Predictor Role of Multicultural Education Perceptions in Respect for Identity Differences: A Study on Prospective Social Studies Teachers[1]

Research Article

Fadime SECGIN[1]

[1]*Gaziosmanpasa University, Faculty of Education, Department of Social Science Education Tokat, Turkey,* ORCID: 0000-0001-6461-8764

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	It is possible to consider teachers as the key to the success of multicultural education aiming at providing equal education opportunities for all students from different races, ethnicities and social groups and developing of cooperation and dialogue between different student groups. In this sense, it is important to determine the prospective social studies teachers' attitudes towards multicultural education considering their mission to educate the individual as an active and collaborative citizen, and prepare for life and whether they respect identity differences. In this study, it has been investigated whether prospective social studies teachers' attitudes towards identity differences are predictors of their multicultural education perceptions. This study was carried out with 220 prospective social studies teachers continuing their education in social studies teaching department at a state university. Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey (TMAS) developed by Ponterotito, Baluch, Greig and Rivera (1998) and adapted to Turkish by Yazıcı, Başol and Toprak (2009) in order to identify perceptions about multicultural education, and Identity Attitudes Scale (IAS) developed by Yazıcı (2016) in order to determine attitudes towards different identities were used. As a result of the study, it was found that respect for gender differences, respect for ethnic identity differences, and respect for differences in political identity which are sub-dimensions of IAS are predictors of multicultural education perception indicated by the multiple regression analysis.
	Keywords: Multicultural Education, Identity, Difference, Attitude, Teaching Social Studies, Prospective Teacher.

Introduction

People want to know 'who they are' and 'who others are' thanks to their endless curiosity; this is one of the elements that provide interaction between individuals. The sense of knowing 'who am I' will provide some facilities for individuals. While knowing yourself provides knowing what to think and what to do,

knowing others provides predicting their thoughts and actions, and this will make one's life easier. Information on identity organizes and structures interaction between people while social structures also give identity to the people (Hogg and Vaughan, 2007). Identity not only is the most sensitive subject of sociology, anthropology and psychology studies, and is a means by which individual know and describe himself/herself and other as we use frequently in our daily lives but also is a concept that differentiates an individual from the others and expresses the facts that distinguish it from others (Parekh, 2014, p.53). The meaning of the concept of identity from Latin idem 'same' was defined as ''the sameness of a person or thing at all times or in all circumstances; the condition or fact that a person or thing is itself and nor something else; individuality, personality' by Oxford English Dictionary (OED) (Gleason, 2014, p. 23). Thereby, identity is based on a combination of two concepts which are identity and difference, which are paradoxes. In addition to emphasizing common aspects with others, the main importance of identity is that it emphasize inequality and the difference as a result of this inequality because each person has different life experiences, no one has the same life (Lawler, 2008, p.5). Therefore, each person has different identities on an individual basis, so identity is a stance against others, and in this respect, it is a means of self-expression (Anık, 2012, p.21).

Based on the social science literature, it can be stated that there are two different dimensions of concept of identity: individual identity and social identity, which are closely related (Anık, 2012, p.22; Jenkins, 2016, p.32; Parekh, 2014, p.53). However, these two categories are not completely separated from each other and they refer to forms of identity which are permanently related with each other and occasionally conflict. Individuals sometimes determine their behaviors towards others with the personal identity as a unique entity having specific personality, likes, skills, attitudes and thoughts. Individuals are the subject of their own personal experiences, their official or informal interactions with others, the events they witness, the books they read or the films they watch (Parekh, 2014, p.55). All these experiences leave a deep mark on the individual and shape his/her identity. The individual's self-definition, taking into account the personality characteristics, can also exist in a particular group environment. However, in the group environment, there is a new identity option; we can perceive ourselves as a member of a social group and as someone who has the characteristics of the group. We can define ourselves as a woman, a football player, a college student and so on (Brehm and Kassin, 1993, s. 88). All these definitions create our social identity. Social identity is a category that includes our corporate identities based on our social roles (Snow, Oselin and Corrigal-Brown, 2005; Snow, 2001).

