$, $C= 0,224$) i tvrdnje 22. ($\chi^2 = 14,404$; $df=4$; $p<0,05$, $C= 0,223$). Kako kod ostalih varijabli nije uočena značajnost, nemamo dovoljno dokaza za prihvaćanje hipoteze 4. Naime, kod svega četiri varijable uočene su statistički značajne razlike samo u stavovima nastavnika koji imaju više od 20 godina staža u obrazovanju, ali nedovoljne da hipotezu prihvatimo. Tu činjenicu možemo objasniti time da su nastavnici koji imaju više od 20 godina staža provedenog u školi u tim tvrdnjama češće birali odgovore „slažem se/potpuno se slažem“. Nadalje, na osnovi dobivenih rezultata možemo zaključiti da H4 koja glasi: Postoje razlike u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti između nastavnika s obzirom na godine staža, odbacujemo.

Tablica 6

Pouzdanost i valjanost instrumenta

Kako bismo izmjerili pouzdanost Skale interkulturalne osjetljivosti izračunate su vrijednosti Cronbach alfa koeficijenta. Instrument bi trebao imati zadovoljavajuću pouzdanost ako je izmjereni koeficijent α veći ili jednak .70. Vrijednost koeficijenta koji smo dobili za cjelokupnu ljestvicu iznosi $\alpha=,844$, što nas upućuje na dobru pouzdanost i primjerenost na različite uzorke. Međutim, radi bolje ocjene pouzdanosti instrumenta izračunat je Cronbach alfa koeficijent za svaku pojedinačnu tvrdnju. Kako nismo uočili da je neki od koeficijenata veći od ukupnog koeficijenta za cijelu ljestvicu, zadržali smo sve tvrdnje. Proveli smo i testiranje pretpostavki primjerenosti podataka za faktorsku analizu s pomoću Kaiser-Meyer-Olkinov mjera ($k=,860$) i Bartlettova testa sfernosti ($\chi^2=1974,551$, $p<0,01$) koji potvrđuju podobnost matrice za faktorizaciju, ali su i otvorili prostor za daljnja istraživanja interkulturalne osjetljivosti nastavnika.

Zaključak

Na temelju rezultata istraživanja dobivenih frekvencijskom analizom i hi-kvadrat testom, kao i pregledom statistički značajnih rezultata (na razini signifikantnosti 5%) možemo zaključiti da prihvaćamo nultu hipotezu koja glasi: Ne postoji statistički značajna razlika u interkulturalnoj osjetljivosti među nastavnicima. Ispitali smo i

utvrdili da su nastavnici interkulturalno osjetljivi, nije utvrđena razlika s obzirom na stručnu spremu (nastavnik razredne nastave – nastavnik predmetne nastave), spol (muški – ženski), status škole (centralna škola – područna škola) i godine staža (do 10 godina, od 11 do 20 godina ili više od 20 godina) provedene u nastavi.

Interkulturalna osjetljivost nastavnika predstavlja osobnu sposobnost razvijanja pozitivnih emocija prije svega razumijevanjem i prihvaćanjem kulturnih razlika, zbog čega je potrebno ustrajati na kontinuiranom obrazovanju nastavnika na svim razinama. Nadalje, izobrazba nastavnika u području interkulturalnog obrazovanja trebala bi biti usmjerena na razvijanje i poticanje interkulturalnih kompetencija, posebno interkulturalne osjetljivosti, vještina koje pogoduju interakciji preko sposobnosti prihvaćanja, poštivanja, priznavanja, tolerancije i integriranja kulturnih razlika (Drandić, 2014). Teoretičari interkulturalnog obrazovanja, koji se bave interkulturalnim kompetencijama nastavnika, naglašavaju potrebu pripreme nastavnika za kulturnu, etničku i jezičnu raznolikost učenika utemeljenu na načelu ljudskog dostojanstva i poštivanja različitosti. Dio tog procesa uključuje osvještavanje i uklanjanje barijera u interkulturalnoj komunikaciji. Razvijenost interkulturalnih kompetencija, poput otvorenosti, fleksibilnosti, snošljivosti, empatije i interakcije, omogućuje nastavnicima da kod sebe osvijeste i uklone te barijere. Kako bi nastavnici mogli promicati interkulturalne sadržaje, vrijednosti i vještine, važno ih je usmjeriti na uvođenje novih sadržaja, metoda i strategija poučavanja kako bi omogućili i potaknuli razvoj interkulturalnih kompetencija kod učenika, posebno interkulturalne osjetljivosti kao emocionalne kompetencije o kojoj ovisi kvaliteta međusobne interakcije, kao i pozitivno ozračje u razredu.

Rezultati istraživanja interkulturalne osjetljivosti nastavnika koje smo dobili koristeći se Skalom interkulturalne osjetljivosti, potvrdili su primjerenost upotrebe te vrste instrumenta na uzorku nastavnika razredne i predmetne nastave u osnovnim školama, ali su i otvorili prostor za daljnja istraživanja interkulturalne osjetljivosti nastavnika na svim razinama obrazovanja. Naše je istraživanje, nadalje, poslužilo i za provjeru valjanosti i pouzdanosti Skale interkulturalne osjetljivosti u kontekstu našeg odgojno-obrazovnog sustava.