



Reverse Tullip Education

# **Investigation of Preschool Teacher Candidates' Tolerance Levels in Terms of Various Variables**

**<sup>1</sup>. Mercan CİNGİ <sup>2</sup>. Atila ÇAĞLAR**

## **Abstract**

The aim of this study is to examine the tolerance levels of prospective teachers with various variables. The variables to be examined for this purpose are; education level of the parents, socioeconomic level, high school type graduated, and grade level of prospective teachers. The study sample of the research consists of 112 students in the 1st and 4th grades who study in the Department of Primary Education in Kastamonu University, Faculty of Education, Department of Preschool Education. As a data collection tool, 'Teacher Candidates Tolerance Scale', which consists of 15 item sand 4 sub-dimensions (Empathy, Importance, Harmony and Attitude) adapted by Turkish by Gül, Karataş and Borkoev (2019), was used. The data obtained were entered into the SPSS program, and percentage and frequency from the descriptive statistics, t test for groups independent of difference tests, anova test was used for variables with more than 2 options. Separate analyzes were made for each sub-dimension. As a result of the research; No significant difference was found in the educational status of the students, socioeconomic levels, high school types graduated, and university class levels, and a significant result was found in favor of the father who had undergraduate and graduate education in the attitude subscale of the father education status.

**Keywords:** Tolerance, Prospective Teachers, Education, Morality.

1. Kastamonu University, mcingi@kastamonu.edu.tr

2. Kastamonu University, atilacaglar@gmail.com

## **Citation:**

Cingi, M., & Çağlar, A. (2020). Investigation of Preschool Teacher Candidates' Tolerance Levels in Terms of Various Variables Social Scientific Centered Issues, 2(1), 15-23.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Tolerance is a form of communication. This form of communication is a process that embraces all kinds of emotions, thoughts, and behaviors, as well as unrequited understanding, love, trust and respect for people who we think are distant or distant (Büyükkaragöz, 1995). To tolerate those who reveal the feelings they feel and whose thoughts are different from ours; is the most direct definition of tolerance. The most basic condition of tolerance; to give people the right to freely express their thoughts and values they believe, and to meet these different feelings and thoughts naturally (Kavcar, 1995). The situation of not being disturbed by the religion, belief, and different understanding that someone else believes explains tolerance.

Philosophical tolerance; it is the state of accepting and respecting people and other thoughts other than the patterns that they have (Aslan, 2001). Tolerance; is a phenomenon that regulates human relations. It has mutual love, respect and understanding. It is considered as a moral situation because it allows them (Mutluer, 2015). To tolerate the creature because of the creator is associated with the moral structure. After the declaration of the World Year of Tolerance by UNESCO in 1995, tolerance started to be mentioned in various authorities. The facts of tolerance that belong to human and glorify people have made tolerance a virtue (Küçükbezirci, 2013; Yılmaz & Ertuğrul Akyol, 2019). So much so that; It is assumed that if human beings are tolerant, their social relationships will be positive, they will behave in a way that will benefit people, reflect this to themselves and those around them, and even make the world more beautiful (Başaran, 1995).

It also includes respect for different people and thoughts in tolerance. So much so that everyone should learn to live with these differences regardless of age. Multicultural life is now very common, especially in the globalizing world (Yılmaz, Yaz & Yüzbaşıoğlu, 2019). It is necessary to be open to ideas other than yourself, to have an understanding of these idea owners. The only thing people seek in today's world is to live in peace. This can only be achieved by the presence of tolerant individuals who resolve conflict without violence, respect others and their ideas and are in solidarity (Reardon, 1997).

It contains two main points in tolerance: empathy and the right of person to imperfection within a certain boundary. Empathy, putting the person in the shoes of the other person; It is defined as looking at events, thoughts from one's window. Undoubtedly, when talking about tolerance, it cannot be ignored that it contains empathy. The right to the flaw of the tolerance offered to the person in a certain framework is also very important. It is quite difficult to create this frame and to draw the limits of it. It differs from person to person. The environment, economic and cultural differences in which people grow can vary from person to person (Basaran, 1995).

