



İNÖNÜ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

THE IMPACT OF TASK-BASED INTERCULTURAL LANGUAGE TEACHING ON INTERCULTURAL MINDSET DEVELOPMENT

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ
MASTER'S THESIS

AYBÜKE BURKAÇ

MALATYA, 2026

T.C.
INONU UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

**THE IMPACT OF TASK-BASED INTERCULTURAL LANGUAGE TEACHING ON
INTERCULTURAL MINDSET DEVELOPMENT**

Aybüke BURKAÇ

Department of Foreign Language Education
English Language Teaching Program

Master's Thesis

Advisor

Prof. Dr. Gülten GENÇ

MALATYA

2026

 İNÖNÜ ÜNİVERSİTESİ EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ	KABUL ONAY FORMU	Doküman No	İNÜ-KYS-FRM-142
		Yayın Tarihi	19.08.2019
		Revizyon No	
		Revizyon Tarihi	

İNÖNÜ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

THE IMPACT OF TASK-BASED INTERCULTURAL LANGUAGE TEACHING ON
INTERCULTURAL MINDSET DEVELOPMENT

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

DANIŞMAN
PROF. DR. GÜLTEN GENÇ

HAZIRLAYAN
AYBÜKE BURKAÇ

Jürimiz tarafından 29/06/2026 tarihinde yapılan tez savunma sınavı sonucunda bu tez **oybirliği /oyçokluğu** ile başarılı bulunarak **Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı** Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Jüri Üyelerinin Unvanı Adı Soyadı

İmza

1.Prof. Dr. Gülten GENÇ (Tez Danışmanı)

.....

2.Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Peri ASLAN

.....

3.Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Emine KULUŞAKLI

.....

O N A Y

Bu tez, İnönü Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim Yönetmeliği'nin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca yukarıdaki jüri üyeleri tarafından kabul edilmiş ve Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu'nun .../.../20... tarih ve 20.../..... sayılı Kararıyla da uygun görülmüştür.

.....

Enstitü Müdürü

T.C.

İNÖNÜ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

ETİK VE YAPAY ZEKA KULLANIM BEYANI

29/06/2026

İnönü Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Tez Yazım Kurallarına uygun olarak, “Prof. Dr. Gülten GENÇ” danışmanlığında hazırlayıp sunduğum “The Impact of Task-Based Intercultural Language Teaching on Intercultural Mindset Development” başlıklı Yüksek Lisans tezimde:

1. ETİK VE BİLİMSEL SORUMLULUKLARIM:

- Tezimde yer alan verileri, bilgileri ve belgeleri akademik ve etik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi, değerlendirme ve sonuçları bilimsel etik ve ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu,
- Çalışmada yararlandığım tüm kaynaklara bilimsel kurallara uygun şekilde atıfta bulunduğumu ve kaynakça gösteriminde APA 7. baskı kurallarına uyduğumu,
- Tezimin özgün olduğunu, çalışma ve yazım sürecinde patent ve telif haklarını ihlal edici hiçbir davranışta bulunmadığımı,
- Aksi bir durumda doğabilecek tüm hukuki ve akademik sonuçları kabul ettiğimi,

2. YAPAY ZEKA KULLANIMINA İLİŞKİN BEYANIM:

(✓) Tez yazım sürecinde yapay zekâ tabanlı araçlardan faydalandım.

Bu durumda:

- Yapay zekâ araçlarını, yazım sürecinde ifadelerimi akademik açıdan güçlendirmek ve daha açık bir biçimde ifade edebilmek amacıyla sınırlı ölçüde kullandığımı, bu kullanımın yalnızca dilsel düzenleme ve ifade netleştirme ile sınırlı olduğunu,
 - Hipotez geliştirme, veri analizi ve yorumlama gibi çalışmanın özgün bilimsel katkısını oluşturan aşamalarda yapay zekâdan yararlanmadığımı ve bu kullanımın tezin özgünlüğüne ve bilimsel etik kurallara aykırı olmadığını,
 - Usulsüz kullanımlara kesinlikle başvurmadığımı,
 - Kullanılan yapay zekâ araçlarının danışmanımın bilgisi dâhilinde şeffaf biçimde belirtildiğini,
 - Yükseköğretim Kurumları Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Faaliyetlerinde Üretken Yapay Zekâ Kullanımına Dair Etik Rehber’de belirtilen ilkelere riayet ettiğimi,
- kabul ve taahhüt ederim.

Aybüke Burkaç

EK: Yapay Zekâ Kullanım Tablosu

EK: Yapay Zekâ Kullanım Tablosu

No	Üretken Yapay Zekâ Aracı	Kullanım Amacı	Kullanıldığı Bölüm	Kullanım Şekli
1	ChatGPT	Dil ve yazım denetimi	Giriş, Literatür Taraması, Tartışma ve Sonuç	Metinlerdeki dil bilgisi, yazım ve ifade hatalarının düzeltilmesi için kullanılmıştır. Üretilen metinler doğrudan kullanılmamış, öneriler araştırmacı tarafından değerlendirilerek düzenlenmiştir.
2	ChatGPT	APA 7 kaynakça ve atıf kontrolü		Atıf ve kaynakça biçimlerinin APA 7 kurallarına uygunluğunun kontrol edilmesinde yardımcı araç olarak kullanılmıştır. Öneriler araştırmacı tarafından değerlendirilerek düzenlenmiştir.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	x
ÖZET	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Problem Statement	3
1.3. Purpose of the Study	6
1.4. Significance of the Study	6
1.5. Research Questions	8
1.6. Assumptions	8
1.7. Limitations	9
1.8. Definitions	9
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1. Intercultural Communicative Competence in EFL Education	11
2.1.1. From Language–Culture Relationship to Intercultural Competence	11
2.1.2. Intercultural Awareness & Communicative Competence	14
2.2. Task-Based Language Teaching and intercultural learning	20
2.2.1. Principles of task-based language teaching	20
2.2.2. Task-Based Activities for Intercultural Development.....	22
2.3. Social-Emotional Competence in Language Learning	24
2.3.1. Definition and Components of Social–Emotional Competence	24
2.3.2. Social-Emotional Processes in Interaction	26
2.4. Intolerance of uncertainty in language and intercultural contexts.....	28
2.4.1. Intolerance of Uncertainty and Ambiguity in Language Learning.....	28
2.4.2. Managing Uncertainty through Task-Based Language Learning.....	30
2.5. Relationships Among Intercultural Awareness, Social-Emotional Competence, and Intolerance of Uncertainty.....	31
2.6. Related Studies	33
2.6.1. Studies Conducted in Türkiye	33
2.6.1.1. Intercultural competence studies in Turkish EFL contexts.....	33
2.6.1.2. Task-based language teaching research in Türkiye	34
2.6.1.3. Studies on affective and socio-emotional variables.....	35
2.6.2. Studies Conducted Abroad.....	36

2.6.2.1. Experimental studies on intercultural training.....	36
2.6.2.2. Task-based intercultural learning interventions	37
2.6.2.3. Research connecting intercultural competence and socio-emotional development .	38
2.6.2.4. Studies addressing uncertainty and ambiguity tolerance in SLA	38
3. METHODOLOGY	41
3.1. Research Design	41
3.2. Participants.....	42
3.3. Data Collection Instruments.....	44
3.3.1. Demographic Information Form.....	44
3.3.2. Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire (IAQ)	44
3.3.3. Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale (IUS-12)	45
3.3.4. Delaware Social-Emotional Competency Scale (DSECS-S).....	46
3.4. Validity and Reliability	46
3.5. Data Collection Procedure.....	47
3.5.1. Preparation Phase	47
3.5.2. Treatment Phase	48
3.6. Data Analysis	57
4. FINDINGS	59
4.1. Findings Related to Research Question 1.....	59
4.2. Findings Related to Research Question 2.....	62
4.3. Findings Related to Research Question 3.....	63
4.4. Findings Related to Research Question 4.....	63
4.5. Findings Related to Research Question 5.....	64
5. DISCUSSION	66
5.1. Pre-Test Levels of Intercultural Mindset	66
5.2. Effect of the Task-Based Intercultural Teaching Program on Intercultural Awareness	67
5.3. Effect of the Task-Based Intercultural Teaching Program on Social-Emotional Competence.....	69
5.4. Effect of the Task-Based Intercultural Teaching Program on Intolerance of Uncertainty	70
5.5. Within-Group Differences	73
6. Conclusion	75
6.1. Conclusion	75
6.2. Implications	76
6.3. Suggestions for Further Research.....	77
REFERENCES.....	80
APPENDICES.....	93

Appendix 1: Ethical Report	93
Appendix 2: Consent Form of Participants.....	94
Appendix 3: Consent Form for Parents of Student Participants	95
Appendix 4: Permission to Collect Data from MoNE.....	96
Appendix 5: Data Collection Tool	97
Appendix 6: Permissions to Use Scales	101
Appendix 7: Photos from Intervention Process.....	102



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Prof. Dr. Gülten Genç, for her guidance, patience, and support throughout this entire process. Her valuable feedback shaped this thesis in many ways.

This thesis demanded considerable time, effort, and personal sacrifice at every stage. Writing it while holding a Fulbright scholarship in the United States added a particular weight to the process, but also made it uniquely meaningful. Balancing a teaching position with thesis work across two countries pushed me past what I thought I could handle. I would also like to thank myself for the patience and perseverance this journey required.

Above all, I want to thank my mother, Pınar Kantarcıoğlu, whose support has never wavered at any point in my life, whether in education or in my professional journey. Her presence, encouragement, and unwavering belief in me made this possible. This thesis belongs to her as much as it does to me.

ABSTRACT

THE IMPACT OF TASK-BASED INTERCULTURAL LANGUAGE TEACHING ON INTERCULTURAL MINDSET DEVELOPMENT

The present study aimed to investigate the impact of an eight-week task-based intercultural language teaching program on the development of intercultural mindset among 9th-grade EFL learners. In this study, intercultural mindset was conceptualized as a multidimensional construct consisting of intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty.

A quasi-experimental pre-test/post-test control group design was employed in the study. The participants consisted of 46 ninth-grade students attending a public high school in Malatya, Türkiye. While the experimental group received an eight-week task-based intercultural teaching program, the control group continued with regular instruction. Data were collected through the Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire, the Delaware Social-Emotional Competency Scale, and the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale. ANCOVA, paired-samples t-tests, and Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Tests were used to analyze the data.

The findings revealed that the task-based intercultural teaching program did not produce a statistically significant group effect on intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, or intolerance of uncertainty. No significant within-group change was identified in either the experimental or the control group.

The findings suggest that short-term task-based intercultural teaching programs may not be sufficient to generate statistically measurable changes across the dimensions of intercultural mindset within an eight-week period. The study contributes to the literature by conceptualizing intercultural mindset as a multidimensional construct and by providing empirical evidence at the high school EFL level.

Keywords: Intercultural Awareness, Intercultural Mindset, Intolerance of Uncertainty, Social-Emotional Competence, Task-Based Language Teaching

ÖZET

GÖREV TEMELLİ KÜLTÜRLERARASI DİL ÖĞRETİMİNİN KÜLTÜRLERARASI ZİHNİYET GELİŞİMİNE ETKİSİ

Bu çalışmanın amacı, sekiz haftalık görev temelli kültürlerarası dil öğretimi programının 9. sınıf İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin kültürlerarası zihniyet gelişimi üzerindeki etkisini incelemektir. Bu çalışmada kültürlerarası zihniyet; kültürlerarası farkındalık, sosyal-duygusal yeterlik ve belirsizliğe tahammülsüzlük boyutlarından oluşan çok boyutlu bir yapı olarak ele alınmıştır.

Araştırmada ön test-son test kontrol gruplu yarı deneysel desen kullanılmıştır. Çalışma, Malatya'daki bir devlet lisesinde öğrenim gören toplam 46 dokuzuncu sınıf öğrencisiyle yürütülmüştür. Deney grubuna sekiz hafta boyunca görev temelli kültürlerarası öğretim programı uygulanırken kontrol grubunda mevcut öğretim süreci sürdürülmüştür. Veriler Kültürlerarası Farkındalık Ölçeği, Delaware Sosyal-Duygusal Yeterlik Ölçeği ve Belirsizliğe Tahammülsüzlük Ölçeği aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Verilerin analizinde ANCOVA, eşleştirilmiş örneklem t-testi ve Wilcoxon İşaretli Sıralar Testi kullanılmıştır.

Araştırma sonuçları, görev temelli kültürlerarası öğretim programının kültürlerarası farkındalık, sosyal-duygusal yeterlik ve belirsizliğe tahammülsüzlük üzerinde istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir grup etkisi oluşturmadığını göstermiştir. Deney ve kontrol gruplarında anlamlı bir grup içi değişim de belirlenmemiştir.

Elde edilen bulgular, sekiz haftalık kısa süreli görev temelli kültürlerarası öğretim programlarının kültürlerarası zihniyet boyutlarında istatistiksel olarak ölçülebilir değişimler oluşturmak için yeterli olmayabileceğine işaret etmektedir. Çalışma, kültürlerarası zihniyeti çok boyutlu bir yapı olarak ele alması ve lise düzeyinde deneysel kanıt sunması bakımından alana katkı sağlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Belirsizliğe Tahammülsüzlük, Görev Temelli Dil Öğretimi, Kültürlerarası Farkındalık, Kültürlerarası Zihniyet, Sosyal-Duygusal Yeterlilik

LIST OF TABLES

Table No	Page No
Table 1. Demographic statistics of participants	43
Table 2. Mean and standard deviation of participants' age.....	44
Table 3. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for scales.....	46
Table 4. The course syllabus used in the study	49
Table 5. Normality test results	57
Table 6. Summary of data analysis methods by research question.....	58
Table 7. Overall descriptive statistics for pre-test scores by group	59
Table 8. Pre-test Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire scores by demographic variables	60
Table 9. Pre-test Social-Emotional Competency Scale scores by demographic variables	61
Table 10. Pre-test Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale scores by demographic variables.....	61
Table 11. ANCOVA results for the effect of the intervention on intercultural awareness	62
Table 12. ANCOVA results for the effect of the intervention on social-emotional competence.....	63

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the present study. It begins with the background of the study, followed by the statement of the problem and the purpose and significance of the study. The research questions, limitations, assumptions, and definitions of key terms are also presented in this chapter.

1.1. Background of the Study

Learning a new language involves more than just acquiring a different means of communication; it is also a process of cultural adaptation. The language learning process is similar to a traveler getting used to new expectations, social frameworks and beliefs. Similar to how a traveler returns home with a new way of understanding their surroundings, language learners also go through a change in their view of language and meaning (Tomlinson, 2013).

Agar (2002) describes the connection between language and culture by claiming that while language creates the sounds that connect people, culture gives those sounds meaning and builds human relationships. In this way, language has cultural importance and culture is founded in language. Culture has a profound impact on individuals and groups in a variety of ways, including daily habits, social standards, and eating habits (Larzén, 2005; Spencer-Oatey, 2021)

Culture plays a necessary role in shaping human behavior, their interactions, and society's norms, with its active and developing nature, especially in the time where English serves as a necessary tool for global communication (Zorba, 2019).

Learning a language is not just about acquiring the ability to communicate linguistically. It clearly also requires learners to grasp and navigate the cultural aspects that shape how language is used (Kramsch, 2014). Students need to engage and interact with factors that influence human communication, such as new cultural norms, values, and social cues when interacting with a new language (Alisoy, 2024; Kramsch, 2014). It is crucial to integrate intercultural competence into language education as globalized societies continue to interact. This can ensure that students are not only proficient communicators but also culturally sensitive individuals who can adjust to a variety of communicative contexts (Cong-Lem, 2025).

Intercultural communication and intercultural competence play a particularly significant role in the context of second/foreign language education. Intercultural competence, which is described as

“the ability to step beyond one’s own culture and function effectively and appropriately with speakers from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds” by Huang (2021), has emerged as a key component of language proficiency, complementing linguistic skills with the ability to navigate cultural differences (Cong-Lem, 2025).

As Crystal (2003) points out, when a language has a unique role recognized in every country, it reaches true global status, and ownership of the language shifts. According to Christie & McKay (2002), a global language must belong to individuals who use it rather than to any certain country. As a result, contact in international settings is no longer limited to native speaker-nonnative speaker exchanges (Byram, 2008). Alptekin (2002) claims that most of the communication in English involves nonnative users of English and it will continue to involve even more. In this regard, Lázár et al. (2007) argue that native or near-native fluency alone does not guarantee successful communication with persons from various cultures, emphasizing the importance of better understanding the cultural dimension of language. Furthermore, Baker (2009) emphasizes that cultural awareness is limited to learners' own culture and the target culture, which is insufficient in today's diverse communicative contexts. In addition to positive attitudes like tolerance, respect, and open-mindedness toward all cultures, intercultural awareness demands cultural knowledge about the similarities and clear differences between learners' own culture, target culture or cultures, and other cultures. It also requires abilities like observing, comparing, exploring, and reflecting (Zorba, 2019).

An intercultural mindset builds upon the foundations established by Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC). While ICC focuses on the skills, knowledge, and attitudes required to communicate effectively across cultural boundaries (Byram, 1997), an intercultural mindset emphasizes the underlying attitudes of curiosity, openness, and respect that drive these competencies (Deardorff, 2006). It extends the scope of ICC by fostering self-awareness, global awareness, and the ability to navigate complex cultural dynamics with flexibility and adaptability (Hofmeyr, 2024). Hence, one can claim that an intercultural mindset supports the development of ICC and acts as a wider framework for developing a proactive and reflective approach to intercultural relations.

Task-based learning (TBL) is a teaching approach in which learning spaces are designed to include students in real-world problem-solving exercises while also allowing them to delve deeper into the subject matter. This approach also motivates students to perform meaningful tasks on their own, leading to the creation of real-world products (Kuswoyo & Wahyudin, 2017). TBLT gives students real-world tasks that use language as a tool to solve issues and communicate effectively, much like everyday chores like writing an essay, making a phone call, or filling out a form. This method promotes

interlanguage development and increases student autonomy by emphasizing meaningful task completion (Hashemi, Azizinezhad, & Darvishi, 2012).

1.2. Problem Statement

Culture is a dynamic and evolving force, and it has an important role in shaping human behavior, interactions, and societal norms, especially at a time when English is the major medium of global communication (Zorba, 2019). Language acquisition in second and foreign language education goes beyond linguistic competency; it also requires students to grasp and analyze the cultural settings in which language exists. Engaging with new language means being acquainted with new cultural norms, values, and communicative practices (Kramsch, 2014). In an increasingly globalized society, incorporating intercultural competency into language instruction is critical for preparing students to speak successfully and appropriately across diverse cultural situations (Cong-Lem, 2025).

There are multiple interrelated reasons why intercultural awareness is crucial to this study. Intercultural awareness is a construct consisting of the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to recognize and negotiate cultural similarities and differences in real-world intercultural interactions (Zorba, 2019). Baker (2009) makes a distinction between intercultural awareness and cultural awareness: intercultural awareness includes broader engagement with multiple cultures as well as the capacity to apply this understanding flexibly in real-time interaction, while cultural awareness refers to learners' understanding of both their own culture and the target culture. Because interaction between speakers from different cultural origins is becoming the norm rather than the exception, this broadened perspective makes intercultural awareness a more acceptable foundation for today's varied communicative circumstances (Baker, 2009; Zorba, 2019).

Intercultural awareness is closely related to intercultural sensitivity, yet the two concepts are distinct. Intercultural sensitivity, as defined in Bennett and Bennett's (2004) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, is the affective and attitudinal dimension of intercultural development that includes openness, tolerance, interest, and an eagerness to engage with cultural diversity (Zorba 2019). In contrast, intercultural awareness represents the cognitive dimension: the ability to perceive, analyze, and critically reflect on cultural differences (Byram, 1997; Baker, 2009). This distinction is also represented in Chen and Starosta's (1998) ICC framework, which clearly defines intercultural awareness like the cognitive component and intercultural sensitivity as the affective component of intercultural communicative competence (Zorba, 2019).

Intercultural awareness is a core component of ICC, not a separate entity. Byram (1997) positions critical cultural awareness at the heart of his ICC paradigm, viewing it as the integrating dimension that brings attitudes, knowledge, and skills together. In this sense, establishing intercultural

awareness serves as both a prerequisite and an expression of greater ICC. However, ICC frameworks have been criticized for focusing on observable abilities and knowledge while ignoring the underlying dispositions that influence intercultural behavior (Deardorff, 2006; Byram, 2020). As a result, the current study views intercultural awareness as a cognitive component of a larger intercultural mindset that includes affective and uncertainty-related elements (Baker, 2009; Byram, 1997). Given that classroom practices in contexts such as Türkiye tend to address intercultural content superficially rather than through structured pedagogical intervention (Zorba, 2019), the gap between curricular goals and actual learner development is fundamentally a problem of awareness, making intercultural awareness the natural and necessary central point of this research.

Despite the recognition of intercultural objectives in curricula, including those implemented in Türkiye, a gap persists between theoretical aims and classroom practice. Coursebooks, whether locally produced or internationally distributed, often privilege native-speaker cultures while marginalizing learners' own cultural identities and other global perspectives (Çelik & Erbay, 2013). Moreover, globally marketed materials tend to present "sanitized" cultural content that avoids complexity and critical engagement (Gray, 2002; Melliti, 2013). As a result, intercultural awareness is frequently addressed superficially rather than through structured pedagogical intervention.

This superficial approach to intercultural content has real consequences for learners' development. When classroom instruction restricts culture to factual descriptions of target-culture customs and behaviors, students come to see it as a static body of knowledge to memorize rather than a dynamic, interactive process to be experienced and critically engaged with (East, 2012; Kramsch, 2013). According to East (2012), teachers in communicative language classrooms tend to emphasize factual cultural knowledge over intercultural awareness, which means that students are rarely asked to compare perspectives, reflect on their own cultural assumptions, or engage with cultural complexity in meaningful ways. The issue is thus not only one of content but also of pedagogical approach: even when cultural elements appear in materials, the absence of purposefully designed tasks that promote reflection and cultural comparison means that the conditions required for genuine intercultural development are not created (Brunsmeier, 2021; East, 2012). Intercultural awareness, in this sense, requires not only exposure to cultural material, but also structured chances to observe, compare, explore, and reflect – abilities that typical coursebook-based training rarely provides (Zorba, 2019).

This pedagogical gap reflects a deeper issue: even when cultural content is included in curricula and materials, the lack of structured, task-based interaction means that learners rarely have opportunities to compare perspectives, challenge assumptions, or engage with cultural complexity in meaningful ways (East, 2012; Brunsmeier, 2021). As a result, students may start to view culture as a

set of facts to memorize rather than a dynamic process to be experienced and negotiated (East, 2012; Brunsmeier, 2021). In other words, the issue is not just one of content, but also of pedagogy.

Studies conducted in Türkiye largely focus on implementing intercultural activities with undergraduate students, who are assumed to possess higher levels of cognitive maturity and language proficiency (Zorba, 2019). Özmen, Cephe, and Kınık (2016) found that intercultural communication was among the least studied areas in Turkish ELT doctoral research, with only 2 out of 137 dissertations addressing it.

Beyond the empirical gap, there are compelling pedagogical and developmental reasons why high school students are an especially important demographic for intercultural research. High school is an essential phase of both language and socio-emotional development, during which perspective-taking, empathy, and the ability to engage with cultural differences emerge (Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009). These are precisely the skills required for intercultural competence, as openness, empathy, and the ability to engage with cultural differences are essential for intercultural development (Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006). Research on younger learners in Türkiye is scarce, despite its importance for development and education (Karaca, 2024; Nazlı, 2022; Saylan, 2023). The gap is thus not only empirical, but also indicates an unmet educational need: high school students are a demographic for whom intercultural intervention is both critical and potentially transformative, but they have got too little interest in the literature.

Although interculturality and cultural diversity are reflected in the revised EFL curriculum, and cultural elements are positively included (MoNE, 2018, 2025), instructional materials and classroom practices frequently fail to provide concrete and structured activity suggestions appropriate for younger learners (Zorba, 2019). In other words, cultural objectives have been expressed in the curriculum but have not been converted into structured educational practice. East (2012) argues that communication techniques usually overlook the intercultural dimension because teachers prioritize factual cultural knowledge over organized intercultural engagement. Similarly, Brunsmeier (2021) underlines that effective intercultural learning requires carefully planned exercises that allow students to compare cultures, reflect on their own perspectives, and engage critically with cultural differences. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) provides a structured framework for meaningful intercultural learning and interaction (Ellis, 2017; East, 2012; Brunsmeier, 2021). As a result, there is a clear need for structured, pedagogically acceptable interventions that systematically promote intercultural development at the high school level. To discuss these gaps, this study examines the effectiveness of a structured task-based intercultural training program in fostering an intercultural mindset among high school EFL learners.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The primary aim of this study is to examine the impact of an eight-week task-based intercultural training program on the development of an intercultural mindset among 9th-grade students learning English as a foreign language. In this study, intercultural mindset is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct encompassing cognitive, social-emotional, and uncertainty-related dimensions of intercultural development.

