

Article

Intercultural Sensitivity and Ethnocentrism Levels of Theology Students in a Turkish University Sample

Irfan Erdogan *  and Muhiddin Okumuslar 

Department of Religious Education, A. K. Faculty of Theology, Necmettin Erbakan University, 42090 Konya, Turkey; mokumuslar@erbakan.edu.tr

* Correspondence: ierdogan@erbakan.edu.tr; Tel.: +90-332-323-8250 (ext. 8189)

Received: 4 March 2020; Accepted: 20 April 2020; Published: 12 May 2020



Abstract: In this study, we aimed to examine the intercultural sensitivity levels and ethnocentrism levels, as well as some variables that affect them, of students studying in the Necmettin Erbakan University Theology Faculty in Turkey. A descriptive survey research method was adopted to realize this aim. The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Generalized Ethnocentrism Scale were used as the data collection tools. The sample of the study consisted of 326 students studying in the Necmettin Erbakan University Faculty of Theology during the 2018–2019 academic year. According to our findings, the intercultural sensitivity level of the theology students was “high,” whereas their ethnocentrism level was “low.” The intercultural sensitivity levels of the theology students differed based on age and exposure to individuals from another country or culture. Ethnocentrism levels in the students differed based on gender, the nationality of the students (Europe, Turkey, Asia-Africa), the size of the settlement unit, and exposure to individuals from different countries or cultures.

Keywords: Turkey; theology students; intercultural; intercultural sensitivity; ethnocentrism

1. Introduction

Today, levels of communication and interaction among people from different cultures and communities are higher than they have ever been in the past. The main reasons for this are the following: the spread of various communication tools through technological development (Spiteri 2017, p. 111; Cantle 2012, p. 4), migration (Verkuyten and Yogeewaran 2020, p. 3; Cantle 2012, p. 31), ease of transportation (Council of Europe 2008, p. 13), international economic activities (Chen and Starosta 1996, p. 354), student exchange programs (Bennett 2009), study abroad opportunities (Fuller 2007; Zhang and Han 2019), and the activities of international organizations (Ogut and Olkun 2018). These changes have led to increased acceptance of differences in social life. As a result, the concept of multiculturalism has emerged in the sense that different ethnic, cultural, and religious groups live together.

Currently, we see that the discourse of multiculturalism has begun to be replaced by the discourse of interculturalism. This concept has also been adopted by the Council of Europe (2008) and UNESCO (2009). The concept of interculturality is not new and can be traced back to 1959 in the U.S., while European perspectives date from the 1980s and 1990s (James 2008). Cantle (2012) suggests that interculturalism could begin to eclipse the narrative of multiculturalism, which is still generally conceptualized as being about the relationships between majority and minority populations within nation states and revolving around singular and binary concepts of racialized difference. According to Cantle (2012), interculturality offers opportunities to replace multiculturalism as a concept and to offer a new positive model to support harmonious communities. It will also contribute to creating a new vision allowing one to learn to live in a globalized and highly diverse world. The concept and experience of multiculturalism has been explored in the literature, and it has been noted that it no longer

commands political or popular support. In other words, the concept of interculturalism emerged when the concept of multiculturalism was found to be inadequate in responding to new realities. For example, while global migration increases the number of people with international ties, an increasing number of people have mixed origins and multiple identities. Indeed, the concept of interculturalism is no different from multiculturalism, but it places more emphasis on intergroup communication and dialogue, promoting the complexity of identities and developing a sense of commonality and shared belonging (Verkuyten and Yogeeswaran 2020). Interculturalism, at least intellectually, cannot eclipse multiculturalism, so it should be considered complementary to multiculturalism (Meer and Modood 2012, p. 3).

Meer and Modood (2012) critically evaluate four ways in which conceptions of interculturalism are being positively contrasted with multiculturalism. Their findings include the following:

First, as something greater than coexistence, in that interculturalism is allegedly more geared toward interaction and dialogue than multiculturalism. Second, that interculturalism is conceived as something less ‘groupist’ or more yielding of synthesis than multiculturalism. Third, that interculturalism is something more committed to a stronger sense of the whole, in terms of such things as societal cohesion and national citizenship. Finally, that where multiculturalism may be illiberal and relativistic, interculturalism is more likely to lead to criticism of illiberal cultural practices

(as part of the process of intercultural dialogue).

Interculturalism actually requires interaction and exchange among cultures and does not confine cultures to so-called “separate” areas. Interculturalism aims to challenge racism, xenophobia, nationalism, and ethnocentrism (Kaya and Kentel 2005). Interculturalism defines moments of encounter and reciprocity based on violence or peace between cultures. Moreover, this concept is used to define cultures that are engaging in processes of cultural integration within themselves and in their relations with other cultures (Tutal 2006, p. 115).

The concept of *intercultural sensitivity* refers to awareness of the importance of cultural differences and sensitivity to the perspectives of people from other cultures (Bhawuk and Brislin 1992, p. 414). It is defined as the ability of an individual to engage in intercultural interaction and perceive his/her role in another culture (Yuen and Grossman 2009, p. 350). Chen and Starosta (1996, p. 362), who regard intercultural sensitivity as the affective dimension of intercultural communication competence, state that intercultural sensitivity has four characteristics: self-conception, open-mindedness, nonjudgmental attitudes, and social relaxation.

Another concept discussed in our research is the concept of *ethnocentrism*. According to William Sumner, “Ethnocentrism is the technical name for the view of things in which one’s own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it” (Sumner and Keller 1940, p. 13). More recently, Ting-Toomey (1999, p. 157) stated that “ethnocentrism is our defensive attitudinal tendency to view the values and norms of our culture as superior to other cultures, and we perceive our cultural ways of living as the most reasonable and proper ways to conduct our lives.” Ethnocentrism is also seen as a result of a sense of superiority, mistrust, avoidance, and unwillingness to give equal legal rights to an ethnic group beyond what is necessary to achieve legitimate common goals (Smootha 1987, p. 23).

According to Dutton (2019), ethnocentrism can be seen in two different ways. The first is expressed as “positive ethnocentrism”, which means that one is proud of his or her ethnic group or nation and is ready to sacrifice him- or herself for the greater good of the group. On the other hand, “negative ethnocentrism” means that one is prejudiced against people from other ethnic groups and acts hostile towards them.

Religion is an important element of culture. It is also a phenomenon that is appealing to many individuals worldwide. While the teachings of each religion differ in their approach to one another, being a member of an ethnic minority (Ameli and Molaei 2012), political attitudes (Allen and Barter

2017), and religious fundamentalism (Wrench et al. 2006) can cause differences in terms of intercultural sensitivity or ethnocentrism even among people or sects of the same religion. In some studies, it has been posited that ethnic–religious conflicts are on the rise worldwide (Eko and Putranto 2019). In this respect, it is a fact one can presume that developing a healthy understanding of religion is an important solution to this problem.

This study aims to examine the intercultural sensitivity levels and the ethnocentrism levels—which are an obstacle to intercultural communication—as well as the variables that affect them, of the students studying in the Necmettin Erbakan University Faculty of Theology in Turkey.

