



Do General Multicultural Attitudes Matter Beyond Other Teacher and Classroom Related Factors? A Cross-Sectional Study on the Effect of Multicultural Attitudes on Cultural Responsive Teaching Attitudes.

Name: Bente Jongkees (5995914)

First examiner: M.A. Krijnen

Second examiner: M.T. Mainhard

Utrecht University

Date: 07-06-2021

Wordcount: 7140

Abstract

Teachers' positive attitudes towards Culturally Responsive Teaching can improve the disadvantaged position of minority group students in the Netherlands (Henrichs et al., 2020). The main aim of this study was to explore if and how multicultural attitudes impact cultural responsive teaching attitudes, beyond other teacher and classroom related factors which are already known to be of considerable impact. Furthermore, this study provided insight into the question whether teachers can endorse multiple teaching attitudes at the same time. That is, a new developed questionnaire on three teaching attitudes (Krijnen et al., 2021) was investigated alongside the Dutch Multicultural Ideology Scale (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003) which measured multicultural attitudes. The teachers participating in this study were Dutch primary school teachers. Drawing from retrieved data, two positive correlations between the teaching attitudes scales were found. Along those lines, it could be concluded that teachers can endorse to multiple teaching attitudes. Furthermore, multicultural attitudes formed a factor of influence for teaching attitudes, beyond other teacher and classroom related factors. Practical implications of these findings will be discussed.

Keywords: CRT, diversity, teaching attitudes, multicultural attitudes, migration background

Despite the serious efforts of the Dutch government to support and assist immigrants in their educational pathways, the academic performance gap between non-western immigrant students (i.e., who themselves or whose parents were born in a non-western country) and non-migrant students remains a significant problem (Scheerens & van der Werf, 2018; van Middelkoop et al., 2017). The disadvantageous position of immigrant students has been associated to a discrepancy between home and school culture (Phalet et al., 2004). A commonly proposed solution that can pave the way for prospect is Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT; Gay, 2000; SLO, 2008). In the Dutch context, teachers' attitudes towards CRT varies (van Middelkoop et al., 2017). Yet, for CRT to be successful, positive teacher attitudes are a prerequisite (Civitillo, 2019). Previous studies reported on teacher and classroom related factors (e.g. years of experience and ethnic classroom composition) that play a contributing role in adopting responsive teaching attitudes (e.g. Van Geel & Vedder, 2011; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2013). Furthermore, there are grounds upon which it can be assumed that teachers' multicultural attitudes play a vital role in this matter too (Abacioglu et al., 2020; Nieto, 2004). Yet, not clearly established is the role that teachers' multicultural attitudes have on (culturally responsive) teaching attitudes beyond these teacher and classroom related factors (Civitillo, 2019; Verkuyten & Maykel, 2013). More awareness on this issue allows to narrow down whether responsive teaching attitudes proceeding from a professional teacher role will suffice, or that teachers' positive multicultural attitudes are required for responsive teaching attitudes too. When the latter is the case, teachers' multicultural attitudes represent a factor to consider and intervene on, for example by offering opportunities of self-reflection for pre-service teachers (Civitillo, 2019). Therefore, the main aim of this study was to investigate the association between multicultural attitudes and teaching attitudes in the Dutch educational context, beyond other teacher and classroom related factors. Along those lines, questionnaires measuring teaching and multicultural attitudes were investigated and compared.

Teachers' Attitudes Towards Diversity

Attitudes are defined as an individual's negative or positive evaluation of a particular 'object' (e.g. a person, a group, a thing, an idea) (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006). Furthermore, attitudes form a driving force for the interpersonal judgments one holds and affect our perception and understanding of others (Sanbonmatsu & Fazio, 1990). When investigating ways in which teachers can deal with the increasing diversity in Dutch education, teaching attitudes are an important factor to take into consideration. Teaching attitudes refer to the attitudes that teachers hold towards the cultural and socio-economic backgrounds of their students and relate to extend to which teachers take student differences into account (Harrington & Hathaway, 1995). Multiple studies (Cabello and Burstein, 1995; Middelkoop et al., 2017) found that teaching attitudes are often reflected in both teachers' practices and their judgments of students. Along those lines, positive teaching attitudes are likely to have a positive impact on the learning opportunities of students (Hachfeld et al., 2015).

One way in which teachers can take cultural diversity into account is by endorsing and practicing the ideology of CRT (Ladson-Billings, 1995). CRT is often defined as a student-centered perspective that includes and celebrates diversity (Gay, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). This approach acknowledges that cultural differences between students should be used as conducts for teaching. In this way, CRT refers to teaching attitudes that emphasizes cultural differences and perceive these as an enrichment rather than as a deficit. CRT touches on many dimensions of teaching. Banks & Banks (2019) investigated several dimensions that play a major role in the particular area of multicultural education, a dimension commensurate with cultural responsive education. The authors found that an important high-profile predictor of a culturally relevant pedagogy is the way in which teachers interact with diverse student populations. For this reason, the continued focus of this study will be on this specific component of CRT.

American studies (Aronson & Laughter, 2016; Ladson-Billings, 2001) investigating the

effects of the dimensions of CRT suggest auspicious results. In fact, responsive teachers who were emboldened with insights about the different cultural experiences of their students showed to be better equipped to attend both to students' unique cultural strengths and their prejudicial realities. Added to this, teachers were able to align instruction with the perceptions and experiences of their students, resulting in a cultural responsive curriculum with more relevant instruction, a greater understanding of the materials and higher student engagement (Bassey, 2016; Hill, 2012). All in all, several aspects of CRT were found to be promising in a US context.

Due to these American successes, CRT recently found its way to European countries like the Netherlands (Dietz, 2007). There is some evidence that CRT can indeed yield positive outcomes for student outcomes (Henrichs et al., 2020). Yet, up until now, hardly any studies on the effects of CRT in the Netherlands have been published. Most research on teaching attitudes originates from the US and distinguishes between multicultural, pluralistic attitudes and egalitarian or colorblind attitudes (e.g. Banks, 2004; Banks & Diem, 2008; Plaut et al., 2009). In this study these two most used teaching attitudes are referred to as 'cultural responsive' and 'shared culture'.

'Cultural responsive' attitudes align with the CRT approach which was shortly touched upon in the previous section (Banks, 2004; Civitillo et al., 2017; Schachner, 2019). As appointed, teachers holding a cultural responsive attitude welcome and emphasize cultural diversity among students (Schachner et al., 2016). They acknowledge that all students are different but have equal social status (Banks & Diem, 2008). In this regard, cultural responsive attitudes are often translated in a multicultural curriculum in which cultural traditions and characteristics serve as a starting point and students and teachers show interest in the cultural backgrounds of immigrant students (Gay, 2015).

Teachers holding 'shared culture' attitudes emphasize similarities among students (Civitillo et al., 2019; Hachfeld et al., 2015; Schachner, 2019). Such a perspective of equality

and inclusion encourages contact between groups with the aim of reducing prejudice and discrimination (Civitillo et al., 2017). In the educational context, teachers endorsing to a 'shared culture' generally pay less attention to the different cultural backgrounds of their students. This attitude can therefore be interpreted as an approach which tries to ignore diversity but is not exactly the same as the so the called 'colorblind' approach (Hachfeld et al., 2015). In fact, colorblindness is mainly focused on de-emphasizing cultural differences among students and not always on emphasizing similarities.

Drawing drawing from a Dutch perspective, another dimension with an emphasize on 'national culture' will be introduced as well. In fact, considering the Dutch educational context, it is questionable whether the fairly left-oriented 'cultural responsive' and 'shared culture' attitudes, which are often still ideological in nature (Byrd, 2016), provide a full picture of the prevailing teacher attitudes in Western countries like the Netherlands (Civitillo et al., 2019; Hachfeld et al., 2011). Teaching attitude scales investigating more right-wing, traditional and nationalistic values are scarce and not yet explicitly measured (Verkuyten & Maykel, 2013; Theeuwes, Saab, Denessen & Admiraal, 2019). These attitudes are characterized by a focus on conveying and living the Dutch culture, meaning that students with a migration background gradually adopt parts of it (Banks & Diem, 2008). Still, this scale does not require students to abandon the culture from their country of origin.