Tolerance; it does not mean pulling, folding, compromising or ignoring. Confusion arises in the society that it is accepted as such. Irresponsibility and discipline occur (Atasü, 1995). To avoid this, education of tolerance should be adopted as a principle. Future generations should receive education within the framework of tolerance and internalize tolerance (Yılmaz, 2004).

The ability of the person in front of us to manage his situation, even if we disagree with my ideas, is defined as tolerance (Hotaman, 2012). Tolerance is a way of life and requires mutual understanding. This does not mean that the person in front of us is right in any case and his thoughts are correct. Although we disagree with every thought and emotion of the person in front of us, it is the situation of welcoming him with understanding (Kıroğlu, Elma, Kesten & Egüz, 2012).

Today, we can say by taking a look at our society that the importance given to these value judgments is decreasing. It will not be difficult to believe that people are selfish in society, do not respect and value anyone and anything else besides themselves. This situation causes unhappiness in the society; prepares the ground for the loss of trust environment. For these reasons, tolerance is one of the most important values that a person should have (Widmalm, 2005).

Those who can reach every segment of society are teachers. The teachers themselves must have the virtue of tolerance first. In this regard, teachers and prospective teachers have great duties (Kaymakcan, 2007). The teacher is the role model of the society. The teacher, who is tolerant of himself, should be tolerant both in his interaction with his students at work and in his daily life in order to spread tolerance in the society. For values education, it is important that the teacher has tolerance and instills this in his students (Tatar, 2009). The internalization of students' tolerance depends on the environment of tolerance that their teachers will offer to their students (Kalın & Naçacı, 2017). Students with a value of tolerance will easily adopt other values. The foundations of democratic life are created only by people who respect each other. Tolerance is the main factor in raising generations that respect each other (Şahin, 2011).

Undoubtedly, tolerance plays a major role in preventing many negative behaviors in the society. Preservice teachers will reflect their tolerance as a role model to their students in their professional lives (Thompson, 2010). Only in this way can people's confidence problems, disrespectful behaviors, prejudices against ideas decrease. Respecting people and personalities; accepting people as they are (Khitruk & Ulianova, 2012); Considering the diversity of people as cultural diversity (Korkmaz, 2000); It is estimated that non-marginalization (Senemoğlu, 2015) and many other similar behaviors will only occur through tolerant generations.

Preschool period is the period when the characters of the children sit and the foundations of their later life are laid. It is certain that how tolerant the preschool teachers preparing these children for the future are. For this reason, how preschool teacher candidates who have not started their profession evaluate tolerance is the main problem of this research. Within the framework of this problem, the answer to the question of whether the pre-service teacher candidates made a change in their educational life and the social life that the university has added to them will be sought.

## **2. METHOD**

### **Research Method**

In this study; Descriptive survey model, one of the quantitative research methods, was used. Descriptive scans are a method used to reveal the existing cases clearly (Slavin, 2007).

### **Study Group**

The sample of the study consists of 127 students in the 1st and 4th grades who study in the Department of Primary Education in Kastamonu University, Faculty of Education, Department of Primary Education. The research group was determined by using stratified purposeful sampling, which is one of the non-selective purposeful sampling methods. Stratified purposeful sampling is preferred to show the characteristics of the group to be used in the research, to describe these features and to enable comparison between groups (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006).

### **Data collection tool**

As a data collection tool, 'Teacher Candidates Tolerance Scale', which consists of 15 items and 4 sub-dimensions (Empathy, Importance, Harmony and Attitude) adapted to Turkish by Gül, Karataş and Borkoev (2019), was used. The Tolerance Scale is a 5-grade Likert-type scale (I totally agree, I agree, I am indecisive, I do not agree, I never agree).

### **Analysis Of Data**

The data obtained were entered into the SPSS program, and percentage and frequency from the descriptive statistics, t test for groups independent of difference tests, Anova test was used for variables with more than 2 options (Yılmaz & Yanarateş, 2020). Separate analyzes were made for each sub-dimension.