According to Tajfel (1982, p. 2), social identity is "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value or emotional significance attached to that membership". Tajfel (1979) suggested that the groups (e.g. social class, family, football team etc.) which people belonged to were an important source of pride and self-esteem. According to him, such groups give the individual a sense of belonging to the social world, namely, a sense of social identity. Social identity is relevant to how we identify ourselves in relation to others according to what we have in common. The social categories are conducted by certain norms and are related to each other in a certain sense. For example, being a woman in some societies is not only biologically, but also socially important category. It is expected that women gain certain characteristics and behave in certain ways. In race-based societies, being black and white are socially important categories. According to Parekh (2014, p. 62), since social categories define individuals as specific persons and subject them to certain norms and expectations, such identities are defined as social identities. Social identities can provide people with self-esteem, identify their social environment and affect people's behavior. When a person says "I am from Turkey.", "I'm from region of the black sea.'', and "I am a teacher." they all describe themselves, but they also describe others. Thus, identity can be common or collective, and the impact and efficiency of collective identities on individuals are not the same (Ogbu, 2004). The responses to the question 'who are we?' for

individuals refer to the collective identity. Ethnic identity, national identity, religious identity, political identity and gender identity are the most common types of collective identities.

Ethnic identity is described as a term defining people thinking of having common features differentiating themselves from other collective structures in a society where they belong and exhibit original cultural behavior or considered as such by others (Marshall, 1999, s. 215). The elements that distinguish one ethnic group from one another involve language, religion, history or ancestors, traditions, lifestyle, clothing, or decoration forms. National identity is a socio-political category depending on the actual or probable limits of a state (Wallerstein, 2000). Nation is a territorial community with common myths and memories as well as ethnicity. However, while the connection with a country in ethnicity can only be established historical and symbolic, this bond has a physical and political character in the nation (Kurubaş, 2008). Religious identity is one of the oldest forms of belonging. The differences of interpretation within the same religion and the ways in which people do not believe or believe determine their religious identities and their 'we/other' relationship. Not only 'we' and 'other' categories of gender are shaped between men and women but the people who do not meet the roles that society expects from men and women are also declared 'other' in terms of gender. Political identity is defined by the social and political values and principles that express the political tendencies of individuals (Güldü, 2010).

Collective identities generate partnership between those who share the references on which they base themselves while they tend to make a difference between those who do not share these references. Those within the boundaries determined by a collective identity are defined as 'we', while those out of the social boundaries are declared as ''other'' (Yazıcı, 2016, p.44). The relationship between 'us' and other in the change of collective identities over time is an important factor.

When the social life from the creation of humanity to the present day is examined, it is seen that it consists of different religions, languages and ethnic structures. Therefore, these differences led to the emergence of different cultures. Although almost all societies today have a multicultural structure, it is observed that these differences have not been accepted and ignored by some societies in every period of history or that societies have not adopted a multiculturalism in terms of politics. The main difference between multicultural and multiculturalism arises at this point. Multicultural refers to the presence of the cultural diversity of the individual or collective identity carriers whose daily life is different because of differences in historical, religious, ethnic and sexual characteristics in a society. On the other hand, multiculturalism refers that cultural groups and individuals having cultural differences with various characteristics have the right to be recognized along with these differences and that this should be met with respect. It also includes various regulations relevant to this matter (Anık, 2012, p. 76). For example, non-exclusion from society due to ethnicity and belief, non-discrimination due to sexual identity and skin color, regulation of public space in respect to these differences and shaping employment, social policy, education and political participation in this direction are possible with the development of policies with multicultural understanding. The people defending the concept of multiculturalism are against the assimilation of cultural differences and the dissolution of different cultures within the social order in the dominant culture (Vermeulen and Slijper, 2003, cited by Canatan, 2009).

The most effective way for multiculturalism not to turn into conflicts is an educational system with multicultural orientations. As a reflection of multicultural policies multicultural education can be defined as a whole of curricula of different cultural / ethnic communities, recognition of difference in schools and classroom environment, approaching these communities from the point of equal rights and educational practices that enable them to integrate into society. Multicultural education is to create a learning environment where students will be more interested and therefore more active by using cultural knowledge, experiences, grounds and performance styles (Gay, 2000). Through multicultural education, the teachers

enable the students to feel comfortable, so to be more motivated (Campbell, 2004). Sleeter (1991) describes multicultural education as human relations approach that aims to increase awareness of the students towards 'other'. Multicultural education is directly related to democratic education and this is emphasized in almost all definitions. The most important prejudice or lack of knowledge in multicultural education is to consider it as an issue related to ethnic problems (Yazıcı, Başol and Toprak, 2009). According to Parker (2002, p. 133) multicultural education is realized by maintaining difference and unity together in a gentle balance. Accordingly, unity without difference results in cultural pressure and hegemony. Difference without unity leads to dissociation of the nation state.

