

HEMŞİRELİK ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN KÜLTÜREL FARKINDALIK VE KÜLTÜRLERARASI DUYARLILIK DÜZEYLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ

Noor Kheder ABBAS

Bilim Uzmanı, University of Bağdat, Nursing Department, noorkederabbas@gmail.com, Bağdat, 0000-0002-5630-9221

Ayla ÜNSAL

Prof. Dr. University of Kırşehir Ahi Evran, Faculty of Health Science, Nursing Department, ay_unsal@hotmail.com, Kırşehir/Türkiye, 0000-0003-3319-1600

Öz

Hemşirelik öğrencileri, farklı kültürlerden gelen sağlıklı/hastalara bakım verirken ve farklı kültürlerden gelen öğrenci arkadaşlarıyla ve yurtdışında farklı kültürlerde tanıştıkları insanlarla iletişim kurarken belirli düzeyde kültürel farkındalığa ve kültürler arası duyarlılığa sahip olmalıdır. Bu doğrultuda yürütülen mevcut çalışmanın amacı, hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürel farkındalık ve kültürler arası duyarlılık düzeylerini belirlemektir. Tanımlayıcı çalışma, Kırşehir Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi Hemşirelik Bölümü'nde öğrenim gören 616 hemşirelik öğrencisi üzerinde yürütülmüştür. Veriler; Tanımlayıcı Özellikler Formu, Kültürler Arası Farkındalık Ölçeği (ICAS) ve Kültürler Arası Duyarlılık Ölçeği (ISS) kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Veri toplamadan önce, çalışmanın yürütüldüğü kurumdan kurumsal onay, etik kurul onayı ve öğrenci onamı alınmıştır. Verilerin analizinde sayılar, yüzdelere, ortalamalar, standart sapmalar, Cronbach alfa katsayısı, Kolmogorov-Smirnov ve Shapiro-Wilk testleri, bağımsız gruplar t-testi, tek yönlü ANOVA ve Pearson korelasyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmaya katılan öğrencilerin kültürel farkındalık düzeyi ($33,42 \pm 4,90$) çok yüksek olmamakla birlikte ortalama düzeyin üzerindedir. Çalışmadaki öğrencilerin kültürlerarası duyarlılık düzeyi ($84,14 \pm 8,00$) çok yüksek olmamakla birlikte ortalama düzeyin üzerindedir. Öğrencilerin kültürel farkındalıkları ile kültürlerarası duyarlılıkları arasında pozitif yönde bir ilişki olduğu, öğrencilerin kültürel farkındalıkları arttıkça kültürlerarası duyarlılıklarının da arttığı bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kültürel Farkındalık, Kültürlerarası Duyarlılık, Hemşirelik Öğrencileri, Kültür.

EXAMINATION of NURSING STUDENT'S CULTURAL AWARENESS and INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY LEVELS

Abstract

Nursing students should have a certain level of cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity while caring for the healthy/patients from different cultures and communicating with their fellow students from different cultures and people they meet in different cultures abroad. The aim of the present study conducted in this direction is to determine the levels of cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity of nursing students. The descriptive study was conducted on 616 nursing students who are studying at Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Nursing. The data were collected using the Descriptive Characteristics Form, Intercultural Awareness Scale (ICAS), and Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS). Prior to data collection, institutional approval, ethics committee approval, and student consent were obtained from the institution where the study was conducted. Data were analyzed using counts, percentages, means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alpha coefficient, Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests, independent groups t-test, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson correlation analysis. The level of cultural awareness of the students participating in the study (33.42 ± 4.90) was not very high, but it was above the average level. Although the level of intercultural sensitivity of the students in the present study (84.14 ± 8.00) was not very high, it was found to be above the average level. It was found that there was a positive relationship between students' cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity. It was found that as students' cultural awareness increased, their intercultural sensitivity also increased.

Keywords: Cultural awareness, Intercultural Sensitivity, Nursing Students, Culture.

1. INTRODUCTION

Culture is very important for individuals to sustain their lives and has a major impact on their health (1). Culture is the traditions, beliefs, values, attitudes, habits, and behaviors that are transmitted, learned, and shared from generation to generation as a result of human intellectual, religious, and emotional activities (2-4).

Culture is shaped by cultural awareness (CA). Cultural awareness is an attempt to understand the reasons for the beliefs of a different cultural group. It is also defined as awareness of the behaviors, expectations, perspectives, and values of group members and their actions (5). The individual's perception and identification with the culture of the society in which he/she lives, and different cultures indicate cultural awareness (6). With the increase in migration and globalization, people from different religions, ethnic backgrounds, and socioeconomic statuses are coming together on a global scale. In this way, different group interactions emerge. High levels of cultural awareness reduce individual biases in group interactions and increase positive communication (7).

Intercultural sensitivity (IS) is one of the skills that enables group interaction at the highest level (8). Intercultural sensitivity analyzes and evaluates cultural differences. It is also explained as an individual's ability to relate to others while feeling good (9). The expression "desires inspired by knowing, appreciating, and accepting intercultural differences" can be used for intercultural sensitivity. Intercultural sensitivity is the tendency of people to show their true sensitivity to cultural differences and their willingness to adjust their behavior according to these differences (10,11). Individuals with high intercultural sensitivity are those who are aware of their personality, have high moral sensitivity, have developed empathy skills, and are aware of their responsibilities (12). In this sense, cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity are concepts that exist at the core of nursing.

As the nurse's own cultural beliefs, values, and attitudes significantly influence his/her practice and nursing decisions, the cultural beliefs, values, and attitudes of individuals also have a strong influence on nursing care (13). Accordingly, the cultural beliefs and values of the nurse and the healthy/patient individual are an important part of comprehensive nursing care. In a globalized world, nurses need to be culturally competent to meet the cultural needs of society. Nursing education should include competencies focused on cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity (14,15). Educating health professionals about culture increases their knowledge about the subject, cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity. It also helps them to understand people from different cultures more easily and to improve their communication skills in this regard. On the other hand, it also removes the barriers for service users to access health services (16).

In order to provide individualized nursing care, it is necessary to train nurses with developed cultural awareness and high intercultural sensitivity (17). According to studies, it is known that nursing students are inadequate in terms of cultural interactions (18,19). It has been observed that students have difficulties in caring for people with different cultures, religious beliefs, and lifestyles (20). In order to provide effective care to ethnic groups, nursing students should be taught more about how to provide individualized nursing care (17).

In addition, nursing students are in constant contact with their international peers studying in their departments. With globalization, the number of students studying at universities outside their home countries is increasing every year (21). In addition, students may spend part of their education in different countries. In these cases, they are confronted with the concepts of cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity.

Thus, nursing education can be designed in this direction if the cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity levels of nursing students are known from their undergraduate years. Nursing students should have a certain level of cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity both when providing nursing care to healthy individuals/patients from different cultures and when communicating with fellow students from different cultures and people they meet in different cultures abroad. In addition, there is no study in the literature that examines both cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity in nursing students together. Based on these considerations, the present study was conducted to determine the level of cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity in nursing students.

2. METHOD

The present study was conducted between October 10 and 19, 2022, in the Department of Nursing of the Faculty of Health Sciences of Kırşehir Ahi Evran University in Kırşehir, which is located in the Central Anatolian region of Turkey. This department, which has a four-year undergraduate program, has been continuing its education since 1997. There are 18 academicians working in a department that provides education in two programs, both regular education (day) and evening education (night).

