

Turkish & Moroccan Background Students in the Netherlands:

Cultural Preferences on Teachers

Jan van Hoven

6316794

Master's Thesis

Utrecht University

10 June, 2020

Supervisor: Brianna Kennedy

Second Assessor: Monika Donker

Word count:7999

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Abstract

Many teachers struggle with multicultural classrooms, because they need to be able to address the differences between their own cultural and ethnic values and those of their students. Students' cultural values influence their preferences about teachers' interpersonal behaviors. Hofstede described four dimensions on which cultural values differ. This study uses these dimensions to get a view on the preferences of students with Turkish and Moroccan backgrounds on teachers' interpersonal behavior, compared to those of Dutch background students. A questionnaire was written based on Hofstede's cultural dimensions, which was filled in by students from Turkish, Moroccan, and Dutch cultural backgrounds. Students were regarded as having Turkish and Moroccan backgrounds if they, or their parents, were born in Turkey or Morocco. The immigrant generation of the student groups wasn't taken into account when comparing these groups. A MANOVA was performed to investigate possible differences between the groups. The results of this study showed no statistically significant differences in preferences of Turkish, Moroccan, and Dutch students in the Netherlands regarding teachers' interpersonal behavior on Hofstede's cultural dimensions. Given the fact that this study has several limitations that may have largely influenced these results, conclusions about the results have to be interpreted very cautiously.

Key words: Multicultural Classroom; Culturally Embedded Student Preferences; Cultural Values; Teacher Interpersonal Behavior

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Turkish & Moroccan Background Students in the Netherlands:

Cultural Preferences on Teachers

The cultural composition of Dutch society has changed a lot in the last couple of decades. Whereas in 1947, less than 300.000 inhabitants of the Netherlands were born in another country (mainly neighboring country Germany), due to the inflow of guest workers since the sixties from countries like Turkey, Morocco and Yugoslavia, this number grew rapidly to over 600.000 inhabitants born outside of the Netherlands in 1971 (Nicolaas & Sprangers, 2007). In 2019, over four million inhabitants of the Netherlands are born in another country, or have parents that are born in a country other than the Netherlands. Over fifty percent of them have non-western backgrounds (CBS, 2019).

This multicultural society is reflected in the Dutch classrooms. Many teachers struggle with their multicultural classrooms, because gaining students' cooperation while ensuring their learning involves addressing students' cultural, ethnic, social, identity development, language and safety needs, as well as their academic growth (Brown, 2003). Teachers often lack knowledge of strategies that are needed to connect to diverse students, and often do not understand the relationship between culture and classroom behavior (Brown, 2003; Makarova et al., 2019; Siwatu et al., 2017). In order to engage multicultural classrooms in genuine learning, teachers need to be able to address the differences between their own cultural and ethnic beliefs and those of their students (Brown, 2003).

Veldman et al. (2006) state that students' culturally embedded interpretations and values influence their preferences about teachers' interpersonal behaviors. These preferences are important, since teachers' interpersonal behaviors influence students' behavior (Fisher et al., 1995). Hofstede (1986) did research on culturally embedded values, and described six dimensions on which cultural

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

values differ. These dimensions were derived from questionnaires consisting of work-related questions, filled in by employees from the organization IBM (Hofstede, 1980).

For four dimensions, Hofstede stated that the dimensions can also be applied to education (Hofstede, 1986). This application has occasionally been mentioned by other studies (Veldman et al., 2009), and has also been used to investigate students' preferences regarding the learning environment (Fisher & Waldrip, 1997), but as a metareview of Brok & Levy (2005) puts forward, studies that focused on student perceptions have only interpreted differences in terms of the cultural dimensions, while not explicitly measuring these dimensions in terms of individual students.

In this study, the four cultural dimensions of Hofstede will be used as a framework to find out if these dimensions can indeed provide us with useful information about students' culturally rooted preference on teachers' interpersonal behaviors, so that these can be addressed by teachers. The focus is on students with Turkish and Moroccan cultural backgrounds compared to those with Dutch backgrounds, because these are the biggest culturally non-dominant groups in the Netherlands (1911 people with Turkish nationality aged 15 to 30 and 2167 people with Moroccan nationality aged 15 to 30 year (CBR, 2019).

For the purpose of this study, a participant will be considered as having a Moroccan cultural background if at least one of his or her parents, or the participant himself or herself, is born in Morocco. The participants of Turkish cultural backgrounds are categorized in the same way. No bicultural category was made, in order to have enough participants for each group. A participant is considered as having a Dutch cultural background when both parents and the participant himself or herself are born in the Netherlands.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Theoretical Framework

Students' Perceptions

Since the early 1990's, educators have noted that students had been excluded from the discourse about education. They called to reconsider this exclusion and took steps to bring about more inclusion in the educational discourse (Cook-Sather, 2006). This led to an increase in studies addressing the 'Student voice' (Cook-Sather, 2006). The justification for these researches was that researchers have to be aware of the perspectives of learners in relation to the issues that are studied in the educational field.

Accounting for student voices is assumed to afford insights that will not be found from adults' perspective (Cook-Sather, 2006). This idea is influenced by the information processing view of teaching and learning processes. This perspective emerged in the 1980's, and emphasizes that students' responses to instruction will determine what is learned (Anderson, 1981), and that active manipulation must occur to process information (Peterson et al., 1981). The information processing view implies that teachers must be aware of students' responses, and attempt to influence them (Anderson, 1981). The role of teachers shifts from provider of information for passive recipients to facilitator of active student mental processing (Gagne, 1985, in Knight et al., 1989). As a result, the research emphasis has shifted to an examination of the mediating role students' perceptions play in learning, teaching, and achievement (Knight et al., 1989).

The literature about classroom learning environments emphasizes the student-mediating or student cognition paradigm, which assumes that students' perceptions of the learning environment are essential for understanding opportunities to make every student learn (Knight &, 1991, in Waxman & Huang, 1996; Fraser, 1990). Students should be seen as experts of their own views and experiences at school (Delpit, 1988; Oldfather, 1995). Their perception may be different from intended or observed

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

instruction practices (Knight et al., 1989). While observants gained expertise through mastering and applying the content of adult-created frameworks of effective teaching, students possess naturally acquired expertise through lived, everyday experiences in classrooms, making them experts in contingencies in their environment (Wallace et al., 2016). Research has repeatedly shown that students' perceptions differ from teachers' perceptions; often, teachers' perceptions on classroom environments are more positive than students' perceptions (Dorman 2008; Fraser 1982; Raviv et al. 1990; Sinclair & Fraser 2002).

Because learning can be improved by looking into the views and interpretations of students on classroom instruction and the learning environment, it is important to take these views into account (Waxman & Huang, 1996). Studies have demonstrated that students' perceptions of their classroom learning environments affect students' cognitive and affective outcomes (Fraser & Fisher, 1982; Haertel et al., 1981; Walberg, 1976), and students achievement have been found to be higher in the types of classroom environments that they prefer (Fraser & Fisher, 1983, in Sinclair & Fraser, 2002). Students, namely, will essentially respond to what they perceive as important (Schultz, 1979).

Student's perceptions and Culture The cultural background of students influences their interpretation of teachers' interpersonal styles. For example, Moroccan students in the Netherlands perceive their teachers as more strict and dominant than their Dutch peers (Brok et al., 2004, in Veldman et al., 2006). Even if a teacher treats all students equally, his behavior will be perceived differently because of cultural differences between students (Veldman et al., 2006). For Turkish and Moroccan students, perception of teachers' behavior is even more important than for Dutch students, because of a stronger association between their perceptions of teacher's behavior and student's subject-related attitudes (such as enjoyment, perceived relevance, anxiety and motivation) (Brok et al, 2004, in Brok & Levy, 2005). Perceptions of Turkish and Moroccan students' on their teachers, which are influenced by

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

students' values and norms, may therefore be very influential on their learning outcomes (Brok & Levy, 2005).

Cultural Values

Geert Hofstede developed an influential model in the research field of cultural values, the 4-D Model of Cultural Differences. This model provides insight into values and norms from different national cultures, and is based on a questionnaire on values that was filled in by employees of IBM-companies in 40 different countries (Hofstede, 1986). The questions were work-related, and had an action bias; purely intellectual or esthetical values were not included. Based on the answers, four dimensions were created, which were related to prior work on cultural dimensions by Inkeles and Levinson (1969, in Hofstede, 2011). The dimensions were also validated on data collected from other populations. Hofstede computed index scores (between 0 and 100) based on scale scores for each dimension to compare national cultures (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

The model of Hofstede is frequently mentioned by studies on teachers' interpersonal behavior (e.g. Veldman et al., 2006, Brok & Levy, 2005) and is seen as the dominant explanation of behavioral differences between countries (Williamson, 2002). The model is often used as a framework for research on students' learning. For example, Blanchard & Frasson (2005) developed a questionnaire based on Hofstede's dimensions to identify students' cultural preferences regarding e-Learning, Tempelaar et al. (2012) used the dimensions of Hofstede as a framework to investigate how cultural differences influence student's self-regulating and learning behavior in blended learning and Parrish & Linder (2010) based their Cultural Learning Preferences Framework partially on Hofstede's dimensions.