Since the second half of the 20th century, cultural differences have begun to see an increasing degree of value and the demands in this direction have become popular, so this has affected education policies and as a result of this effect, multicultural education concept has been adapted to some special teaching areas. One of these areas is social studies teaching programs. Social studies teaching is extremely important in relation to social life. In recent years, it has been observed that there are changes in both purpose and content of social studies programs and new perspectives have been included in social studies program. according to The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS-USA) (1994, p. 274) multicultural education gives an opportunity to create and maintain a civil society that works for the common good, help students understand and approve the social culture and to overcome cultural barriers. Multicultural education seeks to realize the idea of multitude in unity, to create society that recognizes and respects the cultures of different people, and to create a group of people who hold democratic values above all else. According to NCSS (2004), the main purpose of social studies helps young people develop knowledge-based and rational decision-making skills for the benefit of society as citizens of a democratic society with cultural differences in a global World. Multicultural social studies require dialogue between people with different perspectives and experiences and respect for different ideas. It creates the ground for alternative sounds (as cited by Yazıcı, 2016, p. 292).

In determining the content of teaching social studies, it is essential that other cultures living on the world are also made a part of the content by considering the social history of a society from multiple perspectives. According to Singer (2009, p. 153), multicultural social studies are an attempt to present a holistic picture of all histories, societies and cultures in the world. Therefore, it is possible to regard social studies teachers as the key to success of multicultural education aiming at providing equal education opportunities to all students from different races, ethnicities and social groups and developing dialogue and cooperation between different student groups in social studies courses.

Teachers' attitude towards this issue is important in order to ensure respect for identity differences in education because, social studies teachers will face the social reality of the society when they educate the individual as an active and collaborative citizen and prepare for life. Social studies teachers can manage the classroom environment formed by students with different perspectives from different identities through healthy dialogue without transforming into conflict. In increasing communication and interaction between cultural differences, social studies teachers have important responsibilities in preventing conflict and discrimination. By developing attitudes according to the requirements of multiculturalism in the classroom the teacher can contribute to a non-conflict society by presenting the experiences of how we can live with differences in the classroom, which constitutes a small model of society (Yazıcı, 2016, p. 295).

In this sense, it is important to determine whether attitudes of prospective social studies teachers who will be teachers of the future towards multicultural education and respect for identity differences. In this study, it has been investigated whether prospective social studies teachers' identity attitudes are predicator for multicultural education.

Method

Research Model

The relational screening model was used in the study that investigates whether prospective social studies teachers' identity differences attitudes are predicator for multicultural education. Relational screening model is a research model aiming at defining the presence and degree of change between two or more variables (Karasar, 2005).

Study Group

The study group consisted of 220 prospective teachers in the department of social studies teaching in a faculty of education located in the region of the Black Sea during the 2017-2018 academic year. Considering the variables such as the class and the program where the participants are studying, purposive sampling method was used in the creation of the study group.

Demographic characteristics of the prospective social studies teachers participating in the study are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Prospective Social Studies Teachers Participating in the Study **n:220**

Variables		f	%
Gender	Female	136	61,8
	Male	84	38,2
Year	1	49	22,3
	2	51	23,2
	3	57	25,9
	4	63	28,6
Ethnic Identity	Turkish	186	84,5
	Other (Kurdish, Circassian, Zaza, Georgian, Arabian, etc.)	34	15,5
Political Identity	Conservative	36	16,4
	Nationalist	59	26,8
	Social Democrat	34	15,5
	Impartial	91	41,4
Religious Identity	Sunni	197	89,5
	Alevi	20	9,1
	Other	3	1,4

As seen in the table, 61.8% (136) of the participants were female and 38.2% (84) of them were male. The distribution of participants by their year at study was as 22,3% (49) was in their first year, 23,2% (51) was in second year, 25,9% (57) was in third year, and 28,6% (63) was in fourth year. In terms of ethnicity while 84,5% of participants (186) described themselves as Turks, 15,5% (34) stated other ethnic identities such as Kurdish, Circassian, Zaza, Georgian, and Arabian. In terms of political identity, while 41,4% of the participants (91) considered themselves as impartial 15,5% (34) described themselves as the social democrat

as 26,8% (59) as nationalist and 16,4% (36) as conservative. In terms of religious identity, 89,5% (197) of the participants describe themselves as Sunni and 9,1% (20) as Alevi; 1,4% (3) indicate other religious identities.

Data Collection Tools

In the research, the demographic information form, the '*Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey'* and the '*Identity Attitudes Scale'* were used as the data collection tools in order to learn about the socio-demographic status of the participants.

Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey (TMAS)

Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey (TMAS) developed by Ponterotito, Baluch, Greig and Rivera (1998) and adapted to Turkish by Yazıcı, Başol and Toprak (2009) was used in order to identify perceptions of multicultural education. TMAS contains 20 items that measure teachers' attitudes towards multicultural education and is single dimensional. The survey is the 5-point Likert scale; the answers range from 'Strongly disagree' 'Disagree' 'Neutral' 'Agree' 'Strongly agree'. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Internal Consistency of the scale were 79,80.

Identity Attitudes Scale (IAS)

Another scale used in research is Identity Attitudes Scale (IAS) developed by Yazıcı (2016) in order to determine attitudes towards different identities. IAS aims to measure attitudes towards collective identity differences. In this context, the scale consists of 5 dimensions: gender, national identity, ethnic identity, political identity and religious identity. IAS consisting of with 28 items is the 5-point Likert scale; the answers range from 'Strongly disagree' 'Disagree' 'Neutral' 'Agree' 'Strongly agree'. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of internal consistency for the factors have been calculated as 77, 05 in the gender dimension, as 76,20 in the national identity dimension, as 79,36 in the ethnic identity dimension, as 80,10 in the political identity dimension and as 80,94 in the religious identity dimension. The value for overall IAS is 78, 57. All these findings indicate that IAS provides internal consistency (Büyüköztürk, 2008).

Data Analysis

The data obtained in this study were analyzed with SPSS package program. In order to decide on the analysis, it was examined whether the dataset shows normal distribution. For this purpose, Q-Q plots, and skewness and kurtosis values of the dimensions were examined according to each variable category. Considering that the skewness and kurtosis coefficients equal '0' indicates that the distribution is perfectly normal (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013) and the skewness coefficient greater than 3 and the kurtosis coefficient greater than 10 shows that the distribution is not normal (Kline, 2016), the dataset of the study was normally distributed since the skewness coefficient of the scale items was ± .027 - ± 1.425 and the kurtosis coefficient was within the range of ± .027 - ± 3.931. Besides, it is observed that data point fall along a 45-degree line in Q-Q plots. This finding is also another parameter that indicates the normal distribution of the data set. Since data meets normality assumptions parametric tests were used in the study.

The relationship between respect for identity differences and attitudes towards multicultural education was calculated with Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique. Multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the level of the predictor role of multicultural education perception in identity attitudes.

Findings

In this part of the study, firstly, average, standard deviation, minimum and maximum values of participants concerning identity attitudes and perceptions about multicultural education were calculated and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Average, Standard Deviation, Minimum and Maximum Values of the Sub-Dimensions of the Identity Attitude Scale and the Perception about Multicultural Education

Dimension	$\overline{X}$	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Multicultural Education	3,77	,41	2,50	4,89
Gender Differences	2,72	1,04	1,00	5,00
National Identity Differences	2,85	,87	1,00	5,00
Ethnic Identity Differences	3,82	,74	1,40	5,00
Political Identity Differences	3,71	,70	1,50	5,00
Religious Identity Differences	3,96	,72	1,00	5,00
Total	3,42	,50	1,79	4,82

When Table 2 is examined, participants' perceptions about multicultural education are $\overline{X}$ = 3, 77 out of 5 which is the highest score that can be obtained from the scale, it is seen that it has an average value above the average of 3. When Identity Attitudes Scale (IAS) are examined, it is understood that except gender differences and national identity differences, the other sub-dimensions and total score are greater than 3, which is the midpoint of the 5-point Likert scale. However, the dimension having the lowest average value with $\overline{X}$ = 2.72 is respect for gender differences while dimension having the highest average value with

$\overline{X}$ =3,96 is respect for the religious identity differences. In accordance with the purposes of the research The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients has been used in order to demonstrate the relationship between respect for identity differences and attitudes towards multicultural education; the results are given in Table 3.

Table 3. The Correlation Values of Sub-Dimensions of Identity Attitudes Scale and the Scores of the Attitudes Scale towards Multicultural Education

	1	2	3	4	5
Multicultural Education	,170*	,114	,497**	,390**	,383**
(1) Respect For Gender Differences		,206**	,022	,101	,139*
(2) Respect For National Identity Differences			,077	,001	,030
(3) Respect For Ethnic Identity Differences				,489**	,543**
(4) Respect For Political Identity Differences					,610**
(5) Respect For Religious Identity Differences					

*p<,05, **p<,01

When Table 3 is examined, it is observed that there is a positive significant (p<,01 level) relationship between multicultural education and ethnic identity, political identity and religious identity which are sub-

dimensions of respect for identity differences and also a positive significant (p < ,05 level) relationship with respect for gender differences. The results of the multiple regression analysis for predicting multicultural education of the attitudes towards identity differences are given in Table 4. In regression analysis, respect for gender differences, respect for national identity differences, respect for ethnic identity differences, respect for political identity differences and respect for religious identity differences which are the sub-dimensions of attitudes towards identity differences are used as predictors of multicultural education.

