

The Effects of Dominant Ideology on Teachers’ Perceptions and Practices towards the “Other”

Konstantinos Nikolaos Vasileiadis

School of Early Childhood Education, Faculty of Education
Faculty of Education Building, University Campus
54124 Thessaloniki, Greece
E-mail: kostas.vasiliadis@gmail.com

Konstantinos Alexandros Tsioumis

School of Early Childhood Education, Faculty of Education
Faculty of Education Building, University Campus
54124 Thessaloniki, Greece
Tel: +302310 995010 E-mail: ktsioumi@nured.auth.gr

Argyris Kyridis

School of Early Childhood Education, Faculty of Education
Faculty of Education Building, University Campus
54124 Thessaloniki, Greece
Tel: +302310995061 E-mail: akiridis@nured.auth.gr

Accepted: December 14, 2012 Published: January 25, 2013

Doi:10.5296/ijld.v3i1.3132 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v3i1.3132>

Abstract

In this study the aim is to show the role of dominant ideology as a co –creative condition of teacher’s perceptions and their influences on the confronting and managing practices of the ‘Other’. According to the admission that the intercultural educational programs often downgraded and recanted by the dominant perceptions and ideology, this research attempts to highlight the impact of dominant ideology as the everyday, non-rethinking experienced ideology. We admit the negative role of dominant ideology as a director of teacher’s perceptions and practices. Using the conceptual framework (Multicultural Teacher Education Framework) that Cochran-Smith suggests, the research examines the teacher’s perceptions both about the ‘Other’, the school role and the cooperative culture development. The research took place in spring 2011. The 102 Greek teachers who participated in the research were asked to declare their acceptance degree for a number of perceptions and practices.

Keywords: dominant ideology, intercultural education, teacher's perceptions

1. Introduction

“Half-truth is the worst of lies”, although does not prevent the “half” true to hide the lie. The historicity of man is an effort both for the creation and dissolution of myths: creation in order to explain, to be placed in the environment, dissolution when with experience and knowledge, seeks for a change. The objective, in our opinion, would be the development of a critical stance leading to a transformation of the ideology which considers “natural” and “unaltered” and thus non-negotiable issues relating to the placement of man towards life and social acts, in such a way that reveals the lie “the other side of truth”. We refer to the development of a dialectic which “teaches us how to discern in all of its futures the confession of its fallibility (note, that of thought), a confession which removes its power and connects it with truth” (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1986, p.41).

Perceptions, mediating between knowledge and action (Bandura, 1982, p.122), play an important role, acting as “filters” which seem to have implications on teachers both in terms of their teaching and of their contact and interaction with the “other”, as well as their expectations of their students' academic success (Unruh & McCord, 2010, p.36).

The purpose of this study is to highlight the role of dominant ideology, in the way in which it acts over teachers' perceptions of the “Other”, its impact on teachers' practices, on their opinions concerning the role of school, the intercultural education; to reconnect the politics of positional difference and that of cultural difference (Young, 2007, pp.79-80), as components of the politics of difference whose disconnection validates the separation in terms of class policies (Bourne, 2002, p.200), leaves status quo untouched (Giroux 1993, McLaren 1994, Mc Carty 1993, Wallace 1993 as cited in Boyle-Baise & Gillette, 1998, p.20; Bullivant, 1997 [1986], p.80-81), failing, in this way, to grasp “the causality and the determinism of social relations” (Pavlidis, 2006, p.185), fact that could lead to domination itself (Gorski, 2007). Rikowski and McLaren (2002) point out that through the fragmentation of personality and the various “narrations” and relations with the “Other”, we end up “with very little or nothing in common on which we can build a politics of resistance against capital” (p.6).

2. The dialectics of intercultural education in the transformation of the educational and social life

Lippmann, in his book *Public Opinion*, maintains that what every man does is not based on immediate and positive knowledge, but on images made by him/her or given by others (Lippmann, 1988, pp.31-32). In this way we define something based on what our cultural tradition has set for us and we tend to “fathom what we have chosen in a form that has been made for us a stereotype by our cultural tradition” (p. 83). Stereotyped thinking, includes a multitude of negative (towards the exo-group) or positive (towards the inner-group) (Labridis, 2004, p.21) emotions and judgments based and realized by a set of values, which most of the times, is embraced by the subject (which thinks and evaluates) as “natural”, “unaltered” and mostly as a mechanism determining “reality”. Stereotypes are used as a mechanism both of individual and social self-determination and hetero-determination and in many cases form the basis upon which our opinion on the environment is grounded (Hilton & von Hippel, 1996, p.238). The concepts of self-determination and hetero-determination are bases of predicates which structure identity and identity in turn defines the otherness too (Jenkins, 2007, p.28; Gefou-Madianou, 2003, p.44). Identity, in such a way, is a dynamic process of selection or internalization but also of a social groups' cultural context data transformation; is the result of

an internal-external dialectics and also the interpretive framework to identifying the “Other” (Gotovos, 1996, pp.6-8; Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2001, p.242).

The otherness is legitimized through indicators that allude to origin, religion, lifestyle (Gotovos, 2002, pp.109-110), usually in a subtractive manner by making use of categorical thinking and by viewing some elements of one's identity. The focus on difference with the simultaneous hiding of differentiation's causes, adopts an idealistic, essentialist conception of human's culture “been”, as an “unchanging natural substance” failing to conceive it as a result of interactions.

But what are those factors that favor the birth of stereotypes and prejudices? How dominant ideology does operate in order to prevent a meaningful interaction and to maintain, produce and reproduce new stereotypes and prejudices?