The selection of these three dimensions is theoretically justified. Intercultural awareness is the cognitive part of the intercultural mindset, which refers to learners' ability to perceive, analyze, and reflect on cultural differences across diverse cultural contexts (Baker, 2009; Byram, 1997). This cognitive orientation also aligns with Chen and Starosta's (1998) definition of intercultural awareness as a cognitive component of intercultural communicative competence (Zorba, 2019). Social-emotional competence is the affective dimension, which includes emotional control, empathy, and social skills that allow learners to interact constructively and properly with culturally diverse individuals (CASEL, n.d.; Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009). Intolerance of uncertainty addresses the ambiguity tolerance aspect, demonstrating learners' ability to deal with the unpredictable and complicated nature of intercultural encounters (Carleton et al., 2007; Li et al., 2017). Intercultural communication typically involves confusing and unfamiliar situations, and learners' ability to manage such ambiguity has a direct impact on how openly and effectively they can connect with cultural diversity (Hosseini & Seifoori, 2018; Youfi & Brigui, 2024). These three characteristics work together to fulfill the cognitive, affective, and adaptive demands of intercultural development in an intentional and integrated manner, demonstrating a theoretically grounded understanding of the intercultural mindset.

The present study was conducted to investigate whether a structured task-based intercultural training program can contribute to the development of an intercultural mindset among high school EFL learners. In doing so, it seeks to explore the extent to which such a program can foster learners' intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and tolerance of uncertainty as interconnected dimensions of intercultural development.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study contributes to the field of foreign language teaching by addressing the gap in empirical research on intercultural development at the high school level. Although intercultural awareness is widely acknowledged as a curricular objective, classroom methods frequently favor linguistic proficiency over intentional intercultural engagement.

Theoretically, this study advances our knowledge of intercultural growth by operationalizing intercultural mindset as a multidimensional concept with three distinct dimensions: intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty. Previous research has focused on intercultural competence as a cognitive construct, with little consideration for its impact on affective and psychological dimensions including social-emotional competence and intolerance of uncertainty (Baker, 2009; Sarıkayış, 2022). While some research suggests that intercultural and multilingual experiences can help individuals cope with uncertain situations (Vaitonytė et al., 2020), there is still limited empirical research on the relationship between intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty within a task-based instructional framework (Cai et al., 2026; Hosseini & Seifoori, 2018; Long & Long, 2026; Sarıkayış, 2022). Unlike previous studies that approached interculturality through a single construct or dimension, this multidimensional mindset model provides a deeper understanding about how learners develop intercultural competence, resulting in a more integrated view of intercultural development in foreign language education.

Methodologically, this study adds to the generally descriptive and higher education-focused literature in Türkiye, where interculturality studies have primarily relied on surveys and interviews with university students, faculty members, and professors (Karaca, 2024). Despite recent studies (Nazlı, 2022; Saylan) there is currently a lack of intervention-based research at earlier educational levels. Furthermore, many studies on intercultural competence have primarily focused on classroom activities or instructional materials designed to raise cultural awareness (Coşkun, 2024; Tural & Cubukcu, 2021; Zorba, 2019) but they rarely address structured task-based intercultural training programs. Research on task-based language teaching has focused on developing language skills and classroom interaction, rather than its potential impact on intercultural awareness (Çakal, 2024; Okcan, 2023). Additionally, the development of a multidimensional intercultural mindset has not been thoroughly examined from an empirical perspective (Ellis, 2017; East, 2012). This study uses a quasi-experimental design with experimental and control groups at the high school level to give empirical evidence for the effectiveness of a structured task-based intercultural training program. The use of validated instruments to assess the three dimensions of intercultural mindset increases the study's methodological rigor. In this regard, this study is one of the few that has generated experimental evidence on intercultural growth at the high school level in Türkiye.

Pedagogically, the findings are likely to have practical consequences for the systematic integration of intercultural aims into high school EFL training. The EFL curricula in Türkiye has been designed according to the CEFR since 2006. The importance of intercultural awareness has been emphasized since 2013. However, rather than putting the focus on primary schools, lower secondary

schools, and high schools, the studies usually focus on coursebook analyses and applying activities on undergraduate students for a short time (Zorba, 2019).

Furthermore, as Zorba (2019) points out, coursebooks, which serve as the key tools for implementing the curriculum in Turkish EFL classrooms, indicate significant issues in terms of intercultural understanding. Given the constraints of coursebook-based instruction, this study analyzes whether complementing conventional coursebook instruction with organized task-based intercultural activities can aid in the development of an intercultural mindset among high school EFL students. By addressing this gap using a multidimensional mindset model and experimental data, this work not only contributes to the Turkish EFL setting but also provides insights that can be applied to other expanding circle contexts where similar gaps in intercultural education exist.

1.5. Research Questions

1. What are the pre-test levels of intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty among the participants, as described by their demographic characteristics?
2. Does the task-based intercultural training program affect intercultural awareness among 9th-grade EFL learners?
3. Does the task-based intercultural training program affect social-emotional competence among 9th-grade EFL learners?
4. Does the task-based intercultural training program affect intolerance of uncertainty among 9th-grade EFL learners?
5. Are there significant within-group differences between pre-test and post-test scores in the experimental and control groups in terms of intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty?

1.6. Assumptions

The current analysis is based on various assumptions. First, it is assumed that the scales and instruments used to assess intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and uncertainty tolerance are valid and reliable tools for evaluating the targeted constructs. Second, it is assumed that participants respond to the pre-test and post-test instruments honestly and accurately, reflecting their genuine perceptions of intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and uncertainty in intercultural contexts. Third, it is assumed that the experimental and control groups have similar levels of intercultural mindset at the start of the study, before the intervention starts. Finally, it is assumed

that the task-based intercultural training program is implemented as originally designed, with no significant deviations that could influence the study's outcomes, and that the intervention's eight-week duration is sufficient to produce observable and measurable differences in the targeted constructs.

1.7. Limitations

There are various limitations to this study that should be addressed. First, the study is limited to 9th-grade students at a single public high school in Malatya, Türkiye. As a result, the findings may not be applicable to students from different regions, age groups, or educational settings. Second, the intervention is limited to eight weeks, which may not be long enough to capture the long-term or sustained effects of the task-based intercultural training program. Third, despite the study's quasi-experimental design with experimental and control groups, the nature of the educational context prevents random assignment of participants. Fourth, because the study uses self-report instruments to assess multicultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and uncertainty tolerance, the results may be influenced by response bias.

Finally, external variables such as students' prior intercultural experiences, personal backgrounds, or individual differences as well as potential teacher-related effects, which were not controlled or systematically measured in the study, may have influenced the outcomes. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted within this specific educational and socio-cultural context and may not be directly generalizable to different populations or settings.

1.8. Definitions

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT): A pedagogical approach centered on engaging learners in meaningful tasks that mirror real-world scenarios (Kuswoyo & Wahyudin, 2017).

Intercultural Mindset: A multidimensional construct encompassing cognitive, social-emotional, and uncertainty-related dimensions of intercultural development (Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006; Hofmeyr, 2024).

Intercultural Awareness: The knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to recognize and navigate cultural similarities and differences in real-life intercultural encounters (Zorba, 2019).

Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC): The ability to communicate with people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds in a language other than one's native language in an appropriate and productive manner (Tran & Duong, 2018).

Social-Emotional Competence: Individuals' capacity to navigate and manage both intrapersonal experiences and interpersonal situations in ways that enable effective social functioning (Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009).

Intolerance of Uncertainty: The tendency to view the potential for a negative event, regardless of its likelihood, as unsatisfactory (Carleton et al., 2007).

Intercultural Competence: The capacity to transcend one's own culture and interact with speakers from various language and cultural origins in a suitable and productive manner (Huang, 2021).

Social-Emotional Learning (SEL): The process by which people learn and use the attitudes, abilities, and information required to control their emotions, accomplish their objectives, show empathy, build relationships of support, and make wise decisions (CASEL, n.d.).

EFL (English as a Foreign Language): English instruction and acquisition in situations where it is not the main language of communication (Zorba, 2019).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Intercultural Communicative Competence in EFL Education

2.1.1. From Language–Culture Relationship to Intercultural Competence

English acts as a common language around the world. It has become one of the most commonly used languages since the mid- 1980s. More and more people have started using it since. English is also taught and spoken as a second or foreign language globally, other than its role as a native language in many countries. This makes its status as a global language stable (Zorba, 2019).

Kramsch (2009) emphasizes culture's role even more and says that language is the main medium via which people manage their social lives. Every culture has unwritten rules affecting the way people interact, both orally and written. For example, a job application letter or a business letter requires different types of language use. Culture determines which communication manners are appropriate or not. Communication is made possible by social groups, such as family or an ethnic community (Kramsch, 2009).

Language and culture are inseparable. Brown (2007) claims that language and culture are intertwined in such a way that it is impossible to separate one from the other. This is a reason for the widely studied role of culture in language learning (Kramsch, 2013). In the past, the goal of language teaching was getting to native-like proficiency, focusing on the everyday behaviors and traditions of native speakers, while often focusing on cultural representations that are stereotypical (Kramsch, 2013).

There is no singular definition of culture, different scholars highlight different aspects of its complexity and changing nature. According to Brown (2007), culture is a way of life. He says that culture shapes how people behave and keeps society together. Kim (2003) sees culture as a collection of attributes special to specific human groups. Beliefs, values, norms and customs are the main components of culture and distinguish groups from one another. Matsumoto et al. (1996) describe culture as a collection of attitudes, values and behaviours which get passed down from generation to generation.

Pulverness and Tomlinson (2003) offer a broad definition, describing culture as a whole way of life, embracing all the behaviors, symbols, beliefs, and value systems of a society. In a similar way, Kramsch (1998) describes culture as a shared set of norms for seeing, thinking, judging, and behaving. According to Kramsch (1998), this system is co-constructed by the members of a community and

remains with them regardless of where they are or whom they interact with. Byram (2003) offers an alternative viewpoint, characterizing culture as a social group's common beliefs, values, and actions. He explains that culture is not only on the national level; families, universities or small social groups can also have their own unique culture. Culture doesn't need a large population to exist. His definition of culture portrays culture as dynamic, complex, multi-layered and always evolving; unlike earlier simple interpretations (Zorba, 2019).

Several key characteristics of culture are pointed out by Spencer-Oatey (2021). These include the influence it has on behavior and perceptions, its depth levels, the difference it has from both global human nature and individual personality, the effect it has on biology, its relationship to social groups, the way it exists both as an individual and collective matter, its expansion between individuals and communities, the way it combines global and unique elements, the unstoppable evolution it has, and the connection of its components (Spencer-Oatey, 2021).

Culture shapes almost every aspect of human life, from dietary habits to social norms and daily routines, demonstrating its pervasive influence on individuals and societies (Larzén, 2005; Spencer-Oatey, 2021). Culture does not stay still, it always changes and evolves with time. Especially today with English becoming the global communication tool, culture has become even more important in human interactions (Zorba, 2019).

All of these definitions have things in common. All researchers see culture as a common social system which affects how individuals behave, think, and engage with one another. Brown (2007), Kim (2003), and Matsumoto et al. (1996) all believe that culture keeps groups together, makes them a group of people who share same beliefs, values and rules. It also separates groups from each other. But not all the scholars say the same things about culture. They all agree that culture is important but focus on different aspects of it. Brown (2007) emphasizes how culture affects individuals. He also claims that culture shapes human behavior and identity. Kim (2003) on the other hand focuses on the collective rather than individuals, focusing on the distinguishing factors among groups. Matsumoto et al. (1996), emphasize cultural transmission between generations, drawing attention to its continuity across time. Byram (2003) and Kramsch (1998) goes beyond these views, they present culture as dynamic, co-constructed, and context-dependent rather than a permanent collection of characteristics. Spencer-Oatey (2021) goes a step farther, they define culture as both individual and collective, universal and unique. This definition has a complexity that previous definitions fail to grasp. Taken together, these perspectives indicate a theoretical shift in the field: from considering culture as a relatively fixed group trait to understanding it as a fluid, multi-layered process. This transition is

especially relevant in foreign language teaching, where a dynamic awareness of culture is required to create true intercultural competency.

When individuals learn a foreign language and interact with other cultures, they start to have a change in their perspectives of their own language and cultures. Many people don't realize their own culture because they grow up with it. Their own culture is very natural for them. Because of this, most of them don't even question their thinking or behavior patterns. In this light, culture acts as a framework for understanding the world, making it difficult for people to notice cultural biases. Byram (2003) refers to this as the modification of monocultural awareness, emphasizing the potential for teaching materials to challenge learners' perspectives by focusing not only on the target culture but also on their own.

According to Kramsch (2013), there are two primary viewpoints on the function of culture in teaching foreign languages: modernist and postmodernist. The modernist viewpoint makes a distinction between small C culture, which includes attitudes, values, beliefs, and daily lifestyles, and Big C culture, which refers to literature and the arts. After the communicative shift in language pedagogy in the 1970s, culture in language instruction came to be connected with the everyday routines and actions of the target language's native speakers. This view, grounded in the modernist convention of "one language = one nation," assumed that all members of a society share uniform linguistic and cultural behaviors. Consequently, foreign language teaching often focused on stereotypical representations of the dominant native-speaker culture, particularly Anglo-American culture, which became the central theme in coursebooks and materials (Kramsch, 2013). However, this dependence on native-speaker norms has led to challenges, as nonnative-speaking teachers may feel pressured to conform to these norms, finding it difficult to address learners' cultural contexts or integrate their own culture into teaching (Alptekin, 2002; Zorba, 2019).

The postmodernist view reflects a more dynamic, multi-layered, and complex understanding of culture, aligning with the definition by Byram (2003). Globalization and technology have changed communication and culture, detaching it from the borders of nation-states. Culture is no longer limited to one country (Kramsch, 2013). Byram (2003) emphasizes that modern language learners often act as mediators between cultures, they don't only learn a language, they also learn to understand and connect different cultural perspectives. Kramsch (1998) expands on this idea and puts the idea of a "third place" forward. The third place is where learners stand between their own culture and the target culture. They get to compare both cultures and understand both more deeply. They develop a new perspective that is not completely one culture or the other (Kramsch, 1998).

2.1.2. Intercultural Awareness & Communicative Competence

It has been argued that early language education approaches, which prioritized language proficiency, paid insufficient attention to sociocultural awareness (Lantolf, 2006). Language academics have so argued more and more for a stronger emphasis on sociocultural knowledge, especially the ability to understand and react to cultural norms in a variety of communication scenarios (Cong-Lem, 2025).

A "cultural turn" has occurred in language education in reaction to this criticism, especially with the emergence of Communicative Language Teaching (Byrnes, 2002). This turn emphasizes the way language and culture are connected, with language being viewed as a reflection of cultural realities rather than just a means of communication. Teaching language requires taking into account cultural differences in beliefs, values, and behaviors (Kramsch, 2014). As a result, intercultural competency has gained widespread acceptance as An essential component of teaching languages. The design of curricula, instructional strategies, learning objectives, and student achievement in cross-cultural settings like study abroad programs and international communication all involve an understanding of intercultural competence (Kural & Bayyurt, 2016; Cong-Lem, 2025).

Intercultural competence, which is defined as the capacity to transcend one's own culture and interact successfully and appropriately with speakers from various linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Huang, 2021), is an essential component of language proficiency that enhances linguistic skills by allowing one for negotiating cultural differences (Cong-Lem, 2025). Several significant advancements can be linked to the significance of intercultural competency. The move in language instruction toward communicative competence, which emphasizes the capacity to use language in socially acceptable contexts, is one important contributing factor (Tran & Duong, 2018).

Scholars like Bennett & Bennett, (2004), Byram (1997), Sinicrope et al. (2007) have defined intercultural communication competence (ICC) in a variety of ways, which has led to some ambiguity in how the construct is addressed (Tran & Duong, 2018). In the present context ICC can be defined as the ability to communicate with people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds in a language other than one's native tongue in an appropriate and successful manner. Drawing on the studies of scholars such as Bennett and Bennett (2004), Byram (1997), and Sinicrope et al. (2007) ICC can be thought of as consisting of intercultural competence, which includes attitudes, knowledge, abilities, and awareness, as well as language competence, which includes linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse competence, which together enable effective and appropriate participation in multicultural settings (Tran & Duong, 2018).

Across the literature, several models have been proposed to understand the multidimensional nature of ICC, including Byram's (1997) model of ICC, Fantini's (2000) intercultural competence model, and Deardorff's (2006) pyramid model of intercultural competence. Among these, Byram's (1997) framework is considered one of the most comprehensive models for both developing and assessing learners' ICC in varied educational contexts (Tran & Duong, 2018). According to his model, intercultural competence is made up of five elements: attitudes, knowledge, skills of interpretation and relating, skills of discovery and interaction, and critical cultural awareness or political education. It is closely related to linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse competences. Drawing on these elements, Byram (1997) formulates specific educational objectives to guide language and culture instruction and to provide criteria for evaluating learners' intercultural competence. Although these objectives are detailed, the model does not establish distinct levels of intercultural competence at different stages of learning, as Byram argues that defining levels, particularly for attitudes, is problematic (Tran & Duong, 2018).

Fantini's (2000) model of intercultural competence, which includes awareness, attitudes, skills, and knowledge, overlaps in several respects with Byram's (1997) framework. While language is not explicitly listed as a separate element within the model, Fantini (1997) emphasizes that proficiency in the host language plays a significant role in fostering intercultural competence (Tran & Duong, 2018). In order for students to acquire the awareness, attitudes, abilities, and knowledge required to participate more successfully at both local and global levels as well as to better understand and empathize with others, he further contends that language education should place a greater emphasis on intercultural dimensions (Fantini, 1997; Tran & Duong, 2018). Additionally, Fantini (2000) describes awareness as involving self-awareness and reflection, suggesting that it promotes deeper cognitive development, skills, and attitudes, while simultaneously being strengthened through their growth. Additionally, he emphasizes that developing intercultural competence is an ongoing, lifelong process because people are never totally interculturally competent. According to Fantini (2000), meaningful contact and positive experiences with speakers of other languages and cultures provide favorable conditions for developing intercultural competence.

Deardorff's (2006) pyramid model of intercultural competence, which is grounded in empirical research, incorporates the elements of attitudes, knowledge, and skills found in previous models, but also introduces internal and external outcomes as additional dimensions. These five components are arranged hierarchically, with the low levels acting as the baseline for the development of higher levels. In addition to the pyramid representation, Deardorff (2006) proposes a process model of intercultural competence that contains the same elements but presents them in a cyclical format. This process model illustrates that while attitudes and/or skills and knowledge may directly influence external

outcomes, the appropriateness and effectiveness of these outcomes are enhanced when the full cycle is completed and the process continues iteratively (Deardorff, 2006).

Among the theoretical frameworks in the field, Byram's (1997) Intercultural Communicative Competence model remains one of the most important in second and foreign language education. Five interconnected elements make up the model's conceptualization of intercultural competence: attitudes (openness and curiosity), knowledge (awareness of one's own and others' cultural practices), skills of interpretation and relating, skills of discovery and interaction, and critical cultural awareness. It emphasizes that language learning entails mediating between cultures rather than solely mastering linguistic structures. In the revised edition, (Byram, 2020) he refines the model by addressing earlier critiques and placing greater emphasis on affective dimensions such as empathy and intercultural attitudes. He further elaborates on the ethical side of important cultural awareness and highlights the model's applicability in contemporary and technology-mediated contexts.

Deardorff's (2006) Process Model provides a complementary perspective by framing intercultural competence as a cyclical and developmental process grounded in foundational attitudes such as openness, respect, and curiosity. Unlike more structurally defined approaches, this model underscores that intercultural competence is not static but evolves through reflection, adaptation, and continuous learning. This developmental orientation aligns with the dynamic and diverse contexts in which contemporary intercultural interactions occur (Cong-Lem, 2025).

By describing a continuum from ethnocentric to ethnorelative orientations, Bennett & Bennett's (2004) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) considerably advances our understanding of intercultural development. The model explains how individuals progress from viewing their own culture as central toward recognizing and adapting to cultural diversity. Intercultural sensitivity, within this framework, involves noticing, understanding, and adjusting to cultural differences in ways that foster respectful and meaningful interaction (e.g., Gholami Pasand & Hassaskhah, 2024). This staged perspective has proven particularly useful in educational contexts for supporting learners' intercultural development (Cong-Lem, 2025).

The three models discussed above have a common foundation in that they all consider intercultural competence as a multidimensional construct that includes attitudes, knowledge, and skills. However, they differ in significant ways. Byram's (1997) model is unique in that it explicitly integrates language competency with intercultural competence, emphasizing critical cultural awareness as the pinnacle of intercultural growth and directly relating it to educational goals. Fantini's (2000) model's components mostly align with Byram's (1997), but it places a distinct emphasis on language proficiency as a facilitating condition for intercultural competence rather than a parallel

dimension, and, more importantly, it frames intercultural competence as a lifetime, never-ending procedure. Deardorff's (2006) model differs the most from the others in that it introduces a hierarchical and cyclical structure, explicitly includes internal and external results, and is based on practical study rather than theoretical propositions. Bennett and Bennett's (2004) DMIS, on the other hand, differs from all three in its developmental orientation: rather than listing competence components, it charts a shift in perspectives from ethnocentric to ethnorelative, providing a stage-based understanding of how intercultural sensitivity develops over time. Whereas Byram (1997) and Fantini (2000) define intercultural competence and Deardorff (2006) describes how it develops as a process, Bennett and Bennett (2004) emphasis on a learner's position on a developmental continuum. These frameworks are complimentary rather than competing, as each highlights a dimension that the others leave partially in shade.

When combined, these frameworks provide a thorough theoretical framework for analyzing how language, culture, and communication interact in the teaching of second and foreign languages. By offering structured conceptual tools, they support both research and pedagogical practice aimed at fostering linguistic proficiency alongside intercultural awareness and sensitivity (Cong-Lem, 2025).

While these models provide valuable and comprehensive frameworks for understanding intercultural communicative competence, they have also been critiqued for placing greater emphasis on observable skills and knowledge, rather than on the underlying dispositions that shape intercultural behavior (Deardorff, 2006; Byram, 2020). In this respect, they tend to highlight what learners are able to do, while giving less attention to how they internally orient themselves in intercultural situations.

In response to this limitation, more recent perspectives have introduced the notion of an intercultural mindset, which shifts the focus from performance to perception and interpretation (Hofmeyr, 2024). This perspective draws attention to how learners make sense of and approach intercultural encounters, rather than simply how they perform within them. An intercultural mindset emphasizes internal orientations such as openness, curiosity, flexibility, and tolerance of ambiguity, qualities that are particularly important when navigating complex and dynamic intercultural contexts (Deardorff, 2006; Bennett & Bennett, 2004).

From this perspective, the concept of an intercultural mindset can be seen as both complementing and extending existing ICC frameworks. By bringing together cognitive, affective, and dispositional dimensions, it offers a more holistic understanding of intercultural development.

Building on these perspectives, the present study conceptualizes the intercultural mindset as a multidimensional construct that brings together cognitive, social-emotional, and uncertainty-related dimensions. Within this framework, intercultural awareness is understood as the cognitive

component, referring to learners' understanding of cultural diversity and their ability to interpret cultural meanings (Baker, 2009; Byram, 1997).

In addition, social-emotional competence reflects the interpersonal and affective dimension that supports effective and appropriate interaction with others (CASEL, n.d.; Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009). This dimension highlights learners' ability to manage emotions, show empathy, and engage constructively in social contexts. Furthermore, intolerance of uncertainty is included as a key dimension, as it relates to learners' capacity to cope with ambiguity and unpredictability, features that are inherent in intercultural communication (Carleton et al., 2007; Li et al., 2017). These dimensions are considered interrelated and mutually reinforcing components. By integrating cognitive, affective, and behavioral tendencies, they provide a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of intercultural development in foreign language learning contexts.

Intercultural communicative competence (ICC) is based on the integration of communicative and intercultural competence. ICC is defined by Chen & Starosta (1998) as the ability to effectively and appropriately perform communication behaviors in ways that negotiate cultural identities across culturally varied situations. Intercultural sensitivity (affective dimension), intercultural awareness (cognitive dimension), and intercultural adroitness (behavioral dimension) are the three main dimensions of ICC identified by their framework. These components collectively address both verbal and nonverbal aspects of interaction, which are essential elements of intercultural competence (Zorba, 2019). Expanding this framework, Wiseman (2002) introduces motivation as an additional critical component, underscoring that successful intercultural interaction depends not only on knowledge and skills but also on the willingness to engage across cultural differences (Zorba, 2019).

In his article, Cong-Lem (2025) states that the concepts of intercultural competence and intercultural communication are closely interconnected and have been conceptualized in different ways across the literature. He notes that, in general, both concepts seek to explain how individuals manage communication within culturally diverse environments. Ten Thijs (2020) explains that any communication occurring between individuals from different linguistic and/or cultural backgrounds can be described as intercultural communication. Furthermore, drawing on Byram (1997), he highlights intercultural competence as the ability to function effectively within one's own culture as well as others while engaging in meaningful interaction with individuals from diverse cultural contexts. Similarly, Baker (2024) defines intercultural communication as situations where participants or researchers view linguistic and cultural differences as important.

Intercultural competence, according to Deardorff (2015) is the capacity to communicate and behave in ways that are appropriate and productive in cross-cultural relationships. Effectiveness is the

achievement of communicative goals, whereas appropriateness is the way those goals are pursued in a certain environment. The ability to effectively communicate with individuals from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds while transcending one's own cultural barriers is another way Huang (2021) defines intercultural communication competency. Intercultural competence, thus, encompasses more than just language proficiency; it also involves managing the complexities that emerge in cross-cultural encounters, adapting to various cultural norms, and critically evaluating one's own and other people's cultural practices.

In second and foreign language education, intercultural communication and intercultural competence hold a central position. Language learning involves learning linguistic forms in addition to understanding the cultural frameworks that shape language use (Kramsch, 2014). Learners must engage with new cultural norms, values, and communicative conventions that influence interaction (Alisoy, 2024). In an increasingly globalized world, integrating intercultural competence into language education has become essential to ensure that learners develop both communicative effectiveness and cultural responsiveness (Cong-Lem, 2025).