Criticism on Hofstede. Hofstede's work on culture is very influential and widely cited (Jones, 2007), but is also met by criticism. McSweeney (2002) is one of the major critics of Hofstede's dimensions. He questions the assumption that the tendency of the IBM sample is also

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

the national tendency. According to him, the results may be affected by the context of the organization, and moreover; the responses are probably more affected by individual characteristics than by culture. This critique on the validity of Hofstede's model is posed by Williamson (2002), who points out Hofstede's findings that differences in responses between countries were more significant than those between sex or age, and that the dimensions aren't only applicable to one organization since the dimensions are confirmed by many studies (e.g. Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997; Chinese Culture Connection, 1987; Smith, 2002; Smith et al., 1996; Sondergaard, 1994; Wooliams, 1997).

Another major point of criticism on Hofstede's model is that that Hofstede's view on national culture is too simplistic, because it doesn't address the wide intranational variety of culture (McSweeney, 2002; Baskerville, 2003). In Williamson's opinion, this is indeed a limitation of Hofstede's theory, but he states that Hofstede's model was never intended to provide in-depth information about national cultures, but rather to provide relative scores that can be used for comparing different countries (Williamson, 2002). Since this is the purpose of this study, Hofstede's dimensions are a very useful tool. Nevertheless, it is important to take into account that Hofstede's dimension scores aren't to be interpreted as absolute scores for uniform national cultures, but as averages for a variety of cultures within a nation (Williamson, 2002).

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions. These are Hofstede's four dimensions (Hofstede, 1986):

1. Individualism as a characteristic of culture, set off against Collectivism. Individualist cultures assume that a human beings are primarily aimed at their own benefit and the benefit of close family. Collectivist cultures presume that human beings belong to one or more tight "in-groups", from which they cannot disconnect themselves. In exchange for permanent loyalty, the "in-group" protects the interest of its members.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

In collectivist classrooms, students prefer small groups, and may not speak unless called upon. There is an emphasis on group grades and retention of 'face' or honor. Therefore, teachers should avoid direct confrontation with these students, to make sure that 'face loss' is avoided. Sometimes, teachers might be expected to give preferential treatment to group leaders (Hofstede, 1986). The Dutch culture is characterized by high Individualism (Index score: 80), whereas Moroccan (Index: 37), and Turkish (Index: 46) cultures are characterized by low Individualism (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

The collectivistic culture in Morocco and Turkey is mentioned regularly in cultural research. For example, Teunissen (1997, in Zurk, 2003) describes a collectivistic culture in Morocco where individuals live in strong, tight groups, who provide individuals with lifelong protection in exchange for unconditional loyalty. Lindo (1996, in Veen & Meijen, 2001) describes the Turkish culture similarly, stating that Turkish families are part of social networks with strong social control and close relationships, and that for Turkish, it is very important not to discredit the family.

2. Power Distance as a characteristic of culture can be defined as the extent to which less powerful individuals in a society tolerate inequality in power, and consider it normal. Although every culture is familiar with inequality, not every culture tolerates inequality in the same way. Parent-child relationships in high Power-Distance cultures are characterized by high inequality, which is continued in a teacher-student inequality when children enter school (Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

In high Power-Distance classrooms, teachers are greatly respected by students based on age and profession. Lessons have a strict order and are mostly centered around the teacher, who initiates most communication, while students are rarely proactive or challenging, and only speak up when invited to. The teacher is seen as a *guru*, who passes on values and knowledge, has power and therefore deserves respect (Hofstede, 1986).

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

This is very common in Islamic education. Szyliowicz (1973) reports that freedom of thought isn't a central value of Muslim society and culture, and that the emphasis is on acquiring as much of the accepted wisdom as possible. This is reflected in the character of the educational system (Szyliowicz, 1973 in Brousseau, 2000). The educational system of Islamic countries has a focus on teacher-centered education, which reflects the Power Distance dimension (Brousseau, 2000). The Dutch culture is characterized by low Power Distance index scores (38), whereas Morocco (70) and Turkey (66) are characterized by high Power Distance (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

Hierarchy and authority are very important values in Moroccan culture, especially compared to Dutch culture (Pels, 1991). When facing adults, an attitude of respect is paramount for Moroccan children. Children are expected not to be brutal, which in this case means contradicting the adult. The social order is provided by God, and isn't questioned. One doesn't question, one conforms. Turkish culture also emphasizes obedience and respect for parents and other adults, Pels et al. (2009) state. Nevertheless, a qualitative study of Zurk (2003) on the perception of Moroccan students in the Netherlands on their (behavioral) problems in school nuances this view. Moroccan students participating in this study stated that teachers have to earn their respect, whereas their parents have their respect just because they are parents. In their opinion, the Dutch teachers have to show more authority, be stricter, and set clearer boundaries (Zurk, 2003).

3. Uncertainty Avoidance as a characteristic of culture can be defined as the extent to which people tend to get anxious from unstructured, unclear or unpredictable situations. Uncertainty Avoidant cultures try to avoid these situations by maintaining strict behavioral codes, and by a belief in absolute truths. These cultures are active, aggressive, emotional, compulsive, security-seeking, and intolerant. Cultures with a weak uncertainty avoidance are contemplative, less aggressive, unemotional, relaxed, accepting personal risks, and relatively tolerant (Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

For students that are used to a low uncertainty tolerance cultures, unclear rules about how to treat one another can lead to them feeling unsafe. They expect teachers to have an answer to all questions, and if this doesn't appear to be the case, this gives them a feeling of uncertainty. It is important that teachers set clear and explicit rules for these students, and that the lessons are explicitly structured (Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

The Dutch culture has an index score of 55, Turkey has an index score of 85 and Morocco has an index score of 68 (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). The high score on Uncertainty Avoidance in Turkey is in line with research by Yavuz & Bos (2009, in Giltaij, 2010), who found that personal uncertainty can elicit strong defensive reactions from Turkish people.

4. Masculinity as a characteristic of a culture is set against Femininity. These differ in terms of the social roles that are attributed to either men or women. Values across this dimension vary considerably more for men than for women (Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). People in masculine cultures strive for maximal differences between what men and women are expected to do. Men are expected to be assertive, ambitious and competitive, to strive for material success, and to respect whatever is big, strong and fast, whereas women are expected to serve and care for the non-material quality of life, for children and for the weak. Feminine cultures tend to have more overlapping gender roles, in which men don't need to be competitive, but may also go for something other than material success. They may respect whatever is small, soft and unhurried (Hofstede, 1986).

In feminine classrooms, teachers will rather praise weaker students, in order to encourage them, than openly praise good students. Teachers are valued because they are friendly, rather than based on brilliance, and students are praised for social skills rather than academic performance. In feminine cultures, students are socialized to be nonaggressive, whereas in masculine cultures students are allowed to express aggression (Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). Dutch culture is characterized by low Masculinity

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

(Index: 14), whereas Morocco (Index: 53) and Turkey (Index: 45) are characterized by relatively moderate Masculinity. For example, Turkey and Morocco have a cultural emphasis on academic achievement (Pels, 2000), but with the emphasis on family values and caring for each other makes the cultures also partly feminine (Al-Alawi & Alkhodari, 2016).

In the 2000's, the dimensions Long term versus Short Term orientation and Indulgence versus Restraint were added using data from the World Values Survey (Minkov, 2007; Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). These are not accounted for in this study, because they are not directly applicable to teachers' interpersonal behavior, and Hofstede didn't mention the relationship between these dimensions and education.

Cultural Learning Environment Questionnaire

Hofstede (1991) described how his cultural dimensions can be observed in the classroom, but didn't test this using an observation tool or questionnaire. For their research on cultural factors of science classroom learning environments, Fisher & Waldrip (1997) used Hofstede's dimensions to develop a measurement tool. This tool, the Cultural Learning Environment Questionnaire (CLEQ), was developed to assess culturally sensitive factors of students' learning environments from students' perspective. It was influenced by Moos' research (1979), which formed the basis for many 'student-perspective instruments' aimed at assessing qualities of classroom environments. The result was a questionnaire containing 35 items in seven scales: Equity, Collaboration, Deference, Competition, Teacher Authority, Modeling and Congruence. These scales were related to Hofstede's cultural dimensions and Moos' learning environment dimensions (1979). Each scale contains five items that are to be answered on a five-point scale from Disagree to Agree. The CLEQ was used to identify culturally sensitive factors of students' learning environments within specific multicultural classes, to examine

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

associations with students' attitudes and enquiry skills, and to examine the variance of perceptions between selected schools in Australia (Fisher & Waldrip, 1997)

The CLEQ can be a useful framework for this study, because it can be used to provide insights in culturally embedded learning preferences of students, but it isn't fully applicable to the purpose of this study. The CLEQ focuses on learning environments, whereas the current research focusses on (interpersonal behavior of) teachers. Questions like *'It is important for me to be involved in class discussions.'* are not useful for the purpose of this study. Next to that, some of the questions are focused on experiences students have in the specific classroom they are in (e.g. *'What I learn in this class agrees with what I learn at home'*). These questions don't provide information about students' preferences. Therefore, in order to be able to compare culturally embedded preferences of students from Turkish, Moroccan and Dutch cultural backgrounds, a new questionnaire had to be developed.