There are three basic theories explaining the process of acquiring prejudices which start either form the individual's personality, the family and cultural environment or from the social and cultural influences affecting the individual as a result of social structures (Azizi-Kalantzi, Sideri & Vlachou, 1998, pp.36-42). The first theory referring to the relation between personality and prejudices states that the individuals exhibiting the so-called “authoritarian personality” tend to dominate others, feeling superior and displaying a dogmatic and absolute attitude towards others who consider them more disadvantageous. Dogmatism as a rigid and narrow way of perception is the uncritical acceptance of a system of values and the claim of acceptance of these values by others without evidence or reasoning. Thus the dogmatic-authoritarian person refuses the two-way communication and consequently adheres to the already known, making it static and unchangeable. The authoritarian environment affects the person's personality so that he/she shows blind allegiance to the beliefs and values of the group where he/she belongs, aggression to those who do not follow this system of values and beliefs, resistance to anything new, but also lower moral crisis. Studies have shown the relationship between authoritarianism and ethnocentrism as well as the inverse relationship between “moral judgment” and authoritarianism. People who had the concept of moral fairness more developed showed fewer percentages of authoritarianism and ethnocentrism (Ijzendoorn, 1989, pp.43-44).

The second theory, based on social learning approaches, considers that prejudices are associated with children's education by their family and their cultural milieu while it understands both typical (school) and informal (family, friends, etc.) forms of education as autonomous spaces functioning independently from social structures' influences.

The third theory understands social structure itself and the system of values that it professes, “as a carrier and medium of giving meaning to the world, as a regulating principle, that serves people to identify their reality, the way they perceive it and stand before it (Patelis 2006). Values are determined by the particular organization of society. In the context of capitalist society construction, “values” are getting their own rate. As Vasioulin mentions, in modern societies “the concept of value acquires a particular significance... In a status of commercial and financial relations' domination, everything - including men - falls into the course of these relations and acquires its own price. Everything can be sold and purchased; everything can be and actually is evaluated (assessed). Man, everything and anything along with its properties, is transformed into commodity, which means that is also becoming a thing” (Vasioulin, 1998, pp.145).

The “Other” is required to be harmonized with the “values” of the dominant group in order to experience success. His/her failure is attributed to alleged intrinsic characteristics: his/her bilingualism, indifference, and the inferiority of his/her culture (Cummins, 1999,p.58). Success

is realized through acceptance, assimilation and harmonization, adaptation to the existing system. In this way, a stereotypical expression of a social discourse is created, that of “unaltered reality”, both “natural” and “unchanged”. This stereotypical perception legitimizes and reproduces the prejudices and furthermore the relations of domination which they serve. The social control by the dominant group it happens by invoking not elements of legitimacy but the “Ego’s sense of reality” (Lasch, 2007, p.43). As Bennett states “People’s real culture” is not erased but shifted to the dominant culture’s “ideological and cultural field” losing its radicalism (in Apple 2008, p. 163).

The “Other”, the one who is “different”, is the one who should be making the effort to embrace the demands of modern society, of modern reality which is “given” and irreversible. The acceptance, however, of this value system and the relations of dominance is merely the reproduction of prejudices through the reproduction of existing social structures. The internalization of this value system will lead to the adoption of prejudices and stereotypes itself, against another group with less power; and, as Devine points out, the activation of stereotypes in the past has made them a well-learned set of relationships automatically activated in the presence of a target group’s member. A person learns through stereotypical images and later develops a system of values and personal beliefs (Devine, 1989, p.6). As a result, either stereotypes and prejudices regulate the individual’s type and quality of values and beliefs, or the individual experiences a conflict when values and personal beliefs are at odds with the stereotypes of the past. Moscovici considering that the “basic problem of social knowledge is the coupling of any objective information with a specific causal scheme”, concludes that people maintain their formed opinion through the information given, even if an explanation is given for its falsity, due to the fact that they previously constructed an explanation which agrees with this information (Moscovici, 1995, p.75-76).

The increased competition and the “asymmetries of social status” (Secord & Backman as cited in Gotovos 1996,23) characterize the social context that determines the assessment of each group’s member (Ellemers et al., 2002,p.165), through a kind of social knowledge, as a result of social interactions, and its processing with ideas, values and models of the group to which it belongs, and also with the underlying ideology of the broader society (Jodelet as cited in Papastamou, 1995, p.138).

Thus, stereotypes occur as a result of society’s organization, the assumption of different social roles, the conflicts between groups, as a means of maintaining status quo, or even the individual’s need for his/her acceptance by a social group (Eagly 1995, Fiske 1993, Jost & Banaji 1994, Sidanius 1993, Hogg & Abrams 1988 as cited in Hiron & von Hippel, 1996, p.238).

If, for example, the education’s goal is solely to provide knowledge for the social mobility of people and the occupation of certain positions in the existing social hierarchy, then we are talking about an implicit acceptance of the status quo. Very aptly Freire notes “...the oppressed feel an irresistible attraction towards the oppressor and his way of life. Sharing this way of life becomes an overpowering aspiration. In their alienation, the oppressed want at any cost to resemble the oppressor, to imitate him, to follow him” (Freire 1979).

3. Common Sense and prejudices. The cognitive process in the construction and deconstruction of stereotypes and prejudices and the role of education.