Building on these theoretical perspectives, the concept of an intercultural mindset builds upon the foundations of ICC. While ICC centers on the attitudes, abilities, and knowledge required for effective cross-cultural communication (Byram, 1997), an intercultural mindset places greater emphasis on underlying dispositions such as openness, curiosity, and respect, which enable the development of these competencies (Deardorff, 2006). It broadens the scope of ICC by fostering self-awareness, global awareness, and the capacity to navigate complex cultural contexts with adaptability and flexibility (Hofmeyr, 2024). In this sense, an intercultural mindset not only reinforces ICC but also provides a more comprehensive framework for promoting reflective and proactive engagement in intercultural encounters (Zorba, 2019).

Baker (2009) distinguishes between cultural awareness and intercultural awareness, presenting them as related yet distinct constructs. In the context of language learning, cultural awareness refers to a person's conscious knowledge of both their own and the target cultures. Intercultural awareness, however, extends beyond this understanding to include broader engagement with multiple cultures. In English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) contexts where cultural influences are complex and constantly changing, intercultural awareness, according to Baker (2009), builds upon cultural awareness and provides a more suitable framework for the dynamic and fluid nature of intercultural communication. According to Baker (2009), intercultural awareness is the ability to apply this understanding flexibly and contextually in real-time engagement, as well as a conscious comprehension of how culturally grounded forms, practices, and interpretative frameworks influence

intercultural communication. Additionally, Baker (2011) suggests three levels of awareness, each with unique dimensions: basic cultural awareness, advanced cultural awareness, and intercultural awareness. The wider global and intercultural aspects of English language use are also emphasized by related ideas like multicultural awareness, critical cultural awareness, and transcultural awareness.

2.2. Task-Based Language Teaching and intercultural learning

2.2.1. Principles of task-based language teaching

The educational approach known as Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) places a strong emphasis on using meaningful tasks as the main teaching unit. Instead of focusing primarily on explicit grammar instruction, TBLT encourages learners to develop their language abilities through active engagement in communicative activities (Ellis, 2017). According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), task-based language teaching shifts the emphasis from the presentation of grammatical structures to task performance, where learners use language in meaningful situations and later reflect on language forms that emerge during communication. Through this process, learners develop both fluency and communicative competence while engaging in realistic language use (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Nunan (2004) highlights that TBLT promotes encouraging students to utilize language in relevant contexts and by increasing both the effectiveness and the motivational value of language learning. He suggests that TBLT contributes to language education through several important principles, including the use of materials tailored to learners' needs, the emphasis on interactive methods to promote communicative competence, the integration of authentic texts into the classroom, chances for students to concentrate on language and the learning process itself, the integration of students' past experiences into class activities, and the creation of links between classroom instruction and language use in the real world (Nunan, 2004).

Central to TBLT is the concept of a "task." Richards and Rodgers (2001) describe tasks as activities completed through the usage of language, like solving puzzles, reading maps and giving directions, making phone calls, writing letters, or following instructions. Similarly, Long (1985) characterizes a task as a piece of work done for oneself or others, such as filling out forms, making a purchase, reserving a hotel room, or giving directions. According to Nunan (1989), tasks are classroom activities that emphasize meaning over form and challenge students to understand, produce, and engage in the target language. Building on these definitions, Skehan (1998) identifies several key characteristics of tasks: meaning is the primary focus, learners generate their own language instead of repeating fixed expressions, tasks resemble real-world activities, successful completion of the task is the primary objective, and assessment is based on task outcomes

In addition to defining tasks, TBLT also emphasizes authentic communication and meaningful interaction. Willis (1996) argues that task-based learning provides chances for students to communicate authentically similar to real-life language use. Through participation in meaningful tasks, learners can develop their language abilities while interacting with others and negotiating meaning. Similarly, Kuswoyo & Wahyudin (2017) explain that task-based learning environments encourage learners to participate in authentic problem-solving activities and to produce meaningful outcomes through tasks. Project-based learning shares similar characteristics, as it engages learners in complex and realistic tasks that foster creativity, independence, responsibility, and analytical thinking while culminating in the production of tangible outcomes (Kuswoyo & Wahyudin, 2017).

Several scholars have proposed frameworks for structuring task-based lessons, although these frameworks generally share similar stages. One widely recognized model is proposed by Willis (1996), who describes task-based instruction as consisting of three main stages: Language focus, task cycle, and pre-task. During the Pre-task stage, the teacher introduces the topic and prepares learners for the task by activating prior knowledge and providing necessary instructions. The Task Cycle consists of three stages: Task, Planning, and Report. In the Task stage, learners work individually or collaboratively to complete the assigned activity. During the Planning stage, learners organize their ideas and prepare to present the outcomes of the task. During the Report stage, students use written displays or spoken presentations to share their findings with the class. Finally, the Language Focus stage involves analyzing linguistic patterns that emerged during task completion and practicing relevant language forms (Willis, 1996).

Similarly, Hashemi et al. (2012) describe task-based instruction as consisting of three main phases: pre-task, during-task, and post-task stages. In the pre-task phase, teachers introduce the task and activate learners' background knowledge. During the task phase, learners perform the task individually or collaboratively as the teacher watches the procedure and provides support when necessary. In the post-task phase, learners think about their performance, discuss outcomes, and receive feedback from the teacher.

Bygate (2016) also puts importance on structuring tasks into sequential phases. According to Bygate (2016), the pre-task phase prepares learners for the task through instructions and input materials, the on-task phase involves active participation in the task, and the post-task phase allows learners to evaluate outcomes and focus on linguistic features that emerged during task performance (Bygate, 2016).

Although these frameworks differ slightly in terminology, they share common pedagogical principles. All models emphasize preparation before the task, meaningful communication during task

performance, and reflection and language analysis after the task. These stages allow learners to engage in authentic interaction while also providing opportunities to focus on language development (Willis, 1996; Bygate, 2016; Hashemi et al., 2012).

Aside from structural similarities, Willis (1996), Hashemi et al. (2012), and Bygate (2016) differ in their instructional focus. Willis (1996) emphasizes the report stage, in which students communicate task outcomes to the class, viewing the public dimension as a source of both language production and accountability. Hashemi et al. (2012) focus on the teacher's active monitoring role during task performance, emphasizing guided support as critical to successful task completion. In contrast, Bygate (2016) emphasizes the post-task phase as a space for focused language reflection on forms that developed naturally during interaction. These distinctions are not disagreements, but rather complimentary contributions: when combined, the three theories show that what happens before, during, and after a task each serves a separate and vital role in language development.

Teachers and learners also assume specific roles within TBLT. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), teachers act as task selectors and organizers who design, adapt, and sequence tasks based on learners' needs, interests, and language proficiency levels. Teachers provide support during the pre-task stage, monitor learner interaction during task performance, and help learners focus on relevant language forms. Learners, on the other hand, actively participate in communication, often working in pairs or groups, and employ strategies such as paraphrasing, gestures, or clarification requests when faced with linguistic limitations (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Authentic materials are frequently incorporated into TBLT in order to enhance meaningful communication. Newspapers, television programs, and internet resources can be used to design tasks such as analyzing news reports, creating job advertisements, planning travel activities, or participating in online discussions (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Nunan (2004) defines authentic materials as texts that were not originally produced for language teaching reasons but originate from real-world contexts (Nunan, 2004) similarly argues that exposure to authentic texts enables learners to recognize the relevance of classroom learning to real-world communication.

2.2.2. Task-Based Activities for Intercultural Development

Research has demonstrated that task-based approaches can also support intercultural learning. Müller-Hartmann (2000) shows that task-based e-mail projects can promote intercultural learning by encouraging students to engage in collaborative investigation, reflection, dialogue, and action. Such tasks contribute to the development of Byram's intercultural savours by promoting positive attitudes and factual knowledge about other cultures (Müller-Hartmann, 2000). Similarly, East (2012) argues that communicative approaches often neglect the intercultural dimension because

teachers tend to emphasize factual cultural knowledge rather than intercultural awareness. However, he suggests that intercultural competence can be effectively developed through TBLT when tasks are deliberately designed to encourage reflection, comparison, and engagement with cultural differences.

Juan-Garau & Jacob (2015) explain that TBLT has generated significant pedagogical innovation and has been extensively researched over the past three decades. Research in instructed second language acquisition has demonstrated that pedagogical tasks promote authentic interaction and collaborative language learning (Ellis, 2003, 2012; Willis, 1996; Juan-Garau & Jacob, 2015). Other studies have examined how task design and implementation influence learner interaction, language performance, and learning outcomes (Philp, Oliver, & Mackey, 2006; Robinson, 2011; Skehan & Foster, 1999; Juan-Garau & Jacob, 2015). Robinson (2011) further suggests that complex tasks can encourage learners to engage in “think-for-speaking,” which supports conceptual development and language production.

Brunsmeyer (2021) emphasizes that tasks function as important pedagogical tools that structure classroom learning processes. Tasks can therefore act not only as instruments for language learning but also as tools for cultural learning (Müller-Hartmann & Schocker-von Dittfurth, 2011; Brunsmeyer, 2021). According to Brunsmeyer (2021), intercultural tasks should enable learners to interpret cultural information from different sources, such as songs, stories, pictures, or personal texts, and encourage learners to make connections between their own and other cultures by identifying similarities and differences. In addition, such tasks can guide learners to reflect on their own behavior and perspectives and to critically engage with cultural stereotypes. Through these processes, task-based activities can contribute to the growth of intercultural communication skills and awareness (Brunsmeyer, 2021).

Müller-Hartmann (2000), East (2012), and Brunsmeyer (2021) all hold the view that task-based activities may promote intercultural learning, but they provide diverse and complimentary perspectives. Müller-Hartmann (2000) provides empirical evidence that collaborative activities, such as e-mail projects, increase intercultural learning in practice, relating task-based engagement directly to the development of Byram's intercultural skills. East (2012) shifts from evidence to condition, claiming that TBLT's international potential is not built-in but rather dependent on deliberate task design that favors reflection and culture comparison over factual knowledge transmission. Brunsmeyer (2021) expands on this by identifying the specific characteristics of good intercultural tasks, such as understanding cultural information from diverse sources, comparing cultures, reflecting on one's own perspectives, and critically addressing stereotypes. Whereas Müller-Hartmann (2000) demonstrates the potential benefits of intercultural task-based learning, East (2012) describes the conditions under

which it works, and Brunsmeier (2021) specifies the design principles that enable it. This cumulative logic directly supports the instructional framework for the present study.

2.3. Social-Emotional Competence in Language Learning

2.3.1. Definition and Components of Social–Emotional Competence

Social and emotional competence refers to individuals' capacity to navigate and manage both intrapersonal experiences, such as regulating feelings of anxiety, and interpersonal situations, such as cooperating with others (Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009). It is also described as non-cognitive or psychosocial competence and is considered a broad construct encompassing personal capacities, motivations, and behaviors that allow people to exist effectively in social contexts (Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009). Previous research has consistently linked social and emotional competence with positive outcomes, including academic achievement and personal well-being (Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009).

According to Rose-Krasnor (1997), social-emotional competence is the outcome of structured actions that satisfy both immediate and long-term developmental goals. Within the prism model, this construct is represented at multiple levels. At the most general level, social competence refers to effectiveness in interaction, while more specific levels include social, emotional, and social-cognitive abilities that contribute to successful interpersonal functioning (Denham, 2006).

Within this framework, Denham (2006) identifies several core components of social–emotional competence, including connection skills, social problem solving, emotional expressiveness, emotion knowledge, and emotion regulation. These domains are presented as interrelated aspects of effective social functioning within interactional contexts.

Social-emotional learning is described by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) as the procedure which people learn and use knowledge, abilities and behaviors needed to develop functioning identities, deal with emotions, show empathy, make good decisions, build relationships that are supportive (CASEL, n.d.).

Five basic competencies serve as the foundation for social-emotional learning within the CASEL framework: awareness of oneself, self-control, social consciousness, interpersonal abilities, making responsible decisions. Self-awareness is the ability to identify one's feelings and ideas and comprehend how they affect action. Effectively controlling feelings, ideas, and actions in various contexts—such as stress management, sustaining motivation, and overcoming obstacles—is a key component of self-management. The capacity to comprehend and feel sympathy for others with different backgrounds and viewpoints is known as social awareness. Building and sustaining wholesome and encouraging

relationships via cooperation, communication, and dispute resolution are all part of relationship skills. Making positive decisions while taking moral principles and one's own and others' welfare into account is referred to as responsible decision-making (CASEL, n.d.).

In addition to these theoretical perspectives, several scholars emphasize that social–emotional competencies can be developed through educational processes. Filiz & Durnalı (2019) describe social–emotional learning as the development of communication through sensitivity toward others, responsible decision-making, ethical behavior, emotional awareness, and constructive problem solving. Similarly, social–emotional skills include managing emotions, demonstrating empathy, exercising self-control, building relationships, resolving interpersonal conflicts, and addressing social problems (Akcaalan, 2016; Sarıkayış, 2022). These competencies can be taught, modeled, and practiced in educational environments, contributing to positive outcomes both in academic settings and in everyday life (Sarıkayış, 2022).

According to CASEL (n.d.), social–emotional learning also provides several educational benefits. It contributes to improvements in students' academic achievement, attitudes toward school, and perceptions of classroom climate, while also supporting reductions in anxiety, behavioral problems, and engagement in risky behaviors. In the long term, social–emotional learning promotes positive social behaviors, improved emotional regulation, and higher levels of academic performance.

Social–emotional learning is therefore understood as a developmental process that begins early in life and continues throughout adulthood. While it has traditionally been studied within psychology, it has growing in importance as a field of study in education. Through the development of emotional awareness, empathy, social understanding, and relationship skills, social–emotional learning supports individuals in managing both personal and social challenges effectively (Sarıkayış, 2022).

The frameworks discussed above address social-emotional competency from different but complimentary perspectives. Rose-Krasnor and Denham (2009) define it primarily as effectiveness in interaction, placing the term within relational and developmental contexts. Denham (2006) expands on this by identifying particular components; relationship skills, social problem solving, emotional expressiveness, emotion knowledge, and emotion regulation which collectively comprise effective social functioning. CASEL (n.d.) broadens the scope by structuring social-emotional learning around five key competencies that apply across educational contexts, with an emphasis on teachability and measurable academic and behavioral outcomes. Filiz and Durnalı (2019) and Akcaalan (2016) agree that these competencies can be fostered through education. All of these viewpoints agree on one thing: social-emotional competence is a dynamic, learnable set of skills that develop with interaction

and practice. Where they differ is in emphasis: Rose-Krasnor and Denham (2009) and Denham (2006) focus the interactional and developmental dimensions, whereas CASEL (n.d.) emphasizes the educational and institutional setting in which these abilities are developed.

In intercultural communication contexts, social-emotional competence plays a central role in helping learners understand others' perspectives, regulate their emotional responses, and sustain effective interaction (Denham, 2006; Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009). These skills are particularly important when learners interact with people from different cultural backgrounds, where sensitivity and adaptability are required.

At the same time, intercultural encounters are often marked by uncertainty, ambiguity, and unpredictability (Carleton et al., 2007). For this reason, learners' ability to tolerate uncertainty becomes a crucial aspect of intercultural engagement, as it shapes how they respond to unfamiliar situations and cultural differences (Li et al., 2017; Hosseini & Seifoori, 2018).

When considered together, social-emotional competence and tolerance of uncertainty can be understood as key affective dimensions that support the development of an intercultural mindset. These dimensions enable learners not only to engage with others more effectively but also to stay open and resilient when faced with cultural complexity.

2.3.2. Social-Emotional Processes in Interaction

Social-emotional competence is described as transactional in nature, emerging through interactions between individuals and their social partners rather than existing solely as a stable internal attribute (Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009). The prism model further distinguishes between intrapersonal goals and interpersonal connectedness, emphasizing that effectiveness in interaction involves balancing personal objectives with relational harmony (Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009). Within Denham's (2006) framework, effective social functioning involves emotional expression, emotion understanding, emotion and behavior control, social problem solving, and interpersonal skills. These components are assessed within social contexts, reflecting the interactional nature of the construct.

As the importance of foreign language learning continues to increase, efforts are being made to make language learning more efficient, effective, and high-quality. To achieve this, various methods and strategies have been proposed. While learning a foreign language, students employ a range of strategies, one of which includes social and emotional language learning strategies (Sarıkayış, 2022). Varışoğlu (2018) states that social strategies, as well as learning the target language and its associated culture, play an important role in the language learning process. Social interaction holds an important

place in language learning, as students who attempt to learn a language collaboratively with others are likely to learn more effectively.

According to Varışoğlu (2018) social strategies in foreign language learning include clarification, verification of information, cooperation, and cultural sensitivity. Emotional strategies include self-awareness, managing emotions, self-encouragement, empathy, maintaining relationships, self-esteem, emotional self-efficacy, self-control, self-regulation, and coping with anxiety.

When learning a language, interaction is crucial. The significance of interaction has been stressed, particularly with the rise of the communicative language approach. It is expected of learners to actively utilize and communicate in the target language. Classrooms provide a social environment that facilitates such interaction. As social beings, individuals naturally strive to communicate within classroom settings. This is particularly evident in foreign language classrooms, especially those characterized by cultural diversity. In such environments, students' efforts to understand the emotions and thoughts of peers from different cultural backgrounds may create a supportive and conducive social learning atmosphere (Sarıkayış, 2022).

Recognizing different cultures and interacting with individuals from those cultures contribute positively to language learning. Students with higher levels of intercultural awareness tend to communicate with their peers in a more respectful and healthy manner. Moreover, individuals who recognize and regulate their emotions, behave ethically, establish positive relationships, and develop social-emotional competencies are more likely to approach foreign language learning positively (Sarıkayış, 2022). İşeri (2016) emphasizes that learning does not occur in isolation but through support from teachers, parents, or peers. Interaction is therefore crucial for developing social-emotional learning skills (Sarıkayış, 2022).

In conclusion, individuals who possess social-emotional learning competencies are more likely to have success in foreign language learning. For social-emotional skills to be effectively integrated into foreign language education, students must first develop these competencies. Furthermore, teachers themselves need to possess social-emotional competencies in order to support this process (Sarıkayış, 2022).

Although research on the impact of social-emotional competencies on foreign language learning remains limited, it can be suggested that social-emotional learning promotes social interaction and enables language learners to integrate social and affective factors to enhance their foreign language proficiency (Sarıkayış, 2022).

The studies presented in this section are in agreement that social-emotional competence is a relational capacity that emerges from interaction rather than an internal, static trait. Rose-Krasnor and Denham (2009) and Denham (2006) lay the theoretical groundwork for this viewpoint, describing social-emotional functioning as transactional and context-dependent. Varışoğlu (2018) and Sarıkayış (2022) show that social and emotional strategies play an important role in language learning. İşeri (2016) emphasizes the importance of peer and teacher support in social-emotional development. Where these contributions divide is in scope. Varışoğlu (2018) examines strategy use, Sarıkayış (2022) examines the relation between social-emotional competence and attitudes towards language learning, and İşeri (2016) examines the relational factors that promote development. Taken together, they imply that the foreign language classroom is more than just a linguistic setting, and that planning for interaction also means designing for social and emotional development.

2.4. Intolerance of uncertainty in language and intercultural contexts

2.4.1. Intolerance of Uncertainty and Ambiguity in Language Learning

The inclination of a person to find it unacceptable that a bad event might occur, regardless of the likelihood of it happening, is known as intolerance of uncertainty. It plays a crucial role in concern, state anxiety, and associated anxiety disorders (Carleton et al., 2007).

Individuals' tolerance of uncertainty varies as a personality trait and can be measured on a scale ranging from absolute intolerance to absolute tolerance. Individuals with a high tolerance for uncertainty may cope comfortably with novel stimuli or situations and tend to perceive ambiguous events as challenging and exciting (Stanley Budner, 1962). Individuals with a limited tolerance for uncertainty, on the other hand, may dislike or avoid such situations and prefer systematic approaches to decision making. Individuals who can tolerate ambiguity tend to use information more efficiently (Li et al., 2017). It has also been proposed that individuals with high tolerance for uncertainty employ problem-focused coping strategies, whereas those with lower tolerance tend to rely more on emotion-focused coping strategies (Herman et al., 2010).

Ambiguity tolerance has also been talked about related to uncertainty in the literature on second language learning. Ely (1989), one of the first researchers to explore intolerance of ambiguity in second language acquisition as a personality characteristic, links ambiguity closely to uncertainty. Within personality research, tolerance of ambiguity has been classified as a lower-order personality trait associated with the openness dimension of the Big Five Model (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). Despite their similarities, ambiguity and uncertainty are not the same thing. Furnham & Ribchester (1995) note

that uncertainty is a broader construct that involves situations in which possible outcomes are known, whereas ambiguity refers more specifically to unclear or incomplete information.

Because it is difficult to assess risks and make the right decisions when there is a lack of information, people who have a low tolerance for ambiguity often react emotionally to ambiguous situations. Such situations may therefore be perceived as threatening or uncomfortable. As a result, individuals may respond with stress, avoidance, delay, suppression, or denial. Similarly, Carleton et al. (2007) report that individuals with low tolerance for uncertainty tend to interpret ambiguous situations as sources of discomfort.

These perceptions often lead to three types of responses among individuals with low tolerance for uncertainty. First, cognitive reactions may involve interpreting ambiguous situations in rigid black-and-white terms. Second, emotional reactions may include feelings of discomfort, uneasiness, anger, or anxiety. Third, behavioral reactions may involve rejecting or avoiding uncertain situations (Grenier et al., 2005).

Uncertainty is a common feature of language learning processes. When learning a first or second language, learners may come across circumstances where the meaning is ambiguous or the information is insufficient. This is especially noticeable while learning a second language for the first time, as learners may struggle to interpret unfamiliar vocabulary, understand idiomatic expressions or humor, or fully comprehend their interlocutors.

Learners in language classrooms may experience uncertainty for various reasons, including unclear instructions, lack of understanding, and difficulties completing tasks or interacting with teachers and peers. Factors such as learners' familiarity with tasks, previous experiences, perceived competence, task complexity, and unclear explanations from teachers may influence learners' behaviors and contribute to feelings of uncertainty (Blumenfeld et al., 1987).

According to Dağtaş & Şahinkarakaş (2019), there are three primary types of circumstances that can cause ambiguity when learning a language. These include classroom factors, such as uncertainty about tasks or language-related issues like vocabulary and grammar; social factors, such as disagreements or negotiations among group members; and cognitive factors, such as lack of knowledge, misunderstandings, or limited critical thinking skills.

When faced with uncertainty, learners may adopt a variety of strategies. These include wishful thinking, revising prior beliefs, analyzing possible outcomes, seeking additional information, and acting more cautiously (Starbuck, 2009). Completing tasks in which learners generate knowledge often

involves risk and ambiguity because there could not be a single right answer for a task and the process of constructing knowledge may be unpredictable.

Although uncertainty has been examined in various educational domains, such as science education, research on how language learners experience uncertainty remains limited (Dağtaş & Şahinkarakaş, 2019). For instance, Jordan (2010) looked into how fifth-grade students dealt with uncertainty in robotics engineering projects and discovered that they used a variety of techniques to deal with uncertainty that came from a variety of sources.

The literature reviewed in this section reveals both conceptual coherence and significant differences. Carleton et al. (2007), Budner (1962), and Herman et al. (2010) all agree that people differ in their responses to uncertain situations, and that lower tolerance is connected with avoidance, stress, and rigid thinking. Furnham and Ribchester (1995) and Ely (1989) strengthen this concept by distinguishing between uncertainty and ambiguity, which are related but not identical concepts – a distinction that is important in language learning circumstances when both sorts of ambiguous situations occur simultaneously. Dörnyei and Ryan (2015) place tolerance of ambiguity within broader personality theory, relating it to the openness dimension of the Big Five Model, implying that it is a relatively stable individual difference rather than a situational response. Dağtaş and Şahinkarakaş (2019) establish three sources of uncertainty for language learners: task-related, cognitive, and social. They also demonstrate that task structure affects the level of uncertainty learners experience. Dağtaş and Şahinkarakaş (2019) view uncertainty tolerance as a dynamic, context-sensitive experience, rather than a personality trait as previously proposed. This transition from trait to process is essential for the current study because it implies that instructional design can either increase or reduce learners' feelings of uncertainty in intercultural task-based settings.

2.4.2. Managing Uncertainty through Task-Based Language Learning

Classroom tasks are often carried out in environments characterized by risk and ambiguity (Doyle & Carter, 1984). In task-based learning environments, learners frequently encounter situations in which they must negotiate meaning, solve problems, and collaborate with peers, which may create conditions of uncertainty.

Hosseini & Seifoori (2018) investigated the connection between task-based oral output accuracy and EFL learners' ambiguity tolerance. In task-based speaking tasks, learners with higher levels of ambiguity tolerance produced more correct oral descriptions, according to their findings, which showed a substantial positive association between ambiguity tolerance and oral performance accuracy. These results imply that learners' language performance and task-based oral output accuracy may be significantly impacted by ambiguity tolerance.

Similarly, Dağtaş and Şahinkarakaş (2019) investigated learners' experiences of uncertainty in foreign language learning from a dynamic systems perspective. Their findings show that learners frequently encounter uncertainty while participating in collaborative tasks and co-constructing meaning during classroom interaction. The study identified multiple sources of uncertainty, including course-related factors such as unfamiliar vocabulary or grammatical structures, cognitive factors such as difficulty generating ideas or solving problems, and social factors such as disagreements among group members. The results also suggest that the structure of classroom tasks influences learners' experiences of uncertainty, as less structured tasks tend to generate greater cognitive and social uncertainty than more structured tasks.