Theology graduates in Turkey are often employed as religious education teachers, Quranic course teachers, imams, preachers, muftis, and spiritual counselors in religious services. Determining the intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels of this group is of great importance, as they will serve as educators in all employment areas and address a wide social group of different ages. On the other hand, it is also important to determine the variables that affect these attitudes. Novikova et al. (2020) suggest a complex study of different intercultural competency predictors, such as social and cultural contexts and experiences, social attitudes, personality traits, national and/or cultural origin, gender, and age. In this sense, we aim to broadly examine the variables that affect intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels in a certain group.

2. Research Method

A descriptive survey research method, which is a quantitative research strategy, was used in this study. Descriptive survey research provides a quantitative or numeric description of the trends, attitudes, and opinions of the research population (Creswell 2014).

2.1. Participants and Setting

The universe of the study consisted of the students of the A. K. Faculty of Theology of Necmettin Erbakan University. A total of 2100 students were studying in this faculty. Approximately 16.1% were international students coming from 65 different countries (Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Burundi, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Indonesia, Ivory, Jordan, India, Iraq, Iran, Italy, Montenegro, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Madagascar, Macedonia, Mali, Mongolia, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Uzbekistan, Palestine, Pakistan, the Philippines, Rwanda, Russia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan, Chad, Thailand, Togo, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Yemen) (Faculty Records). During the 2018–2019 academic year, the data collection tools were applied with Ethics Committee approval to an equal number of randomly selected students at each grade level. The sample consisted of 326 students who completed the forms with no missing data. All the students in our study were Muslim, as all of the students registered to the Faculty of Theology were Muslim. The data obtained was analyzed by using SPSS 15.0 Statistical Package software.

2.2. Data Collection Tools

The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS), developed by Chen and Starosta (2000) and adapted into Turkish by Ustun (2011), and the Generalized Ethnocentrism Scale (GENE), developed by Neuliep and McCroskey (1997) and adapted into Turkish by Ustun (2011), were used. Linguistic equivalence, validity, and reliability studies of the two scales were performed by Ustun. The ISS and GENE scales were adopted for the present study as these scales have high reliability and demonstrated validity. The original form of the ISS had a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.88, and the Turkish version had an alpha coefficient of 0.90. With respect to the GENE scale, the original form had a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.92, and the Turkish version had an alpha coefficient of 0.82.

The dependent variables of the research were “intercultural sensitivity” and “ethnocentrism,” the independent variables were gender, grade level, age, type of high school, the geographic region in

which the participant grew up in Turkey, zone of origin, type of settlement in which the participant grew up, exposure to individuals from a different country or culture, and an experience of having lived abroad.

2.3. Analysis of Data

The data of the study were analyzed using SPSS 15.0 Statistical Package software. Pearson correlation analysis was performed to examine the direction and strength of the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism. Then, multivariate ANOVA (MANOVA) was applied to include these two dependent variables in the same analysis. MANOVA is used to test whether groups formed according to one or more factors show significant differences or not in terms of more than one dependent variable (Büyükoztürk 2012). An LSD test from multiple-comparison post hoc tests was applied to determine the difference between the groups in which significant differences occurred.

3. Findings

The Cronbach's alpha (α) values of the data obtained in our study were examined. The intercultural sensitivity scale reliability coefficient was found to be 0.719; and the ethnocentrism scale reliability coefficient was found to be 0.850. These findings show that the data obtained with both scales are reliable.

According to the findings of the study, descriptive statistics of intercultural sensitivity scores and ethnocentrism scores of theology students are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Mean and standard deviation of students' scores in the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Ethnocentrism Scale.

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intercultural sensitivity	Total	326	88.089	7.235
Ethnocentrism	Total	326	45.365	9.873

As shown in Table 1, the mean intercultural sensitivity score of 326 theology students in our sample was 88.089. This score was obtained from the 5-point Likert-type Intercultural Sensitivity Scale, which consists of 23 items. In this respect, the 78.5–96.9 score range can be considered “high level” according to the scale. The mean score of ethnocentrism of the students was 45.365. Considering that the ethnocentrism scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 20 items, this score is in the range of 36.1–52.1, which can be described as “low level.” In summation, it appears the intercultural sensitivity level of the theology students was high, and the ethnocentrism level was low.

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was calculated to examine the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism. A significant and negative correlation was found between intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism ($r = -0.577, p < 0.001$). According to this result, it may be argued that ethnocentrism decreases as intercultural sensitivity increases; or, inversely, intercultural sensitivity decreases as ethnocentrism increases. When we consider the strength of the relationship, the 0.577 coefficient demonstrates a moderate and strong relationship (Linneman 2014, p. 275). According to these correlation findings, 33.2% of the variance in intercultural sensitivity was explained by ethnocentrism.

The first question of our study aimed to answer was “Is there a significant relationship between the gender of theology students and the level of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism?” Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation values of the theology students regarding their total scores according to their gender.

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation of students' scores by gender in the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Ethnocentrism Scale.

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intercultural Sensitivity	Female	253	88.482	7.158
	Male	73	86.730	7.387
Ethnocentrism	Female	253	44.579	9.648
	Male	73	48.091	10.225

As shown in Table 2, while the intercultural sensitivity level of male students was lower than female students, the ethnocentrism level of the male students was higher than female students. The number of male students was lower as 22% of the theology students were males in this department, compared to 88% female students. This difference was reflected in the proportion of male students who attended the study.

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) test was required to examine whether the group mean scores obtained from the components of two dependent variables were significant (George and Mallery 2019, p. 300). Accordingly, the assumptions of the MANOVA test were checked. Taking into consideration that the skewness and kurtosis values were within the ± 1 range for both scales, it was decided that the normality assumption was met.¹ Levene's test values of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale ($F = 0.166, p > 0.05$) and Levene's test values of the Ethnocentrism Scale ($F = 0.592, p > 0.05$) showed that the variances of the groups were equal ($p > 0.05$). The Box's M test result ($F = 0.396, p > 0.05$) showed that covariance matrices were also equal. Therefore, it is possible to say that the assumptions of the MANOVA test were met.

The result of the MANOVA test presented in Table 3 shows that the scores obtained from the linear component of the intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores of the theology students differed according to gender ($\lambda = 0.978, F = 3.702, p < 0.05$). Accordingly, at least one of the intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism attitudes differed significantly by gender. The interaction between dependent and independent variables is given in Table 4.

Table 3. The results of the MANOVA test on the Intercultural Sensitivity and Ethnocentrism levels of theology students by gender.

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	<i>p</i>
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda (λ)	0.004	39543	2.00	323.00	0.000
Gender	Wilks' Lambda (λ)	0.978	3.702	2.00	323.00	0.022

When Table 4 is examined, it can be determined that the intercultural sensitivity level for the theology students had no significant difference according to gender ($F = 3.344, p > 0.5$), while ethnocentrism levels differed significantly by gender ($F = 7.306, p < 0.5$). When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that the significant difference in the levels of ethnocentrism was in favor of the male students. Accordingly, it is possible to argue that male students had higher levels of ethnocentrism.

Our second research question was "Is there a significant relationship between the grades of theology students and the levels of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism?" The mean and standard deviation values of the theology students according to total scores by grades received are given in Table 5.