With the concept of common sense, as Heller comments, everyday social practice “is not out of history but at the very center of historical events; is the essence itself of social being” (Heller,

1983, p.9). Everyday social practice is the space in which dominant ideology is structured and reproduced as “natural” and irreversible. Humans are born in everyday life, learning, from very early, how to handle things, their behavior towards the others, in short, the elements of their cultural environment. This appropriation of things (Moscovici as cited in Papastamou & Mandoglou, 1995, p.15-16), Heller notes, it simultaneously means that they also appropriate social relations. The knowledge that comes from direct personal experience is non-reflective, and partial. Man receives, perceives empirical knowledge’s data, and creates consciousness of the self and of his/her relation to the others; which, though, it may contain false worldviews and irrational elements in general (Pavlidis, 2009-2010, p.50). “Common sense” according to Lawrence “is controversial and fragmented, is non-systematized... is inconsistent, exactly because what is common in relation to it is that “it is not subjected to the tests of internal consistency and reasonable accuracy” ... it is knowledge “considered to be given” (Lawrence as cited in Cole 1997, p.209). Similarly, the great educator Paulo Freire states that «... our mind in the spontaneous orientation that we adopt in the world, does not operate scientifically. It does not address critically, questionably, methodically, with accuracy the world of objects to which it tends. This is the knowledge produced by experience, but does not have the filter of critical thinking» (Freire, 2006 [1993], p.260). Moscovici, in his writing, *La psychanalyse, son image et son public*, observes that the individual is often faced with a wealth of information (dissemination of information) available to him/her without this meaning that with this information he/she can establish “a solid foundation of knowledge” for the “other”; concluding that even the differences on the level of education among individuals are overshadowed by the way itself that people are equipped to communicate or to express an opinion (as cited in Papastamou & Mandoglou 1995, p.22-23).

The unilateral, fragmented knowledge, not only becomes reproductive, regarding stereotypes and prejudices, but also produces a kind of absolute stereotypical discourse when, directly or indirectly, understands reality as natural and unchanging. This is achieved in two ways: when differences in language, gender, religion, class are not taken into account, or are taken into account separately and not in their dialectic relation (Nieto 2005), and when education is not focused on understanding and studying the contradictions of “social reality”, on “understanding the mechanisms of manipulation which act within society and lead to the formation of cultural arrogance, discriminations and racism” (Tsiakalos, 2006, p.225-226).

In addition, it discloses the role of education on the deconstruction of stereotypes and far more on the removal of negative prejudices on the “Other”.

Both Banks (2004c) and Haberman (1994) (as cited in Ponterotto et.al, 2006) have highlighted the importance of the way in which knowledge is constructed for the deconstruction of stereotypes and the development of positive and friendly attitudes towards others. The analysis of teachers’ prejudices and beliefs, Haberman maintains, is the “precursor” to fight prejudice and racism (as cited in Ponterotto et.al, 2006, p.166). Through the knowledge of inconsistencies and their limitations, a substantial change is plausible.

This means that teachers should: (a) consider the contents of their own perceptions on the superiority or inferiority of those who are different, (b) examine, along with their students, their experiences, cultural backgrounds, as sources of behaviors, perceptions and attitudes, through a critic of their views, as culturally determined and partial, (c) think and reflect that their views influence positively or negatively the others and (d) challenge knowledge’s neutrality and to understand that knowledge is not neutral and can be subjective or objective.

The versatile examination of things presupposes encouraging students to express their views: “the more views we have the more we approach precision” (Banks, 2004, p.158).

3. The aim of the research

Assumptions were the “master guide” for the examination of the relations between variables (Athanasίου, 2007, p.77; Cohen & Manion 1997, p.33-37). Our initial assumption is that the dominant ideology will affect perceptions of teachers and thus the sociocultural factors (gender, professional experience, level of education, previous experience in a multi-cultural environment) will determine the kind of perception that teachers have regarding their contact with the “Other”. We attempted to check whether exists the main theory’s reasoning: If dominant ideology permeates the individuals’ beliefs, then teachers also carry dominant ideology so their perceptions are dominant ideology’s perceptions (deductive method). The aim of the research was to investigate and evaluate cases to draw conclusions and proposals. As Cohen & Manion stress “the value of scientific research in education is that it will give the ability to educators to develop the kind of strong knowledge base ..., a skill which will ensure for education a maturity and a sense of forward motion” (Cohen & Manion, 1997d, p.69).

3. Research methodology

In order to check the assumptions a questionnaire was utilized having closed type questions with qualitative and quantitative rating of answers. A four-point Likert scale was used. The four-point scale was chosen in order to avoid the selection of replies in the “center”. Following the basic characteristics of a “good” questionnaire (Athanasίου, 2007, pp.173-179) and addressing the issues of its form (Javeau, 1996, pp.126-147) we ranked our questions using nominal and ordinal scale .

For the questionnaire’s preparation, Cochran-Smith’s conceptual framework was used divided into eight pillars (Cochran-Smith 2003), in order both the ideologies and the practices of teachers towards the “Other” to be examined.

The questionnaire, after the first pilot testing in a limited number of teachers to detect any ambiguities or misunderstandings, was made digital via Google Docs in order to be forwarded electronically to teachers. The choice of contacting the research with the use of Internet was made for the following reasons: (a) Reduction of financial costs and time needed to conduct an investigation (Van Selm & Jankowski, 2006, p.437; Olsen, 2009, p.593), (b) Ensure anonymity and avoiding pressure on the respondent, (c) The increasing use of the Internet that allows its use for scientific purposes and ensures data collection in a direct way (Ekman & Litton, 2007, p.287; Schmidt, 1997, p.279), (d) The possibility given for all the questions to be answered.

