Cilt/Volume: 4
Sayı/Issue: 2
Aralık/December 2015

BÜEFAD

BARTIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ EĞİTİM FAKÜLTESİ DERGİSİ

Uluslararası Hakemli Dergi

BARTIN UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF FACULTY OF EDUCATION

International Refereed Journal

ISSN 1308-7177

2015-4

2

BARTIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ EĞİTİM FAKÜLTESİ DERGİSİ

BARTIN UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF FACULTY OF EDUCATION

ISSN:1308-7177

ULUSLARARASI HAKEMLİ DERGİ / INTERNATIONAL REFEREED JOURNAL

Cilt/*Volume*: 4, Sayı/*Issue*: 2, Aralık/December 2015

Sahibi
Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Adına
Prof. Dr. Firdevs GÜNEŞ (Dekan)

Editör
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sedat BALYEMEZ

Alan Editörleri
Prof. Dr. Çetin SEMERCİ
Doç. Dr. Necati HIRÇA
Doç. Dr. Nuriye SEMERCİ
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayşe Derya IŞIK
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayla ÇETİN DİNDAR
Yrd. Doç. Dr. F. Gizem KARAOĞLAN YILMAZ
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gülsün ŞAHAN
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Harun ER
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Neslihan USTA
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sinem TARHAN
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Süleyman Erkam SULAK
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Süreyya GENÇ
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yılmaz KARA

Yabancı Dil Sorumlusu
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özge GÜN

Yayıma Hazırlık
Arş. Gör. Arzu ÇEVİK
Arş. Gör. Ömer KEMİKSİZ

Sekretarya
Arş. Gör. Hasan Basri KANSIZOĞLU

Teknik Sorumlular
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ramazan YILMAZ
Arş. Gör. Barış ÇUKURBAŞI

İletişim
Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi
74100 BARTIN – TÜRKİYE
e-posta: buefad@bartin.edu.tr
Tel: +90 378 223 54 59

Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (BÜEFAD), yılda iki kez yayımlanan uluslararası hakemli bir dergidir. Yazıların sorumluluğu, yazarlarına aittir.

Owner
On Behalf of Bartin University Faculty of Education
Prof. Firdevs GUNES (Dean)

Editor
Asst. Prof. Sedat BALYEMEZ

Field Editors
Prof. Cetin SEMERCI
Assoc. Prof. Necati HIRCA
Assoc. Prof. Nuriye SEMERCI
Asst. Prof. Ayse Derya ISIK
Asst. Prof. Ayla CETIN DINDAR
Asst. Prof. F. Gizem KARAOGLAN YILMAZ
Asst. Prof. Gulsun SAHAN
Asst. Prof. Harun ER
Asst. Prof. Neslihan USTA
Asst. Prof. Sinem TARHAN
Asst. Prof. Suleyman Erkam SULAK
Asst. Prof. Sureyya GENC
Asst. Prof. Yilmaz KARA

Foreign Language Specialist
Asst. Prof. Ozge GUN

Preparing for Publication
RA. Arzu CEVIK
RA. Omer KEMIKSIZ

Secretary
RA. Hasan Basri KANSIZOGLU

Technical Assistants
Asst. Prof. Ramazan YILMAZ
RA. Baris CUKURBASI

Contact
Bartin University Faculty of Education
74100 BARTIN – TURKEY
e-mail: buefad@bartin.edu.tr
Tel: +90 378 223 54 59

Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education (BUJFED) is a international refereed journal that is published two times a year. The responsibility lies with the authors of papers.

Kapak: Arş. Gör. Barış ÇUKURBAŞI – Öğr. Gör. Hüseyin UYSAL

Dizin / İndeks
ULAKBİM Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Veri Tabanı, EBSCOHOST, Index Copernicus, Proquest Education Journals Database, Modern Language Association, Citefactor, The Directory of Research Journal Indexing, Open Academic Journal Index, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

YAYIN DANIŞMA KURULU / *EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD*

Prof. Dr. Hayati AKYOL	Gazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Hüseyin ALKAN	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Sebahattin ARIBAŞ	Adıyaman Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ahmet ARIKAN	Gazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Safure BULUT	Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Recai DOĞAN	Ankara Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Firdevs GÜNEŞ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ahmet GÜNŞEN	Trakya Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Bilgin Ünal İBRET	Kastamonu Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ramazan KAPLAN	Bartın Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Firdevs KARAHAN	Sakarya Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Aziz KILINÇ	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ahmet KIRKKILIÇ	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Murat ÖZBAY	Gazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ahmet SABAN	Konya Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Çetin SEMERCİ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. M. Fatih TAŞAR	Gazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Yavuz TAŞKESENLİGİL	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Cemal TOSUN	Ankara Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Selahattin TURAN	Osmangazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Mimar TÜRKKAHRAMAN	Akdeniz Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Selma YEL	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Bahri ATA	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Eyyup COŞKUN	Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Erol DURAN	Uşak Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Tolga GÜYER	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Emine KOLAÇ	Anadolu Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Nuriye SEMERCİ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Sabri SİDEKLİ	Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Çavuş ŞAHİN	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Neşe TERTEMİZ	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Kubilay YAZICI	Niğde Üniversitesi

BU SAYININ HAKEMLERİ / *REFEREES OF THIS ISSUE*

Prof. Dr. Firdevs GÜNEŞ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Çetin SEMERCİ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. İbrahim BİLGİN	Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Nergüz BULUT SERİN	Lefke Avrupa Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Adnan KARADÜZ	Erciyes Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ali Osman ALAKUŞ	Dicle Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ayşe OKVURAN	Ankara Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Başaran GENÇDOĞAN	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Berna CANTÜRK GÜNHAN	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Cemal TOSUN	Bartın Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Cihan ÖZDEMİR	Yunus Emre Enstitüsü
Doç. Dr. Çiğdem KILIÇ	Mersin Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Deniz Beste ÇEVİK KILIÇ	Balıkesir Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Duygu PİJİ KÜÇÜK	Marmara Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Erdal TATAR	Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Fatma ŞAŞMAZ ÖREN	Celal Bayar Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Fatime BALKAN KIYICI	Sakarya Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Gizem SAYGILI	Isparta Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Gökhan DEMİRCİOĞLU	Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Gülsen ÜNVER	Ege Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. H. Elif DAĞLIOĞLU	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Hünkâr KORKMAZ	Hacettepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Kasım YILDIRIM	Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mehmet Altan KURNAZ	Kastamonu Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mehmet Barış HORZUM	Sakarya Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mustafa BAŞARAN	Bozok Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mustafa KURT	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Oğuzhan KILDAN	Kastamonu Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ömer ADIGÜZEL	Ankara Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Salih Zeki GENÇ	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Sevgi KINGIR	Hacettepe Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Soner Mehmet ÖZDEMİR	Kırıkkale Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Şebnem Kandil İNGEÇ	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Tazegül DEMİR ATALAY	Kafkas Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Tolga ERDOĞAN	Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Tolga KABACA	Pamukkale Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Türkay Nuri TOK	Pamukkale Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yavuz ERİŞEN	Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yusuf CERİT	Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yücel ÖKSÜZ	Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Zarife SEÇER	Konya Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ahmet YIKMIŞ	Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Aslıhan OSMANOĞLU	Trakya Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayla ÇETİN DİNDAR	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Aynur PALA	Celal Bayar Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayşe Derya IŞIK	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayşe ELİÜŞÜK	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Bekir Necati ALTIN	Niğde Üniversitesi