Table 4. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis for Predicting the Perception about Multicultural Education of Sub-Dimensions of Attitudes towards Identity Differences

Predictive Variables	B	Standard Error	β	t	p
Multicultural Education	2,164	,182		11,899	,000
Respect for Gender Differences	,053	,025	,126	2,127	,035
Respect for National Identity Differences	,028	,030	,056	,960	,338
Respect for Ethnic Identity Differences	,227	,042	,381	5,401	,000
Respect for Political Identity Differences	,095	,047	,151	2,028	,044
Respect for Religious Identity Differences	,040	,025	,065	,841	,401

The Table 4 reveals that respect for gender differences, respect for ethnic identity differences, and respect for political identity differences that are sub-dimensions of the identity attitudes scale are significant predictors of perception about multicultural education. 30% of the perception about multicultural education (R_2 = 0.301) constitutes respect for identity differences. The rest is explained by other factors. Respect for differences of national identity and respect for differences of religious identity are not regarded by teacher candidates as a significant predictor of perception about multicultural education.

Discussion and Conclusion

The average of prospective social studies teachers' perceptions about multicultural education is above the average value of 3; this reveals that social studies teachers have positive attitudes towards multicultural education. In a study on prospective social studies teachers, Çalışkan and Gencer (2016) have obtained a similar result. When this result was generally evaluated, it can be highlighted that prospective social studies teachers regard themselves as multicultural educators due to the nature of social knowledge, consider multicultural education as equal opportunity provider in schools and prefer classes where multiple cultures have equal rights to classes dominated by an additional culture. In studies conducted in Turkey with prospective teachers on multiculturalism, in general, it was also found that prospective teachers had a positive and high attitude towards multicultural education (Coşkun, 2012; Demir and Başarır, 2013; Çoban, Karaman and Doğan, 2010; Yavuz and Anıl, 2010; Polat, 2009; Yazıcı, Başol and Toprak, 2009).

While averages of sub-dimensions concerning IAS for prospective social studies teachers are highest in religious identity differences, they are at the lowest level in national and gender identity differences. Similarly, in the study conducted by Yazıcı (2017, p.15) with prospective teachers, the attitude scores of prospective teachers are the highest in religious identity differences and the lowest in national and gender identities. The lowest average score obtained from the subscales is the attitude towards national identity differences. Studies showing that the uncontrolled migration wave and the problems faced during immigrant integration adversely affect the attitude towards immigrants (Güney and Konak, 2016; Özdemir and Öner-Özkan, 2016; Polat and Kaya, 2017; Topkaya and Akdağ, 2016; Ünal, 2014) gives a clue to the reason behind the low average score obtained from national identity differences. Another sub-dimension

where averages of prospective teachers are low is gender differences, including gender and sexual orientation differences. Participants' negative attitudes towards gender differences can be explained by the general prejudices about homosexuality and the role of women in Turkey. In Turkey, as in many societies, homosexuality generally is perceived as unacceptable and abnormal; some studies have found that there are negative attitudes towards homosexuals (Esmer, 2012; Herek, 1984; Lance, 1987; Okutan and Büyükşahin-Sunal, 2011; Oliver and Hyde, 1995; Yılmaz and Göçmen, 2015). Brown (2012) has conducted a study to determine the values of Turkey with 1605 participants. It was found that homosexual individuals were the least tolerated group with a rate of 84%. The same study concluded that gender roles based on inequality were widely accepted by participants.

As a result of the multiple regressions analysis concerning predicting multicultural education of attitudes towards identity differences, it was indicated that respect for gender differences, respect for ethnic identity differences, and respect for differences in political identity which are sub-dimensions of IAS are predictors of perception about multicultural education. However, respect for differences of national identity and respect for differences of religious identity are not considered as a significant predictor of the perception about multicultural education by prospective social studies teachers. The fact that respect for gender, political and ethnic identity differences is important predictor is possible to explain in the light of the definitions of multiculturalism and multicultural education. All in all, in a society, multiculturalism refers to the presence of the cultural diversity of the individual or collective identity carriers whose daily life is different because of differences in historical, religious, ethnic and sexual characteristics in a society (Anık, 2012, p.76). Multicultural education aims to provide equal education opportunities to all students from different races, ethnicities and social groups, to develop dialogue and cooperation between different student groups in social studies courses, to create society that recognizes and respects the cultures of different people, and to form a group of people who hold democratic values above all else. Therefore, the individuals' attitudes towards different identities can also affect their perspectives on multicultural education. On the other hand, what the people of Turkey generally realize from identity differences is ethnic differences. Although it has an empire history, Turkey was not a country that take in immigrants from different countries such as the United States, Canada or Australia until the last 10 years. In the last 10 years, it is seemed that the migration wave including especially the Syrians, have not changed prospective social studies teachers' attitudes on this subject. In other words, since immigrants living in Turkey are not yet considered a settled part of the country, prospective social studies teachers do not deem necessary a change in the education system for these communities within the scope of multicultural education. The fact that national identity differences are not significant predictors of the attitude towards multicultural education confirms this situation.