The questionnaire was checked for its reliability, i.e. as to the internal consistency of the data: the alpha reliability of 42 items, was 0,74. This figure is considered highly satisfactory (Howitt & Cramer, 2003, p.259).

4. The Sample

The survey was conducted on a sample of 102 primary and secondary school teachers.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the sample

Gender	n		%		
Male	33		32,4		
Female	69		67,6		
Professional occupation in Education	n	%	Years of work experience	n	%
Nursery Teacher	15	14,7	1 – 10 years	34	33,3
Teacher	66	66,7	11 – 20 years	43	42,2
Specialized teacher	9	8,8	More than 21 years	25	24,5
Teacher of a specific discipline in Secondary education	12	11,8	Experience in multicultural education	n	%
			Yes	57	55,9
			No	45	44,1
			n	%	
School of pedagogics			13	12,7	
University degree			46	45,1	
2 nd class degree in pedagogics			31	30,4	
Postgraduate degree			10	9,8	
Ph.D. degree			2	2,0	

5. Analysis of the data

The teachers who participated in the research were asked to express their agreement to the following statements. We have to recall that we used a four point Likert scale (1: strongly disagree, 2: disagree, 3:agree, 4: strongly agree).

Ref. Nr	Statement	Mean	S.D.
1.1	Children, from different cultural environments, do not have the necessary skills to meet the demands of the school	2,27	,946
1.2	The family environment is so "poor" educationally, that it consists a disadvantage for them	2,09	,986
1.3	The presence of children from different cultural environments in the classroom, is a "problem"	1,72	,801
1.4	The presence of children from different cultural environments in the classroom is for me a "positive challenge"	3,22	,698
2.1	I try to teach children that they have to adapt to what the school asks of them if they want to "progress"	2,12	,824
2.2	They must accept that now they should behave and act differently from what they have learned so far, if they want to succeed	1,99	,826
2.3	They need to accept the values of Greek society	2,32	,881
2.4	The social problems faced by children from different cultural environments are not a subject of education	1,54	,886
2.5	The intercultural education involves only foreign students	1,37	,596
2.6	The main objective of intercultural education is to make students feel	2,79	,958

	comfortable in their new environment		
2.7	The aim of intercultural education will be to make foreign students reach the same level as the students of the majority	2,72	,969
2.8	The public school has no obligation teaching the cultures of "others"	1,34	,572
2.9	The crisis of the Greek Education is due to its higher percentage in the existence of many foreigners in school	1,22	,480
3.1	In preparing my teaching I always keep in mind the needs of the "other"	3,35	,753
3.2	The knowledge of the culture of the "other" helps me serve them more	3,61	,632
3.3	Knowing the country of origin, I am more aware of the culture of my students	3,25	,713
3.4	Children need to learn what the school asks of them, if you want to succeed in life	2,16	,780
3.5	Foreign students must learn the Greek language. Everything else is secondary	2,26	,878
4.1	The presence of foreign students causes me anxiety and fear	1,53	,713
4.2	My class is relatively homogeneous. My students do not need some kind of intercultural education	1,53	,741
4.3	For a successful teaching in multicultural classes, I must have the necessary materials and assistance	3,04	,843
4.4	For a successful teaching in multicultural classes, I should be mainly trained in technics of approaching the "other"	3,28	,776
4.5	For a successful teaching in multicultural classes, I will need to change both the way I teach and my perceptions	3,15	,837
5.1	I teach everyone the same way. In this way I avoid discrimination	1,97	,959
5.2	I use collaborative teaching with homogeneous groups (groups of the same sex, nationality)	1,44	,863
5.3	I encourage children working more as a team than working individually	3,50	,728
5.4	"Time is limited and the course content a lot. There is no time for discussion and dialogue with children"	1,65	,886
6.1	The foreign children, will fail in school	1,25	,539
6.2	The way that I understand my students is influenced by my own culture and values	3,25	,724
6.3	I distinct the activities that I give them, according to their capacities	2,88	,812
6.4	The presence of many foreign students "holds back the whole class»	1,94	,877
6.5	When I enter in the classroom, I expect my students to have the necessary knowledge in accordance with the level of the class which they attend to	1,80	,890
7.1	I believe that my cooperation with foreign teachers will help both me and my students	3,33	,680
7.2	The collaboration with the parents of all of my students is very important	3,75	,521
7.3	Parents of foreign children can offer significant help in the education of their children	3,45	,726
7.4	I use their knowledge (that of the parents) in order me, in turn, to help their children	3,19	,841
8.1	All teachers should teach in a cross-cultural perspective	3,52	,641
8.2	In school, students should be taught what is defined by the curriculum. Any deviation in not correct	1,44	,752
8.3	Education must be neutral. Social inequality issues should not be	1,35	,655

	discussed in school		
8.4	The intercultural approach is related only to some lessons i.e. Civics etc. It is not suitable for all courses	1,25	,496
8.5	For me intercultural education is another way of thinking and perception	3,25	,938
8.6	The school is a place of knowledge. Children come to learn. The emphasis on multiculturalism has a negative impact on their academic development	1,23	,486

The procedure Independent Samples T-Test was applied in cases where the independent variable entailed two categories with different subjects, for the purpose of controlling the relation between them, i.e. the statistically significant differences. On the contrary, the process One Sample T-Test was used in cases with only one variable. In case of questions where the teams were more than two and there were no connection between the statistical process used was the One way Analysis of Variance: ANOVA (Javeau, 1996, p.221-245). On the correlations of teachers' responses we applied Spearman's r ratio.

6. Research findings.

Perceptions involving dominant ideology, as it was defined in this study's theoretical framework, were associated with perceptions of other routes, in terms of teachers' expectations and practices towards the "Other".

