

## Okul Yöneticilerinin Çok Kültürlü Kişilik, Farklılık Yaklaşımları ve Çatışma Yönetim Stratejileri Arasındaki İlişki

### The Relationship Between School Administrators' Multicultural Personality Traits, Diversity Perspectives and Conflict Management Strategies

Gizem Günçavdı-Alabay<sup>1</sup>

Doç. Dr. ◆ Bursa Uludağ University, Department of Educational Sciences ◆

[gizemguncavdi@uludag.edu.tr](mailto:gizemguncavdi@uludag.edu.tr) ◆ ORCID: 0000-0001-5055-2565

Soner Polat

Prof. Dr. ◆ Kocaeli University, Department of Educational Sciences ◆ [spolat@kocaeli.edu.tr](mailto:spolat@kocaeli.edu.tr) ◆

ORCID: 0000-0003-2407-6491

#### Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı, okul yöneticilerinin çok kültürlü kişilik özellikleri, farklılık yaklaşımları ve çatışma yönetimi stratejileri arasındaki ilişki hakkındaki algı ve görüşlerini incelemektir. Araştırma, açıklayıcı sıralı karma desen olarak tasarlanmıştır. Çalışmanın örneklemi 475 okul yöneticisinden oluşmuştur. Araştırmanın nicel boyutunda, okul yöneticilerinden Çok Kültürlü Kişilik Ölçeği, Farklılık Yaklaşımları Ölçeği ve Çatışma Yönetimi Stratejileri Ölçeği kullanılarak veri toplanmıştır. Araştırmanın nitel boyutunda ise nicel boyutta elde edilen dikkat çekici bulguların nedenlerini derinlemesine anlamak amacıyla yarı yapılandırılmış bir görüşme formu oluşturulmuştur. Bu doğrultuda 13 okul yöneticisi ile görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Okul yöneticilerinin çoğunluğunun yüksek oranda çok kültürlü kişilik özelliklerine sahip olduğu, farklılık yaklaşımlarında en çok renk körlüğü yaklaşımını benimsedikleri ve çatışma yönetiminde ise kaçınma stratejisini tercih ettikleri gözlemlenmiştir. Ayrıca, okul yöneticilerinin çok kültürlü kişilik özelliklerine sahip olmalarına rağmen, çatışmalardan kaçınmayı tercih etmeleri ve tüm çatışma yönetimi stratejilerinde zaman zaman homojenliğin desteklenmesi yaklaşımını benimsemeleri önemli bir bulgu olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Okul yöneticileri, renk körlüğü yaklaşımının tercih edilmesinin gerekçe olarak yönetici ve eğitim sistemiyle ilgili faktörleri öne çıkarmışlardır. Çatışma yönetiminde kaçınma stratejisinin tercih edilmesi ise yöneticinin çatışmalara yaklaşımındaki farklılıklar ve çatışma taraflarının özellikleriyle açıklanmıştır. Ayrıca, okul yöneticileri, çok kültürlü kişiliğe sahip yöneticilerin çatışma yönetiminde kaçınma stratejisini en yüksek düzeyde tercih etmelerinin, yönetici, eğitim sistemi, okul ve çatışmanın doğasıyla ilgili olabileceğini belirtmişlerdir. Son olarak, çok kültürlü kişiliğe sahip yöneticilerin homojenliğin desteklenmesini zaman zaman kullanamamalarının sebeplerini ise yönetici ve eğitim sistemiyle ilgili faktörlerle açıklamışlardır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Çok kültürlü kişilik, farklılık yaklaşımları, çatışma yönetimi, okul yöneticileri

#### Abstract

This study aims to examine the perceptions and views of school administrators regarding the relationship between their multicultural personality traits, diversity perspectives, and conflict management strategies. The research is designed as an explanatory sequential mixed-methods approach. The sample of the study consists of 475 school administrators. In the quantitative aspect of the research, data were collected from the school administrators using the Multicultural Personality Scale, the Diversity Perspective Scale, and