It can be stated that respect for gender and political identity differences are significant predictors of the attitude towards multicultural education because although multicultural education has emerged based on ethnic diversity, its scope has expanded over time. Multiculturalism has emerged as a political project for the first time in the 1970s, depending on the cultural, ethnic, social and political demands of national minorities and immigrants in Canada (Yanık, 2013, p. 42). According to Yazıcı (2007) factual dimension of multiculturalism refers that certain societies are historically and sociologically composed of different ethnic, religious, moral, gender, social class and cultural groups in the past or today. Kymlicka (1998, p.49-50), indicate that when it is considered in terms of ethnic, religious, moral, gender, social class, political ideologies and other cultural differences, all countries are multicultural and widens the scope of multiculturalism. According to him, multiculturalism should meet rightful demands of disadvantaged groups such as gay, lesbian, disabled. According to Banks (1999, p.10) one of five different dimensions of effective multicultural education is 'equity pedagogy dimension' and the other one is 'acquire power dimension'. It is aimed to provide a teaching which has equal effect on the academic achievements of

different ethnic, religious, cultural and gender groups through multicultural education in equity pedagogy dimension, while to promote equality between gender, ethnic and social classes in school and social structure through multicultural education in acquire power dimension.

Teachers come into prominence as the most important element in order to achieve success and provide the desired efficiency of multicultural education (Brown and Kysilka, 2002). According to Roux (2000), the successful implementation of multicultural education in the classroom largely depends on the knowledge, attitudes, thoughts and behaviors of the teacher. As a result, teachers' attitude towards this issue is important in order to ensure respect for identity differences in education. However, as general results of the study, teachers' attitudes towards multicultural education are above the middle value (3) but below the upper value (5). On the other hand, when the averages of the sub-dimensions related to identity attitudes are examined, it is observed that the national identity and gender differences are below average. Depending on this result, the measures to take in order to increase the attitudes of prospective teachers who are social studies teachers of the future towards respect for multicultural education and identity differences provide that social studies teacher can manage the classroom environment formed by students with different perspectives from different identities through healthy dialogue without transforming into conflict. It is suggested that prospective social studies teachers should be informed about multicultural education and identity differences or be raised their awareness. In this context, respect and tolerance for multicultural education and identity differences can be given in some courses. It is also recommended that learning and teaching environments should be organized in a manner sensitive to multicultural education.

REFERENCES

Anık, M. (2012). *Kimlik ve çokkültürcülük sosyolojisi*. İstanbul: Açılım.

Banks, J.A. (1999). *An introduction to multicultural education.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bilgin, N. (1999). *Kolektif kimlik.* 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2008). *Veri analizi el kitabı: İstatistik, araştırma deseni, spss uygulamaları ve yorum. 9.Baskı,* Ankara: Pegem-Akademi.

Brehm, S. ve Kassin, S. M. (1993). *Social psychology.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Brown, R. (1988). *Group processes*: *Dynamics within and betıueen groups.* Oxford: Basil BlackvvellInc.

Brown, R. (2005). Social Identity. A. Kuper, & J. Kuper (Eds.), *The Social Science Encyclopedia* (2nd ed., ss. 1356-1358) in,London and NewYork: Rotledge.

Brown, S.C., & Kysilka, M. (2002). *Applying Multicultural And Global Concepts In The Classroom And Beyond*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Canatan, K. (2009). Avrupa toplumlarında çokkültürcülük: Sosyolojik bir yaklaşım. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 2*(6), s.80-97.

Coşkun, M.K. (2012). Din kültürü ve ahlak bilgisi öğretmen adaylarının çokkültürlü eğitime yönelik tutumları. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 34,33-44.