Perceptions falling into this category include:

- The need of the "Others" to adapt in order to "succeed" in life (Q.2.1)
- The so-called neutrality of education on problems that students from different cultural environments are faced with (Q.2.4)
- The idea that intercultural education is concerned with some students (foreigners) and not all of them (Q.2.5)
- The public's school non-obligation to teach the "Other's" culture (Q.2.8)
- The emotions that teachers have by the presence of foreign students in the classroom (Q.4.1)
- Attitudes towards intercultural education (Q.8.1)

On the idea that students' need to adapt to school's demands in order to succeed, the following correlations are observed:

There is a moderate intensity's correlation to variable 1.1 ($r=,34$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 1.2 ($r=,35$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 1.3. ($r=,39$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 3.4 ($r=,51$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 3.5 ($r=,41$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 4.2. ($r=,35$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 5.1. ($r=,34$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 6.4. ($r=,35$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 6.5 ($r=,37$, $df=100$, $p<,001$) and 8.2 ($r=,34$, $df=100$, $p<,001$).

Teachers who concur with the idea that students need to adapt to school's demands, seem to (a) agree that those coming from different cultural environments do not have the necessary qualifications to meet these demands, (b) agree with the educational theory on educational capital "deficit" of those coming from different cultural environments, (c) consider as "problem" the presence of children from different cultural environments, (d) reject the necessity of intercultural education for children from different cultural environments, (e) consider as a basic goal students to learn the Greek language regarding other targets as secondary, (f) regard their classroom as homogenous, (g) pursue teaching in a uniform way, (h)

consider that the presence of foreign students constricts their class' level development, (i) believe that all students should be at the same cognitive level according to their class and (j) demonstrate an undeviating adherence to the syllabus.

Concerning the perception on education's neutrality the following correlations are observed: There is a moderate to strong intensity's correlation to variable 3.1 ($r=.43$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variable 6.5 ($r=.39$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variable 7.1 ($r=-.35$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variable 7.3 ($r=-.35$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variable 8.1 ($r=-.51$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variable 8.5 ($r=-.36$, $df=100$, $p<.001$) and to variable 8.6 ($r=.42$, $df=100$, $p<.001$). Teachers who concur with the idea of education's neutrality seem (a) not to take into account for their teaching planning the needs of the "Other", (b) to consider that the students' cognitive level should correspond to that of the class, (c) not to consider as important the collaboration with foreign teachers, (d) not to believe that foreigner students' parents can contribute to the education of their children, (e) not to consider necessary that all educators should teach under an intercultural perspective, (f) that they do not agree with the idea that intercultural education is another way of thinking (g) to consider school as a place of providing knowledge where the emphasis on multiculturalism would have negative consequences to the students' academic progress.

Also interesting are the correlations concerning the views of a number of teachers on intercultural education. Examining the idea considering that intercultural education solely concerns foreign students, the following correlations were documented:

There is a moderate intensity's correlation to variable 3.2 ($r=-.40$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variable 4.2 ($r=.49$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variable 5.1 ($r=.32$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variable 5.2 ($r=.51$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variable 6.1 ($r=.33$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variable 7.1 ($r=-.31$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variables 7.2 ($r=-.45$, $df=100$, $p<.001$) and 8.1 ($r=-.47$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), to variables 8.2 ($r=.47$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 8.3 ($r=.56$, $df=100$, $p<.001$) and 8.4 ($r=.37$, $df=100$, $p<.001$).

Teachers who concur with the idea that intercultural education solely concerns foreign students seem (a) to display a lesser degree of agreement with the idea that considers necessary knowing the "Other's" culture in order to help him/her more, (b) tend to regard their classroom as homogenous, (c) tend to teach all their students in the same mode with the argument that in this way they avoid discrimination, (d) use homogeneous groups (same gender, nationality, etc.) in their teaching, (e) believe that these students will fail in school, (f) consider as important the collaboration with foreign teachers, (g) do not consider important both collaborating with parents and all educators teach under an intercultural perspective, (h) tend to agree with the undeviating adherence of the syllabus, they consider that education should remain neutral while they regard school as a place of providing knowledge where the emphasis on multiculturalism would have negative consequences to the students' academic progress, and (i) consider that this education refers to one set of modules and it is not appropriate for all modules.

Concerning the correlation of the idea, which wants to consider that the public school has no obligation to teach the culture of the "Other", to other variables, we observe the following: There are moderate intensity's correlations to variables 1.3 ($r=.36$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 5.1 ($r=.35$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 5.4 ($r=.35$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 8.2 ($r=.34$, $df=100$, $p<.001$) and 8.6 ($r=.35$, $df=100$, $p<.001$). Teachers who concur with the idea that the public school has no obligation to teach the culture of the "Other", seem to agree with the idea that considers the presence of foreign students in class as a problem, teach using the same mode as with all of their students, feel the pressure of time and of the obligation to conclude with the proposed teaching curriculum, avoid departing from the curriculum, while finally, tend to regard school as a place

of providing knowledge where the emphasis on multiculturalism would have negative consequences to the students' academic progress.