In the Dutch educational context, teachers often consider diversity in various ways, leading to diverging teaching attitudes. In the year 2006, Dutch schools were obliged to add democratic citizenship education to the curriculum (Doppen, 2007). Democratic citizenship education provides the opportunity to approve and recognize cultural differences in education, in the context of a shared national identity (Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2015). On the one hand, CRT can play an important role within democratic citizenship education, as Dutch schools are expected to make a positive contribution to multicultural attitudes (Scheerens & van der Werf, 2018). However, another important part of democratic citizenship education is to introduce

students to the Dutch culture and to transfer Dutch social standards (Doppen, 2007). The question whether Dutch teachers can endorse to a responsive attitude while at the same time endorse a national culture attitude, has not been covered by previous studies. Therefore, an unresolved tension between the positive effects of CRT for immigrant students on the one hand and the social role of teachers in introducing all pupils to the Dutch society on the other, can be distinguished.

Factors That Might Influence Teaching Attitudes

There are multiple factors known to be of considerable impact on teaching attitudes (Thijs & Verkuyten, 2013). In fact, Verkuyten & Bekhuis (2010) found that almost a quarter of the variance in teaching attitudes was attributable to teacher and classroom related factors. One factor explaining a fundamental part in teaching attitudes is ethnic class composition (Schachner et al., 2016; Van Geel & Vedder, 2011; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2013). Agirdag et al. (2016) found that a higher level of ethnic diversity in the classroom led to a higher urgency to pay attention to differences in the classroom, with the collateral effect that teachers were more likely to adopt responsive teaching attitudes. Another factor that affects teachers' strategies is their years of teaching experience (Brekelmans et al., 2002). The relationship between years of experience and teachers' inclusive strategies (e.g. strategies which are closely aligned with responsive attitudes and address obstacles that hinder full participation for all students; Boon & Spencer, 2010) strongly increases with the years (Schwab et al., 2019). By the use of personalized teaching examples, these strategies proved to embolden teachers to refer to diverse cultural backgrounds. On the base of these results, it is of added value to take these factors into account in this study as well.

Multicultural Attitudes as a Factor of Influence

Beyond the influential factors linked to the professional role of the teacher, teachers' general and more personal attitudes might impact the way in which teachers deal with diversity too (Dubbeld et al., 2019; Gay, 2010; Pit-ten Cate & Glock, 2019). A common way to

investigate teachers' general attitudes towards diversity is by approaching them on the basis of 'multiculturalism' (Dubeld et al., 2019). Generally, the multicultural ideology relates to the extent to which a majority group holds positive attitudes towards cultural maintenance and aims to deal with diversity in an equity way (Arends-Tóth & Vijver, 2003; Verkuyten, 2005). For multiculturalism to be successful, a multicultural ideology is a prerequisite (Citrin et al., 2001). When considering the relationship between CRT and teachers' multicultural attitudes, it is vital to take into account that a teacher has certain roles which are accompanied by particular representations and responsibilities. A teacher, for instance, may as well fulfil a role as school leader and that role entails different professional attitudes. In this way, a teacher might endorse and practice CRT in his teacher role, while at the same time hold different multicultural attitudes beyond his role as a teacher (Guerra & Wubbena, 2017; Horenczyk & Tatar, 2002). It is known that multicultural attitudes to some degree always resonate in teaching attitudes (Abacioglu et al., 2020). Yet, little is known about the strength of this relationship and the extent to which teachers' multicultural attitudes are reflected in teaching attitudes, beyond the abovementioned teacher and classroom factors.

Current Study

When teachers hold positive attitudes towards CRT, this approach holds potential to remedy in the fight for equality in Dutch education (SLO, 2008). In the Dutch educational context, teachers adopt diverging teaching attitudes towards CRT. However, little is known about the extent to which these can overlap. Furthermore, there is a lack of clarity about the question how teachers' multicultural attitudes resound in their teaching attitudes, beyond other teacher and classroom related factors that are already known to have an impact (Verkuyten & Maykel, 2013). Considering the uncertainty in the field, the aim of this study was to gain a broader understanding on this issue in the Dutch education context, by explicitly testing this in two steps. The first part of this study investigated how the three teaching attitudes were related and whether multiple attitudes can exist within one teacher. Drawing from the findings of

Hachfeld et al. (2015), who found a correlation of .62 between the multicultural and colorblind attitudes, it was expected that teachers can indeed consider both attitudes as important and use one and the other in their teaching practices. Relying on the study of Rosenthal and Levy (2010), the feasibility to equate the terms ‘shared culture’ and ‘colorblind attitudes’ was guaranteed and approved. In fact, the authors indicate that colorblind attitudes can be explained in two ways, namely by ignoring differences and emphasizing similarities (which is the definition of ‘shared culture’).

The second part was guided by the question whether teaching attitudes were affected by teachers’ multicultural attitudes, beyond other teacher and classroom related factors. In correspondence with the findings of Civitillo et al. (2019), it was expected that this will indeed be the case. The authors found that teachers working with the same specific teacher and classroom related factors still fairly differed in their degree of cultural responsiveness. To test the hypotheses, multiple correlations between different teaching attitudes were computed. Onwards, both the teacher and classroom related factors and teachers’ multicultural attitudes were related to their teaching attitudes through a hierarchical multiple regression. Ultimately, this allowed to clarify whether multicultural attitudes explain a significant amount of variance in teaching attitudes, beyond other teacher and classroom related factors.

Method

Research Design

This study concerned an explanatory quantitative survey research and tested different relationships expected on theoretical grounds. The study was part of project BLOK, a joint project on correlates of culturally responsive teaching within democratic citizenship education. The first part of the design, drew from a new developed questionnaire (Krijnen et al., 2021). The second part was conducted by means of previously developed scales.

Participants

328 Dutch primary school teachers participated in this study by means of the online

survey software Qualtrics. Participants were approached via LinkedIn, phone, email and in person with a request for participation. The recruitment of schools was not random, since there was aimed for a diverse sample (e.g. schools that differ in ethnic class composition). The aim was to include 120 teachers in this study, which is an adequate sample size for this study (Field, 2013). After correction for incomplete data, a total of 160 Dutch primary school teachers (13,8% men, 85% women, 1,3% 'other', $M_{\text{age}} = 39.2$) remained for further analysis, of whom 5,6% had an ethnic background other than Dutch. The participants on average had 13.01 years of experience ($SD = 11.6$).

Instrumentation

Teaching Attitudes (dependent variable)

For the purpose of this study, the new Cultural Responsive Teaching Attitudes Scale (CRTAS) was developed to investigate teaching attitudes towards cultural and socio-economic diversity, in classroom interaction with elementary school students (Krijnen et al., 2021). In this questionnaire, teachers were asked to answer 27 items divided in three dimensions: (1) *cultural responsive* (11 items, e.g. "I consider it important to take into account the cultural background of my students"), (2) emphasis on *shared culture* (8 items, e.g. "I consider it important to treat students equally, despite their different cultural backgrounds") and (3) emphasis on and adoption of the dominant national culture *national culture* (8 items, e.g. "I do not think that it is necessary to pay attention to different cultures, because all children grow up in the Netherlands"). Teachers arranged their responses on a 7 point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (totally not important) to 7 (very important). The three dimensions were not mutual exclusive since combinations could coexist and aspects could be related to each other. Appendix B sets out all the items as they were presented to the participants.

Model fit was checked using an explorative factor analysis. In this regard, a Principal axis factoring (PAF) was conducted forasmuch as the aim of the factor analysis was to uncover the structure of an underlying set of variables (Field, 2009). Examination of the data

indicated that most variables were reasonably normally distributed. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis, $KMO = .82$. This is 'meritorious' according to (Kaiser & Rice, 1974) and is well above the acceptable limit of .5 (Field, 2013). An initial analysis was run to obtain eigenvalues for each factor in the data. Seven factors had eigenvalues exceeding Kaiser's criterion of 1 and were identified as underlying the CRTAS. A Promax rotation was applied as factors were expected to be correlated. When an item had a factor load of $<.40$, it could be assumed that this item was negligible (Field, 2013). Seven items were removed from the data (Appendix D). The items that clustered on the same factor suggested that factor 1 represented 'national culture', factor 2 represented 'shared culture' and factor 3 and 4 represented 'cultural responsive'. After the obtained data was subjected to the factor analysis, the internal consistency for the four factors was investigated using Chronbach's Alpha. The first three factors had high reliabilities ($\alpha > .7$). Yet, the fourth factor did not provide reasonable reliability. Furthermore, the third factor by itself reported better results. Therefore, it was decided not to further include this factor in the analysis. Three factors remained and accounted for around 45,45% of the variance. Scale 1 consisted of six items with factor loadings ranging from .50 to .83. Scale 2 consisted of four items with factor loadings ranging from .71 to .85. Scale 3 consisted of four items with factor loadings ranging from .53 to .82. Appendix D presents the factor loadings after rotation.