¹ A kurtosis value of ± 1.0 is considered excellent for most psychometric purposes. As with kurtosis, a skewness value of ± 1.0 is considered excellent for most psychometric purposes (George and Mallery 2019, pp. 114–15).

Table 4. The interaction between the gender of the theology students and Intercultural Sensitivity and Ethnocentrism.

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Intercultural Sensitivity	173.789 ^a	1	173.789	3.344	0.068
	Ethnocentrism	698.719 ^b	1	698.719	7.306	0.007
Intercept	Intercultural Sensitivity	1,739,220.665	1	1,739,220.665	33,461.073	0.000
	Ethnocentrism	486,525.024	1	486,525.024	5087.371	0.000
Gender	Intercultural Sensitivity	173.789	1	173.789	3.344	0.068
	Ethnocentrism	698.719	1	698.719	7.306	0.007
Error	Intercultural Sensitivity	16,840.688	324	51.977		
	Ethnocentrism	30,985.374	324	95.634		
Total	Intercultural Sensitivity	2,546,704.939	326			
	Ethnocentrism	702,602.093	326			
Corrected Total	Intercultural Sensitivity	17,014.477	325			
	Ethnocentrism	31,684.093	325			

^a R Squared = 0.010 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.007); ^b R Squared = 0.022 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.019).

Table 5. Mean and standard deviation of students' scores by grades received in the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Ethnocentrism Scale.

	Grade Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intercultural Sensitivity	1st year	81	88.848	7.662
	2nd year	78	88.268	7.558
	3th year	90	88.173	6.369
	4th year	77	87.013	7.407
Ethnocentrism	1st year	81	44.824	10.662
	2nd year	78	46.430	9.769
	3th year	90	44.742	9.314
	4th year	77	45.586	9.847

As seen in Table 5, there were differences in intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores according to the grade level. However, a MANOVA test was used to determine if this difference between the means was statistically significant. Firstly, it was seen that the MANOVA test assumptions were met. As determined by the test, there was no statistically significant difference between intercultural sensitivity levels ($\lambda = 0.984$, $F = 0.878$, $p > 0.05$). This finding reveals that intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels of the students did not change according to their grades.

Our third research question was "Is there a significant relationship between the age of the theology students and the levels of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism?" Consequently, the effect of the age of theology students on intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels was examined. The mean and standard deviation values of the theology students by age are given in Table 6.

As shown in Table 6, there were differences between the mean scores of the various age groups. To test whether this difference was statistically significant, the assumptions of the MANOVA test were checked. After the MANOVA test assumptions were met, a significant difference was found between age groups ($\lambda = 0.937$, $F = 2.626$, $p < 0.05$). This finding reveals that at least one of the students' intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels varied according to the age of the students.

The interaction between dependent and independent variables, which can reveal which dependent variable is related to age, is given in Table 7.

Table 6. Mean and standard deviation of students' scores by age in the Intercultural Sensitivity and Ethnocentrism Scales.

	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intercultural Sensitivity	20 years and younger	45	86.227	7.897
	21 years	84	90.260	7.285
	22 years	73	88.947	6.308
	23 years	72	86.534	7.294
	24 years and older	52	87.144	6.854
Ethnocentrism	20 years and younger	45	47.350	9.385
	21 years	84	44.773	10.406
	22 years	73	44.800	10.030
	23 years	72	46.177	10.483
	24 years and older	52	44.275	8.209

Table 7. Interaction between Intercultural Sensitivity and Ethnocentrism and the ages of the theology students.

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Intercultural Sensitivity	826.275 ^a	4	206.569	4.096	0.003
	Ethnocentrism	339.129 ^b	4	84.782	0.868	0.483
Intercept	Intercultural Sensitivity	2,382,111.926	1	2,382,111.926	47,235.507	0.000
	Ethnocentrism	638,697.778	1	638,697.778	6540.827	0.000
Age	Intercultural Sensitivity	826.275	4	206.569	4.096	0.003
	Ethnocentrism	339.129	4	84.782	0.868	0.483
Error	Intercultural Sensitivity	16,188.202	321	50.431		
	Ethnocentrism	31,344.964	321	97.648		
Total	Intercultural Sensitivity	2,546,704.939	326			
	Ethnocentrism	702,602.093	326			
Corrected Total	Intercultural Sensitivity	17,014.477	325			
	Ethnocentrism	31,684.093	325			

^a R Squared = 0.049 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.037); ^b R Squared = 0.011 (Adjusted R Squared = -0.002).

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that intercultural sensitivity level of these theology students had a significant difference in terms of age ($F = 4.096$, $p < 0.5$), while their level of ethnocentrism ($F = 0.868$, $p > 0.5$) did not significantly differ. The LSD test, which is one of the multiple-comparison post hoc tests, was applied to determine which groups had significant differences in terms of intercultural sensitivity scores. The results are given in Table 8.

According to Table 8, a significant difference in intercultural sensitivity levels was found between those 20 years and younger (=86.227) and 21 years (=90.260), and 22 years (=88.947) against those 20 years and younger; between 21-year-old students (=90.260) and 23-year-olds (=86.534) and 24 years and older (=87.144) in favor of 21-year-olds; and between 22-year-old (=88.947) students and 23-year-olds (=86.534) in favor of 22-year-old students.

Table 8. The LSD test results of students’ Intercultural Sensitivity levels according to age groups.

Age	Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	p
20 years and younger	21 years	−4.0331(*)	1.31188	0.002
	22 years	−2.7203(*)	1.34592	0.044
	23 years	−0.3070	1.34948	0.820
	24 years and older	−0.9171	1.44585	0.526
21 years	20 years and younger	4.0331(*)	1.31188	0.002
	22 years	1.3128	1.13631	0.249
	23 years	3.7261(*)	1.14052	0.001
	24 years and older	3.1161(*)	1.25307	0.013
22 years	20 years and younger	2.7203(*)	1.34592	0.044
	21 years	−1.3128	1.13631	0.249
	23 years	2.4133(*)	1.17951	0.042
	24 years and older	1.8032	1.28866	0.163
23 years	20 years and younger	0.3070	1.34948	0.820
	22 years	−3.7261(*)	1.14052	0.001
	23 years	−2.4133(*)	1.17951	0.042
	24 years	−0.6100	1.29238	0.637
24 years and older	20 years and younger	0.9171	1.44585	0.526
	21 years	−3.1161(*)	1.25307	0.013
	22 years	−1.8032	1.28866	0.163
	23 years	0.6100	1.29238	0.637

* p < 0.05.

The fourth research question was, “Is there a significant relationship between the nationality of the theology students and the levels of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism?” The impact of being a citizen of the Republic of Turkey on intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels of the students was also examined. The mean and standard deviation values of the students regarding their total scores according to their status as citizens of the Republic of Turkey are given in Table 9.

Table 9. Mean and standard deviation of students’ scores by nationality in the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Ethnocentrism Scale.

