

Learning Critical Incidents and Socio-Cultural Differences: An Interactive Tool of Reorienting Students in a Multicultural Classroom

Jim Duran, Dr. Carlos S. Lanting College, The Philippines

The Asian Conference on Education 2016
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

This conceptual paper attempted to describe the significance of developing awareness and knowing socio-cultural differences and critical incidents in social educational participation experiences. Observe the nature of each country; diet, customs, the age of the patient; speech; manners; fashion; even his silence...One has to study all these signs and analyze what they portend (Hippocrates, 5th century BCE). It further aimed to (1) identify which culture is more dominant in a small- multicultural school, (2) demonstrate the types of cultural traits that affect intercultural communication of students, and (3) describe the common differences wherein critical incidents of communication can be present to improve one's understanding of these differences. The study subscribed to Cultural Criticality Approach, Pike's (1954) Emic and Etic Approach, Dynamic Process Approach and Kolb's (1984) Experiential Learning Theory, the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. Knowledge results from the combination of grasping and transforming experience.

Keywords: intercultural educational communication, learning diversity, cultural differences in classroom,

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Critical incidents, culture and education defined

Oftentimes, critical incidents are tools for increasing our awareness and understanding of human attitudes, expectations, behaviours, and interactions. They are intended to engage participants at a meaningful, personal level as they examine attitudes and behaviours that might be critical to their effectiveness in the roles they are already performing or preparing for (in the workplace, in educational settings, and in society at large). Triandis first used critical incidents to develop cross-cultural competence in the 1960s in his work with cultural assimilators (see also Triandis, 1994).

Further, education is the process of cultivating human potential in a person so that s/he can contribute to his/her personal growth as well as those of others. Quality education, according to UNESCO-APNIEVE (Asia-Pacific Network for International Education and Values Education) nurtures competence in learning, doing, relating – a way of being – in a Globalized Community as well as values based on the dignity of the person and integrity of creation (UNESCO, 2005). Individuals possess and represent culture in different ways according to their personal experiences in the course of their lives. People learn culture throughout their lives so it can be changed corresponding with each person's experience. Culture can be represented slightly different from person to person. However, in order for a certain way of life to be culture, it should be shared by a group of people in community (Jandt, 2004). Helman (2001) reaffirms that:

Culture is a set of guidelines (both explicit and implicit) that individuals inherit as members of a particular society, and that tell them how to view the world, how to experience it emotionally, and how to behave in it in relation to other people, to supernatural forces or gods, and to the natural environment (p.2).

It is important to note that the words 'cross-cultural' and 'intercultural' are frequently used interchangeably in our daily lives (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997); however, they are identified in a dissimilar way in this study. Cross-cultural communication employs 'etic' view of the other cultures. In contrast, intercultural communication with people from different cultures by engaging communication with people from different cultures. 'Emic' view comes from the participants who are in the communication with different cultures. In order to identify the difference between cross-cultural communication and intercultural communication, the term cross-cultural communication is defined. Gudykunst and Kim (1997) assure us that "the term cross-cultural traditionally implies a comparison of some phenomenon across culture. Cross-cultural communication involves 'etic' view of different cultures. One of the most cited cross-cultural communication research studies was carried out by Hofstede in 1980 (Hofstede, 2001). In Hofstede's study, he compares cultures that affect communication between people whose ethnic backgrounds are different. His study helps people to understand what might affect communication between people from different cultures (Min, 2008).

In another study, according to Hall (1976), he suggested the categorisation of cultures into high context versus low context cultures in order to understand their basic differences in communication style and cultural issues. Communication style refers to ways of expressing oneself, to communication patterns that are understood to be 'typical' of, say, Finns or Japanese people. Cultural issues mean certain societal factors, such as the country's status, history, religion and traditions. Cultural issues also include Hofstede's (2008) individualism vs. collectivism dimension. According to Lewis (2005, 70, 89), linear-active cultures are calm, factual and decisive planners. They are task-oriented, highly organised and prefer doing one thing at a time. They stick to facts and figures that they have obtained from reliable sources. They prefer straightforward, direct discussion, and they talk and listen in equal proportions.