Çalışkan, H. & Gençer, R. (2016). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmen adaylarının çokkültürlü eğitime ilişkin tutum düzeylerinin incelenmesi, *V. Sakarya'da Eğitim Araştırmaları Kongresi.* Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya/Türkiye.

Çayır, K. (2014). *" Biz" Kimiz? Ders kitaplarında kimlik, yurttaşlık, haklar.* İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Çoban, A. E., Karaman, G. N., & Doğan, T. (2010). Öğretmen adaylarının kültürel farklılıklara yönelik bakış açılarının çeşitli demografik değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Dergisi, 10*(1), 125-136.

Çoban, A. E., Karaman, N. G. & Doğan, T. (2010). Öğretmen adaylarının kültürel farklılıklara yönelik bakış açılarının çeşitli demografik değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,10*(1), 125-131.

Demir, S. & Başarır, F. (2013). Çokkültürlü eğitim çerçevesinde öğretmen adaylarının öz-yeterlilik algılarının incelenmesi. *International Journal of Social Science, 6* (1), 609-641.

Demir, S. (2012). Çokkültürlü eğitimin Erciyes Üniversitesi öğretim elemanları için önem derecesi. *Electronic Turkish Studies*,7(4), 1454-1475.

Esmer, Y. (2012). *Türkiye değerler atlası 2012*. İstanbul: Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, andpractice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Giddens, A. (2010). *Modernite ve bireysel-kimlik geç modern çağda benlik ve toplum*, (Çev. Ümit Tatlıcan), İstanbul: Say Yayınları.

Gleason, P. (2014). Kimliği tanımlamak: Semantik bir tarih. Fırat Mollaer (Ed.), *Kimlik politikaları, tanınma, özdeşlik ve farklılık* (ss. 21-52)*içinde,* Ankara: Doğubatı.

Güldü, Ö. (2010). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde siyasal kimlik.* (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi), Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Güney, Ü. & Konak, N. (2016). Bolu'da Suriyeli ve Iraklı sığınmacılar vatandaşlık ve kaynak dağılımı temelinde öteki algısı. *Marmara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilimler Dergisi* 4(2), 113-133.

Herek, G. M. (1984). Beyond "homophobia": A social psychological perspective on attitudes toward gay and lesbian populations. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*, 1-21.

Hogg A. &Vaughan G. M. (2007). *Sosyal psikoloji.* (Çev. İ. Yıldız; A. Gelmez). Ankara: Ütopya.

Jenkins, K. (2016). Amelioration and inclusion: Gender identity and the concept of woman. *Ethics*, *126*(2), 394-421.

Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi.* Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kılıçbay, M. A. (2003). Kimlikler okyanusu. *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi, 23*, 155-159.

Kurubaş, E. (2008). Etnik sorunlar: Ulus-devlet ve etnik gruplar arasındaki varoluşsal ilişki. *Doğu Batı,44*, 11-41.

Kline R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*, 4th Edn. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1998). *Çokkültürlü yurttaşlık*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Lance, L. M. (1987). The effects of interaction with agy persons on attitudes toward homosexuality. *Human Relations,40*(6), 329-336.

Lawler, S. (2008). *Identity: Sociological perspectives*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Luckmann, T. (2003). *Görünmeyen din modern toplumlarda din problemi.*(Çev. Ali Coşkun-Fuat Aydın), İstanbul: Rağbet Yayınları.

Marshall, G. (2005). *Sosyoloji sözlüğü*, (Çev. Osman Akınhay, Derya Kömürcü), Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.

NCSS (1991). Curriculum Guidelines for Multricultural Education.

NCSS (1994). Curriculum Standarts For Social Studies: Expectations Of Excellence Washington DC: Nacional Council fort he Social Studies.

Ogbu, J. U. (2004). Collective identity and the burden of "acting white" in black history, community, and education. *The Urban Review,36*(1), 1-35. doi:10.1023/B:URRE.0000042734.83194.f6

Okutan, N. & Büyükşahin-Sunal, A. (2011). Eşcinsellere yönelik tutumlar, cinsiyetçilik ve romantik ilişkilerle ilgili kalıp yargılar: Yetişkin bağlanma biçimleri açısından bir değerlendirme. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, *14*(27), 69.

Oliver, M. B. & Hyde, J. S. (1995). Gender differences in attitudes toward homosexuality: A reply to Whitley and Kite. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 155-158.

Oliver, M. B. & Hyde, J. S. (1995). Gender differences in attitudes toward homosexuality: A reply to Whitley and Kite. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*, 155-158.

Onat, H. (2009). Türkiye'de cemaatler ve kimlik. M. Çağatay Özdemir (Ed.), *Türk kimliği* (ss. 808-825) içinde, İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.

