

Relationships between Prospective Teachers' Multicultural Education Attitudes and Classroom Management Styles

Murat Debbagⁱ
Bartın University

Mustafa Fidanⁱⁱ
Bartın University

Abstract

This correlation study investigates the relationships between prospective teachers' multicultural education attitudes and classroom management styles. The participants were 495 prospective teachers majoring in different departments of education faculties at two state universities in Turkey. "Democracy and Multicultural Education Attitude Scale" and "Classroom Management Style Scale" were used as data collection tools. Correlation and regression analyses were performed for data analysis by using SPSS 23.0 software. The results of descriptive analyses showed that most of the participants adopted authoritative style in terms of classroom management. Also, they had positive attitudes towards multicultural and democracy education. According to correlation analysis, there were significant relationships between the variables. Specifically, authoritative style was a powerful predictor of the attitude towards democracy and multicultural education. The prospective teachers with more authoritarian and indifferent styles had more biases towards multicultural education. Moreover, it is estimated that discussion and educational implications will shed light on teacher education.

Keywords: Multiculturalism, Multicultural Education, Attitude, Classroom Management Style, Prospective Teacher.

DOI: 10.29329/ijpe.2020.241.8

ⁱ **Murat Debbag**, Instructor Dr., Distance Education Application and Research Centre, Bartın University, ORCID: 0000-0002-8406-9931

ⁱⁱ **Mustafa Fidan**, Assist. Prof. Dr., Educational Sciences, Bartın University, ORCID: 0000-0001-7461-4994

Correspondence: mfidan@bartin.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

Multiculturalism is also a concept that based on the phenomenon of globalization emerging from dizzying developments in technology and political, cultural, and economic events. Although multiculturalism first came to the fore in countries such as America, Australia, and Canada, it has become an important issue for almost all countries in political, economic, and cultural dimensions (Parekh, 2002). According to Banks (2008), multiculturalism is a multi-faceted concept that involves recognizing different cultural characteristics such as age, sexual orientation, disability, social class, ethnicity, religion, and language in comparison to mono-culturalism.

Today, countries have started to shape their education policies with this awareness. This concept, which finds its place in practice as “multicultural education”, provides a basis for equal education of students with different ethnicity, language, religion, race, gender, sexual orientation rather than a standardized understanding and argues that they should not experience inequality of opportunities due to these differences (Banks & Banks, 2010). Multicultural education is based on philosophical concepts such as peace, freedom and equality. With this understanding of education, it is aimed to help culturally diverse learners to develop coexistence skills by providing equal opportunities to them (Banks, 2010). In societies where such an educational approach is not seen, education programs focusing on the characteristics of the dominant culture are prepared and the cultural differences of minority groups are ignored.

One of the most important variables in the implementation of multicultural understanding is the education programs being used (Gay, 1995). Even if a multicultural approach is included in the existing curricula, teachers should internalize the understanding of multicultural education and develop the necessary attitudes in order to maintain the understanding of multicultural education and to achieve its aims (Banks, 2008). One of the primary goals of the multicultural perspective is to redefine the aims of education and democracy by deepening them at the cultural level (Banks, 2002). What is expected from the education system within the scope of this goal is to educate individuals who are democratic, free and able to make their own decisions, yet this is only possible with the democratization of the education. Teachers who do not adopt multicultural understanding cannot create a democratic learning environment in the classroom. This situation may bring about problems such as discrimination, polarization and othering, and may lead to the formation of a classroom climate where negative perceptions towards students' differences prevail (Banks & Banks, 1995). Therefore, in order to avoid negative situations due to these and similar differences, educators should have the necessary personality traits for multicultural education and learners should have a positive attitude towards individual differences in cultural context (Bennett, Niggle & Stage, 1990).