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emrullah YILMAZ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Erol BARIN	Hacettepe Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Esen ERSOY	Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Esin ERGÜN	Karabük Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cansel KADIOĞLU	Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gülce COŞKUN ŞENTÜRK	Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gürcan UZAL	Namık Kemal Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gürsoy MERİÇ	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. F. Gizem KARAOĞLAN YILMAZ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hülya KUTU	Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hüseyin EŞ	Sinop Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. İlker CIRIK	Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. İlknur GÜVEN	Marmara Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kemal Zeki ZORBAZ	Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kemalettin PARLAK	İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. M. Hülya ÜNAL KARAGÜVEN	Marmara Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehmet BİLGİN	Çukurova Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mustafa KALE	Gazi Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mustafa Onur CESUR	Maltepe Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Neslihan BAY	Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Neslihan USTA	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Nurhan ÖZTÜRK GEREN	Sinop Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özge GÜN	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ramazan YILMAZ	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ramazan YİRCİ	Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sadet MALTEPE	Balıkesir Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Safiye ASLAN	Aksaray Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sedef CANBAZOĞLU BİLİCİ	Aksaray Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Seçil Eda KARTAL	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sefa DÜNDAR	Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sema SOYDAN	Mevlana Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sema SULAK	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Serpil ÖZDEMİR	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sevan NART	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sibel SADİ YILMAZ	Kafkas Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sinem TARHAN	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Songül GİREN	Aksaray Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Süleyman GÖKSOY	Düzce Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Şenay YAPICI	Amasya Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Tuncay Yavuz ÖZDEMİR	Fırat Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yasemin KIYMAZ	Ahi Evran Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yılmaz KARA	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yılmaz TONBUL	Ege Üniversitesi
Öğr. Gör. Dr. Özge ELİÇİN	Uludağ Üniversitesi
Dr. Hayriye Tuğba ÖZTÜRK	Ankara Üniversitesi

Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi Cilt 4, Sayı 2, Aralık 2015, BARTIN-TÜRKİYE

Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education, Volume 4, Issue 2, December 2015, BARTIN-TURKEY

İÇİNDEKİLER / *CONTENTS*

Firdevs GÜNEŞ

Başlık ve Zihni Yönlendirme

Title and Guiding Mind

Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000131232 290-305

Belgin BAL İNCEBACAK

Müzede Drama: Heykel ve İmgelem Kavramı

Drama at the Museum: The Concept of Sculpture and Imagination

Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.1082000222 306-318

Özgür EROĞLU

Eğitim Fakültesi Mezunu Müzik Öğretmenlerinin Armoni Bilgi ve Becerilerine İlişkin Görüşleri

Faculty of Education Graduate Music Teachers' Opinions on their Harmony Knowledge and Skills

Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000143436 319-330

Yeliz ÇELEN

İlköğretim Öğretmenlerinin Matematiğe Yönelik Tutumlarının Öğretmen Özellikleri Açısından İncelenmesi

Review of Primary School Teachers' Attitude towards Mathematics in the Framework of their Teaching Features

Doi: 10.14686/buefad.01263 331-343

Melike YAVUZ TOPALOĞLU - Fatime BALKAN KIYICI

Fen Bilimleri Programlarının Karşılaştırılması: Türkiye ve Avustralya

Comparison of Science Curriculum: Turkey and Australia

Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.1082000266 344-363

Cafer ÇARKIT – Adnan KARADÜZ

Ortaokul Yazarlık ve Yazma Becerileri Dersi Bağlamında Yazma Becerisi Öğretimi Üzerine Öğretmen Görüşleri

Teachers' Perceptions in Teaching Writing Skills in the Context of Middle School Authorship and Writing Skills Course

Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000137223 364-381

Oğuz DİLMAÇ – Cihan İNANÇ

Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Görsel Sanatlar Dersine Yönelik Öz Yeterlik Düzeyleri

The Self-Sufficiency Levels of Classroom Teachers about Visual Arts Course

Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.1082000254 382-400

Ayşe Belgin AKSOY – Hurşide Kübra ÖZKAN

Çocukların Bilişsel Tempoları İle Sosyal Problem Çözme Becerilerinin Bazı Demografik Özellikler Açısından İncelenmesi (Kırklareli İl Merkezi Örneklemi)

Examination of Children's Cognitive Tempo and Social Problem-Solving Skills Regarding Some Demographic Characteristics (A Sample Study of Kirklareli City Centre)

Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000136006 401-417

Feyza GÜN – Hilal BÜYÜKGÖZE

Araştırma Görevlilerinin Bireysel Gelişim İnisiyatifinde Özyeterliğin Rolü

The Role of Self-Efficacy on Personal Growth Initiative among Research Assistants

Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000139086 418-432

Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi Cilt 4, Sayı 2, Aralık 2015, BARTIN-TÜRKİYE

Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education, Volume 4, Issue 2, December 2015, BARTIN-TURKEY

İÇİNDEKİLER / *CONTENTS*

Ali KIRKSEKİZ - Mehmet UYSAL – Onur İŞBULAN - Özcan Erkan AKGÜN Mübin KIYICI – Mehmet Barış HORZUM

Okul Deneyimi ve Öğretmenlik Uygulaması Derslerine Eleştirel Bir Bakış: Problemler, Beklentiler ve Çözüm Önerileri
A Critical View to School Experience and Application of Teaching Courses: Problems, Expectations and Solution Suggestions
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.1082000250 — 433-451

F. Ceyda ÇINARDAL - Levent ÇINARDAL – Binali ÇATAK

Mesleki Müzik Eğitimi Veren Yükseköğretim Kurumlarındaki Öğrencilerin Eleştirel Düşünme Eğilimleri
Critical Thinking Tendency of Students at Higher Education Institutions Providing Professional Music Education
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.1082000240 — 452-465

Güngör KESKİNKILIÇ YUMUŞAK

Öğretmen Adaylarının Yansıtıcı Düşünme Eğilimleri Ve Mesleğe Yönelik Tutumları
Reflective Thinking Tendencies of Preservice Teachers and their Attitudes towards the Teaching Profession
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.1082000206 — 466-481

Ensar AYDIN - Süleyman Erkam SULAK

Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarının "Değer" Kavramına Yönelik Metafor Algıları
Metaphor Perception of Prospective Primary School Teachers for "Value" Concept
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000148420 — 482-500

Abdullah Çağrı BİBER – Ziya ARGÜN

Matematik Öğretmen Adaylarının Tek ve İki Değişkenli Fonksiyonlarda Limit Konusunda Sahip Oldukları Kavram Bilgileri Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi
The Relations Between Concept Knowledge Related to the Limits Concepts in One and Two Variables Functions of Mathematics Teachers Candidates
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.26967 — 501-515

Arzu ÖZYÜREK – Fatih AKÇA

Zihinsel Yetersizliği Olan Çocukların Oyuncak Profillerinin İncelenmesi
An Examination of the Toy Profiles of the Children with Mental Deficiency
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000142122 — 516-529

Aysun DOĞUTAŞ

Cultural Intelligence Level of Turkish Teacher Candidates in Globalized World
Küreselleşen Dünyada Türk Öğretmen Adaylarının Kültürel Zekâ Seviyeleri
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000131990 — 530-547

Ali SICAK – Mehmet BAŞÖREN

Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Akademik Motivasyonlarının Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi (Bartın Örneği)
An Investigation of High School Students Academic Motivation in Related to Various Variables (Bartın Samples)
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.1082000239 — 548-560

Songül GİREN – Emre DURAK

Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Oyuncak Kavramına İlişkin Metaforik Algıları
Early Childhood Education Teachers' Metaphors about Toy Concept
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000143590 — 561-575

Erdal TATAR

Bir Kimyasal Problem Çözme Tekniği: Stokiyometrik Haritalama
A Chemical Problem Solving Technique: Stoichiometric Mapping
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000138529 — 576-585

Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi Cilt 4, Sayı 2, Aralık 2015, BARTIN-TÜRKİYE

Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education, Volume 4, Issue 2, December 2015, BARTIN-TURKEY

İÇİNDEKİLER / *CONTENTS*

Yavuz ERİŞEN - Fazilet YAVUZ BİRBEN - Hatun SEVGİ YALIN - Pınar OCAK

Üstün Yetenekli Çocukları Fark Edebilme ve Destekleme Eğitiminin Öğretmenler Üzerindeki Etkisi
The Awareness and Support Training for Gifted Children: The Impact on Teachers
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000137872 — 586-602

Ahmet AKIN – Mehmet BAŞÖREN

Algılanan Empatik Öz-Yeterlik ve Sosyal Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeğinin Türkçe Formunun Geçerlik ve Güvenirliği
The Validity and Reliability of Turkish Version of the Perceived Empathic and Social Self-Efficacy Scale
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.1082000235 — 603-610