Research Design

The research question for this study is: *'What are the preferences of students from both Turkish and Moroccan backgrounds compared to those of dominant Dutch backgrounds when it comes to teachers' interpersonal behavior?'*

A new questionnaire was developed based on the CLEQ (Fisher & Waldrip, 1997) which uses Hofstede's cultural dimensions to get a view of the preferences of students from Turkish and Moroccan backgrounds on teachers' interpersonal behavior. For the development of this questionnaire, the observations from Hofstede about the presumed relationship between his dimensions and education were used (Hofstede, 1986; Hofstede, 2010). The questions were all tied to one of the four dimensions, so that scale scores could be derived.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

The hypothesis is: *Preferences of students with both Turkish and Moroccan cultural background students on teachers' interpersonal behavior score higher on the Collectivism, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance and Masculinity scale than those of students of Dutch cultural backgrounds.*

Methodology

Participants

In order to finetune the measurement tool that was developed for this study, a sample of 3 participants was selected consisting of one Dutch background student, one Moroccan background student and one Turkish background student. The focus group was intended to be bigger, and performed orally, but this was not possible due to the COVID-19 measures which made it harder to get in contact with participants. The participants were all in secondary education, MBO or higher education. We asked our network to help us contact students from Turkish and Moroccan backgrounds that might be willing to participate in our research, and we did the same to recruit students from Dutch backgrounds. To find more Turkish and Moroccan participants, the questionnaire was spread via Muslim Facebook pages.

For the validation of the measurement tool, a sample of secondary school, MBO or higher education students was used, consisting of 50 students from Dutch backgrounds, 89 students from Moroccan backgrounds and 48 students from Moroccan backgrounds. There were also 4 students with other cultural backgrounds. Their responses were taken into account for the validation of the measurement tool.

After the validation, these responses, except for those of 'other cultural backgrounds', were also used to answer the research question. The minimum number of participants for answering the research question was 42 for each group, based on calculations using G*Power (Erdfelde et al., 1996), with an assumed Cohen's f^2 effect size of 0.0625, a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Although research by Joy & Kolb (2009) on the effect size of culture on learning indicates that it might be better to base sample

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

sizes on a small effect size, it was based on a medium effect size because basing the number of participants on a small effect size would mean that 756 participants would be required, which was unfeasible due to time limitations. The small sample size therefore limits the conclusions that can be derived from this study.

Measures

To collect data on preferences of Turkish, Moroccan and Dutch students on teachers' interpersonal behavior, a new questionnaire was developed based on the CLEQ and Hofstede's cultural dimensions. Questions from the CLEQ were left out if these were not relevant to answer the research question. Other questions were adjusted, so that they could be used for answering the research question. Based on Hofstede's observations of cultural dimensions in the classroom, some questions were added. The adjustments to the CLEQ are described in Appendix B.

The questionnaire consisted of 48 questions, which were all linked to one of the four cultural dimensions. Next to these questions, participants were asked to fill in the country where both of their parents were born in order to categorize the participants in groups. Unfortunately, due to a mistake of one of the researchers, only 38 questions were answered by the participants. The questionnaires were filled in online, and the consent form was added to the questionnaire.

Validity and Reliability

In order to finetune the measurement tool, a qualitative approach was used. The focus group was asked to fill in the questionnaire and answer some additional questions on the clarity of the questionnaire. Based on the feedback, questions were adapted or left out of the final questionnaire. Next to some minor language adaptations, the Likert scale was adapted from 'Agree' and 'Somewhat Agree' to 'Totally Agree' and 'Agree', to clarify the scales. The same was done for 'Disagree' and 'Somewhat

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Disagree'. In order to investigate whether the factor structure of the cultural dimensions that the questionnaire was based on was applicable to our participants, a confirmatory factor analysis was performed using SPSS. Varimax rotation was chosen because it is a general approach that simplifies the interpretation of factors (Field, 2000). The tested factors were Masculinity (Q5, Q6, Q11, Q12, Q19, Q24, Q25, Q26, Q32), Power Distance (Q2, Q4, Q7, Q8, Q14, Q15, Q22, Q23, Q29, Q30, Q34), Uncertainty Avoidance (Q1, Q3, Q9, Q10, Q13, Q17, Q19, Q20, Q21, Q28, Q33, Q35, Q38) and Collectivism (Q16, Q18, Q27, Q31, Q36, Q37).

First, the internal consistency, the correlation between items that measure the same category, was calculated. For items that are supposed to measure the same concept, the Cronbach's alpha (α) should be greater than or equal to 0.6 (Field, 2000). The negatively formulated items were recoded so that a higher score means a positive response. The Cronbach's alpha of all of the four scales was below 0.6, meaning that the items within the scales didn't correlate enough with each other. This is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Reliability initial scales

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
Uncertainty Avoidance	.326
Power Distance	.516
Masculinity	.232
Collectivism	.552

Because the items within the scales didn't correlate enough with each other, it was concluded that the intended categories didn't apply to the questionnaire. Although Hofstede doesn't mention it, it may be

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

necessary for the application of his dimensions to education that the dimensions are divided into more specific subscales, similar to how Fisher & Waldrup (1997) organized their CLEQ, and how some of Hofstede's critics proposed cultural dimensions should be identified (McSweeney, 2002; Baskerville, 2003; Ailon, 2008). Therefore, the questionnaire was reorganized into new, more specific scales. To stay in line with the theoretical framework, it was important that the new categories could still be largely explained by Hofstede's dimensions. In order to check whether some participants messed up for the rest, a check for multivariate outliers was performed by calculating the Mahalanobis distance. Based on a probability of the Mahalanobis distance of $p < .001$ (Leys et al., 2019), two respondents were deleted from the dataset.

After deleting the outliers, a correlation matrix was made using SPSS, and items that correlated with each other were grouped into categories. The reliabilities of the scales are shown in the Table 2.

Table 2

Reliability new scales

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
Uncertainty Avoidance Shame	.723
Power Distance Student Voice	.683
Power Distance Disagreement	.500
Reward	.779

The first scale consisted mostly of Uncertainty Avoidance items and some Collectivism items that were related to shame (Q9, Q13, Q16, Q18, Q21, Q31, Q38). The second scale consisted of Masculinity items (Q25, Q26, Q38). The third scale consisted of Power Distance items related to student voice; whether or

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

not a student can have a say in the curriculum (Q2, Q22, Q23, Q29). The fourth scale consisted of Power Distance items related to appropriateness for a student to disagree with a teacher (Q7, Q8, Q14, Q30). The fifth scale, which consisted of items related to rewards, wasn't related to any of Hofstede's dimensions (Q6, Q10, Q23, Q32). Whereas it was expected that some of these items correlated negatively with each other, since they emphasized different things students should be rewarded for, all these items correlated positively with each other. This meant that it wasn't measured what a student should be rewarded for, but if students should be rewarded in the first place. Although this wasn't part of the theoretical framework, analyses were performed on this scale because it might provide us with extra information about the preferences of Turkish and Moroccan students on teachers' behavior.

Items that didn't correlate enough to any of the categories were left out. After forming the five new scales, the internal consistency of the scales was calculated. The items that negatively influenced the internal consistency of the scales were removed, until the internal consistency of the scales couldn't be improved anymore by deleting items.

In order to check whether the new factors measured what they were meant to measure, the construct validity was studied (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955), by calculating scale scores for every factor and subsequently calculating Pearson correlation coefficients between the scale scores. The construct validity of factors is reflected in scale scores that are moderately related. High correlations ($r > 0.7$), however, would indicate that factors measure the same concept and these factors may be combined and/or some items could be removed. As shown in the table below, none of the scales correlated highly with other scales ($r < 0.7$), so the construct validity was regarded as sufficient.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Table 3*Pearson Correlations Scales*

		Uncertainty Avoidance_ Shame	Masculinity	PowerDistance_ StudentVoice	PowerDistance_ Disagreement	Reward
UncertaintyAvoidance_ Shame	Pearson Correlati	1	-,025	-,175	,039	,238
Masculinity	Pearson Correlati	-,025	1	,323	,306	-,134
PowerDistance_StudentVoi	Pearson Correlati	-,175	,323	1	,378	-,443
PowerDistance_Disagreeme	Pearson Correlati	,039	,306	,378	1	-,198
Reward	Pearson Correlati	,238	-,134	-,443	-,198	1

Data Analysis Procedures

Due to time limitations, the same data that was used for the validation of the measurement tool (except for the responses of students from other cultural backgrounds than Turkish, Moroccan or Dutch) was used for answering the research question. On this data, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed using SPSS. A MANOVA can be used to test differences between groups on different dependent variables (Smith, Gnanadesika & Hughes, 1962). The dependent variables were

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

the mean factor scores of students on Hofstede's dimensions. The independent variable was cultural background (Turkish, Moroccan and Dutch). The differences between the scores of the groups per scale were investigated using Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) post hoc comparisons.

Prior to MANOVA, its assumptions have to be checked. These assumptions were multivariate normality, homogeneity of covariance matrices and independency (Field, 2000). The assumption of multivariate normality was checked using the Shapiro-Wilk test, which was chosen instead of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test because it is more appropriate for the relatively small sample size (Zimmerman, 2003, in Pienaar, 2014). Only for the Uncertainty Avoidance scale, the independent groups were found to be normally distributed ($W=.972, p=.470$; $W=.979, p=.299$; $W=.968, p=.333$). Therefore, outliers from the other scales were removed based on the histograms. Although this still didn't result in all the scales being normally distributed, MANOVA was performed anyway, because MANOVA is relatively robust to violations of normality if not due to outliers (Mertler & Vannatta, 2002).

The assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was checked using Levene's test and Box's test. Levene's test should not be significant for any of the matrices for this assumption to be met, whereas Box's test should be non-significant if the covariance matrices are equal (Field, 2000). Box's test was indeed non-significant using an alpha of .001 ($M= 46,71, p=.047$). The Levene's test was based on median, because this works best for skewed distributions (Brown & Forsythe, 1974). As table 4 shows, Levene's test was not significant for all the scales. Therefore, homogeneity of variances was assumed and the assumption was met.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Table 4*Levene's Test Scales*

Scale	Levene Statistic Based on Median	Sig.
Uncertainty Avoidance Shame	1.712	.184
Masculinity	2.777	.077
Power Distance Student Voice	.535	.587
Power Distance Disagreement	1.737	.180
Reward	.051	.950

Results**Uncertainty Avoidance Shame**

For the performance of MANOVA, Roy's statistic will be used in SPSS. This statistic is the most powerful one if independent groups differ along one independent variable (Field, 2000). A MANOVA revealed no significant differences between Turkish, Moroccan and Dutch students on their preferences

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

regarding teachers' behavior on the Uncertainty Avoidance scale ($F=2.807$; $p=.064$). As table 5 shows, the post-hoc Tukey HSD test also revealed no significant differences between the individual groups.

Table 5*Post Hoc Test Uncertainty Avoidance Shame*

Dependent Variable		(I) Turkish/ Moroccan	(J) Turkish/ Moroccan	Mean Differen (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Uncertainty Avoidance_ Shame	Tukey HSD	Dutch	Moroccan	,1362	,09806	,349	-,0961	,3685
			Turkish	-,0860	,11115	,720	-,3493	,1773
		Moroccan	Dutch	-,1362	,09806	,349	-,3685	,0961
			Turkish	-,2222	,09721	,061	-,4525	,0081
		Turkish	Dutch	,0860	,11115	,720	-,1773	,3493
			Moroccan	,2222	,09721	,061	-,0081	,4525

Masculinity

A MANOVA revealed no significant difference between Turkish, Moroccan and Dutch students on their preferences regarding teacher's behavior on the Masculinity scale ($F=.541$, $p=.583$). Table 6 shows that the post-hoc Tukey HSD test also didn't yield significant differences between the three cultural backgrounds.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Table 6*Post Hoc Test Masculinity*

Dependent Variable	(I) Turkish/ Moroccan	(J) Turkish/ Moroccan	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Masculinity	Tukey H _S	Dutch	-.1013	.10701	.612	-.3548	.1522
		Turkish	-.1088	.12129	.643	-.3961	.1785
	Moroccan	Dutch	.1013	.10701	.612	-.1522	.3548
		Turkish	-.075	.10609	.997	-.2588	.2438
	Turkish	Dutch	.1088	.12129	.643	-.1785	.3961
		Moroccan	-.013	.10701	.612	-.3548	.1522

Power Distance Student Voice

The MANOVA revealed no significant difference in preferences of students from Turkish, Moroccan and Dutch cultural backgrounds regarding the Power Distance Student Voice scale ($F=2.542, p=.082$). Table 7 shows that the post hoc Tukey's test also didn't yield any significant differences between the cultural background groups on this scale.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Table 7*Post Hoc Test Power Distance Student Voice*

Dependent Variable	(I) Turkish/ Moroccan	(J) Turkish/ Moroccan	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Power Distance Student Voice	Dutch	Moroccan	.0835	.09285	.641	-.1364	.3035
		Turkish	-.1238	.10524	.470	-.3730	.1255
	Moroccan	Dutch	-.0835	.09285	.641	-.3035	.1364
		Turkish	-.2073	.09205	.066	-.4253	.0108
	Turkish	Dutch	.1238	.10524	.470	-.1255	.3730
		Moroccan	.2073	.09305	.066	-.0108	.4253

Power Distance Disagreement

The MANOVA showed no significant difference between students from Dutch, Moroccan and Turkish cultural backgrounds in their preferences regarding teacher's behavior on the Power Distance scale. As Table 8 shows, the post hoc Tukey's test also showed no significant differences on this scale between the three cultural background groups.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Table 8*Power Distance Disagreement*

Dependent Variable	(I) Turkish/ Moroccan	(J) Turkish/ Moroccan	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Power Distance Disagreement	Tukey H _s Dutch	Moroccan	-.1193	.08350	.329	-.3171	.0785
		Turkish	-.1593	.09464	.215	-.3835	.0649
	Moroccan	Dutch	.1193	.08350	.329	-.0785	.3171
		Turkish	-.0400	.08278	.879	-.2361	.1560
	Turkish	Dutch	.1593	.09464	.215	-.0649	.3835
		Moroccan	.0400	.08278	.879	-.1560	.2361

Reward

The MANOVA showed no significant difference in preferences of students from Dutch, Moroccan and Turkish students on the Reward scale ($F=.463, p=.630$). As Table 9 shows, the post hoc Tukey's test also didn't show significant differences between the groups on this scale.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Table 9*Post Hoc Test Reward*

Dependent Variable	(I) Turkish/ Moroccan	(J) Turkish/ Moroccan	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Reward	Tukey HSI Dutch	Moroccan	.0867	.11342	.726	-.1820	.3553
		Turkish	-.0052	.12856	.999	-.3097	.2994
	Moroccan	Dutch	-.0867	.11342	.726	-.3533	.1820
		Turkish	-.0918	.11244	.693	-.3582	.1745
	Turkish	Dutch	.0052	.12856	.999	-.2994	.3097
		Moroccan	.0918	.11244	.693	-.3582	.1745

Discussion

The results of this study didn't show any statistically significant differences between preferences of Dutch, Moroccan and Turkish background students in the Netherlands on teachers' interpersonal behavior related to Hofstede's cultural dimensions. In other words, no differences in culturally embedded preferences on teacher's interpersonal behavior between the three cultural backgrounds could be distinguished. This is not in line with what was expected based on the countries' index scores on the cultural dimensions of Hofstede (1986). Based on these scores, both preferences of Turkish and

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Moroccan students were expected to be more related to Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Collectivism and Masculinity than those of Dutch students.

There are some possible explanations from literature for this unexpected results. Firstly, there can be a difference between a country's educational culture and the preferences of students. For example, a study by Brosseau (2000) on students preferences regarding teacher behavior in Morocco shows indications that even in a culture with an educational system based on high Power Distance, students prefer low Power Distance teacher-student interactions. Brosseau's study implicates that the student voice isn't always reflected and taken into account in educational cultures; the educational culture doesn't always match the preferences of students (Brousseau, 2000).

Secondly, Hofstede based his theories on participants living in the country of birth of their parents, whereas for this study, this isn't the case. This study focused on students whose family culture differs from the culture they live in at school. Next to the values they adopt from their families, these students are also exposed to the Dutch cultural values, which could influence their own values and preferences about teachers. Veldman (2006) describes Dutch students from immigrant backgrounds as living in a 'mixed culture'. According to Veldman, students whose home culture differs from the prevailing culture at school tend to adapt oneself to this culture when they are at school; their behavior at school differs from their behavior at home. A study by Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver (2004, in Kasaroglu, 2013) confirms this; it states that Dutch-Turkish adolescents find it important to preserve the Turkish culture within private domain, whereas they are a proponent of adapting to the Dutch culture at school. The distinction between the family culture and the culture students adapt to at school may explain why there are no differences between the three cultural groups in preferences on teachers' behavior. In this regard, it is important to note that schools are places where cultural values are transferred, explicitly and

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

implicitly. For example, even the way the tables and chairs are positioned implies a vision on authority of the teacher (Versteegt, 2010). It is plausible that this influences student's attitude to power distance.

Next to the influence of schools, many researchers emphasize the strong influence of peers on cultural values of immigrant students, which can undermine the transfer of values from parents to students (Vedder, et al., 2009). Because of this influence, ideas and values from the parents' country of origin are no longer simply adopted by children (Bartels, 2001, in Zurk, 2003). New interpretation frameworks emerge from this, influenced by the Dutch culture students live in. Moroccan parents perceive that their children tend to get more disobedient and assertive, influenced by the Dutch society (Pels, 1991), and it is said that the new Turkish generation mainly adopts the Dutch values and loses the Turkish cultural aspects (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2004, in Kasaroglu, 2013). As a result of this, there's a difference in values between Turkish and Dutch-Turkish students (Kasaroglu, 2013). Major research by Dagevos (2001) confirms this, stating that second generation Turkish and Moroccan in the Netherlands are far more oriented to the Dutch society, and that their values are more progressive than those of the previous generation. These studies imply that for Turkish and Moroccan students in the Netherlands, cultural differences with Dutch students may fade, which is a possible explanation for the absence of differences in this study between Turkish, Moroccan and Dutch students on culturally embedded preferences.

Limitations

It is important to take into account the many limitations this study has before moving on to the implications of this study, because these limitations could very much explain the unexpected results of this study.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

The first limitation is the small sample size of this study, which was due to the limited time for this thesis combined with trouble getting in contact with participants due to the COVID-19 measures. The small sample size seriously affects the power of the study, which means that the results of this study will have to be interpreted very cautiously.