Although multicultural education has recently been the focus of interest for researchers, the practice of multicultural education in teacher education is still in its infancy. Specifically, in Turkey, where different ethnic origins are hosted, about 15 different languages are spoken, religious and sectarian diversity as well as regional differences are observed and a multicultural texture prevails, the concepts of democracy and multiculturalism need to be treated at a more advanced level and their educational roles should be deepened (Parker & Sword, 2013). However, the contents of multicultural education for prospective teachers in higher education are not included in the curricula adequately. In addition, it is also seen that issues related to multicultural education are the result of unintended learning taking place within the hidden curriculum other than the written and formal curriculum. Therefore, educations, lectures or activities that teachers receive before starting the teaching profession should be able to develop their attitudes towards multicultural education and maintain this understanding.

The relevant researchers have predominantly focused on the assessment of the situation or scale development studies in relation to prospective teachers' multicultural education attitudes (Aslan & Kozikoğlu, 2017; Cho & DeCastro-Ambrosetti, 2005; Yazıcı, Başol & Toprak, 2009). Besides, although there are studies in critical or theoretical (Sleeter & McLaren, 1995; Eryaman, 2007; May & Sleeter, 2010) and partially relational contexts (Koçak & Özdemir, 2015; Yaşar Ekici, 2017), the

variables underlying the prospective teachers' perspectives towards multicultural education have not been the subject of research much. In fact, in-depth examination and revealing of the factors affecting prospective teachers' attitudes towards multicultural education can make significant contributions to teacher education in both theory and practice.

One of these important variables is also the teachers' classroom management styles. Accordingly, the teachers' individual differences should be taken into consideration in the development of multicultural education understanding (Akçaoğlu, 2017). In preservice education programs, there are courses related to classroom management for the professional development of prospective teachers. Therefore, it can be said that prospective teachers receive a planned education on classroom management. During this education, they can develop their own classroom management styles in line with their prior knowledge and experience by developing a perception towards providing an appropriate learning environment in the classroom.

Importantly, these management styles can be an important determinant in the development of their attitudes towards multicultural education and the creation of a suitable education environment in accordance with this understanding of multicultural education. The democratic values underlying this understanding can only be learned and internalized by practising in democratic environments. According to Ertürk (1993), students cannot be expected to grow up by experiencing democracy unless teachers create a democratic environment in all aspects. Therefore, it is thought that teachers who do not exhibit a democratic management may discriminate among students without considering the cultural diversity in the classroom. These reactions of the teachers may cause a negative classroom climate. Therefore, there is a need for relational studies in which classroom management styles of prospective teachers are revealed and discussed together with the element for multicultural education and individual differences are emphasized in cultural context. In the relevant literature, there are very few studies that provide correlative evidence between prospective teachers' classroom management styles and their attitudes towards multicultural education. Therefore, in the present study, the relationships between prospective teachers' classroom management styles and their attitudes towards multicultural education was examined. The findings of the present study may contribute to taking necessary measures and making educational inferences regarding the change of prospective teachers' attitudes, beliefs and perspectives towards multicultural education due to their classroom management styles that shape after starting their teaching career.

In the light of this information, the research questions (RQ) were as follows:

- RQ1- What are the relationships between prospective teachers' democracy and multicultural education attitudes and classroom management styles?
- RQ2- Do classroom management styles of prospective teachers predict their multicultural education attitudes?

Multicultural education attitude

Educators have play an important role in achieving the objectives of multicultural education. The knowledge, readiness, attitudes and competencies that teachers have regarding multicultural education are effective in organizing educational situations in accordance with the purpose (Banks, 2008). In this respect, it has become a necessity for teachers to be informed and educated in order to acquire awareness about the different characteristics of students due to multicultural education especially prior to teaching service (Premier & Miller, 2010; Riedler & Eryaman, 2016). As a matter of fact, the prospective teachers who do not have this awareness may have negative tendencies towards the differences of learners after starting teaching.

Teachers' positive perspectives about multicultural education is an important factor in creating an appropriate classroom environment for all students to receive equal education without being exposed to discrimination (Banks, 1994). With respect to the development of this understanding of

education, the pre-service education is effective in the development of the prospective teachers' perspectives and tendencies towards multicultural education. In this regard, Bennett, Niggle and Stage (1990) underlined that prospective teachers should hold the values of respect for universal human rights, respect for the world community and respect for the world in the development of multicultural education. On the other hand, Van der Zee, Van Oudenhoven, Ponterotto and Fietzer (2013) examined the prospective teachers' multicultural personality traits in terms of cultural empathy, flexibility, social assertiveness, open-mindedness, and emotional balance.