There are also strong intensity's positive correlations to variables 4.2 ($r=.42$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), and 8.4 ($r=.40$, $df=100$, $p<.001$). Teachers who concur with the idea that the public school has no obligation to teach the culture of the "Other" tend to regard their classrooms as homogenous and intercultural education as one set of modules or curriculum. Moreover, there are moderate intensity's negative correlations to variables 3.1 ($r=-.35$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 3.2 ($r=-.36$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 5.3 ($r=-.35$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 7.1 ($r=-.33$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 7.2 ($r=-.39$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 7.3 ($r=-.39$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), and 7.4 ($r=-.38$, $df=100$, $p<.001$). Teachers who concur with the idea that the public school has no obligation to teach the culture of the "Other" tend not to take into account for their teaching planning the needs of the "Other", not believing that the knowledge of his/her culture could be useful to that planning. Teachers having these ideas do not encourage group work, while they do not deem important the collaboration with foreign teachers and foreign students' parents. In Addition they do not use parents' knowledge in order to help their students. Finally, there are strong intensity's negative correlations to variables 1.4 ($r=-.41$, $df=100$, $p<.001$) and 8.1 ($r=-.46$, $df=100$, $p<.001$). Teachers who concur with the idea that the public school has no obligation to teach the culture of the "Other" do not accept as positive challenge the presence of foreign students in their classroom and tend to be even more negative against the idea to teach under an intercultural perspective.

The examination of the variable, which concerns teachers' intercultural educational preparedness and refers to feelings of anxiety and fear that can be caused to them by the presence of foreign students in the classroom, together with its correlations to other variables is presented as follows: There are moderate intensity's positive correlations to variables 1.3 ($r=.34$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 2.9 ($r=.35$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 5.4 ($r=.35$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 6.4 ($r=.35$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 6.5 ($r=.34$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 8.2 ($r=.36$, $df=100$, $p<.001$) and 8.3 ($r=.33$, $df=100$, $p<.001$). Teachers to whom the presence of foreign students causes them anxiety and fear, tend to deem their presence as "problem", attributing to that presence the Greek Education Crisis. In addition they feel that the pressure of time and the obligation to conclude with the proposed teaching curriculum are negative factors to developing interaction with their students, while they consider that the presence of many foreigners in their classroom constricts the progress of students. In a greater degree, they believe to the undeviating adherence of the syllabus considering that education should remain neutral on issues of social inequality. Finally, in a great extent, they expect students to meet the level of class which they attend. Also, There is a strong intensity's correlation of the particular variable to variable 6.4. ($r=.41$, $df=100$, $p<.001$). Teachers to whom the presence of foreign students causes them anxiety and fear, believe in a greater degree that foreign students will fail in school and vice versa. Possibly that belief to those children's failure is responsible for the anxiety and fears they feel.

Finally, in an attempt to investigate whether the positive perceptions towards intercultural education affect in the same way their practices too, variable 8.1 was correlated to other axis' variables. The results of these associations are as follows: There are strong intensity's negative correlations to variables 1.3 ($r=-.40$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 2.9 ($r=-.48$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 4.2 ($r=-.42$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 5.1 ($r=-.48$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), 5.4 ($r=-.45$, $df=100$, $p<.001$), and 6.5 ($r=-.40$, $df=100$, $p<.001$). Teachers who have a positive view towards intercultural education are more negative towards perceptions that consider the presence of foreign students as problem and do not agree that the crisis in education is caused by their presence. In addition, they avoid teaching in the same way their students, apparently acknowledging everyone's different needs and abilities, and do not expect their students to be at the same level with the class they attend to. Finally, they disclaim the excuse concerning the lack of time or the

“burden” of the curriculum as factors that prevent interaction with their students. There is a moderate intensity’s negative correlation to variable 2.2 ($r=-,36$, $df=100$, $p<,001$). Teachers who have a more positive view towards intercultural education have a lesser degree of agreement with the perception that wants students from different cultural environments to have to adapt in order to succeed. Also, there are strong intensity’s positive correlations to variables 1.4 ($r=,39$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 3.1 ($r=,48$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 3.2 ($r=,43$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 7.1 ($r=,46$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 7.2 ($r=,57$, $df=100$, $p<,001$), 7.3 ($r=,45$, $df=100$, $p<,001$) and 7.4 ($r=,51$, $df=100$, $p<,001$). Teachers who have a more positive view towards intercultural education treat the presence of foreign students in their class as a positive challenge, taking into account, in a greater extent, the “Other’s” needs and seeking to know his/her culture in order their teaching to become more effective. Moreover on the level of collaboration with foreign teachers and parents appear to be more positive considering it important and beneficial. There is, finally, a moderate intensity’s positive correlation to variable 4.5 ($r=,34$, $df=100$, $p\le;,001$). Teachers who have a more positive view towards intercultural education agree, in a greater extent, that they should change their teaching modes and their perceptions in order to apply a successful intercultural teaching.

7. Conclusions.

We focused on dominant ideology’s core, that of the “lived” and “natural” reality which demands adaptation to this reality and its assimilation by those who are different, by the “Other”, in order to experience success. The demand for adaptation to reality affects negatively the perceptions of the “Other”, asks for a change in behavior and in the way of living, starting from the deficit theory and treating foreign students as a problem while it invokes education’s neutrality and persists on the undeviating adherence to the syllabus.

From the correlations of teachers’ perceptions, we conclude that there is a close relation between these perceptions and teachers’ practices and attitudes: educators, who adopt dominant ideology and therefore relations of dominance, tend to follow similar attitudes and practices that practically conserve and reproduce the dominant ideology and hence the dominant social relations. Apple in his book *Official Knowledge* refers to how the concepts of equality, freedom and in general of the principles regulating social relations obtain a different meaning which is defined by the social structures the existing relations of dominance, are perceived as natural reality by the un free subject itself and are implemented by it. Dominant ideology using the dilemma success or failure drives the individual identifying the existing reality as natural and fighting, not to change it, but to assume a better position in labor market and henceforth within the given hierarchy. Marcuse by acutely criticizing the ethics of modern industrialized society points out the necessity for awareness of the way in which the predominant needs are appropriated by the individual so that, the latter not to be fighting for his/her emancipation but for the delusion of the freedom of choice, “to succeed or to fail” between “black and white”.