Secondly, it is a limitation of this study that students weren't able to self-identify, since they may feel more Dutch than Turkish or Moroccan through the aforementioned influence of Dutch culture. The unexpected results might be explained by the possibility that many students identify as Dutch. If a student identifies as Dutch, this would indicate that its preferences regarding teachers may be to a large extent explained by influences of Dutch culture. However, including self-identification is a complicated issue. Research by Huijink & Andriessen (2016) found that around 80 percent of both Turkish and Moroccan background adolescents in the Netherlands feels strongly Turkish or Moroccan, whereas 40 to 50 percent of both groups identifies strongly as being Dutch; the overlap indicates that many adolescents feel both Turkish or Moroccan and Dutch. This implies that including self-identification in future research would have to mean more than just a binary choice between feeling Dutch and Turkish or Moroccan.

Thirdly, over 90 percent of the participants in this study was in higher education. This makes it difficult to generalize the results to the population, since Veen & Meijnen (2001) state that higher educated Turkish and Moroccan students in the Netherlands conform to a lesser degree to the norms of the Turkish or Moroccan group, because they are less oriented towards their family culture. This is in line with research by Huijink & Andriessen (2016), who state that higher educational levels are related to stronger identifications with the Netherlands and slightly weaker identifications with Turkey or Morocco. It could therefore be that the influence of Dutch culture on these students is reinforced by a

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

higher educational level. If more MBO-students had participated in this study, there might have been clearer differences between the groups.

Fourthly, not enough variables were included in the study. Study by Vedder et al. (2009) indicates that the time immigrant adolescents have spent in their country of residence correlates with the adherence of values in the country of settlement. This is something that wasn't taken into account in this study. A variable indicating the time the student or the student's parents have spent in the Netherlands could have provided us with more specific insights in why there were no significant differences between preferences of the cultural background groups.

The fifth limitation is the quality of the questionnaire. During the validation process, the cultural dimensions couldn't be as clearly distinguished as expected. This may be due to the quality of the questionnaire. The focus group was smaller than intended, so the questions couldn't be optimally finetuned. Therefore, it may be possible that some questions were misinterpreted by the participants, or by one specific cultural background group. Moreover, the quality of the questionnaire was influenced by the fact that 10 questions that were accidentally left out of the final questionnaire. As a result of this, the dimensions may not have been optimally measured, and it remains unclear to what extent Hofstede's dimensions are applicable to teachers' interpersonal behavior. Nevertheless, the lack of validity of the intended scales is not a problem only this study encountered; several studies have reported criticism on the validity of Hofstede's dimensions, suggesting that it might not be possible to conceptualize a culture in only four dimensions (McSweeney, 2002; Baskerville, 2003; Ailon, 2008). It might have been better to divide the cultural dimensions into subcategories. But since the same responses were used for the validation as for the analysis, the categories of the questionnaire couldn't be optimally refined. For future research, it may be better to base questionnaires on Hofstede's cultural dimensions on subcategories, like the CLEQ (Waldrip & Fisher, 1997).

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Recommendations for further research

Following from Vedder et al.'s theories (2009) that influence of Dutch culture on Turkish and Moroccan students is related to the time they have spent in the Netherlands, it could be interesting to replicate this study on primary and secondary school students, since they might not be as much influenced by Dutch culture as students aged 16 and older.

In this sense, it could also be interesting to focus further research on students that were born in Turkey and Morocco, because they may be less influenced by Dutch culture. An exploratory analysis comparing preferences of the few students in this study that were born in Turkey or Morocco to Dutch students' preferences found significant differences between the groups on the Masculinity and the Power Distance Student Voice scales. However, this has to be interpreted very cautiously because of the small groups, so it would be interesting to investigate this possible difference further. Another way to get more insight into the influence of Dutch culture on immigrant students' preferences could be to distinguish between students whose parents were both born in Turkey or Morocco and students with one parent from one of these countries, which in this research was not possible due to the small sample size.

Another remarkable aspect of this study that could be interesting to investigate further is that the descriptives and Tukey's tests show bigger differences between the Turkish and Moroccan groups than between the Turkish and Dutch and Moroccan and Dutch groups. This was the case for the Power Distance Scale, which showed a small, insignificant difference between the Turkish ($M=2.17$, $SD=.52$) and Moroccan ($M=1.96$, $SD=.43$). For the Uncertainty Avoidance Scale, there was also a small, insignificant difference between the Turkish ($M=2.70$, $SD=.55$) and Moroccan ($M=2.48$, $SD=.48$) groups. This would indicate that shame plays a bigger role for Turkish students than for Moroccan

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

students, and that Turkish students are more proponent of teacher-centered education than Moroccan students.

The difference on Uncertainty Avoidance is in line with Hofstede's index scores, on which Morocco's index score is even closer to the Netherlands than to Turkey (Turkey: 85, Morocco: 68, The Netherlands: 55). Although this difference in index scores is quite clear, not much research has been done on cultural differences between Morocco and Turkey. In educational research, the Turkish and Moroccan in the Netherlands are often taken as one group, comparing them with Dutch peers (e.g. Veen & Meijnen, 2001; Merz et al., 2009). This study suggests that it might be better to treat Turkish and Moroccan students in the Netherlands as separate groups because of the cultural differences between them.

Another explanation for these minor differences between Turkish and Moroccan students in the Netherlands on culturally embedded preferences may be that the Moroccan are more influenced by Dutch culture than the Turkish. Crul & Doornik (2003) suggested that the social integration of Moroccan immigrants is proceeding at a faster pace than the integration of their Turkish counterparts. This view fits studies by Valk & Liefbroer (2003) and Phalet & Schönflug (2001), which suggest that Turkish migrants are more inclined to stick to their traditional values than Moroccan migrants, and that value transmission is more intense in Turkish than in Moroccan immigrant families. This may be reinforced by the fact that Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands are better able to organize themselves and have a higher organizational degree than Moroccan immigrants (Prins, 1996). As a result, the second generation Moroccan in the Netherlands have more progressive values than their Turkish peers (Dagevos, 2001). However, Prins (1996) states that the Moroccan culture is more traditional the Turkish, which is more open and emancipated, so there are still some ambiguities that have to be studied further. Nevertheless, the different integration paths of Turkish and Moroccan in the Netherlands may be an

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

extra reason for future educational or cultural researchers to treat Turkish and Moroccan in the Netherlands as separate groups.

Conclusion

This study adds to the understanding about culturally embedded preferences on teachers' interpersonal behavior from Turkish and Moroccan students in the Netherlands, in a sense that these preferences might not differ as much as expected by Veldman (2006). Based Hofstede's literature (2000), teachers were advised to choose a different approach for Turkish and Moroccan students than for Dutch students; to avoid direct confrontation with Turkish and Moroccan students in order to avoid face loss, to perform teacher-centered education and to communicate in a more masculine style, but this study suggests that from students' own perspectives, no different approach is needed. Due to the many implications of this study, this conclusion has to be taken with great caution, so further research is needed but the results are consistent with Tennekes' (1990) and Verkuyten & Thijs' (1999) view on culture. According to them, cultures shouldn't be seen as static 'things' with a defined content (which is more like Hofstede's view on culture), but as having a complex, interactive and reflective character (Tennekes, 1990). Cultural characteristics are being used, mixed and transformed in relation to the context one is living in. These dynamics of culture are often easily forgotten in discussions about the multicultural society, and are important to keep in mind for further research on culturally embedded preferences of students living in mixed cultures (Verkuyten & Thijs, 1999).

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

References

- Ailon, G. (2008). Mirror, mirror on the wall: culture's consequences in a value test of its own design. *Academy of Management Review*, 33 (4), 885–904.
- Al-Alawi, A., & Alkhodari, H. J. (2016). Cross-cultural differences in managing businesses: applying Hofstede cultural analysis in Germany, Canada, South Korea and Morocco. *Elixir Inter. Busi. Mgmt.*
- Anderson, L. M. (1981). Short-term student responses to classroom instruction. *The Elementary School Journal*, 82(2), 97-108.
- Joy, S., & Kolb, D. A. (2009). Are there cultural differences in learning style?. *International Journal of intercultural relations*, 33(1), 69-85.
- Baskerville, R.F. (2003) 'Hofstede never studied culture', *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 28 (1), 1–14.
- Blanchard, E. G., & Frasson, C. (2005). Making Intelligent Tutoring Systems Culturally Aware: The Use of Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions.
- Brok, P. den, & Levy, J. (2005). Teacher–student relationships in multicultural classes: Reviewing the past, preparing the future. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 43(1-2), 72-88.
- Brok, P. den, Hajer, M., Patist, J., & Swachten, L. (2004). *Leraar in een kleurrijke school: Keuzes en overwegingen van docenten rond het lesgeven in een multiculturele school*. Bussum: Coutinho.
- Brousseau, M. J. (2000). *University students' preferences for a teacher and teaching style: A case study of Moroccan students*. (Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University).
- Brown, D. F. (2003). Urban teachers' use of culturally responsive management strategies. *Theory into Practice*, 42(4), 277-282.
- Brown, M. B., & Forsythe, A. B. (1974). Robust tests for the equality of variances. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 69(346), 364-367.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

CBR (2019). Bevolking op 1 januari; leeftijd, geboorteland en regio.