Educators and prospective teachers should have the necessary beliefs and attitudes towards this understanding of education in order to acquire the values and characteristics of multicultural education. As a matter of fact, attitudes have a dynamic effect on behaviours (Myers, 1996) and, accordingly, it can be claimed that the effect of educators' attitudes is the determinant of their reactions to multicultural education. The positive or negative tendencies of educators towards multicultural education can be described as their attitudes towards this understanding of education.

Classroom Management Style

In enabling the students to achieve the learning objectives in the process of teaching and learning, the interaction between teacher and student is very important in terms of classroom climate. The teachers' knowledge and skills of classroom management come to the forefront in creating a positive classroom climate. Classroom management is a multidimensional concept that means to provide a favourable environment by minimizing the obstacles to learning (Emmer, Evertson & Worsham, 2003).

The teacher's role and responsibilities in terms of a good classroom management are great. The communication pattern established by the teacher in the classroom, his/her way of guiding the students, and his/her effective management of the learning process are considered important for an effective classroom management (Aktan & Sezer, 2018). Classroom management should not imply a teacher's having an authoritarian attitude and applying pressure on students using the element of force. As a matter of fact, in most of the studies in the literature, student achievement in the classes where effective classroom management was applied was found to be higher than the one in the classes where authoritarian style and force was used.

On the other hand, teachers' behaviours towards students in the classroom, their styles of communication with students, the rules they set up in the classroom, the methods and techniques they use in the classroom are reflections of their classroom management styles. Although the classroom management styles of the teachers in the relevant literature are classified in different ways, the researchers have predominantly accepted the four management styles proposed by Bosworth (1997): authoritarian, authoritative, laissez-faire, and indifferent. Specifically, teachers with an authoritarian style try to create a classroom environment where they try to dominate the students by using the element of "force" in the classroom, adhere to the classroom rules and do not take into consideration the students' decisions. Teachers in this category use the "control" factor at the highest level and believe that the punishment approach should be used in the classroom. Authoritative teachers try to apply rules based on logical reasons in the classroom. It is essential that students are warned politely rather than being rebuked. The classroom climate is generally positive, and teachers treat students sincerely. There is a controlled learning environment open to criticism and discussion. Teachers with a laissez-faire classroom management profile aim to create a flexible environment within the classroom. They value students' affective characteristics. Teachers with indifferent classroom management style do not tend to exert any discipline and pressure on students. These teachers try to spend time in the classroom without focusing on the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process. They are also insensitive to students.

METHOD

This study adopted as a predictive correlational design. This model allows to examine the relationships among variables and reveal the predictive power of them (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2012). It was selected to determine the possible effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. However, this design can not clearly indicate causation. In the study, whereas the independent variables of the research are the sub-factors of classroom management style, “authoritarian”, “authoritative”, “laissez-faire”, and “indifferent” as predictor, the dependent variables are the variables of “attitude towards multicultural education”, “biased attitude towards multicultural education”, “attitude towards democracy education”, “attitude towards democracy”, and “attitude towards cultural differences”.

Participants

The participants were 495 prospective teachers majoring in different departments of education faculties at two state universities in Turkey. 197 of these participants were male and 298 of them were female, aged from 19 to 28 ($M = 21.02$, $SD = 1.14$). 157 of the prospective teachers were sophomores, 165 of them were juniors, and 173 of them were seniors. The participants were selected according to the following two criteria: (i) majoring in any department of education faculty (ii) taking “classroom management” course.