Multicultural Attitudes (independent variable)

The Dutch Multicultural Ideology Scale (DMIS) was used to investigate teachers' multicultural beliefs (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003). The DMIS is a short (8 items) and reliable scale which investigates the majority support for a culturally diverse society and is an adapted and translated version of the Canadian Multicultural Ideology Scale (Berry & Kalin, 1995). The same 7 point Likert-type scale was used in this part of the questionnaire. This scale generated single-factor solutions ([.43 – .88]) and high reliability coefficients ($\alpha = 0.76$). Appendix B sets out all the items as they were presented to the participants.

Teacher and Classroom Related Factors (predictors)

Both the years of experience and the ethnic class composition were asked out in the demographics, prior to the actual questionnaire. For the first predictor, teachers were offered the opportunity to fill out the numeric number of teaching experience. For the second predictor, teachers indicated the amount of students with a migration background in their classroom, which allowed to assign the class to a certain category. These categories were based upon a six point Likert-scale, ranging from 1 (none) to 5 (almost the whole class) and 6 (does not apply).

Procedure

Within the scope of confidentiality and transferability, the data retrieved from the questionnaire was handled anonymous by using Qualitrix and YoDa, which are highly secured online environments, administered by Utrecht University. Prior to the data collection, participants were asked to sign the informed consent by ticking a box (Appendix B). Subsequently, participants were asked to report on their age, gender, migration background and years of teaching experiences. Moreover, participants were asked to indicate some general classroom characteristics (the grade, number of students and ethnic classroom composition). Eventually, teachers filled out the actual questionnaire consisting of 88 items. Completing the questionnaire averagely took 20 minutes.

Data Analysis

All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics, version 26. To investigate the first research question, the CRTAS measured the dependent variable 'teaching attitudes'. In this regard, Pearson correlations were computed to assess the relationships between the three teaching attitudes. Prior to the analysis, possible outliers and the assumptions for homoscedasticity, normal distribution and linearity were checked upon. Onwards, the residuals were checked by inspecting the normal Q-Q and detrended Q-Q plots for all variables. Lastly, the distribution of the scores alongside other descriptive statistics were examined. Drawing from these results, a way was found to define Dutch teaching attitudes in order to gain a broader

understanding about the possibility to score high on more than one dimension.

The second research question was answered utilizing three separate hierarchal multiple regression analyses. These analyses allowed to investigate the relationship between the three dependent outcome variables (teaching attitudes) and three predictors: years of experience, ethnic classroom composition and multicultural attitudes (independent variable). The proportion of variance explained by the different factors was investigated by adding the different predictors one by one. This method enabled to measure several predictors simultaneously to the outcome measure. In the first step, years of experience and ethnic class composition were added. To assess which part of the percentage of the variance was explained by multicultural attitudes and whether multicultural attitudes explained a significant amount of variance, multicultural attitudes were added at the very last. These steps were followed for all three outcome variables. It is important that the amount of participants is commensurate with the amount of variables included in the regression (Stevens et al., 1992). The general rule of thumb is a minimum of 15 participants per predictor for reliable estimates of regression comparisons. This requirement was met. A significance level of $p < .05$ (two-tailed) and confidence level [CI] of 95% was used.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

328 Dutch primary school teachers participated in this study. However, 168 participants did not completely fulfil the CRTAS and DMIS and were removed from the data-set. Henceforth, 160 participants remained for further analysis. Descriptive results and correlation coefficients for all study variables are summarized in Table 1. To examine the research questions, an explorative factor analysis, three correlations between the different teaching attitudes subscales and a hierarchal multiple regression were conducted. Next, the main findings of each analysis are reported.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Coefficients for Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Cultural Responsive	6.16	0.51					
2. Shared Culture	6.08	0.58	.56**				
3. National Culture	5.15	0.60	-.11	.17*			
4. Multicultural Attitudes	3.72	0.45	.41**	.28**	-.46**		
5. Years of Experience	11.79	1.403	-.03	.12	-.01	-.08	
6. Ethnic Class Composition	3.03	2.52	.04	-.05	.03	-.15	.10

** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed)

* $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed); N = 160

Teaching Attitudes (RQ1)

To assess hypothesis 1, the size and the direction of the relationship between the different subscales of the CRTAS were calculated using three bivariate Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (r). Prior to calculating r , the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were assessed and found to be supported. Specifically, a visual inspection of the normal Q-Q and detrended Q-Q plots for all variables confirmed that both were normally distributed. Similarly, visually inspecting a scatterplot confirmed that the relationship between these variables was linear and heteroscedastic.

Bias corrected and accelerated bootstrap 95% CI's are reported in square brackets. First, shared culture was found to be significantly correlated to national culture, $r(160) = .17$, CI [-0.02, .34], $p < 0.05$. This is a positive but weak correlation (Field, 2003). Second, national culture and cultural responsive was found to be non-significantly correlated $r(160) = -.11$, CI [-0.28, .05], $p > 0.05$. Lastly, the bivariate correlation between shared culture was significantly correlated to cultural responsive $r(161) = .56$, CI [.44, .66], $p < 0.01$. This is a moderate positive correlation (Field, 2003). Table 1 sets out the results of the three correlations.

Multicultural Attitudes (RQ2)

To test hypothesis 2, three hierarchical multiple regression analysis (MRA) were employed. Before interpreting the results of the MRA, a number of assumptions were tested, and checks were performed. First, stem-and-leaf plots and boxplots indicated that each variable in the regression was normally distributed but also indicated a few univariate outliers. The participants that formed outliers were taken into further inspection and the analysis was performed with and without outliers. Since the results showed no noticeable differences, it was decided not to remove the outliers from the data. Also, an analysis of standard residuals was carried out, which showed that the data contained no outliers (Std Residual Min = -2, Std. Residual Max = 2). In fact, 95% of the data of the standardized residuals showed that less than 5% of the sample scored outside the limits. Therefore, our data appears to conform to what we would expect for a fairly accurate model (Field, 2013). Second, inspection of the normal probability plot of standardized residuals and scatterplot of standardized residuals against standardized predicted values indicated that the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity of residuals were met. Third, Mahalanobis distance did not exceed the critical χ^2 for $df = 3$ (at $\alpha = 0.01$) of 16.27 for any cases in the data file, indicating that multivariate outliers were not of concern. Finally, relatively high tolerances for all three predictors in the final regression model indicated that multicollinearity would not interfere with our ability to interpret the outcome of the MRA.

Cultural Responsive Attitude

In model 1 of the hierarchical MRA, years of experience and ethnic class composition accounted for a non-significant 0.1% of the variance in teaching attitudes, $R^2 = .00$, $F(2, 156) = .07$, $p = .932$. In model 2, the predictor 'multicultural attitudes' was added to the regression equation and accounted for an additional 15.6% of the variance in teaching attitudes, $\Delta R^2 = .17$, $\Delta F(1, 155) = 30.58$, $p < .001$. In combination, the three predictor variables explained 15.7% of the variance in teaching attitudes, $R^2 = .17$ adjusted $R^2 = .15$, $F(3, 155) = 10.25$, $p < .001$. By Cohen's (1988) conventions, a combined effect of this magnitude can be considered "small" but

close to “medium” ($f^2 = .20$).

Shared Culture Attitude

In model 1 of the hierarchical MRA, years of experience and ethnic class composition accounted for a non-significant 1.8% of the variance in teaching attitudes, $R^2 = .02$, $F(2, 156) = 1.46$, $p = .236$. In model 2 the predictor ‘multicultural attitudes’ was added to the regression equation and accounted for an additional 8.5% of the variance in teaching attitudes, $\Delta R^2 = .09$, $\Delta F(1,156) = 18.61$, $p < .001$. In combination, the three predictor variables explained 10.3% of the variance in teaching attitudes, $R^2 = .10$ adjusted $R^2 = .09$, $F(3, 155) = 5.95$, $p < .001$. By Cohen’s (1988) conventions, a combined effect of this magnitude can be considered “small” but close to “medium” ($f^2 = .11$).