1.1. Sample

The research population consists of 758 students enrolled in the Department of Nursing of the Faculty of Health Sciences of Kırşehir Ahi Evran University in the academic year 2022-2023. Sample selection method was not used in this research. 616 nursing students (81.2% of the population) who were present in the classroom at the time of data collection and volunteered to participate in the research were included in the research.

1.2. Data Collection

The Descriptive Characteristics Form, the Intercultural Awareness Scale (ICAS), and the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) were used to collect the data. After the literature review, in the Descriptive Characteristics Form created by the researchers, there are a total of 18 questions in which nursing students' introductory characteristics (11 questions) and their knowledge of culture (seven questions) are questioned (15,22-25). This form was first applied to 20 students. As a result of this preliminary application, the clarity of the questions was tested. It was seen whether there was a question that was difficult to understand or if there were any misunderstood questions, and the survey questions were left as they were and 20 students were included in the scope of the research.

The Intercultural Awareness Scale (ICAS) was developed by Rozaimie et al. (26) and the validity and reliability study of the scale was made out by Yakar and Alpar (22). The scale is a scale consisting of 9 articles and 3 sub-dimensions. The existing intercultural awareness dimension of the scale consists of articles 1, 6, 8, 9, the perceived intercultural awareness dimension consists of items 3 and 5, cultural communication awareness dimension consists of articles 2, 4 and 7. It has 5-point Likert type scale. While the lowest score from the scale is 9, the highest score is 45. A low score from the scale indicates that individuals have intercultural differences (22).

The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) is a scale developed by Chen and Starosta (10) and includes five emotional dimensions necessary for intercultural sensitivity. The Turkish validity and reliability study of the scale was made by Bulduk et al. (15). The 24-articles scale Consists of the following sub-dimensions: responsibility in communication (1, 11, 13, 21,22,

23, 24), respect for cultural differences (2, 7, 8, 16, 18, 20), self-confidence in communication (3, 4, 5, 6, 10), enjoyment of communication (9, 12, 15) and being careful in communication (14, 17, 19). Articles 2, 4, 7, 9, 12, 1, 5, 18, 20, 22. of the scale are reverse coded. The scale has 5-point Likert type and its point range is between 24-120. There is no cut-off point for the scale, and an increase in the score from the scale indicates an increase in the level of Intercultural Sensitivity (15).

Before collecting the research data, permission was obtained from the Ethics Committee and the Institution. The data were started to be collected after the purpose of the research was explained to the nursing students and their approval was obtained. The data were collected in the classrooms of the students by face-to-face interview method. It took an average of 8-10 minutes for students to fill out the data collection tool.

1.3. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed in a computerized statistical program. First of all, descriptive statistics such as number, percentage, mean and standard deviation were made on the data. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were taken into account in the analysis of the internal consistency and reliability of the scales used in the research. Kolmogorov Smirnov and Shapiro Wilk tests were used to check whether the data showed normal distribution or not (27,28). It was determined that the data showed a normal distribution, t-test was applied in independent groups for the difference between two independent groups in the comparison of the data, and One Way ANOVA analysis was applied in the comparison of more than two independent groups. Pearson correlation analysis was used to determine whether there was a relationship between the sub-dimensions and total scores of the two scales used in the research. In statistical decisions, $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

1.4. Ethical Procedure

Before starting data collection, the ethics committee approval of Kırşehir Ahi Evran University Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee dated 07.07.2022 and decision number 2022/05/10 was obtained. In addition, the permission of the Institution numbered E-92802276-755.02.01-00000471064 was obtained from the Department of Nursing of the Faculty of Health Sciences of Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, the institution where the research was conducted. The research was carried out in accordance with the articles stated in the Declaration of Helsinki. Permission to use the scales was obtained from the researchers who adapted the Intercultural Awareness Scale (ICAS) and Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) used in the research into Turkish.

3. RESULTS

It was found that the majority of the students were female (66.4%), were citizens of the Republic of Turkey (93.5%), were freshmen (31.7%), were between the ages of 21 and 25 (53.1%), were single (96.9%), had an income that covered their expenses (55%), lived in Central Anatolia (43.5%) and in the provincial center (56.5%). 66.9% of the students did not know any foreign language other than Turkish. Among those who do, English (62.7%), Arabic (20.5%), and Persian (7.3%) were the most common languages. 90.6% of the students had never traveled abroad and 9.4% had been abroad for some reason. It was found that those who had been abroad were traveling, sightseeing (48.1%), language learning (31%), business (10.3%), living (8.6%), and migration (1.7%). 60.4% of students would like to work abroad. The continents where they would like to work are Europe (77.9%), America (17.7%), Asia (2.6%), and Australia (1.6%) (Table

Tablo 1. Comparison of the Student's Descriptive Characteristics and Intercultural Awareness Scale (ICAS) Sub and Total Scores.