Instruments

Democracy and Multicultural Education Attitude Scale consisting of five factors with 27 items was developed by Toraman, Acar and Aydın (2015). The sub-factors are as follows: “attitude towards multicultural education” (AtME; 7 items; e.g., “If I had a decision-maker role in the education system, I would bring a multicultural perspective to education.”), “biased attitude towards multicultural education” (BAAtME; 7 items; e.g., “The practice of multicultural education in the schools irritates me.”), “attitude towards democracy education” (AtDE; 5 items; e.g., “I include democracy education in my classes.”), “attitude towards democracy” (AtD; 5 items; e.g., “I see cultural differences among students as a wealth of our society and democracy.”), and “attitude towards cultural differences” (AtCD; 3 items; e.g., “I teach the course according to my students' cultural differences in order that they can become successful”). Using a 5-point likert scale (ranging from “strongly disagree”=“1” to “strongly agree”=“5”), the participants rated their responses.

In the present study, the internal consistency coefficients were satisfactory for sub-factors: .85, .87, .89, .83, and, .77, respectively. According to Tavşancıl (2014), the coefficients higher than .70 can be considered reliable. The confirmatory factor analysis presented acceptable indices ($\chi^2/df = 2.71$; $TLI = .92$; $NFI = .89$; $GFI = .89$; $RMSEA = .05$; $SRMR = .04$). Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger and Müller (2003) suggested that TLI, NFI, GFI indices should be higher than .90 and RMSEA, SRMR values should be lower than .08 for acceptable model fit.

Classroom Management Style Scale consisting of four factors with 12 items was developed by Bossworth (1997) and adapted into Turkish by Aktan and Sezer (2018). The sub-factors, each of which consists of 3 items, are as follows: “Authoritarian” (e.g., “I do not accept the excuses of the students who come to class late”), “Authoritative” (e.g., “I always try to explain the reasons for my decisions and rules to my students.”), “Laissez-faire” (e.g., “I always respect when my students ask for permission to leave the classroom during lesson.”), “Indifferent” (e.g., “I do not want to impose sanctions on my students by means of rules.”).

In the present study, the internal consistency coefficients were acceptable for sub-factors: .72, .74, .72, and .70, respectively. According to Tavşancıl (2014), the coefficients higher than .70 can be considered reliable. The confirmatory factor analysis presented acceptable indices ($\chi^2/df = 2.39$; $TLI = .93$; $NFI = .90$; $GFI = .92$; $RMSEA = .04$; $SRMR = .03$). Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger and Müller (2003) suggested that TLI, NFI, GFI indices should be higher than .90 and RMSEA, SRMR values should be lower than .08 for acceptable model fit.

Procedure and data analysis

The permission was obtained from two researchers who developed the scales. The data were collected during the spring semester of 2018-2019 academic year. The participants completed the scales in 7-15 minutes. All analyses were carried out by using SPSS 23.0 software. To address the RQs of study, the correlation and regression analyses were used. Prior to regression analysis, the assumptions such as normality distribution, outliers, linearity, and multicollinearity were tested. The skewness and kurtosis values were checked for normality. The values ranged from +2 and -2 for all sub-factors of the variables.

When the relationships between the independent variables were examined, the highest correlation value was .48. Büyüköztürk (2012) expressed that if this value is above .80, there can be multi-connection problem. According to regression analysis, Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values ranged from 1.14 to 2.67 and Tolerance Value (TV) ranged from .30 to .59. Büyüköztürk (2012) also suggested that there can be multi-connection problem when VIF is above .10 and TV is less than .20.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

According to the descriptive statistics, most of the participants had more authoritative style ($M = 4.24$, $SD = .42$) and less indifferent style ($M = 2.85$, $SD = .75$). Whereas the AtME ($M = 3.48$, $SD = .73$) and AtDE scores of prospective teachers ($M = 3.11$, $SD = .59$) were high, the AtCD ($M = 1.67$, $SD = .42$) and their BAtME ($M = 2.51$, $SD = .62$) scores were low. Table 1 shows the mean, standard deviation as descriptive statistics.

Prior to correlation and regression analyses, the effects of the variables of gender and grade on multicultural education attitude and classroom management styles were checked. For this, the independent sample t test and one-way ANOVA were used, respectively. The results showed that these demographic variables had no significant effect on the sub-factors of the scales ($p > .05$). The results showed that the prospective teachers' multicultural education attitude can be examined independently from demographic variables.