Moreover, reactives are courteous, outwardly amiable, accommodating, compromising and good listeners. Their cultures are called 'listening cultures'. Reactives prefer to listen first, in order to establish both their own and the other's position. They often seem slow to react after a presentation or speech, and when they speak up, it is without clear signs of confrontation (Lewis, 2005, 70–71). Multi-actives are warm, emotional, loquacious and impulsive. They like to do many things at a time. They often talk in a roundabout, animated way. It is typical of them to speak and listen at the same time, leading to repeated interruptions. They are uncomfortable with silence and seldom experience it between other multi-actives (Lewis, 2005, 70, 89).

Diversity in Philippine education

In an undated study on Filipino culture by Florido, the Filipino character is actually a little bit of all the cultures put together. The *bayanihan* or spirit of kinship and camaraderie that Filipinos are famous for is said to be taken from Malay forefathers. The close family relations are said to have been inherited from the Chinese. The piousness comes from the Spaniards who introduced Christianity in the 16th century. Hospitality is a common denominator in the Filipino character and this is what distinguishes the Filipino. Filipinos are probably one of the few, if not the only, English-proficient Oriental people today. Pilipino is the official national language, with English considered as the country's unofficial one.

The Filipinos are divided geographically and culturally into regions, and each regional group is recognizable by distinct traits and dialects - the sturdy and frugal *Ilocanos* of the north, the industrious *Tagalogs* of the central plains, the carefree *Visayans* from the central islands, and the colorful tribesmen and religious Moslems of Mindanao. Tribal communities can be found scattered across the archipelago. The Philippines has more than 111 dialects spoken, owing to the subdivisions of these basic regional and cultural groups. The country is marked by a true blend of cultures; truly in the Philippines, East meets West. The background of the people is Indonesian and Malay. There are Chinese and Spanish elements as well. The history of American rule and contact with merchants and traders culminated in a unique blend of East and West, both in the appearance and culture of the Filipinos, or people of the Philippines (Florido, n.d.).

In addition, this setting demonstrates the challenges of educating students of diverse cultures and sub-cultures with English as the medium of education. It is also important to note that the Philippines as a country is somehow unique in Asia because, together with a new country, Timor Leste, it is the only country where the great majority of people are baptized Christians. While the earliest peoples of the islands were considerably influenced by the cultures of Hinduized empires of Southeast Asia and their Muslim successor states, the Spanish influence is quite evident in its socio-religious practices. The Anglo-Saxon influence through English as the medium of instruction, has become the 'vehicle of ideas distinctive of the culture of English speaking peoples, the most important of which are those ideas of democratic government which have been incorporated in the Constitution of the Republic' (De la Costa, 1961).

Lastly, as mentioned by Ramirez (2006) the mission of education today is to promote life in its wholeness, to bring into communion and solidarity in the light of authentic globalization the finest expressions of diverse cultures, expressions of human dignity through creativity in work, loving relationships, and challenges amidst suffering brought about by severe objective limitations of the environment. This objective appears 'unrealistic' at this time in the context of a dominant economic system that has introduced a materialistic, consumerist and mechanical worldview. Unknowingly or even unconsciously this worldview gets embedded in the school system even as it teaches religion. Courses and programs are judged of quality and of excellence when they could be 'internationally competitive'.

In sum, diversity of Philippine education is not new and unusual since the country has been a melting pot of various European, American, and Asian cultures. However, with the fast upgrading of social media and other communications technology like applications in smartphone, learning cultures especially south-east Asian, will be more interactive and can happen anytime and anywhere. It is very likely that the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) integration is a major driving force in instituting culture studies in most Philippine schools.

Problem

The main objective of this study is to investigate power of intercultural educational communication of Dr. Carlos S. Lanting College students. Specifically this research paper sought to answer the following question, what attitude and perception do respondents have toward a culture more dominant in a small-multicultural classroom? Also how do types of cultural traits affect or impact intercultural communication of student-respondents, and how significant is the difference between the assessments of socio-cultural differences and critical incidents of communication of respondents, in improving one's understanding of these differences?