	Nationality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intercultural Sensitivity	Turkish	261	88.034	7.391
	Foreign	65	88.314	6.622
Ethnocentrism	Turkish	261	45.906	9.729
	Foreign	65	43.195	10.227

When Table 9 is examined, it is shown that intercultural sensitivity scores were approximately equal; however, the ethnocentrism levels of Turkish students were relatively higher than others. This difference in ethnocentrism was found to be statistically significant (p = 0.047, t = 1.989). However, the MANOVA test revealed that the scores obtained from the linear component consisting of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores did not differ according to nationality (λ = 0.984, F = 2.543, p > 0.05).

The fifth research question was, “Is there a significant relationship between intercultural sensitivity, ethnocentrism levels, and the region where the theology students live?” Table 10 shows the mean and standard deviation values of the theology students regarding the total scores they received according to the zone where they live.

Table 10. Mean and standard deviation of students' scores in the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Ethnocentrism Scale according to the zone of origin.

	Zone	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intercultural Sensitivity	Europe	54	88.756	6.414
	Turkey	257	84.040	5.727
	Asia–Africa	15	88.186	7.422
Ethnocentrism	Europe	54	42.570	10.398
	Turkey	257	49.062	9.048
	Asia–Africa	15	45.737	9.712

The zone variable, as in the location from where the students originated, has three sub-groups (Europe, Asia-Africa, Turkey). We acknowledged that each zone had differences due to previous experiences, geographical region, economic activities, and socioeconomic status. Therefore we grouped the zones based on perceived similarities to make analysis possible. In this regard, the grouping criteria was based upon socioeconomic status and migration. Migration was a factor as the idea of multiculturalism developed as post-war migration increased (Cantle 2012). Consequently, the concept of interculturalism arose. In our study, students in the European zone originated from France (N = 7), Ukraine (N = 3), Belgium (N = 4), Germany (N = 21), Canada (N = 3), Austria (N = 6), The Netherlands (N = 3), Italy (N = 1), Denmark (N = 3), Montenegro (N = 1), and Bosnia and Herzegovina (N = 2). These countries are considered to have developed economies (United Nations 2019). It is possible to say that Europe and its countries have ethnically diverse, multicultural societies in general. This may be due to the influx of immigrants from Africa and Asia, many of whom were citizens of the receiving countries (Gundara 2000). Students in the Asia–Africa group were from Afghanistan (N = 1), Syria (N = 4), Bangladesh (N = 1), Azerbaijan (N = 1), Togo (N = 1), Benin (N = 1), Pakistan (N = 1), Senegal (N = 1), Burkina Faso (N = 1), China (N = 2), Mongolia (N = 1). All of these countries are considered to have developing economies (United Nations 2019). These areas of Africa and Asia are not industrialized, and it is generally considered that there is no prospect of productive capacity or of migration (Gundara 2000). So, we can presume that there is less cultural diversity in comparison to Europe, perhaps in part due to migration. Conversely, Turkey is situated as a bridge between Asia, Europe, and Africa as a developing economy (United Nations 2019). The only official language is Turkish (1982), although there are many languages spoken by ethnic minorities, including Abkhazian, Albanian, Arabic, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Bosnian, Circassian, Georgian, Kurdish, Laz, Romaic, Syriac, and Zazaki. While most Turkish citizens are ethnically Turkish, Armenians, Greeks, and Jewish people are recognized minorities (Polat and Barka 2014). With this diversity within its national borders, Turkey has a multicultural society, although this diversity does not stem from migration.

Upon examination of Table 10, it is shown that the theology students had different levels of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism according to their zone of origin. The intercultural sensitivity levels of European students ($\bar{x} = 88.756$) and Asian and African students ($\bar{x} = 88.186$) were quite similar. However the intercultural sensitivity level of students from Turkey ($\bar{x} = 84.040$) was lower than both groups.

While the ethnocentrism level of the students coming from Europe ($\bar{x} = 42.570$) was the lowest, the ethnocentrism level of Turkish students ($\bar{x} = 49.062$) was the highest. The level of ethnocentrism of students from Asia and Africa ($\bar{x} = 45.737$) was in-between.

According to the results of the MANOVA test applied, the scores obtained from the linear component consisting of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores of the theology students showed significant differences according to their zone of origin ($\lambda = 0.968$, $F = 2.604$, $p < 0.05$). This finding reveals that at least one of the students' intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels varied according to the region where the student lived. The interaction between dependent and independent variables, which reveals which dependent variable is related to the region they live in, is given in Table 11.

Table 11. The interaction between Intercultural Sensitivity and Ethnocentrism and the zone where the theology students live.

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Intercultural Sensitivity	272.307 ^a	2	136.154	2.627	0.074
	Ethnocentrism	662.486 ^b	2	331.243	3.449	0.033
Intercept	Intercultural Sensitivity	764,644.813	1	764,644.813	14,751.987	0.000
	Ethnocentrism	211,842.793	1	211,842.793	2205.728	0.000
Zone	Intercultural Sensitivity	272.307	2	136.154	2.627	0.074
	Ethnocentrism	662.486	2	331.243	3.449	0.033
Error	Intercultural Sensitivity	16,742.170	323	51.833		
	Ethnocentrism	31,021.607	323	96.042		
Total	Intercultural Sensitivity	2,546,704.939	326			
	Ethnocentrism	702,602.093	326			
Corrected Total	Intercultural Sensitivity	17,014.477	325			
	Ethnocentrism	31,684.093	325			

^a R Squared = 0.016 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.010); ^b R Squared = 0.021 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.015).

When we examine Table 11, it can be noted that the theology students did not have statistically significant differences according to the zone of origin in ($F = 2.627$, $p > 0.05$), while ethnocentrism scores differed significantly according to the region they live in ($F = 3.449$, $p < 0.05$). The LSD test, which is one of the multiple-comparison Post Hoc Tests, was applied to determine which groups had significant differences in the ethnocentrism scores; and the results are given in Table 12.

Table 12. The LSD test results regarding the Ethnocentrism Levels of students according to zone of country.

Zone	Zone	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	<i>p</i>
Europe	Turkey	-6.4918(*)	2.86031	0.024
	Asia-Africa	-3.1674(*)	1.46706	0.032
Turkey	Europe	6.4918(*)	2.86031	0.024
	Asia-Africa	3.3244	2.60317	0.202
Asia-Africa	Europe	3.1674(*)	1.46706	0.032
	Turkey	-3.3244	2.60317	0.202

* $p < 0.05$.

Table 12 shows a significant difference in terms of ethnocentrism. This difference is between European students ($\bar{x} = 42.570$) and Turkish students ($\bar{x} = 49.062$), and is in favor of students from Turkey; and between students from Europe ($\bar{x} = 42.570$) and students from Asia and Africa ($\bar{x} = 45.737$) in favor of students from Asia and Africa. The difference between students from Asia and Africa, and students living in Turkey was not statistically significant. This finding reveals that students from Europe had a lower level of ethnocentrism than students in the other two groups.

The sixth research question was, "Is there a significant relationship between the high school type of theology students and their levels of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism?" Table 13 shows the mean and standard deviation values of the theology students regarding the total scores they received according to the type of high school from which they graduated.

Table 13. Mean and standard deviation of students' scores by the type of high school they graduated from in the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Ethnocentrism Scale.