Hosseini and Seifoori (2018) and Dağtaş and Şahinkarakaş (2019) propose similar but separate perspectives on the relationship between uncertainty and task-based learning. Hosseini and Seifoori (2018) use ambiguity tolerance as an individual difference variable to investigate its impact on task-based oral performance, discovering that learners with higher tolerance produce more accurate output. Dağtaş and Şahinkarakaş (2019) examine the experience of uncertainty during collaborative tasks, discovering numerous sources and demonstrating that task structure affects the amount of uncertainty learners encounter. These two studies show a reciprocal relationship: while individual tolerance levels influence task performance, the task design determines how much uncertainty learners must manage. This has a clear connection to the current study: carefully creating intercultural tasks may assist manage learners' experiences of uncertainty, making it productive rather than overwhelming, and therefore aiding both language development and intercultural engagement.

2.5. Relationships Among Intercultural Awareness, Social-Emotional Competence, and Intolerance of Uncertainty

Intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty are interconnected constructs that influence learners' experiences in foreign language learning and intercultural communication. Intercultural awareness refers to individuals' ability to recognize, interpret, and evaluate cultural differences while reflecting on their own cultural perspectives (Byram, 1997; Baker, 2009). Through this process, learners become more capable of understanding culturally embedded meanings and having interactions with people from different cultural backgrounds (Byram, 1997). In language learning contexts, developing intercultural awareness encourages learners to move beyond ethnocentric perspectives and to interpret cultural differences more flexibly (Deardorff, 2006; Baker, 2009).

Social-emotional competency and the growth of intercultural sensitivity are intimately linked. The ability to identify and control one's emotions, show empathy, build healthy relationships, and

make moral decisions in social situations are all components of social-emotional competence (CASEL, n.d.). These competencies are necessary for effective communication and cooperation, particularly in culturally diverse environments (Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009). According to Denham (2006), social-emotional competence includes several interrelated components such as emotion regulation, emotional understanding, social problem-solving, and relationship skills. In foreign language classrooms, intercultural communication often requires learners to interpret others' perspectives, regulate emotional reactions, and engage in collaborative interaction, which directly involves social-emotional processes (Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009; Denham, 2006).

Another factor that influences intercultural interaction and language learning is individuals' tolerance of uncertainty. The inclination to view ambiguous or uncertain circumstances as unsettling or dangerous is known as intolerance of uncertainty. (Carleton et al., 2007). Language learning environments frequently involve uncertain situations such as encountering unfamiliar vocabulary, interpreting implicit meanings, or negotiating communication with speakers from different cultural backgrounds. Individuals with higher tolerance of uncertainty tend to deal better with such situations and are more open to exploring new linguistic and cultural input (Budner, 1962; Li et al., 2017). Research also indicates that learners with greater ambiguity tolerance demonstrate better performance in task-based speaking activities, suggesting that the ability to manage uncertainty can positively influence language learning outcomes (Hosseini & Seifoori, 2018).

Taken together, the literature reviewed in the previous sections suggests that intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty are conceptually related constructs in foreign language learning contexts. While intercultural awareness involves understanding cultural differences and perspectives (Baker, 2009; Byram, 1997), social-emotional competence supports interpersonal interaction and empathy in communication (CASEL, n.d.; Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2009). At the same time, intolerance of uncertainty enables learners to cope with ambiguity and unfamiliar situations that frequently arise in language learning and intercultural communication (Carleton et al., 2007; Hosseini & Seifoori, 2018; Stanley Budner, 1962). These three traits work together to meet the cognitive, affective, and adaptive needs of intercultural growth through an intentional and integrated framework, indicating a conceptually grounded understanding of the intercultural mindset.

2.6. Related Studies

2.6.1. Studies Conducted in Türkiye

2.6.1.1. Intercultural competence studies in Turkish EFL contexts

The development of intercultural awareness in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes has been the subject of numerous studies carried out in Turkey. One of these research was conducted by Zorba (2019), who looked at the efficacy of intercultural awareness-raising exercises used in seventh-grade English classes. An eight-week educational intervention was part of the study's mixed-method case study approach. A pre- and post-test called the Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data, and coursebook analysis, semi-structured interviews, and field notes were used to obtain qualitative data. The results showed that the use of intercultural awareness exercises greatly increased students' interest in cultural subjects, intercultural knowledge, and interpersonal skills. Additionally, students showed an improved capacity to draw comparisons between their own and other cultures. The study also showed that the development of intercultural awareness in English language classes may be hampered by grammar-focused teaching methods and the scant representation of cultural aspects in coursebooks.

In a similar vein, Tural & Cubukcu (2021) looked into how short stories could help EFL students become more interculturally conscious. The study used a quasi-experimental approach, with B1-level university students enrolled in preparatory programs in Turkey making up the experimental and control groups. While the control group studied nonliterary texts with cultural information, the experimental group read short stories with various cultural topics during the six-week implementation period. The Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire was used as a pre-test and post-test to gather quantitative data. The results indicated that the experimental group's intercultural awareness scores had slightly increased, but there was no statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test levels. Additionally, there was no discernible difference between the experimental and control groups. The results also indicated that gender and international experience did not significantly influence learners' intercultural awareness levels. The study concluded that although literary texts may contribute to language learning, the development of intercultural awareness may require longer instructional periods and more diverse cultural activities.

More recently, Coşkun (2024) explored the development of intercultural awareness through portfolio-based writing activities in Turkish secondary EFL classrooms. The study involved 84 secondary school students and employed a mixed-method research design combining portfolio assessment and semi-structured interviews. The findings demonstrated that students who participated in culture-

integrated writing activities developed significantly higher levels of intercultural awareness compared to those receiving traditional instruction. Additionally, both students and teachers expressed positive attitudes toward integrating cultural elements into language learning tasks. These findings suggest that structured classroom tasks incorporating cultural content can support the development of intercultural awareness in EFL contexts.

Taken together, these three studies show that intentional inclusion of cultural content into EFL instruction promotes intercultural awareness development. However, they differ in important ways. Zorba (2019) and Coşkun (2024) both report significant increases in learners' intercultural awareness, but their instructional formats differ, awareness-raising activities versus portfolio-based writing tasks, implying that the specific method may be less important than the deliberate integration of cultural reflection into classroom practice. Tural and Cubukcu (2021) discovered no statistically significant improvement after a six-week literary text intervention, implying that short-term or passive exposure to cultural content may not be enough to create meaningful change. Notably, none of these research investigate whether increases in intercultural awareness are followed by improvements in learners' social-emotional competence or tolerance for uncertainty, and none use a structured task-based intercultural program as an intervention framework. These limitations highlight a gap that the current study intends to fill.

2.6.1.2. Task-based language teaching research in Türkiye

Numerous studies carried out in Turkey have looked at the efficacy of task-based language instruction (TBLT) in EFL situations, in addition to intercultural awareness studies. Okcan (2023) looked into how task-based language instruction affected elementary school pupils' listening comprehension of English. Thirty fourth-graders made up the experimental and control groups in this quasi-experimental study. The control group was taught using conventional methods, whereas the experimental group was given task-based language learning. The findings showed that the pre-test results did not significantly differ between the groups. The experimental group did, however, show a statistically significant improvement, according to the post-test results. These findings suggest that task-based language teaching can significantly enhance students' listening skills while also increasing motivation and classroom participation.

In a similar vein, Acar (2024) investigated the attitudes and knowledge of EFL teachers about task-based language teaching in Turkish preparatory schools. 201 EFL instructors working in preparatory programs in Ankara were given a Likert-scale questionnaire to complete as part of the study's quantitative research approach. The results indicated that instructors who had previously received TBLT training demonstrated higher levels of awareness and more positive perceptions of this

instructional approach. Participants described TBLT as a student-centered method that promotes collaborative learning and real-world communication. However, the study also identified several challenges in implementing TBLT, including large class sizes, limited instructional resources, and students' unfamiliarity with group work.

In another study, Çakal (2024) examined how learners used their first and second languages during task-based teaching activities. A quasi-experimental mixed-method design with pre- and post-test procedures was used in the investigation. To examine how students used language and interacted throughout task-based activities, both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered. The findings indicated that task-based activities facilitated language development, supported task management, and encouraged social interaction among learners. These results suggest that task-based language instruction can provide meaningful opportunities for communication and collaborative learning in language classrooms.

While these studies all support the use of TBLT in Turkish EFL classes, they differ significantly in topic and setting. Okcan (2023) demonstrates that TBLT improves listening abilities at the elementary level, while Çakal (2024) emphasizes its significance in promoting language use and social interaction among learners. Acar (2024) focuses on teachers rather than learners, demonstrating that TBLT awareness is strongly linked to prior training and that institutional obstacles such as large class sizes and limited resources, continue to hinder implementation. All three research agree that TBLT fosters real communication and collaborative involvement. However, none of these studies look into whether task-based instruction affects intercultural awareness or affective factors like social-emotional competence. This is a significant gap in Turkish literature, as the intercultural potential of TBLT at the high school level has not been empirically studied.

2.6.1.3. Studies on affective and socio-emotional variables

In addition to instructional approaches, some studies conducted in Türkiye have focused on affective variables related to foreign language learning. Sarıkayış (2022) examined the connection between students' perceptions of English classes, their intercultural awareness, and their social-emotional competence. The study was conducted with secondary school students in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. The findings revealed that students demonstrated moderately positive attitudes toward English lessons, while their levels of intercultural awareness and social-emotional competence were relatively high. Furthermore, the results indicated significant positive relationships among the three variables. Intercultural awareness showed a moderate positive correlation with students' attitudes toward English, whereas social-emotional competence demonstrated a weaker but still positive relationship with students' attitudes. These findings highlight the importance of intercultural

awareness and social-emotional competence as affective factors influencing students' perceptions of foreign language learning.

The study's findings confirm that intercultural awareness and social-emotional competence favorably connect among secondary school EFL learners. However, the study uses a correlational design and does not involve any instructional intervention, indicating that it documents a connection rather than a growth process. Furthermore, the variable of intolerance of uncertainty is entirely missing from this study. Taken together, the Turkish research discussed in this part indicate the importance of both intercultural and affective characteristics in EFL instruction; nevertheless, none investigate how these dimensions might be developed simultaneously through a systematic educational intervention, the very objective of the current study.

2.6.2. Studies Conducted Abroad

2.6.2.1. Experimental studies on intercultural training

Several international studies have examined the development of intercultural competence through instructional interventions in foreign language classrooms. One of these studies was conducted by Hofmeyr (2024), who investigated the development of an intercultural mindset among Japanese university students enrolled in EFL courses consisting solely of domestic learners. Data were collected over one academic year from 205 students through a longitudinal survey administered at three stages: pre-intervention, mid-intervention, and post-intervention. The survey measured several components of intercultural competence, including curiosity, openness, respect for cultural differences, cultural self-awareness, and global awareness through Likert-scale items and coded open-ended answers. The findings indicated gradual increases in students' curiosity about other cultures as well as significant development in cultural self-awareness and global awareness over the academic year. In addition, students demonstrated greater openness toward cultural differences. However, the study also showed that cultural comparison activities could sometimes reinforce stereotypes if they were not carefully guided by the instructor. According to student feedback, classroom discussions, collaborative research tasks, and intercultural assignments were the most effective activities in promoting intercultural understanding. Overall, the findings suggest that EFL courses can contribute to the development of an intercultural mindset even in educational contexts where study abroad opportunities are limited.

Hofmeyr's (2024) study is notable because it directly investigates intercultural mindset development in a domestic EFL classroom setting, rather than depending on study abroad experiences. Its longitudinal design and various measurement points demonstrate methodological strength.

However, the study was made at the university level and focused exclusively on mindset components such as curiosity, openness, and global awareness, without investigating related affective aspects such as social-emotional competence or intolerance of uncertainty. Furthermore, the intervention was not designed using a task-based framework. These limitations suggest that, while Hofmeyr (2024) provides an important proof of concept for mindset development in EFL contexts, it does not address how structured task-based intercultural programs may influence a broader, multidimensional conception of intercultural mindset at high school level.

2.6.2.2. Task-based intercultural learning interventions

The potential of task-based language teaching (TBLT) to promote intercultural learning has been investigated in a few research. East (2012) investigated the effectiveness of task-based language instruction in addressing the multicultural aspect of language acquisition. Semi-structured interviews with foreign language instructors and educational consultants in New Zealand were used to gather data for this qualitative study. The findings revealed that many teachers tended to approach culture mainly as factual information about the target culture, whereas advisors emphasized the importance of integrating intercultural reflection into language learning. The results suggested that well-designed tasks can give opportunities for students to compare cultures, reflect on similarities and differences, and develop intercultural communicative competence. Overall, the study highlighted the potential of task-based language teaching to support intercultural learning when tasks encourage critical cultural reflection and interaction.

Similarly, Juan-Garau and Jacob (2015) examined the development of transcultural skills in teenage EFL learners through a combination of content- and task-based instruction supported by computer-mediated communication. In the study, secondary school students from Spain and Poland collaborated on a thematic unit about Africa and shared their presentations and reflections through a class blog. The results showed that a variety of transcultural skills, including as global awareness, world learning, affective development, and empathy for cultural differences, were promoted by content- and task-based activities. Additionally, authentic connection between students from various cultural backgrounds was made possible by the usage of blogs as virtual communication platforms, which raised students' interest in the learning process. Overall, the study showed that the development of transcultural competence in EFL situations can be aided by integrating task-based education with online intercultural conversation.

East (2012) and Juan-Garau and Jacob (2015) complement one another in important ways. East (2012) argues theoretically that well-designed tasks can foster intercultural reflection, whereas Juan-

Garau and Jacob (2015) provide empirical support by demonstrating that content- and task-based activities promote transcultural skills in adolescent learners. At the same time, they vary in scope and depth. East (2012) is centered on teacher and advisor perspectives rather than learner data, making it difficult to draw conclusions regarding real student outcomes. Juan-Garau and Jacob (2015) examine transcultural skills as a whole, rather than intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, or intolerance of uncertainty. Together, these studies demonstrate that task-based intercultural training has promise, but they do not investigate its impact on the multidimensional intercultural mindset that the current study aims to develop.

2.6.2.3. Research connecting intercultural competence and socio-emotional development

Studies have looked at the connection between psychological or affective characteristics and intercultural competence. For example, Vaitonytė, Öztürk, and Müller (2020) looked into the connection between intolerance of ambiguity, multilingualism, and intercultural experience. The purpose of the study was to ascertain whether multilingual people exhibit lower levels of uncertainty intolerance than monolingual people. The results showed that people who were more multilingual tended to be less intolerant of ambiguity. Furthermore, individuals who had spent more time overseas also showed noticeably lower intolerance of ambiguity scores. These findings imply that exposure to multiple languages and cultures may enhance people's capacity to handle unexpected circumstances and accept ambiguity. The scientists came to the conclusion that exposure to linguistic and cultural diversity may lessen people's resistance to ambiguity and may have favorable effects on psychological health.

2.6.2.4. Studies addressing uncertainty and ambiguity tolerance in SLA

The importance of ambiguity and uncertainty tolerance in second language acquisition has been the subject of additional research. Hosseini and Seifoori (2018) investigated the connection between the accuracy of task-based oral performance and the ambiguity tolerance of EFL learners. Sixty Iranian EFL students studying English at a language school in Tabriz participated in the study. The accuracy of learners' task-based oral communication was found to be significantly correlated with their ambiguity tolerance. More accurate descriptions were produced by students who had higher levels of ambiguity tolerance, whereas learners with lower tolerance tended to produce more inaccurate speech. The findings suggest that the ability to tolerate ambiguous situations in language learning can positively influence learners' performance in task-based speaking activities. The study therefore emphasized the importance of recognizing individual differences, such as ambiguity intolerance, in foreign language education and task-based learning environments.

More recently, Long and Long (2026) used a mixed-method research design to examine the association between academic self-efficacy and intolerance of uncertainty among 274 Chinese high school EFL students. The results showed that students' poorer academic self-efficacy was correlated with higher levels of intolerance of uncertainty. Students who experienced higher levels of uncertainty tended to perceive ambiguous academic tasks as threatening, avoid challenging learning situations, and experience difficulties in regulating their learning processes. These findings suggest that uncertainty may negatively influence learners' confidence, engagement, and willingness to participate in challenging language learning tasks.

Similarly, among 400 Grade 10 EFL students in China, Cai, Chen, and Yang (2026) investigated the connection between test anxiety, uncertainty tolerance, and English achievement. The results showed a negative correlation between test anxiety and English proficiency, suggesting that pupils with higher anxiety levels typically performed worse in the language. In contrast, uncertainty tolerance was positively related to English achievement, suggesting that learners who were more comfortable dealing with uncertainty in language learning tasks tended to perform better. The study also found that test anxiety partially moderated the link between uncertainty tolerance and English achievement. These results indicate that higher tolerance of uncertainty may reduce test anxiety and contribute to more positive language learning outcomes.

Lastly, Youfi and Brigui (2024) looked into how Moroccan high school EFL students' intercultural communication skills and uncertainty tolerance related to one another. The study used a Likert-scale questionnaire to gather data from 104 students using a quantitative research approach. The results showed that students' levels of uncertainty tolerance were moderate, and there were no discernible gender variations in this category. More significantly, the study found that intercultural communication skills and uncertainty tolerance are positively correlated. Higher levels of intercultural communication competency were typically displayed by students who felt more at ease handling ambiguity.

When these studies are viewed together, they indicate a common finding as well as a significant gap. Hosseini and Seifoori (2018), Long and Long (2026), and Cai et al. (2026) all point to the same conclusion: more tolerance for uncertainty is related with better language learning results, whether evaluated by oral accuracy, academic self-efficacy, or overall accomplishment. Youfi and Brigui (2024) expand on this line of research by relating uncertainty tolerance to intercultural communication competency, implying that the ability to deal with uncertainty may be a key component of intercultural interaction. However, these studies look at uncertainty intolerance independently from other emotive and intercultural aspects, and none of them place it within a task-

based instructional framework. Vaitonytė et al. (2020) also discovered that multilingual and multicultural exposure reduced intolerance of uncertainty, but without an experimental approach. What remains missing across this body of research is an empirical examination of how intolerance of uncertainty interacts with intercultural awareness and social-emotional competence within a structured pedagogical program, the gap the present study directly addresses.

Despite the growing body of research on intercultural competence, task-based language teaching, and affective variables in foreign language learning, several important gaps can still be identified. Previous research has primarily focused on intercultural awareness as a cognitive construct, with little attention given to how it interacts with affective and psychological dimensions like social-emotional competence and tolerance of uncertainty (Baker, 2009; Sarıkayış, 2022). Several studies have focused on classroom activities or instructional materials aimed to increase cultural awareness (Coşkun, 2024; Tural & Cubukcu, 2021; Zorba, 2019), but have not addressed organized task-based intercultural training programs. This results in a rather fragmented view of intercultural development.

Although task-based language teaching has been widely explored in relation to language skills development and classroom interaction, its potential to support the development of a multidimensional intercultural mindset has not been thoroughly examined from an empirical perspective (Ellis, 2017; East, 2012; Çakal, 2024; Okcan, 2023). In other words, the relationship between task-based teaching and broader intercultural development remains underexplored. Several studies have examined the role of psychological and affective factors such as social-emotional competence, ambiguity tolerance, and intolerance of uncertainty in language learning contexts (Cai et al., 2026; Hosseini & Seifoori, 2018; Long & Long, 2026; Sarıkayış, 2022). However, these variables have generally been examined independently rather than in relation to intercultural learning processes. Research suggests that intercultural and multilingual experiences can help individuals cope with uncertainty (Vaitonytė et al., 2020). However, there is limited empirical research on how intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty interact within a task-based instructional framework.

Third, a large number of intervention studies in this area have been conducted at the tertiary level, with secondary school contexts receiving relatively little attention (Zorba, 2019; Coşkun, 2024). As a result, there is little understanding of how these approaches work in high school EFL contexts.

Given these gaps, there is a clear need for empirical research that combines cognitive, affective, and uncertainty-related features of intercultural development into a structured task-based instructional framework. Such study is especially essential in high school EFL settings, as students are at a critical stage in their linguistic and socio-emotional development.

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter includes the methodology of the study. The information about the research design, participants, data collection instruments, data collection procedure, and data analysis procedure are explained in detail.

3.1. Research Design

The general approach a researcher uses to logically and cogently combine the elements of a study, ensuring efficient data collection, measurement, and analysis, is known as research design (Creswell, 2014). In this regard, quantitative research seeks to evaluate objective theories by investigating the relationships between variables that can be measured and analyzed statistically (Creswell, 2014). Quantitative designs include true experiments and quasi-experiments, the latter of which involves the nonrandomized assignment of participants to groups (Campbell & Stanley, 2011; Creswell, 2014).

Quasi-experimental designs are utilized in natural social settings where researchers can apply experimental logic, despite the fact that full control over participant randomization is impossible (Campbell & Stanley, 2011). Such designs are especially common in educational settings when entire groups, such as classes, must be maintained due to practical and administrative constraints. In such circumstances, entire groups, rather than individual participants, are assigned to treatment (Gay et al., 2012). Despite the lack of full experimental control, quasi-experimental designs are nonetheless scientifically useful methods for investigating causal relationships, enabling researchers to apply experimental logic to real-world contexts, such as schools, factories, and other institutional environments, where true experimental conditions cannot be established (Campbell & Stanley, 2011).

This study employed a quasi-experimental design because it was not practical to randomly assign participants to experimental and control groups. According to Gay et al. (2012), it is not always feasible to randomly assign individual participants to groups; in order to get permission to engage students in a study, a researcher frequently needs to consent to maintain the integrity of existing classrooms. In the current investigation, entire classes were assigned to experimental and control settings, respectively. This was exactly the case. The inability to randomize does not invalidate the design; rather, it requires the researcher to be more conscious of whatever specific variables the design fails to control (Campbell & Stanley, 2011).

The nonequivalent control group quasi-experimental design is used in this investigation. The primary distinction is that intact groups are assigned to treatments rather than individuals at random in the nonequivalent control group design, which entails pretesting two or more treatment groups, giving a therapy, and posttesting (Gay et al., 2012). Additional validity hazards, including regression and interactions between selection, maturation, history, and testing, are brought about by the inability to randomly assign individuals to treatments. Gay et al. (2012) advise the researcher to make every effort to include groups that are as similar as possible in order to lower these risks and strengthen the study. If differences are found between the groups on any significant extraneous variable, analysis of covariance can be used to statistically adjust for initial group differences. This analytical method is explicitly supported by Gay et al. (2012), who state that if groups are not essentially the same on the pretest, posttest scores should be analyzed using analysis of covariance. This method is better than using gain or difference scores to determine treatment effects because it adjusts posttest scores for initial differences on any variable, including pretest scores.

A major concern in quasi-experimental research is identifying and managing plausible rival hypotheses, which are uncontrolled variables such as history, maturation, and testing effects that may account for observed outcomes independent of the experimental treatment (Campbell & Stanley, 2011). To reduce the impact of such concerns on internal validity, the current study included various methodological protections. A control group was included to account for the effects of history and maturation, and pretest scores were utilized as a covariate in ANCOVA analyses to statistically compensate for pre-existing group differences.

It is also important to recognize the epistemological role of quasi-experimental designs in the larger scientific enterprise. Campbell and Stanley (2011) underline that experiments, including quasi-experiments, are used to "probe" rather than "prove" a hypothesis. Experimental results do not definitively validate a hypothesis; rather, they reinforce it in the sense that it withstands repeated probing and remains the most parsimonious explanation for the data under numerous uncontrolled situations. The findings should therefore be interpreted as context-bound evidence regarding the potential effectiveness of the program rather than definitive causal proof.

3.2. Participants

The study was conducted with 46 ninth-grade students studying English as a foreign language (EFL) in a public high school in Malatya, Türkiye. Convenience sampling was used because of institutional limitations and accessibility. Convenience sampling, sometimes known as inadvertent or haphazard sampling, is the process of choosing study participants based on their accessibility and availability (Gay et al., 2012). Although this approach is practical in educational settings where

institutional constraints prevent random selection, a key limitation is that findings may not be fully generalizable to a bigger population, as those who are available and willing to participate may differ from those who are not.

The students were drawn from two intact classrooms. The assignment of classes to experimental and control conditions was made by the researcher; one class ($n = 23$) was used as the experimental group and the other class ($n = 23$) served as the control group. The assignment was conducted before the pre-test administration and independent of students' achievement levels. The existing class rosters were established by the school administration prior to the study. Most of the students had been learning English since primary school in accordance with the national curriculum (MoNE, 2018), and the two groups had similar instructional backgrounds in terms of prior English language exposure. Baseline equivalence was examined through pre-test comparisons. The demographic characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic statistics of participants

Variable	Group	n	Percent
Group	Experiment	23	50.0
	Control	23	50.0
Gender	Female	27	58.7
	Male	19	41.3
Mother education status	Primary school	16	34.8
	Middle school	20	43.5
	High school	6	13.0
	University	4	8.7
	Post-graduate	0	0.0
Father education status	Primary school	8	17.4
	Middle school	10	21.7
	High school	23	50.0
	University	5	10.9
	Post-graduate	0	0.0
Perceived English proficiency level	High level	12	26.1
	Medium level	27	58.7
	Low level	7	15.2

In terms of gender, the majority of the participants were female ($n = 27$, 58.7%), while males constituted 41.3% ($n = 19$) of the sample. Regarding parental education levels, most mothers had a middle school education (43.5%), followed by primary school (34.8%). Similarly, the majority of fathers

had completed high school (50.0%). Only a small proportion of parents had university-level education, and none had postgraduate degrees (see Table 1).

