UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Antecedents, implications, and professional development of teachers' multiculturalism

Abacioglu, C.S.

Publication date
2022

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Abacioglu, C. S. (2022). *Antecedents, implications, and professional development of teachers' multiculturalism*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

Appendix C

Supplementary Chapter 5

Part 1 - Pilot Study

The first aim of this pilot was to identify misbehaviors that teachers face in their classrooms. Teachers were asked to describe a problematic incident they had recently experienced in class due to student misbehaviors (e.g., aggression between students, no attention to the lesson, absent-mindedness). The second aim was to identify teachers' interventions. They were therefore asked to describe their immediate and/or delayed interventions to the incident. The results of this pilot study were used when preparing the measurement of teacher interventions in our main study, which subsequently tested our hypotheses.

Method

Participants, Procedure, and Measures

We conducted the pilot study using an online survey with open-ended questions. In total, 25 participants were reached via a Facebook advertisement, targeting teachers in Dutch primary schools located in Amsterdam.

Following the steps of Hsieh and Shannon (2005), we performed content analysis on the reported problematic incidents and teacher interventions. We assigned a code to each answer in order to reduce our data. Answers related to the same misbehavior within the problematic incidents and same teacher interventions were respectively clustered together to detect patterns and trends, on which we grounded our conclusions.

Since student misbehaviors were relatively well studied in the literature, and the nature of the identified misbehaviors in our study was in line with misbehaviors identified in primary and secondary schools from various parts of the world–for instance, from United Kingdom (Houghton, Wheldall, & Merrett, 1988), from Australia, (Little, 2005), from Norway, (Stephens, Kyriacou, & Tønnessen, 2005), and from China (Sun & Shek, 2012)–we used predetermined codes (i.e., directed content analysis) obtained from a similar exploratory study of Sun and Shek (2012) for clustering the reported misbehaviors. However, since teachers' intervention strategies are less studied–especially in the Netherlands context–and since they are the main interest of our study, we did not use premeditated codes when analyzing the reported teacher interventions in order to permit the clusters to emerge from the data (i.e., conventional content analysis).

Results and Discussion

Every teacher described one problematic incident he/she recently experienced in the classroom (i.e., 25 reported incidents in total). The main misbehavior categories that emerged

from the described problematic incidents were 'verbal and physical aggression', 'talking out or turn/hindering others', 'disrespecting the teacher', and 'non-attentiveness/daydreaming/ idleness/ sleeping'.

Table S1

Summary of Teacher Perceptions on Student Misbehaviors

Misbehavior Category	Frequency of Misbehavior	Frequency of Incidents Involving Ethnic Minority Children
Verbal and physical aggression	9	4
Talking out of turn, hindering others	8	5
Disrespecting the teacher	6	5
Non-attentiveness, daydreaming, idleness, sleeping	5	2

Note. Some of the reported problematic incidents involved more than one category of misbehavior.

We asked each teacher to indicate their immediate and/or delayed intervention(s) to the problematic incident they reported. While most of the intervention categories we identified are punitive in nature, the most frequently reported teacher intervention to the student misbehaviors ('discuss the misbehavior with the student in private') is relatively neutral (Table 2). This finding is in line with that of previous studies, which suggest that teachers, in general, react often mildly rather than harshly to common student misbehaviors (e.g., talking out of turn; Glock, 2016). Moreover, rewarding good behavior could be a long-term follow-up intervention that might not have been captured within the scope of our study. Alternatively, as we asked teachers to indicate only problematic incidents, we might have primed them to report mostly punitive or neutral interventions to the misbehaviors described in the incidents.

Table S2

Summary of Teacher Interventions to Student Problem Behaviors

Category	Frequency
Warn & express disapproval (warn)	7
Give detention/time-out/send out of class (expel)	8
Discuss the behavior with the student in private (discuss)	16
Contact parents	3

Note. There are more than 25 interventions, because some of the reported interventions were assigned to more than one category.

The most frequently reported student misbehaviors and teacher interventions were used to create the instrument for measuring teacher interventions in the main study. The misbehaviors summarized in Table 1 were used to create short vignettes describing student misbehaviors, and the teacher interventions summarized in Table 2 were used to create options for teachers to report on the interventions they would give to the misbehaviors described in the vignettes. Next to the teacher interventions identified in the pilot study, we also provided the teachers with a intervention option of 'doing nothing'. This is because during the pilot study, we asked teachers to report on what they did when they faced with a recent problematic incident. However, this might have led them to feel obliged to report an actual action. However, 'doing nothing' could in itself be an intervention.

Part 2 - Measuring Teacher Interventions

Table S3

Vignettes and Their Two Version Per Scenario

VIGNETTE	VERSION 1	VERSION 2
1	**not cooperating with others**	
EN	XX does not want to cooperate with the other students during an in-class group exercise. This behavior is disrupting for the classroom atmosphere and the other students cannot work on their exercise.	XX refuses to work within a group during a class activity. This behavior is disturbing overall atmosphere and the other classmates cannot focus on their activity.
NL	XX wil niet meedoen met de andere leerlingen tijdens een lesopdracht. Dit gedrag is storend voor de atmosfeer in de klas en de andere leerlingen kunnen zo niet aan hun opdracht werken.	XX weigert om in een groepje te werken tijdens een lesopdracht. Dit gedrag is storend voor de atmosfeer in de klas en de andere leerlingen kunnen zich niet concentreren op hun activiteit.
2	**verbal/physical aggression**	
EN	There is a conflict between two students. One of them, XX, starts to verbally challenge and physically threaten the other student with an aggressive attitude.	During a disagreement, XX starts to show aggressive behavior towards another student by physically intimidating and verbally attacking the other.
NL	Er is een conflict tussen twee leerlingen. Één van hen, XX , begint de ander verbaal uit te dagen en fysiek te bedreigen met een agressieve houding.	Tijdens een meningsverschil begint XX agressief gedrag tegen een andere leerling te vertonen, door de ander fysiek te intimideren en verbaal aan te vallen.
3	**hindering others**	

