# Enhancing English Prospective Teachers' Presentational Communication Skills and Intercultural Competence: Post-Process Based Program

**Safaa M. Abdelhalim Aly**

Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt

**International Journal of English Language Teaching**
**Vol.2, No.3, pp.15-36, September 2014**
**Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK** (www.eajournals.org )

International Journal of English Language Teaching (IJELT) is a peer-reviewed international journal run by the European Centre for Research Training and Development, United Kingdom. IJELT aims at reporting high-quality empirical and original research contributions for the benefit of teachers and researchers in the field of English Language Teaching. The scope includes theory and practice in English language teaching and learning, language teachers' training and education, teaching English as a second or foreign language. It also publishes book reviews of potential interest to readers.

## INTRODUCTION

Richards (2011: 9) states that teachers' ability and skill in communicating their message in terms of shaping their content and style to suit students in the class, largely determine their success in fostering student's learning through establishing clear communication and engaging students in the learning process. Hamm (2006: 7) adds that thinking of teaching as an attempt to influence, including the production of knowledge among students, makes the choices teachers make about what to say and how to say it crucial means of influence, towards achieving the teaching goals. Thus, Presentational communication skills are integral elements of the complex craft of teaching (Teaching and Educational Development Institute, 2011).

Reoll (2010:7) argues that teachers should be trained on the skills of effective presentation, including how to begin and end, include and refer to visuals, and use keynotes, to inform the audience (students) about the main points of the lesson and then referring to those points during the presentation. Hamm (2006: 11) considers presenter's nonverbal tools beside the ability to read the audience and change speaking strategies accordingly as crucial elements of effective presentational communication of ideas. He adds that a successful presentation leaves the audience with a deep understanding of the meaning of the communicated message that exceeds the superficial word level.

The National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project [NSFLEP] (2006) defines presentational communication as "one person produces a message in oral or written form for an audience of listeners, viewers, or readers". Shrum and Glisan (2010:300) add that presentational communication requires a skill of how to communicate with audience and an ability to transmit cross-cultural information based on the cultural background of that audience. This means that, presenters (speakers or writers) need to know the cultural perspectives, background, and expectations of their listeners/readers in order to have successful presentational communication.

Many researchers' studies i.e. Kelly (1998), Thanasoulas (2001), Hammer (2003) and Qawasmi (2003) support the belief that language cannot be taught separately from its culture. They consider that the teaching/learning of a foreign language includes in addition to the linguistic elements namely sounds and grammar, the social use of the language. It is essential for language learners to understand the cultural allusions and conventions of the target language to use it appropriately within each situation. Thanasoulas (2001) points out that in the recent studies culture is considered to be the fifth skill after listening, speaking, reading and writing in teaching and learning any

language. Abousenna (1994) assures that dialogue of cultures and languages eliminate the foreigness and the mutual alienation among Arabic and English cultures which might lead to peace and international understanding.

To quote Robinson, "the beauty of being a language instructor is that we are so much more than just dictionaries or grammarians; we are the bridges of cultural divides, we are the delegates of social communication, and above all, we are agents of social responsibility and change. Not only do language instructors guide learners down the right path to achieve their acquisition goals, but they also expose the speed bumps of cultural miscommunication" (Robinson 2012: 14).

Hammer, Bennet and Wiseman (2003: 416) highlight the importance of intercultural competence in both global and domestic contexts referring to it as 'a core competency needed for the 21st century'. Qawasmi (2003:2) posits that the ignorance of cultural features i.e., being unaware of cultural content indicates incapacity to use the language appropriately. Therefore, gaining cultural knowledge of the target language is an integral part of the learning process. Also, developing cultural knowledge is essential to overcome false ideas and prejudices against the people who speak the target language.

The ability to use cultural knowledge as an aspect of communicative competence is termed by Byram (1997) as intercultural communicative competence (ICC). Byram defined four types of knowledge within ICC: 1. Knowing oneself and others, 2. Knowing how to interpret and relate, 3. Knowing how to engage oneself, and 4. Knowing how to discover/interact. Thus, among the responsibilities of FL teachers is to provide students with activities that put them in contact with the culture world of the target language and reflect on their own culture and analyze it from an external perspective. Hence, students acquire cross/in between-culture, one that bridges between the cultures as it is partially understood on the basis of their own culture and partially on the basis of their exposure to the target cultures (Thanasoulas, 2001).

Robert, Byram, Barro, Jordan and B. Street (2001, as cited in Shrum & Glisan, 2010: 161) describe the process of making culture an integral part of language teaching/learning as a challenge task for teachers and learners. They attribute this to certain factors: first, culture has been limited traditionally in the classroom to cognitive knowledge of the language, sociolinguistics, literature and arts of the targeted culture. Second, teachers themselves often lack sufficient cultural experiences and have difficulty integrating culture into the linguistic component of the language program.

El-Koumy (1994) conducted a study on the teacher's willingness and preparedness to deal with foreign cultural issues on English language classroom. His study was based upon a sample of secondary school EFL teachers in Menoufia and Qina in Egypt. The results of the study indicated that: the teachers are not acquainted with knowledge about English speaking cultures or techniques of teaching cultural awareness. The results revealed also a strong correlation between teachers' cultural awareness and their willingness to deal with cultural issues. The study recommended that, pre-service and in-service training may promote the teachers' willingness to bring culture to their EFL classes. Also, Frank (2013) states that many EFL teachers lack formal training in incorporating cultural elements in teaching/ learning English. Also, there is no accepted set of criteria that instructors can use as a guide.

Elgeddawy (2006) indicates that the post-process movement shifts attention from a focus on the question of 'how we write and what writing is' to another question of 'what it means to write'. The post-process paradigm strives to transcend the limitations of the process approach to writing and pays attention to the socially situated nature of writing itself (Sinor& Huston, 2004: 371). It encourages students to write the way "real" writers write and to be aware of the context of writing, not simply the visible processes of writing. At the level of classroom practice, Post-Process theory calls for writing for real audiences, purposes, and contexts.

Matsuda (2003) and Mc Comiskey (2000) argue that the Post-process approach is but an extension and not a complete rejection of the writing process but rather one that also stresses the necessity of socio cultural and interactional contexts of writing that are based on mutual relationship between context and cognition. Accordingly, Post-Process instruction focuses on social aspects of culture and context where the students are introduced to the idea of cultural values that are embedded in texts.