The ideals of intercultural education seem to be put in the second place in order for the individuals to succeed in their lives by internalizing the given reality and by following the road of adaptation. The concepts of Education itself and of intercultural education lose the element of vision: in formulating a complete personality, ending up being a regulator of the already existing relations rather than becoming the remodeling and redefining area of these relations.

If Willis’ (1981), research contribution came to show that anti-school culture, as a way of reaction against the dominant ideology that school displays, in essence increases inequalities since it confirms and conserves the gap between manual and intellectual labor, this research comes to show that this dimension is updated and shaped by dominant ideology itself: the educated is the better adapted as far education is not the individual’s overall development but is

constructed instrumentally as the means to “success”, to occupying a position to the already established system of values.

The institution of education appropriating the established system of values, attempts to “produce” skilled and flexible laborers: the concepts of freedom, equality, and humanistic education come to regulate individuals’ relations rather than constitute the fertile ground of co-creation and transformation: they are transpired as rhetorical devices having a “regulatory” content; sometimes they withdraw in order for the goal of efficiency to be achieved. The “Other”, the one different, is defined in quantitative terms, “less knowledge”, “educational deficit”. The concept of difference overlays the deep inequality and obscures the unequal social relationships. The “different” should be “equal” in the existing system of values, which is fundamentally unequal, so that difference does not exist anymore. Adorno mentions that “racial difference is risen to absolute difference in order to be absolutely abolished, even in the sense that anything different would not survive anymore”. (Adorno, 2000, p.183).

Under this framework, if intercultural education wants to renounce been characterized as “culturalizing” and to become a radical pedagogic suggestion, it should enrich its philosophy through critical social theory. Treating things superficially leaves status quo untouched (see theoretical framework); a theory that does not address the objective reality, remains a theory without practice, a pedagogy without meaning and purpose, when it does not study the “Other” as the essence of history itself.

We believe that the contribution of this study lies exactly in this point. That is to point out how the dominant ideology mediates the “viewing” of the “Other”, demonstrating and exploring other socio-cultural factors that mediate this perspective and making it necessary to study and investigate dominant ideology in the education’s institutional norm. The findings of this particular research descriptively show that among Greek teachers, those who adopt the notion of deficit for the culturally different students believe that intercultural education concerns foreign students and that school does not have the obligation to teach the “Other’s” culture. The presence of those “different” creates in them feelings of fear and anxiety and they, the teachers, adopt the dominant social perception that wants the foreigners being a threat. On the contrary teachers who adopt the hypothesis of difference reject initially stereotypes and criticize conformity pressures. These educators tend to take into greater account the needs of the other and to adopt towards him/her positive evaluation practices. But most of all, these teachers tended to support Banks’ transformative educational polic

Corresponding Author: Argyris Kyridis

References

- Adorno, Th. (2000). *Minima Moralia- Reflections from Damaged Life*. Athens: Alexandria.
- Apple, M. (2008). *Official knowledge: Democratic knowledge in a conservative age*. Thessaloniki: Epikentro.
- Azizi-Kalantzi, Zoniou – Sideri, A. & Vlahou, A. (1998). *Biases and stereotypes. Creation and confrontation*. Athens: G.S.P.T
- Athanasiou, L. (2007). *Methods and techniques of research in the sciences of education*. Ioannina: Efyra.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self - efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122-147. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122
- Banks, A.J. (2004). *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*. Athens: Papazisis.

- Boyle-Baise, M. & Gillette, M. (1998). Multicultural Education from a Pedagogical Perspective: A response to Radical Critiques. *Interchange*, 29(1), 17-32.
- Bourne, J. (2002). Racism, Postmodernism and the flight from class. In D. Hill, P. McLaren, M. Cole and G. Rikowski. *Marxism Against Postmodernism in Educational Theory*. New York – Oxford: Lexington books.
- Bullivant, B. (1997). To a radical multiculturalism: Analysis of tendencies in the analytic program and in the educational planning. (pp. 65-88) In M. Sohan. G. Verma, K. Mallick, C. Modgil. Multicultural Education, *The Interminable Debate*. Zoniou Sideri Athina & Haramis Paulos (eds), Athens: Ellinika Grammata,
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). The multiple Meanings of Multicultural Teacher Education: A Conceptual framework. *Teacher Education Quarterly Spring*, 30,(2), 7- 26.
- Cole, Mike. (1997). Teaching and learning for the racism: A criticism of multicultural education in the Britain, (pp.197-234). In M. Sohan. G. Verma, K. Mallick, C. Modgil. *Multicultural Education, The Interminable Debate*. Zoniou Sideri Athina & Haramis Paulos (eds), Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Cummins, J. (1999). *Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society*. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Devine, G.P. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 5–18.
- Ekman, A, & Litton, J-E. (2007). New times, new needs; e-epidemiology. *Eur. J. Epidemiology*, 22, 285-292. doi: 10.1007/s10654-007-9119-0
- Ellemers, N., Srears, R., & Doosje, B. (2002). Self and Social identity. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 53, 161-186. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135228.
- Freire, P. (1976). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Athens: Rappas.
- Freire, P. (2006). *Teachers As Cultural Workers: Letters to Those Who Dare Teach*. Athens: Epikentro
- Gefou,-Madianou, D. (2003). Concepts of the self and the «Other»: Questions of identity in the modern anthropologic theory (pp. 15-110). In D. Gefou - Madianou, *Self and the Other. Concepts, identities and practices in Greece and Cyprus*. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Gorski, C.P. (2007). Good Intentions Are Not Enough: A Decolonizing Intercultural Education. Retrieved on 12/6/2010 from http://www.edchange.org/publications/intercultural_education.pdf
- Gotovos, A. (1996). *Racism. Social, Psychological and Pedagogic aspects of ideology and practiceς*. Athens: G.S.P.T
- Gotovos, A. (2002). *Education and Variation, Questions of Cross-cultural Pedagogics*. Athens: Metaihmio
- Hilton, L.J. & Hippel, von W. (1996). Sreereotypes. *Annu.Rev.Psychl.* 27, 237-271. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.237
- Heller, A. (1977). *Revolution and Everyday Life*. Athens: Odysseas.
- Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, Th. (1986). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Athens: Ypsilon.
- Howitt, D. & Cramer, D. (2003). *Statistics with SPSS 11 for Windows*. Athens: Klidarithmos.