Descriptive characteristics		Number (%)	Exist intercultural awareness		Felt intercultural awareness		Cultural communication awareness		Total intercultural awareness	
			$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test / p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test / p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test / p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test / p
Gender	Female	409 (66.4)	14.70 \pm 2.48	-.715	7.62 \pm 1.56	1.091	11.29 \pm 2.12	3.370	33.62 \pm 4.87	1.432
	Male	207 (33.6)	14.86 \pm 2.68	.475	7.47 \pm 1.62	.276	10.68 \pm 2.09	.001	33.02 \pm 4.96	.153
Nationality	Republic of Turkey	576 (93.5)	14.87 \pm 2.48	4.253	7.61 \pm 1.54	2.364	11.08 \pm 2.09	-.340	33.56 \pm 4.79	2.809
	Other (Iraq, Somalia, Syria, Afghanistan, Turkmenistan, Iran)	40 (6.5)	13.12 \pm 2.89	.000	7.00 \pm 2.06	.018	11.20 \pm 2.61	.734	31.32 \pm 6.03	.005
Classroom	1. Grade	195 (31.7)	13.86 \pm 2.53		7.31 \pm 1.77		11.04 \pm 2.10		32.22 \pm 4.77	
	2. Grade	114 (18.5)	14.72 \pm 2.66	14.713	7.59 \pm 1.38	2.682	10.93 \pm 2.03	.465	33.26 \pm 4.92	7.053
	3. Grade	158 (25.6)	15.51 \pm 2.16	.000	7.75 \pm 1.60	.046	11.12 \pm 2.34	.707	34.39 \pm 4.87	.000
	4. Grade	149 (24.2)	15.16 \pm 2.53		7.68 \pm 1.41		11.23 \pm 1.99		34.08 \pm 4.81	
Age	16-20 Years	275 (44.6)	14.28 \pm 2.42		7.49 \pm 1.55		11.00 \pm 2.11		32.78 \pm 4.58	
	21-25 Years	327 (53.1)	15.22 \pm 2.57	8.671	7.68 \pm 1.58	3.611	11.20 \pm 2.12	1.687	34.11 \pm 5.03	6.228
	26-30 Years	12 (2.0)	13.16 \pm 2.48	.000	6.75 \pm 1.28	.013	9.91 \pm 2.39	.169	29.83 \pm 4.91	.000
	31 Years and above	2 (0.3)	14.50 \pm 2.12		5.00 \pm 4.24		11.00 \pm 2.82		30.50 \pm 9.19	
Marital status	Single	597 (96.9)	14.79 \pm 2.53		7.59 \pm 1.56		11.09 \pm 2.12		33.47 \pm 4.86	
	Married	17 (2.8)	13.70 \pm 2.61	1.506	6.64 \pm 1.96	4.457	10.88 \pm 2.34	.518	31.23 \pm 5.66	2.258
	Divorced/separated	2 (0.3)	15.00 \pm 7.07	.223	9.50 \pm .70	.012	12.50 \pm 2.12	.596	37.00 \pm 9.89	.105
Income status	Income less than expenses	239 (38.7)	14.75 \pm 2.61		7.49 \pm 1.59		11.10 \pm 2.07		33.35 \pm 4.96	
	Income covers expenses	338 (55.0)	14.67 \pm 2.39	2.136	7.59 \pm 1.54	.688	11.04 \pm 2.11	.520	33.31 \pm 4.66	1.574
	Income more than expenses	39 (6.3)	15.56 \pm 3.34	.119	7.79 \pm 1.86	.503	11.41 \pm 2.54	.595	34.76 \pm 6.38	.208
Geographical region where they have lived the longest	Central Anatolia	268 (43.5)	14.65 \pm 2.55		7.57 \pm 1.57		11.13 \pm 2.10		33.36 \pm 4.98	
	Mediterranean	127 (20.6)	14.80 \pm 2.44		7.48 \pm 1.39		10.86 \pm 2.05		33.14 \pm 4.67	
	Southeast Anatolia	95 (15.4)	15.28 \pm 2.23		7.57 \pm 1.72		10.87 \pm 1.98		33.73 \pm 4.48	
	Eastern Anatolia	43 (7.0)	14.48 \pm 3.08		7.93 \pm 1.54		11.34 \pm 2.21		33.76 \pm 5.06	
	Outside Turkey	31 (5.0)	13.41 \pm 3.01	2.975	7.09 \pm 2.03	1.297	11.09 \pm 2.58	.906	31.61 \pm 5.86	1.731
	Aegean	25 (4.1)	15.68 \pm 1.84	.004	8.04 \pm 1.36	.249	11.76 \pm 2.40	.501	35.48 \pm 4.53	.099
	Black Sea	15 (2.4)	14.06 \pm 2.49		7.13 \pm 1.92		11.26 \pm 2.40		32.46 \pm 5.51	
	Marmara	12 (2.0)	15.91 \pm 2.35		7.83 \pm 1.19		11.58 \pm 2.23		35.33 \pm 4.61	
The longest-lived settlement	Provincial center	348 (56.5)	14.64 \pm 2.69		7.63 \pm 1.65		10.92 \pm 2.21		33.19 \pm 5.25	
	District	186 (30.2)	14.98 \pm 2.32	1.131	7.63 \pm 1.39	3.226	11.40 \pm 2.09	3.149	34.03 \pm 4.47	2.171
	Village	82 (13.3)	14.75 \pm 2.38	.323	7.15 \pm 1.65	.040	11.06 \pm 1.75	.044	32.97 \pm 4.22	.115
Knowledge of a foreign language other than Turkish	Yes	204 (33.1)	14.79 \pm 2.60	.258	7.66 \pm 1.54	1.048	11.03 \pm 2.27	-.410	33.50 \pm 5.06	.294
	No	412 (66.9)	14.74 \pm 2.52	.797	7.52 \pm 1.60	.295	11.11 \pm 2.05	.682	33.38 \pm 4.83	.769
Have you ever gone abroad	Yes	58 (9.4)	14.50 \pm 3.11	-.820	7.62 \pm 1.62	.248	11.25 \pm 2.13	.636	33.37 \pm 5.60	-.070
	No	558 (90.6)	14.78 \pm 2.48	.413	7.56 \pm 1.58	.804	11.07 \pm 2.13	.525	33.42 \pm 4.83	.944
Status of willingness to work abroad	Yes	372 (60.4)	15.01 \pm 2.51	3.115	7.69 \pm 1.54	2.420	11.16 \pm 2.19	1.113	33.88 \pm 4.95	2.886
	No	244 (39.6)	14.36 \pm 2.56	.002	7.38 \pm 1.63	.016	10.97 \pm 2.02	.266	32.72 \pm 4.77	.004

It was found that the mean total score of students' CAS was 33.42 \pm 4.90, existing cultural awareness was 14.76 \pm 2.55, perceived cultural awareness was 7.57 \pm 1.58, and cultural communication awareness was 11.08 \pm 2.13.

It was found that the mean total score of students' CAS was 33.42 ± 4.90 , existing cultural awareness was 14.76 ± 2.55 , perceived cultural awareness was 7.57 ± 1.58 , and cultural communication awareness was 11.08 ± 2.13 .

In the present study, it was found that gender, nationality, class, age, marital status, geographical region, and settlement of the students where they have lived the longest, and their desire to work abroad affected their cultural awareness. The mean scores of females, those belonging to the Republic of Turkey, older students, younger students, divorced/separated individuals, those living in the Marmara region, those living in the district, and those wanting to work abroad were found to have higher mean scores on the CAS compared to other groups. No significant difference was found between income status, knowledge of a foreign language other than Turkish, and living abroad, and the mean scores of the subdimensions and total scores of the ISS ($p > 0.05$) (Table 1).

Table 2. Comparison of the student's cultural characteristics and intercultural awareness scale (ICAS) sub and total score averages.

Cultural characteristics		Number (%)	Exist intercultural awareness		Felt intercultural awareness		Cultural communication awareness		Total intercultural awareness	
			$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test/p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test/p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test/p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test / p
Do you know about intercultural nursing	Yes	146 (23.7)	15.03 ± 2.85	1.263	7.75 ± 1.81	1.273	11.28 ± 2.28	3.443	34.07 ± 5.87	2.605
	Partially	312 (50.6)	14.62 ± 2.48	.284	7.50 ± 1.50	.281	10.87 ± 2.12	.033	33.00 ± 4.65	.075
	No	158 (25.7)	14.77 ± 2.37		7.53 ± 1.52		11.34 ± 1.95		33.64 ± 4.33	
Status of having a foreign national friend	Yes, There Are Few	315 (51.1)	14.88 ± 2.41	.768	7.76 ± 1.46	5.158	11.19 ± 1.87	.826	33.84 ± 4.47	2.398
	Yes, There Are Many	118 (19.2)	14.61 ± 2.85	.465	7.42 ± 1.79	.006	10.91 ± 2.51	.438	32.95 ± 5.76	.092
	No, Not at All	183 (29.7)	14.63 ± 2.57		7.32 ± 1.60		11.02 ± 2.27		32.99 ± 4.98	
Willingness to communicate with foreign nationals	Yes	523 (84.9)	14.82 ± 2.54	1.449	7.66 ± 1.53	3.371	11.08 ± 2.11	-.195	33.56 ± 4.82	1.751
	No	93 (15.1)	14.40 ± 2.57	.148	7.06 ± 1.79	.001	11.12 ± 2.25	.845	32.60 ± 5.31	.080
Have you done an internship in any health institution	Yes	421 (68.3)	15.09 ± 2.43	4.941	7.64 ± 1.48	1.759	11.09 ± 2.08	.195	33.83 ± 4.83	3.196
	No	195 (31.7)	14.01 ± 2.66	.000	7.40 ± 1.77	.079	11.06 ± 2.23	.846	32.48 ± 4.97	.001
Willingness to communicate with foreign Patients during internships	Yes	503 (81.7)	14.85 ± 2.53	1.924	7.64 ± 1.57	2.541	11.10 ± 2.10	.346	33.60 ± 4.88	1.970
	No	113 (18.3)	14.34 ± 2.56	.055	7.23 ± 1.60	.011	11.02 ± 2.23	.729	32.60 ± 4.95	.049
Willingness to provide nursing care to foreign patients during internships	Yes	452 (73.4)	14.94 ± 2.53	2.907	7.64 ± 1.57	1.825	11.07 ± 2.13	-.272	33.65 ± 4.95	1.977
	No	164 (26.6)	14.26 ± 2.53	.004	7.37 ± 1.60	.068	11.12 ± 2.11	.786	32.77 ± 4.73	.049
The situation of providing nursing care to foreign national patients in internships	Yes	300 (48.7)	15.12 ± 2.48	3.495	7.73 ± 1.41	2.477	11.23 ± 2.12	1.599	34.09 ± 4.84	3.317
	No	316 (51.3)	14.41 ± 2.57	.001	7.41 ± 1.72	.014	10.95 ± 2.12	.110	32.78 ± 4.89	.001