### 3. RESULTS

In this section, the tables in which the tolerance levels of 1st and 4th grade students, who constitute the sample of the research, are measured in various variables.

**Table 1:** Personal information of the sample

Gender	Woman	96	85,7
	Man	16	14,3
	Toplam	112	100
Grade	1. Grade	56	50,0
	4. Grade	56	50,0
	Total	127	100
Type of high school graduated	Vocational high School	30	26,8
	Anatolian High School	56	50,0
	Other	26	23,2
	Total	112	100
Mother's education level	Primary school	70	62,5
	Middle School	21	18,8
	High school	13	11,6
	Undergraduate	8	7,1
	Total	112	100
Father's education level	Primary school	36	32,1
	Middle School	28	25,0
	High school	25	22,3
	Undergraduate	23	20,5
	Total	112	100
Socioeconomic situation	1000-2500	34	30,4
	2500-5000	58	51,8
	5000-7500	20	17,9
	Total	112	100

The sample consists of 85.7% female students and 14.3% male students. While 56 of the students in the group constituting the sample are 1st grade, the number of 4th grade students is 56. In the research, 3 different graduated high school types were used as variables, these are vocational high schools, Anatolian high schools and other high school types. 28.8% of students graduated from vocational high schools, 50% from Anatolian high schools and 23.2% from other high school types. Parental education levels are another variable that constitutes the research and they were evaluated separately for the mother and father. 62.5% of mothers are fathers and 32.1% are primary school graduates. 18.8% of mothers and 25.0% of fathers are secondary school graduates. 11.6% of mothers are high school graduates and 22.3% of fathers are high school graduates. 7.1% of mothers are undergraduate and 20.5% of fathers are undergraduate. From a socioeconomic perspective, 30.4% of the students participating in the study stated that they had monthly income between 1000 and 2500 TL, 51.8% between 2500 and 5000 TL and 17.9% between 5000 and 7500 TL.

T-Test Results for Comparing the Tolerance Tendency Scores of the Candidate Teachers Participating in the Study According to the Class Level Variable are given in Table 2.

**Table 2:** T-Test Results for Comparison of Teacher Candidates' Tolerance Tendency Scores According to Class Level Variable

Dimension	Grade	N	X	SS	F	p
Empathy	1	56	1,4107	,30847	,115	,908
	4	56	1,4036	,34639		
Importance	1	56	1,7143	,38855	,500	,618
	4	56	1,6741	,45954		
Harmony	1	56	1,8214	,60290	-,256	,799
	4	56	1,8512	,62900		
Attitude	1	56	1,3631	,40838	-,306	,760
	4	56	1,3869	,41573		
All Scale	1	56	1,5643	,26299	,041	,967
	4	56	1,5619	,34014		

In the examination made in terms of the grade levels of the students, it was concluded that there was no significant difference in the tolerance tendencies of 1st grade and 4th grade pre-service teachers. Examination was carried out in four different sub-dimensions of the applied scale, and it was concluded that the different grade levels did not affect the tolerance tendencies.

Another variable of the research is the high school type of prospective teachers graduated. ANOVA test was used for the high school variable in which the teacher candidates who participated in the research graduated.

**Table 3:** ANOVA Test Results for the Comparison of Tolerance Tendency Scores According to the High School Variable Graduated by Pre-Service Teachers Participating in the Study

Dimension	Type of high school graduated	N	X	SS	F	p
Empathy	Vocational high School	30	1,4067	,36192	,506	,604
	Anatolian High School	56	1,4321	,30695		
	Other	26	1,3538	,33134		
	Total	112	1,4071	,32652		
Importance	Vocational high School	30	1,6833	,46393	1,854	,162
	Anatolian High School	56	1,7589	,37223		
	Other	26	1,5673	,4668		
	Total	112	1,6942	,42409		
Harmony	Vocational high School	30	1,7444	,61078	2,095	,128
	Anatolian High School	56	1,9524	,62094		
	Other	26	1,6923	,57289		
	Total	112	1,8363	,61349		
Attitude	Vocational high School	30	1,2778	,38240	1,173	,313
	Anatolian High School	56	1,4167	,38795		
	Other	26	1,3974	,48092		
	Total	112	1,3750	,41039		
All Scale	Vocational high School	30	1,5222	,30929	2,132	,123
	Anatolian High School	56	1,6202	,28453		
	Other	26	1,4872	,31987		
	Total	112	1,5631	,30265		

When analyzed in terms of the type of high school graduated, no significant difference was found in terms of teacher candidates' tolerance tendencies. An evaluation has been made for each sub-dimension of the scale applied and no significant difference has been reached.