	School Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intercultural Sensitivity	Imam Hatip High School	235	87.911	7.514
	Others	91	88.550	6.476
Ethnocentrism	Imam Hatip High School	235	45.989	9.664
	Others	91	43.754	10.275

As demonstrated in Table 13, although the intercultural sensitivity mean scores of students were approximately at the same level, Imam Hatip High School graduate students' ethnocentrism scores ($\bar{x} = 45.989$) were higher than students who graduated from other schools ($\bar{x} = 43.754$). In order to examine the statistical significance of the difference, the MANOVA test was performed. It was found that the scores obtained from the linear component of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores of theology students did not differ according to the type of school graduated ($\lambda = 0.989$, $F = 1.777$, $p > 0.05$).

Our seventh research question was, "Is there a significant relationship between the geographical region that theology students live and their levels of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism?" The mean and standard deviation values of the theology students according to the region they live in are given in Table 14.

Table 14. Mean and standard deviation of students' scores by the region in which they live in the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Ethnocentrism Scale.

	Region	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intercultural Sensitivity	Marmara	8	87.964	5.908
	Black Sea	7	86.571	8.619
	Central Anatolia	196	87.946	7.593
	Mediterranean	21	87.843	7.910
	Aegean	13	91.242	6.084
	Southeastern Anatolia	4	90.181	9.444
	Eastern Anatolia	8	90.207	6.894
	Outside of Turkey	69	87.779	6.155
Ethnocentrism	Marmara	8	45.375	7.328
	Black Sea	7	52.429	9.414
	Central Anatolia	196	46.111	9.600
	Mediterranean	21	42.095	9.583
	Aegean	13	42.846	10.189
	Southeastern Anatolia	4	45.246	9.117
	Eastern Anatolia	8	46.875	12.597
	Outside of Turkey	69	43.836	10.445

We can see in Table 14 that the intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels of theology students were relatively different according to the region from where they originated in Turkey. In order to determine whether these differences were significant, the MANOVA test was applied, which showed that intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels did not differ significantly according to the geographical regions where the students grew up ($\lambda = 0.947$, $F = 1.261$, $p > 0.05$). This finding shows that the scores obtained from the linear component of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels of theology students did not change depending on the geographical regions where the students grew up.

Our eighth research question was, “Is there a significant relationship between the settlement that theology students grew up and intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism?” The mean and standard deviation values of the theology students’ total scores according to the type of settlement in which they were raised are given in Table 15.

Table 15. Mean and standard deviation of students’ scores by the settlement where they grew up in the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Ethnocentrism Scale.

	Settlement	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intercultural Sensitivity	Village	38	87.353	7.575
	Town	31	87.386	6.628
	County	59	88.050	7.082
	City Center	76	89.041	7.284
	Metropolis	122	87.924	7.3725
Ethnocentrism	Village	38	45.791	10.865
	Town	31	45.697	9.294
	County	59	42.052	9.595
	City Center	76	47.869	10.101
	Metropolis	122	45.191	9.357

According to the mean scores in Table 15, it is understood that the students with the highest level of intercultural sensitivity were those who grew up in a city center ($\bar{x} = 89.041$). The students with the highest ethnocentrism level were also the students who grew up in a city center ($\bar{x} = 47.869$). A MANOVA test was performed. The test results showed that the scores obtained from the linear component consisting of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores differed significantly according to the type of settlement in which they grew up ($\lambda = 0.924$, $F = 3.226$, $p < 0.05$). When the interaction between dependent and independent variables was examined, it was found that only the level of ethnocentrism differed significantly according to settlement type. ($F = 2.990$, $p < 0.05$). According to the LSD test, a significant difference was demonstrated between those who grew up in the county, those who grew up in the city center, and those from a metropolitan area ($p < 0.05$); and this difference was in favor of those who grew up in the city center and those in the metropolitan area. As a result, it is possible to conclude that the level of ethnocentrism was higher among those who grew up in a city center or metropolitan areas.

Our ninth research question was, “Is there a significant relationship between living experience having lived abroad and intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores of the theology students?” The mean and standard deviation values of the theology students’ scores based on their experiences of having lived abroad are given in Table 16.

Table 16. The Mean and standard deviation scores of the students by their experience of having lived abroad in the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Ethnocentrism Scale.

	Experience of Having Lived Abroad	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intercultural Sensitivity	Yes	157	88.326	7.153
	No	169	87.870	7.326
Ethnocentrism	Yes	157	44.723	9.884
	No	169	45.963	9.856

When Table 16 is examined, it shows that the intercultural sensitivity level of theology students who have lived abroad was relatively higher, and the levels of ethnocentrism were slightly lower. After assuming that the distribution of variance and the covariance equality of the groups were met, the MANOVA test was performed. According to the results of the MANOVA test, it was observed that

the scores obtained from the linear component of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores of theology students did not change depending on their experience of having lived abroad ($\lambda = 0.996$, $F = 0.646$, $p > 0.05$).

Our tenth research question was, “Is there a significant relationship between the intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels and theology students’ having exposure to individuals from a different country or culture?” The mean and standard deviation values of the theology students according to the status of having a friend from a different country or culture are given in Table 17.

Table 17. Mean and standard deviation of the scores of the students in the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the Ethnocentrism Scale by their exposure to individuals from a different country or cultural background.

	Status of Exposure to Individuals from a Different Country or Cultural Background	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intercultural Sensitivity	Yes	271	88.760	7.054
	No	55	84.789	7.276
Ethnocentrism	Yes	271	44.488	9.852
	No	55	49.687	8.863

As shown in Table 17, intercultural sensitivity scores of students with exposure to individuals from a different country or culture were higher, and ethnocentrism scores were significantly lower.

A MANOVA test was applied to examine the changes in the scores obtained from the linear component consisting of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores of the theology students according to the status of having exposure to individuals from a different country or culture. Assumptions of normal distribution, equality of variance, and equality of covariance matrices were found to be met. As a result of the MANOVA test, it was found that having exposure to individuals from a different country or culture had an effect on the levels of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism; and there was a significant difference between the groups ($\lambda = 0.948$, $F = 8.796$, $p < 0.05$). The interaction between dependent and independent variables is given in Table 18.

Table 18. The interaction between Intercultural Sensitivity and Ethnocentrism and the status of exposure to individuals from a different country or culture from the theology students.

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Intercultural Sensitivity	720.867 ^a	1	720.867	14.335	0.000
	Ethnocentrism	1235.411 ^b	1	1235.411	13.146	0.000
Intercept	Intercultural Sensitivity	1,377,068.536	1	1,377,068.536	27,383.141	0.000
	Ethnocentrism	405,496.991	1	405,496.991	4314.834	0.000
Zone	Intercultural Sensitivity	720.867	1	720.867	14.335	0.000
	Ethnocentrism	1235.411	1	1235.411	13.146	0.000
Error	Intercultural Sensitivity	16,293.610	324	50.289		
	Ethnocentrism	30,448.682	324	93.977		
Total	Intercultural Sensitivity	2,546,704.939	326			
	Ethnocentrism	702,602.093	326			

Table 18. Cont.