Among the students, 74.3% had knowledge about intercultural nursing, 70.3% had more or less friends from different countries and/or cultures, and 84.9% had the desire to communicate with people from different countries and/or cultures. It was observed that 68.3% of the students had completed a clinical placement in a healthcare institution, 81.7% of them were willing to communicate with patients from different cultures and 73.4% of them were willing to provide nursing care to patients from different cultures during their clinical placement. 48.7% of the students reported that they provided nursing care to foreign national patients during their clinical rotations. In the present study, it was found that students' knowledge of intercultural nursing, having foreign national friends, willingness to communicate with foreign national individuals, doing a rotation in a healthcare institution, willingness to communicate with foreign national patients during rotations and provide nursing care, and providing

nursing care influenced their cultural awareness. Those who had knowledge about intercultural nursing, who had a friend who was a foreigner, who had a desire to communicate with foreigners, who had done a placement in any health institution, and who had a desire to communicate with foreign patients and to provide nursing care during the placement had a higher cultural awareness than the others (Table 2).

Table 3. Comparison of the student's descriptive characteristics and intercultural sensitivity scale (ISS) sub and total score averages.

Descriptive characteristics		Responsibility in communication		Respect for cultural differences		Self-confidence in communication		Enjoyment of communication		Being careful in communication		Total intercultural sensitivity	
		$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test / p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test / p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test / p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test / p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test / p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test / p
Gender	Female	23.73±3.26	1.296	23.06±3.42	4.685	16.10±2.43	-.878	11.12±2.55	1.512	10.81±1.88	.672	84.84±7.61	3.085
	Male	23.37±3.21	.195	21.62±3.96	.000	16.27±1.80	.380	10.77±2.87	.131	10.70±2.05	.502	82.75±8.57	.002
Nationality	Republic of Turkey	23.60±3.19	-.422	22.76±3.57	4.764	16.10±2.20	-2.170	11.14±2.58	5.135	10.78±1.90	.519	84.41±7.87	3.204
	Other (Iraq, Somalia, Syria, Afghanistan, etc.)	23.82±4.03	.673	19.95±4.20	.000	16.90±2.58	.030	8.95±3.07	.000	10.62±2.41	.604	80.25±8.96	.001
Classroom	1. Grade	23.56±3.19		22.98±3.48		16.11±1.93		10.91±2.59		10.79±1.92		84.38±8.20	
	2. Grade	23.02±3.41	2.766	21.94±3.83	2.650	16.47±3.49	1.281	10.59±2.63	1.593	10.54±1.99	.810	82.58±8.30	1.793
	3. Grade	23.56±3.38	.041	22.85±3.59	.048	15.94±1.78	.280	11.21±2.59	.190	10.91±1.99	.488	84.49±7.62	.147
	4. Grade	24.17±2.98		22.24±3.83		16.20±1.75		11.21±2.85		10.79±1.87		84.63±7.83	
Age	16-20 Years	23.22±3.25		22.76±3.42		16.06±2.66		10.93±2.47		10.66±1.85		83.66±8.02	
	21-25 Years	23.93±3.16	3.402	22.49±3.80	2.615	16.19±1.81	1.155	11.07±2.79	2.028	10.86±2.00	.588	84.56±7.84	2.468
	26-30 Years	23.16±4.21	.017	20.16±5.09	.050	17.25±1.86	.326	10.16±3.51	.109	11.00±2.48	.623	81.75±10.63	.061
	31 Years and above	27.50±4.94		26.00±.00		16.50±.70		15.00±.00		11.00±.00		96.00±4.24	
Marital status	Single	23.66±3.19	2.598	22.60±3.63	1.983	16.14±2.26	1.326	10.99±2.64	1.057	10.76±1.94	.384	84.17±7.90	2.325
	Married	22.35±4.38	.075	22.29±4.75	.139	16.94±1.19	.266	11.64±3.49	.348	11.17±2.03	.681	84.41±10.86	.099
	Divorced/separated	20.00±7.07		17.50±4.94		15.00±1.41		9.00±2.82		10.50±2.12		72.00±1.41	
Income Status	Income less than expenses	23.43±3.47	2.303	22.15±3.70	2.679	15.95±1.82	2.390	10.67±2.75	3.272	10.64±1.99	4.741	82.87±8.08	5.969
	Income covers expenses	23.62±3.00	.101	22.87±3.60	.069	16.23±2.50	.092	11.24±2.47	.039	10.77±1.83	.009	84.75±7.64	.003
Geographical region where they have lived the longest	Income more than expenses	24.64±3.71		22.64±3.95		16.71±1.97		10.94±3.53		11.66±2.35		86.61±9.45	
	Central Anatolia	23.36±3.22		22.47±3.62		16.26±2.66		10.85±2.61		10.75±1.93		83.70±8.10	
	Mediterranean	23.77±3.14		22.96±3.63		15.94±1.68		11.31±2.62		10.66±1.78		84.67±7.39	
	Southeast Anatolia	24.11±3.01		22.50±3.70		16.15±1.57		11.01±2.59		10.91±1.97		84.70±7.43	
	Eastern Anatolia	23.76±3.13	.947	23.02±3.94	1.951	15.97±2.07	.774	11.55±2.97	1.139	11.23±1.94	.908	85.55±8.85	.991
	Outside Turkey	23.70±3.88	.469	20.54±4.17	.060	16.70±2.69	.609	10.22±3.10	.337	10.77±2.62	.499	81.96±9.84	.437
	Aegean	23.92±2.98		23.00±2.75		16.32±1.88		11.40±2.58		10.92±1.60		85.56±7.29	
	Black Sea	23.40±4.37		23.53±3.83		15.53±1.72		10.86±2.92		9.93±2.60		83.26±9.56	
	Marmara	22.25±4.33		23.25±3.13		15.83±2.03		10.58±2.31		10.58±.90		82.50±7.30	
	Provincial center	23.58±3.53	.802	22.25±3.96	3.488	16.36±2.57	3.712	10.87±2.83	1.460	10.84±2.00	1.140	83.93±8.44	1.689
The longest lived settlement	District	23.82±2.73	.449	23.12±3.17	.031	15.94±1.61	.025	11.28±2.40	.233	10.77±1.89	.321	84.96±7.23	.186
	Village	23.29±3.05		22.71±3.31		15.75±1.78		10.92±2.51		10.48±1.75		83.18±7.67	
Knowledge of a foreign language other than Turkish	Yes	23.80±3.55	1.014	22.32±3.96	-1.208	16.31±1.87	1.245	10.92±2.91	-.523	10.75±2.02	-.174	84.13±8.66	-.012
	No	23.52±3.08	.311	22.70±3.52	.227	16.08±2.39	.214	11.04±2.54	.601	10.78±1.90	.862	84.14±7.67	.990