Methodology

To fully develop great results from cross-sectional approach, the researcher used mixed quantitative methodologies in analyzing information from student-respondents. Exploring how different cultures take in intercultural educational communication competence and its relationship with multicultural classroom performance included data collection in Dr. Carlos S. Lanting College, the researcher selected student-respondents based on their cultural background, their academic performance, and their willingness to voluntarily participate in this research study.

The main participants of this study are 122 students from different regional backgrounds in the Philippines using various local languages and with a few foreign students. The student-respondents are divided into two groups of population samples, 61 from the College of Nursing and the other group is from Business Department.

The researcher asked student-respondents to describe an inter-culturally and communicatively competent student, to rank the dimensions of intercultural educational communication competence based on their understanding of this theoretical construct, and to describe their views about the correlation between intercultural communication competence and performance in multicultural classroom.

Results and Discussion

Below Table 1 presents the Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of the Respondents.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of the Respondents

Profile of the Respondents	Frequency	Percentage
Classification		
Nursing	61	50.0
Business	61	50.0
Total	122	100.0
Gender		
Male	35	28.7
Female	85	69.7
No Answer	2	1.6
Total	122	100.0
Age		
16-20 years old	86	70.5
21-25 years old	17	13.9
26-30 years old	8	6.6
31-35 years old	4	3.3
36-40 years old	2	1.6
41 years old and above	4	3.3
No Answer	1	.8
Total	122	100.0
Civil Status		
Single	118	96.7
Married	4	3.3
Total	122	100.0
Nationality		
Filipino	116	95.1
Rwandese	2	1.6
Indonesian	1	.8
No Answer	3	2.5
Total	122	100.0
Religion		
Roman Catholic	86	70.5
Islam/Muslim	4	3.3
Born Again	6	4.9
Christian	11	9.0
Baptist	1	.8
Iglesia ni Cristo	2	1.6
Iglesia ng Diyos	4	3.3
Mormon	1	.8
No Answer	7	5.7
Total	122	100.0

Table 1 presents the distribution of respondents according to their profile variables. The study have an equal number of nursing (n=61; 50%) and business (n=61, 50%) respondents – a ratio of 1:1. In terms of gender, 69.7% (n=85) of the respondents are female and 28.7% (n=35) are male. However, 1.6% (n=2) did not declare their gender in the survey questionnaire. In terms of age, majority or 70.5% (n=86) of the respondents age from 16 to 20 years old. It was followed by those who are 21 to 25 years old with 13.9% (n=17) of the total respondents, those who are 26 to 30 years old with 6.6% (n=8), those who are 31 to 35 years old, and 41 years old and above each with 3.3% (n=4) and lastly, those who are 36 to 40 years old with 1.6% (n=2). Here is the distribution of respondents according to the languages they speak. With regards to the respondents L1, 77.0% (n=94) speak Tagalog as their L1. Only 1.6% (n=2) speak English. 16.4% (n=20) of the respondents speak other languages/dialects which include Kinyarwanda, *Bisaya*, *Tausug*, *Antiqueno*, *Pangasinense*, *Chavacano*, *Iloko*, *Bicolano*, *Pangalatok*, and *Waray*. On the other hand, in terms of their L2, 60.7% (n=74) speak the English language followed by 11.5% (n=14) of the respondents who speak Tagalog as L2. Moreover, 13.1% (n=16) of the respondents speak other languages/dialects which include French, *Ilonggo*, Muslim, *Maranao*, *Batangueno*, *Iloko*, *Hiligaynon*, *Bisaya*, *Ibaloi* and *Bicolano*. Lastly, in terms of their L3, 63.1% (n=77) may have no third language spoken or did not declare their L3. However, 16.4% (n=20) speak English as their L3, 6.6% (n=8) speak Tagalog as L3 and 13.9% (n=17) speak other languages/dialects.

Problem: What attitude and perception do respondents have toward a culture more dominant in a small-multicultural classroom?

Below Table 2 presents the mean, median and standard deviation of the attitude and perception of respondents toward a culture more dominant in a small-multicultural classroom.