- Javeau, C. (1996). *The research with questionnaire. The handbook of the good researcher*. Athens: Tipothito.
- Jenkins, R. (2007). *Social Identity*. Athens: Savvalas.
- Jodelet, Denise. (1995). Social representation: phenomena, significance and theory (pp.124-160). In S. Papastamou, and A. Mandoglou (1995). *Modern researches in the social psychology*. Social Representations, Athens: Odysseas.
- Lampridis, A.E. (2004). *Stereotype. Bias. Social Identity. Studying dynamic the social representation for the gypsies*. Athens: Gutenberg
- Macrae, C.N., & Bodenhausen. V.G. (2001). Social cognition: Categorical person perception. *British Journal of Psychology*, 92, 239-255. DOI: 10.1348/000712601162059
- Lasch, C. (2007). *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged*. Athens: Nisides.
- Lippmann, W. (1988). *Public Opinion*. Athens: Kalvos.
- Lyotard, J.- F. (1988). *The Postmodern Condition*. Athens: Gnosi.
- Nieto, S. (2005). Cultural Difference and Educational Change in a Sociopolitical Context, (pp.138-159). In A. Hargreaves (ed), *Extending Educational Change*. New York: Springer
- Marcuse, H. (1971). *One Dimensional Man*. Athens: Papazisis.
- Moscovici, S. (1995). The season of social representations, (pp.65-106). In S. Papastamou and A. Mandoglou. *Modern researches in the social psychology. Social Representations*. Athens: Odysseas.
- Olsen, B.S. (2009). Choosing between internet and mail survey modes for choice experiment surveys considering non-market goods. *Environ. Resource Econ.*, 44, 591-610. DOI 10.1007/s10640-009-9303-7
- Papastamou, S. & Mandoglou, A. (1995). *Modern researches in the social psychology. Social Representations*. Athens: Odysseus
- Patelis, D. (2006). The values as expressions of cultural by no means (pp. 170-183). In K. Voudouris K. (ed) *The philosophy of culture*. Athens: Ionia.
- Paulidis, P. (2006). Conflict of cultures and education of multiculturalism: critical regard of liberal opinion (pp. 184-196). In K. Voudouris (ed), *The philosophy of culture*. Athens: Ionia.
- Paulidis, P. (2009-2010). *Gnosiological questions of education*. Thessaloniki: PTDE/AUTH.
- Ponterotto, G.J. Utsey, O.S. & Pedersen, B.P. (2006). *Preventing Prejudice. A Guide for Counselors, Educators and Parents. Multicultural Aspects of counseling and psychotherapy, Series 2*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.
- Rikowski, G. & McLaren, P. (2002). Postmodernism in Educational theory (pp.3-14). In D. Hill, P. McLaren, M. Cole and G. Rikowski. (2002). *Marxism Against Postmodernism in Educational Theory*. New York-Oxford: Lexington books.
- Schmidt, C.W. (1997). World-Wide Web survey research: Benefits, potential problems, and solutions. *Behavior Research methods, Instruments & Computers*, 29(2), 274-279. doi: 10.1177/089443930101900201
- Tzekaki, M. (2002). *Methodology of educational research and elements of Descriptive Statistics*. Thessaloniki: A.U.Th.
- Tsiakalos, G. (2006). *Opposite in the laboratories of racism*. Athens: Tipothito.

-
- Unruh, E.L. & McCord, M.D. (2010). Personality Traits and Beliefs About Diversity in Pre-service Teachers. *Individual Differences Research*, 8(1).
- Van, Ijzendoorn. H. M. (1989). Moral Judgment, Authoritarianism, and Ethnocentrism. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 129 (1), 37-45.
- Van Selm, M. & Jankowski, W.N. (2006). Conducting online surveys. *Quality & Quantity*, 40(3), 435-456. DOI: 10.1007/s11135-005-8081-8
- Vasioulin, A. (1998). Paradoxically the dignity in the light of Marx. *Utopia*, 30.
- Willis, P. (1981). *Learning to Labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Young, M.I. (2007) Structural Injustice and the Politics of Difference. In K. A. Appiah, S. Benhabib, I. M. Young & N. Fraser (2007). *Justice, Governance, Cosmopolitanism, and the Politics of Difference. Reconfigurations in a Transnational World*, W.E.B. Du Bois Lectures 2004/2005, Berlin, Alle Rechte liegen bei den Autoren.