Correlation Analysis

To answer RQ1, correlation analysis was conducted. The results revealed that there were significant relationships between the sub-factors of variables. Table 1 shows the correlation coefficients for all variables.

Table 1. The findings of descriptive statistics and correlation analysis.

Variable	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Authoritarian	3.35 (.69)	1	.23**	.34**	.48**	.30**	.36**	.17**	.22**	.22**
2. Authoritative	4.24 (.42)		1	.48**	.06	.56**	-.16**	.71**	.73**	.66**
3. Laissez-faire	3.49 (.56)			1	.40**	.44**	.22**	.30**	.41**	.39**
4. Indifferent	2.85 (.75)				1	.18**	.49**	.05	.09	.12*
5. AtME	3.48 (.73)					1	-.21**	.57**	.67**	.61**
6. BAtME	2.51 (.62)						1	-.21**	-.16**	-.10**
7. AtDE	3.11 (.59)							1	.66**	.41**
8. AtD	3.00 (.55)								1	.46**
9. AtCD	1.67 (.42)									1

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, AtME: Attitude towards Multicultural Education, BAtME: Biased Attitude towards Multicultural Education, AtDE: Attitude Democracy Education, AtD: Attitude towards Democracy, AtCD: Attitude towards Cultural Differences

As shown in Table 1, while authoritative style was positively and moderately correlated with AtME ($r = .56$), AtDE ($r = .71$), AtD ($r = .73$), and AtCD ($r = .66$), it was negatively and weakly correlated with BAtME ($r = -.16$). Laissez-faire style was positively and moderately correlated with AtME ($r = .44$), AtD ($r = .41$), and AtCD ($r = .39$). It was also positively and weakly correlated with BAtME ($r = .22$) and AtDE ($r = .30$). There was a positive and moderate significant relationship between indifferent style and BAtME ($r = .49$). Indifferent style was positively and weakly correlated with AtME ($r = .18$) and AtCD ($r = .12$). As indifferent style was not significantly correlated with both AtD and AtDE, it was not included in the regression analysis.

Regression Analysis

To answer RQ2, regression analysis was conducted. The results showed that some independent variables were significant predictors of the dependent variables. Table 2 shows the findings of regression analysis.

Table 2. The findings of regression analysis.

Variable	B^a	SE^b	β^c	t	F	ΔR^2
AtME						
Authoritarian	.21	.09	.11	2.21**		
Authoritative	.97	.09	.45	9.83**	59.92	.42
Laissez-faire	.31	.10	.15	3.07**		
Indifferent	.06	.08	.04	.41		
BAtME						
Authoritarian	.59	.13	.21	4.43**		
Authoritative	-.97	.14	-.31	-6.57**	49.54	.34
Laissez-faire	.46	.15	.15	3.05**		
Indifferent	.90	.13	.34	6.82**		
AtDE						
Authoritarian	.06	.07	.04	.89		
Authoritative	1.06	.07	.62	13.59**	64.37	.40
Laissez-faire	-.01	.08	-.00	-.18		
AtD						
Authoritarian	.08	.06	.05	1.32		
Authoritative	.97	.06	.60	14.06**	85.09	.47
Laissez-faire	.16	.07	.10	2.33**		
AtCD						
Authoritarian	.10	.05	.09	1.81		
Authoritative	.47	.06	.38	7.62**	34.52	.27
Laissez-faire	.17	.06	.15	2.73**		
Indifferent	-.01	.05	-.01	-.20		