Table 2. Mean, Median and Standard Deviation of the Attitude and Perception of Respondents Toward a Culture More Dominant in a Small-Multicultural Classroom

Attitude and Perception Towards a Culture More Dominant in a Small-Multicultural Classroom	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	SD	QD
I believe American culture is a dominant culture in our classroom.	118	4	2.62	3.00	.73	Agree
Chinese culture is more dominant in our class.	97	25	1.88	2.00	.68	Disagree
Filipino culture is the most dominant culture in our class.	118	4	3.60	4.00	.63	Strongly Agree
Cultural differences can be a barrier of communication in our classroom.	110	12	2.45	2.00	.77	Disagree
Age is an issue in our class.*	119	3	1.39	1.00	.60	Strongly Disagree
Race is important consideration in learning to acculturate.	115	7	2.70	3.00	.80	Agree
Gender plays a big role in understanding cultures in our class.	111	11	2.69	3.00	.88	Agree
I respect other cultures.	122	0	3.76	4.00	.52	Strongly Agree
It is hard for me to learn or adjust to the customs of other cultures in my class.	114	8	2.39	2.00	.82	Disagree
Learning sociocultural differences should be taken seriously in our class to avoid conflicts and misunderstanding.	121	1	3.29	3.00	.75	Agree
Overall Mean	122	0	2.70	2.70	.33	Agree (Positive)

Legend: 1.00 – 1.49 Strongly Disagree (Very Negative) 2.50 – 3.49 Agree (Positive)
 1.50 – 2.49 Disagree (Negative) 3.50 – 4.00 Strongly Agree (Very Positive)

*statement was reversed

Table 2 shows the descriptive result in determining the student-respondents attitude and perception towards a culture more dominant in a small multicultural classroom. It can be seen that student-respondents strongly agree that they respect other cultures ($\bar{x}=3.76$, $s=.52$) and that Filipino culture is the most dominant culture in their class ($\bar{x}=3.60$, $s=.63$).

On the other hand, the student-respondents agreed on the following statements: that they believe American culture is a more dominant culture in their classroom ($\bar{x}=2.62$, $s=.73$), that race is an important consideration in learning to acculturate ($\bar{x}=2.70$, $s=.80$), and that learning sociocultural differences should be taken seriously in their class to avoid conflicts and misunderstanding ($\bar{x}=3.29$, $s=.75$). The student-respondents disagreed that

Chinese culture is more dominant in their class ($\bar{x}=1.88$, $s=.68$), that cultural differences is a barrier in communication in their classroom ($\bar{x}=2.45$, $s=.77$) and that it is hard for them to learn or adjust to the customs of other cultures in their class ($\bar{x}=2.39$, $s=.82$).

Furthermore, the student-respondents strongly disagreed that age is an issue in their class ($\bar{x}=1.39$, $s=.60$). Generally, the student-respondents have a mean of 2.70 ($s=.33$) with a qualitative description of agree; consequently, in general, they have a positive attitude and perception about a more dominant culture in a small multicultural classroom. It is clear that the components of Cultural Criticality Approach play a vital function in associating the interpersonal communicative behavior of respondents who try to understand a dominant culture by understanding the barriers and accepting differences.

Another factor that has to be looked into in studying the potential part of Cultural Criticality Approach in understanding culture is gender as a potential barrier especially in oriental cultural background of respondents. But most of the respondents agreed that respecting differences in age, gender, and race advocates understanding cultures. This assumption is not just supported by the theory of Cultural Criticality but by the findings collected as well.

Problem: How do types of cultural traits affect or impact intercultural communication of student-respondents?

Below Table 3 presents the mean, median and standard deviation of the types of cultural traits that affect intercultural communication of student-respondents.