CBS (2019). Bevolking; geslacht, leeftijd, generatie en migratieachtergrond, 1 januari.

Chinese Culture Connection. (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 18(2), 143-164.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Cook-Sather, A. (2006). Sound, presence, and power: "Student voice" in educational research and reform. *Curriculum inquiry*, 36(4), 359-390.

Cronbach, L. J. & Meehl, P.E. (1955). "Construct Validity in Psychological Tests". *Psychological Bulletin*. 52 (4): 281–302.

Crul, M., & Doornik, J. (2003). The Turkish and Moroccan second generation in the Netherlands: Divergent trends between and polarization within the two groups. *International Migration Review*, 37(4), 1039-1064.

Dagevos, J. (2001). *Perspectief op integratie; over de sociaal-culturele en structurele integratie van etnische minderheden in Nederland*. WRR.

Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard educational review*, 58(3), 280-299.

Dorman, J. (2008). Using student perceptions to compare actual and preferred classroom environment in Queensland schools. *Educational Studies*, 34, 299–308.

Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., & Buchner, A. (1996). GPOWER: A general power analysis program. *Behavior research methods, instruments, & computers*, 28(1), 1-11.

Field, A. (2000). *Discovering Statistics using SPSS for Windows*. London: SAGE Publications.

Fisher, D., Fraser, B., & Cresswell, J. (1995). Using the " Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction" in the Professional Development of Teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 20(1), 2.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

- Fraser, B. J. (1982). Differences between student and teacher perceptions of actual and preferred classroom learning environment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 4, 511–519.
- Fraser, B. J. (1990). Students' perceptions of their classroom environments. In K. Tobin, J. B. Kahle, & B. J. Fraser (Eds.), *Windows into science classrooms: Problems associated with higher-level cognitive learning* (99-221). Bristol, PA: Falmer
- Fraser, B. J., & Fisher, D. L. (1982). Predicting students' outcomes from their perceptions of classroom psychosocial environments. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19, 498–518.
- Fraser, B. J., & Fisher, D. L. (1983). Student achievement as a function of person-environment fit: A regression surface analysis. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 53, 89–99.
- Gagne, E. P. (1985). *The cognitive psychology of school learning*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.
- Giltaij, A. (2010). Als de dood voor onzekerheid: Zekerheid en persoonlijk zelfvertrouwen als kernmotieven in bevestiging en verdediging van het culturele wereldbeeld.
- Haertel, G. D., Walberg, H. J., & Haertel, E. H. (1981). Sociopsychological environments and learning: A quantitative synthesis. *British Educational Research Journal*, 7, 27– 36.
- Hofstede, G. (2003). Cultural dimensions. Retrieved April 2020, from Institute for Training in Intercultural Management (ITIM) International Web site at http://www.geert-hofstede.com/hofstede_dimensions.php
- Hofstede, G. & Hofstede, G.J. (2005). *Allemaal Andersdenkenden*. *Business Contact*
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (Rev. 3 rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill. S".
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online readings in psychology and culture*, 2.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of intercultural relations*, 10(3), 301-320.
- Huijnk, W., & Andriessen, I. (2016). Integratie in zicht? De integratie van migranten in Nederland op acht terreinen nader bekeken [Integration in Sight? The Integration of Migrants in the Netherlands in Eight Areas].
- Inkeles, A., & Levinson, D. J. (1969). National character: The study of modal personality and sociocultural systems. *The handbook of social psychology*, 4, 418-506.
- Jones, M. L. (2007). Hofstede–Culturally Questionable? Faculty of Commerce-Papers. In *Oxford Business & Economics Conference, Oxford*.
- Kasaroglu, G. (2013). *De invloed van land en cultuur op het normbesef van jongeren* (Master's thesis).
- Joy, S., & Kolb, D. A. (2009). Are there cultural differences in learning style?. *International Journal of intercultural relations*, 33(1), 69-85.
- Knight, S. L., Waxman, H. C., & Padron, Y. N. (1989). Students' perceptions of relationships between social studies instruction and cognitive strategies. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 82(5), 270-276.
- Knight, S. L., & Waxman, H. C. (1991). Students' cognition and classroom instruction. *Effective teaching: Current research*, 239-255.
- Leys, C., Delacre, M., Mora, Y. L., Lakens, D., & Ley, C. (2019). How to classify, detect, and manage univariate and multivariate outliers, with emphasis on pre-registration. *International Review of Social Psychology*, 32(1).
- Lindo, F. (1996). *Maakt cultuur verschil [Does Culture Make a Difference]?* Het Spinhuis, Amsterdam.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

- Makarova, E., Gilde, J. 't, & Birman, D. (2019). Teachers as risk and resource factors in minority students' school adjustment: an integrative review of qualitative research on acculturation. *Intercultural Education*, 1-30.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2008). Designing a qualitative study. *The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods*, 2, 214-253.
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. (2002). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation*. Taylor & Francis.
- Merz, E. M., Özeke-Kocabas, E., Oort, F. J., & Schuengel, C. (2009). Intergenerational family solidarity: Value differences between immigrant groups and generations. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23(3), 291.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: a triumph of faith - a failure of analysis. *Human Relations*. 55(1). 89–118.
- Minkov, M. (2007). What makes us different and similar: A new interpretation of the World Values Survey and other cross-cultural data. Sofia, Bulgaria: Klasika i Stil.
- Moos, R. H. (1979). *Evaluating educational environments*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nicolaas, H., & Sprangers, A. (2007). Buitenlandse migratie in Nederland 1795-2006: de invloed op de bevolkingssamenstelling. *Twee eeuwen Nederland getfield: Onderzoek met de digitale Volks-, Beroeps-en Woningtellingen 1795–2001*, 19-50.
- Oldfather, P. (1995). Songs "come back most to them": Students' experiences as researchers. *Theory into practice*, 34(2), 131-137.
- Parrish, P., & Linder-VanBerschot, J. (2010). Cultural dimensions of learning: Addressing the challenges of multicultural instruction. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 11(2), 1-19.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

- Pels, T. (1991). Sociale controle in de Marokkaanse gezinscultuur. *Tijdschrift voor criminologie*, 33, 142-153.
- Pels, T. (2000). Opvoeding en integratie: een vergelijkende studie van recente onderzoeken naar gezinsopvoeding en de pedagogische afstemming tussen gezin en school. Assen: Van Gorcum
- Peterson, P. L., Janicki, T. C., & Swing, S. R. (1981). Ability× treatment interaction effects on children's learning in large-group and small-group approaches. *American Educational Research Journal*, 18(4), 453-473.
- Pels, T., Distelbrink, M., & Postma, L. (2009). Opvoeding in de migratiecontext. *Review van recent onderzoek naar de opvoeding in gezinnen van nieuwe Nederlanders, in opdracht van NWO. Utrecht: Verwey-Jonker Instituut.*
- Phalet, K., & Schönplflug, U. (2001). Intergenerational transmission of collectivism and achievement values in two acculturation contexts: The case of Turkish families in Germany and Turkish and Moroccan families in the Netherlands. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 32(2), 186-201.
- Pienaar, C. E. (2014). *The anchoring and adjustment heuristic in unstructured interviews: an experimental study* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cape Town).
- Prins, K. S. (1996). Van 'gastarbeider' tot 'Nederlander': adaptatie van Marokkanen en Turken in Nederland. s.n.
- Raviv, A., Raviv, A., & Reisel, E. (1990). Teacher and students: Two different perspectives?! Measuring social climate in the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27, 141-157
- Schultz, R. A. (1979). Student importance ratings as indicator of structure of actual and ideal sociopsychological climates. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 827-883
- Sinclair, B. B., & Fraser, B. J. (2002). Changing classroom environments in urban middle schools. *Learning Environments Research*, 5(3), 301-328.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

- Siwatu, K. O., Putman, S. M., Starker-Glass, T. V., & Lewis, C. W. (2017). The culturally responsive classroom management self-efficacy scale: Development and initial validation. *Urban Education*, 52(7), 862-888.
- Smith, H., Gnanadesikan, R., & Hughes, J. B. (1962). Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). *Biometrics*, 18(1), 22-41.
- Smith, P. (2002). Culture's consequences: Something old and something new. *Human Relations*, 1, 119-35.
- Smith, P., Dugan, S. & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National culture and the values of organizational employees: A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27, 231-64.
- Szyliowicz, J. S. (1973). *Education and modernization in the Middle East*. 234-35. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Sondergaard, M. (1994). Hofstede's consequences: A study or reviews, citations and replications. *Organization Studies*, 15, 447-56
- Tartwijk, J. van, Brok, P. den, Veldman, I., & Wubbels, T. (2009). Teachers' practical knowledge about classroom management in multicultural classrooms. *Teaching and teacher education*, 25(3), 453-460.
- Tempelaar, D. T., Rienties, B., Giesbers, B., & Schim van der Loeff, S. (2012). How cultural and learning style differences impact students' learning preferences in blended learning. In E. J. Francois (Ed.), *Transcultural Blended Learning and Teaching in Postsecondary Education* (pp. 30-51). Hershey PA: IGI-Global..
- Tennekes, H. (1990). *De onbekende dimensie: Over cultuur, cultuurverschil en macht*. Apeldoorn: Garant.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