Post-process theory, at least according to the vision promoted in the present study, does not necessitate one's overlook of other approaches of writing (product, process and genre based). George (2002: 13) assures that writing instruction that stresses or focuses on only one specific aspect of writing, be it product, process or social purpose gives students a restricted, unbalanced and incorrect view of how successful writers act. The present study explores the effectiveness of implementing a post-process approach based program to help participants communicate in the presentational communication mode in various tasks that provide them with opportunities to analyze, search, discuss, observe and create a variety of written and oral cultural genre based presentation formats.

## LITERATURE REVIEW (THEORY)

### Oral and written presentational communication

Though presentational communication actually occurs in speaking and writing, historically it has been explored within the focus of writing skills development and evaluation. Harmer (2004: 274) states that prepared oral presentations represent a well known and beneficial speaking genre. He stresses that well prepared oral presentation on a topic is more 'writing-like' as it is not prepared for informal spontaneous conversation. Also, the same as the process of writing, the stages of developing the oral presentation, from original ideas to finished work, is critical. It is assumed that the sole difference between written and oral presentations is the delivery mechanism—words on paper vs. words spoken. Shrum & Glisann (2010:305) argues that due to paucity in oral presentation research studies, implications of written presentation can be applied to oral presentations as successful speakers use the same process of generating ideas, revision and paying attention to the impact of the presentation on the intended audience. They added also that speakers often start by preparing a written form of their oral presentations.

### Characteristics of presentational communication mode:

1. Oral, multimedia, and written presentations are prepared in advance and may require research on a given topic;
2. Its coherence is psychological more than logical;
3. Presentational mode often deliberately create a sensory/emotional experience for the audience/reader;
4. Presentational mode depends on language strategies of description and narration (Shrum & Glisan, 2010: 300).

### Cultivating presentational communication in FL classroom

Williams (2005, as cited in Shrum & Glisan, 2010: 308-9) introduce number of suggestions for successful cultivating presentational writing into the FL classroom. These suggestions are also applicable to the teaching of oral and multimedia presentations:

- Providing plenty of practice in class and outside of class followed with discussions of the writing process;
- Teaching about the FL writing process;
- Teaching students to self-monitor and self reflect;

- Designing writing tasks to reflect authentic purposes and genres;
- Providing focused practice on syntax;
- Combining reading and writing: in two ways; and
- Integrating a writing conference into instructional approach: discussing about their progress and the ways in which they might improve.

**Characteristics of successful oral and written presentational communicator**

**1. Successful writers**

- Use nonlinear approach of reviewing and revising throughout the composition process (Roca, Manchon & Murphy, 2006);
- Keep the audience and the meaning of the message in focus (reader-centered) (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001);
- Spend enough time working on proficiency in writing; improving meaning expression style or discover a better match between what they want to write and how they write it (Roca, Manchon & Murphy, 2006);
- Self-regulate; engage in a kind of inner dialogue between themselves as writers and the reader (audience);
- View the writing process in a multidimensional way;
- search various resources to meet the demands of the writing task;
- Use effective language, know how to generate well-formed sentences, and connect structure and meaning (Khaldieh, 2000).

**2. Successful speakers**

- Demonstrates full knowledge of the presentation topic through doing the necessary research;
- Know when they should speak spontaneously and when it would be appropriate to read from a script.
- Maintain eye contact with the audience, whether they are speaking spontaneously or from a script.

- Use multimedia, including visuals, pictures, and props to make it easy for the listener to understand the speakers intention and general meaning; and enhance the impact of the message.
- Rehearse; practice their presentations prior to presenting before the targeted audience.
- Know how to alter the presentation as needed depending to the reaction of the audience.
- Offer the audience an opportunity to ask questions (Shrum & Glisan, 2010: 305).

**From Cultural Awareness to intercultural competence**

Porto ( 2010), Suzuki ( 2010) and Baker (2012) argues that cultural awareness (CA) represented in exploring and experiencing the socio-cultural norms of one particular native speaker community , needs to be re-evaluated since English language is now used as a global lingua franca a cross different cultural contexts. Thus, the correlation between the English language and a specific culture and nation is clearly problematic. Baker (2009) states that to understand the socio-cultural contexts of English as a global lingua franca we need to approach culture in a non-essential and dynamic manner. Pennycook (2007) stresses the importance of being able to negotiate these complex and dynamic cultural references in communicating successfully across cultures. “cross-cultural capability/skills”, “cross-cultural awareness”, “intercultural communication”, “intercultural awareness” and “intercultural competence” are different terms used when referring to communication between people from different cultures, For the sake of the present study the term “Intercultural communication competence” is used.

Dodd (1998:38) points out that effective intercultural communication competence in English involves a range of skills, attitudes and knowledge that exceed the basic linguistic knowledge of grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. Chen (2010) argues that Intercultural awareness, the process of becoming more aware of and better understanding one’s own culture and other cultures around the world, represents the cognitive aspect of intercultural communication competence. The aim of intercultural learning is to increase international and cross-cultural tolerance and understanding. Baker (2012:69) declares that examining intercultural awareness in ELT relates mainly to understanding culture, language, and communication in general, as well as in relation to particular contexts, and an awareness of the dynamic relationship between English and its diverse sociocultural settings.

**Features of intercultural competence**

- Inquisitiveness and openness to other cultures;

- understanding and appreciating intercultural differences;
- building bridges across misunderstanding among different cultures (Zhang, 2011);
- the ability to relate something from another culture and make it comprehensible to members of one's own,
- the ability to establish intercultural social contact based on acquired knowledge and experiences;
- the ability to critically evaluate the cultural practices and products of one's own culture and that of other countries (Byram, 1997 cited in Frank 2013:6).

**Elements of intercultural competence**

Byram (1997), Hammer, Bennet &Wiseman (2003: 422) and Utley (2011:6) assume that there are two main elements of intercultural competence: Cultural briefing/knowledge: acquiring information about a specific culture, both factual and affective; and Intercultural awareness or sensitization (cultural skills) – awareness of the differences between cultures and the ability to interact in a variety of cultures, displaying attitudes of openness, tolerance, acceptance and the ability to cope with ambiguity. Moran (2001) and Utley (2011:8) recommended three main goals for intercultural competence training programs: Cognitive: adding to the learner's stock of knowledge; Affective: changing the learner's attitude by developing openness, tolerance, acceptance and awareness; and Behavioral: the learner learns the 'dos and don'ts of the target culture. Accordingly, the content of such training programs should cover: The 'what' of facts and descriptions; the 'how' of appropriate behavior in particular context; and the 'why' of cultural phenomena, using background knowledge of the historical development of the target culture.