Table 3. Mean, Median and Standard Deviation of the Types of Cultural Traits that Affect Intercultural Communication of Student-Respondents

Types of Cultural Traits that Affect Intercultural Communication of Student-Respondents	Valid		Mean	Median	SD	QD
	N	Missing				
I think Filipinos in my class are influenced by American culture and customs.	118	4	2.68	3.00	.76	Agree
I am a big influence on my classmates' manners.	117	5	2.59	3.00	.81	Agree
Filipino is somehow the most dominant culture in class, it is American because Filipinos are accustomed.*	113	9	2.59	3.00	.74	Agree
My speech changed when I started talking to my foreign classmate.	119	3	2.93	3.00	.66	Agree
I see culture as multilayered and complex.	115	7	2.99	3.00	.68	Agree
Culture is dynamic and ever changing that is why it can have impact in communication.	121	1	2.98	3.00	.68	Agree
My class has an exchange of cultural traits.	119	3	2.82	3.00	.61	Agree
Customs and fashion are the most influential cultural traits that affect student's own acceptance of culture.	117	5	3.09	3.00	.69	Agree
I understand other cultures to be significant.	119	3	3.18	3.00	.57	Agree
I understand why my classmates behave the way they do because it is part of their norms.	119	3	3.24	3.00	.59	Agree
Overall Mean	122	0	2.91	2.90	.30	Agree (Positive)

Legend: 1.00 – 1.49 Strongly Disagree (Very Negative) 2.50 – 3.49 Agree (Positive)
 1.50 – 2.49 Disagree (Negative) 3.50 – 4.00 Strongly Agree (Very Positive)

*statement was reversed

Table 3 presents the descriptive of the different types of cultural traits that affect intercultural communication of the student-respondents. It can be seen from the table that the respondents agreed on all the statements: that they think Filipinos in their class are influenced by American culture and customs ($\bar{x}=2.68$, $s=.76$), that they are a big influence on their classmates' manners ($\bar{x}=2.59$, $s=.81$), that the Filipino is somehow the most dominant culture in class and it is not American ($\bar{x}=2.59$, $s=.74$) and that they understand why their classmates behave the way they do because it is a part of their norms. In addition to that, the student-respondents had the highest agreement on the last statement of where they understand the behavior of their classmates including the reason.

It is important to note, from the data above that the variables and components of Emic and Etic Theory are significant in the respondents' way of interpreting dominant cultural traits. And with this in application, Dynamic Process Approach gives learners perspective in seeing another culture as multilayers, complex and changing. **Problem:** How significant is the difference between the assessments of socio-cultural differences and critical incidents of communication of respondents, in improving one's understanding of these differences?

Below Table 4 presents the mean, median and standard deviation of the sociocultural differences of student-respondents.

Table 4. Mean, Median and Standard Deviation of the Sociocultural Differences of Student-Respondents

Sociocultural Differences of Student-Respondents,N wherein Critical Incidents can be Present	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	SD	QD
Books are not sufficient in learning customs and traditions.	115	7	2.50	2.00	.88	Agree
Listening to lectures is not enough to know cultures.*	120	2	2.42	2.00	.85	Disagree
My speech somehow changed as I learn Tagalog or Filipino in my class.	114	8	2.84	3.00	.76	Agree
My fashion changed as I get acquainted with other Asian, Afro and American culture.	112	10	2.48	2.50	.73	Disagree
I learned my manners from classmates who come from other cultural background.	113	9	2.65	3.00	.85	Agree
Overall Mean	122	0	2.58	2.60	.42	Agree (Positive)
Critical Incidents of Communication						
To experience being confronted with new and unknown situations in understanding cultural differences is not necessary.*	117	5	1.98	2.00	.60	Disagree
To experience security in a multicultural classroom is normal.	120	2	3.04	3.00	.52	Agree
To experience insecurity in a multicultural classroom is not normal in DCLC.	117	5	2.52	2.00	.76	Agree
I do not experience fear and rejection in a classroom in DCLC.*	109	13	2.72	3.00	.86	Agree
I have not experienced trust, sympathy and empathy in a diverse classroom in DCLC.	106	16	2.18	2.00	.81	Disagree
Overall Mean	122	0	2.50	2.50	.32	Agree (Positive)

Legend: 1.00 – 1.49 Strongly Disagree (Very Negative) 2.50 – 3.49 Agree (Positive)
 1.50 – 2.49 Disagree (Negative) 3.50 – 4.00 Strongly Agree (Very Positive)
 *statement was reversed

Table 4 shows the descriptive on the assessment of socio-cultural differences and critical incidents in communication of student-respondents. Based on the results, the student-respondents agreed that books are not sufficient in learning customs and traditions (\bar{x} =2.50,s=.88), that their speech somehow changed as they learn Tagalog or Filipino in

their class ($\bar{x}=2.84$, $s=.76$) and that they learned manners from their classmates who come from other cultural background ($\bar{x}=2.65$, $s=.85$). Meanwhile, they disagreed that listening to cultures is not enough to know cultures ($\bar{x}=2.42$, $s=.85$) and that their fashion changed as they get acquainted with other Asian, Afro and American culture ($\bar{x}=2.48$, $s=.73$).