In terms of perceived English proficiency levels, most students reported being at the medium level (58.7%), followed by high (26.1%) and low levels (15.2%). These levels were determined based on students' self-assessments. Students in the high category reported feeling confident and able to understand most of the course content, those in the medium category indicated partial understanding despite some difficulties, and those in the low category reported experiencing challenges and needing further improvement. The mean age of the participants was 14.87 years ($SD = 0.75$), indicating a relatively homogeneous age distribution (see Table 2).

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation of participants' age

Variable	N	M	SD
Age	46	14.87	0.75

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

3.3.1. Demographic Information Form

The researcher prepared a demographic information form to gather participant background data. Gender, age, father's and mother's levels of education, and perceived English proficiency level were all asked on the form. Perceived English proficiency was assessed through a single self-report item with three response options: high level (feeling confident and understanding most of the course content), medium level (partial understanding despite some difficulties), and low level (experiencing challenges and needing further improvement).

3.3.2. Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire (IAQ)

The Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire (IAQ), developed in Zorba's (2019) doctoral dissertation, was used in this study to measure participants' intercultural awareness. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and Baker's (2009) recommendations for intercultural awareness served as the basis for the questionnaire's construction. To ensure reliability, a pilot study was conducted with 104 students from four lower secondary schools (excluding the primary research site). The Cronbach's Alpha was calculated as 0.900, indicating high reliability and internal consistency of the questionnaire. The IAQ consists of 31 items grouped into five dimensions:

Intercultural Awareness Dimensions: A total of 31 items grouped into five dimensions:

- **Intercultural Sensitivity** (Items: 5, 13, 14, 18, 27, 29, and 31),
- **Intercultural Knowledge** (Items: 3, 7, 9, 11, 19, 20, 28, and 30),
- **Intercultural Skills** (Items: 2, 6, 10, 15, 17, and 24),
- **Intercultural Interaction** (Items: 12, 16, 21, 25, and 26),
- **Intercultural Interest** (Items: 1, 4, 8, 22, and 23).

Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5). In the original study, the scale was applied as both a pre-test and post-test to measure changes in intercultural awareness (Zorba, 2019).

3.3.3. Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale (IUS-12)

Students' intolerance of uncertainty was measured in this study using the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale – Short Form (IUS-12), which was first created by Carleton, Norton, and Asmundson (2007). Sarıçam, Erguvan, Akin, and Akça (2014) carried out the scale's Turkish adaption. Twelve self-report items on a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 ("Not at all characteristic of me") to 5 ("Entirely characteristic of me"), make up the IUS-12. Higher scores correspond to higher levels of intolerance of uncertainty, with total scores ranging from 12 to 60 (Carleton et al., 2007). This study's scale consists of two components:

- Prospective Anxiety (Items 1–7)
- Inhibitory Anxiety (Items 8–12)

The whole scale's Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was .88, the Prospective Anxiety subscale's was .84, and the Inhibitory Anxiety subscale's was .77. For the entire scale, test-retest reliability over a four-week period was .74 (Sarıçam et al., 2014). Reverse coding is not necessary for the Turkish version of the scale. The Turkish validation study verified that reverse coding is not required, despite some sources suggesting that Item 1 might be reverse-scored (Sarıçam et al., 2014). Higher scores on the scale indicate higher levels of intolerance of uncertainty. The measure's total score goes from 12 to 60. The IUS-12 was used in this study as a pre-test and a post-test to look at how students' intolerance of uncertainty changed after the intervention.

3.3.4. Delaware Social-Emotional Competency Scale (DSECS-S)

Mantz et al. (2016) created the Delaware Social-Emotional Competency Scale (DSECS-S) to evaluate students' social-emotional skills. Twelve items make up the original scale, which is divided into four sub-dimensions: Social Awareness (Items 2, 6, 10), Relationship Skills (Items 4, 8, 12), Self-Management (Items 3, 7, 11), and Responsible Decision-Making (Items 1, 5, 9). A 4-point Likert scale is used to rate the items, and item 1 is reverse-coded. The range of total scores is 12 to 48 (Mantz et al., 2016). The scale created by Filiz and Durnalı (2019) was adapted for Turkish use in this study. Unlike the original version, the Turkish form does not include reverse-coded items. The Turkish version of the scale was restructured under two sub-dimensions:

- **Self-Awareness:** Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 9
- **Social Awareness:** Items 6, 8, 10, and 11

Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient for the total Turkish form was reported as .70. For the sub-dimensions, the alpha values were .79 for Self-Awareness and .76 for Social Awareness. Test-retest reliability over a two-week interval yielded a correlation coefficient of .73, indicating stability over time (Filiz & Durnalı, 2019). In this study, the Turkish version of the DSECS-S was administered as both a pre-test and a post-test. The scale was used to measure the socio-emotional component of intercultural mindset.

3.4. Validity and Reliability

Table 3. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for scales

Scale / Instrument	Pre-test α	Post-test α
Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire	.732	.901
Social-Emotional Competence Scale	.702	.773
Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale	.704	.830

Note. α = Cronbach's alpha.

Regarding reliability, Cronbach's alpha coefficients indicated acceptable levels of internal consistency across the scales. In line with commonly accepted criteria, alpha values above .70 are considered acceptable, while values above .80 indicate good reliability (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013; Hinton et al., 2004). As presented in Table 3, the Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire demonstrated acceptable pre-test reliability (α = .732) with notable improvement at post-test (α = .901). The Social-

Emotional Competence Scale yielded acceptable reliability at both pre-test ($\alpha = .702$) and post-test ($\alpha = .773$). The Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale demonstrated acceptable pre-test reliability ($\alpha = .704$) and good post-test reliability ($\alpha = .830$). These results suggest that the instruments used in the study were reliable measures of the targeted constructs. In terms of validity, all instruments used in this study were previously developed and validated in the literature. In the present study, these validated instruments were used without modification, ensuring the appropriateness of the measurements for the research context.

3.5. Data Collection Procedure

3.5.1. Preparation Phase

The Provincial Directorate of National Education gave formal permission and the relevant institutional review board provided ethical approval prior to data collection. A preparation phase was carried out to design the task-based intercultural language teaching program and organize the instruction process. During this phase, the researcher reviewed relevant literature on task-based language teaching and intercultural communicative competence to lay the theoretical groundwork for the intervention.

Based on this review, an eight-week instructional program was developed, with each week focusing on a different intercultural topic. While designing the weekly sessions, extra attention was given to ensure that each lesson had a meaningful task with a clear outcome, in accordance with task-based language teaching principles.

Following this, appropriate instructional materials were selected and adapted to support the objectives of the program. Some of the materials used in this study were partially adapted from the coursebook *Mirrors and Windows* (Huber-Kriegler et al., 2003), which aims to develop intercultural communicative competence. Rather than following the book in its entirety, selected sections and activities were used based on their relation to the objectives of the study. These materials were simplified and adapted to suit the learners' A1–A2 proficiency level and were transformed into task-based activities. In weeks where the coursebook was not used, additional materials were developed by the researcher to ensure alignment with the goals of the program.

In addition, weekly lesson plans were created in advance. Each lesson was organized using the task-based framework, which included pre-task, task, and post-task phases. The pre-task stage attempted to introduce the topic and activate past knowledge, while the task stage required students to work together to perform a communicative task, and the post-task stage focused on presenting and reflection.

The researcher acted as the English language teacher for both the experimental and control groups during the study. The dual roles of researcher and classroom instructor guaranteed uniformity in instruction across both groups, as all classes were conducted by the same teacher. The researcher implemented the task-based intercultural teaching program as intended in the experimental group. The researcher followed the standard curriculum-based instruction in the control group, without any supplementary intercultural activities. This arrangement enabled direct comparability between the two groups regarding teacher-related features, while also mirroring the naturalistic conditions of classroom-based research.

At the beginning of the study, the pre-test instruments were administered to both the experimental and control groups during regular English class hours to ensure maximum participation. The questionnaires were distributed in hard-copy format and completed within approximately 15–20 minutes under the supervision of the researcher.

Both the experimental and control groups received four 40-minute lessons per week in English. The two groups received the same curriculum-based instruction using the ninth-grade English textbook endorsed by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) and covered the same English topics aligned with the national curriculum. In addition to the task-based intercultural teaching program, the experimental group received it in two out of the four weekly sessions. The control group received no additional activities beyond the standard curriculum. Both groups were taught by the same teacher throughout the study. At the end of the eight-week intervention period, the post-test instruments were administered to both groups under the same conditions as the pre-test.

3.5.2. Treatment Phase

The course syllabus implemented during the treatment phase of the study is presented in Table 4. The eight-week program was organized around a sequence of intercultural themes, each designed to engage learners in meaningful comparison, reflection, and interpretation of cultural practices from different parts of the world. In line with task-based language teaching principles, each week culminated in a clearly defined task outcome, such as a poster, booklet, guide, diary entry, or oral presentation, that required learners to use language purposefully while exploring intercultural content. The instructional focus of each session aimed to promote key components of intercultural awareness, including the ability to recognize cultural perspectives, compare everyday practices across cultures, interpret cultural meanings, and reflect on Comparing and contrasting their own culture with others. Overall, the eight-week syllabus was designed to provide a coherent and progressive framework through which learners could develop both their linguistic skills and intercultural understanding simultaneously.

Table 4. The course syllabus used in the study

Week	Topic	Task outcome	Instructional focus
Week 1	Cultural Perceptions of Time	Poster on time-related proverbs across cultures	Developing awareness of cultural perspectives on time
Week 2	Food Culture and Daily Meals	Two-page cultural food booklet	Comparing food practices and daily meals across cultures
Week 3	Cultural Conversation Norms and Etiquette	"Do & Don't" guide and Cultural Survival Card	Exploring communication norms and social etiquette
Week 4	School Life Around the World	Comparative diary entries on school life	Examining school routines and educational practices
Week 5	Traditional Houses Around the World	Illustrated Home Profile Cards	Understanding the relationship between housing, climate, and culture
Week 6	Cultural Symbols and Superstitions Around the World	Group skits based on cultural superstitions	Interpreting cultural beliefs and comparing them with Turkish culture
Week 7	Clothing Around the World	Suitcase preparation task with short explanations	Exploring clothing practices in relation to climate and culture
Week 8	Traditional Sports Around the World	World Sports Reporter Card and oral presentation	Understanding how traditional sports reflect cultural values

Week 1: Cultural Perceptions of Time

During the first week of the intervention, the emphasis was on introducing students to various cultural perspectives on time. The lesson was based on the "Rock around the Clock" section from the book *Mirrors and Windows* (Huber-Kriegler et al., 2003), and the reading text was simplified and presented using teacher-prepared slides to enable comprehension at the A1-A2 level.

The session began with a warm-up activity which aimed to improve students' awareness of how time is viewed differently based on context. This was followed by guided discussion questions that encouraged students to consider their own cultural views on punctuality and waiting.

During the main task phase, students were exposed to proverbs about time from many civilizations, including German-speaking countries, Italy, Greece, and Arabic cultures. Students worked in groups and were given one culture. Each group chose at least two proverbs, analyzed their meanings, and sought corresponding expressions in Turkish.

The main task required students to produce a poster with the selected proverbs in both languages, their meanings, and visual representations. This task sought to increase intercultural awareness by encouraging students to compare how different cultures view time and apply these insights to their own cultural context. Finally, students presented their posters to the class and analyzed cultural similarities and differences. This task promoted the development of intercultural awareness by allowing students to reflect on various cultural norms and beliefs around time.

Week 2: Food Culture and Daily Meals

The second week of the intervention focused on examining food culture and daily eating habits in different cultures. The goal was to increase pupils' food-related vocabulary while also instilling intercultural awareness through comparison and reflection. The course started with a warm-up activity in which students saw photos of different meals like sushi, tacos, curry, stir fry, injera, and fish & chips. Students were instructed to match each dish to its country of origin and share their guesses in groups. This activity was designed to engage past knowledge and introduce students to world food diversity in an engaging and visual manner.

Following the warm-up, students participated in a reading activity using simplified texts to describe traditional dishes from many countries, such as haggis, Yorkshire pudding, beans on toast, tamago kake gohan, and fatta. These texts described the ingredients, preparation methods, and cultural settings of the food. After reading, students answered True/False comprehension questions to ensure they understood and reinforced essential material.

To increase intercultural reflection, students engaged in guided discussions including questions such as whether they would try various cuisines, whether similar dishes exist in Turkish culture, and how eating patterns differ between cultures. This stage encouraged students to apply new material to their own cultural experiences and to consider parallels and differences.

During the main task phase, students were assigned to a group project in which they were to make a two-page cultural food booklet. Students were separated into groups and assigned to specific countries. Each group was supposed to present one breakfast, lunch, and dinner meal from the assigned culture, as well as to describe one meal in terms of ingredients and method of preparation.

To emphasize the task-based character of the activity, students were asked to compare the assigned culture to Turkish food culture and identify important parallels and contrasts. This required them to have meaningful discussions, make decisions, and create language cooperatively. The end product was a two-page pamphlet. The first page concentrated on the assigned culture, while the

second page discussed Turkish food culture, including meals and ingredients, as well as a comparison statement. Students used visual elements like drawings and flags to support their work.

In the final stage, students displayed their booklets to the class. A whole-class debate took place, during which students studied other countries and considered which food traditions were most comparable to their own. The teacher then gathered the materials and organized them into a class booklet, providing a physical result of the learning experience. Overall, this week promoted the growth of cross-cultural communication skills by requiring students to understand cultural material, compare perspectives, and create meaningful and collaborative output within a task-based framework.

Week 3: Cultural Conversation Norms and Etiquette

The third week of the intervention centered on investigating cultural differences in conversation norms and social etiquette. The goal was to make students aware of how communication techniques, acceptable topics, and social behaviors differed among cultures. This week's instructional design was inspired by *Mirrors and Windows* (Huber-Kriegler et al., 2003)'s sections on "conversation and silence," "conversation topics," and "nonverbal communication," which focus on cultural differences in communication norms and interaction patterns.

While the original materials were not directly used, essential concepts such as appropriate conversation topics, personal space, body language, and communication styles were altered and included into the class activities. The researcher simplified and restructured these parts to reflect the learners' competence level and the program's task-based structure.

The lesson began with a warm-up discussion in which students were asked if certain topics, such as age, relationships, money, and health, are appropriate to discuss in Turkish society. This activity enabled students to consider their own cultural standards and acknowledge that conversation rules are culturally based.

During the input phase, students were introduced to short cultural scenarios and simplified texts which demonstrated differences in communication styles across cultures. Examples included asking personal questions, speaking loudly in public, greeting practices, and making physical contact in social interactions. In addition, students were given standardized "Do's and Don'ts" lists from other countries, which highlighted appropriate and inappropriate behavior in different cultural settings. The teacher guided comprehension by providing simplified explanations and encouraging students to reflect on their reactions.

To reinforce understanding, students took part in an interactive "Green/Red Card" activity. In this activity, students were assigned specific cultures and asked to determine if certain actions (such

as hugging in public, eating with the left hand, or asking about income) were appropriate or unacceptable in their assigned culture. Students raised green or red cards and then provided brief justifications for their decisions. This stage encouraged active participation and required students to interpret cultural norms.

During the main task phase, students collaborated in groups to create a cultural awareness product consisting of a "Do & Don't" guide and a cultural survival card. Each group concentrated on a specific culture and developed a set of guidelines for tourists, such as appropriate conversation topics and social behaviors. In addition, students developed a comparison section with comparable rules for Turkish culture, allowing for direct intercultural comparison.

To strengthen the task-based dimension of the activity, students were required to make decisions about which behaviors were most important and relevant for visitors. They discussed, negotiated, and selected key points to include in their guides. The final products included both textual explanations and visual elements.

In the last stage, students demonstrated their guides to the class. A review activity in the form of a "Guess the Culture" quiz was administered, in which students recognized cultures based on behavioral descriptions. This activity reinforced learning outcomes by encouraging students to recall and apply intercultural knowledge. Overall, this week supported the development of intercultural communicative competence by making students engage in analyzing cultural norms, reflecting on their own cultural practices, and producing meaningful, comparison-based outcomes within a task-based learning framework.

Week 4: School Life Around the World

The fourth week of the intervention focused on analyzing school life, everyday routines, and educational practices from different cultures. The aim was to develop students' understanding of how schooling systems vary globally while encouraging reflection on their own experiences. The instructional materials were created by the researcher and adapted from simplified texts based on real-world sources that describe school life in various countries.

The lesson began with a warm-up conversation in which students thought about their own school experiences. They were asked about school schedules, clothing, lunch styles, class sizes, and everyday activities. Students first thought independently, then discussed their ideas in pairs or small groups, and then presented their responses to the entire class. This stage used prior information to prepare students for intercultural comparison.

In the following stage, students were given visual input in the form of school lunch images from various countries. They were asked to identify the dishes, determine the country, and discuss how the meals compared to Turkish school lunches. This activity helped strengthen background knowledge and introduced cultural diversity in an entertaining way.

Following that, students engaged in a group reading activity. They were divided into small groups and given simplified texts about school life in several countries, including Finland, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, and Japan. Each group read a text and filled out a True/False worksheet to measure comprehension. After a few minutes, the texts were switched across groups, exposing all students to various kinds of cultural information. The teacher supported comprehension and reviewed the responses with the class.

In the main task phase, students were assigned a writing task titled “One Day in Two Schools.” Working in groups, students created two short diary entries: one describing a school day in an assigned country based on the reading input, and another describing a typical school day in Türkiye based on their own experiences. Students were instructed to include details such as school start and end times, classroom activities, lunch routines, uniforms, and one interesting feature.

To strengthen the task-based nature of the activity, students were required to compare the two school systems and reflect on similarities and differences. They discussed and decided which aspects were most important to include in their diary entries, thereby engaging in meaning-focused communication and collaborative decision-making.

The final products consisted of two diary entries written collaboratively by each group. Some groups shared their work with the class, and a short discussion followed in which students reflected on cultural differences in education systems. Students were also asked to decide which school system they would prefer and explain their reasons. Overall, this week supported the development of intercultural awareness by encouraging students to interpret authentic cultural information, compare educational practices, and produce meaningful written outputs within a task-based learning framework.

Week 5: Traditional Houses Around the World

The fifth week of the intervention focused on traditional houses and how they reflect environmental conditions, cultural practices, and lifestyle differences. The goal was to assist students comprehend the relationship between climate, materials, and human living habits while also increasing their intercultural awareness.

The lecture began with a visual warm-up activity in which students saw images of several traditional residences, including cave houses, yurts, and stone cottages. Students were urged to explain what they saw in basic phrases (for example, "It is made of stone," "It is small," or "It is in a hot place"). The teacher guided students through questions such as, "Why do homes look different in each country?" and "Is it because of weather, materials, or culture?" This step used existing knowledge to explain the concept of environmental adaptation.

In the next stage, students engaged in a deductive reading activity. They were given short descriptive texts about various types of houses without names and asked to match them to the correct categories in a partially completed chart. The texts described each home's country, materials, climate compatibility, and cultural aspects. Students worked in pairs to find missing information by analyzing text clues, which needed reasoning rather than direct comprehension.

After the matching activity, students completed a categorization task. They classified the houses according to factors such as climate (hot, cold), mobility (fixed or mobile), and materials (natural or contemporary). This assignment prompted students to consider cross-cultural trends and find similarities and differences in housing practices.

During the primary task phase, students were instructed to construct two "Home Profile Cards." Each group chose one foreign house and one Turkish traditional house. They created brief written descriptions of the house's name, location, materials, climate compatibility, and cultural aspects. They also made basic drawings to represent the houses. Students utilized guided language structures such "It is made of...," "It is good for...," and "People live in it because...".

To emphasize the task-based aspect of the activity, students were asked to compare the two houses and explain the differences in terms of environment and lifestyle. This enabled meaningful discussion and collaborative decision-making. The profile card task promotes task-based learning because it demands students to select, organize, and compare information in order to obtain a meaningful result.

The final product was illustrated profile cards that indicated student understanding of cultural and environmental differences in housing. Some groups presented their work to the class, which helped to reinforce speaking skills and intercultural reflection. This week blended reading, reasoning, categorization, and production tasks to develop intercultural awareness using a task-based learning approach.

Week 6: Cultural Symbols and Superstitions Around the World

In Week 6, the lesson focused on introducing students to cultural beliefs and superstitions from different parts of the world aiming to enhance intercultural awareness and comparison skills. The lesson began with a pre-task phase in which students were exposed to a visual “superstition map” presenting various cultural beliefs from different countries. Students explored selected examples and engaged in guided discussion, reflecting on whether similar beliefs exist in Turkish culture and evaluating how these beliefs might be perceived by outsiders. Following this, a short guessing activity was conducted using visual superstition cards. Students were asked to guess the meaning and origin of different superstitions based on images, which encouraged interpretation, inference, and cultural comparison.

In the main task, students worked in groups of four to create and perform short, non-verbal skits based on cultural superstitions. Each group selected three superstitions from different countries on the poster and one or two from Turkish culture. Using a planning worksheet, they identified key actions, roles, and reactions for each superstition.

Students then rehearsed and performed their skits without using spoken language. While watching, the rest of the class tried to guess both the superstition and its country of origin. After each performance, the group confirmed the correct answers and provided a brief explanation in simple English. In the post-task phase, students participated in a whole-class reflection, discussing which superstitions they found surprising, familiar, or confusing. They also made simple comparisons between Turkish and other cultural beliefs, reinforcing intercultural understanding through reflection and discussion.

Week 7: Clothing Around the World

In Week 7, the lesson focused on exploring how clothing varies across cultures and what factors influence these differences. Students were introduced to examples of traditional and everyday clothing from different countries and discussed when and why these items are worn. The lesson began with a visual discussion in which students examined different types of clothing and shared their ideas about their origins and uses. This was followed by a group reading activity where students learned about clothing practices in different countries and answered comprehension questions.

In the main task, students worked in groups and imagined that they were preparing a suitcase for a trip to one of the countries they had studied in. They selected and drew clothing items suitable for that country, considering factors such as climate and cultural context. They also added a small number of comparable items from Türkiye and wrote short sentences explaining their choices. In the

final stage, groups presented their work to the class, explaining what they packed and why. Through this task, students demonstrated their understanding of how clothing is shaped by cultural and environmental conditions, while also making simple comparisons between cultures.

Week 8 - Traditional Sports Around the World

The eighth and final week of the intervention focused on traditional sports from different countries, with the goal of teaching students how physical activities reflect cultural values, traditions, and ways of life. The course was prepared using the task-based structure, which included pre-task, task, and post-task stages.

During the pre-task phase, students were introduced to the topic via a visual guessing activity. The teacher showed pictures of numerous traditional sports without naming them, and students were asked to determine what they were, where they came from, and what kind of equipment or activities they required. This practice was designed to stimulate prior knowledge and inspire curiosity. Following that, students talked in couples about why individuals play sports, and their comments were led by cultural notions like tradition, identity, community, and values. The lesson's key intercultural question, "What does this sport tell us about the culture it comes from?" was introduced and reinforced throughout.

After this, students were grouped and given simplified Sport Information Cards about different traditional sports from various countries. These cards included basic information about how the sport is played and one cultural aspect related to it. Students read the texts collaboratively and completed short comprehension tasks to ensure understanding.

During the task phase, students worked together to develop a "World Sports Reporter Card." They were asked to believe they were reporters working on a short cultural report for a magazine. Each group filled out a structured template with the name of the sport, its place of origin, how it is played, and, most importantly, the cultural values it represents. Furthermore, students were asked to draw a parallel with Turkish culture by choosing a similar sport or practice and highlighting at least one difference using simple comparison frameworks.

Language support was supplied throughout the task, including sentence starters and model structures (e.g., "In [country], people play... because..." and "In Türkiye, something similar is..."). While completing the task, students collaborated to discuss and negotiate meaning, reflecting the key premise of task-based learning, which uses language as a tool for communication. The teacher observed the groups and guided them with questions that prompted deeper cultural inquiry.

After finishing their reporter cards, students displayed their work around the classroom and took part in a brief gallery walk. During this step, students examined each other's work and wrote brief thoughts on sticky notes, such as something unexpected they discovered or a cultural connection they noticed. This stage emphasized interaction and intercultural awareness.

During the post-task phase, each group gave a brief oral presentation to the class that summarized the sport, its cultural significance, and its relationship to Turkish culture. These lectures provided students with opportunities to practice speaking while also reinforcing intercultural understanding. Finally, students performed an individual reflection assignment (exit ticket) in which they evaluated what they had learned about cultures via sports.

3.6. Data Analysis

All participants completed both the pre-test and post-test instruments; therefore, no missing data treatment was required. Prior to inferential analyses, the data were screened for outliers using boxplots and standardized z-scores. No extreme outliers were identified that would warrant the exclusion of any cases from the analyses. The data were analyzed using SPSS (Version 27). Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, means, and standard deviations, were calculated to summarize the sociodemographic characteristics of the participants and the pre-test scores of the main variables.

Prior to conducting the main analyses, the normality of the pre-test score distributions was examined separately for the experimental and control groups using the Shapiro-Wilk test, which is recommended for small sample sizes ($n < 30$). Table 5 presents the Shapiro-Wilk statistics, skewness, and kurtosis values for all three scales.