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Total	Intercultural Sensitivity	17,014.477	325			
	Ethnocentrism	31,684.093	325			

^a R Squared = 0.042 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.039); ^b R Squared = 0.039 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.036).

When Table 18 is examined, it is shown that both the level of intercultural sensitivity ($F = 14.335$, $p < 0.5$) and the level of ethnocentricity ($F = 13.146$, $p < 0.5$) of the theology students differed significantly according to the status of having exposure to individuals from a different country or culture. Looking at the data presented in Table 17, it is demonstrated that this difference in terms of intercultural sensitivity was in favor of the students who had exposure to individuals from a different country or culture. As for ethnocentrism, it is understood that students who had not had exposure to individuals from a different country or culture, had a higher ethnocentric attitude.

4. Discussion

In our study, it was found that the intercultural sensitivity level of the theology students was high. In the study conducted by [Ogut and Olkun \(2018\)](#), the intercultural sensitivity level of university students was found to be satisfactory. In a study conducted by [Polat and Barka \(2014\)](#), intercultural sensitivity level of Turkish teachers was found to be moderate. In another study conducted by [Abasli and Polat \(2019\)](#), intercultural sensitivity level of Turkish university students was similarly found to be moderate. In a study conducted by [Bulduk et al. \(2017\)](#), the intercultural sensitivity level of the students attending vocational school in health services was found to be under moderate level. Looking at the findings of these studies, it can be considered that the intercultural sensitivity level of the theology students is higher than that of other students in Turkey.

In our study, the ethnocentric attitude of the theology students was found to be low. We can presume the low-level ethnocentric attitude to be better than very-low-level. This is because an individual with a very low level of positive ethnocentrism could potentially spy on the enemy for financial reward or because of some common ideology they share ([Dutton 2019](#)). Therefore, when we consider negative and positive ethnocentrism as a whole, although low-level ethnocentrism is more desirable than high-level ethnocentrism, low-level ethnocentrism is more desirable than very-low-level ethnocentrism.

In this study, although the intercultural sensitivity levels of the theology students did not show a significant difference according to gender, it was seen that there was a significant difference in ethnocentrism levels by gender, with higher levels in men. [Yurtseven and Altun \(2015\)](#) showed that there was no significant difference in intercultural sensitivity scores according to gender. Similarly, [Hadi Kusuma and Susilo \(2020\)](#) found that there was no significant difference between the two gender group in terms of intercultural sensitivity. [Holm et al. \(2009\)](#) observed that high-school-aged girls' intercultural sensitivity levels were significantly higher than boys. In the scale developed by [Hammer et al. \(2003\)](#), only in the denial/defense sub-dimension were the scores of male students found to be significantly higher than females. [Mellizo \(2017, p. 579\)](#) found that female students scored significantly higher than male students in her research on intercultural sensitivity levels. In his study, [Chocce \(2014, p. 7\)](#) did not detect a significant difference in the levels of intercultural sensitivity by gender, but noted that female students had higher scores. In conclusion, it is reasonable to say that gender is not a reliable predictor for intercultural sensitivity.

The levels of ethnocentrism of Japanese university students and American university students differed significantly according to gender, and similar to our findings, male students' scores were higher in both groups ([Neuliep et al. 2001](#)). Linking ethnocentrism to evolutionary reasons, [Dutton \(2019\)](#) argued that boys have more negative ethnocentrism than girls. According to Dutton, in China and India there is an imbalance between the male and female populations as a result of infanticide or

sex-selective abortion, as, culturally, girls are less desirable than boys. As a result, he argued that the male-to-female ratio imbalance, directly or indirectly, causes more ethnocentrism in those countries.

There was no significant relationship between intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores of the theology students by academic grade levels. In a study conducted on Japanese and American university students, it was found that grades were not a significant factor in ethnocentric attitudes, which was similar to our findings (Neuliep et al. 2001).

In our study, although intercultural sensitivity levels showed significant differences according to age, it was determined that ethnocentrism levels did not. In another study, significant differences were observed by age in three dimensions: interaction engagement, respect of cultural differences, and interaction enjoyment. In these dimensions, participants under 30 showed the best results (Segura-Robles and Parra-González 2019). Contrary to our findings, there are studies that find intercultural sensitivity levels do not show significant differences according to age (Abasli and Polat 2019; Hammer et al. 2003).

A study on Dutch adults aged 12–31 years by Rekker et al. (2015, p. 141) showed that the level of ethnocentrism increases slightly up to the age of 16, but then shows a downward trend. In a study conducted by Capucão (2010, p. 177), there was a significant difference in ethnocentrism levels according to age, while it was found that the higher age group had a higher level of negative out-group ethnocentrism attitude. Making a similar claim, Dutton (2019) stated that societies with a young population are more ethnocentric than societies with an older population. Therefore, he claimed that ethnocentrism is higher in countries like Burundi, where the average age is 17, and Niger, where the average age is 15, compared to Western European countries where the average age is around 40. However, Dutton et al. (2016) did not find a significant relationship between negative ethnocentrism and age, similar to the findings of our study.

Since the number of students with different nationalities was not sufficient to analyze as a separate group, the participants who had Turkish nationality were included in one group and the students who had other nationalities were separated into another group. Accordingly, the scores obtained from the linear component of the students' intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores did not differ significantly according to nationality. Yurtseven and Altun (2015) reported results that were similar to ours when evaluating primary school teachers. No significant difference was observed among the intercultural sensitivity scores according to nationality.

According to the findings of our study, the intercultural sensitivity levels of the students did not differ significantly according to their region of origin (Europe, Africa–Asia, or Turkey). The concept of interculturalism, sometimes called multiculturalism, transculturality, social justice, or globalization, has become popular in the U.S. since the 1960s, in Europe since the 1970s, and recently in the rest of the world (Dervin 2016, p. 3). If we look at the findings of our research, this awareness may have created a certain improvement among students and may have contributed to a similar level of intercultural sensitivity. It is a fact that education is the most important tool to develop intercultural competency. Furthermore, the use of certain tools, like analogy, in the preparation of students for their future intercultural encounters is possible (Abe 2019). In another study, the effectiveness of flipped learning for learning intercultural competences versus the use of a traditional methodology was proved by Fuentes Cabrera et al. (2020). Furthermore, Escarbajal-Frutos et al. (2019) suggested intercultural schools help to make intercultural society a reality.

In our study, it was found that the ethnocentrism levels of the students studying in theology faculty differed according to the region of origin, and that the ethnocentrism levels of the students coming from Europe were lower. Some theories were put forward as to what is affecting the levels of ethnocentrism. One of them is the Genetic Similarity Theory. Accordingly, the level of ethnocentrism varies depending on whether the gene pool is large or small. For example, people in Northeast Asia, who have a smaller gene pool, are more ethnocentric than Europeans, who have a larger gene pool. In the same way, it was shown that South Asians, mostly Arabs, are more ethnocentric than Europeans. Additionally, research shows that there is a significant positive relationship between the practice of

cousin marriage and negative ethnocentrism. This is associated with the Genetic Similarity Theory in that practice of cousin marriage leads to a small pool of genes (Dutton 2019). Further studies are needed to support these theories.