Ercan ATASOY – Neslihan UZUN – Berna AYGÜN

Dinamik Matematik Yazılımları ile Desteklenmiş Öğrenme Ortamında Öğretmen Adaylarının Teknolojik Pedagojik Alan Bilgilerinin İncelenmesi
Investigating Pre-service Teachers' Technological Pedagogical Content knowledge in Learning Environment Supported by Dynamic Mathematics Software
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000143622 — 611-633

A. Oğuzhan KILDAN – Berat AHİ

Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Bilimsel Çalışmalara Yönelik Okuma Alışkanlıkları
Reading Habits of Scientific Studies For Pre-School Teachers
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.1082000251 — 634-650

Tuncay CANBULAT - Hadiye KÜÇÜKKARAGÖZ - Fatma ERDOĞAN – Ayşe YEŞİLOĞLU

Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarında Empatik Eğilim Düzeyi ve Geleceğe Dönük Beklenti
The Level of Hopelessness and Empathic Tendency of a Group of Class Teacher Candidates
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000145067 — 651-665

Nail İLHAN - Yakup DOĞAN – Özge ÇİÇEK

Fen Bilimleri Öğretmen Adaylarının "Özel Öğretim Yöntemleri" Dersindeki Yaşam Temelli Öğretim Uygulamaları
Preservice Science Teachers' Context Based Teaching Practices in "Special Teaching Methods" Course
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000143534 — 666-681

Rıza SALAR – Ümit TURGUT

Implementing Differentiated Instruction on Pre-Service Physics Teachers: Agendas
Fizik Öğretmen Adaylarına Farklılaştırılmış Öğretimin Uygulanması: Ajandalar
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000136908 — 682-695

Fadime KOÇ DAMGACI - Yeliz KAYA - Rafet GÜNAY

David Fetterman'ın Değerlendirme Modeli: Yetkilendirme Değerlendirmesi
David Fetterman's Evaluation Model: Empowerment Evaluation
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000139306 — 696-710

Sinem ATIŞ – Mustafa ARSLAN

Yabancılara Türkçe Öğretiminde Dilsel Becerilerin Gelişimine Etkisi Bakımından Ders Materyallerinin Önem Derecelerinin Analitik Hiyerarşi Süreci (AHS) İle Belirlenmesi
Determining the İmportance Level of Teaching Materials by Using Analytic Hierarchical Process (AHP) in Terms of Their Influence Over the Development of Language Skills in Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000136908 — 711-726

Gökmen ARSLAN

Psikolojik İstismar Ölçeği (PİÖ) Geliştirme Çalışması: Ergenlerde Psikometrik Özelliklerinin İncelenmesi
Development Psychological Maltreatment Questionnaire (PMQ): Investigating Psychometric Properties in Adolescents
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000146983 — 727-738

İÇİNDEKİLER / *CONTENTS*

Fatma SUSAR KIRMIZI – Ceren SAYGI

Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarının Yaratıcı Drama Yöntemini Kullanmaya Yönelik Özyeterlik Algıları
Elementary
Teacher Candidates' Self-Efficacy Perceptions towards Using the Creative Drama Method 739-750
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000144840

Burçin GÖKKURT – Tuğba ÖRNEK - Fatih HAYAT – Yasin SOYLU

Öğrencilerin Problem Çözme ve Problem Kurma Becerilerinin Değerlendirilmesi
Assessing Students' Problem-Solving and Problem-Posing Skills 751-774
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000145637

Soner DOĞAN – Celal Teyyar UĞURLU - Orhan KAYA

Okul Yöneticilerinin Etik Liderlik Davranışlarının Öğretmenlerin Algı ve Görüşlerine Göre Değerlendirilmesi
Evaluation of School Administrators' Ethical Leadership Behaviors According Teachers' Perceptions and Opinions 775-789
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000145818

Cemil KIRIM – Necati HIRÇA

Lise Öğrencilerinin Kişisel Hijyen ve Temizlik Alışkanlıklarının Fen Okur-Yazarlığına Göre Değerlendirilmesi
The Evaluation of High School Students' Personal Hygiene Habits Based on Science Literacy 790-802
Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000138700

Bartın Üniversitesi
Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi
Cilt 4, Sayı 2, s.530-547, Aralık 2015
BARTIN – TÜRKİYE

ISSN: 1308-7177

Bartin University
Journal of Faculty of Education
Volume 4, Issue 2, p.530-547, December 2015
BARTIN – TURKEY

Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000131990

Cultural Intelligence Level of Turkish Teacher Candidates in Globalized World

Aysun DOĞUTAŞ, Yrd. Doç. Dr., Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, adogutas@pau.edu.tr

Abstract: This study aims to examine and explore the cultural intellengence level of teacher candidates in a descriptive manner. It also tries to show whether the cultural intelligence level is associated with the socio-demographics of the participants such as parent's education, gender, the department they enrolled, and the hometown region. Participants of the study were 450 teacher candidates enrolled in the teacher education program at a university in Turkey on 2014-2015 academic years. Data were gathered through Cultural Intelligence Scale developed by Ang et al. in 2007 adapted to Turkish and assessed its psychometrics properties by Ilhan and Cetin in 2014. The gathered data are examined through a couple of steps including univariate information about the computed and recoded variables by showing tabulation and simple data presentation. It then presents the mean comparison of the cultural intelligence level variables based on the socio-demographics of participants and the bivariate analyses of cultural intelligence level and socio-demographic variables using correlation coefficient method (Pearson's r). Regarding the mean comparison of the participants' cultural intellinge scores, this study determined some differences among teacher candidates based on their gender and department they study. Also, looking at the results of the Pearson correlation coefficients, this study identified some significant relationships between some socio-demographics and cultural intelligence scores of the candidates.

Key Words: Cultural intelligence, culture, teacher candidates, globalization, education

Küreselleşen Dünyada Türk Öğretmen Adaylarının Kültürel Zekâ Seviyeleri

Öz: Bu çalışma, öğretmen adaylarının kültürel zeka seviyelerini betimsel olarak araştırma ve incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca, katılımcıların kültürel zeka seviyesi ile anne-babalarının eğitimi, cinsiyet, üniversitede devam ettikleri bölüm ve memleketleri gibi sosyo-demografik geçmişleri arasında ilişki olup olmadığını göstermeye çalışacaktır. Katılımcılar, 2014-2015 akademik yılında Türkiye'deki bir üniversitenin eğitim fakültesine kayıtlı 450 öğretmen adayından oluşmaktadır. Veriler, 2007'de Ang ve arkadaşları tarafından geliştirilen ve 2014'te Ilhan ve Cetin tarafından Türkçe'ye uyarlanan ve psikometrik testleri yapılan Kültürel Zeka Ölçeği kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Toplanan veriler, öncelikle basit veri sunumu ve çizelge sunumu yapılarak değişkenlerin kodlaması ve analize hazır hale getirilmesi aşamalarının da dahil olduğu birkaç adımda incelenmiştir. Daha sonra katılımcıların kültürel zeka puanlarının ortalamaları sosyo-demografik geçmişlerine göre karşılaştırılmış ve korelasyon katsayısı metodu (Pearson's r) kullanılarak sosyo-demografik ve kültürel zeka seviye değişkenlerinin iki yönlü analizleri sunulmuştur. Katılımcıların kültürel zeka puanlarının ortalamaları karşılaştırıldığında, bu çalışma öğretmen adaylarının cinsiyet ve okudukları bölüme göre aralarında bazı farklılıklar gösterdiklerini belirlemiştir. Ayrıca bu çalışma, Pearson korelasyon katsayılarına bakıldığında, öğretmen adaylarının kültürel zeka seviyeleri ile bazı sosyo-demografik geçmişleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki tespit etmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kültürel zekâ, kültür, öğretmen adayları, küreselleşme, eğitim

1. INTRODUCTION

Today, it is not wrong to say that borders among countries are removed due to developments on science and technology. For the last two decades we as world citizens have been living in a village due to globalization. What is globalization? Globalization sometimes refers to process of arising only one culture since societies are alike each other; sometimes refers to process of expressing differences and identities of individuals and socities (Cafoglu & Somuncuoglu, 2000).