<sup>1</sup> This research was produced from Gizem Günçavdı Alabay's Ph.D. dissertation with the same name, which was submitted to graduate from Kocaeli University, Institute of Social Sciences, Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economics Doctoral Program in 2022 and approved by the institute's board of directors on 05.07.2022.

the Conflict Management Strategies Scale. In the qualitative aspect of the research, a semi-structured interview form was developed to understand the reasons behind the findings obtained in the quantitative phase. In this regard, interviews were conducted with 13 school administrators. It was observed that the majority of school administrators exhibit high levels of multicultural personality traits, predominantly adopt the color-blind approach to diversity, and prefer the avoidance strategy in conflict management. Furthermore, school administrators tend to avoid conflicts and occasionally support homogeneity. School administrators explained their preference for the color-blind approach to factors related to both the administrators' personal views and the education system. The preference for the avoidance strategy in conflict management was explained by differences in the administrator's approach to conflicts and the nature of the conflict parties. Additionally, administrators stated that the high preference for the avoidance strategy might be related to factors such as the administrator, the education system, the school environment, and the nature of the conflict.

**Keywords:** Multicultural personality, diversity perspectives, conflict management, school administrators

## 1. Introduction

Developing technology, communication, and transportation tools enable individuals from many different cultures with different characteristics, competencies, and values to live, receive education, and work together. However, when individuals from different cultures interact, their unique differences and the cultures shaped by these differences can result in conflicts if not managed properly.

Conflict can be defined as the process that results in tension between group members due to existing or perceived differences (De Dreu & Weingart, 2003). Studies show that organizational managers spend half of their time dealing with conflict processes (Dana, 2001). It has been revealed that not only managers but also 42% of employees spend their time on existing conflicts or attempting to resolve conflicts in organizations (Dana, 2001). Researchers have revealed that using organizational conflict management strategies is necessary, and various models have been developed regarding this (Hall, 1996; DeDreu, Evers, Beersma, Kuluwer, & Nauta, 2001; Rahim, 1983). DeDreu et al. (2001) explained conflict management strategies with a five-dimensional model. These dimensions are problem-solving, compromise, avoiding, forcing, and yielding. Kirchmayer and Cohen (1992) stated that it is important to manage conflict effectively in multicultural organizations where the probability of conflicts is high due to cultural differences and different cultures coexist.

It is a fact that multicultural organizations need employees and employers with multicultural personalities in order to be successful in the modern world (Jannessari et al. 2024). As Kirchmayer and Cohen (1992) stated, multicultural personality is thought to be important since it is effective in conflict management strategies. Multicultural personality is a concept that affects an individual's ability to take an active role in intercultural interaction processes, to be successful while working in a multicultural environment professionally, and to adapt to such an environment personally (van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2000). For this reason, van der Zee and van Oudenhoven (2000) developed a Multicultural Personality Model for multicultural personality, which is an important concept in the 21st century, when the effects of differences increase in organizations. According to this developed model, multicultural personality consists of five dimensions: cultural empathy, openness, emotional stability, social initiative, and flexibility.

Multicultural personality, which is effective in the management of conflicts, is a feature that includes the adoption of the differences that individuals have. The differences between individuals in organizations are not only related to variables such as ethnic origin and race but also to variables such as age, gender, religious belief, sexual orientation, and physical and mental disability (Hubbard, 2004). It has become a necessity in the 21st century to manage the mentioned differences in line with the

aims of the organization and not ignore them (Khan & Javaid, 2023). For this reason, the management of differences has become an issue that should be given importance to organizations.