Quappe and Giovanna (2010) identify four main levels of intercultural awareness that reflect how people grow to perceive cultural differences: a) My way is the only way – where people are aware only of their own way of doing things and ignore the impact of cultural differences, b) I know their way, but my way is better - At the second level, people are aware of other ways of doing things, but still consider their way as the best one. In this stage, cultural differences are perceived as source of problems, c) My Way and Their Way - At this stage people use cultural diversity to create new solutions and alternatives, and d) Our Way - The creation of a culture of shared meanings, People dialogue repeatedly with others, create new meanings, new rules to meet the needs of a particular situation.

Schulz (2007, as cited in Shrum & Glisan, 2010: 164) proposes five main objectives for culture learning and the development of intercultural competence in a college foreign language learning course:

1. Students demonstrate awareness that cultural perspectives and practices, including language use and styles of communication within a certain culture are results of the geographic, historical, economic, social/religious, and political factors.
2. Students develop and demonstrate awareness that situational variables e.g., context and role expectations, have a critical impact on shaping the communicative interaction and behavior.
3. Students examine stereotypes about their own culture and the target cultures in terms of the amount of substantiating proof.
4. Students recognize that each culture has culture-conditioned images and culture-specific connotations of some words, phrases, proverbs, idiomatic formulations, gestures, etc.
5. Students identify types of causes (linguistic and nonlinguistic) for cultural misunderstanding within intercultural communication.

**Strategies for teaching intercultural competence**

Frank (2013:6-10) and Shrum & Glisan (2010: 161) state that English language teachers help their students become intercultural competent through building "culturally friendly" classroom using the following strategies:

1. Exploring language learning materials i.e. critically evaluate images and descriptions of cultures in locally produced textbooks and images of other cultures in local and imported ELT textbooks

2. Exploring the traditional media and arts through English to critically explore images of local and other cultures.

3. Exploring IT/ electronic media (Web quests) to explore cultural representations daily routines, school and interests and compare these data to their own responses.

4. Use of authentic documents: students discover information dealing with practices and products by analyzing authentic documents, such as restaurant ads, bus/subway schedules, invitations..

5. Learning centers (Cultural islands): area of the classroom that contains materials and directions for a specific learning task, such as a game, an interpretive listening activity or reading task.

6. Critical incidents and problem solving: are descriptions of incidents or situations, which demand that a participant in the interaction make some kind of decision.

**From process to post-process approach**

The term ‘post-process’ was first mentioned by White Trimbur (1994). Trimbur (1994, as cited in Matsuda, 2003: 79) indicates that the term 'post' in Post-Process reflects the social turn of the 1980s post-cognitive theory and pedagogy that treats literacy as an ideological field and writing as a cultural activity through which learners relate themselves to their own and others' personalities and behaviors. McComiskey (2000: 42) refers to the 'post' as a 'Social-Process Rhetorical Inquiry' represented in writing classes in the form of cultural questions based on the cycle of cultural production, contextual distribution, and critical consumption. Kent (1999) highlights that the most distinguished aspect of post-process approach is that it stresses the importance of understanding the writing act as public, interpretive, and situated. In this regard it is against the static application of the process approach.

**Principles of post-process approach:**

1. **Writing as a public act and communicative interaction:** Kent (1999) states that the writing act is conceived in this respect as a socio-cultural and public venture that attack the boundaries between the personal and the social through tasks that give students the chance to anticipate the viewpoints of other students (audience). Writing is not a monolithic and static action but an engaging, dynamic and public dialogue with other language users (students).

2. **Writing is interpretive:** writing is a continuous process of interpretation and making sense of the surrounding world from both the writer and the reader as well. They are purposefully interested in listening to each other’s digressive utterances about the addressed topic, issue or experience in the world**.**

3. **Writing is situated:** writers are always situated in relation to other language users (audience). They are always engaged in anticipating how their discursive utterances will be perceived, interpreted and understood by others. “One’s socio-culturally and historically pre-dispositioned codes and values help in interpret and understanding the other (reader/audience) and making written utterances comprehensible and meaningful to those who do not share the same code and values.

4. **Writing as a cultural activity:** Trimbur (1994:113) and Elgeddawy (2006, p.14) argue that post process approach to writing is similar to reading and writing a cross

cultures. they describe post process theory in terms of an open-ended pedagogy that may draw on culturalism, multiculturalism, critical literacy, dialogism and any other pedagogic content that may help writers understand their identities

**Background of the problem**

In spite of the importance of presentational communication skills and their role in the overall preparation of the model language teacher, in Egypt, teaching productive language skills at college level has remained confined to teaching certain technical aspects and process based activities with little regard for other higher-level concerns such as public writing/speaking. This is thought to be due to the exam system which requires the traditional written/oral format of specific tasks to test language forms. It may also be due to the prevailing idea that acquiring some command or knowledge of phonology, syntax, vocabulary and semantics leads necessarily to the development of the presentational mode. They are also neglected by students themselves as long as they know they will not be tested on them. Accordingly, practicing the presentational communication skills is either partially ignored or completely neglected.

Also, intercultural competence represented in understanding and demonstrating awareness of the dynamic relationship between English and its diverse sociocultural settings has not received the appropriate level of attention by Egyptian prospective teachers' educational institutions. According to this view, EFL learners and teachers face several problems: being forced to express and deal with a culture of which they have no experience. Second, the feeling of alienation, developing a new identity what Byram (1997) calls "otherness". Such problems result in negative impact on language learning represented in reluctance to learning and difficulty in understanding literary texts. Due to the previously indicated reasons and purposes the researcher was motivated to carry out this study and felt the need for it.

**Hypotheses of the study**

1. There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment group participants on the pre and post-administrations of the oral presentational communication test in overall oral presentational communication skill as well as in each of its sub-skills in favor of the - post-testing scores.

2. There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment group participants on the pre and post-administrations of the written presentational communication test in overall written presentational communication skill as well as in each of its sub-skills in favor of the post-testing scores.

3. There is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment group participants on the pre and post-administrations of the intercultural communication situation test and scale in favor of the post-testing scores.

**Significance of the study**

This study could contribute in:

- Allowing English prospective teachers the space and time to practice the presentational communication skills and begin to apply them to different educational and life situations. Hence be good models for their students.
- Drawing the attention of instructors, methodologists and curriculum designers to the importance of post-process approach in providing opportunities for enhancing the presentational communication skills and in promoting prospective teachers' intercultural awareness.
- Paving a way for teachers who teach large classes to make use of the suggested program. That suggests that structuring oral/writing classes to facilitate cooperative learning activities may allow more interaction.
- Providing English teachers and professionals with a program in which language, presentational communication skills and intercultural communication competence are interrelated and have the same level of importance.