National Culture Attitude

In model 1 of the hierarchical MRA, years of experience and ethnic class composition accounted for a non-significant 0.1% of the variance in teaching attitudes, $R^2 = .00$, $F(2, 156) = .05$, $p = .956$. In model 2, the predictor ‘multicultural attitudes’ was added to the regression equation and accounted for an additional 21.1% of the variance in teaching attitudes, $\Delta R^2 = .15$, $\Delta F(1,155) = 30.58$, $p < .001$. In combination, the three predictor variables explained 21.2% of the variance in teaching attitudes, $R^2 = .21$ adjusted $R^2 = .20$, $F(3,155) = 13.88$, $p < .001$. By Cohen’s (1988) conventions, a combined effect of this magnitude can be considered “medium” ($f^2 = .27$). Unstandardized (B) and standardised (β) regression coefficients, and squared semi-partial or part correlation for each predictor on each step of the hierarchical MRA are reported in Table 3.

Table 3

Unstandardized (B) and Standardized (β) Regression Coefficients, and Squared Semi-Partial Correlations (sr^2) for each predictor variable on each step of a Hierarchical Multiple Regression

Variable	Cultural Responsive						Shared Culture						National Culture											
	M1		M2				M1		M2				M1		M2									
	B [95% CI]		β	sr^2	B [95% CI]		β	sr^2	B [95% CI]		β	sr^2	B [95% CI]		β	sr^2	B [95% CI]		β	sr^2				
YoE	-0.00	[-.01, .01]	-.03	0.56	-0.00	[-.01, .01]	-.00	0.00	0.01	[.00, .02]	.16	0.27	0.01	[.00, 0.02]	.16	0.31	-0.00	[-.00, .02]	-.00	0.01	-0.00	[-.03, .04]	-.04	0.07
ECC	0.00	[-.03, .03]	.01	0.02	-0.01	[-.04, .02]	-.30	0.07	0.01	[-.04, .04]	-0.00	0.06	0.00	[.13, 0.00]	-.00	0.00	-0.02	[-.03, .04]	-.02	0.05	0.01	[-.01, .01]	.02	0.05
MA				0.46			.41	0.81					0.37							-.62			-.46	0.92
				[.30, .63]*									[.23, 0.62]*	.30	0.58						[-.80, -.43]*			

Note: YoE= Years of experience, ECC = Ethnic Class Composition, MA = Multicultural Attitudes

* P < 0.01 (2-tailed); N = 160;

Discussion

The goal of this paper was to examine how teachers' multicultural attitudes resound in their teaching attitudes, beyond other teacher and classroom related factors which were already known to be of substantial influence. To scrutinize this goal, two questions guided this study. First of all, this study investigated whether teachers can endorse multiple teaching attitudes at the same time. Second, this study measured if and how multicultural attitudes impact cultural responsive teaching attitudes, beyond the effect of ethnic class composition and teachers' years of experience.

In present study, the focus was on three different teaching attitude scales ('cultural responsive', 'shared culture' and 'national culture'), which allowed to compare effects. Several combinations of teaching attitudes were investigated. The results of Pearson's correlations were in agreement with those obtained by Hachfeld et al. (2015). In fact, the high correlation ($r = .62$) between multicultural and colorblind attitudes found by these authors, resembled with the moderate significant correlation ($r = .56$) between shared culture and cultural responsive identified in this study. In this way, the results confirmed the association that teachers can indeed endorse multiple teaching attitudes. Yet, this result only applied when the combination of teaching attitudes included shared culture as a teaching attitude. In fact, this study found a weak positive correlation between shared culture and national culture but a negative and non-significant correlation between national culture and cultural responsive. The question whether it is possible for teachers to adhere to both national culture and cultural responsive attitudes, which was put forward on the base of this study, has thus been answered negatively since these attitudes seem to not be interrelated. On these grounds, teaching and preaching the Dutch culture is unlikely to coexist with attitudes supporting the provision for other cultures in the classroom.

There are several possible explanations for this result. First of all, it seems conceivable that these results are due to the fact that national culture and cultural responsive are further apart in terms of what they reflect and put forward. In the spectrum of 'lots of room for

different cultures' on the one hand and 'imposing the dominant culture' on the other, shared culture could be considered as an 'intermediate' attitude which is relatively easy to endorse for teachers on both sides of the spectrum. In addition, it is highly probable that the fact that shared culture can be explained in two ways (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010) contributed to the result that teachers are more likely to relate to this attitude.

Second, the negative correlation between national culture and cultural responsive may be attributable to the considerable tension between national culture and cultural responsive, as was expected and touched upon in the theoretical part of this study. In fact, drawing from the results of this study, it is now clear that this tension does exist in actual practice as well. Therefore, it stands to reason that the negative correlation between these attitudes flows from the fact that it is hard to reconcile two such opposing attitudes since teachers are on the one hand expected to educate students in line with the Dutch democratic citizenship education, while on the other hand incorporate diverse student cultures in their teaching (Doppen, 2007).

Another possible explanation might be found in the fact that the participating teachers were in little contact with non-western immigrant students. In point of fact, 72.3% of the teachers reported that half - or less than half - of the students were of Dutch origin. Furthermore, solely 5.6% of the teachers reported to have a migration background themselves. It is conceivable that this skewed sample might have caused teachers to be less 'open-minded' to endorse to both national culture and cultural responsive attitudes, as the concrete reason was missing (Sullivan & A'Vant, 2009). As a matter of fact, a previous non-Western study (Agirdag et al., 2016) found that the opposite case is often accompanied with higher levels of readiness to adopt responsive teaching attitudes. Therefore, one might assume that when the teachers who carry a greater tendency towards national culture attitudes based on their personal conviction were trained and introduced in CRT, this could have led to different results (Pettigrew, 1998).

The second research question dived deeper into this topic. Even, following from previous studies (Schachner et al., 2016; Van Geel & Vedder, 2011; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2013; Brekelmans et al., 2002) it was expected that the factors ‘ethnic class composition’ and ‘years of teaching experience’ would explain a significant percentage of the variance in teaching attitudes. Contrary to the expectations, it was found that the investigated teacher and classroom related factors did not explain a significant part of the explained variance in teaching attitudes. These results indicate that it is not possible to predict and anticipate on teaching attitudes, based on what is already known about teachers (their years of experience and the ethnic class composition they work with). This directly answers the question raised in the previous section. In fact, as the results of this study indicate, the introduction to CRT through a diverse ethnic class composition, will probably not affect teachers’ attitudes towards CRT. Yet, it should be noted that it is very much likely that the reason for this non-significant result can again be traced back to the relative small percentage of teachers and students with a migration background.

The fact that years of teaching experience did not constitute a significant predictor, may be exploited through similar other research. By means of reasoning through the theory of self-efficacy, it can be stated that being good at something, often also leads people to find this particular thing more important (Bandura, 1977). This argumentation holds for the opposite case as well. In addition, for teachers to be successful in CRT, it is of great importance that they critically reflect and have a student-focused view on teaching (Gay, 2010). However, learning and internalizing these things take time and experience (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Considering the fact that a substantial part of the participants had little teaching experience, this factor potentially played along in this result of the study.

Aside from the fact that these classroom and teacher related factors did not explain a significant part of the variance, multicultural attitudes did explain variance for all three teaching attitude scales. These results further support the finding of previous studies (Abacioglu et al., 2020; Civitillo et al., 2019), in which was found that multicultural attitudes explain another

significant percentage of the variance, beyond the variance explained by these teacher and classroom related factors. By including the attitude 'national culture' in this study, it became possible to pronounce on the Dutch educational context. In this way, the findings provide more insight in and knowledge about the professional identity of Dutch teachers. This automatically led us to value the effect of reflection on personal attitudes (Civitillo, 2019). In fact, drawing from these results, it became possible to understand that the way in which a teacher deals with cultural diversity not only arises from a professional role. Yet, this mostly flows from teachers' personal attitudes towards cultural diversity, which will therefore, to some extent, always reflect in the way in which teachers approach cultural diversity. On these correlates, the results showed that the personal beliefs of a teacher do say something about how a teacher stands in front of the classroom as they are of significant influence on teaching attitudes. Therefore, on the base of these results, it can be stated that responsive teaching attitudes proceeding from a professional teacher role will not suffice as teachers' positive multicultural attitudes are required for responsive teaching attitudes too.