Table S3

Continued

VIGNETTE	VERSION 1	VERSION 2
EN	During class, XX is chatting with a classmate who is sitting nearby. The classmate is getting distracted and is giggling about a funny comment.	During class, XX keeps talking to a classmate. The classmate is being interrupted by the chatting and is laughing with the student about a funny drawing.
NL	Tijdens de les is XX aan het praten met een klasgenoot die nabij zit. De klasgenoot raakt afgeleid en is aan het giechelen over een grappige opmerking.	Tijden de les blijft XX praten met een klasgenoot. De klasgenoot wordt gestoord door het gepraat en is aan het lachen met de leerling over een grappige tekening.
4	**disrespecting the teacher**	
EN	XX starts being argumentative when you point out undesirable conduct. The student is talking back in a disrespectful manner.	After your comments to inappropriate behavior, XX starts disputing against you. The student's conduct with the teacher is very rude.
NL	XX spreekt u tegen wanneer u de leerling wijst op ongewenst gedrag en begint op een respectloze manier terug te praten.	Na uw commentaar op ongepast gedrag van XX begint deze met u te redetwisten. De omgang van de leerling met u is erg bot.
5	**non-attentiveness/daydreaming/idleness/sleeping**	
EN	XX is not paying attention to what you are saying. The student is daydreaming and does not listen to you.	XX is not actively involved in the lesson. The student is doodling on a notebook and does not pay attention to the course content.
NL	XX besteedt geen aandacht aan wat u zegt. De leerling is aan het dagdromen en luistert niet naar u.	XX is niet actief betrokken bij de les. De leerling is aan het schetsen in een notitieblok en besteedt geen aandacht aan de inhoud van de les.
6	**being out of seat**	
EN	XX does not want to go back inside after the break is over. The student wants to keep on playing outside.	XX does not want to be in the classroom and insists wanting to go home. The student wants to play computer games and does not want to listen to the course content.
NL	XX wil niet terug naar binnen na de pauze. De leering wil door blijven spelen buiten.	XX wil niet in het klaslokaal zijn en dringt erop aan naar huis te willen gaan. De leerling wil computerspelletjes spelen en wil niet luisteren naar de les.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

There are quite a number of correlations between the teacher interventions that are greater than .3, which suggests that factor analysis could be appropriate here (see Tables S3 and S4).

Table S4

Correlations of the Teacher Interventions that are Averaged Across Scenarios: Ethnic Majority Target Group

Intervention	Do nothing	Warn	Expel	Discuss	Contact parents
Do nothing	1	-	-	-	-
Warn	.080 (.335)	1	-	-	-
Expel	-.064(.438)	.409** (.00)	1	-	-
Discuss	-146 (.077)	.062 (.455)	.178* (.03)	1	-
Contact parents	.014 (.863)	.256**(.002)	.309** (.00)	.403** (.00)	1

Note. * *p* < .05, ** *p* < .01.

Table S5

Correlations of the Behaviors that are Averaged Across Scenarios: Ethnic Minority Target Group

Intervention	Do nothing	Warn	Expel	Discuss	Contact parents
Do nothing	1	-	-	-	-
Warn	.119 (.149)	1	-	-	-
Expel	.125 (.131)	.363** (.00)	1	-	-
Discuss	-.151 (.068)	.044 (.594)	.151 (.068)	1	-
Contact parents	.022 (.79)	.238** (.004)	.340** (.00)	.359** (.00)	1

Note. * *p* < .05, ** *p* < .01.

The value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) was .58 and .61 for the ethnic majority and ethnic minority target groups respectively, which are within acceptable limits for factor analysis. The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant for both target groups (*p* < .01).

Meeting the analysis requirements, we conducted a separate exploratory factor analysis for teacher interventions (averaged across scenarios) for both the ethnic majority and ethnic minority target groups. Two components were extracted for each group using principal component analysis (PCA), explaining 59.5% and 60% of variance for ethnic majority

and ethnic minority target groups respectively. The retention of a factor was decided on Kaiser's eigenvalue greater than 1 criterion (Fabrigar et al., 1999), cumulative variance, and inspection of the scree plots. Factors were orthogonally rotated using Varimax rotation. Teacher interventions that load on the first factor (i.e., 'warn', 'expel', 'contact parents') suggest it represents interventions that are mostly punitive in nature, and the second factor (i.e., 'do nothing", 'discuss') suggests it represents interventions that are more neutral in nature (Table S5). We therefore refer to them as dismissive and tolerant respectively.

Table S6

Varimax Rotated Principal Component Matrix with Kaiser Normalization

Teacher Intervention	Ethnic Majority Target Group Component		Ethnic Minority Target Group Component	
	1	**2**	**1**	**2**
Do nothing	.196	-.697	.444	-.610
Warn	.777	-.238	.727	-.071
Expel	.747	.087	.765	.116
Discuss	.327	.737	.171	.805
Contact parents	.647	.395	.578	.536

*Rotation converged in 3 iterations.