**METHODOLOGY AND METHODS**

**The pilot study**

To come to a closer identification of the problem, a pilot study was conducted by the researcher. The pilot study came in three main steps. First, the researcher interviewed a group of professors and lecturers (n=8) at faculty of Education by asking them about the position of culture and mainly intercultural competence in the English courses they have taught, most of them, especially professors of literature, clarified that culture is rooted and restricted to the literary texts they teach. They stated that only when students fail to understand the context of the texts they try to provide them with hints about the cultural associations related to the subject. Concerning the presentational communication skills, most of the professors and lecturers (90%) argued that there is not enough time to train students on presentation skills especially with large classes they teach. Second, the researcher conducted a semi-structured interview in which English prospective teachers (30) were asked about the opportunities they have to be trained on and practice their presentational skills. Also, they were asked about their background about intercultural competence and how far they have exposure to it throughout their study courses. Results

of the interview revealed that: Most of the students (78%) considered their study courses to be inadequate in improving their presentational skills and intercultural awareness. Also, students expressed their desire to participate in a training program that involves them in cultural discussions that enlighten their intercultural awareness. Finally, the researcher administered the written and the oral presentational tests and the intercultural competence situation test and scale (see appendices C & D) to a random sample of third year English prospective teachers to assess their level in presentational communication and intercultural communication competence. The results showed that the majority of students (91%) lacked the enough confidence and appropriate organizational and presentational skills to express their ideas; and eighty four percent (84%) of students lack intercultural awareness. Such conditions encouraged the researcher to conduct this study.

**Design**

The present study is partially experimental and partially analytical. The one-group pre-/post-test quasi-experimental design was used to investigate the actual effectiveness of the proposed training program on the oral and written presentational communication skills as well as intercultural competence.

**Limitations**

The present study was limited to:

- A group of 36 students enrolled at the English section, faculty of education, Helwan University. They were chosen because they were expected to have more language input than the first and second year students. Also, there were only 17 students registered in the fourth year.
- A colleague (PHD holder) who assisted the researcher as a rater in assessing participants' performance in the oral and written presentation tests.

**Participants**

A group of 36 prospective Egyptian prospective Teachers of English (27 female, 9 male) participated. The researcher selected the participants from the third year on a voluntary basis, English department, basic education, Helwan University. All participants ranged in age from 21 to 22 years. The students had similar educational backgrounds. They were of different levels of intelligibility; this enabled the good to help the poor and made different and various levels of interactions in the classroom.

**Duration:**

The experimental treatment was provided to the participants within the framework of 12 training sessions (3 hours each) over 6 weeks (two sessions a week) during the second term of the academic year 2013-2014.

**Instruments of the study**

The present study made use of the following instruments:

1. An oral presentational communication test. It was divided into two sections. section one: each student is asked to read a short passage that tackled one of the intercultural communication topics in two minutes or listen to a lecture on the same topic (one minute and 20 seconds) after that he/she has 3 minutes to summarize and explain facts presented in the reading or the lecture presenting his/her opinion on the issue. Section two required students in threes give a presentation (10 minutes) about previously selected topic of interest (one week before the test), using power point supported with audio, Video, pictures, photos (see appendix A for the oral presentational scoring rubric).

2. A written presentational communication test. The test consists of two writing sections. In the first section, students write a journal article for a local newspaper about only one of two given topics, using examples and illustrations to support their message. Section two required students in threes prepare a poster or brochure about a previously selected intercultural communication topic of interest (one week before the test), supported with pictures, photos, figures and/or tables. No restriction was given on the length of their writing, more freedom to express them as much as they could (see appendix B for the written presentational rubric),

3. Intercultural communication competence situation test. The test consisted of (14) situations each situation asked students to state three actions/suggestions they have to do in such a situation. The test measured the following aspects of intercultural communication competence: openness to interact, ambiguity to tolerance, flexibility in behavior, emotional stability, social initiative, empathy, and self-efficacy. (see appendix C), and

4. Intercultural communication competence scale. It included (28) items. The scores given to the positive items were 5-4-3-2-1, while the negative items were given 1-2-3-4-5 (see appendix D).

**The training program**

The program's sessions are run as Task based/interactive workshops with all the members enthusiastically involved in preparing for their presentations and then publish their work to the intended audience. The researcher provides the writing topics though the participants are always free to make suggestions, which they do very often. Since oral/ written presentational communication in the light of the post process is largely a way of writing/speaking rather than writing on or speaking about a given subject, students are directed to be aware of three types of competencies that should be demonstrated in their composition and presentation: subject competency, organizational and linguistic competency, and audience awareness. The presentation topics have great variety i.e. Why intercultural competence?, Types and stereotypes, profiling national cultures, Profiling group cultures, establishing intercultural social contact – positive communication – multi-channeling – developing intercultural competence (dos and don'ts). The program procedures, from session two to session twelve, as diagramed below (fig 1), emphasize performance at seven stages of an experiential cycle:


Figure 1. Procedures of the training sessions

1. Analyze (forming intentions). Students are asked to analyze in groups the assigned task, in terms of intended outcome and targeted audience (Think about who will be listening to or reading your work), and take notes.
2. Search related/available sources. Students are asked to collect data through library research, internet and field trips. They have to take notes, and critically evaluate the ideas of others to formulate their knowledge about a specific intercultural topic.
3. Discuss in groups (discussion circles). Students discuss reached information/data and relate it to the task and targeted audience. They also try to relate the targeted cultures to their own through comparing and contrasting reaching adaptation level according to the intercultural communication competence. Students are also instructed to have a

clear understanding of what they expect their readers to do with the writing/speech, taking into account the constraints (personal, material, time, system, etc.) that they are expected to face while writing and speaking about the intended topic.

4. Design (oral or/and written presentation). Students start to give shape to the skeletal structure prepared before writing. They have to consider first, how content is given linguistic expression (through definition, description, explanation, classification, generalization, comparison, contrast, and hypothesis, etc. second, how thought connectors are used. Third, how a formal discourse is organized. Finally, how sub-headings, diagrams, tables, and charts can be used in the final layout of the composition poster.
5. Rehearse/review. In this stage writers/presenters reexamine their first draft along with the peer evaluation checklist and consider peer comments while writing/preparing the final draft. In some cases, students may have to reconsider their decisions in the first stage regarding scope, purpose, audience, and framework, and revise the draft accordingly.
6. Publish. Participants give a presentation and/or publish a brochure, poster, journal article to the real targeted audience. (Note: Prior to this stage there are many administrative and security issues to be done by the researcher to facilitate participants' mission).
7. Reflect. The final product (e.g. Travel brochures or posters or presentations) produced by the students could be the basis for a discussion about comments of the audience. Participants are encouraged to reflect on the whole experience and write what they have learned and what they intended to improve in the next presentation.