Another variable of the research is the socioeconomic level of prospective teachers. Anova test was used to determine whether the prospective teachers participating in the study contributed to the tolerance tendencies of the socioeconomic level variable.

**Table 4:** ANOVA Test Results for the Comparison of Tolerance Tendency Scores of the Candidate Teachers Participating in the Study According to the Socioeconomic Status Variable

Dimension	Socioeconomic situation	N	X	SS	F	p
Empathy	1000-2500	34	1,4118	,31117	1,402	,250
	2500-5000	58	1,3690	,32184		
	5000-7500	20	1,5100	,35821		
	Total	112	1,4071	,32652		
Importance	1000-2500	34	1,7206	,38319	,315	,730
	2500-5000	58	1,6638	,44562		
	5000-7500	20	1,7375	,44036		
	Total	112	1,6942	,42409		
Harmony	1000-2500	34	1,8235	,69745	,071	,932
	2500-5000	58	1,8276	,57309		
	5000-7500	20	1,8833	,60481		
	Total	112	1,8363	,61349		
Attitude	1000-2500	34	1,3627	,37933	2,289	,060
	2500-5000	58	1,3161	,37162		
	5000-7500	20	1,5667	,51978		
	Total	112	1,3750	,41039		
All Scale	1000-2500	34	1,5667	,29140	1,340	,266
	2500-5000	58	1,5287	,28528		
	5000-7500	20	1,6567	,36146		
	Total	112	1,5631	,30265		

As seen in Table 4, as a result of the research carried out in the socioeconomic situation, no significant difference was found in the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies. Four sub-dimensions of the scale were included in the study and it was revealed that there was no significant difference.

Another variable of the research is the level of education at which the mothers of prospective teachers graduated last. In Table 5, the education levels and analyzes of the mothers last are given.

**Table 5:** ANOVA Test Results for the Comparison of Tolerance Tendency Scores of Prospective Teachers Participating in the Study According to the Mother Education Level Variable

Dimension	Mother's education level	N	X	SS	F	p
Empathy	Primary school	70	11,3914	,33438	,205	,893
	Middle School	21	1,4476	,34586		
	High school	13	1,4000	,29439		
	Undergraduate	8	1,4500	,29761		
	Total	112	1,4071	,32652		
Importance	Primary school	70	1,7179	,40585	,463	,709
	Middle School	21	1,7143	,56061		
	High school	13	1,5962	,31521		
	Undergraduate	8	1,5938	,35197		
	Total	112	1,6942	,42409		
Harmony	Primary school	70	1,8333	,58083	1,178	,322
	Middle School	21	1,7460	,61377		
	High school	13	2,1026	,77441		
	Undergraduate	8	1,6667	,59094		
	Total	112	1,8363	,61349		
Attitude	Primary school	70	1,3429	,40912	1,002	,395
	Middle School	21	1,4603	,42787		
	High school	13	1,3077	,39585		
	Undergraduate	8	1,5417	,39591		
	Total	112	1,3750	,41039		
All Scale	Primary school	70	1,5571	,29750	,043	,988
	Middle School	21	1,5810	,34650		
	High school	13	1,5744	,29255		
	Undergraduate	8	1,5500	,29761		
	Total	112	1,5631	,30265		

According to the analysis result; It was concluded that the mother education levels of prospective teachers participating in the study did not make a significant difference in the tolerance tendencies of the preservice teachers. All sub-dimensions of the scale used in the analysis were included, and no significant difference was found.