Cox and Blake (1991) argued that the differences that are managed effectively and used in line with the goals of the organization reduce the costs in the organization, facilitate the provision of equal resources, develop creativity, and find effective problem-solving techniques within the organization. For this reason, managing and approaching diversities in an optimal way has become an important issue for contemporary organizations (Chun & Evans, 2023; Mor et al., 2024; Toma & Martin, 2024). In order to understand, evaluate, and choose the best way to approach diversities, Podsiadlowski et al. (2013) grouped diversity approaches under five headings. These are reinforcing homogeneity, color blindness, fairness, access and integration-and-learning. The aforementioned approaches include different approaches from the point of view where the differences are completely ignored, and the differences are seen as wealth, and it is aimed to be used for the benefit of the organization. It is possible to say that among the diversity approaches, choosing the approaches where all differences are seen as wealth in the organization enables the effective management of differences.

When the studies in the literature are examined, it can be seen that these three concepts have been studied and tried to be understood in different organizations, from health organizations to hotels (Aseery et al., 2023; Jangsiriwattana & Duangkumnerd, 2023; Poquiz et al., 2023; Tracey et al., 2023). Studies showed that educational organizations are no exceptions for these concepts, and multicultural personality, diversity approaches, and conflict management have been studied in educational environments. For conflicts, the causes of conflicts experienced by stakeholders in schools have been among the subjects that have been studied (Kreidler, 1984: cited in Bettman and Moore, 1994; Türnüklü, 2007; Özmen & Aküzüm, 2010; Vestal, 2011). Regarding the relationship between conflict management and multicultural personality, Yıldızoğlu (2013) revealed that the personality traits of school administrators have a significant effect on conflict management strategies. In a similar study, Vallone et al. (2022) examined the relationship between teachers' multicultural personality traits and the conflict management strategies they preferred in conflicts and found that there was a correlation between the scores of teachers in the sub-dimensions of multicultural personality and their preferred conflict management strategies. Furthermore, studies conducted in educational organizations on diversity approaches showed that effective management of differences has positive effects on teachers' organizational commitment and organizational citizenship levels (Kurtulmuş, 2016), job satisfaction (Ateş & Ünal, 2021), and organizational happiness (Arslan & Polat, 2021). Differences that are not managed effectively lead to a decrease in the efficiency of the organization, a lack of communication between employees and managers, unfair recruitment and promotion, and, as a result, intra-organizational conflicts (Hubbard, 2004).

As technology, transportation, and communication tools continue to evolve, the changing conditions of today's world require employees from diverse backgrounds to collaborate within organizations. These modern interactions help foster multicultural environments, emphasizing the importance of multicultural personality traits in all types of organizations. Educational institutions, in particular, are among the settings where the interplay of these factors is most evident. Consequently, it is believed that the multicultural personality traits of educational administrators, along with their approach to diversity shaped by these traits, play a vital role not only in conflict management but also in all organizational processes. This study takes a unique approach by examining the intersection of school administrators' multicultural personality traits, their views on diversity, and their conflict management strategies. Exploring these interconnected dimensions sheds light on how multicultural personality traits shape practical administrative practices, especially in navigating diversity and resolving conflicts within schools. In light of this information, the aim of this research is to examine the relationship between school administrators' multicultural personality traits, their approaches to

differences, and conflict management strategies. In line with this general purpose, answers were sought to the following questions in quantitative and qualitative dimensions, respectively.

- 1) What is the level of perceived multicultural personality traits of school administrators?
- 2) What is the level of diversity perspectives adopted by school administrators?
- 3) What is the level of conflict management strategies used by school administrators?
- 4) How do multicultural personality traits predict diversity perspectives?
- 5) How do multicultural personality traits predict conflict management strategies?
- 6) How do diversity approaches predict conflict management strategies?
- 7) What are the opinions of school administrators about the reason why they adopt color blindness?
- 8) What are the opinions of school administrators on the reason why they mostly prefer avoiding?
- 9) What are the school administrators' views on the reasons why school administrators with multicultural personalities use avoiding conflict management strategies at the highest level?
- 10) What are the opinions of school administrators on the reason why the approach of reinforcing homogeneity, one of the diversity perspectives, is related to all conflict management strategies according to their perceptions?