Table 5. Normality test results

Scale	Group	N	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk (W)	p-value
Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire	Experimental	23	.314	-.624	.955	.371*
	Control	23	.865	.410	.943	.205*
Social-Emotional Competency Scale	Experimental	23	-.364	-.916	.951	.305*
	Control	23	-.404	-.785	.955	.362*
Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale	Experimental	23	-.544	-.063	.962	.514*
	Control	23	.526	-.539	.954	.353*

Note. W = Shapiro-Wilk statistic. * $p > .05$ indicates normal distribution.

To examine the effect of the intervention on intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty, ANCOVA was conducted. In these analyses, post-test

scores were treated as the dependent variables, group (experimental vs. control) as the fixed factor, and pre-test scores as covariates. This approach was employed to control for initial differences between the groups and to provide a more accurate estimation of the intervention effect.

The ANCOVA assumptions were thoroughly reviewed prior to performing the primary analyses. Shapiro-Wilk tests and visual examination of Q-Q plots were used to determine whether the residuals were normal. Scatterplots for each group were used to assess the linearity between the covariate and the dependent variable, and they revealed a linear connection. The interaction term between group and pre-test scores was added to the model to examine the homogeneity of regression slopes; a non-significant interaction verified that the regression slopes were homogeneous across groups. Levene's test was used to evaluate homogeneity of variance.

For normally distributed data, paired samples t-tests were used to investigate within-group differences between pre-test and post-test scores. The Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was employed as a non-parametric substitute when the normalcy assumption was not satisfied. Paired samples t-tests and Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Tests were used independently to examine within-group changes from pre-test to post-test in both the experimental and control groups, while ANCOVA was used to examine between-group differences in post-test scores after controlling for pre-test scores. These two analytical approaches serve complementary purposes: ANCOVA addresses the adjusted group effect of the intervention, whereas within-group analyses examine the pattern of change within each group independently. The significance level for all statistical analyses was set at $\alpha = .05$. The magnitude of the observed differences was evaluated by reporting effect sizes. The ANCOV effect size measure was partial eta squared (η^2p). For paired samples t-tests, Cohen's d was given, and for Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Tests, r was computed as the effect size. The analysis methods used for each research question are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Summary of data analysis methods by research question

Research Question	Variable	Analysis Method
RQ1	IAQ, SEC, IUS (Pre-test); gender, mother's education, father's education, perceived English proficiency level	Descriptive statistics
RQ2	Intercultural Awareness (Total)	ANCOVA
RQ3	Social-Emotional Competence (Total)	ANCOVA
RQ4	Intolerance of Uncertainty (Total)	ANCOVA
RQ5	IAQ, SEC, IUS total scores	Paired Samples T-test / Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test

4. FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of the study. The analysis examined the effects of the task-based intercultural teaching program on students' intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty. The findings are presented in accordance with the research questions.

4.1. Findings Related to Research Question 1

The first research question examined the pre-test levels of intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty among the experimental and control group participants. Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics for all three scales prior to the intervention.

Table 7. Overall descriptive statistics for pre-test scores by group

Scale	Group	n	M	SD	Min	Max
Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire	Experimental	23	111.65	11.097	94.00	134.00
	Control	23	112.17	11.610	95.00	141.00
Social-Emotional Competency Scale	Experimental	23	30.83	4.386	22.00	37.00
	Control	23	30.52	5.712	19.00	40.00
Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale	Experimental	23	36.91	7.077	22.00	49.00
	Control	23	42.83	8.473	30.00	60.00

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation.

Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics for the pre-test total scores of both groups across the three scales. Prior to the intervention, both groups demonstrated comparable pre-test levels on intercultural awareness and social-emotional competence; however, a notable difference was observed in intolerance of uncertainty scores.

Regarding intercultural awareness, the experimental group ($M = 111.65$, $SD = 11.097$) and the control group ($M = 112.17$, $SD = 11.610$) obtained comparable total scores on the Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire. With respect to social-emotional competence, the experimental group ($M = 30.83$, $SD = 4.386$) and the control group ($M = 30.52$, $SD = 5.712$) yielded nearly identical total scores on the Social-Emotional Competency Scale.

Concerning intolerance of uncertainty, the experimental group ($M = 36.91$, $SD = 7.077$) obtained a notably lower total score than the control group ($M = 42.83$, $SD = 8.473$) on the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale, reflecting an approximately six-point difference between the groups at baseline.

This initial difference was taken into account in subsequent analyses by including pre-test scores as a covariate in the ANCOVA.

In addition to comparing the experimental and control groups, pre-test scores were examined according to participants' demographic characteristics, specifically gender, mother's education level, father's education level, and perceived English proficiency level. Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10 below present these results.

Table 8. Pre-test Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire scores by demographic variables

Demographic	Group	N	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Gender	Female	27	112.41	10.18
	Male	19	111.21	12.84
Mother's education	Primary school	16	111.63	12.86
	Middle school	20	110.75	10.87
	High school	6	115.50	8.17
	University	4	113.50	12.92
Father's education	Primary school	8	112.25	9.36
	Middle school	10	110.00	12.58
	High school	23	111.52	11.39
	University	5	117.00	12.41
English proficiency	High	12	111.75	10.15
	Medium	27	111.85	12.58
	Low	7	112.43	8.44

Note. N = 46. Scores range from 31 to 155.

Table 8 presents pre-test Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire scores according to participants' gender, mother's education level, father's education level, and perceived English proficiency level. Based on the observed mean scores, values on the Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire stay close across these demographic groups, ranging from 110.00 to 117.00, suggesting similar pre-test intercultural awareness levels across gender, parental education, and perceived English proficiency.

Table 9. Pre-test Social-Emotional Competency Scale scores by demographic variables

Demographic	Group	N	M	SD
Gender	Female	27	30.93	4.65
	Male	19	30.32	5.66
Mother's education	Primary school	16	29.94	5.04
	Middle school	20	30.15	5.36
	High school	6	32.50	4.64
	University	4	33.50	3.70
Father's education	Primary school	8	30.13	6.36
	Middle school	10	29.30	4.42
	High school	23	31.78	4.99
	University	5	29.20	4.32
English proficiency	High	12	31.17	4.80
	Medium	27	30.33	5.12
	Low	7	31.14	5.76

Note. N = 46. Scores range from 10 to 40.

Table 9 presents pre-test Social-Emotional Competency Scale scores according to participants' gender, mother's education level, father's education level, and perceived English proficiency level. Based on the observed mean scores, students whose mothers hold a university degree show the highest score on the Social-Emotional Competency Scale ($M = 33.50$, $SD = 3.70$). The descriptive statistics indicate that students whose fathers hold a university degree show the lowest score among father's education groups ($M = 29.20$, $SD = 4.32$). Descriptively, gender and English proficiency level show minimal variation, with means ranging from 30.32 to 31.17.

Table 10. Pre-test Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale scores by demographic variables

Demographic	Group	N	M	SD
Gender	Female	27	43.00	7.62
	Male	19	35.42	7.20
Mother's education	Primary school	16	39.44	8.59
	Middle school	20	38.70	6.96
	High school	6	43.83	2.86
	University	4	41.50	17.14
Father's education	Primary school	8	39.63	8.67
	Middle school	10	39.90	7.03
	High school	23	40.22	7.99
	University	5	38.60	13.20
English proficiency	High	12	40.25	10.40
	Medium	27	38.93	7.76
	Low	7	42.86	6.34

Note. N = 46. Scores range from 12 to 60.

Table 10 presents pre-test Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale scores according to participants' gender, mother's education level, father's education level, and perceived English proficiency level. Based on the observed mean scores, female students score higher on the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale ($M = 43.00$, $SD = 7.62$) than male students ($M = 35.42$, $SD = 7.20$). Mean scores across mother's and father's education levels stay close to the overall sample mean of 39.87. The descriptive statistics indicate that students who rate their English proficiency as low score somewhat higher ($M = 42.86$) than students who rate it as high ($M = 40.25$). Overall, pre-test scores on the three scales show similar patterns across demographic groups, with one exception. Descriptively, female students report higher scores than male students on the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale.

4.2. Findings Related to Research Question 2

A one-way ANCOVA was used with post-test Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire (IAQ) scores as the dependent variable, group (experimental vs. control) as the fixed factor, and pre-test IAQ scores as the covariate to investigate the impact of the task-based intercultural teaching program on students' intercultural awareness. The assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes was checked and verified prior to the analysis ($F(1, 42) = .831$, $p = .367$), showing that there was no significant difference between groups in the connection between the covariate and the dependent variable. Furthermore, Levene's test showed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was satisfied ($p > .05$). Table 11 below displays the ANCOVA results.

Table 11. ANCOVA results for the effect of the intervention on intercultural awareness

Source	SS	Df	MS	F	p	η^2p
Group	5.309	1	5.309	.017	.896	.000
Pre-test (Covariate)	15.727	1	15.727	.051	.822	.001
Error	13226.794	43	307.600			

Note. SS = sum of squares; df = degrees of freedom; MS = mean square; η^2p = partial eta squared.

As shown in Table 11, after controlling for pre-test scores, the ANCOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of the intervention on post-test intercultural awareness scores, $F(1, 43) = .017$, $p = .896$, $\eta^2p = .000$. These findings suggest that the task-based intercultural teaching program did not produce a statistically significant improvement in intercultural awareness compared to the control group.

4.3. Findings Related to Research Question 3

A one-way ANCOVA was used with post-test Delaware Social-Emotional Competency Scale (DSECS) scores as the dependent variable, group (experimental vs. control) as the fixed factor, and pre-test DSECS scores as the covariate to investigate the impact of the task-based intercultural teaching program on students' social-emotional competence. The assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes was checked and verified prior to the analysis ($F(1, 42) = .554, p = .461$), suggesting that there were no significant group differences in the relationship between the covariate and the dependent variable. Furthermore, Levene's test showed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was satisfied ($p > .05$). Table 12 displays the ANCOVA results.

Table 12. ANCOVA results for the effect of the intervention on social-emotional competence

Source	SS	Df	MS	F	p	η^2p
Group	2.724	1	2.724	.100	.753	.002
Pre-test (Covariate)	75.528	1	75.528	2.772	.103	.061
Error	1171.516	43	27.245			

Note. SS = sum of squares; df = degrees of freedom; MS = mean square; η^2p = partial eta squared.

As shown in Table 12, after controlling for pre-test scores, the ANCOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of the intervention on post-test social-emotional competence scores, $F(1, 43) = .100, p = .753, \eta^2p = .002$. These findings suggest that the task-based intercultural teaching program did not produce a statistically significant improvement in social-emotional competence compared to the control group.

4.4. Findings Related to Research Question 4

A one-way ANCOVA was used with post-test Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale (IUS-12) scores as the dependent variable, group (experimental vs. control) as the fixed factor, and pre-test IUS-12 scores as the covariate to investigate the impact of the task-based intercultural teaching program on students' intolerance of uncertainty. The assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes was checked and verified prior to the analysis ($F(1, 42) = .072, p = .789$), suggesting that there were no significant group differences in the connection between the covariate and the dependent variable. Furthermore, Levene's test showed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was satisfied ($p > .05$). Table 13 displays the ANCOVA results.

Table 13. ANCOVA results for the effect of the intervention on intolerance of uncertainty

Source	SS	Df	MS	F	p	η^2p
Group	8.272	1	8.272	.088	.769	.002
Pre-test (Covariate)	158.639	1	158.639	1.681	.202	.038
Error	4057.709	43	94.365			

Note. SS = sum of squares; df = degrees of freedom; MS = mean square; η^2p = partial eta squared.

As shown in Table 13, after controlling for pre-test scores, the ANCOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of the intervention on post-test intolerance of uncertainty scores, $F(1, 43) = .088$, $p = .769$, $\eta^2p = .002$. These findings suggest that the task-based intercultural teaching program did not produce a statistically significant reduction in intolerance of uncertainty compared to the control group.

4.5. Findings Related to Research Question 5

To examine within-group changes from pre-test to post-test, paired samples t-tests and Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Tests were conducted separately for the experimental and control groups across all three scales. The choice of test was determined by the results of the Shapiro-Wilk normality test conducted for each group separately. Paired samples t-test was applied when the assumption of normality was met ($p > .05$), while the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was used when normality was violated ($p \leq .05$).

Intercultural Awareness

Table 14 below presents the pre-test and post-test total score comparison for both groups on the Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire.

Table 14. Within-group comparisons of pre-test and post-test Intercultural Awareness Questionnaire scores

Group	N	Pre-test M	Post-test M	t/Z	df	p	d/r
Experimental	23	111.65	114.22	$t = .575$	22	.571	$d = .120$
Control	23	112.17	114.87	$Z = -1.043$	22	.297	$r = .218$

Note. t = paired samples t-test statistic; Z = Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test statistic; d = Cohen's d; r = effect size.

As shown in Table 14, no statistically significant difference was found between pre-test and post-test total intercultural awareness scores for the experimental group ($t(22) = .575$, $p = .571$, $d =$

.120). For the control group, the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test likewise revealed no statistically significant difference ($Z = -1.043$, $p = .297$, $r = .218$).

Social-Emotional Competence

Table 15 below presents the pre-test and post-test total score comparison for both groups on the Delaware Social-Emotional Competency Scale.

Table 15. Within-group comparisons of pre-test and post-test Social-Emotional Competency Scale scores

Group	n	Pre-test M	Post-test M	t/Z	df	p	d/r
Experimental	23	30.83	31.65	$Z = -.793$	22	.428	$r = .165$
Control	23	30.52	31.09	$t = .382$	22	.706	$d = .080$

Note. t = paired samples t-test statistic; Z = Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test statistic; d = Cohen's d ; r = effect size.

As shown in Table 15, no statistically significant difference was found between pre-test and post-test total social-emotional competence scores for the experimental group ($Z = -.793$, $p = .428$, $r = .165$) or the control group ($t(22) = .382$, $p = .706$, $d = .080$).

Intolerance of Uncertainty

Table 16 below presents the pre-test and post-test total score comparison for both groups on the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale.

Table 16. Within-group comparisons of pre-test and post-test Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale scores

Group	n	Pre-test M	Post-test M	t/Z	df	p	d/r
Experimental	23	36.91	41.13	$t = 2.039$	22	.054	$d = .425$
Control	23	42.83	43.48	$t = .251$	22	.805	$d = .052$

Note. t = paired samples t-test statistic; Z = Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test statistic; d = Cohen's d ; r = effect size.

As shown in Table 16, no statistically significant difference was found between pre-test and post-test total intolerance of uncertainty scores for the experimental group ($t(22) = 2.039$, $p = .054$, $d = .425$), although the result approached statistical significance. Notably, the experimental group's mean IUS-12 score increased from pre-test ($M = 36.91$) to post-test ($M = 41.13$), indicating a rise in intolerance of uncertainty over the intervention period. The control group showed no statistically significant difference ($t(22) = .251$, $p = .805$, $d = .052$), with a comparatively smaller increase from pre-test ($M = 42.83$) to post-test ($M = 43.48$).

5. DISCUSSION

The main aim of this study was to investigate the effects of a task-based intercultural training program on students' intercultural mindset. Within this framework, intercultural mindset was approached as a multidimensional construct including intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty. The study was conducted with 9th-grade EFL learners, and the impact of the eight-week intervention was examined through pre-test and post-test comparisons between experimental and control groups.

5.1. Pre-Test Levels of Intercultural Mindset

Prior to the intervention, both groups demonstrated broadly comparable levels across the intercultural awareness and social-emotional competence measures, suggesting that they entered the study with similar cognitive and affective orientations toward intercultural engagement. This comparability is an important baseline condition for interpreting subsequent findings: any differences that emerge between groups at post-test can more confidently be attributed to the differential effect of instruction rather than pre-existing group differences.

One notable exception was observed in the intolerance of uncertainty measure, where the experimental group entered the study with meaningfully lower scores than the control group, indicating that, at baseline, the experimental group already exhibited a greater tolerance for uncertainty than their peers in the control group. This pre-existing difference was addressed analytically by including pre-test scores as covariates in the ANCOVA, but it also carries theoretical relevance for interpreting the IUS-12 results at post-test. Learners who begin a program already disposed toward tolerating ambiguity may have less room for measurable further change within the limited timeframe of an eight-week intervention. This ceiling consideration should be kept in mind when evaluating the absence of a between-group effect on intolerance of uncertainty.

The pre-test descriptive data also point to the relatively homogeneous character of the sample in terms of intercultural experience. The participants were 9th-grade students attending a public high school in Malatya, a context in which exposure to culturally diverse materials and authentic intercultural encounters is likely to be limited. In this sense, the pre-test scores across all three scales reflect not a deficit but a realistic starting point for learners whose prior schooling has addressed intercultural content only incidentally, if at all.

Beyond the group comparison, pre-test scores were also examined according to participants' gender, mother's education level, father's education level, and perceived English proficiency level. Intercultural awareness and social-emotional competence scores stayed close across every demographic group, with means differing by only a few points. Mean scores on the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale also stayed close across mother's education level, father's education level, and English proficiency groups.

Gender showed a different pattern on the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale. Female students scored higher at pre-test than male students, a gap of nearly eight points. This finding is consistent with the descriptive trend reported by Osmanağaoğlu et al. (2021), who also found higher intolerance of uncertainty scores among preadolescent girls compared to boys, although their difference did not reach statistical significance. Bottesi et al. (2023) reported a statistically significant gender difference in the same direction among Italian adolescents. This descriptive difference in the present study could not be tested for statistical significance given the sample size (27 female, 19 male participants), but its size, combined with converging evidence from these two studies, suggests that gender may function as a relevant background variable in future replications of this design, particularly with larger and more balanced samples.

5.2. Effect of the Task-Based Intercultural Teaching Program on Intercultural Awareness

The absence of statistically significant between-group differences in overall intercultural awareness is consistent with previous research suggesting that short-term instructional interventions may not be sufficient to produce measurable development across all dimensions of intercultural competence simultaneously. Tural and Cubukcu (2021) reported slight increases in intercultural awareness following a six-week intercultural intervention in Turkish EFL classrooms; however, these changes did not reach statistical significance between groups. Taken together, these findings suggest that intercultural development, particularly in high school EFL contexts, may emerge gradually and selectively rather than uniformly through short-term instructional exposure. Furthermore, the effect size associated with the between-group comparison on intercultural awareness was trivial, falling well below Cohen's (1988) conventional threshold for a small effect, suggesting that the intervention produced no practically meaningful differentiation between groups on this dimension, a finding that reinforces the interpretation that eight weeks of task-based intercultural instruction was insufficient to generate detectable intercultural awareness development at the group level.

Another possible explanation for the limited between-group effects may relate to the contextual and pedagogical challenges associated with implementing task-based intercultural instruction in formal school settings. Peng and Pyper (2021) argue that many classroom activities

described as tasks do not fully meet the important principles of task-based language teaching, particularly regarding authentic communicative purpose and meaningful interaction. Similarly, Maulana (2021), drawing on Ellis (2009), emphasizes that TBLT should be understood as a flexible and context-sensitive framework rather than a fixed instructional model. From this perspective, the limited effects found in this study may reflect the practical difficulties of fully implementing intercultural task-based instruction within the time, curricular, and institutional constraints of a high school environment.

The findings of the present study also support the view that intercultural development is a gradual and multidimensional process that may not immediately translate into statistically measurable attitudinal change. Ishii (2009), for example, found no statistically significant between-group differences following task-based intercultural instruction among Japanese high school EFL learners, although learners with lower initial intercultural orientations demonstrated greater developmental gains. Similarly, Harper (2019) argues that intercultural communicative competence develops cumulatively through sustained opportunities for cultural reflection, comparison, and interaction rather than through isolated instructional interventions. In this respect, the limited between-group effects observed in the present study should not necessarily be interpreted as evidence of instructional ineffectiveness, but rather as an indication of the complex and gradual nature of intercultural mindset development.

A further pattern worth noting is that both groups demonstrated a modest increase in intercultural awareness scores from pre-test to post-test. The fact that both groups increased to a comparable degree suggests that the observed gains may not reflect an intervention-specific effect. Several methodological factors may account for this parallel pattern. Campbell and Stanley (2011) identify maturation, the natural developmental changes that occur within participants over time, and testing, the tendency for familiarity with an instrument to improve performance on repeated administration, as threats to internal validity that can produce pre-test to post-test gains independently of any treatment. In the present study, both groups remained in the same school environment throughout the eight-week period and were exposed to regular English instruction as part of the national curriculum, constituting a shared experiential context that may have contributed to modest gains in intercultural awareness scores in both groups. Gay et al. (2012) similarly note that in nonequivalent control group designs, interactions among selection, maturation, history, and testing can produce parallel changes across groups that are unrelated to the intervention itself. Additionally, the reactive effects associated with study participation, known as the Hawthorne effect, may have contributed to the observed increases, as awareness of being observed or assessed can itself motivate more thoughtful responding (Gay et al., 2012). Taken together, these design-inherent factors suggest

that the parallel increases observed across both groups are more plausibly attributable to general developmental, contextual, and measurement-related influences than to the specific effects of the intercultural teaching program.

A further explanation for the limited effects observed may relate to the gap between task design and actual classroom implementation. İlin, İnözü, and Yumru (2007) found that in Turkish EFL classrooms, task-based activities were largely reduced to form-focused practice despite teachers' sound theoretical understanding of TBLT. Students consistently perceived tasks as revision exercises rather than meaningful communicative experiences. This suggests that even well-designed intercultural tasks may not produce their intended effects if learners do not engage with them as meaningful intercultural experiences during execution.

5.3. Effect of the Task-Based Intercultural Teaching Program on Social-Emotional Competence

The absence of statistically significant between-group differences in social-emotional competence, alongside the lack of significant within-group change in either group, warrants careful interpretation. Social-emotional competence is generally conceptualized as a multidimensional construct involving emotional regulation, empathy, self-awareness, and interpersonal functioning, and its development is recognized as a gradual process shaped through ongoing social and emotional learning experiences (Domitrovich et al., 2017; CASEL, n.d.). In this respect, the eight-week duration of the present intervention may not have provided sufficient time for measurable development in these affective dimensions to emerge. Furthermore, the effect size associated with the between-group comparison on social-emotional competence similarly fell within the trivial-to-small range, remaining below Cohen's (1988) threshold for a small effect, showing that the intervention did not produce a practically meaningful group-level differentiation in social-emotional competence scores, consistent with the view that affective development of this kind requires considerably more sustained instructional engagement than an eight-week program can provide.

Another possible explanation may relate to the nature of the measurement instrument employed in the study. Although the Delaware Social-Emotional Competency Scale is a validated measure of general social-emotional functioning, it may not be sufficiently sensitive to the specific affective dynamics associated with intercultural task-based engagement. As a result, modest affective changes potentially experienced by learners during the intervention may not have been fully reflected in the quantitative findings.

Similar patterns have also been reported in previous TBLT research conducted in Turkish EFL contexts. Akin (2020), for example, found no statistically significant differences in learners' language

self-efficacy beliefs following a six-week task-based intervention, despite observable increases in mean scores across several dimensions. Importantly, qualitative findings from the study indicated that learners participating in task-based instruction reported feeling more active, motivated, and confident in language use. This suggests that affective gains associated with task-based instruction may occur at the individual level even when they do not become statistically detectable through short-term quantitative comparisons.

A further pattern worth noting is that both groups demonstrated a modest increase in social-emotional competence scores from pre-test to post-test, with neither change reaching statistical significance. The comparable magnitude of these increases across both groups raises an important interpretive question: rather than asking why the intervention did not produce change, it may be more informative to ask why both groups showed similar gains. Domitrovich et al. (2017) emphasize that social-emotional competence develops through ongoing social and emotional learning experiences that are embedded in daily interactions, relationships, and school life rather than through discrete instructional episodes alone. From this perspective, the modest parallel increases observed in both groups may reflect the natural developmental trajectory that adolescent learners undergo through their regular participation in classroom and peer interactions throughout the school term, independent of any specific instructional program. Since slight increases were observed in both groups, the pattern may therefore reflect general developmental, contextual, or measurement-related influences rather than an intervention-specific effect. This interpretation is further consistent with the broader SEL literature, which suggests that measurable development in affective and interpersonal competencies typically requires sustained, coordinated, and multi-year implementation rather than short-term discrete interventions (Domitrovich et al., 2017).

Taken together, these findings suggest that effective and dispositional dimensions of intercultural development may require longer instructional periods and more context-sensitive measurement approaches before measurable change becomes statistically visible. The findings also indicate that the impact of task-based intercultural instruction may extend beyond what standardized quantitative outcomes alone are able to capture.

5.4. Effect of the Task-Based Intercultural Teaching Program on Intolerance of Uncertainty

The absence of statistically significant between-group differences in intolerance of uncertainty represents one of the more theoretically complex findings of the present study, particularly given the recognized role of ambiguity tolerance in intercultural communication research. Intolerance of uncertainty, defined as the tendency to perceive uncertain and unpredictable situations as unacceptable regardless of their actual probability (Carleton et al., 2007), has been identified as an

important dispositional factor influencing how learners respond to unfamiliarity and unpredictability in intercultural encounters (Hosseini & Seifoori, 2018; Li et al., 2017). Although the present intervention was theoretically expected to support learners' tolerance for uncertainty through intercultural tasks involving cultural comparison and perspective-taking, statistically significant changes were not observed.