**RESULTS**

Analysis of data in the present study depended on quantitative and qualitative parts.

**Quantitative data:** The results of the study are presented by relating them to the study hypotheses.

**Verifying the first hypothesis**, t-tests for paired samples were used. The t-test results revealed statistically significant difference at 0.01 level between the mean scores of the treatment group students on the pre- and post-administrations of the oral presentational communication test in overall oral presentational communication performance (t value = 42.43) and its sub-skills in favor of the post-testing scores (see table 1). Also the proposed training program proved to have a large effect size on the required oral presentational communication performance in general and on each sub-skill in particular.

| Skills | Pre-Test M (*SD*) | | Post-Test M (*SD*) | | MD | T value | Sig level | Effect size ($\eta^2$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Content** | 2.89 | *(0.32)* | 4.00 | *(0.00)* | 1.111 | 20.917 | .0001 | .93 |
| **2. Clarity/ organization** | 2.25 | *(0.44)* | 3.47 | *(0.51)* | 1.222 | 13.569 | .0001 | .84 |
| **3. Delivery/style** | 1.97 | *(0.29)* | 3.64 | *(0.49)* | 1.667 | 20.917 | .0001 | .93 |
| **4. Effective language** | 2.56 | *(0.50)* | 3.94 | *(0.23)* | 1.389 | 15.174 | .0001 | .87 |
| **5. Posture/physical appearance** | 2.14 | *(0.35)* | 3.03 | *(0.17)* | .889 | 16.733 | .0001 | .89 |
| **6. Visual aids** | 2.67 | *(0.48)* | 3.69 | *(0.47)* | 1.028 | 12.180 | .0001 | .81 |
| **7. Enthusiasm/audi enceawareness** | 1.17 | *(0.38)* | 3.14 | *(0.35)* | 1.972 | 31.395 | .0001 | .97 |
| **overall performance** | 15.72 | *(1.77* | 24.44 | *(1.40)* | 8.722 | 42.439 | .0001 | .98 |

`***Table 1*** t-test results comparing the pre-test VS post-test means for the treatment group subjects in overall oral presentational communication and its skills (N=36, *df*=35)

**Verifying the second hypothesis**. In order to determine the relative extent of change fostered by the implementation of the proposed training program from the pre-test till the post-test for the treatment group in overall written presentational communication skill as well as in its sub-skills a t-test for paired samples was used. The t-test results proved that there were statistically significant differences at 0.01 level between the mean scores of the pre-and post-administrations of the written presentational communication test in overall written presentational communication performance as well as its sub-skills (see table 2). Moreover all the effect sizes were very large. Therefore the second hypothesis was accepted.

| Skills | Pre-Test M (*SD*) | | Post-Test M (*SD*) | | MD | T value | Sig level | Effect size ($\eta^2$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Topic/Content** | 3.28 | (*0.45*) | 4.00 | *(0.00)* | .722 | 9.539 | .0001 | .72 |
| **2. Organization/ logic** | 2.81 | (*0.40*) | 3.89 | *(0.32)* | 1.083 | 13.000 | .0001 | .82 |
| **3. Research analysis/ sources** | 2.75 | (*0.44*) | 3.69 | *(0.47)* | .944 | 11.936 | .0001 | .80 |
| **4. Effective language** | 2.53 | (*0.56*) | 3.22 | *(0.42)* | .694 | 7.940 | .0001 | .64 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5. Aesthetics/visual aids** | 2.81 | (*0.40*) | 3.97 | *(0.17)* | 1.167 | 18.520 | .0001 | .91 |
| **6. Suitability for purpose & audience** | 1.92 | (*0.28*) | 3.44 | *(0.50)* | 1.528 | 16.372 | .0001 | .88 |
| **overall performance** | 16.08 | (*1.25*) | 22.25 | *(1.03)* | 6.167 | 53.090 | .0001 | .99 |

***Table 2*** t-test results comparing the pre-test VS post-test means for the treatment group subjects in overall written presentational communication and its skills (N=36, *df*=35)

**Verifying the third hypothesis.** To determine the relative extent of change fostered by the implementation of the proposed program from the pre-test to the post-test for the treatment group concerning intercultural communication competence, t-test for paired samples was used. This t-test aimed at comparing the mean scores of the treatment group on the pre-VS the post- administration of the intercultural communication competence situation test and scale (see table 3).

| **Skills** | **Pre-Test M (*SD*)** | | **Post-Test M (*SD*)** | | **MD** | **T value** | **Sig level** | **Effect size ($\eta^2$)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Situation test** | 26.53 | (*2.92*) | 40.03 | *(1.32)* | 13.500 | 33.307 | .0001 | .97 |
| **Scale** | 103.53 | (*7.05*) | 168.72 | *(5.66)* | 65.194 | 77.327 | .0001 | .99 |

***Table 3*** t-test results comparing the pre- test VS the post-test means of the treatment group in intercultural communication competence (N=36, *df*=35)

Table (3) shows that there is statistically significant difference at 0.01 level in intercultural communication competence in favor of the post-testing scores since the estimated t-values were (33.307) for the situation test and (77.327) for the scale. In addition, the estimated effect size values (0.97 and 0.99) shown in the table indicates that the program had a very large effect on the treatment group students' intercultural communication competence on the post-test as compared to their performance on the pre-test.

**Qualitative data**

Beside the quantitative results mentioned previously, there were qualitative results reflected through analyzing participants' classroom performances, comments as well as their reflections after each session. Participants reported that they felt the instructional techniques used in the proposed program sessions differ largely in nature from those used

in their regular classes. In particular, they enthusiastically reported that creating more time for practice improved their proficiency in public speaking/writing. Also, they highlighted the significance of studying different cultures through discussions and presentations that helped them in bridging the gap between these cultures and their own. Omnia, one of the participants, emphasized this saying "our intercultural competence leads us to more critical thinking as citizens with political and social understanding of our own and other communities"

Moreover, participants admitted that their uncertainty and negative or low attitudes and stereotype were due to the lack of contact with foreign cultures. One student put it, "I used to consider that the western culture is a collection of bad behaviors". Some participants found intercultural communication activities make the language class more interesting. Esraa added that "By comparing how others behave and the difference between our culture and their cultures, we started to accept the otherness of the target culture away from stereotypes and making judgments". Omar comments on the program saying "during the program we had voice and speak openly through having the opportunity to decide what we want to do. Issues of power and choice are left to us as presenters."

## DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

### Participants' performance in oral and written presentational communication skills

The proposed training program proved to have a large effect size on the required oral and written presentational communication skills. Yet there were varieties in its effect size from one oral/written presentation sub-skill to another as follows: in oral presentation enthusiasm and audience awareness had the largest effect size followed by delivery/style and content, posture/physical appearance, effective language, clarity and organization and finally visual aids. The largest effect size in the written presentational communication skills occurred in Aesthetics/visual aids Followed by suitability for purpose and audience, organization/logic, research analysis and finally effective language.

It seems that post-process approach encouraged the participants to build their own strategies for planning, identifying the characteristics and demands of the expected audience before composing and presenting, focus on content meaning rather than form, use visual aids and eye contact that explain and reinforce the presentation , be relieved from worrying about making corrections and be engaged in anticipating how their discursive utterances will be perceived, interpreted and understood by the expected audience which in turn enhanced their written presentational performance and public

speaking; this is consistent with literature and research that declare post-process approach as a socio-cultural and public venture that attack the boundaries between the personal and the social through tasks that give students the chance to anticipate the viewpoints of the audience (Elgeddawy, 2006; Kent, 1999; Mastuda, 2003; and Mcchomiskey, 2000). Also, this agrees with Experimental studies (Roca et al.2006, Storch & Wigglesworth, 2008) which stressed on the importance of audience in teaching and learning presentational communication rather than activities to practice language forms.

**Participants' performance in intercultural competence**

The study results revealed that the participants performed significantly better on the post application of the intercultural communication competence situation test and scale as compared to their performance on the pre application. This progress might be attributed to some factors like:

1. The application of intercultural task based training sessions related to: social identity, social interaction at different levels, belief and behavior, socio-political institutions, media, arts and language variation, enriched participants' knowledge, experience and awareness of the target cultures and led them to a more critical understanding of their own and other communities. This was supported by Moran (2001:19) who states that it is necessary to incorporate cultural knowing with culture experience, as all learning is experience. Also, Frank (2013:11) argues that in intercultural based activities classroom, teachers have to incorporate a framework that enables students to understand the social interaction aspects of different cultures instead of introducing traditional holidays, food and folk songs of each target culture
2. Using various resources in studying the target cultures e.g. authentic materials to some aspects of the everyday foreign cultures and task based activities serve as a springboard into the real world of experiential intercultural interaction and gain cultural understanding. Students tried to put themselves in the place of others to think out such issues. As many researchers e.g., Frank (2013) and Shrum & Glisan (2010), have shown that multimedia offers the possibility of developing the sociocultural competence of language learners more readily than the pages of a textbook, or the four walls of a classroom.

All These positive results of the study could also be due to the following reasons:

- The cyclical form of the training sessions stages (see figure 1). This design led to providing the participants with continuous evaluation and giving them an immediate

feedback which helped them greatly in integrating and developing both their intercultural competence through searching and discussion; and presentational communication skills through practicing and actual publishing for their work followed by reflection that feeds in the following presentation.

- The learning environment represented in the friendly atmosphere i.e. participants with high motivation and high achievements were helping those who had little self confidence.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings, there is a necessity to provide the following elements in the foreign language classroom that aims at improving presentational communication skills and/or intercultural communication competence:

- Stressing the Socio-linguists and anthropologists' views of Language and culture relation as interrelated and intertwined,
- EFL educators should not only work to dispel stereotypes but also to contribute to learners' understanding of self first then awareness of others,
- A well prepared teacher who masters different aspects of the target language cultures as well as his own culture,
- An interactive environment that models and presents a variety of social, linguistic, and cognitive tools for structuring and interpreting participation public presentations,
- The use of authentic language combined with thought provoking drama/video that broadens intercultural competence and improves EFL learning,
- Intercultural-based tasks that are purposeful and meaningful to the learner and that parallel real-life situation in which they might expect to communicate with people from different culture,
- The necessity of providing students with an audience other than the teacher in practicing presentational communication skills,

Based on findings of the present study the following further studies are recommended:

1. Explore the effectiveness of post-process approach in developing interpersonal communication skills.

2. Investigate the effect of developing intercultural communication competence on developing problem solving and decision making skills.
3. investigate the effect of developing presentational communication skills on teaching performance and self efficacy of prospective teachers

**REFERENCES**


Abousenna, M. (1994). Cultural Dialogue through literature. *CDELT National Symposium on English Language Teaching in Egypt* (pp.205- 282). Cairo: Ain Shams University.

Baker, W. (2009). The cultures of English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly* 43 (4), 567-92.

Baker,W. (2012). From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: culture in ELT. *ELT Journal* 66(1), 62-70.

Braine, G. (2001). A Study of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Writers on a Local- Area Network (LAN) and in Traditional Classes. *Computers and Composition, 18*(3), 275. Retrieved May 29, 2014 from https://www.learntechlib.org/p/92680/.

Byram, M. (1994). *Culture and language learning in higher education*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.

Byram, M. (1997).*Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Chen, G. (2010). *A Study of Intercultural Communication Competence*. Hong Kong: Review Academic Publishers Limited.

Dodd,C.H. (1998). *Dynamics of intercultural communication*. New York:McGraw-hill .

Elgeddawy, A. (2006). The post-process movement in rhetoric and composition: A philosophical Hermeneutic reading of being in the world with others. PhD Dissertation, school of graduate studies and research Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

El-Koumy, A. (1994). Teachers' willingness and preparedness to deal with the foreign cultural issues in the classroom. P*roceedings of the 13th*

*National Symposium on English LanguageTeaching in Egypt* (pp.189-206). Ain Shams University, Cairo: CDELT

Frank, J. (2013). Raising Cultural Awareness in the English Language Classroom. English. *Teaching Forum*, 51 (4), 2-11.

George, D. (2002). From Analysis to Design: Visual Communication in the Teaching of Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (Sep., 2002), pp. 11-39

Hamm, H. (2006). *Teaching and Persuasive Communication: Class Presentation Skills*. *A handbook for faculty, teaching assistants and teaching fellows*. Providence : The Harriet W. Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning Brown University.

Hammer R. , Bennett J., Wiseman R., (2003). Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 27 (2), 421–443.