** $p < .001$, ^aUn-Standardized Beta Coefficient, ^bStandard Error, ^cStandardized Beta Coefficient

As shown in Table 2, all the independent variables together explained 42% of the total variance of AtME ($F_{(4,490)} = 59.92, p < .001$). The strongest significant predictor was authoritative style ($\beta = .45$) while indifferent style was not a significant predictor of AtME ($p > .05$). The independent variables together explained 34% of the total variance of BAtME ($F_{(4,490)} = 49.54, p < .001$). All of the independent variables were significant predictors of BAtME: indifferent ($\beta = .34$), authoritative ($\beta = -.31$), authoritarian ($\beta = .21$), and laissez-faire ($\beta = .15$). The independent variables explained together 40% of the total variance of AtDE ($F_{(4,490)} = 64.37, p < .001$). The strongest significant predictor was authoritative style ($\beta = .62$) and other styles were not significant predictors of AtDE ($p > .05$). The independent variables altogether explained 47% of the total variance of AtD ($F_{(4,390)} = 85.09, p < .001$). The strongest significant predictor was authoritative ($\beta = .60$). None of the authoritarian and indifferent styles were significant predictors of AtD ($p > .05$). Lastly, the independent variables together explained 27% of the total variance of AtCD ($F_{(4,490)} = 34.52, p < .001$). The strongest

predictor was authoritative style ($\beta = .38$), yet authoritarian and indifferent styles were not significant predictors of AtCD.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results showed that prospective teachers had mostly authoritative style in terms of classroom management. This finding is consistent with the results of some similar studies in the literature (Ekici, Aluçdibi & Öztürk, 2012; Yurtal & Yaşar, 2018). In the research, the prospective teachers' attitudes towards multicultural education and democracy are generally positive. Remarkably, it is an important finding that they have low attitudes towards cultural differences. This finding indicates that students have general knowledge about multicultural education and democracy, but more specifically, they do not have enough information about cultural differences and sensitivities.

The studies in the literature have shown that educators have basic competencies and positive tendencies about multicultural education in general (Başbay, Kağnıcı & Sarsar, 2013; Karakaş & Erbaş, 2018; Perkins, 2012). However, some studies conducted about prospective teachers have emphasized that they do not have sufficient knowledge and skills about multicultural education since there is no course or curriculum for multicultural education (Erbaş, 2019; Aslan, 2017; Kaya, 2014). This shows that, in general, theoretical and practical activities towards multicultural education are insufficient. Similarly, Taştekin et al. (2016) indicated that there were deficiencies in preschool teachers' classroom activities related to multicultural education during the implementation process although their attitudes towards multicultural education were positive. In this respect, it is regarded important to focus on the integration of multicultural education into curricula by conducting a systematic and planned needs analysis for multicultural education.

According to the results of the correlation analysis, there was a significant relationship between prospective teachers' classroom management styles and their attitudes towards democracy and multicultural education. Specifically, the attitudes of prospective teachers with authoritative classroom management style towards multicultural education, democracy, democracy education and cultural differences were found to be remarkably positive. There were moderately positive significant relationships between laissez-faire classroom management style and prospective teachers' attitudes towards multicultural education, democracy and cultural differences. In addition, prospective teachers' biased attitudes towards multicultural education are positively correlated with indifferent, authoritarian, and laissez-faire classroom management styles while they are negatively and weakly correlated with authoritative classroom management style. According to these results, it can be said that authoritative management style is compatible with democratic and multicultural understanding. On the other hand, this also indicates that prospective teachers with other management styles have biases towards multicultural education. These findings are related to within the scope of democratic values (Çiftçi, 2015; Yılmaz, 2010).

According to the findings obtained from the regression analysis, the most powerful predictor of the attitude towards multicultural education is authoritative classroom management style. This means that prospective teachers with authoritative style can have positive attitudes towards democracy, democracy education, and cultural differences. Therefore, teachers need to have an authoritative understanding of classroom management in order to create a positive classroom climate for multicultural education. On the other hand, authoritative style is a negative predictor of multicultural education while indifferent and authoritarian classroom management style is a positive predictor of biased attitude towards multicultural education.

Educational implications

This study has some educational inferences in the light of the findings. Authoritative classroom management is considered important in creating a democratic classroom climate and minimizing the problems arising from individual differences of learners. Therefore, it can be focused on the necessary activities for prospective teachers to adopt authoritative management style. On the

other hand, it should also be focused on the internalization of the multicultural education and democratic values by teachers. For this purpose, the integration of multicultural education into the curricula and teaching courses such as classroom management and teaching principles, methods, and techniques can be provided in teacher education. It is also possible that the students who will be educated by teachers who have been raised with a democratic understanding will develop positive attitudes towards these concepts. In addition, as a role-model in teacher education, the academicians' management behaviours in the classroom can be a latent variable in the formation of classroom management styles of prospective teachers.