At this period, various cultures' getting together and improving dialogue among cultures is an essantiality for all countries (Cirik, 2008, p. 37). Culture is the basic element that bring socities together. It is important to protect one's own culture. Culture is defined as a whole of organized behaviors, thoughts and perceptions and constituting roles detemining expected behaviors from a group by Duverger (2004).

Since we as world citizens are living in a globalized world. Nowadays, individuals, companies and cultures from different parts of the world are interacting with each other very often. Thus, individuals should be aware of different cultures, languagaes, and people to be able to live in this multicultural world. Turkey is located between Asia and Europe and getting many immigrants and tourists from different countries. Also, Turkey has different ethnic, language, and cultural differences within its own borders. Since Turkey gets many immigrants and tourists from different cultures and has various cultural differences within its borders, determining cultural intelligence of Turkish people, especially the teacher candidates expected to shape our future, will be significant.

Although globalization has made the world seem smaller and 'flat' in many ways (Friedman, 2005), increasing cultural diversity creates challenges for individuals and organizations, making the world 'not so flat' after all (Ang et. al., 2007). For example, a quite large body of research demonstrates the challenges of indvidulas functioning in new cultural settings. Relatively little research, however, focuses on factors that could improve intercultural encounters (Gelfand et al., 2007). Responding to this need, Earley and Ang (2003) developed the construct of cultural intelligence (CQ) based on contemporary theories of intelligence (Sternberg, 1986).

Thus, it is important to identify cultural intelligence level of teacher candidates because in 2006 State Planning Organization emhasized the necessity of supporting multicultural education and improving teachers' sensitivity to cultural differences by the way of improving teacher training (Demir, 2012). However, there is still nothing to determine where we are on this subject. Therefore, it would be a good start with the identification of cultural intellengence level of teacher candidates to fill in the gap between the goal of the State and the reality of the situation.

1.1. What is Cultural Intelligence?

Although early research tended to view intelligence narrowly as the ability to grasp concepts and solve problems in academic settings, there is now increasing consensus that "intelligence may be displayed in places other than classroom" (Stenberg & Detterman, 1986). The growing interest in "real-world" intelligence has identified new types of intelligence that focus on specific content domains. These new types of intelligence are social intelligence, emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence. Since we are living in a globalized world, it is important to see the level of cultural intelligence level of people.

Eventhough every society has its own culture; according to joint history, living environment, vernacular, economig field occupation and socio-economic level people groups

living in the same society develop various sub-cultures (Cirik, 2008). In this context, cultural intelligence can be seen as an intelligence type propounded to describe the differences seen among people in the persepective of capability of getting interaction with diverse cultures both within his/her own society or with other societies (Ilhan & Cetin, 2014, p. 95). Since the point is differences, teachers cultural level of intelligence should be high to interact with students from different settings.

"Cultural Intelligence, defined as an individual's capability of function and manage effectively in culturally diverse settings" (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008, p.3). Cultural intelligence is a multidimensional concept and have four subdimensions according to Early and Ang (2003). These are metacognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral dimensions. The following section will present these four dimensions of cultural intelligence.

The first one is metacognitive cultural intelligence. It "refers to an individual's level of concious cultural awareness during cross-cultural interactions" (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008, p. 5). People whose metacognitive cultural intelligence is high mostly question their own cultural assumptions, reflect during interactions, and adjust their cultural knowledge when interacting with those form other cultures (And & Van Dyne, 2008, p. 5).

The second dimension of cultural intelligence is cognitive cultural intelligence. Cognitive cultural intelligence represents knowledge of norms, practices, and conventions in different cultures that has been acquired from educational and personal experiences, while metacognitive cultural intelligence focuses on higher-order cognitive processes (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008). Cultural intelligence reflects an individual's level of cultural knowledge or knowledge of the cultural environment.

Another dimension of cultural intelligence is motivational cultural intelligence which "reflects the capability to direct attention and energy toward learning about and functioning in situaitons characterized by cultural differences" (Ang & Van Dyne, p. 6). People who have high motivaitonal cultural intelligence direct attention and energy toward cross-cultural situations based on intrinsic interest (Deci & Rayn, 1985) and confidence in cross-cultural effectiveness (Bandura, 2002).

Last dimension of cultural intelligence is behavioral cultural intelligence. It represents "the capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions when interacting with people from different cultures" (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008, p. 7). As Early and Ang (2003) stated individuals with high behavioral cultural intelligence are flexible and can adjust their behaviors to the specifics of each cultural interaction.

1.2. Evaluating Cultural Intelligence

To evaluate cultural intelligence Ang et. al. (2007) improved Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS). It can be said that individuals getting high scores from the CQS have developed capability on performing appropriate behaviors during interactions with people from diverse cultures, enjoying having multicultural interactions, having self confidence on interacting with diverse cultures, having knowledge about diverse cultures and arranging obtained knowledge according to the culture's necessities that he/she interacting (Ang et al. 2007; Brislin, Worthley & MacNab, 2006). On the other hand, it can be said that individuals getting low score from CQS are unwilling to have knowledge about diverse cultures, adaptation to differences among diverse cultures and interact with diverse cultures (Brislin, Worthley & MacNab, 2006, p. 97).

1.3. Previous Studies

Emprical studies on cultural intelligence are quite new around the world. Although empirical research on cultural intelligence is relatively new, the initial results are strong and

promising. Results in three substantive studies across different cultural, educational and work settings of Ang et al. (2007) demonstrate a systematic pattern of relationships between dimensions of CQ and specific intercultural effectiveness outcomes (n= 794). These findings show the value of using contemporary conceptualizations of intelligence as a framework for conceptualizing a set of intercultural competencies: metacognitive CQ, cognitive CQ, motivational CQ and behavioral CQ.

Results of Ang et al. (2007) have demonstrated that Cultural Intelligence predicts cultural judgment and decision making (CJDM) and task performance. In another empirical study that focused specifically on motivational CQ and expatriate adjustment, Ang et al. showed that motivational Cultural Intelligence predicts all three types of adjustment, even after controlling for time in the host country and experience in international assignments.

More recently, cultural bias in surveys has been examined by Culpepper & Zimmerman (2006). These authors found evidence of extreme response bias among Hispanic respondents and also the tendency to avoid using the mid-point of the scale.

Studies done outside Turkey mostly focused on one dimension of intelligence level, however, this study will try to explain the general intelligence level of Turkish teacher candidates and its' relations with some socio-demographic items. Since the studies on cultural intelligence are somewhat new and Cultural Intelligence Scale was adapted to Turkish in 2014, there hasn't been any study done in Turkey on cultural intelligence level using the CQS. This study will be the first study done on cultural intelligence level of Turkish people.

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study was to examine and explore the cultural intellengence level of teacher candidates in a descriptive manner. It also tries to show whether the cultural intelligence level is associated with the socio-demographics of the participants such as parent's education, gender, the department they enrolled, and the hometown region. With this aim, the primary hypothesis of the study was that cultural intelligence level of teacher candidates is associated with socio-demographics of themselves. Secondary hypotheses were;

1- Cultural intelligence level of teacher candidates whose parents' have higher education is higher.

2- Cultural intelligence level of female teacher candidates is higher than male candidates.

3- Cultural intelligence level of teacher candidates who enrolled in social sciences department is higher than those in other departments.

2. METHOD

This section explains and justifies the method used for determining cultural intelligence level of teacher candidates studying at a university in Turkey. The sequence of sub-titles are rationale for the study, participants, sources of data and survey instrument and data collection used in this study. It also presents the detailed information about the statistical analysis and techniques utilized for data analysis.