Hammer, M. R. (1999a). Cross-cultural training: the research connection. In S. M. Fowler, &M. G. Mumford(Ed s.). *The intercultural sourcebook*, Vol. 2 (pp. 1–18). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Essex , England: longman

Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (2001). Factors Relating to EFL Writers' Discourse Level Revision Skills. *International Journal of English Studies* 1(2):71-101 DOI:10.6018/ijes.1.2.48111

Khaldieh, S. (2000). Learning strategies and writing processes of proficient vs. less proficient learners of Arabic. *Foreign Language Annals*, 3(33): 522-534.

Kealey, D. J. (1996). The challenge of international personnel selection. In D. Landis, & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training (2nded .) (pp. 81–105). Thousand Oaks,CA: Sage.

Kelly, M. (1998) "Towards an Intercultural Practice of Language Teaching" in Killick D. & M. Parry (eds) (1999) Languages for Cross-cultural Capability

Kent, Thomas (1999). *Post-Process Theory: Beyond the Writing Process Paradigm*. USA: Southern Illinois University.

Matsuda, P. Kei. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century. A situated history perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed) *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 15 – 34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McComiskey, B. (2000). *Teaching composition as a social process*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Moran, P. (2001). *Teaching culture: Perspectives in practice*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London: routledge.

Porto, M. (2010). Culturally responsive L2 education: an awareness-raising proposal. *ELT Journal*, 64(1), 45-53.

Qawasmi, N. (2003). Developing foreign language cultural understanding and awareness for students of English at Hebron University Palestine. Unpublished PH.D Dissertation, Faculty of Education, Ain Shams University, Egypt.

Quappe, S. Giovanna, C. (2010). "What is Cultural Awareness, anyway? How do I build it?" retrived from http://www.culturosity.com/pdfs/What%20is%20Cultural%20Awareness accessed on 10/3/2014

Richards, J. ( 2011). *Competence and performance in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University press

Roberts, C., Byram, M., Barro, A. Jordan, S. & B. Street (2001). Language learners as ethnographers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Robinson, N. (2012). "The Relationship Between Teacher Cultural Competency and Student Engagement". Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 553. https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/553

Roca de Larios, J., Manchón, R. M., & Murphy, L. (2006). Generating text in native and foreign language writing: A temporal analysis of problem-solving formulation processes. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 100-114.

Roell, C. (2010). Intercultural training with films. English teaching forum, 48 (2), 2-15.

Scrivener J. (2004). *Learning teaching: a guidebook for English language teachers*. London: Macmillan.

Shrum, J. & Glisan, E. (2010). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction*. Boston, USA: Heinle, Cengage Learning 4th ed.

Sinor, J., & Huston, M. (2004). The role of ethnography in the post-process writing classroom. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 31(4), 369– 382

Schulz, R. A. (2007) The challenge of assessing cultural understanding in the context of foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(1), 9-26.

Straub, H. (1999). Designing a cross-cultural course. English Forum, July-September.

Suzuki, A. (2010). Introducing diversity of English into ELT: student teachers' responses. *ELT journal*, 65 (2), 145-53

Teaching and Educational Development Institute, University of Queensland, Australia (2011). Presentational skills for teachers

Thanasoulas, D. (2001). The importance of teaching culture in the foreign language classroom. *Radical pedagogy*, 3 (3), 1-21.

Trimbur, J. (1994) Taking the social turn: Teaching Writing Post – Process. *College Composition and Communication*. 45 (2), 108 – 118

Utley D. (2011). *Intercultural resource book: intercultural communication resources for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 7th ed.

Zhang, X. (2011). On Interpreters' Intercultural Awareness. *World Journal of English Language*. 1(1), April 2011. doi:10.5430/wjel.v1n1p47

## Appendix A: The oral presentation scoring rubric

| Achievement level | Content | Clarity/organization | Delivery/style | Effective language | Posture/ physical appearance | Graphics/use of visual aids | Enthusiasm/audience awareness |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4-excellent** | -Rich and reflective<br>-communicates interesting & valuable information<br>-Supported with sufficient reasons, examples and details<br>-answers all audience questions in detail | -Clear stated purpose & subject<br>-creative and engaging introduction<br>-logical and interesting development of ideas<br>-smooth and clear transitions. Audience can easily follow<br>-effective conclusion | -Spontaneous delivery that holds attention of entire audience<br>-effective use of direct eye contact<br>-use notes effectively<br>-speaks with clarity and variation in volume &inflection during the entire presentation,<br>-mispronounce no words.<br>-Rarely interruptions or clarification are required | -Sophisticated and varied language that suit the topic & the audience. Clear and<br>- discerning words, expressions and sentence structures.<br>-few noticeable grammatical errors without any effect on the meaning. | -Dress professionally<br>-Stands up straight<br>-high self confidence<br>-Effective use of gestures that significantly enhance speakers words<br>-Moves around the room appropriately | -Use various visual aids that effectively explain and reinforce presentation | -shows strong enthusiasm about the topic during entire presentation.<br>-Significantly increases audience understanding & knowledge of the topic<br>-interact professionally with the audience (ice-breaking, sense of humor, etc) |
| **3- good** | -Sufficiently addresses the required elements of the presentation topic.<br>-Answers audience questions but without elaboration | -Somewhat clear purpose and subject<br>-Clear attempt to organize the presentation using: beginning, middle and end in which the main points are reviewed | -consistent use of eye contact<br>-Using notes occasionally interrupt the flow of the presentation.<br>-Speaks with satisfactory clarity and variation of tone, pace & inflection.<br>-Mispronounce 2 words<br>-Occasional seek for clarification/ interruption from the audience | -Appropriate language but with less expressiveness.<br>-Appropriate vocabulary but 1-2 words might be strange to the audience.<br>-Few grammatical errors, but only one or two major errors cause confusion. | -Stands up straight<br>-Use gestures at some points to enhance speaker's words | -Visual aids relate to the presentation topic | -Shows some enthusiastic feeling about the topic<br>-Raises audience understanding and awareness of most points<br>- interact with audience comments with ease |
| **2-fair** | -outwardly addresses the basic elements of the topic<br>-hardily answers some primal questions | -Purpose and main idea is evident, yet there are some discrepancies in organization<br>-Weak examples, facts.<br>-conflict use of transitions that make it difficult for the audience to follow the presentation. | -Reads mostly from the notes<br>-displays minimal eye contact with the audience<br>-speaks in uneven volume with little or no inflection<br>-Mispronounce 3 words<br>-Many clarification/ interruption from the audience | -Sometimes Word choice lacks originality & fails to convey meaning (2-3 words).<br>-Many basic grammatical and word order errors that makes comprehension quite difficult. | -Sometimes stands up straight but struggle to do so<br>-Gestures are used sparingly and do not always enhance speaker's words. | -<br>Occasionally use visual aids that rarely support text and presentation | -Shows little or mixed feelings about the topic<br><br>-Raises audience understanding & knowledge of some points.<br>- attempts to interact with the audience reactions |
| **1-Needs improvement** | -Either too general or overwhelm with too many specifics.<br>-Out of topic/irrelevant information | -Unclear purpose,<br>-Irrelevant introduction<br>-Lack of organization<br>-Insufficient support of ideas<br>-No conclusion | -Seldom speaks with clarity,<br>-just reading from notes<br>-No eye contact with the audience<br>-speaks in monotonous tone<br>-Mispronounce more | -Use several words or phrases (more than 3) that are not understood by the audience.<br>-Major grammatical & word order | -Hide behind podium<br>-Gestures rarely/ never used | -Use superfluous visual aids or no visual aids | -Shows no interest in the topic<br>-Fails to increase audience understanding & interest<br>–No interaction with the audience<br>-Audience cannot |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | than 3 words Comprehension is impossible even when the listener interrupts | errors that stops comprehension. | | | understand the presentation |