Have you ever gone abroad	Yes	24.10±3.85	1.202	21.17±4.52	-3.090	16.89±1.93	2.648	10.36±2.86	-1.933	10.84±2.11	.270	83.37±8.88	-.763
	No	23.56±3.18	.230	22.72±3.55	.002	16.08±2.25	.008	11.07±2.64	.054	10.77±1.92	.787	84.22±7.91	.446
Status of willingness to work abroad	Yes	23.94±3.16	3.092	22.75±3.63	1.394	16.23±1.76	1.060	10.94±2.70	-.752	10.85±1.91	1.194	84.72±7.87	2.228
	No	23.11±3.32	.002	22.32±3.72	.164	16.04±2.81	.289	11.10±2.63	.452	10.66±1.98	.233	83.25±8.14	.026

It was found that the mean total ISS score of students was 84.14±8.00, sub-dimensions of responsibility in communication 23.61±3.24, respect for cultural differences 22.58±3.67, self-confidence in communication 16.15±2.23, enjoyment in communication 11.00±2.67, and attention in communication 10.77±1.94. In the present study, students reported that their gender, nationality, grade, age, income level, and the settlement where they have lived for the longest time affected their cultural awareness. Females, those who belong to the Republic of Turkey nationality, seniors, those who are older and have higher income, and those who live in the district have higher levels of intercultural sensitivity than others. There was no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) between marital status, geographical region of longest residence, knowing a foreign language other than Turkish, living abroad, and wanting to work, and the mean scores of subdimensions and total scores of ISS (Table 3).

Table 4. Comparison of the student's cultural characteristics and intercultural sensitivity scale (ISS) sub and total score averages.

Cultural characteristics		Responsibility in communication		Respect for cultural differences		Self-confidence in communication		Enjoyment of communication		Being careful in communication		Total intercultural sensitivity	
		$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test/p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test/p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test/p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test/p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test/p	$\bar{X} \pm SS$	Test/p
Do you know about intercultural nursing	Yes	24.27±3.48		22.43±3.82		16.45±1.64		11.19±2.92		10.92±1.90		85.28±8.28	
	Partially	23.38±3.11	3.999	22.65±3.70	.165	16.06±2.55	1.646	10.83±2.58	1.285	10.70±1.95	.639	83.63±7.88	2.125
	No	23.46±3.22	.019	22.58±3.49	.848	16.08±2.02	.194	11.16±2.60	.277	10.79±1.96	.528	84.08±7.92	.120
Status of having a foreign national friend	Yes, there are few	23.54±3.04		22.70±3.56		16.21±2.56		11.08±2.62		10.79±1.81		84.35±7.62	
	Yes, there are many	24.05±3.78	1.369	22.16±3.99	.980	16.32±2.03	1.217	11.04±3.05	.441	10.88±2.40	.400	84.45±9.40	.664
	No, not at all	23.44±3.20	.255	22.63±3.65	.376	15.95±1.68	.297	10.85±2.49	.643	10.68±1.83	.671	83.57±7.67	.515
Willingness to communicate with foreign nationals	Yes	23.78±3.14	3.182	22.90±3.61	5.225	16.24±2.29	2.157	11.14±2.63	3.078	10.84±1.91	2.060	84.92±7.81	5.909
	No	22.63±3.65	.002	20.78±3.51	.000	15.69±1.84	.031	10.22±2.73	.002	10.39±2.07	.040	79.74±7.67	.000
Internship status in any health institution	Yes	23.61±3.24	-.016	22.40±3.71	-1.766	16.20±2.35	.690	11.05±2.67	.516	10.77±1.93	-.145	84.04±7.74	-.486
	No	23.61±3.28	.987	22.96±3.57	.078	16.06±1.96	.491	10.93±2.64	.606	10.79±1.97	.885	84.38±8.85	.627
Willingness to communicate with foreign patients during internships	Yes	23.73±3.14	1.943	22.91±3.61	4.778	16.24±2.28	2.097	1.09±2.70	1.706	10.85±1.83	2.153	84.84±7.72	4.696
	No	23.07±3.64	.052	21.11±3.62	.000	15.76±1.96	.036	10.61±2.49	.089	10.42±2.35	.032	81.00±8.50	.000
Willingness to provide nursing care to foreign patients during internships	Yes	23.93±3.21	4.146	22.84±3.63	2.907	16.18±1.74	.533	11.05±2.77	.820	10.85±1.91	1.588	84.88±7.78	3.838
	No	22.72±3.19	.000	21.87±3.70	.004	16.07±3.23	.595	10.85±2.38	.412	10.57±1.99	.113	82.10±8.28	.000
The situation of providing nursing care to foreign national patients during internships	Yes	23.81±3.35	1.475	22.40±3.75	-1.202	16.20±1.74	.513	11.07±2.79	.574	10.94±2.03	2.049	84.43±7.89	.877
	No	23.42±3.13	.141	22.75±3.59	.230	16.11±2.62	.608	10.94±2.55	.566	10.62±1.84	.041	83.86±8.11	.381

In the present study, it was found that students' knowledge about intercultural nursing, their willingness to communicate with foreigners, their willingness to communicate with and provide nursing care to foreign patients in their clinical placements, and their nursing status affected their intercultural sensitivity. There was no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) between having foreign national friends and doing a clinical placement in a healthcare institution and the mean scores of the sub-dimensions and total scores of the ISS (Table 4).

Table 5. Relation between the student's intercultural awareness scale (ICAS) and intercultural sensitivity scale (ISS).

Intercultural sensitivity scale	intercultural awareness scale							
	Exist intercultural awareness		Felt intercultural awareness		Cultural communication		Total intercultural awareness	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Responsibility in communication sub-dimension	.210**	.000	.224**	.000	.166**	.000	.254**	.000
Respect for cultural differences sub-dimension	.177**	.000	.222**	.000	.164**	.000	.235**	.000
Self-confidence in communication sub-dimension	.102*	.011	.108**	.008	.063	.116	.115**	.004
Enjoyment of communication sub-dimension	.130**	.001	.131**	.001	.094*	.020	.151**	.000
Being careful in communication sub-dimension	.171**	.000	.234**	.000	.224**	.000	.262**	.000
Total intercultural awareness scale	.280**	.000	.323**	.000	.246**	.000	.357**	.000

Table 5 shows the relationship between the scores of the CAS and the ISS. Accordingly, high positive correlations were found between the sub-dimensions and total mean scores of both scales ($p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$, $p < 0.001$).

4. DISCUSSION

In the present study, the Cronbach's alpha of the CAS was found to be 0.81 and the Cronbach's alpha of the ISS was found to be 0.71. Cronbach's alpha values greater than 0.60 indicate that the scale used is reliable (27).

A small number of students in the study (6.5%) had a nationality other than that of the Republic of Turkey. Similar to the present study Muslu and Tuzcu (29), also found that a small number of nursing students (2.8%) were foreign nationals. Today's universities have become globalized, attracting students from a wide range of countries, ethnicities, and cultural traditions (21). In the present study, approximately 2/3 of the students (66.9%) indicated that they did not know any foreign language other than Turkish. A review of the literature on this topic revealed that 57.7% Polat & Terzi (30), 57.4% Muslu & Tuzcu (29), 55.1% Yiğit et al. (31), 52.7% Bulduk et al. (15), 51.6% Topcu (23), 51.1% Okuyan (32), and 44% Ceylan & Çetinkaya (33) did not know any foreign language. It was found that 42.4% Baksi et al. (34), and 47.4% Karasu et al. (35), of nursing students had poor English proficiency. In the present study, the number of students who do not speak a foreign language is slightly higher, although it is similar to the number of students in the other mentioned studies. This may be due to the fact that the studies were conducted with sample groups studying in schools in different regions. In addition, each individual's assessment of his or her foreign language level may vary. Therefore, only when a standardized test is administered to all students at the same time will the students' foreign language proficiency levels be revealed. Similar to the students in the present study, very few of the students in the studies conducted by Hergül et al. (36), Topcu (23), and Baksi et al. (34), had been abroad. As in the present study, students cited travel and language training as reasons for going abroad (36,23,34). As in the present study, in many studies in the literature, more than half of nursing students indicated that they wanted to work abroad (34,32,36,37).