Test of Significant Differences

Below Table 5 presents the test of significant differences on the attitude and perception of student-respondents toward a culture more dominant in a small-multicultural classroom.

Table 5. Test of Significant Differences on the Attitude and Perception of Student-Respondents Toward a Culture More Dominant in a Small-Multicultural Classroom

Profile Variable	N	Mean Rank	Nonparametric Test	Test Statistic	Asymp. (2-tailed)	Sig.
Classification	Nursing	61	61.19	Mann-Whitney U	U=1841.50	.922
	Business	61	61.81			
Gender	Male	35	61.29	Mann-Whitney U	U=1460.00	.874
	Female	85	60.18			
Age	16 – 20 years old	86	61.40	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df = 5 $\chi^2=.610$.988
	21 – 25 years old	17	61.53			
	26 – 30 years old	8	55.31			
	31 – 35 years old	4	54.25			
	36 – 40 years old	2	59.00			
	41 years old & above	4	69.38			
L1	Tagalog	94	56.73	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=2.669$.263
	English	2	91.75			
	Others	20	63.50			
L2	Tagalog	14	59.29	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=5.770$.056
	English	74	48.16			
	Others	16	66.63			
L3	Tagalog	8	25.31	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=.426$.808
	English	20	23.20			
	Others	17	21.68			
Nationality	Filipino	116	59.30	Mann-Whitney U	U=92.50	.166
	Others	3	87.17			

As presented in Table 5, to compare the attitude and perception of student-respondents towards a culture more dominant in a small multicultural classroom, the Mann Whitney U Test and Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test were used. At 0.05 level of significance and with the mean ranks compared, the results shows that there is no significant difference on the attitude and perception of the student-respondents when grouped according to course [classification] (U=1841.50, $p=.922$), gender (U=1460.00, $p=.874$), age (df=5, $\chi^2=.610$, $p=.988$), L1 (df=2, $\chi^2=2.669$, $p=.263$), L2 (df=2, $\chi^2=5.770$, $p=.056$), L3 (df=2, $\chi^2=.426$, $p=.808$) and nationality (U=92.50, $p=.166$). Such results

then imply that these profile variables are not factors on determining students' attitude and perception with regards to a dominant culture in a multicultural classroom.

Below Table 6 shows the test of significant differences on the types of cultural traits that affect intercultural communication of student-respondents.

Table 6. Test of Significant Differences on the Types of Cultural Traits that Affect Intercultural Communication of Student-Respondents

Profile Variable		N	Mean Rank	Nonparametric Test	Test Statistic	Asymp. (2-tailed)	Sig.
Classification	Nursing	61	64.53	Mann-Whitney U	U=1675.50		
	Business	61	58.47				
Gender	Male	35	60.19	Mann-Whitney U	U=1476.50		
	Female	85	60.63				
Age	16 – 20 years old	86	60.76	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df = 5 $\chi^2=5.793$		
	21 – 25 years old	17	65.12				
	26 – 30 years old	8	65.19				
	31 – 35 years old	4	71.38				
	36 – 40 years old	2	5.50				
	41 years old & above	4	57.63				
L1	Tagalog	94	58.26	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=1.533$		
	English	2	87.25				
	Others	20	56.75				
L2	Tagalog	14	57.86	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=.700$		
	English	74	51.03				
	Others	16	54.59				
L3	Tagalog	8	20.81	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=.314$		
	English	20	23.88				
	Others	17	23.00				
Nationality	Filipino	116	60.47	Mann-Whitney U	U=119.00		
	Others	3	41.67				

Below Table 7 shows the test of significant differences on the sociocultural differences of student-respondents.