- Teunissen, F. (Ed.) (1997). *Taalbeleid concreet. Nederlands als tweede taal en onderwijs in allochtone talen op multi-etnische scholen*. 's-Hertogenbosch: KPC Groep.
- Trompenaars, F. & Hampden-Turner, C., (1997). Response to Geert Hofstede. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21(1), 149-159.
- Valk, H. de, & Liefbroer, A. C. (2003). Gender, international migration and integration family formation of Turkish and Moroccan youngsters in the Netherlands: how strong is the influence of the family?. *European Population: Challenges and Opportunities*.
- Vedder, P., Berry, J., Sabatier, C., & Sam, D. (2009). The intergenerational transmission of values in national and immigrant families: The role of Zeitgeist. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 38(5), 642-653.
- Veen, I. van der, & Meijnen, G. W. (2001). The individual characteristics, ethnic identity, and cultural orientation of successful secondary school students of Turkish and Moroccan background in the Netherlands. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 30(5), 539-560.
- Veldman, I., Tartwijk, J. W. F. van, Brok, P. den, & Wubbels, T. (2006). Leren omgaan met leerlingen in de multiculturele klas. *VELON: tijdschrift voor lerarenopleiders*, 27(2), 30-36.
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (1999). Nederlandse en Turkse jongeren over multiculturalisme: cultuurbehoud, aanpassing, identificatie en groepsdiscriminatie. *Sociologische gids*, 46(5), 407-425.
- Versteegt, I. C. (2010). *Diversiteit in de klas: perspectieven van de leerkracht. Een kwalitatief-empirisch onderzoek naar de wijzen waarop leerkrachten in het protestants-christelijk primair onderwijs betekenis toekennen aan religieuze en etnische diversiteit van leerlingen*. BOX Press.
- Walberg, H. J. (1976). Psychology of learning environments: Behavioral, structural, or perceptual?
- Waldrip, B. G., & Fisher, D. L. (1997). Cultural Learning Environment: Validity and Application of a Questionnaire.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

- Wallace, T. L., Kelcey, B., & Ruzek, E. (2016). What can student perception surveys tell us about teaching? Empirically testing the underlying structure of the tripod student perception survey. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(6), 1834-1868.
- Waxman, H. C., & Huang, S. Y. L. (1996). Classroom instruction differences by level of technology use in middle school mathematics. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 14(2), 157-169.
- Williamson, D. (2002). Forward from a critique of Hofstede's model of national culture. *Human relations*, 55(11), 1373-1395.
- Woolliams, P. (1997). The Trompenaars database. In F. Trompenaars & C. Hampden-Turner (Eds), *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business* (2nd edn). London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Yavuz, H., & Van den Bos, K., (2009). Effects of uncertainty and mortality salience on worldview defense reactions in Turkey. *Social Justice Research*, 22, 384–398.
- Zimmerman, D. W. (2003). A warning about the large-sample Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test: Earlier studies conducted in structured interviews. *Understanding Statistics*, 2, 267-280.
- Zurk, N. van (2003). *Werelden van verschil: Over de problemen met betrekking tot Marokkaanse jongeren in het vmbo-onderwijs in Gouda, gezien door de ogen van het schoolpersoneel, de Marokkaanse ouderen en de jongeren zelf.*

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Appendix A

Final Questionnaire

General information

Gender Male/Female/Other

Age

Education Type Secondary School/ Higher Education/ Other

Country of birth The Netherlands/Turkey/Morocco/Other

Country of birth Father The Netherlands/Turkey/Morocco/Other

Country of birth Mother The Netherlands/Turkey/Morocco/Other

Item	Totally Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Totally Agree
1. I like to learn by copying what teachers show me	1	2	3	4
2. Students should occasionally have the chance to choose a topic for a lesson.	1	2	3	4

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

3. I like it when teachers let me find my own approach.	1	2	3	4
4. A good teacher passes on personal wisdom.	1	2	3	4
5. It is of most importance for a teacher to be smart.	1	2	3	4
6. A teacher should award students' academic performance	1	2	3	4
7. If I challenge a teacher, I do not believe that the teacher will be offended.	1	2	3	4
8. The teacher should allow me to criticize or contradict him/her.	1	2	3	4

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

9. I like to listen to what other students say before I answer a question.	1	2	3	4
10. Teachers should reward students for originality.	1	2	3	4
11. It is of most importance for a teacher to be friendly.	1	2	3	4
12. It is more important for a teacher to have social skills than to have academic skills.	1	2	3	4
13. I try to say what I think the teacher wants rather than give my own opinions.	1	2	3	4
14. If I verbally disagree with a teacher, I do not believe that the teacher will be offended.	1	2	3	4

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

\				
15. The teacher should initiate the communication in the classroom.	1	2	3	4
16. I'd rather have the teacher address me personally than in front of the class.	1	2	3	4
17. A good teacher should suppress his emotions when he is teaching.	1	2	3	4
18. It is no problem for me if the teacher tells me I'm wrong in front of the whole class.	1	2	3	4
19. It is OK if a teacher uses language I don't understand.	1	2	3	4

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

20. It is important that a teacher is able to answer all of my questions.	1	2	3	4
21. It is important to me that I give the right answers to questions in class.	1	2	3	4
22. It is important that a teacher leaves room for students' initiatives.	1	2	3	4
23. A teacher should adapt his lessons to students' preferences. Teachers should reward students for accuracy.	1	2	3	4
24. The teacher should focus his praise on the weakest students.	1	2	3	4
25. It is important to communicate in the same way with female teachers as with male teachers.	1	2	3	4

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

26. I like being taught by both male and female teachers.	1	2	3	4
27. There can be valid reasons for a teacher to give some students preferential treatment.	1	2	3	4
28. A teacher is allowed to say 'I don't know'.	1	2	3	4
29. A teacher should use students' input for his lessons.	1	2	3	4
30. It is important that I feel free to challenge or question what the teacher says.	1	2	3	4
31. I feel ashamed if the teacher points my mistake out in front of the whole class.	1	2	3	4

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

32. A teacher should reward students' social skills.	1	2	3	4
33. I like being taught by both male and female teachers.	1	2	3	4
34. A teacher should treat me as an equal.	1	2	3	4
35. I don't feel comfortable if a teacher sets objectives for learning situations that are unclear.	1	2	3	4
36. I think both females and males make excellent teachers	1	2	3	4
37. The teacher should focus his praise on the best students.	1	2	3	4

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

38. It is no problem for me to give my own opinion when the rest the class disagrees with me.	1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

Additional feedback questions for the finetune-sample:

When filling in the questionnaire, note anything that is unclear to you.

1. Which questions were unclear to you? Why?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2. Do you have suggestions on how the questions could be changed to make them more clear?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

3. Do you have other comments on (the clarity of) the measurement tool?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Appendix B:

Adjustments and additions to the CLEQ

Original CLEQ

1. I think that both females and males make excellent teachers.
2. I like being taught by both male and female teachers
3. ~~I feel that comments in class by male and female students are equally important.~~
4. ~~I feel that female teachers should be shown the same amount of respect as male teachers.~~ It is important to communicate in the same way with female teachers as with male teachers.
5. ~~I feel that male students are just as capable as female students in all class activities.~~
6. ~~I like working in groups.~~
7. ~~I feel that it is important for the class to work together as a team.~~
8. ~~I would rather decide what to do as a group than to make a decision by myself.~~
9. It is important for me to be involved in class discussions.
10. ~~I like to work with other students~~
11. I try to say what I think the teacher wants rather than give my own opinions.
12. I like to listen to what other students say before I answer a question
13. ~~I try to say what the class thinks rather than give my own opinion.~~ It is no problem for me to give my own opinion when the rest of the class disagrees with me.
14. It is important that I am able to answer all the questions teachers ask me.
15. It is important to me that I give the right answers to questions in class.
16. ~~It concerns me if I don't do as well as the other students.~~
17. ~~It is very important that I do better than the other students.~~
18. ~~I like to compete against the other students.~~

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

- ~~19. I worry if I don't perform as well as other students.~~
- ~~20. I like to do my work better than other students in the class.~~
- ~~21. I like asking the teachers questions that might be hard for them to answer.~~
- ~~22. I feel that I can challenge or question what teachers say. If I challenge a teacher, I do not believe that the teacher will be offended.~~
- ~~23. I like to question what teachers tell me in class.~~ 48. It is important that I feel free to challenge or question what the teacher says.*
- ~~24. It is OK for me to disagree with teachers.~~ If I verbally disagree with a teacher, I do not believe that the teacher will be offended.
- ~~25. It is OK for me to argue with teachers.~~ The teacher should allow me to criticize or contradict him/her.
- ~~26. I like teachers to show me what to do.~~ A good teacher shows me how to do things.*
27. I like to learn by copying what teachers show me.
- ~~28. I like to see how other students attempt problems.~~
29. I like to have teachers tell me how to work in class. *
- ~~30. I like to watch how my classmates tackle a problem before I start.~~
- ~~31. What I learn at home helps me to do things at school.~~
- ~~32. What I learn in school helps me to do things at home.~~
- ~~33. I feel that ideas I learn at school are similar to those I learn at home.~~
- ~~34. What I learn in this class agrees with what I learn at home.~~
- ~~35. What I learn in this class helps me at home.~~

Comments:

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

- Questions were deleted or adjusted if they were tied to the specific classroom the student is in.
- Questions were deleted or adjusted if they weren't focused on the student's preference regarding (interaction with) the teachers.
- Questions 31-35 were deleted because they were tied to the specific learning environment of the students and, although they were said to be related to the Uncertainty Avoidance dimension, they didn't match Hofstede's description of this dimension.
- Questions marked with '*' were accidentally left out of the final version of the questionnaire.