It was observed that the scores obtained from the linear component of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores of the theology students did not show significant difference depending upon the high school they graduated from. Ustun (2011) also found that there is no significant difference between Imam Hatip high school graduates and other high school graduates in terms of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism, which is similar to our findings.

The findings of our study showed that the scores obtained from the linear component of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores of theology students did not differ depending on the geographical regions in which they grew up in Turkey. That means all students from different geographical regions in Turkey had similar attitudes in terms of ethnocentrism and intercultural sensitivity. Similarly, Erdogan (2017) found that multicultural attitudes of theology students do not differ according to the region where the students raised.

In our study, although the intercultural sensitivity levels of the theology students did not show a significant difference according to the type of settlement in which they were raised, it was found that ethnocentrism levels did show a significant difference. According to the data obtained, the ethnocentrism levels of city center and metropolitan populations were higher than that of those who were raised in the county. In a study conducted on teaching candidates in Turkey, it was proved that the intercultural sensitivity level of students does not differ according to the type of settlement in which they were raised, which is similar to our results (Onur Sezer and Kahraman 2017, p. 555). Contrary to the findings of our study, it was found that ethnocentrism levels of both American and Japanese university students do not differ significantly according to the size of settlement (Neuliep et al. 2001).

It was observed that the scores obtained from the linear component of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism scores of the theology students did not change depending on their having lived abroad. Similar to the findings of our study, some studies in the literature show that the experience of having lived abroad does not have a significant effect on intercultural sensitivity levels (Chocce 2014; Fuller 2007; Yurtseven and Altun 2015). Neuliep et al. (2001) found that there is no significant difference in terms of ethnocentrism between Japanese university students and American university students who had and had not lived abroad.

It was an expected result that, although the intercultural sensitivity of students who had an exposure to individuals from different countries or cultures was higher than the others, the ethnocentrism levels were lower. The findings obtained in our study were as expected. In the study conducted by Ustun (2011) teachers who state that they have friends from different countries or cultures have high intercultural sensitivity and low level of ethnocentrism, whereas only the difference in intercultural sensitivity was statistically significant. This was similar to our findings. In the study conducted by Yurtseven and Altun (2015), no significant difference was found between the intercultural sensitivity scores. The findings of Chocce (2014) on ethnocentrism support the data of our research. In another study conducted by Neuliep et al. (2001), it was observed that there is no significant difference in terms of ethnocentrism between Japanese university students who frequently interact with foreigners and those who do not interact at all. However, according to the findings of the same study, the ethnocentrism scores of American university students who frequently interact with foreigners were found to be significantly lower than those who do not interact at all.

5. Conclusions and Suggestions

In today's world, where the possibilities of interaction between different cultures increase daily, the development of intercultural sensitivity has become a vital issue not only for multinational states but also for single-nation states (Young et al. 2017). Many people from different cultures can be our neighbors for various reasons, particularly education and migration. Turkey has also been affected by such developments in the world. Therefore, in order to maintain a certain order within the society and

to establish a healthy interaction with different nations, it is of great importance to provide education at various levels and to carry out various studies on different platforms. Likewise, it is possible that an ethnocentric attitude may become a threat to a healthy society. Theology students need to have a certain sensitivity in terms of embracing the people they will address when they graduate and an ability to transfer that sensitivity to them. When we look at the findings obtained from our research, it can be considered a positive result that the intercultural sensitivities are at a high level and the ethnocentrism scores are at a low level in general. It is also possible to conduct qualitative research to deepen the findings of our study, which was a quantitative research study examining the intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels of students in terms of various variables.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, I.E. and M.O.; methodology, I.E.; software, I.E.; validation, I.E.; formal analysis, I.E.; investigation, I.E. and M.O.; resources, M.O.; data curation, I.E.; writing—original draft preparation, I.E.; writing—review and editing, M.O.; supervision, M.O.; project administration, M.O.; funding acquisition, M.O. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments: We thank Necmettin Erbakan University, A.K. Faculty of Theology administration for data gathering permission. We are also grateful to the students who were participants in the research for their willingness and sincere answers to the questionnaires.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest

References

- Abasli, Konul, and Sule Polat. 2019. Öğrencilerin Kültürlerarası Duyarlılık ve Kültürel Zekâya İlişkin Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 7: 193–202. [CrossRef]
- Abe, Yuko. 2019. Use of Analogy in the Development of Intercultural Competence. *Philosophies* 4: 25. [CrossRef]
- Allen, Nathan W., and Shane J. Barter. 2017. Ummah or Tribe? Islamic Practice, Political Ethnocentrism, and Political Attitudes in Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Political Science* 25: 45–67. [CrossRef]
- Ameli, Saied Reza, and Hamideh Molaei. 2012. Religious Affiliation and Intercultural Sensitivity: Interculturality between Shia & Sunni Muslims in Iran. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 36: 31–40. [CrossRef]
- Bennett, Milton J. 2009. Defining, Measuring, and Facilitating Intercultural Learning: A Conceptual Introduction to the Intercultural Education Double Supplement. *Intercultural Education* 20: S1–S13. [CrossRef]
- Bhawuk, Dharm P. S., and Richard Brislin. 1992. The Measurement of Intercultural Sensitivity Using the Concepts of Individualism and Collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 16: 413–36. [CrossRef]
- Bulduk, Serap, Esra Usta, and Yeliz Dincer. 2017. Kültürlerarası Duyarlılık ve Etkileyen Faktörlerin Belirlenmesi: Bir Sağlık Hizmetleri Meslek Yüksekokulu Örneği. *Düzce Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi* 7: 73–77.
- Büyüköztürk, Şener. 2012. *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı*, 16th ed. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Cantle, T. 2012. *Interculturalism: The New Era of Cohesion and Diversity*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Capucão, Dave Dean. 2010. *Religion and Ethnocentrism: An Empirical-Theological Study*. Empirical Studies in Theology, v. 19. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Chen, Guo-Ming, and William J. Starosta. 1996. Intercultural Communication Competence: A Synthesis. In *Communication Yearbook* 19. Edited by Brant R. Burleson. California: Sage Publications.
- Chen, Guo-Ming, and William Starosta. 2000. The Development and Validation of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale. *Human Communication* 3: 1–15.
- Chocce, John. 2014. Factors Favoring Intercultural Sensitivity. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Information Security* 1: 5–11.
- In *Constitution of the Republic of Turkey*; 1982. Available online: <https://www.anayasa.gov.tr/en/legislation/turkish-constitution/> (accessed on 5 January 2020).
- Council of Europe. 2008. *White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Creswell, John W. 2014. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Dervin, Fr. 2016. *Interculturality in Education: A Theoretical and Methodological Toolbox*, 1st ed. London: Palgrave Pivot.
- Dutton, Edward. 2019. *Race Differences in Ethnocentrism*, 1st ed. London: Arktos Media Ltd.
- Dutton, Edward, Guy Madison, and Richard Lynn. 2016. Demographic, Economic, and Genetic Factors Related to National Differences in Ethnocentric Attitudes. *Personality and Individual Differences* 101: 137–43. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Eko, Bherta Sri, and Hendar Putranto. 2019. The Role of Intercultural Competence and Local Wisdom in Building Intercultural and Inter-Religious Tolerance. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 48: 341–69. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Erdogan, Irfan. 2017. İlahiyat Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Çok Kültürlülük Algılarının İncelenmesi: Konya Örneği. In *Medeniyet ve Birlikte Yaşama Kültürü*. Edited by Muhiddin Okumuslar and Ertan Ozensel. Konya: Türkiye İmam Hatipliler Vakfı Yayınları.
- Escarbajal-Frutos, Andrés, Tomás Izquierdo-Rus, Inmaculada Aznar-Díaz, and María Pilar Cáceres-Reche. 2019. Intercultural and Community Schools. Learning to Live Together. *Sustainability* 11: 3734. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Fuentes Cabrera, Arturo, María Elena Parra-González, Jesús López Belmonte, and Adrián Segura-Robles. 2020. Educational Potentials of Flipped Learning in Intercultural Education as a Transversal Resource in Adolescents. *Religions* 11: 53. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Fuller, Thomas L. 2007. Study Abroad Experiences and Intercultural Sensitivity among Graduate Theological Students: A Preliminary and Exploratory Investigation. *Christian Higher Education* 6: 321–32. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- George, Darren, and Paul Mallery. 2019. *IBM SPSS Statistics 25 Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*, 15th ed. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Gundara, Jagdish S. 2000. *Interculturalism, Education and Inclusion*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing, Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Hadi Kusuma, Jamaludin, and Sulistiyono Susilo. 2020. Intercultural and Religious Sensitivity among Young Indonesian Interfaith Groups. *Religions* 11: 26. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hammer, Mitchell R., Milton J. Bennett, and Richard Wiseman. 2003. Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 27: 421–43. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Holm, Kristiina, Petri Nokelainen, and Kirsi Tirri. 2009. Relationship of Gender and Academic Achievement to Finnish Students' Intercultural Sensitivity. *High Ability Studies* 20: 187–200. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- James, Malcolm. 2008. *Interculturalism: Theory and Policy*. London: The Baring Foundation.
- Kaya, Ayhan, and Ferhat Kentel. 2005. *Euro-Türkler Türkiye ile Avrupa Birliği Arasında Köprü mü, Engel mi?* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.
- Linneman, Thomas John. 2014. *Social Statistics: Managing Data, Conducting Analyses, Presenting Results*, 2nd ed. Contemporary Sociological Perspectives. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Meer, Nasar, and Tariq Modood. 2012. How Does Interculturalism Contrast with Multiculturalism? *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 33: 175–96. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Mellizo, Jennifer M. 2017. Exploring Intercultural Sensitivity in Early Adolescence: A Mixed Methods Study. *Intercultural Education* 28: 571–90. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Neuliep, James W., and James C. McCroskey. 1997. The Development of a U.S. and Generalized Ethnocentrism Scale. *Communication Research Reports* 14: 385–98. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Neuliep, James W., Michelle Chaudoir, and James C. McCroskey. 2001. A Cross-cultural Comparison of Ethnocentrism among Japanese and United States College Students. *Communication Research Reports* 18: 137–46. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Novikova, Irina A., Marina V. Gridunova, Alexey L. Novikov, and Dmitriy A. Shlyakhta. 2020. Ethno-National Attitudes as Intercultural Competence Predictors in University Students: Gender Differences. *Behavioral Sciences* 10: 56. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ogut, Nesrin, and Emre Osman Olkun. 2018. Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Kültürlerarası Duyarlılık Düzeyi: Selçuk Üniversitesi Örneği. *Selçuk Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Akademik Dergisi* 11: 54–73. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Onur Sezer, Gonul, and Pınar Bağçeli Kahraman. 2017. Sınıf ve Okul Öncesi Öğretmen Adaylarının Çokkültürlü Eğitime Yönelik Tutumları ile Kültürlerarası Duyarlılıkları Arasındaki İlişki: Uludağ Üniversitesi Örneği. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 13: 550–60. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Polat, Soner, and Tania Ogay Barka. 2014. Preservice Teachers' Intercultural Competence: A Comparative Study of Teachers in Switzerland and Turkey. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research* 14: 19–38. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Rekker, Roderik, Loes Keijsers, Susan Branje, and Wim Meeus. 2015. Political Attitudes in Adolescence and Emerging Adulthood: Developmental Changes in Mean Level, Polarization, Rank-Order Stability, and Correlates. *Journal of Adolescence* 41: 136–47. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Segura-Robles, Adrián, and María Elena Parra-González. 2019. Analysis of Teachers' Intercultural Sensitivity Levels in Multicultural Contexts. *Sustainability* 11: 3137. [CrossRef]
- Smooha, Sammy. 1987. Jewish and Arab Ethnocentrism in Israel. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 10: 1–26. [CrossRef]
- Spiteri, Damian. 2017. *Multiculturalism, Higher Education and Intercultural Communication: Developing Strengths-Based Narratives for Teaching and Learning*. Palgrave Studies in Global Citizenship Education and Democracy. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sumner, William Graham, and Albert Galloway Keller. 1940. *Folkways; a Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals*. Boston and New York: Ginn and Company, Available online: <http://archive.org/details/folkwaysastudys00sumngoog> (accessed on 10 November 2019).
- Ting-Toomey, Stella. 1999. *Communicating across Cultures*. The Guilford Communication Series; New York: Guilford Press.
- Tutal, Nilgun. 2006. *Küreselleşme İletişim Kültürlerarasılık*. İstanbul: Kırmızı Yayınları.
- UNESCO. 2009. *Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue*. UNESCO World Report 2. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations. 2019. *World Economic Stiation and Prospects*. New York: United Nations.
- Ustun, Elif. 2011. Öğretmen Adaylarının Kültürlerarası Duyarlılık ve Etnikmerkezçilik Düzeylerini Etkileyen Etmenler. Master's thesis, Yıldız Teknik University Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Verkuyten, Maykel, and Kumar Yogeewaran. 2020. Cultural Diversity and Its Implications for Intergroup Relations. *Current Opinion in Psychology* 32: 1–5. [CrossRef]
- Wrench, Jason S., Michael W. Corrigan, James C. McCroskey, and Narissra M. Punyanunt-Carter. 2006. Religious Fundamentalism and Intercultural Communication: The Relationships among Ethnocentrism, Intercultural Communication Apprehension, Religious Fundamentalism, Homonegativity, and Tolerance for Religious Disagreements. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 35: 23–44. [CrossRef]
- Young, Cheri A., Badiyah Haffejee, and David L. Corsun. 2017. The Relationship between Ethnocentrism and Cultural Intelligence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 58: 31–41. [CrossRef]
- Yuen, Celeste Y. M., and David L. Grossman. 2009. The Intercultural Sensitivity of Student Teachers in Three Cities. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 39: 349–65. [CrossRef]
- Yurtseven, Nihal, and Sertel Altun. 2015. Intercultural Sensitivity in Today's Global Classes: Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies* 2: 49–54. [CrossRef]
- Zhang, Yunying, and Eun-Jeong Han. 2019. Comparative Study of Intercultural Sensitivity of College Students in Two Distinctive Institutions in the U.S. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 48: 477–93. [CrossRef]



© 2020 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).