Table 7. Test of Significant Differences on the Sociocultural Differences of Student-Respondents

Profile Variable		N	Mean Rank	Nonparametric Test	Test Statistic	Asymp. (2-tailed)	Sig.
Classification	Nursing	61	59.11	Mann-Whitney U	U=1715.00	.453	
	Business	61	63.89				
Gender	Male	35	56.51	Mann-Whitney U	U=1364.50	.417	
	Female	85	62.14				
Age	16 – 20 years old	86	60.17	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df = 5 $\chi^2=2.058$.841	
	21 – 25 years old	17	67.29				
	26 – 30 years old	8	50.63				
	31 – 35 years old	4	56.00				
	36 – 40 years old	2	76.25				
	41 years old & above	4	70.13				
L1	Tagalog	94	59.26	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=.716$.699	
	English	2	40.00				
	Others	20	56.80				
L2	Tagalog	14	38.64	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=9.982$.007*	
	English	74	50.92				
	Others	16	71.94				
L3	Tagalog	8	24.25	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=.092$.955	
	English	20	22.65				
	Others	17	22.82				
Nationality	Filipino	116	58.97	Mann-Whitney U	U=54.00	.040*	
	Others	3	100.00				

*significant difference exists at 0.05 alpha level

To compare the student-respondents' assessment on socio-cultural differences in their learning environment, the Mann Whitney U Test and Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test were used. As seen on Table 7, At 0.05 level of significance and with the mean ranks compared, the results shows that there is no significant difference on the attitude and perception of the student-respondents when grouped according to course [classification] (U=1715.00, p=.922), gender (U=1364.50, p=.417), age (df=5, $\chi^2=2.058$, p=.841), L1 (df=2, $\chi^2=.716$, p=.699), and L3 (df=2, $\chi^2=.092$, p=.955). Such results then imply that these profile variables are not factors on determining students' attitude and perception with regards to a dominant culture in a multicultural classroom. On the other hand, when grouped according to L2, it was found out that there exists significant difference on their assessment of socio-cultural differences (df=2, $\chi^2=9.982$, p=.007). Looking at the mean ranks, it can be concluded that student-respondents whole L3 is Tagalog has the lowest assessment of socio-cultural differences (Mean Rank=38.64), followed by the student-respondents whose L3 is English (Mean Rank=50.92) and those whose L3 are other languages/dialects (Mean Rank=71.94). Furthermore, in terms of nationality, student-respondents from other nations (Mean Rank=100.00) have

significantly higher ($p=.040$) assessment of cultural differences than the Filipinos (Mean Rank=58.97).

Below Table 8 presents the test of significant differences on the critical incidents of communication of student-respondents.

Table 8. Test of Significant Differences on the Critical Incidents of Communication of Student-Respondents

Profile Variable	N	Mean Rank	Nonparametric Test	Test Statistic	Asymp. (2-tailed)	Sig.
Classification	Nursing	61	54.68	Mann-Whitney U	U=1444.50	.031*
	Business	61	68.32			
Gender	Male	35	64.01	Mann-Whitney U	U=1364.50	.471
	Female	85	59.05			
Age	16 – 20 years old	86	57.52	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df = 5 $\chi^2=7.876$.163
	21 – 25 years old	17	76.12			
	26 – 30 years old	8	45.94			
	31 – 35 years old	4	78.63			
	36 – 40 years old	2	79.75			
	41 years old & above	4	74.63			
L1	Tagalog	94	60.09	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=1.214$.545
	English	2	45.50			
	Others	20	52.33			
L2	Tagalog	14	42.39	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=1.914$.384
	English	74	54.38			
	Others	16	52.66			
L3	Tagalog	8	17.31	Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis	df=2 $\chi^2=2.121$.346
	English	20	23.28			
	Others	17	25.35			
Nationality	Filipino	116	59.19	Mann-Whitney U	U=80.00	.106
	Others	3	91.33			