Practical Implications

Now that is known that teachers' multicultural attitudes explain a significant part of the variance and that there is an existing tension between the positive effects of CRT for immigrant students on the one hand and the social role of teachers in introducing all pupils to the Dutch society on the other, it is important to apply these insights to practice. To this end, it is first and foremost important that schools determine what it is exactly that they want to radiate. If their desire is to celebrate cultural diversity, close attention should be paid to the general multicultural attitudes that their teachers hold, beyond their professional teacher role. Along those lines, broad consideration should be given to teachers' multicultural beliefs in the teacher trainings. A critical look into the current curriculum revealed that, up until now, little attention is directed to cultural diversity in the classroom (Carter & Darling-Hammond, 2016). It may use training courses, teacher conversations and reflections in which the befitting attitudes can in any case

emerge and perhaps also be formed. It goes without saying that it is vital to take into account the teachers who are already employed in education as well. In this regard, continuous efforts should be directed to offering both student and practicing teachers more possibilities to critically reflect on and speak about their personal multicultural attitudes (Civitillo, 2019).

To take care of the tension between the national culture and cultural responsive attitudes, a greater focus on the concept of self-efficacy might remedy (Abacioglu et al., 2020). Truly, research (Aybek, & Asla, 2019) showed that when (student) teachers find themselves not feeling well prepared to connect with the cultural backgrounds of their students, they will have little confidence in their ability to cope with these cultural differences in class. Furthermore, studies indicated that teachers with high self-efficacy levels show more positive attitudes towards innovative teaching manners and are better able to reflect on their teaching (Bangdura, 2018). Along those lines, more awareness on teachers' self-efficacy levels towards CRT might offer the possibility to deploy CRT as a solution for the current disadvantaged position of many immigrant students in the Netherlands, whilst respecting and incorporation the Dutch democratic citizenship education as well.

Limitations and Implications for Future Research

The present study had a several strengths. The current study was, as far as it is known, the first study to investigate the extend to which multicultural attitudes resound in teaching attitudes, beyond teacher and classroom related factors. Second, this study shed another light on the existing perspectives (e.g. Banks, 2004; Banks & Diem, 2008; Plaut et al., 2009) and thereby contributed to the current understanding, as it investigated different and supplementary forms of teaching attitudes (like 'national culture'). Accordingly, the results of this study went deeper and further than previous research involving CRT. At last, the internal validity was sufficiently ensured for within the current study. In fact, a literature study was used to determine which factors were decisive in mapping and measuring teaching attitudes. Subsequently, the questions in the questionnaires were drawn up in such a way that they directly related to this. Further, the

results of the teachers were appropriately analysed and the sample size was large enough (Field, 2013). The fact that this questionnaire measured teaching attitudes alongside the more general multicultural attitudes, positively influenced the validity of this scale as well. Following from the abovementioned reasons, the current study is an asset to the existing research base on CRT.

Notwithstanding, the current study had a number of limitations. First, given the fact that most teachers reported not to have a migration background and that the majority of these teachers' students were of Dutch descent, the generalizability was a limiting point in this study. Specific attention should be paid to this in future research. Sure enough, given the fact this study mainly focusses on teaching attitudes towards cultural diverse backgrounds, a more diverse target group with students from several different backgrounds would allow to make the results of this study more widely applicable.

Also, within the framework of current research, it was sufficient to answer the questions raised by exploiting a study solely relying on self-report measures. However, self-report measures are notoriously for being relatively more subject for socially desirable answers (Fisher & Tellis, 1998). On top of this, a previous study found some inconsistencies between culturally responsive teaching and teachers' beliefs about cultural diversity (Civitillo et al., 2019). To develop a fuller picture of the teaching attitudes of primary school teachers, additional studies combining quantitative and qualitative data are needed (Hoffman & Seidel, 2015). This could be tackled by making use of informant-reporting measurements alongside self-report measurements.

Added to this, use has been made of cross-sectional data. This ultimately means that it was not possible to make predictive statements about the relation of the variables and the direction of the effect. After all, one event did not happen before the other. Still, we can make a predictive statement from an arithmetic point of view. In fact, there were theoretical grounds (Civitillo et al., 2019) on which it could be assumed that teachers' general multicultural attitudes might trickle down in their teaching attitudes. Therefore, drawing from this starting-point, it can

be presumed and stated that multicultural attitudes predict teaching attitudes.

In this study, a PAF was used to determine which variables cluster. The fact that some subscales positively correlated, indicated that teachers can indeed endorse multiple subscales. Yet, the data from this study did not allow to report on the question whether there were certain subgroups (types of teachers) within the sample that were very similar to each other. Therefore, it would provide even more insight if future studies further explore the way in which the *cases* cluster with each other. Ultimately, further research will allow to test whether there are certain specific teacher profiles. Drawing from this information, a way to make extra detailed statements about the teachers' attitude is made.

Conclusion

CRT offers a solution for the increasing disadvantaged position of Dutch students with a migration background. In order to successfully deploy CRT within the Dutch primary education system, teachers' diverging teaching attitudes should be taken into account. The results of this study revealed that Dutch teachers can adhere to various teaching attitudes. Yet, attitudes focused around conveying and living the Dutch culture (national culture attitudes) cannot overlap with cultural responsive attitudes. In addition, the results indicated that for CRT to be implemented properly, it is vital to pay close attention to teachers' personal multicultural attitudes. After all, these multicultural attitudes will always resonate in teaching attitudes, beyond the attitudes that proceed from a professional teacher role. On these correlates, teachers' general multicultural attitudes merit serious consideration. Therefore, the recommendations of this study are to pay sufficient and ample attention to teachers' personal multicultural attitudes, for example by offering enough room for reflection and conversation (Civitillo, 2019). Furthermore, based on the concept of self-efficacy, enough attention should be given to how capable and skilled teachers feel about the concept of CRT (Abacioglu et al., 2020; Aybek, & Asla, 2019; Bangdura, 2018).

References

- Abacioglu, C. S., Volman, M., & Fischer, A. H. (2020). Teachers' Multicultural Attitudes and Perspective Taking Abilities as Factors in Culturally Responsive Teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(3), 736-752. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12328>
- Agirdag, O., Merry, M. S., & Van Houtte, M. (2016). Agirdag, O., Merry, M. S., & Van Houtte, M. (2016). Teachers' understanding of multicultural education and the correlates of multicultural content integration in Flanders. *Education and Urban Society, 48*(6), 556-582. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1177/0013124514536610>
- Arends-Tóth, J., & Vijver, F. J. V. D. (2003). Multiculturalism and Acculturation: Views Of Dutch and Turkish–Dutch. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(2), 249-266. doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.143
- Aronson, B., & Laughter, J. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(1), 163-206. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315582066>
- Aybek, B., & Aslan, S. (2019). The Predictive Power of the Pre-Service Teachers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs upon Their Preparedness to Teach. *International Education Studies, 12*(9), 27-33. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n9p27>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.84.2.191>
- Bangura, Y. (2018). Multicultural Education: The relationship between preservice teachers' multicultural self-efficacy and cultural awareness when teaching in multicultural classrooms (Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University). https://etd.ohiolink.edu/apexprod/rws_etd/send_file/send?accession=bgsu1522682134643678&disposition=inline
- Banks, J. A. (2004). Approaches To Multicultural Curriculum Reform. *Multicultural Education: Issues and perspectives, 5*, 242-264. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452218533.n491>

- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.) (2019). *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Banks, J. A., & Diem, N. (2008). Diversity and Citizenship Education. *Handbook of Research In Social Studies Education*, 137-154.
- Bassey, M. O. (2016). Culturally Responsive Teaching: Implications for Educational Justice. *Education Sciences*, 6(4), 35. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci6040035>
- Berry, J. W., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada: An Overview of The 1991 National Survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, 27(3), 301. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0008-400x.27.3.301>
- Boon, R., & Spencer, V. (2010). *Best Practices for the Inclusive Classroom: Scientifically Based Strategies for Success*. Sourcebooks, Inc., 2010. shorturl.at/fpAMU
- Bos, J. (2020). *Research ethics for students in the social sciences* (p. 287). Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48415-6>
- Brekelmans, M., Wubbels, T., & Den Brok, P. (2002). Teacher Experience and The Teacher–student relationship in the classroom environment. In *Studies in Educational Learning Environments: An International Perspective* (pp. 73-99). https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812777133_0004
- Breugelmans, S. M., & Van De Vijver, F. J. (2004). Antecedents and Components of Majority Attitudes Toward Multiculturalism in The Netherlands. *Applied Psychology*, 53(3), 400-422. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2004.00177>.
- Byrd, C. M. (2016). Does Culturally Relevant Teaching work? An Examination From Student Perspectives. *Sage Open*, 6(3), 2158244016660744. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016660744>
- Cabello, B., & Burstein, N. D. (1995). Examining Teachers' Beliefs About Teaching In Culturally Diverse Classrooms. *Journal of Tteacher Education*, 46(4), 285-294.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487195046004007>

Carter, P. L., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *Teaching Diverse Learners*. In D. H. Gitomer, & C. A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of Research On Teaching* (5th ed.) (pp 593-637).