2.1. Methodology of Data Collection

During the fall semester of 2014-2015 academic years between September and November, the data were collected at the university. Participants completed questionnaire before their classes begin at the classroom setting. All participated voluntarily and ethical guidelines for protection of participants were observed. The researcher informed them that their names will

not be asked and included in this study to ensure their participation. To encourage survey response, the researcher added a brief statement at the top of survey material in order to let them know about the aim, scope, and the possible outcomes of the study.

2.2. Participants

Participants are selected from freshmans and graduated students. Universities are multicultural settings and there are individuals from different settings. In sophomore and senior years university students are adapted to these differences. However, freshmans are new at the university and come from their homecity recently. Maybe in an academic environment it is the first time they face with individuals from different ethnicity, culture, or language. Thus, it will be meaningful to get freshmans and graduated students' cultural intelligence level and compare them.

Participants of the study were 450 teacher candidates enrolled in the teacher education program at the university on 2014-2015 academic years. 281 (%64,4) are girl and 155 (% 35,6) boy of the study group. 263 of participants (% 58,4) are freshmans and 187 (% 41,6) of them are graduated and enrolled pedagogical formation classes. Freshmans are from different departments of the teacher education program. The participant freshmans are from Turkish Education, CEIT (Computer Education and Instructional Technology), PCG (Psychological Counselling and Guidance), Fine Arts, Social Sciences, Science Education, and Music departments.

2.3. Sources of Data and Survey Instruments

To determine cultural intelligence level of individulas, the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) consisting of 20 items and 4 dimensions was developed by Ang et al. (2007). CQS has gone through an extensive validation process, and research demonstrates that it is generalizable across a) multiple student and executive samples b) time intervals ranging from four weeks to four months c) countries such as Singapore, the U.S., and Ireland, and d) both global and domestic culturally diverse samples (Ang et al., 2007; Van Dyne et al., 2008; Shokef & Erez, 2008; Shannon & Begley, 2008; Kim, Kirkman, & Chen, 2008).

Ang et al., (2007) used three cross-validation samples and substantive studies to support emprically for the realibility and validity of the scale. Results of three cross-validation samples and three substantive studies provide strong empirical support for the reliability, stability and validity of the CQS and demonstrate that specific dimensions of CQ have differential relationships with cognitive, affective and behavioral intercultural effectiveness outcomes. Corrected item-to-total correlations for each subscale (0.46–0.66) demonstrated strong relationships between items and their scales, supporting internal consistency. Reliabilities exceeded 0.70 (metacognitive CQ = 0.77, cognitive CQ = 0.84, motivational CQ = 0.77, and behavioral CQ = 0.84).

CQS developed by Ang et al. in 2007 was adapted to Turkish and assessed its psychometrics properties by Ilhan and Cetin in 2014. Ilhan and Cetin (2014) also assessed scale's validity and realibility. They conducted a research on 5 different study groups, who consisted of 1104 students at Dicle University Ziya Gokalp Education Faculty during 2012 Spring Semester. In Turkish adaptation process of CQS, its language equivalence was assessed and strong positive and significant correlations were obtained between Turkish and English versions. Explanatory and Confirmatory factor analysis showed four factors for Turkish version of CQS similar to its original version. Concurrent validity results showed that correlation between Turkish version of CQS and Intercultural Sensitivity Scale was .61 and correlation between Turkish version of CQS and Tromso Social Intelligence Scale was .44. Reliability analyses showed .85 internal

consistency coefficient and .81 test-retest reliability. Item analyses showed corrected item-total correlations were between .33 and .64. Based on these results, it can be concluded that Turkish version of CQS is a valid and reliable measurement in assessing university students' cultural intelligence.

During the application of survey, the participants were asked to read each positive statement and select the response that best describes their capabilities. Each item contained one idea, was relatively short in length, and used simple and direct language. Since negatively worded items can create artifacts, positively worded items were used. Participants were told to "Select the answer that BEST describes you AS YOU REALLY ARE (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree)."

First dimension is metacognitive level and consists of four questions such as "I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people withdifferent cultural backgrounds." Second dimension is cognitive level and consists of six questions like "I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures." Third dimension is motivational level and consists of five questions. For example, "I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures." Last level is behavioral level and consists of five questions such as "I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it."

While asking questions about cultural intelligence, it would be meaningful to look at the gender, parents education, the department they chose and study, and the region their hometown is located since socio-demographic backgrounds of people could have an impact on them in a various way. Thus, gender, mother education, father education, the department, and the region they live are also asked to the participants.

2.4. Dependent and Independent Variables

To test and analyze the hypotheses, dependent variables such as metacognitive CQ, cognitive CQ, motivational CQ, behavioral CQ, and total CQ were identified. This study handled the socio-demographics like parent's education, gender, the department they enrolled, and the hometown region as independent variables.

To be able to get the variables representing those dimensions of CQS, researcher computed the data gathered by 20 questions based on the dimensions criteria and received four new ordinal variable such as "Metacognition_CQ" (mean=21,09, min=8 and max=28), "Cognition_CQ" (mean=23,57, min=6 and max=39), "Motivation_CQ" (mean=25,36, min=6 and max=35), and "Behavior_CQ" (mean=24,52, min=9 and max=35). Then, to see the total number of Cultural Intelligence Level, researcher computed the answers given for all 20 questions and received a new variable called CQ_Total (mean=94,92, min=45 and max=137). All these five dependent variables are normally distributed (See Table 1).

Table 1: Statistics of dependent variables

	Metacognition	Cognition	Motivation	Behavior	CQ_Total
N	437	434	441	441	408
Mean	21,09	23,57	25,36	24,52	94,92
Std. Deviation	3,569	5,766	5,579	4,930	14,552
Minimum	8	6	6	9	45
Maximum	28	39	35	35	137

Independent variables such as parent's education, gender, the department they enrolled, and the hometown region are socio-demographics of the participants and are assumed as having an impact on dependent variables. Looking at gender, 281 (%64,4) were girl and 155 (% 35,6) boy of the study group (See Table 2).

Participants (n=450) were from different departments of the teacher education program. 263 of them (% 58,4) are freshmans and 187 of them (% 41,6) are graduated and enrolled pedagogical formation classes. The participant freshmans are from Turkish Education (n=64, %14,2), CEIT (Computer Education and Instructional Technology) (n=48, % 10,7), PCG (Psychological Counselling and Guidance) (n=41, % 9,1), Fine Arts (n= 33, %7,3), Social Sciences (n=22, % 4,9), Science Education (n=33, %7,3) and Music departments (n=22, % 4,9) (See Table 2).

Mother of participants' education are classified as illeterate (n=18, %4,2), primary education (n=299, % 69,9), high school education (n=75, % 17,5) and higher education (n=36, % 8,4). Fathers' education level was also classified as illeterate (n= 3 % 0,7), primary education (n=240, % 55,8), high school education (n=101, %23,5) and higher education (n=86, %20) (See Table 2).

Regions that they live classified as Mediterranean (n=68, % 16), Aegean (n=252, % 59,5), Central Anatolia (n=32, % 7,5), Black Sea (n=7, % 1,6), Marmara (n=35, % 8,2), East Anatolia (n=12, % 2,8), and Southeast Anatolia (n=18, % 4,2) (See Table 2).

Table 2: Sociodemographics of Participants as Independent Variables

Sociodemographics			Frequency	Percent
Gender	Girl		281	64,4
	Boy		155	35,6
Department	Turkish		64	14,2
	CEIT		48	10,7
	PCG		41	9,1
	Art		33	7,3
	Social		22	4,9
	Science		33	7,3
	Music		22	4,9
	Pedagogical Formation		187	41,6
Educational Level	Illeterate	Mothers'	18	4,2
		Fathers'	3	,7
	Primary School	Mothers'	299	69,9
		Fathers'	240	55,8
	High School	Mothers'	75	17,5
		Fathers'	101	23,5
	Higher Education	Mothers'	36	8,4
		Fathers'	86	20,0
Regions of Homecities	Mediterranean		68	16,0
	Aegean		253	59,5
	Central Anatolia		32	7,5
	Black Sea		7	1,6
	Marmara		35	8,2
	Southeast Anatolia		18	4,2
	East Anatolia		12	2,8

2.5. Data Analysis

This study aims to examine and explore the cultural intellengence level of teacher candidates in a descriptive manner. It also tries to show whether the cultural intelligence level is associated with the socio-demographics of the participants such as parent's education, gender, the department they enrolled, and the hometown region.