## **2. Methodology**

### **2.1. Research Design**

The research was designed in an explanatory sequential research design. In this study, the explanatory sequential method was used in order to gain an idea of the general situation and understand the reason for the results obtained. In this research, quantitative data was collected and analyzed, and then it was explained in depth with qualitative data. Creswell (2011) stated that in the explanatory sequential design, quantitative data is first explained after being collected and analyzed, and secondly, inferences about how qualitative data help explain quantitative results after collecting and analyzing are included.

### **2.2. Participants**

#### ***2.2.1. The Population and Sample for the Quantitative Dimension***

The population of the study consists of 820 school administrators working in primary and secondary schools in the provinces of Kocaeli in the 2019-2020 academic year. Within the scope of the research, the questionnaires were distributed to all administrators working in Kocaeli during the in-service training they attended. The in-service training lasted approximately 2 months, and it was face-to-face. The researchers handed out the questionnaires to participating administrators. Some of them were absent, and some of them didn't want to participate in the study. Thus, 475 of them returned. To analyze missing values, Little's MCAR test was applied and multiple imputation technique was used. To analyze extreme values, the Mahalanobis distance was calculated. According to the results, 129 data were excluded from the analysis, and the responses of 347 school administrators were used in the data analysis process. The demographic information of participants is given in Table 1.

**Table 1.** *Demographic Data of the Sample in Quantitative Phase*

<b>Demographics</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	53	15.3
Male	276	79.5
<b>School Level</b>		
Kindergarten	31	8.9
Primary school	124	35.7
Elementary school	117	33.7
High school	54	15.6
<b>Age</b>		
28-34	26	6.2
35-39	57	16.4
40-44	73	21.0
45-49	89	25.6
50 +	94	27.1
<b>Managerial seniority</b>		
2 years and less	13	3.7
3-11 years	141	32.6
12-20 years	99	28.5
21-29 years	42	12.1
30 years and more	23	6.6

### **2.2.2. Study Group for the Qualitative Dimension of the Research**

The maximum variation method, which is one of the purposeful sampling methods, was used to determine the study group within the scope of the qualitative dimension of the research. Since it was aimed to ensure maximum diversity while determining the study group of the qualitative dimension of this research, the participants were selected from among the school administrators who work in primary and secondary education organizations in Kocaeli, have different managerial seniority, and belong to different age groups.

It is known that the number of people to be interviewed in order to achieve the research objectives within the scope of the qualitative dimension of the research will be sufficient when the saturation point is reached in the answers received in the interviews (Lincoln & Guba, 1985: p.202). Within the scope of this study, it was noticed that there was no new response in the interviews held after the interview with the 8th person. For this reason, it is thought that the highest saturation level has been reached in the data to be collected within the scope of research purposes. In order to control whether the aforementioned saturation level was reached during the research process, data collection and data analysis processes were carried out simultaneously. Since no new information was received from the next participants, the interviews were completed after the 13th participant.

The demographic information about the school administrators in the research and the codes given to the school administrators within the scope of the research are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** *Demographic Information of Participants in the Qualitative Phase*

School Administrator's Code	Gender	Age	Tenure of office	Managerial seniority	Duty	The school level of duty
M1	Male	36	13	5	Principal	Primary school
M2	Male	36	14	9	Principal	Primary school
M3	Male	36	13	3	Principal	Primary school
M4	Male	40	16	14	Principal	Elementary school
M5	Male	39	15	10	Principal	Elementary school
M6	Male	41	21	20	Principal	High school
M7	Male	38	15	3	Principal	Primary school
M8	Male	48	25	20	Principal	Elementary school
M9	Female	49	25	12	Principal	Primary school
M10	Male	43	21	18	Principal	High school
M11	Male	44	23	14	Principal	High school
MY1	Male	34	13	5	Vice-principal	High school
MY2	Male	46	21	5	Vice-principal	Elementary school