Washington: American Educational Research Association. <https://doi.org/10.3102/978-0-935302-48-6>

Citrin, J., Sears, D. O., Muste, C., & Wong, C. (2001). Multiculturalism in American Public Opinion. *British Journal of Political Science*, 247-275.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2013.742755>

Civitillo, S., Juang, L. P., Badra, M., & Schachner, M. K. (2019). The Interplay Between Culturally Responsive Teaching, Cultural Diversity Beliefs, And Self-reflection: A Multiple Case Study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 77, 341-351.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.11.002>

Civitillo, S., Schachner, M., Juang, L., van de Vijver, F. J., Handrick, A., & Noack, P. (2017). Towards A Better Understanding of Cultural Diversity Approaches at School: A Multi-Informant And Mixed-Methods Study. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 12, 1-14.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2016.09.002>

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis For The Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.).

Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

<http://lab.rockefeller.edu/cohenje/PDFs/159CohenBigFishLittleFishTheSciences1989.pdf>

Dietz, G. (2007). Keyword: Cultural Diversity. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 10(1), 7-30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11618-007-0003-1>

Doppen, F. H. (2007). Now What? Rethinking civic education in the Netherlands. *Education, citizenship and social justice*, 2(2), 103-118.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197907077043>

Dubbeld, A., Hoog, N. D., Den Brok, P., & de Laat, M. (2019). Teachers' Attitudes Toward

- Multiculturalism In Relation To General And Diversity-Related Burnout. *European Education*, 51(1), 16-31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10564934.2017.1401435>
- Eldering, L. (1996). Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education In An International Perspective. *Anthropology & education quarterly*, 27(3), 315-330. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aeq.1996.27.3.04x0352n>
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS* (3rd edition). London, England: Sage Publications.
- Fisher, R. J., & Tellis, G. J. (1998). Removing Social Desirability Bias with Indirect Questioning: Is the Cure Worse Than The Disease?. *ACR North American Advances*. [//www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/8212/volumes/v25/NA-25](http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/8212/volumes/v25/NA-25)
- Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2006). Associative and Propositional Processes in Evaluation: An Integrative Review of Implicit and Explicit Attitude Change. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 692– 731. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e633962013-309>
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press. shorturl.at/insEL
- Gay, G. (2010). Acting On Beliefs in Teacher Education For Cultural Diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 143-152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347320>
- Gay, G. (2015). The What, Why, And How of Culturally Responsive Teaching: International Mandates, Challenges, and Opportunities. *Multicultural Education Review*, 7(3), 123-139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615x.2015.1072079>
- Gay, G., & Howard, T. C. (2000). Multicultural Teacher Education for the 21st century. *The Teacher Educator*, 36(1), 1-16. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1080/08878730009555246>
- Guerra, P. L., & Wubbena, Z. C. (2017). Teacher Beliefs and Classroom Practices Cognitive Dissonance in High Stakes Test-Influenced Environments. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(1), 35-51. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1139327.pdf>

Hachfeld, A., Hahn, A., Schroeder, S., Anders, Y., Stanat, P., & Kunter, M.

(2011). Assessing Teachers' Multicultural and Egalitarian Beliefs: The Teacher Cultural Beliefs Scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(6), 986-996.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.04.006>

Hachfeld, A., Hahn, A., Schroeder, S., Anders, Y., & Kunter, M. (2015). Should Teachers Be Colorblind? How Multicultural and Egalitarian Beliefs Differentially Relate To Aspects of Teachers' Professional Competence For Teaching In Diverse Classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 48, 44-55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.02.001>

Harrington, H. L., & Hathaway, R. S. (1995). Illuminating Beliefs About Diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(4), 275-284 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487195046004006>

Henrichs, L., Lavigne, A. L., Acosta Feliz, J. A., & Shao, S. (2020, July). *Culturally Responsive Teaching in Diverse Elementary Classrooms: Characteristics And Beliefs*. Paper presented at the European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI) Special Interest Groups 10, 21 & 25 annual conference, Groningen, Netherlands. [Conference held virtually].

Hill, A. L. (2012). Culturally Responsive Teaching: An Investigation of Effective Practices For African American learners. *Dissertations*. 353.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1352&context=luc_diss

Hoffman, B. H., & Seidel, K. (2015). Measuring teachers' beliefs. *International Handbook of Research on Teachers' Beliefs*, 106-127.

Hooghe, M., & de Vroome, T. (2015). How Does the Majority Public React to Multiculturalist Policies? A Comparative Analysis of European Countries. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(6), 747-768. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000276421456649>.

Kaiser, H. F., & Rice, J. (1974). Little jiffy, mark IV. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 34(1), 111-117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447403400115>

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects On Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction:

- Teacher Gender, Years of Experience, and Job Stress. *Journal of educational Psychology*, 102(3), 741. doi: 10.1037/a0019237
- Krijnen, M. A., Van Vemde, L., Mainhard, M. T., Wansink, B. G. J., Thijs, J. T., & Hornstra, J. T. (2021). Culturally Responsive Teaching Attitudes Scale [Unpublished]. Utrecht University.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). Crafting A Culturally Relevant Social Studies Approach. *The Social Studies Curriculum: Purposes, Problems, and Possibilities*, 201-215. [shorturl.at/kxDGQ](https://doi.org/10.1080/002203102032003465)
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465>
- Nieto, S.M. (2004). *Affirming Diversity: The Socio-Political Context of Multicultural Education*. Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303824888_Affirming_Diversity_The_Sociopolitical_Context_of_Multicultural_Education
- van Middelkoop, D., Ballafkih, H., & Meerman, M. (2017). Understanding Diversity: a Dutch Case Study on Teachers' Attitudes Towards Their Diverse Student Population. *Empirical Research in Vocational Education and Training*, 9(1), 1-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40461-016-0045-9>
- Pallant, J. (2011). *Survival Manual. A Step By Step Guide To Data Analysis Using SPSS*.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003117407>
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup Contact Theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49(1), 65-85.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65>
- Phalet, K., Andriessen, I., & Lens, W. (2004). How Future Goals Enhance Motivation and Learning in Multicultural Classrooms. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(1), 59-89.
<https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000012345.71645.d4>
- Pit-ten Cate, I. M., & Glock, S. (2019). Teachers' Implicit Attitudes Toward Students from

- Different Social Groups: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 2832.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02832>
- Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is Multiculturalism or Color Blindness Better for Minorities?. *Psychological Science*, *20*(4), 444-446.
<https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02318.x>
- Sanbonmatsu, D. M., & Fazio, R. H. (1990). The Role of Attitudes in Memory-based Decision Making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*(4), 614.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.4.614>
- Schachner, M. K. (2019). From Equality and Inclusion to Cultural Pluralism—Evolution and Effects of Cultural Diversity Perspectives in Schools. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *16*(1), 1-17.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2017.1326378>
- Schachner, M. K., Noack, P., Van de Vijver, F. J. & Eckstein, K. (2016). Cultural Diversity Climate and Psychological Adjustment at School—Equality and Inclusion Versus Cultural Pluralism. *Child development*, *87*(4), 1175.
1191.<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12536>
- Scheerens, J., & van der Werf, G. (2018). Immigrant Student Achievement and Education Policy in The Netherlands. In *Immigrant Student Achievement and Education Policy* (pp. 103-118). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74063-8_7
- Schwab, S., Sharma, U., & Hoffmann, L. (2019). How inclusive are the teaching practices of my German, Maths and English teachers? –psychometric properties of a newly developed scale to assess personalisation and differentiation in teaching practices. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1629121>
- SLO. (2008). *Omgaan met culturele diversiteit in het onderwijs*.
<https://docplayer.nl/4982410-Omgaan-met-culturele-diversiteit-in-het-onderwijs.html>
- Stevens, M. W., Leong, A. S. Y., Fazzalari, N. L., Dowling, K. D., & Henderson, D. W. (1992).