Additions based on Hofstede's literature

Students should occasionally have the chance to choose a topic for a lesson.

I like it when teachers let me find my own approach.

A good teacher passes on personal wisdom.

It is of most importance for a teacher to be smart.

A teacher should award students' academic performance.

Teachers should reward students for originality.

I feel ashamed if the teacher points my mistake out in front of the whole class.

A teacher should reward students' social skills.

It is of most importance for a teacher to be friendly.

It is more important for a teacher to have social skills than to have academic skills.

The teacher should initiate the communication in the classroom.

I'd rather have the teacher address me personally than in front of the class.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

A good teacher should suppress his emotions when he is teaching.

It is no problem for me if the teacher tells me I'm wrong in front of the whole class.

It is OK if a teacher uses language I don't understand.

It is important that a teacher is able to answer all of my questions.

Teachers should reward students for accuracy.

A teacher should treat me as an equal.

It is important that a teacher leaves room for students' initiatives.

A teacher should adapt his lessons to students' preferences.

The teacher should focus his praise on the best students.

The teacher should focus his praise on the weakest students.

There can be valid reasons for a teacher to give some students preferential treatment.

I don't feel comfortable if a teacher sets objectives for learning situations that are unclear.

A teacher is allowed to say 'I don't know'.

It is occasionally allowed for teachers to give physical punishment.

A good teacher shows me how to learn things.

A teacher should allow students to express aggression.*

It is OK if a teacher doesn't openly praise students.*

The teacher has to be strictly impartial to students.*

A teacher should respect the independence of students.*

A good teacher is very strict.*

A good teacher uses plain language.*

A teacher should use students' input for his lessons.*

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Comments:

- Questions marked with ‘*’ were accidentally left out of the final version of the questionnaire.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Appendix C

Research Study Information Letter

March 4, 2020

Dear Participant,

By means of this letter, we would like to invite you to participate in the research project called *Perspectives on Teaching and Learning of Teachers and Students From Nondominant Backgrounds*.

The purpose of this study is to explore and explain the experiences of teachers and students who belong to marginalized ethnic groups in order to understand their views on how culture impacts teaching and learning in the diversifying classroom contexts of the Netherlands. We hope to publish the results of the study and share findings with other interested stakeholders.

What is Expected of You as a Participant

If you agree to participate, we will ask you to fill in a questionnaire on student's preferences on teachers' interpersonal behavior. Afterwards, you will answer some questions about your perspective on the clarity of the questionnaire. All of this will find place during a focus group session with other students, which will take no longer than 30 minutes. During the session, you will all give your own opinion on the questionnaire, and be able to add on to the opinion of the other participants. The focus group will consist of six students from Turkish, Moroccan and Dutch backgrounds. Your perspective on the clarity of the questionnaire will be used for the refinement of the questionnaire.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Confidentiality of Data Processing

No personal data will be asked from you, except from the countries your parents were born. Other genuine researchers may have access to the data in the future. Access will only be granted if they agree to preserve the confidentiality of the information as requested in this form. Their access will also require approval from the original research team.

Risks, Benefits, and Voluntary Participation

We do not anticipate any risks associated with the study. We also do not anticipate that the study findings will directly benefit you. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may decide to end your participation at any time without any explanation and without any negative consequences. If you end your participation, we will use the data collected up to that point unless you explicitly inform us otherwise. If you have an official complaint about the study, you can send an email to the complaints officer at klachtenfunctionaris-fetcsocwet@uu.nl.

If you agree to participate, please return this signed form *within two weeks' time* to a researcher associated with this study. If you have any questions, please contact this study's principal investigator at b.l.kennedy@uu.nl.

Best regards,



Brianna Kennedy and the Research Team

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Department of Education, Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Utrecht University

Langeveld Building, room E3.33

Heidelberglaan 1

3584 CS Utrecht

+31 30 253 3369

I hereby declare that I have read the information letter about the *Perspectives on Teaching and Learning of Teachers and Students From Nondominant Backgrounds* study and agree to participate in the study.

Name

Date

Signature

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Appendix D

FETC Form

Section 1: Basic Study Information

1. Name student:

2. Name(s) of the supervisor(s):

3. Title of the thesis (plan):

4. Does the study concern a multi-center project, e.g. a collaboration with other organizations, universities, a GGZ mental health care institution, or a university medical center?

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

5. Where will the study (data collection) be conducted? If this is abroad, please note that you have to be sure of the local ethical codes of conducts and permissions.

The questionnaire will be filled in at multiple secondary schools and higher education schools

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Section 2: Study Details I

6. Will you collect data?

Yes / No

Yes Continue to question 11

No Continue to question 7

7. Where is the data stored?

8. Is the data publicly available?

Yes / No

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

If yes: Where?

9. Can participants be identified by the student? (e.g., does the data contain (indirectly retrievable) personal information, video, or audio data?)

Yes / No

If yes: Explain.

10. If the data is pseudonymized, who has the key to permit re-identification?

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Section 3: Participants

11. What age group is included in your study?

Students that are 16 years and older

12. Will be participants that are recruited be > 16 years? **Yes/No**

13. Will participants be mentally competent (wilsbekwam in Dutch)? **Yes/No**

14. Does the participant population contain vulnerable persons?

(e.g., incapacitated, children, mentally challenged, traumatized, pregnant) **Yes/No**

15. If you answered 'Yes' to any of the three questions above: Please provide reasons to justify why this particular groups of participant is included in your study.

16. What possible risk could participating hold for your participants?

Barely any risk. The names of students will not be used in the study.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

17. What measures are implemented to minimize risks (or burden) for the participants?

The data will only be shown to the research team.

18. What time investment and effort will be requested from participants?

5 to 10 minutes

19. Will be participants be reimbursed for their efforts? If yes, how? (financial reimbursement, travelling expenses, otherwise). What is the amount? Will this compensation depend on certain conditions, such as the completion of the study?

No

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

20. How does the burden on the participants compare to the study's potential scientific or practical contribution?

The burden is very low; it barely costs time for the participants. The results can contribute to the improvement of education for culturally non-dominant students.

21. What is the number of participants? Provide a power analysis and/or motivation for the number of participants. The current convention is a power of 0.80. If the study deviates from this convention, the FERB would like you to justify why this is necessary.

(Note, you want to include enough participants to be able to answer your research questions adequately, but you do not want to include too many participants and unnecessarily burden participants.)

100 participants with dominant-Dutch backgrounds, and 100 participants with non-dominant Dutch backgrounds. This was calculated by using <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/sample-size/>, with a 10% margin error.

22. How will the participants be recruited? Explain and attach the information letter to this document.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

I will recruit participants by asking people I know that are teachers in secondary school if they can let their students fill in the questionnaire. To recruit extra students from non-dominant backgrounds, I will ask some of my fellow students who have a non-dominant background if they can ask people in their network to fill in the questionnaire.

23. How much time will prospective participants have to decide as to whether they will indeed participate in the study?

A week. After a week, their data will be used for the study.

24. Please explain the consent procedures. Note, active consent of participants (or their parents) is in principle mandatory. Enclose the consent letters as attachments. You can use the consent forms on Blackboard.

The questionnaires will for the most part be distributed to teachers, who will let their students fill in the questionnaires. The teacher can read the information letter aloud

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

25. Are the participants fully free to participate and terminate their participation whenever they want and without stating their grounds for doing so? Explain.

Yes! The participants can just stop filling in the questionnaire if they don't want to do it anymore.

26. Will the participants be in a dependent relationship with the researcher?

Yes / No
If yes: Explain.

27. Is there an independent contact person or a general email address of a complaint officer whom the participant can contact?

Yes; klachtenfunctionaris-fetcsocwet@uu.nl.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

28. Is there an independent contact person or a general email address of a complaint officer whom the participant can contact in case of complaints?

klachtenfunctionaris-fetcsocwet@uu.nl.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Section 4: Data management

29. Who has access to the data and who will be responsible for managing (access to) the data?

The research team has access to the data, and I will be responsible for managing access to this data.

30. What type of data will you collect or create? Please provide a description of the instruments.

I will collect data using a questionnaire I developed about culturally embedded preferences on teachers. The answers are filled in on a likert-scale, and there will be one question about the cultural background of students.

31. Will you be exchanging (personal) data with organizations/research partners outside the UU?

Yes / **No**

If yes: Explain.

32. If so, will a data processing agreement be made up?

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

Yes / **No**

If yes: Please attach the agreement.

If no: Please explain.

33. Where will the data be stored and for how long?

The data will be stored in YoDa, until I finished my thesis.

34. Will the data potentially be used for other purposes than the master's thesis? (e.g., publication, reporting back to participants, etc.)

No.

CULTURAL STUDENT PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS

35. Will the data potentially be used for other purposes than the master's thesis? (e.g., publication, reporting back to participants, etc.)

Yes / **No**

If yes: Explain.