Despite most of the students in the present study (74.3%) stating that they had knowledge about intercultural nursing, 73.4% of the students in Topcu (23), study and 73.8% of the students in Ayaz et al. (38), study stated that they had never heard of the concept of intercultural nursing. Although the present study was conducted on nursing students of all grades, the fact that Topcu (23), study was conducted only on first-year nursing students may have revealed this result. It is encouraging that most of the students in the present study have knowledge about intercultural nursing. Related to this issue, a qualitative study conducted in Turkey in 2015 found that 33 of the 98 undergraduate nursing programs surveyed offered intercultural nursing courses (39). Including the concept of culture, cultural awareness and intercultural nursing in the nursing curriculum from the first year will increase students' knowledge of this topic. Similar to the present study, in many studies in the literature, most of the nursing students have foreign friends (40,23,24,36). Most of the students (84%) are willing to communicate with foreigners. The reluctance to communicate with others creates a communicative distance between the students (41). Accordingly, this desire of the students is very important as it will increase their cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity levels. In the study, the number of students who stated that they did not have a placement in a health institution was equal to the number of first-year students. At the school where the study was conducted, nursing students do their first clinical placement in the spring semester of their first year. Since the period in which the data of the study were collected was the fall semester, it is normal that the students did not have a clinical placement. It is a pleasing result that most of the students are willing to communicate with foreign national patients and provide nursing care to them, although there are students who have never had an internship.

In the present study, the total score of students' CAS was found to be 33.42 ± 4.90 , and the level of cultural awareness was not very high, but above the intermediate level. This finding is consistent with the studies in the literature (42,43). However, in Topcu (23), study the mean scores of the total and subdimensions of CAS of nursing students were found to be slightly lower than in the present study.

Similar to the present study, some studies in the literature found that the grade and age of the students affected their cultural awareness (44-46). Since Istanbul is located in the Marmara region, which has the largest population in Turkey, is cosmopolitan, and is home to people from many cultures, students in this region may have higher cultural awareness. Students' income status, knowledge of a foreign language other than Turkish, living abroad, and CAS scores were very close among all groups. Due to this situation, it is believed that these independent variables do not affect cultural awareness.

In the study of Topcu (23), it was found that having a foreign national as a friend affected the cultural awareness of the students. This situation is similar to the present study. Students desire to communicate with foreign patients and provide care during their internships will inevitably increase their cultural awareness. Because this desire will lead them to communicate with people from different cultures.

As a result of the present study, the mean score of the students on the ISS was 84.14 ± 8.00 , which is above the average level, although this result is not very high. The mean total score of the ISS was 92.62 ± 10.13 and 91.08 ± 12.36 in the study of Beşer et al. (47), 91.20 ± 13.78 in the study of Baksi et al. (34), 90.48 ± 15.14 in the study of Aslan et al. (48), 89.42 ± 13.55 in the study of Kılıç and Sevinç (49), 87.81 ± 11.61 in the study of Karasu et al. (35), and 86.23 ± 9.80 in the study of Polat and Terzi (30). These results were slightly higher than those of the present study (84.14 ± 8.00). In contrast, Baños (50) assessed students' intercultural sensitivity with the Spanish version of the ISS and found 76.49 ± 11.53 . In Turkey, Bulduk et al. (51) found 77.58 ± 9.44 in their study on Turkish nursing students. These differences may be due to the fact that the studies were conducted on nursing students studying in different geographical regions, and the number of sample groups was different from each other. Although the mean score of ISS in the present study is slightly lower or higher than the other mentioned studies, the result is consistent with the literature (36,37,40,52-57).

Similar to the present study Aslan et al. (48) also found that there was a difference between gender and ISS. Similar to the present study, in the studies of Hergül et al. (36), Kılıç and Sevinç (49), Baksi et al. (34), Meydanlıoğlu et al. (40), Bekiroğlu and Balcı (58), Yılmaz and Göçen (59), and Hammer et al. (60). It is believed that the higher mean level of ISS of females compared to males may be related to the fact that females are more emotional and sensitive by nature (34). Similar to the present study, in the study of Baksi et al. (34), students' grades influenced their ISS scores. However, in the studies of Aslan et al. (48), Cetişli et al. (61), and Kılıç and Sevinç (49), no difference was found between grades and intercultural sensitivity scale scores. In contrast to the present study, no significant difference was found between students' age and their intercultural sensitivity scores in the study by Aslan et al. (48). However, similar to the present study Hasan et al. (62) found that there was a difference between students' age and their intercultural sensitivity scores. In the present study, it was observed that the higher the income status of the students, the higher their mean scores on the ISS. The findings of Baksi et al. (34), Kılıç and Sevinç (49) also support each other. Although in some studies Ceylan & Çetinkaya (33), Kılıç & Sevinç (49), Meydanlıoğlu et al. (40), and Aslan et al. (48), knowledge of a foreign language affects intercultural sensitivity, in some studies Baksi et al. (34) and Beşer et al. (47) as in the present study, it is found that it does not affect the intercultural sensitivity score. In Baksi et al. (34) study the desire to work abroad

affected the mean score of the ISS, but in the present study, it did not affect it. However, in the present study and the aforementioned study, the students who wanted to work abroad had higher total intercultural sensitivity scores than those who did not want to work abroad. When the studies conducted in the literature are examined, similar to the present study, it was observed that students who wanted to study abroad and communicated with people from different cultures had higher levels of intercultural sensitivity compared to others (34,40,49,58).

In the present study, it was found that students' knowledge about intercultural nursing, their willingness to communicate with foreign national individuals, their willingness to communicate with and care for foreign national patients in clinical placements, and their nursing status influenced their intercultural sensitivity. It is a natural result that the more students have knowledge about intercultural nursing, the more their sensitivity to this issue increases. Similar to the present study Aslan et al. (48) also found that having a foreign national friend affected students' intercultural sensitivity. When students communicate with foreign nationals, they receive information about new cultures. At this point, it is normal for the result to be like this. It is due to the willingness of students who want to communicate with foreign patients and provide care to them during their internship.

In the present study, a positive correlation was found between cultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity. It was observed that as the cultural awareness level of the students increased, intercultural sensitivity also increased. Educating students on this topic improves their cultural awareness, cultural knowledge, cultural understanding, and cultural skills. In particular, cultural awareness can be increased through a series of trainings and activities (63). As cultural awareness increases, students will meet people from different cultures, communicate with them, learn about their cultures, compare their own cultures with theirs, and so on. Accordingly, their intercultural sensitivity will also increase. These views support the results of the study.

5. CONCLUSION

Intercultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity levels of nursing students are not very high, but above medium. It has been determined that some variables affect the students' Intercultural Awareness Scale (ICAS) and Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ISS) mean scores. In addition, it was determined that as the intercultural awareness levels of the students increased, their intercultural sensitivity also increased.

Intercultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity levels of nursing students should be measured at regular intervals. The trainings to be given to the students to increase the levels of intercultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity are important. Therefore, the aforesaid concepts should be included more in the curriculum of the Department of Nursing, starting from the 1st grade.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the student nurses who participated in the study.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, author-ship, and/or publication of this article.

“EXAMINATION of NURSING STUDENT’S CULTURAL AWARENESS and INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY LEVELS” Research and Ethics Statement Information for the Article with Title

This study has been prepared in accordance with the values of “Research and Publication Ethics” and has been checked by a plagiarism control programme. All responsibility for the study lies with the author(s).

Information	This article is based on a master’s thesis titled “A Study to Determine the Digital Competence Levels and Effects of Healthcare Professionals”
Author Conflict of Interest Statement	There is no conflict of interest among the authors.
Financial Support	No
Author Contribution Statement	The authors contributed equally to this article.
Thanks	We would like to thank the participants who took part in the study.
Ethics Committee Approval Certificate	Ethics Committee approval has been obtained.
Scale Permit	Scale permission has been obtained.

REFERENCES

- Delgado DA, Ness S, Ferguson K, Engstrom PL, Gannon TM, Gillett C. Cultural competence training for clinical staff: Measuring the effect of a one-hour class on cultural competence. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing* 2013; 24 (2): 204–213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104365961247205>.
- Williamson M, Harrison L. Providing culturally appropriate care: A literature review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 2010; 47 (6): 761–769. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.12.012>.
- Douglas MK, Rosenkoetter M, Pacquiao DF, Callister LC, Hattar-Pollara M, Lauderdale J, Milstead J, Nardi D, Purnell L. Standards of practice for culturally competent nursing care: Update. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing* 2011; 22 (4): 317–333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10436596114129>.
- Gümüştakin N. Kültür kavramı ve Osmanlı’dan günümüze kültürel yapının incelenmesi. 38. ICANAS Uluslararası Asya ve Kuzey Afrika Çalışmaları Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı 2007; 317–326.
- Özışık C. Yabancı dil öğretiminde kültürel farkındalık: New headway ders kitaplarının kültür aktarımı açısından incelenmesi ve değerlendirilmesi [Yüksek lisans tezi]. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü; 2004.
- McFarland S. Nurturing the peace flower: A model for the science of peace. *Montessori Life* 1999; 11 (1): 31–35.
- Allen CK, Uskul AK. Preference for dating out-groups members: Not the same for all out-groups and cultural backgrounds. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2019; 68: 55-66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.11.002>.
- Yıldırım K. Üniversite öğrencilerinin kültürlerarası duyarlılık algıları: muğla sıtkı koçman üniversitesi örneği [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Muğla: Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü; 2019.
- Mercan N. Çok kültürlü ortamlarda kültürel zekanın kültürlerarası duyarlılık ile ilişkisine yönelik bir araştırma. *Niğde Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 2016; 9 (1): 1–13.
- Chen G, Starosta WJ. The development and validation of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale. *Human Communication* 2000; 3 (1): 2–14.
- Bae SY, Song H. Intercultural sensitivity and tourism patterns among international students in Korea: Using a latent profile analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 2017; 22 (4): 436–448. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2016.1276087>.
- Durgun H, Uzunsoy E, Tümer A, Huysuz K. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürlerarası duyarlılıkları ile dünya vatandaşlığı için karakter ve değerler algıları. *Ordu Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Çalışmaları Dergisi* 2019; 2 (2): 87–95.
- Kürtüncü M, Arslan N, Çatalçam S, Yapıcı G, Hırçın G. Yataklı tedavi kurumlarında çalışan hemşirelerin kültürlerarası duyarlılıkları ile sosyo-demografik özellikleri ve empati düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkisi. *Hemşirelikte Araştırma ve Geliştirme Dergisi* 2018; 20 (1): 44–56.
- Temel AB. Kültürlerarası (çok kültürlü) hemşirelik eğitimi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi* 2008; 11 (2): 92–101.
- Bulduk S, Tosun H, Ardiç E. Türkçe kültürlerarası duyarlılık ölçeğinin hemşirelik öğrencilerinde ölçümsel özellikleri. *Türkiye Klinikleri Tıp Etiği-Hukuk-Tarihi Dergisi* 2011; 19 (1): 25–31.

16. Majumdar B, Browne G, Roberts J, Carpio B. Effects of cultural sensitivity training on health care provider attitudes and patient outcomes. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* 2004; 36 (2): 161–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2004.04029.x>.
17. Öztürk E, Öztaş D. Transkültürel hemşirelik. *Batman Üniversitesi Yaşam Bilimleri Dergisi* 2012; 1 (1): 293–300.
18. Sarwari AQ, Abdul Wahab MN. Study of the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and intercultural communication competence among international postgraduate students: A case study at University Malaysia Pahang. *Cogent Social Sciences* 2017; 3 (1): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2017.1310479>.
19. Sidani S, Guruge S, Miranda J, Ford-Gilboe M, Varcoe C. Cultural adaptation and translation of measures: an integrated method. *Research in Nursing & Health* 2010; 33 (2): 133–143. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20364>.
20. Morgan S, Yoder LH. A concept analysis of person-centered care. *Journal of Holistic Nursing* 2012; 30 (1): 6–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089801011141218>.
21. Harrison N. Investigating the impact of personality and early life experiences on intercultural interaction in internationalized universities. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 2012; 36 (2): 224–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.007>.
22. Yakar HK, Alpar ŞE. Kültürlerarası farkındalık ve kültürlerarası etkililik ölçeklerinin güvenirlik ve geçerliğinin belirlenmesi. *Journal of Human Sciences* 2017; 14 (3): 2748–2761. <https://doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4885>.
23. Topcu BG. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin etnikmerkezcilik düzeyine kültürel farkındalık eğitiminin etkisi [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Çanakkale: Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Hemşirelik Ana Bilim Dalı; 2019.
24. Bilgiç Ş, Şahin İ. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürlerarası duyarlılık ve etnik merkezcilik düzeyleri. *Süleyman Demiral Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi* 2019; 10 (3): 230–236. <https://doi.org/10.22312/sdusbed.502408>.
25. Yurttaş A, Aras GN. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürlerarası duyarlılıkları ile empati düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Genel Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi* 2020; 2 (3): 117–125. <https://doi.org/10.51123/jgehes.2020.2>.
26. Rozaimie A, Shuib A, Ali AJ, Oii B, Siang C. Multicultural awareness for better ways of life: A scale validation among Malaysian undergraduate students. *2nd International Conference on Business and Economic Research Proceeding* 2011; 1174–1179.
27. Erdoğan S, Nahcivan N, Esin MN. Hemşirelikte Araştırma: Süreç, Uygulama ve Kritik. Nobel Tıp Kitabevi, Ankara. 2014.
28. Karagöz Y. SPSS 23 ve AMOS 23 Uygulamalı İstatistiksel Analizler. Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık, Ankara. 2019.
29. Muslu L, Tuzcu A. Evaluation of cultural awareness in nursing students in antalya: A descriptive-analytic study. *Journal of Nursology* 2022; 25 (3): 161–167. <https://doi.org/10.5152/JANHS.2022.221838>.
30. Polat Ş, Terzi B. Intercultural sensitivity levels of nurses and related factors. *Türkiye Klinikleri Tıp Etiği-Hukuku Tarihi Dergisi* 2020; 28 (2): 216–226. <https://doi.org/10.5336/mdethic.2019-71551>.
31. Yiğit Ü, Çoşkun S, Alpteker H. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürlerarası duyarlılık düzeyleri ve karşılaştıkları başlıca sorunlar. *Abant Sağlık Bilimleri ve Teknolojileri Dergisi* 2021; 1 (2): 92–101.
32. Okuyan CB. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürlerarası duyarlılıklarının belirlenmesi: Bir üniversite örneği. *Hemşirelikte Araştırma Geliştirme Dergisi* 2019; 20 (1-2): 47–54.
33. Ceylan SS, Çetinkaya B. Göçmen hastalara bakım veren hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürel duyarlılık düzeyleri ve deneyimleri: Bir karma yöntem araştırması. *Yaşam Boyu Hemşirelik Dergisi* 2022; 3 (2): 1–20.
34. Baksi A, Sürücü H, Duman M. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürlerarası duyarlılıkları ve ilişkili faktörlerin değerlendirilmesi. *JAREN* 2019; 5 (1): 31–39. <https://doi.org/10.5222/jaren.2019.75046>.
35. Karasu F, Polat F, Okuyan CB. The determination of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels among nurses and nursing students: A border of city, Turkey. *Perspectives in Psychiatry Care* 2022; 58: 314–322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ppc.12788>.
36. Hergül FK, Gök F, İpiçürük HG. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürlerarası duyarlılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *MAS Uygulamalı Bilimler Dergisi* 2022; 7 (1): 228–240. <https://doi.org/10.52520/masjaps.225>.
37. Koç A, Öz Ş, Kılıç T. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürlerarası duyarlılık düzeyleri ve etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesi. *Türkiye Sağlık Bilimleri ve Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2020; 3 (2): 1–15.
38. Ayaz S, Bilgili N, Akın B. The transcultural nursing concept: A study of nursing students in Turkey. *International Nursing Review* 2010; 57 (4): 449–453. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-7657.2010.00817.x>.
39. Tanrıverdi G, Gürsoy M, Tülay A, Şahin A, Tokça A. Türkiye’de hemşirelik lisans programlarında kültürlerarası hemşirelik: Doküman incelemesi. III. Uluslararası Katılımlı Kültürlerarası Hemşirelik Kongre Kitabı, Çanakkale. 2015.