It is known that the considerations such as a good management of not only the teaching resources but also the individuals, the provision of the coordination in student behaviours with an effective supervision and the creation of a positive learning environment are on the foreground while talking about a good classroom management (Taylor, 2009). Besides, the democratic behaviours of the teachers and the frequency of these behaviours in the classroom climate are important for the students to imitate these behaviours. Considering that teachers are also influenced by student behaviours, this democratic environment created by mutual interaction minimizes the problems such as "relationship management" and "behaviour management" which were put forward by Akin, Yıldırım and Goodwin (2016) as some of the problems experienced by teachers in classroom management.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This study has some limitations. First, the study sample consists of prospective teachers, not teachers in service. Although it is a strong criterion that the prospective teachers are taking the classroom management course in selecting the sample of the present study, the inclusion of in-service teachers in the research is important for questioning the generalizability of the findings obtained from this study. Secondly, the recent study focused on the classroom management styles and attitudes towards multicultural education in a correlational context. Further research should examine the relationship the attitudes towards multicultural education and the variables such as democratic values, classroom climate, educational beliefs, critical thinking. Modelling studies can be also conducted.

Today, education systems have shaped to constructivist approach. Hence, the understanding of classroom management shifts from an authoritarian and teacher-centered understanding to a democratic and student-centered one. Although this change occurs in theory, the teachers' managerial behaviours, communication styles and biases are affected by their attitudes and beliefs during the practice in the classroom. Importantly, these relational issues also fall within the scope of the hidden curriculum covering unintended learning outside the formal curriculum (Fidan & Tuncel, 2018). Therefore, classroom management styles and attitudes towards multicultural education may also be the subject of research in the context of the hidden curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Akçaoğlu, M. Ö. (2017). Çokkültürlü eğitim uygulamasının öğretmen adaylarının çokkültürlü eğitim ile sınıf yönetimi tutum ve yeterliklerine etkisi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Akın, S., Yıldırım, A., & Goodwin, A. L. (2016). Classroom management through the *eyes of elementary teachers in Turkey: A phenomenological study*. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 16, 771-797.
- Aktan, S., & Sezer, F. (2018). *Sınıf yönetimi stilleri ölçeğinin psikometrik özelliklerinin incelenmesi*. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 26(2), 439-449.
- Aslan, M. (2017). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin çokkültürlü eğitim ile ilgili görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(2), 231-253.

- Aslan, M., & Kozikođlu, İ. (2017). Öğretmenlerin çokkültürlü eğitime yönelik tutumları: Van ili örneđi. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31, 729-737.
- Banks, J. A. (1994). *Multicultural education: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, C. A. M., & Banks, J. A. (1995). Equity pedagogy: An essential component of multicultural education. *Theory into Practice*, 34(3), 152-158.
- Banks, J. A. (2002). Transforming the mainstream curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, 51(8), 4-8.
- Banks, J. A. (2008). *An introduction to multicultural education*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Banks, J. A. (2010). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 3-30) (7th ed.). ABD: Wiley.
- Bennett, C., Niggle, T., & Stage, F. (1990). Preservice multicultural teacher education: Predictors of student readiness. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 6(3), 243-254.
- Başbay, A., Kađnıcı, D. Y., & Sarsar, F. (2013). Eğitim fakültelerinde görev yapmakta olan öğretim elemanlarının çok kültürlü yeterlik algılarının incelenmesi. *Turkish Studies*, 8(3),47-60.
- Bosworth, B. (1997). What is your classroom management profile? Teacher talk-a publication for secondary education teachers, 1(2). Retrieved from <http://protectiveschools.org/drugstats/tt/v1i2/table.html>.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2012). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı: İstatistik, araştırma deseni, SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum* (17. baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (13. baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Cho, G., & DeCastro-Ambrosetti, D. (2005). Is ignorance bliss? Pre-service teachers' attitudes toward multicultural education. *The High School Journal*, 89(2), 24-28.
- Çiftçi, A. S. (2015). İlkokul öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetim tarzları ve demokratik değerlere ilişkin görüşleri arasındaki ilişki. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Ekici, G., Aluçdibi, F., & Öztürk, N. (2012). Biyoloji öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi profillerinin cinsiyet ve kıdem değişkenleri açısından incelenmesi. *Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 4(8), 13-30.
- Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., & Worsham, M. E. (2003). *Classroom management for secondary teachers* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ertürk, S. (1993). *Diktacı tutum ve demokrasi*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Erbaş, Y.H. (2019). A qualitative case study of multicultural education in Turkey: Definitions of multiculturalism and multicultural education. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 15(1), 23-43. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2019.184.2>
- Eryaman, M. Y. (2007). From reflective practice to practical wisdom: Toward a post-foundational teacher education. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 3(1), 87-107.
- Fidan, M., & Tuncel, M. (2018). Evaluation of information technologies teachers' in-class behaviours in the context of hidden curriculum. *Journal of Education and Future*, 14, 31-56.