The findings are consistent with previous research suggesting that intolerance of uncertainty is a relatively stable construct that may not be easily modified through short-term instructional interventions (Youfi & Brigui, 2024). Existing literature nonetheless indicates that uncertainty tolerance remains closely associated with intercultural communication competence and language learning outcomes. Hosseini and Seifoori (2018) found that learners with higher ambiguity tolerance demonstrated more accurate task-based oral performance, and Youfi and Brigui (2024) reported a favorable correlation between high school EFL students' intercultural communication skills and their ability to tolerate uncertainty. These findings suggest that uncertainty tolerance constitutes an important dimension of intercultural learning, even if measurable development may not emerge within relatively short instructional periods.

Several factors may account for the limited effects observed. Intolerance of uncertainty is conceptualized as a stable individual difference variable with deep cognitive and affective roots (Carleton et al., 2007), and dispositional orientations toward uncertainty may require more sustained engagement before measurable change becomes visible (Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006). Additionally, although the pre-existing difference in IUS-12 scores between groups was statistically controlled through ANCOVA, learners who entered the study already disposed toward greater ambiguity tolerance may have had limited room for further measurable improvement within an eight-week period. Finally, although the tasks encouraged cultural comparison and perspective-taking, they were conducted within the relatively structured environment of the classroom, where authentic unpredictability is necessarily constrained.

Another possible explanation concerns statistical power. The relatively small sample size ($n = 46$) may have limited the ability of the analyses to detect small intervention effects. Therefore, the absence of statistically significant findings should be interpreted cautiously, particularly for outcomes that demonstrated non-trivial effect sizes.

A particularly noteworthy finding concerns the direction of change in IUS-12 scores. Rather than declining, scores in the experimental group increased from pre-test to post-test, as the control group also showed a small increase. The magnitude of increase was considerably greater in the experimental group, and the between-group difference approached but did not reach conventional

levels of statistical significance. This borderline result is particularly important to interpret with care: it does not represent an almost-significant improvement, but rather an almost-significant increase in intolerance of uncertainty in the experimental group relative to the control. The effect size associated with this finding ($d = .425$) is the largest among the three outcome measures and falls between Cohen's (1988) thresholds for small and medium effects, indicating a meaningful degree of practical differentiation between groups, albeit in an unexpected direction.

This pattern warrants careful theoretical interpretation. Rather than reflecting a dispositional deterioration, the rise in IUS-12 scores may indicate that participants became more consciously aware of the ambiguity inherent in intercultural situations, ambiguity that the intervention brought into focus for the first time. Bennett and Bennett's (2004) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), which characterizes intercultural competence as advancing through six stages from ethnocentric to ethnorelative orientations, lends support to this interpretation. Bennett and Bennett (2004) note that learners entering the Acceptance stage may experience a form of paralysis as they confront the equal validity of multiple cultural perspectives simultaneously, precisely because their previously stable worldview is being challenged. From this perspective, the observed increase in IUS-12 scores may reflect an early and characteristic phase of intercultural development, one at which uncertainty becomes more visible, not less, as learners begin to engage seriously with cultural difference. This reading is further supported by Deardorff's (2006) process model, in which the capacity to tolerate ambiguity is identified as a foundational attitude that must be actively cultivated rather than assumed to be present at the outset of intercultural learning.

One possible explanation may be that increased exposure to intercultural complexity heightened students' awareness of uncertainty. However, this interpretation remains speculative because no qualitative data were collected to verify this possibility. Empirical support for this interpretation comes from Wahlund et al. (2020), who observed that some adolescent participants experienced an initial increase in worry during an uncertainty-focused intervention, attributing this to heightened awareness of uncertainty-related triggers rather than genuine deterioration. Allan (2003) similarly found that students in intercultural settings initially experienced confusion and disorientation upon encountering cultural difference, and that progression along the intercultural learning continuum was neither automatic nor uniform. Mitchell and Paras (2018) likewise reported that in a short-term intercultural field school, only half of the students moved forward along the intercultural context, with the remainder staying at the same level or regressing, a pattern they attributed to the disorienting effects of cognitive dissonance generated by unfamiliar cultural encounters. Taken together, these findings suggest that a temporary increase on an uncertainty-related measure in the

early stages of intercultural instruction may reflect a characteristic developmental phase rather than evidence of program ineffectiveness.

A further consideration concerns the parallel increase observed in the control group, which also showed elevated IUS-12 scores at post-test, albeit to a lower degree. This pattern suggests that factors beyond the intervention itself may have contributed to the observed changes. The developmental stage of adolescence is marked by an increased sensitivity to uncertainty, and fluctuations in uncertainty-related orientations may partly reflect broader maturational processes (Carleton et al., 2007). Additionally, post-test data were collected during the final weeks of the second semester, a period typically marked by heightened academic pressure and the approach of end-of-year examinations. These contextual stressors may have independently elevated perceived intolerance of uncertainty across both groups, irrespective of instructional condition. The between-group difference, rather than the absolute direction of change, therefore, remains the more theoretically informative finding.

5.5. Within-Group Differences

The within-group analyses conducted for both the experimental and control groups revealed no statistically significant differences between pre-test and post-test total scores across any of the three scales. These findings suggest that neither the task-based intercultural teaching program nor the regular curriculum-based instruction produced statistically measurable within-group change over the eight-week intervention period.

One important observation is that the control group, which received only regular curriculum-based instruction, also showed no significant change over the same period. This parallel pattern across both groups strengthens the interpretation that the absence of measurable change in the experimental group does not reflect a failure of the task-based intercultural program per se, but rather the inherent difficulty of generating statistically visible intercultural development within a short instructional timeframe regardless of the approach employed. This pattern is connected with previous research indicating that incidental exposure to intercultural content within standard EFL curricula is generally insufficient to produce significant intercultural development (Harper, 2019; Byram, 1997). Tural and Cubukcu (2021) similarly found no significant within-group improvement in intercultural awareness following a six-week intervention, reinforcing the view that short-term exposure alone, whether task-based or traditional, may be insufficient to produce detectable change.

Another consideration concerns the gap between statistical significance and practical meaning. Akin (2020) found no statistically significant within-group differences in learners' language self-efficacy following a six-week task-based intervention in a Turkish EFL context, yet qualitative data

revealed that learners reported feeling more active, motivated, and confident. This suggests that the impact of task-based intercultural instruction may manifest at the experiential level before it becomes statistically measurable. From this perspective, the current study's within-group results should be taken cautiously because the lack of statistical significance does not always indicate that there were no significant learning processes taking place throughout the intervention. Although the result did not reach statistical significance, the experimental group demonstrated a moderate effect size on the IUS measure.

A further consideration concerns the nature of the learning environment itself. Nelson and Luetz (2021) argue that intercultural competence cannot be fully developed within the boundaries of a classroom, as it is more effectively attained through processes of experiential and immersive learning. From this perspective, the structured and predictable conditions of a formal school setting may have inherently limited the depth of intercultural engagement that learners could experience through classroom-based tasks, regardless of the quality of the instructional design. This does not diminish the value of classroom-based intercultural instruction; rather, it suggests that classroom activities may function as a preparatory foundation for deeper intercultural development that ultimately requires more authentic and sustained experiential engagement. In a systematic review of 70 school-based intercultural education studies, Walton et al. (2013) found that intercultural programs that operate at the classroom level alone, without broader support at the whole-school level, have little to no long-term effect. It can be interpreted that intercultural mindset may be more resistant to short-term instructional influence than originally anticipated. These findings suggest that the absence of significant within-group change in the present study may be partly attributable to the inherent limitations of a single-classroom, short-term intervention, and that more sustained and institutionally embedded intercultural instruction may be necessary for measurable change to emerge.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1. Conclusion

This study investigated the impact of an eight-week task-based intercultural language teaching program on the development of intercultural mindset among 9th-grade EFL learners in Türkiye. Unlike many previous studies focusing primarily on intercultural awareness, the present study approached intercultural mindset as a multidimensional construct consisting of intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty simultaneously. In this respect, the study attempted to examine the interaction of cognitive, affective, and uncertainty-related dimensions within a structured task-based intercultural instructional framework.

Although the intervention did not produce statistically significant between-group differences across any of the three dimensions, nor significant within-group change in either group, the findings should not be interpreted as evidence of instructional ineffectiveness. The absence of statistical significance does not imply the absence of any effect: the effect sizes associated with intercultural awareness and social-emotional competence fell within the trivial-to-small range, while the effect size for intolerance of uncertainty was considerably larger, albeit in an unexpected direction. One possible explanation may be that participants became more consciously aware of ambiguity in intercultural situations, a pattern consistent with early-phase intercultural development (Bennett & Bennett, 2004; Deardorff, 2006); however, this interpretation remains speculative and requires further investigation through qualitative and longitudinal research. Taken together, these findings reflect the gradual and cumulative nature of intercultural mindset development and suggest that short-term classroom-based intercultural interventions may function as initial developmental steps within a broader and longer-term process rather than as standalone transformative experiences.

The findings suggest that any potential effects may require longer periods to become measurable. The parallel increases observed across both groups on intercultural awareness and social-emotional competence measures further suggest that general developmental, contextual, and school-related factors may contribute to modest gains independently of the specific instructional program. The study highlights the complexity of fostering cognitive, affective, and dispositional development within relatively short instructional periods and underscores the need for sustained, systematically sequenced intercultural learning experiences that are embedded within the broader curriculum rather than delivered as discrete short-term interventions.

The present study is subject to several limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. First, the eight-week duration of the intervention may have been insufficient to produce statistically measurable change across all dimensions of intercultural mindset, particularly in affective and dispositional constructs that are understood to develop gradually over extended periods. Second, although the tasks implemented in the study were designed to encourage cultural comparison and perspective-taking, they were necessarily conducted within the structured and predictable environment of the formal classroom, which may have constrained the depth and authenticity of the intercultural engagement available to participants. Third, the study relied exclusively on quantitative pre-test and post-test measures, which may not have fully captured the range of learners' intercultural development. Affective and experiential changes that are not statistically detectable at the group level may nonetheless have occurred at the individual level, and the absence of qualitative data sources limits the extent to which such processes can be examined.

Another limitation concerns the relatively small sample size, which may have reduced the statistical power of the study to detect modest intervention effects, particularly in relation to dispositional constructs that may require larger samples to demonstrate measurable change. The sample size was determined by the accessible educational context in which the intervention was implemented. Since the study was conducted in a real high school setting, the researcher worked with intact classrooms rather than recruiting a larger randomized sample. While this approach enhances the ecological validity of the findings, it necessarily constrains the generalizability of the results and the sensitivity of the statistical analyses.

6.2. Implications

The findings of the present study carry several important implications for both research and practice. From a theoretical perspective, the present study contributes to the conceptualization of intercultural mindset as a multidimensional construct by assessing intercultural awareness, social-emotional competence, and intolerance of uncertainty together, rather than through a single measure. This joint assessment reflects the cognitive, affective, and dispositional dimensions of intercultural mindset development and addresses a gap in the literature, where intercultural competence is often measured through a single instrument. The present findings therefore support a more integrated framework for future research on intercultural mindset.

From a pedagogical perspective, the results suggest that task-based intercultural instruction has the potential to contribute to intercultural mindset development in high school EFL contexts, even if statistically significant effects may not emerge uniformly across all dimensions within short instructional periods. EFL teachers working in high school contexts are encouraged to incorporate

culturally comparative tasks and intercultural reflection activities into their regular classroom practice, even within the constraints of existing curricula. As Harper (2019) argues, well-designed intercultural tasks should actively involve learners in meaning-making processes rather than presenting culture as static information. Similarly, Brunsmeier (2021) emphasizes that effective intercultural tasks should encourage cultural comparison, perspective-taking, and engagement with unfamiliar viewpoints. These principles suggest that the quality and design of intercultural tasks may matter as much as their duration.

From a curricular standpoint, the findings highlight the importance of sustained and systematically sequenced intercultural instruction. A single short-term intervention, however well-designed, is unlikely to produce measurable change across all dimensions of intercultural mindset simultaneously. Program developers and curriculum designers are therefore encouraged to integrate intercultural learning objectives across multiple academic years rather than treating intercultural competence as an add-on component of language instruction. Social-emotional and uncertainty-related dimensions in particular may require longer instructional periods and repeated intercultural engagement before statistically measurable development becomes visible.

The findings also point to the importance of authentic intercultural engagement beyond the classroom. The structured nature of formal school settings may inherently limit the depth of intercultural experience available to learners. Opportunities for genuine interaction with culturally different others, whether through exchange programs, digital communication platforms, or community engagement, may be necessary to complement and extend classroom-based instruction.

Effective intercultural education also requires whole-school support rather than relying on individual teachers working in isolation. Research suggests that intercultural competence cannot be fully developed within a single classroom and requires institutional commitment, shared curricular goals, and a school-wide climate that values intercultural engagement (Nelson & Luetz, 2021; Walton et al., 2013). Finally, teacher training in intercultural pedagogy warrants greater attention. Pre-service and in-service teacher education programmes should incorporate dedicated preparation in intercultural language teaching approaches, including the design of tasks that facilitate cultural comparison, perspective-taking, and productive engagement with cultural difference.

6.3. Suggestions for Further Research

The findings of the present study point to several directions for future research on task-based intercultural language teaching and intercultural mindset development.

First, future studies should examine the long-term effects of task-based intercultural instruction by extending the intervention period beyond eight weeks. Longer designs tracking learners' intercultural development across a full academic year or multiple semesters would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how different dimensions of intercultural mindset evolve over time in response to sustained instructional engagement.

Second, future research should adopt mixed-method designs combining quantitative outcome measures with qualitative data sources such as learner journals, interviews, and classroom observations. Qualitative data could give richer views into how learners perceive and experience intercultural tasks, and whether affective changes that are not statistically detectable at the group level nonetheless occur at the individual level.

Third, future studies should involve larger and multi-site samples to increase statistical power and enhance the generalizability of findings. Replication studies across different EFL contexts, learner populations, and educational settings would help with determining whether the patterns observed in the present study are characteristic of high school intercultural instruction more broadly.

Fourth, future research should develop and employ adolescent-sensitive research designs and measurement instruments. The instruments used in the present study were originally validated primarily with adult populations. More context-sensitive measures specifically designed for adolescent EFL learners may be better able to capture the particular ways in which intercultural mindset develops during this critical developmental period.

Fifth, future studies should investigate the trajectory of intolerance of uncertainty over time in intercultural instructional contexts. The unexpected direction of change observed in the present study raises important questions about how uncertainty-related orientations evolve during and after intercultural exposure. Longitudinal designs incorporating delayed post-tests would help determine whether the initial increase observed here represents a transient developmental phase, as the theoretical literature suggests, or a more persistent pattern.

Sixth, future studies should explore the role of task design features in mediating intercultural learning outcomes, investigating how specific task characteristics, such as the degree of cultural authenticity, the level of interactional demand, and the extent of reflective processing required, influence the development of different dimensions of intercultural mindset.

Finally, longitudinal intercultural mindset studies examining all three dimensions simultaneously across extended periods would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how

intercultural mindset develops over time and whether development in one dimension facilitates or constrains development in others.

Although statistically significant results were not observed, the present study offers valuable insight into the challenges encountered during intercultural mindset development within a short-term, eight-week instructional period. These findings provide a foundation for planning future research and pedagogical practices aimed at supporting intercultural mindset development among adolescent EFL learners.



REFERENCES

- Acar, İ. (2024). *Task-based language teaching revisited: Examining EFL instructors' perceptions, awareness and preferences* [Master's thesis]. Başkent University.
- Agar, M. (2002). *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation* (Reprinted). Perennial.
- Akcaalan, M. (2016). *Yaşam boyu öğrenme ile sosyal duygusal öğrenme arasındaki ilişkilerin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* [Master's thesis]. Sakarya University.
- Akın, A. (2020). *Students' attitudes towards and beliefs about task based language teaching and its effects on language self-efficacy beliefs* [Master's thesis]. Ufuk University.
- Alisoy, H. (2024). The Impact of Cultural Differences on ESL Learners' Language Acquisition. *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*, 1(1), 11–17.
<https://doi.org/10.69760/0qzswg04>
- Allan, M. (2003). Cultural dissonance, intercultural learning and the multicultural personality. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 83–110.
- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56(1), 57–64. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.1.57>
- Baker, W. (2009). *Intercultural awareness and intercultural communication through English: An investigation of Thai English language users in higher education* [Doctoral thesis, University of Southampton]. <https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/66542>
- Baker, W. (2011). Intercultural awareness: Modelling an understanding of cultures in intercultural communication through English as a lingua franca. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(3), 197–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2011.577779>
- Baker, W. (2024). Intercultural communication. *ELT Journal*, 78(2), 212–215.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccad040>

- Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (2004). Developing Intercultural Sensitivity: An Integrative Approach to Global and Domestic Diversity. In D. R. Landis (Ed.), *Handbook of Intercultural Training* (pp. 147–165). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231129.n6>
- Blumenfeld, P. C., Mergendoller, J. R., & Swarthout, D. W. (1987). Task as a heuristic for understanding student learning and motivation. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(2), 135–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027870190203>
- Bottesi, G., Iannattone, S., Carraro, E., & Lauriola, M. (2023). The assessment of Intolerance of uncertainty in youth: An examination of the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale-Revised in Italian nonclinical boys and girls. *Research on Child and Adolescent Psychopathology*, 51(2), 209–222. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-022-00944-y>
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed). Pearson Longman.
- Brunsmeyer, S. (2021). A Task-Based Framework for Intercultural Learning in the Primary Efl Classroom. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL*, 10(2), 103–124.
- Bygate, M. (2016). Sources, developments and directions of task-based language teaching. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44(4), 381–400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2015.1039566>
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (2003). On Being ‘Bicultural’ and ‘Intercultural’. In G. Alred, M. Byram, & M. Fleming (Eds), *Intercultural Experience and Education* (pp. 50–66). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596087-007>
- Byram, M. (2008). *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship: Essays and reflections*. Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (2020). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence: Revisited*. Multilingual Matters.

- Byrnes, H. (2002). The Cultural Turn in Foreign Language Departments: Challenge and Opportunity. *Profession*, 114–129.
- Cai, Y., Chen, Y., & Yang, Y. (2026). The role of uncertainty tolerance in lowering test anxiety and enhancing English achievement. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 59, 102027.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2025.102027>
- Çakal, T. (2024). *The L1 and L2 use in task-based language teaching activities* [Master's thesis]. Pamukkale University.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (2011). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Wadsworth.
- Carleton, R. N., Norton, M. A. P. J., & Asmundson, G. J. G. (2007). Fearing the unknown: A short version of the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 21(1), 105–117.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2006.03.014>
- CASEL. (n.d.). *What is the CASEL Framework?* <https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/what-is-the-casel-framework/>
- Çelik, S., & Erbay, Ş. (2013). Cultural Perspectives of Turkish ELT Coursebooks: Do Standardized Teaching Texts Incorporate Intercultural Features? *Education and Science*, 38(167).
- Chen, G.-M., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). A review of the concept of intercultural awareness. *Human Communication*, 2, 27–54.
- Christie, C., & McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588516>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2. ed., reprint). Psychology Press.
- Cong-Lem, N. (2025). Intercultural Communication in Second/Foreign Language Education Over 67 Years: A Bibliometric Review. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 54(1–2), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2025.2456265>

- Coşkun, Ö. (2024). *Developing intercultural awareness through portfolio-based writing activities in Turkish secondary EFL classrooms* [Doctoral dissertation]. Hacettepe University.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed). SAGE Publications.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language, Second edition* (Second Edition). Cambridge University Press.
- Dağtaş, A., & Şahinkarakaş, Ş. (2019). Dinamik Sistem Çerçevesinde Dil Öğreniminde Yaşanılan Belirsizlik Deneyimleri. *Uluslararası Kibris Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi*, 97–1. <https://doi.org/10.22559/folklor.943>
- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241–266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287002>
- Deardorff, D. K. (2015). How to Assess Intercultural Competence. In *Research Methods in Intercultural Communication* (pp. 120–134). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119166283.ch8>
- Denham, S. A. (2006). Social-Emotional Competence as Support for School Readiness: What Is It and How Do We Assess It? *Early Education & Development*, 17(1), 57–89. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15566935eed1701_4
- Domitrovich, C. E., Durlak, J. A., Staley, K. C., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Social-Emotional Competence: An Essential Factor for Promoting Positive Adjustment and Reducing Risk in School Children. *Child Development*, 88(2), 408–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12739>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Doyle, W., & Carter, K. (1984). Academic Tasks in Classrooms. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 14(2), 129–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1984.11075917>

- East, M. (2012). Addressing the intercultural via task-based language teaching: Possibility or problem? *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 12(1), 56–73.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2011.626861>
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. OUP Oxford.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221–246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x>
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118271643>
- Ellis, R. (2017). Task-Based Language Teaching. In *The Routledge Handbook of Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. Routledge.
- Ely, C. M. (1989). Tolerance of Ambiguity and Use of Second Language Strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22(5), 437–445. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1989.tb02766.x>
- Fantini, A. E. (Ed.). (1997). *New ways in teaching culture*. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Fantini, A. E. (2000). A central concern: Developing intercultural competence. In *SIT Occasional Papers Series: Addressing intercultural education, training and service* (Vol. 1, pp. 25–42). SIT (School for International Training).
- Filiz, B., & Durnalı, M. (2019). Delaware Sosyal-Duygusal Yeterlik Ölçeğinin (DSDY-Ö) Türk Diline Uyarlanması. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim*, 12(3), 962–977.
<https://doi.org/10.30831/akukeg.458032>
- Furnham, A., & Ribchester, T. (1995). Tolerance of ambiguity: A review of the concept, its measurement and applications. *Current Psychology*, 14(3), 179–199.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02686907>
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (10th ed). Pearson.

- Gholami Pasand, P., & Hassaskhah, J. (2024). Developmental Patterns of Intercultural Sensitivity in an Online Community of Practice: Evidence from Iranian EFL Learners. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 33(2), 331–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-023-00732-2>
- Gray, J. (2002). The global coursebook in English Language Teaching. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds), *Globalization and Language Teaching* (1st edn, pp. 151–167). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203193679>
- Grenier, S., Barrette, A.-M., & Ladouceur, R. (2005). Intolerance of Uncertainty and Intolerance of Ambiguity: Similarities and differences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(3), 593–600. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.02.014>
- Harper, J. (2019). A Text-Driven, Task-Based Approach to the Design of Materials for Teaching Intercultural Communicative Competence. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 4(1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v4i1.187>
- Hashemi, M., Azizinezhad, M., & Darvishi, S. (2012). Using task- based language teaching, learning practically in English classes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 526–529.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.098>
- Herman, J. L., Stevens, M. J., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (2010). The Tolerance for Ambiguity Scale: Towards a more refined measure for international management research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34(1), 58–65.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2009.09.004>
- Hinton, P., McMurray, I., & Brownlow, C. (2004). *SPSS Explained* (1st edn). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203642597>
- Hofmeyr, A. S. (2024). Beyond language: Fostering an intercultural mindset in foreign language classrooms in Japan. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(8), 1784–1800.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2024.2374086>

- Hosseini, F. K., & Seifoori, Z. (2018). The relationship between Iranian EFL learners' ambiguity tolerance and the accuracy of their task-based oral speech. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 11(23), 85–102.
- Huang, L.-J. D. (2021). Developing intercultural communicative competence in foreign language classrooms – A study of EFL learners in Taiwan. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 83, 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2021.04.015>
- Huber-Kriegler, M., Lázár, I., & Strange, J. (2003). *Mirrors and windows: An intercultural communication textbook*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- İlin, G., İnözü, J., & Yumru, H. (2007). Teachers' and learners' perceptions of tasks: Objectives and outcomes. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama / Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3(1), 60–68.
- İşeri, İ. (2016). *Lise öğrencilerinin duygusal zeka düzeyleri ile sosyal duygusal öğrenme becerileri arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi* [Master's thesis]. Sakarya University.
- Ishii, E. (2009). The effects of task-based intercultural instruction on the intercultural competence of Japanese secondary EFL learners. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 19, 159–181.
- Jordan, M. (2010). *Managing Uncertainty in Collaborative Robotics Engineering Projects: The Influence of Task Structure and Peer Interaction* [Doctoral dissertation]. The University of Texas at Austin.
- Juan-Garau, M., & Jacob, K. (2015). Developing English learners' transcultural skills through content- and task-based lessons. *System*, 54, 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.04.017>
- Karaca, T. (2024). *Developing intercultural awareness in young learners through stories across cultures* [Master's thesis]. Ondokuz Mayıs University.
- Kim, L. S. (2003). Exploring the relationship between language, culture and identity. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 3(2).
- Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford University Press.