Another variable of the research is the father education level of prospective teachers. Table 6 shows the analysis of the teacher candidates' level of father education.

**Table 6:** ANOVA Test Results for the Comparison of Tolerance Tendency Scores of Prospective Teachers Participating in the Study According to Father's Education Level Variable

Dimension	Father's education level	N	X	SS	F	p
Empathy	Primary school	36	1,3722	,33858	1,864	,140
	Middle School	28	1,3571	,32821		
	High school	25	1,3840	,31581		
	Undergraduate	23	1,5478	,29675		
	Total	112	1,4071	,32652		
Importance	Primary school	36	1,7778	,40434	1,723	,167
	Middle School	28	1,6250	,47871		
	High school	25	1,7700	,41408		
	Undergraduate	23	1,5652	,37094		
	Total	112	1,6942	,42409		
Harmony	Primary school	36	1,8241	,51938	,794	,500
	Middle School	28	1,7024	,59725		
	High school	25	1,9467	,79745		
	Undergraduate	23	1,8986	,54527		
	Total	112	1,8363	,61349		
Attitude	Primary school	36	1,2685	,34567	3,003	,034*
	Middle School	28	1,2976	,39896		
	High school	25	1,4533	,45010		
	Undergraduate	23	1,5507	,42174		
	Total	112	1,3750	,41039		
All Scale	Primary school	36	1,5500	,26732	1,170	,325
	Middle School	28	1,4857	,30784		
	High school	25	1,6133	,33830		
	Undergraduate	23	1,6232	,30458		
	Total	112	1,5631	,30265		

As a result of the analysis, while there was no significant difference in the education status of their fathers according to the anova test data of the whole scale; A significant difference was found in the sub-dimension of the attitude sub-dimension. Significant results were found in favor of fathers who had undergraduate and graduate education in the attitude subscale of father's education status.

#### 4. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this research, 'Teacher Candidate Scale of Student Candidates', composed of 15 items and 4 sub-dimensions (Empathy, Importance, Harmony and Attitude) adapted to Turkish by Gül, Karataş and Borkoev (2019). As a result of this scale applied, the following data were obtained.

In addition to the fact that all individuals in the world have the virtue of tolerance; The most basic value is that teachers who educate the society have tolerance. The tolerance levels of prospective teachers participating in the study were measured with various variables, and only a significant difference was found in the attitude sub-dimension of the father's education level. In the light of this data; It can be said that the level of tolerance of teacher candidates was not affected by class differences or socioeconomic levels, but their father's education level.

The most important feature that a teacher should have is that it is tolerant and loving, as well as tolerant of mistakes and mistakes. When we look at the literature, it was noticed that the most important value of teacher candidates is tolerance (Çekin, 2013; Özdemir & Sezgin, 2011; Uzun & Köse, 2017).