Özdemir, F. & Öner-Özkan, B. (2016). Türkiye'de sosyal medya kullanıcılarının Suriyeli mültecilere ilişkin sosyal temsilleri. *Nesne, 4(*8), 227-244.

Pamuk, A. (2014). *Kimlik ve tarih kimliğin inşasında tarihin kullanımı*. İstanbul: Yeni İnsan Yayınevi.

Parekh, B. (2014). Kimliğin Mantığı. Fırat Mollaer (Ed.), *Kimlik politikaları, tanınma, özdeşlik ve farklılık* (s. 54-76) *içinde*, Ankara: Doğubatı.

Polat, D. F. Ç. & Kaya, Y. L. E. (2017). Bir ötekileştirme pratiği: Türkiye'de yaşayan Suriyelilere yönelik tutumlar. *Mersin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *1*(1), 38-48.

Polat, S. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının çokkültürlü eğitime yönelik kişilik özellikleri. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 1*(1),154-164.

Roux, J. L. (2000). Multicultural education: A new approach for a new South African dispensation. *Intercultural Education, 11*(1), 19-29

Singer, A. J. (2009). *Social studies for secondary schools: Teaching to learn, learning to teach*, Routledge: New York.

Sleeter, C. E. (Ed.). (1991). *Empowerment through multicultural education*. SUNY Press.

Snow, D. A. (2001). Collectiveidentityandexpressiveforms. N.J. Smelser ve P.B. Baltes (Eds.). *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (2212-2219) in, London: Elsevier Science.

Snow, D.,Oselin, S. & Corrigal-Brown, C. (2005). Identity. InG. Ritzer (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of social theory I* (pp. 390–393), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using MultivariateStatistics (6th ed.*), Boston: Allynand Bacon.

Tajfel, H. (1979). Individuals and groups in social psychology. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *18*(2), 183-190.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Revieıu of Psychology*, *33*, 1-39.

Topkaya, Y. & Akdağ, H. (2016). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmen adaylarının Suriyeli sığınmacılar hakkındaki görüşleri (Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi örneği). *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 7*(1), 767-786.

Topkaya, Y.& Akdağ, H. (2016). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmen adaylarının Suriyeli sığınmacılar hakkındaki görüşleri (Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi örneği). *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 7*(1), 767-786.

Turner, J. C. &Tajfel, H. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. *Psychology of intergroup relations*, 7-24.

Ünal, S. (2014). Türkiye'nin beklenmedik konukları:" Öteki" bağlamında yabancı göçmen ve mülteci deneyimi. *ZeitschriftfürdieWelt der Türken/Journal of World of Turks*, *6*(3), 65-89.

Wallerstein, I. (2000). *Halklılığın inşası: Irkçılık, milliyetçilik ve etniklik. Irk, ulus, sınıf belirsiz kimlikler* (Ed.) E. Balibar ve I. Wallerstein, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 91-108.

Wetherell, M. (der.) (1996). *Identities, groups and social issues*. London: Sage.

Yanık, C. (2013). *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Çokkültürlülük*.Bursa: Sentez Yayıncılık,

Yavuz, G. &Anıl, D.(2010). Öğretmen adayları için çokkültürlü eğitime yönelik tutum ölçeği: Güvenirlik ve geçerlik çalışması. *International Conference on New Trends in Educationand Tehir Implicationas*. 11-13 November, Antalya, 1056-1062.

Yazıcı, F. (2014). Çokkültürlü Bir Toplumda Tarih Öğretimi. Mustafa Safran (Ed.), *Tarih nasıl öğretilir?* Içinde. İstanbul: Yeni İnsan Yayınevi

Yazıcı, F. (2016). Kimlik tutumları ölçeği: Bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, *5*(4), 41.

Yazıcı, F. (2017). Preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences. *Higher Education Studies*, *7*(3), 11.

Yazıcı, S. (2007). Yapılandırıcı Yaklaşım ve Çokkültürlü Eğitim, (Yayınlanmamış makale).

Yazıcı, S., Başol, G. &Toprak, G. (2009). Öğretmenlerin çokkültürlü eğitim tutumları: Bir güvenirlik ve geçerlik çalışması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 37*, 229-242.

Yılmaz, V. & Göçmen, İ. (2015), Türkiye'de lezbiyen, gey, biseksüel ve trans bireylerin sosyal ve ekonomik sorunları araştırmasının özet sonuçları. *Türkiye Politika ve Araştırma Merkezi* (Research Turkey), 4(6), s.94-101, (http://researchturkey.org/9142).