- Kramsch, C. (2009). Cultural perspectives on language learning and teaching. In K. Knapp, B. Seidlhofer, & H. Widdowson (Eds), *Handbook of Foreign Language Communication and Learning* (pp. 219–245). Walter de Gruyter.
- Kramsch, C. (2013). *Culture in foreign language teaching*.
- Kramsch, C. (2014). Language and Culture. *AILA Review*, 27, 30–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.27.02kra>
- Kural, F., & Bayyurt, Y. (2016). The implementation of an intercultural competence syllabus to prepare study-abroad students for global communication. *Educational Studies*, 42(4), 378–393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2016.1195720>
- Kuswoyo, H., & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2017). Improving Student's Listening Skill Using Task- Based Approach in EFL Classroom Setting. *Proceedings of the 4th Asia Pacific Education Conference (AECON 2017)*. 4th Asia Pacific Education Conference (AECON 2017).
<https://doi.org/10.2991/aecon-17.2017.24>
- Lantolf, J. P. (2006). Sociocultural Theory and L2: State of the Art. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(1), 67–109. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060037>
- Larzén, E. (2005). *In pursuit of an intercultural dimension in EFL-Teaching: Exploring cognitions among Finland-Swedish comprehensive school teachers*. Åbo Akademi University Press.
- Lázár, I., Huber-Kriegler, M., Lussier, D., S.Matei, G., & Christiane, P. (with Europarat). (2007). *Developing and assessing intercultural communicative competence: A guide for language teachers and teacher educators*. European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe.
- Li, Q., Huang, Z., & Christianson, K. (2017). Ambiguity tolerance and advertising effectiveness. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 63, 216–222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2016.12.004>
- Long, L., & Long, H. (2026). A social cognitive perspective on the relationship between intolerance of uncertainty and academic self-efficacy among EFL high school students. *Learning and Motivation*, 93, 102237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lmot.2025.102237>

- Long, M. (1985). A role for instruction in second language acquisition: Task-based language teaching. In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds), *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition*. Multilingual Matters.
- Mantz, L. S., Bear, G. G., Yang, C., & Harris, A. (2016). The Delaware Social-Emotional Competency Scale (DSECS-S): Evidence of Validity and Reliability. *Child Indicators Research*, 11(1), 137–157. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-016-9427-6>
- Matsumoto, D., Kudoh, T., & Takeuchi, S. (1996). Changing Patterns of Individualism and Collectivism in the United States and Japan. *Culture & Psychology*, 2(1), 77–107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X9621005>
- Maulana, M. I. (2021). Task-Based Language Teaching; Potential Benefits and Possible Criticisms in Indonesian Contexts. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues*, 4(2), 69. <https://doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v4i2.12183>
- Melliti, M. (2013). Global Content in Global Coursebooks: The Way Issues of Inappropriacy, Inclusivity, and Connectedness Are Treated in Headway Intermediate. *Sage Open*, 3(4), 2158244013507265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244013507265>
- Ministry of National Education. (2018). *English language curriculum for secondary education (grades 9, 10, 11 and 12)*. Ankara. MEB. (n.d.). Retrieved 1 June 2026, from <https://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/Dosyalar/201812020472656-OGM%20INGILIZCE%20PRG%2020.012018.pdf>
- Ministry of National Education. (2025). *English language curriculum for primary education (grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8)*. Ankara. MEB. (n.d.). Retrieved 1 June 2026, from <https://tyymm.meb.gov.tr/upload/program/ingilizce-dersi-2-8.pdf>
- Mitchell, L., & Paras, A. (2018). When difference creates dissonance: Understanding the ‘engine’ of intercultural learning in study abroad. *Intercultural Education*, 29(3), 321–339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2018.1436361>

- Müller-Hartmann, A. (2000). *The role of tasks in promoting intercultural learning in electronic learning networks*.
- Müller-Hartmann, A., & Schocker- von Ditzfurth, M. (2011). *Task-supported language learning*. UTB GmbH. <https://doi.org/10.36198/9783838533360>
- Nazlı, Ö. P. (2022). *Telecollaborative digital storytelling: A task for enhancing young EFL learners' intercultural communicative competence* [Master's thesis]. Gazi University.
- Nelson, W., & Luetz, J. M. (2021). The Impact of Short-Term Cross-Cultural Experience on the Intercultural Competence of Participating Students: A Case Study of Australian High School Students. *Social Sciences*, 10(8), 313. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10080313>
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Okcan, A. (2023). *Görev temelli dil öğretim yaklaşımının 4. Sınıf İngilizce dersi dinleme becerisine etkisinin incelenmesi* [Master's thesis]. Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University.
- Osmanağaoğlu, N., Creswell, C., Snuggs, S., Stuijzand, S., & Dodd, H. F. (2021). Evaluating the psychometric properties of the intolerance of uncertainty scale for children in a preadolescent sample. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 77, 102343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2020.102343>
- Özmen, K. S., Cephe, P. T., & Kınık, B. (2016). Trends in Doctoral Research on English Language Teaching in Turkey. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 16(5), 1737–1759. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2016.5.0069>
- Peng, Y., & Pyper, J. S. (2021). Finding success with pedagogical innovation: A case from CSL teachers' experiences with TBLT. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(4), 633–655. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819862132>
- Philp, J., Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2006). The impact of planning time on children's task-based interactions. *System*, 34(4), 547–565. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.08.004>

- Pulverness, A., & Tomlinson, B. (2003). Materials for cultural awareness. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing Materials for Language Teaching* (pp. 426–438). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. (2. ed., 16. print). Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Robinson, P. (2011). Task-Based Language Learning: A Review of Issues. *Language Learning*, 61(s1), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00641.x>
- Rose-Krasnor, L. (1997). The Nature of Social Competence: A Theoretical Review. *Social Development*, 6(1), 111–135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.1997.tb00097.x>
- Rose-Krasnor, L., & Denham, S. (2009). Social-emotional competence in early childhood. In K. H. Rubin, W. M. Bukowski, & B. Laursen (Eds), *Handbook of Peer Interactions, Relationships, and Groups* (pp. 162–179). Guilford Press.
- Sarıçam, H., Erguvan, F. M., Akın, A., & Akça, M. Ş. (2014). Belirsizliğe Tahammülsüzlük Ölçeği (Btö-12) Türkçe Formu: Geçerlik Ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Route Educational and Social Science Journal*, 1(3), 148–148. <https://doi.org/10.17121/ressjournal.109>
- Sarıkayış, F. (2022). *İngilizce dersine yönelik tutumun sosyal duygusal yeterlik ve kültürlerarası farkındalık algısı ile ilişkisinin incelenmesi* [Master's thesis]. Pamukkale University.
- Saylan, G. (2023). *Developing intercultural communicative competence through telecollaboration* [Master's thesis]. Ondokuz Mayıs University.
- Sinicrope, C., Norris, J., & Watanabe, Y. (2007). Understanding and assessing intercultural competence: A summary of theory, research, and practice (technical report for the foreign language program evaluation project). *Second Language Studies*, 26(1), 1–58.
- Skehan, P. (1998). Task-Based Instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 268–286. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500003585>
- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1999). The Influence of Task Structure and Processing Conditions on Narrative Retellings. *Language Learning*, 49(1), 93–120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00071>

- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2021). *What is culture? A compilation of quotations for the intercultural field*. GPC (GlobalPeople Consortium). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.29603.37925>
- Stanley Budner, N. Y. (1962). Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable1. *Journal of Personality*, 30(1), 29–50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1962.tb02303.x>
- Starbuck, W. H. (2009). Perspective—Cognitive Reactions to Rare Events: Perceptions, Uncertainty, and Learning. *Organization Science*, 20(5), 925–937. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1090.0440>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6. ed., international ed). Pearson.
- Ten Thijs, J. D. (2020). What Is Intercultural Communication? In G. Rings & S. Rasinger (Eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of Intercultural Communication* (1st edn, pp. 35–55). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108555067.004>
- Tran, T. Q., & Duong, T. M. (2018). The effectiveness of the intercultural language communicative teaching model for EFL learners. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 3(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-018-0048-0>
- Tural, P., & Cubukcu, F. (2021). Raising intercultural awareness through short stories in EFL classes. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 43(1), 18–32. <https://doi.org/10.35923/JES.2021.1.02>
- Vaitonytė, J., Öztürk, Ö., & Müller, L.-M. (2020). Keep calm and learn the language: Do multilinguals have lower intolerance of uncertainty than monolinguals? *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, 42. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/58z8r3wk>
- Varişoğlu, M. C. (2018). Sosyal-duygusal dil öğrenme stratejileri ve Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi. *International Journal Of Turkish Literature Culture Education*, 7(7/1), 379–396. <https://doi.org/10.7884/teke.4126>
- Wahlund, T., Andersson, E., Jolstedt, M., Perrin, S., Vigerland, S., & Serlachius, E. (2020). Intolerance of Uncertainty–Focused Treatment for Adolescents With Excessive Worry: A Pilot Feasibility Study. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 27(2), 215–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpra.2019.06.002>

- Walton, J., Priest, N., & Paradies, Y. (2013). Identifying and developing effective approaches to foster intercultural understanding in schools. *Intercultural Education*, 24(3), 181–194.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2013.793036>
- Willis, J. R. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning* (1. publ., 9. impr). Longman.
- Wiseman, R. L. (2002). Intercultural communicative competence. In W. B. Gudykunst & B. Mody (Eds), *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 207–224). SAGE Publications.
- Youfi, Q., & Brigui, H. (2024). The Role of Uncertainty Tolerance in Enhancing Intercultural Communication Competence among High School Students in Morocco: A Quantitative Analysis. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 7(9), 152–159.
<https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2024.7.9.18>
- Zorba, M. G. (2019). *Raising intercultural awareness of the 7th grade students through practical English activities* [Doctoral dissertation]. Gazi University.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Ethical Report

06.03.2025 15:34
Etilik Kurul Sayısı: 06/03/2025-E.566897

Panel

T.C. İNÖNÜ ÜNİVERSİTESİ BİLİMSEL ARAŞTIRMA VE YAYIN ETİĞİ KURULU Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etik Kurulu					
Oturum Tarihi : 06-03-2025		Oturum Sayısı : 5		Karar Sayısı : 1	
Etik Açından Uygun					
Çalışma Adı		THE IMPACT OF TASK-BASED INTERCULTURAL LANGUAGE TEACHING ON INTERCULTURAL MINDSET DEVELOPMENT			
Araştırmacılar		Doç.Dr. Gülten Genç (Danışman) Yükseklisans Öğrencisi Aybüke BURKAÇ (Yürütücü)			
Başkan					
Başkan		Prof.Dr.EMİN ÇELEBİ			
Kurul Üyeleri					
Kullanıcı pınar özbay				Prof.Dr. Yusuf BATAR	
Prof.Dr. Mehmet ÖNAL				Prof.Dr. Bilal ALTAY	
Prof.Dr. Mehmet GÜNGÖR				Prof.Dr. Süleyman ÇALDAK	
Prof.Dr. Lütfiye ÖZDEMİR					

Appendix 2: Consent Form of Participants

AYRINTILI BİLGİLENDİRME VE GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU

Sayın Katılımcı,

Aşağıda ayrıntılı bilgileri yer alan araştırma T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığının izni ile gerçekleştirilmektedir. Araştırma uygulamasına katılım tamamıyla gönüllülük esasına dayalı olmaktadır. Araştırmaya katılıp katılmamakta özgürsünüz. Araştırma herhangi bir istenmeyen etki ya da risk taşımamaktadır. Katılımınız tamamen sizin isteğinize bağlıdır, reddedebilir ya da herhangi bir aşamasında ayrılabilirsiniz. Araştırmaya katılım sağlanamaması veya araştırmadan ayrılma durumunda okul ile ilgili ilişkileriniz etkilenmeyecektir. Araştırmada sizden kimlik belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplar gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir. Araştırma uygulamaları, kişisel rahatsızlık verecek sorular ve durumlar içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplama işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta özgürsünüz. Araştırmaya katıldıktan sonra istediğiniz an vazgeçebilirsiniz. Böyle bir durumda veri toplama aracını uygulayan kişiye, araştırmayı tamamlamayacağınızı söylemeniz yeterli olacaktır. Araştırmaya katılmamak ya da katıldıktan sonra vazgeçmek size hiçbir sorumluluk getirmeyecektir. Onay vermeden önce konu ile ilgili herhangi bir sorunuz varsa aşağıda iletişim bilgileri verilen araştırmacıya sorabilirsiniz.

Araştırmacının Adı Soyadı	
Araştırmacının İletişim Bilgileri	
Araştırmanın Adı	The Impact Of Task-Based Intercultural Language Teaching on Intercultural Mindset Development/Görev Temelli Kültürlerarası Dil Öğretiminin Kültürlerarası Zihniyet Gelişimine Etkisi
Araştırmanın Amacı	Bu çalışma, görev temelli kültürlerarası dil öğretiminin, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen 9. sınıf öğrencileri arasında kültürlerarası bir bakış açısı geliştirme üzerindeki etkisini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Yukarıda bilgileri bulunan araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum. .../.../.....

İmza:

Katılımcının Adı-Soyadı:

Appendix 3: Consent Form for Parents of Student Participants

Sayın Veli;

Araştırmanın Hedefi: Görev temelli kültürlerarası eğitim programının yabancı dil sınıflarında kültürlerarası zihniyet gelişimine etkisini ölçmektir.

Araştırma Uygulaması: Anket şeklindedir.

Araştırma T.C. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın ve okul yönetiminin de izni ile gerçekleştirilmektedir. Araştırma uygulamasına katılım tamamıyla gönüllülük esasına dayalı olmaktadır. Çocuğunuz çalışmaya katılıp katılmamakta özgürdür. Araştırma çocuğunuz için herhangi bir istenmeyen etki ya da risk taşımamaktadır. Çocuğunuzun katılımı **tamamen sizin isteğinize bağlıdır**, reddedebilir ya da herhangi bir aşamasında ayrılabilirsiniz. Araştırmaya katılmamama veya araştırmadan ayrılma durumunda öğrencilerin akademik başarıları, okul ve öğretmenleriyle olan ilişkileri etkilemeyecektir.

Çalışmada öğrencilerden kimlik belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplar tamamıyla gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir.

Uygulamalar, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek sorular ve durumlar içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden çocuğunuz kendisini rahatsız hissederse cevaplama işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta özgürdür. Bu durumda rahatsızlığın giderilmesi için gereken yardım sağlanacaktır. Çocuğunuz çalışmaya katıldıktan sonra istediği an vazgeçebilir. Böyle bir durumda veri toplama aracını uygulayan kişiye, çalışmayı tamamlamayacağını söylemesi yeterli olacaktır. Anket çalışmasına katılmamak ya da katıldıktan sonra vazgeçmek çocuğunuza hiçbir sorumluluk getirmeyecektir.

Onay vermeden önce sormak istediğiniz herhangi bir konu varsa sormaktan çekinmeyiniz. Çalışma bittikten sonra bizlere telefon veya e-posta ile ulaşarak soru sorabilir, sonuçlar hakkında bilgi isteyebilirsiniz. Saygılarımızla,

*Velisi bulunduğum sınıfı numaralı öğrencisi
.....'ın yukarıda açıklanan araştırmaya katılmasına izin veriyorum.
(Lütfen formu imzaladıktan sonra çocuğunuzla okula geri gönderiniz*).*

...../...../.....

İsim-Soyisim İmza:

Veli Adı-Soyadı :

Telefon Numarası :

Appendix 4: Permission to Collect Data from MoNE



Yeşilyurt Anadolu Lisesi Müdürlüğüne



Başvuru No: MEB.TT.2025.020812

Uygulama Yapılacak MEB Teşkilatının Kurum Kodu: [REDACTED]

Araştırmanın Adı: The Impact of Task-Based Intercultural Language Teaching on Intercultural Mindset Development/ Görev Temelli Kültürlerarası Dil Öğretiminin Kültürlerarası Zihniyet Gelişimine Etkisi

Araştırmanın Niteliği: Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Araştırmanın Örneklem / Çalışma Grubu: Öğrenci

Uygulama Yapılacak MEB Teşkilatı: Yeşilyurt Anadolu Lisesi

Uygulama Yapılacak Birim: Anadolu Lisesi

Uygulama Yapılacak İl: MALATYA

Veri Toplama Aracının Başlığı: Belirsizliğe Tahammülsüzlük Ölçeği (BTÖ-12), Delaware Sosyal-Duygusal Yeterlilik Ölçeği (DSDY-Ö), Kültürlerarası Farkındalık Anketi

Araştırma Uygulama İzninin Kabul Tarihi: 17.03.2025

Araştırmanın Uygulama İzninin Bitiş Tarihi: 17.03.2026

Yukarıda kimliği yazılı araştırmacı "Araştırma Uygulama İzinleri Genelgesine (2024/41)" göre belirtilen kapsamda araştırmasını yapmayı taahhüt etmiştir. Araştırmacının bilgi ve belgelerinin uygunluğu kontrol edilmiş olup araştırma uygulama izni MALATYA İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü tarafından onaylanmıştır.

NOT: Okul/kurum yöneticileri tarafından "Araştırma Uygulama İzni" belgesinin ve veri toplama araçlarının (araçlardaki maddelerinin) modülde yer alan belge ve araçlarla aynı olduğu kontrol edilmelidir. Aynı olmadığı durumda araştırma uygulama izni verilmeyecektir.

- Araştırma Uygulama İzinleri Başvuru ve Değerlendirme Modülü -

Appendix 5: Data Collection Tool

Sevgili öğrenciler,

Aşağıdaki ifadeleri dikkatle okuyunuz ve kendi durumunuzu dikkate alarak yanıtlayınız. İfadelerde doğru ya da yanlış yanıt yoktur. Tüm sorulara yanıt verdiğinizden emin olunuz. Sizin öz düşünceniz, araştırmam için çok önemlidir ve katkı sağlayacaktır. Ayrıca bu ölçeği doldururken lütfen kimliğinizle ilgili hiçbir şey yazmayınız. Yardımlarınız için teşekkür ederim.

Cinsiyet:	Kız		Erkek		
Yaş:					
	İlkokul	Ortaokul	Lise	Üniversite	Yüksek Lisans/Doktora
Annenin eğitim durumu:					
Babanın eğitim durumu:					
İngilizce dersinde kendinizi hangi düzeyde görüyorsunuz?	Güçlü hissediyorum, kendime güveniyorum ve çoğu konuyu anlıyorum/İyi.		Bazı konularda zorlanıyorum ama genel olarak anlayabiliyorum/Orta.		Zorlanıyorum, İngilizce dersinde kendimi geliştirmeye ihtiyacım var/Zayıf.

KÜLTÜRLERARASI FARKINDALIK ANKETİ

	Hiç Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Tamamen Katılıyorum
1. Farklı kültürlerden gelen insanlar çok ilgimi çeker.					
2. Kültürel farklılıklardan dolayı ortaya çıkan anlaşmazlıklarla başa çıkıyorum.					
3. İngilizce öğrenirken farklı ülkelerin kültürleriyle ilgili (İngiliz ve Amerikan kültürleri hariç) yeni şeyler de öğrenirim.					
4. Farklı kültürlerle ilgili yeni şeyler öğrenmekten hoşlanırım.					

	Hiç Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Tamamen Katılıyorum
5. Farklı kültürlerden gelen insanların düşüncelerine açıktır.					
6. Kendi kültürüm ile farklı kültürler arasındaki benzerlikleri tespit ederim.					
7. İngilizce öğrenirken İngilizce konuşulan ülkelerin kültürleriyle ilgili yeni şeyler öğrenirim.					
8. Farklı kültürlerden gelen insanlarla arkadaş olmaya istekliyim.					
9. İnsanları kendi kültürüm açısından değerlendirsem yanlış sonuçlara varabilirim.					
10. Kendi kültürüm ile farklı kültürler arasındaki farklılıkları ayırt ederim.					
11. İngilizce öğrenirken kendi kültürümle ilgili yeni şeyler de öğrenirim.					
12. Farklı kültürlerden gelen insanlarla etkileşim kurarken yanlış anlaşılmalara yol açacak davranışlardan kaçınırım.					
13. Farklı ülkelerden gelen insanların alışılmadık davranışlarını hoş karşılarım.					
14. Farklı kültürlerden gelen insanların farklı yaşam tarzlarını anlarım.					
15. Hem kendi kültürümü hem de farklı kültürleri gözlemlerim.					
16. Farklı kültürlerden gelen insanlarla rahatça etkileşime girerim.					
17. Farklı kültürlerden gelen insanlarla etkileşim kurarken onların kültürleriyle ilgili bilgimi kullanırım.					
18. Farklı ülkelerden gelen insanların inançlarına saygı duyarım.					
19. Farklı ülkelerin kültürlerini öğrenmek için her türlü fırsatı değerlendiririm.					
20. İngilizce öğrenirken kendi kültürümle diğer kültürler arasındaki farklılıkları öğrenirim.					
21. Farklı kültürlerden gelen insanlarla etkileşim kurarken onları anladığımı belli ederim.					
22. Farklı kültürlerle ilgili yeni şeyler öğrenmeye hevesliyim.					
23. Başka kültürlerin yaşam tarzlarını keşfetmeyi severim.					
24. Kendi kültürüm ile farklı kültürler arasındaki benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları açıklarım.					

	Hiç Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Tamamen Katılıyorum
25. Farklı kültürlerden gelen insanlarla etkileşim kurarken genlinim.					
26. Farklı kültürlerden gelen insanlarla etkileşim kurarken onların kültürleriyle ilgili bilgi edinmeye çalışırım.					
27. Farklı kültürlerden insanların değerlerine saygı gösteririm.					
28. İngilizce öğrenirken, (Amerika ve İngiltere hariç) başka ülkelerin kültürleri ile kendi kültürüm arasında benzerlikler olduğunu da öğrenirim.					
29. Kültürel farklılıklardan dolayı ortaya çıkan anlaşmazlıkları hoş görürüm.					
30. İngilizce öğrenirken farklı ülkelerde farklı yaşam tarzlarının olduğunu öğrenirim.					
31. Kendi kültürüm ile diğer kültürler arasında farklılıklar olduğunu kabul ederim.					

SOSYAL-DUYGUSAL YETERLİLİK ÖLÇEĞİ (DSDY-Ö)

NO		Bana hiç uygun değil	Bana çok uygun değil	Bana biraz uygun	Bana çok uygun
1	Başkalanna nasıl davranacağımı kontrol edebilirim.	1	2	3	4
2	Başkaları ile birlikte çatışmaları çözmede iyiyimdir.	1	2	3	4
3	Sergilemiş olduğum davranışta kendimi sorumlu hissedirim.	1	2	3	4
4	Davranışa geçmeden önce düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4
5	Yaptığım hatadan ders çıkarmada iyiyimdir.	1	2	3	4
6	Başkalarının nasıl hissettiği hakkında düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4
7	Başkalarının nasıl hissettiğini önemserim.	1	2	3	4
8	Başkalarıyla iyi geçinirim.	1	2	3	4
9	Başkalarının ne düşündüğü benim için önemlidir.	1	2	3	4
10	İstediğim şeyi bekleme konusunda iyiyimdir.	1	2	3	4

BELİRSİZLİĞE TAHAMMÜLSÜZLÜK ÖLÇEĞİ (BTÖ-12)

Note. Permission to use this scale was granted by Prof. Dr. Hakan Sarıçam (personal communication, February 28, 2025). In accordance with the scale developer's terms of use, only sample items are provided below. The complete scale is available upon request from the scale developer.

No	Madde
1	Beklenmedik olaylar canımı çok sıkar.
8	Belirsizlik beni hayatı dolu dolu yaşamaktan alıkoyar.
12	Tüm belirsiz durumlardan uzak durmak zorundayım.

Appendix 6: Permissions to Use Scales

ölçek kullanım izni Gelen Kutusu x

Aybüke Burkaç
Merhaba Sayın Hocam, Ben İnönü Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi yüksek lisans öğrencisi Aybüke Burkaç. Danışman hocam Doç. Dr. Gülten Genç ile birlikte yürüttü

22 Ara 2024 Paz 05:04 ☆

Mehmet Galip ZORBA
Alıcı: ben

22 Ara 2024 Paz 06:56 ☆ 😊 ↩ ⋮

 Bu iletinin Türkçe olduğu anlaşılıyor
[İngilizce diline çevir](#)

Sayın Aybüke Burkaç,
Emailiniz için teşekkür ederim.
Ölçeği tabi ki de kullanabilirsiniz.
Yüksek lisans çalışmalarınızda başarılar dilerim.
İyi günler.
Doç. Dr. Mehmet Galip Zorba

iPhone'umdan gönderildi

Aybüke Burkaç <aybukeburkac@gmail.com> şunları yazdı (22 Ara 2024 14:03):

ölçek kullanım izni Gelen Kutusu x

Aybüke Burkaç
Merhaba Sayın Hocam, Ben İnönü Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi yüksek lisans öğrencisi Aybüke Burkaç. Danışman hocam Prof. Dr. Gülten Genç ile birlikte yürüttü

25 Şub 2025 Sal 07:30 ☆

d
Alıcı: ben

26 Şub 2025 Çar 01:40 ☆ 😊 ↩ ⋮

 Bu iletinin Türkçe olduğu anlaşılıyor
[İngilizce diline çevir](#)

Merhaba Hocam,

Kullanabilirsiniz.
Ölçek formunu ekte bulabilirsiniz.

teşekkürler.

Bir ek • Gmail tarafından tarandı ⓘ  Drive'a ekle

 dsky-ö türkçe.docx

ölçek kullanım izni Gelen Kutusu x

Aybüke Burkaç
Merhaba Sayın Hocam, Ben İnönü Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi yüksek lisans öğrencisi Aybüke Burkaç. Danışman hocam Prof. Dr. Gülten Genç ile birlikte yürüttü

25 Şub 2025 Sal 07:38 ☆

Hakan Sarıçam
Alıcı: ben

28 Şub 2025 Cum 13:43 ☆ 😊 ↩ ⋮

 Bu iletinin Türkçe olduğu anlaşılıyor
[İngilizce diline çevir](#)

Aybüke Merhabalar,
Ölçeğin maddeleri ve puanlama bilgileri ektedir.
Tez çalışması kapsamında memnuniyetle kullanabilirsiniz.
Kolaylıklar ve sağlıklı günler dilerim.

Not: Ölçek maddeleri ticari kazanç sağlayan çalışmalarda kullanılamaz ve ölçek maddelerinin tamamı sanal ortamda (tezin sonu, web siteleri vb.) paylaşılamaz. Tezin sonunda verilecekse örnek maddeler şeklinde verilmeli.

Prof. Dr. Hakan SARIÇAM

Appendix 7: Photos from Intervention Process