Univariate and bivariate level analysis were conducted through out the study. Since the identification and the explanation of the factors associated with the level of cultural intelligence is not in the scope of the study, multilevel analysis were not conducted.

This study examines data through a couple of steps. First, it begins providing univariate information about the computed and recoded variables by showing tabulation and simple data presentation in a descriptive manner. Univariate statistics mentioned helped to know more about the data through the descriptive statistics like the mean values, standard deviations, and the frequencies of the variables. Second, bivariate analysis such as mean comparison and Pearson's correlation coefficient showed the associations, in general, between socio-demographics (independent variables) and cultural levels of participants (dependent variables).

3. FINDINGS

It would be interesting to see cultural inteligence score if it differs to boy or girl. Therefore, this study compared means for cultural intelligence scores at the categories of metacognition, cognition, motivation, behavior, and total as a whole. Table 7 shows that boys have slightly higher scores on all categories of cultural intelligence except behavior than girls. For example, the mean is higher for boys (21,31) than girls (21,06) regarding metacognitional cultural inteligence. For cognitional cultural intelligence it is (24,36) for boys and (23,28) for girls. Regarding motivational cultural intelligence the mean value is (25,64) for boys and (25,31) for girls. However, the mean value for girls (24,76) is higher than for boys (24,36) regarding the behavioral cultural intelligence. Finally, the mean value for boys (96,00) is higher than for girls (94,80) regarding the total scores of cultural intelligence items (See Table 3).

Table 3: Mean Comparison for Gender

Gender		Metacognition	Cognition	Motivation	Behavior	CQ_Total
Girl	Mean	21,06	23,28	25,31	24,76	94,80
	N	274	270	274	276	254
	Std. Deviation	3,588	5,706	5,705	5,036	14,913
Boy	Mean	21,31	24,36	25,64	24,36	96,00
	N	150	151	153	151	142
	Std. Deviation	3,618	5,806	5,401	4,728	14,048

Also, it would be useful to see cultural inteligence scores regarding the department of teacher candidates that they study. Therefore, this study compared means for cultural intelligence scores based on the departments. Table 8 shows that the teacher candidates in the department of social sciences have the highest mean value (22,00) for metacognitional cultural intelligence score, the candidates in Turkish department have the highest mean value (24,03) for cognitional cultural intelligence, the candidates in sciences department have the highest mean values (27,36) for motivational cultural intelligence and (26,03) for behavioral cultural intelligence score. As a total, the teacher candidates in the sciences department have the highest mean value (99,45) for the cultural intelligence score.

Table 4: Mean Comparison for Department

Department		Metacognition	Cognition	Motivation	Behavior	CQ_Total
Turkish	Mean	20,80	24,03	24,53	24,11	93,27
	N	61	63	62	62	56
	Std. Deviation	3,949	5,016	5,203	5,061	14,591
CEIT	Mean	20,17	23,54	25,33	25,04	94,25
	N	46	46	46	46	40
	Std. Deviation	3,761	5,443	5,379	4,320	13,341
PCG	Mean	20,93	23,05	25,93	25,63	95,21
	N	40	40	41	41	39
	Std. Deviation	3,214	5,134	5,951	4,989	14,909
Art	Mean	21,09	23,18	26,18	23,85	93,94
	N	32	33	33	33	32
	Std. Deviation	2,955	5,903	5,138	4,374	12,099
Social	Mean	22,00	23,57	24,90	24,43	97,05
	N	19	21	21	21	19
	Std. Deviation	4,509	5,075	5,718	6,161	14,081
Science	Mean	21,70	22,83	27,36	26,03	99,45
	N	33	30	33	32	29

	Std. Deviation	3,771	5,608	4,917	4,776	14,108
Music	Mean	20,82	23,10	24,75	24,68	93,68
	N	22	21	20	22	19
	Std. Deviation	3,404	4,036	5,848	3,896	14,083
Pedagogical Formation	Mean	21,28	23,77	25,12	24,13	94,88
	N	184	180	185	184	174
	Std. Deviation	3,438	6,494	5,790	5,073	15,381

Following the comparison of means based on gender and deparment, this study used the Pearson correlation coefficient matrix to see the relationships between dependent and socio-demographic variables such as educational levels of parents. The correlation is one of the most common and most useful statistics. A correlation is a single number that describes the degree of relationship between two variables. It is very functional to show the strength and the direction of the relationship (Trochim, 2001).

The following table is the correlation coefficient matrix that demonstrates whether or not independent variables are associated with the level of Cultural Intelligence. Therefore, this study attempted to represent the strong relationships, which are justifiable both theoretically and statistically concerning theoretical considerations and looking at the results of bivariate analyses mentioned.

Table 9 shows that motheredu and fatheredu are associated with one or two dependent variables. For example, there is statistically significant correlation between motheredu and motivational cultural intelligence at .05 level (r value=,09). Also fatheredu is significantly correlated with metacognitional cultural intelligence (r value=,092 and p<.05). There is an important associatiton between fatheredu and motivational cultural intelligence at .01 level (r value=,129). Finally, fatheredu is significantly correlated with Total Cultural Intelligence score (r value=,105 and p<.05).

Table 5: Correlations

Variables	Fatheredu	Metacognition	Cognition	Motivation	Behavior	CQ_Total
Motheredu	,577**	,072	,048	,090*	-,017	,068
Fatheredu	1	,092*	,041	,129**	,029	,105*
Metacognition		1	,350**	,492**	,439**	,720**
Cognition			1	,338**	,320**	,714**
Motivation				1	,470**	,789**
Behavior					1	,732**
CQ_Total						1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

4. DISCUSSON AND CONCLUSION

Today, it is not wrong to say that borders among countries are removed due to developments on science and technology. For the last two decades we as world citizens have been living in a village because of globalization. As long as the world is getting more and more globalized, the culturally diverse settings in education will be one of the unavoidable routines of educational system.

In diverse settings, some people are good at knowing, understanding and functioning while others have some difficulties in interacting with people from other cultures and socieities. It is increasingly important to understand why some individuals function more effectively than others in culturally diverse situaitons (Erez & Early, 1993; Gelfand, Erez & Aycan, 2007; Triandis, 1994). Regarding the importance of individual's capability of function, cultural intelligence for teachers, therefore, will be a very important issue to consider day by day.

Earley and Ang (2003) developed the construct of cultural intelligence (CQ) based on contemporary theories of intelligence (Sternberg, 1986). Cultural intelligence is a multidimensional concept and have four subdimensions. These are metacognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral dimensions. This study tried to understand if the socio-

demographics of teacher candidates are related to these four dimensions of cultural intelligence. Also, this study examined the relationship between socio-demographics of candidates and the total cultural intelligence score.

According to scale individuals who scored high on Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) have high ability on showing appropriate behaviors in their interaction with people from different cultures, enjoying interactions with other cultures, being competent in having interaction with other cultures, learning about other cultures and adjusting these knowledge based on the requirements of the new culture (Ang et al. 2007; Brislin, Worthley & MacNab, 2006). It can be argued that people who scored low on CQS are reluctant to learn about other cultures, to adapt to intercultural issues, and to have interactions with different cultures (Brislin, Worthley & MacNab, 2006).

The results of the current study primarily show that cultural intelligence level of teacher candidates is associated with some socio-demographics of themselves. Regarding the cultural intellenge scores, this study determined some differences among teacher candidates based on their gender and department they study.

One of the assumption of the study was that cultural intelligence level of female teacher candidates is higher than male candidates. Limited to the sample of the current study, the results showed the opposite of the assumption that boys are more cullturally intelligent based on total cultural intelligent score and all the subdimensions of cultural intelligence except behavioral cultural intelligence dimension. Based on the mean comparison the means for boys are slightly higher than that are for girls.