## References

- Aslan, Ö. (2001). HOŞGÖRÜ VE TOLERANS KAVRAMLARINA ETİMOLOJİK AÇIDAN ANALİTİK BİR YAKLAŞIM. Cumhuriyet üniversitesi ilahiyat fakültesi dergisi, 5(2), 357-380.
- Atasü, E. (1995) Hoşgörü Doğudan Batıya Hoşgörü ve Eğitim Toplantısı. UNESCO Türkiye Milli Komisyonu ve Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Ortak Yayın, No: 2, Ankara.
- Başaran, LE. (1995) Hoşgörü ve Eğitim. Hoşgörü ve Eğitim Toplantısı." UNESCOTürkiye Milli Komisyonu ve Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Ortak Yayın, No: 2, Ankara
- Büyükkaragöz, S., & Kesici, Ş. (1996). Öğretmenlerin hoşgörü ve demokratik tutumları. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 2(3), 353-365.
- Çekin, A. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının ahlaki olgunluk düzeyleri. Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 21(3), 1035-1048.
- Ertugrul-Akyol, B. (2019). Development of Computational Thinking Scale: Validity and Reliability Study. International Journal of Educational Methodology, 5(3), 421-432.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). How to design and evaluate research in education 2006. Mc Grawall Hill.
- Gül, Y. E., Karataş, K., & Borkoev, B.(2019) Öğretmen Adayları Hoşgörü Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye Uyarlama Çalışması. OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, 14(20), 1-1.
- Hotaman, D. (2012). An investigation of pre-service teachers' perceptions of teacher personality characteristics. Journal of Theoretical Educational Science, 5(2), 186-201.
- Kalın, Z. T.,& Nalçacı, A. (2017). Ortaokul 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin hoşgörü eğilimlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 12(23), 293-304.
- Kavcar, C. (1995). Açılış Konuşması. Hoşgörü ve Eğitim Toplantısı.
- Kaymakcan, R. (2007). Bir değer olarak hoşgörü ve eğitimi. Değerler Eğitimi Merkezi Dergisi, 2(6), 114-119.
- Khitruk, V.V.,&Ulianova, O. A. (2012). Inclusive tolerance as a basis of Professional competence of prospective teachers. Problems of Education in The 21st Century, 43, 21-32.
- Kıroğlu, K., Elma, C., Kesten, A., & Egüz, Ş. (2012). Üniversitede demokratik bir değer olarak hoşgörü. Journal of Social Studies Education Research, 3(2), 86-104.
- Korkmaz, S. (2000). Türklerde hoşgörü. Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 1(9), 491- 502.
- Küçükbezirci, Y. (2013). Mevlâna'nın hoşgörü felsefesi ve iletişim. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, (30), 19-25.
- Mutluer, C. (2015). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmen adaylarının "hoşgörü" kavramına ilişkin metaforik algıları. Tarih Okulu Dergisi, 8(22), 575-595.
- Özdemir, S.,& Sezgin, F. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının bireysel ve örgütsel değerler ile öğrencilerde görmek istedikleri değerlere ilişkin önem sırası algıları. Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 4(2), 1-21
- Reardon, B. A. (1997). La tolérance, porte ouverte sur la paix: Unité pour l'enseignement secondaire. Unité 3. Ed. Unesco.
- Senemoğlu, N. (2015). Gelişim, öğretme ve öğretim. Ankara: Yargı Yayınevi
- Şahin, Ç. (2011). Perceptions of prospective teachers about tolerance education. Educational Research and Reviews, 6(1), 77-86.
- Tatar, A. F. (2009). Okul öncesi eğitiminde (5-6 yaş) hoşgörü eğitimi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Thompson, W. C. (2010). Reconsidering tolerance education: should we cover tolerance or replace it with hospitality? Philosophy of Education, 346-348.
- Uzun, M.,& Köse, A. (2017). Okul öncesi eğitimde değerler eğitiminin uygulanmasına yönelik öğretmen görüşleri. Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 12(23), 305-338.
- Weidenfeld, W. (2002). Constructive conflicts: tolerance learning as the basis for democracy. Prospects, 32(1), 95-102.
- Widmalm, S. (2005). Trust and tolerance in India: findings from Madhya Pradesh and Kerala. India Review, 4, 233-257
- Yılmaz, H. (2004). Hz. Peygamber'in eğitiminde bir ilke olarak hoşgörü. Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, (8)1, 109-132.
- Yılmaz, A., & Yanarates, E. (2020). Öğretmen Adaylarının "Su Kirliliği" Kavramına Yönelik Metaforik Algılarının Veri Çeşitlemesi Yoluyla Belirlenmesi. Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 28(3), 1500-1528. DOI: 10.24106/kefdergi.722554
- Yılmaz, A., & Ertugrul Akyol, B. (2019). A Comparative Analysis of the Studies in the Field of Lifelong Learning in Turkey. Social Scientific Centered Issues, 1(2), 28-36. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ssci/issue/51197/661056>
- Yılmaz, A., Yaz, Ö. V., & Yüzbaşıoğlu, M. K. (2019). The Effect of Infographic Use on the Students'Academic Success and Permanence in the Teaching of Basic Machinery Unit. Journal of Current Research on Social Sciences, 9(3), 123-130. doi:10.26579/jocress-9.3.8