40. Meydanlıoğlu A, Arıkan F, Gözüm S. Cultural sensitivity levels of university students receiving education in health disciplines. *Advances in Health Sciences Education* 2015; 20 (5): 1195–1204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-015-9595-z>.
41. Su YC. Assessing Taiwanese college students' intercultural sensitivity, EFL interests, attitudes toward native English speakers, ethnocentrism, and their interrelation. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher* 2018; 27 (3): 217–226. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-018-0380-7>.
42. Lonneman W. Teaching strategies to increase cultural awareness in nursing students. *Nurse Educator* 2015; 40 (6): 285–288. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0000000000000175>.
43. Smith LS. Cultural competence: A guide for nursing students. *Nursing* 2019; 47 (10): 18–20. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NURSE.0000524770.18720.96>.
44. Ceylantekin Y, Öcalan D. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürel farkındalığı ve kültürlerarası hemşirelik dersine yönelik düşünceleri. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi* 2016; 5 (4): 45–53.
45. Segura-Robles A, Parra-González ME. Analysis of teachers' intercultural sensitivity levels in multicultural contexts. *Sustainability* 2019; 1 (11): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11113137>.
46. Purabdollah M, Tabrizi FM, Markani AK, Poornaki LS. Intercultural sensitivity, Intercultural competence and their relationship with perceived stress among nurses: Evidence from Iran. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* 2021; 24 (7): 687–697. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1816944>.
47. Beşer A, Kerman KT, Ersin F, Arkan G. The effects of ethnocentrism and some features on intercultural sensitivity in nursing students: A comparative descriptive study. *Nurse Education in Practice* 2021; 56: 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2021.103180>.
48. Aslan S, Yılmaz D, Kartal M, Erdemir F, Güleç HY. Determination of intercultural sensitivity of Nursing Students in Turkey. *International Journal of Health Sciences & Research* 2016; 6 (11): 202–208.
49. Kılıç SP, Sevinç S. The relationship between cultural sensitivity and assertiveness in nursing students from Turkey. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing* 2018; 29 (4): 379–386. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043659617716518>.
50. Baños RV. Intercultural sensitivity of teenagers: A study of educational necessities in Catalonia. *Intercultural Communication Studies* 2006; 15 (2): 16–22.
51. Bulduk S, Usta E, Dinçer Y. Kültürlerarası duyarlılık ve etkileyen faktörlerin belirlenmesi: Bir sağlık hizmetleri meslek yüksekokulu örneği. *Düzce Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi* 2017; 7 (2): 73–77.
52. Arlı ŞK, Bakan AB. Cerrahi hemşirelerde merhamet ve kültürlerarası duyarlılığı etkileyen faktörler. *Sürekli Tıp Eğitimi Dergisi* 2018; 27 (4): 277–283.
53. Besey O, Sibel Y. Determination of Intercultural Sensitivity Levels of Nurses and the Factors Affecting their Intercultural Sensitivity, *International Journal of Caring Sciences* 2021; 14 (1): 54–67.
54. Abaşlı K, Polat Ş. Öğrencilerin kültürlerarası duyarlılık ve kültürel zekaya ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 2019; 7 (1): 193–202. <https://doi.org/10.18506/anemon.419526>.
55. Claeys A, Berdai-Chaouni S, Tricas-Sauras S, De Donder L. Culturally sensitive care: Definitions, perceptions, and practices of health care professionals. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing* 2021; 32 (5): 484–492. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043659620970625>.
56. Şatır NN. Göçmenlere bakım veren hemşirelerin yaşadığı güçlükler ve kültürel duyarlılıkları [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Samsun: Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü; 2019.
57. Budak F, Karasu F. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin kültürlerarası duyarlılık algıları ve klinik liderlik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Journal of Healthcare Management and Leadership* 2020; 1: 15–27. <https://doi.org/10.35345/johmal.606037>.
58. Bekiroğlu O, Balcı Ş. Kültürlerarası iletişim duyarlılığının izlerini aramak: iletişim fakültesi öğrencileri örneğinde bir araştırma. *Türkiyat Araştırmalar Dergisi* 2014; 1 (35): 429–459.
59. Yılmaz F, Göçen S. Investigation of the prospective primary teachers' intercultural sensitivity levels in of certain variables. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 2013; 6 (15): 373–392.
60. Hammer MR, Bennett MJ, Wiseman R. Measuring intercultural sensitivity: the intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 2003; 27 (4): 421–443. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(03\)00032-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00032-4).
61. Cetişli NE, Işık G, Öztornacı BÖ, Ardahan E, Uran BNÖ, Top ED, Avdal EÜ. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin empati düzeylerine göre kültürlerarası duyarlılıkları. *İzmir Kâtip Çelebi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi* 2016; 1 (1): 27–33.
62. Hasan S, Al-Sharqawi N, Dashti F, Abdülaziz M, Abdullah A, Shukkur M, Bouhaimed M, Thalib L. Level of empathy among medical student in Kuwait University, Kuwait. *Medical Principles and Practice* 2013; 22 (4): 385–389. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000348300>.
63. Liu W, Stone TE, McMaster R. Increasing undergraduate nursing students' cultural competence: An evaluation study. *Global Health Research and Policy* 2018; 3 (1): 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41256-018-0062-2/>