- Gay, G. (1995). Curriculum theory and multicultural education. In J. A. Banks & C. A. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 25-43). New York: Macmillan.
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23-74.
- Karakaş, H., & Erbaş, Y.H. (2018). Öğretmen adaylarının çokkültürlü deneyimleri ve (Türkiye'deki) kültürel ve sosyal gruplara yönelik düşünceleri. *Uluslararası Sosyal ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5 (9), 59-81. <https://doi.org/10.20860/ijoses.374599>
- Kaya, Y. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının çokkültürlü eğitim hakkındaki bilgi, farkındalık ve yeterliliklerinin belirlenmesi. *Asya Öğretim Dergisi*, 2(1), 102-115.
- Koçak, S., & Özdemir, M. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının çok kültürlü eğitime yönelik tutumlarında kültürel zekânın rolü. *Elementary Education Online*, 14(4), 1352-1369.
- May, S., & Sleeter, C. (2010). Introduction. In S. May & C. Sleeter (Eds.), *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Myers, D. G. (1996). *Social psychology*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc
- Parekh, B. C. (2002). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Perkins, R. M. (2012). The multicultural awareness, knowledge, skills and attitudes of prospective teachers: A quantitative and heuristic phenomenological study. *Unpublished Phd thesis*, University of Missouri-Kansas.
- Premier, J. A., & Miller, J. (2010). Preparing pre-service teachers for multicultural classrooms. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(2), 35-48.
- Riedler, M. & Eryaman M.Y. (2016). Complexity, Diversity and Ambiguity in Teaching and Teacher Education: Practical Wisdom, Pedagogical Fitness and Tact of Teaching. *International Journal of Progressive Education*. 12(3): 172-186
- Sleeter, C., & McLaren, P. (1995). *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Tavşancıl, E. (2014). *Tutumların ölçülmesi ve SPSS ile veri analizi* (5.basım). Ankara: Nobel yayın dağıtım.
- Taylor, B. (2009). Classroom management impacts student achievement. Retrieved from <http://Files.Eric.Ed.Gov/Fulltext/ED506815.Pdf>
- Toraman, Ç., Acar, F., & Aydın, H. (2015). Primary school teachers' attitudes and knowledge levels on democracy and multicultural education: A scale development study. *Review of Research and Social Intervention*, 49, 41-58.
- Van der Zee K., Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Ponterotto, J. G., & Fietzer, A. W. (2013). Multicultural personality questionnaire: Development of a short form. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95(1), 118-124.
- Yaşar Ekici, F. (2017). Cultural intelligence levels of pre-service pre-school teachers and their attitudes towards multicultural education. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 25(5), 1941-1956.

- Yazıcı, S., Başol, G., & Toprak, G. (2009). Öğretmenlerin çokkültürlü eğitim tutumları: Bir güvenilirlik ve geçerlik çalışması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 37, 229-242.
- Yurtal, F., & Yaşar, M. (2018). Peer bullying in classes according to teachers' classroom management profiles. *SDU International Journal of Educational Studies*, 5(2), 64-75.