Another hypothesis was that cultural intelligence level of teacher candidates who enrolled in social sciences department is higher than those in other deparments. Based on the comparison of mean values, while the teacher candidates in the department of social sciences have the highest mean value for metacognitional cultural intelligence score, the candidates in Turkish department have the highest mean value for cognitional cultural intelligence. The candidates in sciences department have the highest mean values for motivational cultural intelligence and for behavioral cultural intelligence scores. Looking at the total intelligence scores, the teacher candidates in the sciences department have the highest mean value (99,45) while the candidates in the social sciences get the mean value at (97,05).

Looking at the correlation coefficients, this study also identified some significant relationships between other socio-demographics of candidates and cultural intelligence scores of them. The last hypothesis of the study was that teacher candidates whose parents' have higher education have higher cultural intelligence level. The results support this hypothesis. It shows that the educational level of teacher candidates' parents is associated with one or two subdimensions of cultural intelligence. For example, there is statistically significant correlation between mothers' education and motivational cultural intelligence score. The higher educational level of candidates' mothers is associated with higher motivational cultural intelligence score. In addition, the educational level of candidates' fathers are significantly correlated with metacognitional and motivational cultural intelligence. It means that the higher educational levels of candidates' fathers are associated with the higher metacognitional and motivational cultural intelligence scores. Finally, fathers' higher educational level is also significantly correlated with the higher total cultural intelligence score.

As it is stated above, since the CQS adapted to Turkish in April 2014, there hasn't been any study done about cultural intelligence level of teacher candidates yet in Turkey. When we look at the worldwide literature, there have been many studies done on cultural intelligence level. However, most of these studies were on cultural intelligence level and its'relations with

intercultural negotiation (Imai & Gelfand, 2010), global leadership (Livermore, 2009; Dean, 2007), multicultural teams (Rockstuhl & Ng, 2008), social networks (Fehr & Kuo, 2008).

While reviewing the literature, the researcher couldn't find any study done about relationship between cultural intelligence level and socio-demographics of participants. Thus, this study is the first one tries to examine relationship between participants' socio-demographics and cultural intelligence level. Therefore, it would not be possible to make comparison between the results of this study and previous studies. In most of the previous studies it can be said that, researchers determined a relationship between cultural intelligence as a beginning and further other issues as an outcome, especially, the impact of cultural intelligence on those issues.

In a smilar way, this study distinctively showed the association between socio-demographics as a beginning and cultural intelligence level of teacher candidates as an outcome. This means that it reveals both strengths and weaknesses of the current study. It is distinctive but lacks the advantages of the comprison with the previous studies. For the future studies, this study may be a step to conduct in depth analyises on the factors that have an impact on cultural intelligence itself. Why some people have high scores on cultural intelligence scale while others do not? What should people do to be more culturally intelligent so that they tackle with the barriers in their careers? Future studies might find an answer to these and similar questions.

REFERENCES

Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008). Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness, and nomological network. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (pp. 3–15). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C. K. S., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C. et al. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation, and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3, 335–371.

Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C. S. K., & Ng, K. Y. (2004, August). *The measurement of cultural intelligence.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, New Orleans, LA.

Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in a cultural context. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* 51, 269–290.

Banks, J.A., & Banks, C.A.M. (Eds.). (2007). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (6th Ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Brislin, R., Worthley, R., & MacNab, B. (2006). Cultural intelligence: Understanding behaviors that serve people's goals. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 40-55.

Cafoğlu, Z. & D. Somuncuoğlu. (2000). *Global Values in Education and Character Education*. ERIC NO: ED449449.

Cırık, İ. (2008). Multicultural education and its reflections. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 34, 27-40.

Culpepper, RA & Zimmerman, RA 2006, „Culture-based extreme response bias in surveys employing variable response items: an investigation of response tendency among Hispanic-Americans", *Journal of International Business Research*, 5 (2), 75-83.

Çalık, T. & Sezgin, F. (2005). Globalization, information society, and education, *Gazi University Kastamonu Education Journal*, 13 (1). 55-66.

Dean, B.P. (2007). *Cultural intelligence in global leadership. A model for developing culturally and nationally diverse teams. Unpublished doctoral dissertation*. Rogent University.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior.* New York: Plenum.

Demir, S. (2012). The importance level of multicultural education for instructors' of Erciyes University, *Turkish Studies*, 7 (4), 1453-1475.

Duverger, M. (2004). *Siyaset Sosyolojisi*. (Çev: Tekeli). Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Erez, M. & Earley, P.C. (1993). *Culture, self-identity, and work*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fehr, R. & Kuo, E. (2008): The impact of cultural intelligence in multicultural social networks. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP), San Francisco, CA.

Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-cultural organizational behavior. In S. T. Fiske, D. L. Schacter & C. Zahn-Waxler (Eds.), *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 479–514. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Ilhan, M. & Çetin, B. (2014). Validity and Reliability Study of the Turkish Version of the Cultural Intelligence Scale. *H. U. Journal of Education*, 29(2), 94-114.

Imai, L, & Gelfand, M. J. (2010). The culturally intelligent negotiator: The impact of cultural intelligence (CQ) on negotiation sequence and outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 112, 83-98.

Kim, K., Kirkman, B. L., & Chen, G. (2008). Cultural intelligence and international assignment effectiveness: A conceptual model and preliminary findings. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (pp. 71–90). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Livermore, A.D. (2009). *Cultural intelligence: Improving your CQ to engage our multicultural world.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academics.

Oguzkan, F. (1974). *Dictionary of educatioanl terms*. Ankara: Turkish Language Society Publications.

Reitz, C. (2009). "Herbert Marcuse and the Humanities: Emancipatory Education and Predatory Culture," in Douglas Kellner, Tyson Lewis, Clayton Pierce, K. Daniel Cho, *Marcuse's Challenge to Education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Rockstuhl, T. & Ng, K-Y. (2008). The effects of cultural intelligence on interpersonal trust in multicultural teams. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory Measurment and Applications* (pp. 206-220). New York, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Shannon, L. M., & Begley, T. M. (2008). Antecedents of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (pp. 41–55). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Shokef, E., & Erez, M. (2008). Cultural intelligence and global identity in multicultural teams. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (pp. 177–191). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A framework for understanding conceptions of intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg & D. K. Detterman (Eds.), *What is Intelligence? Contemporary Viewpoints on its Nature and Definition* (pp. 3–15). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Sternberg, R. J., & Detterman, D. K. (1986). *What is Intelligence? Contemporary Viewpoints on its Nature and Definition*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2005). Motivational cultural intelligence, realistic job preview, realistic living conditions preview, and cross-cultural adjustment. *Group and Organization Management, 31,*154–173.

The Ministry of National Education General Directorate of teacher Training and Education (2006). *Teaching profession overall effectiveness*. Retrieved from http://otmg.meb.gov.tr/belgeler/otmg/Yeterlikler.pdf on 20.11.2014.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and Social Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Trochim, W. M. K. (2001). *The Research Methods Knowledge Base.* Atomic Dog Publication.

Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Koh, C. (2008). Development and validation of the CQS: The cultural intelligence scale. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (pp. 16–38). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Geniş Özet

Günümüzde dünyanın farklı kesimlerindeki kişi, şirket ve kültürler değişik nedenlerle etkileşim halindedir. Çok kültürlü dünyada yaşayabilmek için kişiler; farklı kültürlerin, dillerin ve insanların farkına varmak zorunda ve etkin iletişim yollarını araştırmak durumundadır. Pek çok kişi halen başka kültürlere karşı umursamaz bir tavır takınsa dahi, teknolojinin her geçen gün ilerlemesi ve küreselleşen bir dünyada farklı kültürlere sahip toplumların biraraya gelmeleri artık bir ihtiyaç ve zorunluluk haline gelmiştir. Peki devlet ve birey düzleminde neler yapılmalıdır? Eğitim sahasında kısa, orta ve uzun vadede neler yapılabilir? Bu süreçte, küresel eğitim değerleri oluşturmak, kültürler arasındaki etkileşimi hızlandırmak ve farklı kültürleri farkına varacak kişileri yetiştirmek büyük önem arzetmektedir.