## Appendix (B) the written presentation scoring rubric

| Achievement level | Topic/content | Organization/logic | Research analysis/appropriate sources & format | Effective language | Aesthetics/visual aids | Suitability for audience/awareness of reader's needs |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4-Excellent** | -Exceptional understanding of topic with explanation & elaboration.<br>-Ideas professionally developed using well chosen examples and creative details<br>- Evidence is supported with interpretations | Structure is highly clear & appropriate to the task type<br>-meaningful introduction & conclusion<br>-logical progression & development of ideas<br>-effective transition between ideas that enhance reader's understanding<br>-effective conclusion that highly impact the reader | variety of professional information sources<br>- clear & correct documentation following required forms<br>-format aspects enhance presentation impact | -Variety of accurate & concise syntax and vocabulary<br>-No grammar or spelling or punctuation errors | Final text Format is proportionate (heading styles, fonts, margins, white spaces, etc.<br>effective format of all figures and graphs<br>-captions effectively communicate content | -Content structure & delivery were professionally matched to readers needs& the purpose (informing, interesting, persuading)<br>-professionally addresses all readers questions and/or objections<br>-readers are definitely persuaded to consider presented ideas.<br>-use a variety of stylistic & other techniques (images, graphics, and tabular information) to engage reader interest. |
| **3-good** | sufficient understanding of topic with relevant thesis statement<br>-relevant information<br>-clear explanation of most points but with some unsupported arguments | -Structure is clear & appropriate to the task type.<br>-topic introduced clearly<br>-ideas expressed adequately<br>-transitions between ideas not always effective<br>-effective sequence of ideas<br>-Appropriate conclusion | -Appropriate information sources, sometimes lacks variety<br>-Minor inadequacies in reference<br>-flawed documentation<br>- appropriate format followed | -occasional evidence of clear & coherent use of syntax & vocabulary<br>- 1 error in grammar and/or spelling and/or punctuation | -Format is generally proportionate<br>-Captions successfully communicate content | -content structure and delivery tailored to the audience and intended purpose.<br>-Addresses most of readers needs and/or concerns<br>-makes no unreasonable demands<br>- Readers are probably persuaded to consider the presented ideas |
| **2-fair** | -adequate understanding of the topic that requires the audience to make assumptions<br>-thesis statement is present<br>-only basic concepts are presented & interpreted<br>-content occasionally not relevant, lacks accuracy & focus | -Limited structure<br>-Unclear topic sentence<br>-Introduction & conclusion are present-<br>-ideas sometimes obscure<br>-occasional links between ideas | -Appropriate information sources, sometimes lacks accuracy or relevance<br>-Inadequate list of references Documentation highly flawed<br>-format errors | -Vocabulary and language choices not always appropriate to the text type, purpose & audience<br>- 2 errors in Grammatical and/or spelling and/or punctuation | -repeated digression from required format<br>-Captions are ineffective in communicating content | Content structure and delivery to some extent tailored to the audience and intended purpose.<br>-Doesn't override the reader<br>-use at least one technique to engage reader interest (image or graphic or table). |
| **1-needs improvement** | -Confused purpose ,thesis statement is distorted or missing<br>-Content not relevant | -Lacks introduction and/or conclusion<br>-unclear ideas<br>-Incoherent organization | -inappropriate information sources -Very few references<br>-No reference system used<br>-Multiple format used that make | - inaccurate use of vocabulary<br>-many incomplete sentences.<br>-Several spelling and/or punctuation | - required format is not followed<br>-no captions | - Presentation content structure and delivery inappropriately expresses the writer's purpose and gives little attention to audience needs.<br>-No use of techniques to engage the reader<br>-readers are not persuaded to |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | reading difficult | errors that hinders reading | | consider the text's ideas |

## Appendix (D) the intercultural communication competence scale - sample

| N | Items | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | Cultural diversity brings a collective strength that can benefit all of humanity. | | | | | |
| **2** | I approach cultural differences between foreigners and Arabs in a non-judgmental way | | | | | |
| **3** | Learning how to interact properly with people from other cultures is not interesting for me | | | | | |
| **4** | Creativity of the team increases if people from different cultures are present. | | | | | |
| **5** | Perceiving people of the same culture as all being the same is not acceptable | | | | | |
| **6** | Viewing people from their cultural perspectives is helpful when working on a multicultural team. | | | | | |
| **7** | Studying intercultural communication is a must for English language (as lingua franca) learners | | | | | |
| **8** | I am interested in studying cultures of other countries | | | | | |
| **9** | Decision making depends on the social system of where the person is from. | | | | | |
| **10** | Observation/studying about different cultures allows us to form successful multi-communication patterns | | | | | |
| **11** | Generalization capture similarities and hide differences in cultures | | | | | |
| **12** | Foreign cultures often conflicts with my culture | | | | | |
| **13** | I accept people from other cultures only when they act according to my values not theirs. | | | | | |
| **14** | I tend to develop closer relationships with team members from my own country than with team members from other countries. | | | | | |
| **15** | Dealing with and managing cultural uncertainties is troublesome. | | | | | |
| **16** | I feel uncomfortable communicating/ working with people from different countries. | | | | | |
| **17** | I engage in a meaningful dialogue with people from other countries in the same way as with people from my own country. | | | | | |
| **18** | I acknowledge differences in communication and interaction styles when working with people from different countries. | | | | | |
| **19** | Working with people from different cultures is exciting. | | | | | |
| **20** | Dealing with cultural differences is a frustrating process. | | | | | |