## 2.3. Data Collection Tools

### 2.3.1. Data Collection Tools Used in the Quantitative Dimension of the Research

In the quantitative part of the study, questions about demographic information, such as gender, age, and managerial seniority, were asked of school administrators. For the multicultural personality dimension of the study, the Multicultural Personality Scale was used. The scale was developed by Van Oudenhoven and van der Zee (2002, 2003) and adapted to Turkish by Polat (2009). It has five sub-dimensions and 33 items, and the total score of the scale can be calculated. The Multicultural Personality Scale has ten reverse-coded items. The goodness of fit indices of the scale were as follows:  $\chi^2 / df=2.412$ , NFI=0.92, GFI=0.91, RMSEA= 0.067. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale based on the data collected within the scope of this research is 0.78.

The Diversity Perspective Scale, which was developed by Podsiaclowski et al. (2013) and adapted into Turkish by Arslan and Polat (2016), was used in the study. The scale has 17 items and five sub-dimensions. Since each sub-dimension represents a different diversity approach, the total score of the scale cannot be calculated. There are not any reverse-coded items. The goodness of fit indices of the scale were as follows:  $\chi^2 / df=2.672$ , NFI=0.91, GFI=0.90, RMSEA= 0.074. In this study, the

Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients of the scale were found to be 0.67 for reinforcing homogeneity, 0.72 for color blindness, 0.65 for fairness, 0.68 for access, and 0.75 for integration and learning.

The Conflict Management Strategies Scale, developed by DeDreu (2001) and adapted into Turkish by Polat and Metin (2012), was used. The scale has 19 items and five sub-dimensions. As in the Diversity Perspective Scale, each sub-dimension represents a different conflict management strategy, and the total scale score cannot be calculated. There are not any reverse-coded items. The goodness of fit indices of the scale were as follows:  $\chi^2 / df = 1.978$ , NFI=0.94, GFI=0.93, RMSEA= 0.054. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients of the scale were found to be 0.79 for the problem solving, 0.80 for the compromise, 0.75 for the avoiding, 0.78 for the forcing, and 0.73 for the yielding.

### ***2.3.2. Semi-Structured Interview Form Used in the Qualitative Dimension of the Research***

The data in the qualitative part of the research were collected with a semi-structured interview form. The questions in the semi-structured interview form to be used in this research are related to the literature on multicultural personality (van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2000), diversity perspectives (Podsiadlowski et al., 2013) and conflict management strategies (DeDreu et al., 2001). It has been prepared by taking into account the results obtained as a result of both simple linear regression analysis and multiple linear regression analysis in the quantitative dimension of the research. The questions were designed to explore administrators' perspectives on employing various conflict management strategies, with a specific focus on the avoidance strategy and diversity approaches by focusing on the color-blindness approach, which were among the results of simple linear regression analyses. Also, the questions focused on the reasons behind the impact of reinforcing the homogeneity approach on each conflict management strategy, which was a result of multiple linear regression analysis.

## **2.4. Data Collection Process**

For the quantitative data, the questionnaires were distributed to 820 school administrators, who worked in primary and secondary schools in the provinces of Kocaeli in the 2019-2020 academic year, within the scope of in-service training. For the qualitative data, the data were collected between April 2020 and June 2020, which was during a pandemic. Thus, online interviews were conducted by using semi-structured interview forms.

## **2.5. Data Analysis**

### ***2.5.1. Analysis of the Quantitative Data***

In the analysis of the quantitative data, descriptive statistical techniques, simple linear regression, and multiple linear regression were used. The descriptive statistics of the data set include the arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of the variables. A simple linear regression analysis was used to examine the level of prediction of the Multicultural Personality Scale, for which a total score can be obtained. Multiple linear regression analysis was used when examining the predictive degree of the Diversity Perspective Scale and the Conflict Management Scale, whose total scores were not obtained. SPSS 25 package program was used in all analysis processes.