- Cytopathology of Malignant Mesothelioma: A Stepwise Logistic Regression Analysis. *Diagnostic cytopathology*, 8(4), 333-341.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/dc.2840080405>
- Sullivan, A., & A'Vant, E. (2009). *Multicultural Affairs: On the Need for Cultural Responsiveness. Communique*, 38(3), 8-9.
- Theeuwes, B. C., Saab, N., Denessen, E. J. P. G., & Admiraal, W. (2019). Docenten en hun cultuurdiverse klassen in het voortgezet onderwijs. *Pedagogische Studiën*, 96(4), 218-243. <https://scholarlypublications.universiteitleiden.nl/access/item%3A2981067/view>
- Van Geel, M., & Vedder, P. (2011). The Role of Family Obligations and School Adjustment in Explaining The Immigrant Paradox. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40(2), 187-196.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-009-9468-y>
- Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2015). Behind the ethnic–civic distinction: Public attitudes towards immigrants' political rights in the Netherlands. *Social Science Research*, 53, 34-44.
. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.05.002>
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2013). Multicultural Education and Inter-Ethnic Attitudes. *European Psychologist*. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000152>
- Verkuyten, M., Thijs, J., & Bekhuis, H. (2010). Intergroup contact and in-group reappraisal: Examining the deprovincialization thesis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73(4), 398- 416.
<https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1177/0190272510389015>
- Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic Group Identification and Group Evaluation Among Minority And Majority Groups: Testing the Multiculturalism Hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(1), 121. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.121>
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing Culturally Responsive Teachers: Rethinking the Curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20–32.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871020530010>

Appendix A

Informed Consent

XX XXXXX, 2021

Betreft: Informatie en toestemmingsformulier onderzoeksproject [TITEL]

Beste leerkracht,

Hartelijk dank voor uw interesse in de deelname aan deze vragenlijst over lesgeven in diverse bovenbouwklassen. Dit onderzoek is een thesisproject van vier studenten van de master Onderwijswetenschappen aan de Universiteit Utrecht. Het is tegelijk een pilotonderzoek in het kader van het onderzoeksproject *Burgerschap door Lesgeven: Onderzoek in de Klas* (BLOK) dat volgend schooljaar zal worden uitgevoerd.

Onderzoeksdoel en inhoud vragenlijst

Het doel van het huidige onderzoek is om in kaart te brengen hoe leerkrachten uit de bovenbouw denken over omgaan met diversiteit in een klas en welke factoren hiermee samenhangen. In veel basisschoolklassen in Nederland zijn de achtergronden van leerlingen verschillend, zowel op het gebied van migratieachtergrond als sociaal-economische achtergrond. In dit onderzoek testen we een nieuwe vragenlijst, waarin uw mening wordt gevraagd ten aanzien van verschillende strategieën om met een diverse klas om te gaan. Daarnaast vragen we u naar andere aspecten van het leraarschap (zoals uw contact met ouders, uw eigen inschatting van de manier waarop u in het algemeen lesgeeft, en uw samenwerking met collega's) en naar uw houding ten aanzien van de diverse Nederlandse maatschappij. Door deze thema's te onderzoeken, kunnen we leerkrachten beter ondersteunen in het lesgeven aan diverse klassen. Het invullen van de vragenlijst kost u maximaal xxx

minuten.

Privacy

Deze dataverzameling is anoniem: dat betekent dat wij geen persoonsgegevens vragen. Wij behandelen de verzamelde gegevens strikt vertrouwelijk en gebruiken deze enkel voor onderzoeksdoeleinden. Alleen onderzoekers hebben toegang tot de gegevens. Uw antwoorden worden daarnaast op geen enkele manier besproken met, of doorgegeven aan andere betrokkenen. De gegevens worden op een veilige manier opgeslagen. Als het project is afgerond, wordt de anonieme data volgens de geldende regelgeving nog maximaal 10 jaar bewaard, omdat onderzoekers deze dan nog gebruiken voor verder onderzoek.

Vrijwilligheid

Deelname aan dit onderzoek is geheel vrijwillig. U kunt op elk moment beslissen om te stoppen met de vragenlijst.

Toestemming

Als u mee wilt doen aan het onderzoek, dan is het belangrijk dat u toestemming geeft door aan het begin van de vragenlijst aan te kruisen dat u voldoende geïnformeerd bent en vrijwillig meedoet aan dit onderzoek. Als u dit niet doet, kunt u helaas de vragenlijst niet invullen.

Nadere informatie

Mocht u vragen hebben over dit onderzoek, vooraf of achteraf, dan kunt u zich wenden tot m.a.krijnen@uu.nl. Voor eventuele klachten over dit onderzoek kunt u een email sturen naar klachtenfunctionaris-fetcsocwet@uu.nl.

Bij voorbaat hartelijk dank voor uw medewerking!

Met vriendelijke groeten,

Maureen van Boxtel, Bente Jongkees, Iris Lambregtse, en Marieke Post en supervisors: dr. Tim

Mainhard en Minke Krijnen MSc (m.a.krijnen@uu.nl)

TOESTEMMINGSVERKLARING

Voor deelname in wetenschappelijk onderzoeksproject BLOK

Ik ben naar tevredenheid geïnformeerd over het onderzoek. Ik heb de schriftelijke informatie gelezen. Ik heb de gelegenheid gehad om vragen te stellen. De vragen die ik heb gesteld zijn naar tevredenheid beantwoord.

Ik heb goed kunnen nadenken over de deelname van aan het onderzoek. Ik begrijp dat deelname geheel vrijwillig is. Ik weet dat ik op elk moment kan beslissen om te stoppen met het onderzoek. Daarvoor hoef ik geen reden te geven.

Ik ga akkoord met bovenstaande en neem uit vrije wil deel aan dit onderzoek.

Appendix B

Demographics

This appendix sets out all of the demographic information that participants were asked to report on. In sum, participants reported on their age, gender, ethnicity, years of teaching experience and the relevant classroom characteristics. Added to this, this appendix sets out all the items from both the Cultural Responsive Teaching Attitudes Scale (CRTAS) and the The Dutch Multicultural Ideology Scale (DMIS). As the questionnaire was in Dutch, this appendix will report the questions in Dutch as well.

1. Wat is uw leeftijd? (Jaren)
2. Wat is uw geslacht? ('man', 'vrouw', 'anders', 'geef ik liever geen antwoord op')
3. Heeft u een migratieachtergrond (d.w.z. heeft één van uw ouders of hebben uw beide ouders een niet-westerse achtergrond)? ('ja', 'nee')
4. Hoeveel jaar werkt u als leerkracht in het onderwijs? (jaren)
5. Welke groep(en) geeft u dit schooljaar het meeste les? (Groep 1 – groep 8 of 'anders')
6. Hoeveel leerlingen heeft u in de klas?
7. Hoeveel van uw leerlingen in de klas hebben een migratieachtergrond (d.w.z. hoeveel van uw leerlingen hebben minimaal één ouder met een niet-westerse achtergrond)? (1 = niemand, 2 = minder dan de helft, 3 = ongeveer de helft, 4 = meer dan de helft, 5 = (bijna) de hele klas, 6 = niet van toepassing)

Cultural Responsive Teaching Attitudes Scale (CRTAS)

[Unpublished] Krijnen et al. (2021)

Likert schaal: 1 (helemaal niet belangrijk) – 7 (zeer belangrijk).

Scale 1: Cultural responsive

In hoeverre vindt u onderstaande zaken belangrijk?

1. Aandacht besteden aan de normen en waarden die leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden van huis uit meekrijgen.
2. Rekening houden met de culturele achtergrond van leerlingen.
3. Aandacht hebben voor de behoeften van leerlingen met verschillende culturele achtergronden.
4. Vooroordelen tussen leerlingen met verschillende culturele achtergronden verminderen.
5. Mij bewust zijn van de rol van mijn eigen culturele achtergrond in mijn werk als leerkracht.
6. Leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden de mogelijkheid geven vanuit hun eigen perspectief aan de les bij te dragen.
7. Conflicten rondom culture verschillen aangrijpen als leermoment voor omgaan met verschillen.
8. Spanningen die veroorzaakt worden door culturele verschillen openlijk in de klas bespreken.
9. Zorgen dat leerlingen, ongeacht de samenstelling van de klas, zich bewust zijn van culturele diversiteit.
10. Culturele diversiteit in de klas als een verrijking proberen te zien.
11. De omgang tussen leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden stimuleren.

Scale 2: Shared culture

In hoeverre vindt u onderstaande zaken belangrijk?