*significant difference exists at 0.05 alpha level

Table 8 shows the test of significant differences on the critical incidents of communications of student-respondents. Using the Mann Whitney U Test, it was found out that there exists no significant difference between student-respondents when grouped according to gender ($U=1364.50$, $p=.471$) and nationality ($U=80.00$, $p=.106$), and that there exists a significant difference between nursing and business students ($U=1444.50$, $p=.031$). Moreover, using the Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test, it was found out that there are no significant differences on the critical incidents of communication of the respondents when grouped according to age ($df=5$, $\chi^2=7.876$, $p=.163$), L1 ($df=2$, $\chi^2=1.214$, $p=.545$), L2 ($df=2$, $\chi^2=1.914$, $p=.384$) and L3 ($df=2$, $\chi^2=2.121$, $p=.346$). It is also important to note the respondents learn culture not merely from reading books or listening to lectures about culture but experiencing different cultures and their attributes is the best way of cultural education, this is explained by Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory.

Below Table 9 presents the test of significant difference between the assessments of socio-cultural differences and critical incidents of communication of respondents.

Table 9. Test of Significant Difference between the Assessments of Socio-cultural Differences and Critical Incidents of Communication of Respondents

		N	Mean Rank	Nonparametric Test	Z	Sig.
Critical Incidents of Communication – Socio-cultural Differences	Negative Ranks	60 ^a	56.03	Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test	-1.670	.095
	Positive Ranks	46 ^b	50.21			
	Ties	16 ^c				
	Total	122				

a. Critical Incidents < Socio-cultural Differences

b. Critical Incidents > Socio-cultural Differences

c. Critical Incidents = Socio-cultural Differences

Table 9 shows the test of significant difference between the assessment of socio-cultural differences and critical incidents of communication of the student-respondents. Using the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test, there is no significant difference between the two variables ($Z=-1.670$, $p=.095$).

Conclusions and Recommendations

This research analysed the potential strengths of employing intercultural educational communication frameworks in multicultural classrooms. Based from the data, the application of four theories namely Cultural Criticality Approach, Emic and Etic Approach, Dynamic Process Approach and Experiential Learning Theory are vital in designing an eLearning and teaching module on intercultural educational communication divided into four different parts using the four theories as primary areas of study. The module is useful in addressing intercultural conflicts silently and unknowingly present in classrooms and social premises of the school campus. Unreported cases of discrimination, language rift, and religious differences shall be properly entertained and foreign students will have first-hand knowledge of identifying problems of racial bullying and hatred.

As schools have been preparing for the effects in education system of ASEAN integration, small schools can include particular provisions in the student and faculty manual certain policies on socio-cultural conflicts to protect students' individual rights, foreign or local, as they exercise their academic freedom. It cannot be greatly undermined that foreign students from the Philippines' south-east Asian neighbours will multiply as a result of ASEAN integration for work and study whys and wherefores.

References

De la Costa, H. S.J. (1961). 'History and Philippine Culture', *Philippine Studies*, IX:2, p. 346.

Hall, E. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York: Doubleday.

Hofstede, G. (2008). *A summary of my ideas about national culture*. <http://feweb.uvt.nl/center/hofstede/page3.htm>. (retrieved 20.2.2008).

Jandt, F.E. (2001). *Intercultural communication: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Jandt, F.E. (2004). *An introduction to intercultural communication: Identities in a global community* (4th ed.). London: SAGE.

Florido, A. M. (no date). *Educational profile of the Philippines and the best practices in Filipino schools and classrooms*. Garinger High School, Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools.

Gudykunst, W.B. & Kim, Y.Y. (1997). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Lewis, R. D. (2005). *Finland, cultural lone wolf*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Min, J.K. (2008). *A case study of intercultural communication in a multicultural classroom in the Brisbane Metropolitan area*.

UNESCO-APNIEVE Sourcebook n.3. (no date) Learning to Do. *Values for Learning and Working Together in a Globalized World* edited by Lourdes R. Quisumbing (Bonn, Germany: Unesco-Univoc), 2005.

Ramirez, M.M. (2006). *Cultural diversity and education in an increasingly globalizing world (From the perspective of a 'developing country')* Globalization and Education Pontifical Academy of Sciences, *Extra Series* 28, Vatican City. Retrieved from www.pas.va/content/dam/accademia/pdf/es28/es28-ramirez.pdf.

Contact email: jimduran10@gmail.com