Bugün teknoloji ve bilim sayesinde ülkeler arasındaki sınırların kalktığını söylemek yanlış olmaz. Son 20 yıldır küreselleşmenin sonucu olarak biz dünya insanları bir köyde yaşıyor gibiyiz. Dünya daha fazla küreselleştikçe kültürel farklılıklara sahip kişilerin fiziksel yada sanal eğitim araçlarını kullanarak aynı eğitim ortamını paylaşmaları, eğitim sisteminin vazgeçilmezi hatta doğası haline gelecektir. Kaldı ki, birçok ülke kendi sınırları içinde dahi farklı ırk, dil ve kültürel özelliklere sahiptir. Türkiye'nin son zamanlarda farklı kültürlerden çok fazla turist ve göçmen akınına uğraması dikkate alındığında; hem yaz aylarında hem de yılın diğer aylarında eğitim, sağlık, gıda, konaklama vb. hizmet sektörlerinde sorumluluk alacak ve bu hizmetleri çok çeşitli kültürel farklılıklara sahip gruplara yönelik yerine getirecek insanımızı yetiştirecek ve geleceğimizi şekillendirmelerini bekleyeceğimiz öğretmen adaylarının kültürel zeka seviyelerini belirlemek anlamlı olacaktır.

Kültürel zeka son zamanlarda çok sayıda araştırmacının ilgisini çeken, aynı sosyal ve duygusal zeka gibi insanların farklı kültürlerden insanlarla karşılaştıklarında ve aynı ortamı paylaştıklarında ortaya koyacakları performansı doğrudan etkileyen bir unsur olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Bazı kişiler farklı ortamlarda bilme, anlama ve etkin olma konularında iyiyken diğerleri farklı kültür veya toplumlardan kişilerle etkileşimde bulunma konusunda bazı sorunlar yaşamaktadır. Bazı kişilerin farklı kültürel ortamlarda diğerlerine göre neden daha etkin olduğunu yada olamadığını anlamak oldukça önemli bir hususdur. Bu nedenle, bu kişilerin kültürel zeka seviyelerinin farkına varmalarını sağlamak, bununla birlikte, kültürel zekalarını geliştirmelerine katkı sunacak şekilde ve bu kapsamda çalışma yapmak çok yerinde olacaktır.

Bu çalışma, öğretmen adaylarının kültürel zeka seviyelerini betimsel olarak araştırma ve incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca, katılımcıların kültürel zeka seviyesi ile anne-babalarının eğitimi, cinsiyet, üniversitede devam ettikleri bölüm ve memleketleri gibi sosyo-demografik geçmişleri arasında ilişki olup olmadığını göstermeye çalışacaktır. Katılımcılar, 2014-2015 akademik yılında Türkiye'deki bir üniversitenin eğitim fakültesine kayıtlı 450 öğretmen adayından oluşmaktadır. Araştırmaya katılım gönüllülük esasına dayanılarak sağlanmıştır ve bu katılımcılara duyurulmuştur. Veriler, 2007'de Ang ve arkadaşları tarafından geliştirilen ve 2014'te İlhan ve Çetin tarafından Türkçe'ye uyarlanan ve psikometrik testleri yapılan Kültürel Zeka Ölçeği kullanılarak toplanmıştır.

Kültürel zeka ölçeği; üstbiliş, biliş, güdüsel ve davranışsal olmak üzere dört bölümden oluşmaktadır. İlk boyut üstbilişsel boyuttur ve 4 sorudan oluşur. İkinci boyut biliş seviyesi ki, 6 sorudan oluşur. Üçüncü boyut güdüsel boyuttur ve beş sorudan oluşmaktadır. Son boyut ise davranışsal boyuttur ve 5 sorudan oluşmaktadır. Ölçeğe göre yüksek puan alan kişiler farklı kültürlerdeki kişilerle etkileşime girdiğinde uygun davranışlarda bulunur, diğer kültürlerle etkileşim içine girmekten hoşnut olur, diğer kültürlerle etkileşim esnasında rahat olur, diğer kültür hakkında bilgi sahibi olmaya çalışır ve edindiği bilgileri yeni kültürün gereklerine göre uygular. Ölçekte düşük puan kişiler ise tam tersi, diğer kültürleri öğrenme, kültürlerarası sorunlara adapte olma ve diğer kültürlerle etkileşime geçme konularında isteksizdirler.

Katılımcılardan 263'ü lisans birinci sınıf ve 187'si farklı fakültelerden mezun olmuş ve pedagojik formasyon programına kayıt yaptırmış öğretmen adaylarından oluşmaktadır. Katılımcıların 281'i bayan ve 155'i erkektir. Çalışmaya katılan birinci sınıf öğrencilerin devam ettikleri bölümlere baktığımızda; 64'ü Türkçe Öğretmenliği, 48'i BÖTE, 41'i PDR, 33'ü resim, 22'si Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmenliği, 33'ü Fen Bilgisi Öğretmenliği ve 22'si Müzik Öğretmenliği bölümünde eğitimlerine devam etmektedirler.

Toplanan veriler, öncelikle basit veri sunumu ve çizelge sunumu yapılarak değişkenlerin kodlaması ve analize hazır hale getirilmesi aşamalarının da dahil olduğu birkaç adımda incelenmiştir. Daha sonra

katılımcıların kültürel zeka puanlarının ortalamaları sosyo-demografik geçmişlerine göre karşılaştırılmış ve korelasyon katsayısı metodu (Pearson's r) kullanılarak sosyo-demografik ve kültürel zeka seviye değişkenlerinin iki yönlü analizleri sunulmuştur.

Kültürel zeka puanlarına göre bu çalışma, öğretmen adaylarının cinsiyet ve okudukları bölüme göre bazı farklılıklar gösterdiklerini belirlemiştir. Örneğin, toplam kültürel zeka puanlarına göre erkeklerin kültürel olarak az farkla kızlardan daha zeki oldukları görülmüş ve davranışsal kültürel zeka bölümü hariç diğer tüm alt bölümlerde daha yüksek kültürel zeka puan almışlardır. Ayrıca, ortalama değerlerin karşılaştırmalarına göre sosyal bilgiler öğretmenliğinde okuyan öğretmen adayları üstbilişsel kültürel zeka bölümünde yüksek puan almışken Türkçe öğretmenliğinde okuyan öğretmen adayları bilişsel zeka bölümünden yüksek puan almış ve fen bilgisi öğretmenliğinde okuyan öğretmen adayları güdüsel ve davranışsal kültürel zeka bölümlerinden yüksek puanlar almışlardır. Toplam kültürel zeka seviyelerine baltığımızda fen bilgisi öğretmenliğine okuyan öğretmen adayları kültürel zeka seviyesi olarak en yüksek ortalama değeri almışlardır.

Diğer bir bulgu olarak, bu çalışma öğretmen adaylarının kültürel zeka seviyeleri ile sosyo-demografik yapıları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki belirlemiştir. Öğretmen adaylarının anne-baba eğitim durumu ile kültürel zeka seviyesinin bir veya iki alt bölümü birbiriyle ilişkilidir. Örneğin, anne eğitimi ve güdüsel kültürel zeka seviyesi arasında istatistiki olarak anlamlı bir korelasyon olduğu görülmüştür. Katılımcıların annelerinin eğitim seviyesini yüksek olduğunda güdüsel kültürel zeka seviyelerinin de yüksek olduğu belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca, katılımcıların baba eğitimi ile üstbilişsel ve güdüsel kültürel zeka seviyesi arasında anlamlı bir ilişki vardır. Son olarak babanın eğitimi ile toplam kültürel zeka seviyesi arasında anlamlı bir ilişki vardır. Aynı şekilde babalarının eğitim seviyeleri yüksek olan katılımcıların kültürel zeka seviyelerinin de yüksek olduğu tespit edilmiştir.