1. Leerlingen op dezelfde manier benaderen, ondanks hun verschillende culturele achtergronden.
2. Overeenkomsten tussen leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden benadrukken.
3. Aan leerlingen overbrengen dat mensen van verschillende culturele achtergronden veel gemeen hebben
4. Zorgen dat leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden juist hun onderlinge overeenkomsten zien.
5. De omgang tussen leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden stimuleren, zodat ze zien dat ze eigenlijk heel erg op elkaar lijken.
6. Benadrukken dat we allemaal mensen zijn, ondanks onze verschillende culturele achtergronden.
7. Wederzijds begrip stimuleren tussen leerlingen met verschillende culturele achtergronden.
8. Zorgen dat leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden elkaars tradities en gebruiken leren kennen.

Scale 3: National Culture

In hoeverre vindt u onderstaande zaken belangrijk?

9. Zorgen dat leerlingen bekend zijn met Nederlandse normen en waarden.
10. Stimuleren dat leerlingen zich gedragen volgens Nederlandse normen en waarden.
11. Alle leerlingen houden zich aan Nederlandse normen en waarden.
12. De Nederlandse cultuur overbrengen aan leerlingen.
13. Leerlingen laten zien hoe we in Nederland met elkaar omgaan.
14. Ervoor zorgen dat alle leerlingen op school alleen maar Nederlands praten.
15. Alle leerlingen stimuleren mee te doen aan de Nederlandse tradities op school

The Dutch Multicultural Ideology Scale (DMIS)

Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver (2003)

Likert schaal: 1 (helemaal mee eens) – 7 (helemaal niet mee eens).

1. Nederlanders zonder migratieachtergrond moeten accepteren dat Nederland uit allerlei culturele en godsdienstige groepen bestaat
2. Mensen die er zelf voor kiezen om naar Nederland te komen dienen zich aan te passen
3. Het is het beste voor Nederland als mensen met een migratieachtergrond hun culturele achtergrond zo snel mogelijk vergeten
4. Hoe meer culturen er zijn, hoe beter het is voor Nederland
5. Mensen met een migratieachtergrond mogen hun eigen waarden en normen behouden, ook buiten huis
6. Nieuwkomers moeten zoveel mogelijk hun eigen cultuur opgeven en de cultuur van Nederlanders overnemen
7. Nederland is van oorsprong een christelijk land en dat moet ook zo blijven
8. In de samenleving moet geen enkele groep meer te zeggen hebben dan andere groepen
9. Alle culturele groepen moeten gelijke kansen krijgen in Nederland
10. De volgende vragen gaan over algemene multiculturele attitudes.
11. Nieuwkomers hebben net zo veel te zeggen over de toekomst van Nederland als mensen die in Nederland geboren zijn

Appendix C

Academic Integrity

Sample characteristics

The goal was to involve at least 30 teachers, through which ultimately 120 teachers are included in this joint project. Furthermore, the aim was to collect a representative sample. That is, a sample consisting of teachers employed in diverse neighbourhoods including different degrees of cultural responsive teaching in their education. This was important since this allowed to provide a clear picture of the prevailing Dutch teacher attitudes towards cultural responsiveness and multiculturalism in the Netherlands. It was decided not to ask participants about their place of birth. Instead, participants were asked whether they have a migration background. In fact, his question could be experienced as too personal and reduce feelings of anonymity which does not weigh up against the profit that this extra information can yield within this study. Furthermore, teachers were asked to indicate their gender (possible answers: male, female, other, prefer not to say).

To protect teacher's anonymity and hence the confidentiality, personal data was handled in a responsible manner with which it would in no way be possible to identify participants. This means that information like names and contact details were stored separately from all other data collected. In this way, no links within the data were established and the data could be assumed as practically anonymous. Finally, teachers were asked to indicate their age in years instead of their date of birth which also contributed to the protection of teacher's anonymity.

Choice of instruments, possibly sensitive questions and other issue concerning the academic integrity the study

The questionnaire in this study did not address any sensitive topics and did not involve invasive, intrusive, or potentially harmful procedures. Yet, there is always a possibility that teachers take the questions personal or feel insecure about their role as a

teacher when they answer questions against cultural responsiveness. This relates to the possible risk of socially desirable answers as well. This risk can be minimized by including an extensive explanation explaining that all data will be kept anonymous as well as that there is no ‘right or wrong’ and there will not be any judgment about the given answers. Finally, to prevent people for psychological damage, it was stressed that there is always a possibility to discuss their thoughts afterwards, both with a gatekeeper from the school as with the researchers of the project-team.

Data handling and storage

Another important way to control for confidentiality is by using data techniques that guarantee anonymization (Bos, 2020). In fact, “Secure storage of research data is at the core of research ethics (...). It serves two basic purposes: verification and reuse” (p.262). In this regard, current study aims to treat all data in the most anonymous manner possible. The data was executed with the use of Qualtrics. Qualtrics is in management of Utrecht University, who have duty to act on the protection of personal data and protects the participants’ data very well. Furthermore, Qualtrics offers an option which allows to remove ip-addresses of participants. In addition, relying on NWO and H2020 guidelines, all data was stored in YoDa, which is an extra secured program of Utrecht University.

Consent procedures

An informed consent is an excellent manner to guarantee this confidentiality (Bos, 2020). In this regard, informed consent is a requirement for participation in this study. This means that only those participants that actively ‘signed’ the informed consent by ticking a box, were allowed to participate in the study. The consent informed participants of what will happen during the data analysis, to ensure that the participants completely understand what the study amounts to and are aware of the purpose and procedure of the study. Furthermore, it was explained that all data would be used strictly confidential and for research purposes only. Moreover, it was pointed out that only the project-team had access to the data and that

answers would in no way be discussed with or passed on to other parties. Finally, participants were informed about the fact they were allowed to quit their participation at any given moment, that participation in this study was free-willed and that they could have their data removed from the study at any time.

Appendix D

Table 1

Deleted Items After Rotation

Item	
C10	Culturele diversiteit in de klas als een verrijking zien.
C1	Aandacht besteden aan de normen en waarden die leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden van huis uit meekrijgen.
S6	Benadrukken dat we allemaal mensen zijn, ondanks onze verschillende culturele achtergronden.
S7	Wederzijds begrip stimuleren tussen leerlingen met verschillende culturele achtergronden.
C11	De omgang tussen leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden stimuleren
N2.1	Ik vind het niet nodig om aandacht te besteden aan niet-Nederlandse culturen in mijn klas.

Table 2

Promax Rotated Factor Structure of the CRTAS

CRTAS item	Rotated Factor Loadings		
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
<i>In hoeverre vindt u onderstaande zaken belangrijk?</i>			

Factor 1: National Culture

N1	Zorgen dat leerlingen bekend zijn met Nederlandse normen en waarden	.818
----	---	------

N2	Stimuleren dat leerlingen zich gedragen volgens Nederlandse normen en waarden.	.835
N3	Alle leerlingen houden zich aan Nederlandse normen en waarden.	.822
N5	Leerlingen laten zien hoe we in Nederland met elkaar omgaan.	.718
N4	De Nederlandse cultuur overbrengen aan leerlingen.	.500
N7	Alle leerlingen stimuleren mee te doen aan de Nederlandse tradities op school.	.633

Factor 2: Shared Culture

S4	Zorgen dat leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden juist hun onderlinge overeenkomsten zien.	.810
S2	Overeenkomsten tussen leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden benadrukken.	.852
S3	Aan leerlingen overbrengen dat mensen van verschillende culturele achtergronden veel gemeen hebben.	.767
S5	De omgang tussen leerlingen van verschillende culturele achtergronden stimuleren, zodat ze zien dat ze eigenlijk heel erg op elkaar lijken.	.713

Factor 3: Cultural Responsive

C7	Conflicten rondom cultuurverschillen aangrijpen als leermoment voor omgaan met verschillen.	.815
C8	Spanningen die veroorzaakt worden door culturele verschillen openlijk in de klas bespreken.	.735
C4	Vooroordelen tussen leerlingen met verschillende culturele achtergronden verminderen.	.527
C9	De samenstelling van de klas, zich bewust zijn van culturele diversiteit	.632

Eigenvalues	4.68	3.51	1.36
% of variance	22.28%	17.0%	6.47%
α	.82	.82	.71

Note: $N = 160$. The extraction method was Principal axis factoring with an oblique (Promax with Kaiser normalization) rotation.