### ***2.5.2. Analysis of the Qualitative Data***

In the qualitative aspect of the research, the relationship between school administrators' multicultural personality traits, diversity approaches and conflict management strategies were tried to



be explained and examined in detail. In this direction, the audio recordings taken from the interviews were analyzed by being converted into text by the researcher in detail, including all the details related to the research purpose. The qualitative data of the research were analyzed using the descriptive analysis technique. Within the scope of the qualitative data analysis of the research, firstly, coding was performed to determine what the data obtained from the interviews with the school administrators could mean. Then, the related codes were brought together, and categories were created. In the description and naming of the categories, the theoretical background of the research cases and the findings related to the quantitative data were used as a framework for which the theme and main theme could be evaluated.

## **2.6. Ethical Concern**

Ethics committee approval was received for the research at the meeting of the Kocaeli University Social and Humanities Ethics Committee dated 21/11/2019 and numbered 2019/12.

## **3. Findings**

### **3.1. Findings on Quantitative Data**

Within the scope of the research, descriptive statistics were first examined. The data obtained showed that the multicultural personality traits of the school administrators ( $M= 3.60$ ,  $SD= 0.28$ ) were above the average. The arithmetic mean of school administrators' perceptions of the sub-dimensions of multiculturalism were, respectively, cultural empathy ( $M= 3.88$ ,  $SD= 0.36$ ), social initiative ( $M= 3.85$ ,  $SD= 0.48$ ), openness ( $M=3.48$ ,  $SD= 0.46$ ) emotional stability ( $M= 3.33$ ,  $SD=0.42$ ), and flexibility ( $M= 3.11$ ,  $SD=0.42$ ). When the data on diversity perspectives were examined, school administrators' perceptions of diversity perspectives were respectively color blindness ( $M= 4.19$ ,  $SD=0.57$ ), integration and learning ( $M=4.10$ ,  $SD= 0.53$ ), fairness ( $M= 3.86$ ,  $SD= 0.59$ ), access ( $M= 3.82$ ,  $SD= 0.62$ ) and reinforcing homogeneity ( $M= 3.43$ ,  $SD= 0.72$ ). Finally, school administrators' perceptions of conflict management strategies were respectively avoiding ( $M= 3.63$ ,  $SD=0.52$ ), problem-solving ( $M=3.56$ ,  $SD= 0.49$ ), compromise ( $M= 3.09$ ,  $SD= 0.55$ ), forcing ( $M= 3.04$ ,  $SD= 0.63$ ) and yielding ( $M= 2.79$ ,  $SD=0.71$ ).

Before conducting regression analysis, bivariate correlations between the independent variables were examined for the multicollinearity problem. The results in Table 3 show that the correlation between any two independent variables was not above 0.59. The fact that the correlation between variables did not exceed 0.80 indicates that there is no multicollinearity issue in the dataset. VIF values were also examined to test for multicollinearity. It was found that the VIF values ranged from approximately 1.321 to 1.998. The fact that the VIF values are below 10 supports the conclusion that there is no multicollinearity issue (Stevens, 2009).



**Table 3.** *The Results of Pearson Correlation Analysis*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Multicultural personality	1	0.23*	0.24*	0.35*	0.15*	0.05	0.19*	0.39*	0.43*	0.34*	0.45*
2. Problem solving		1	0.43*	0.30*	0.39*	0.21*	0.29*	0.21*	0.23*	0.28*	0.04
3. Compromising			1	0.39*	0.46*	0.33*	0.30*	0.22*	0.33*	0.32*	0.14*
4. Avoiding				1	0.45*	0.37*	0.27*	0.23*	0.27*	0.28*	0.20*
5. Forcing					1	0.48*	0.30*	0.12*	0.20*	0.19*	0.02
6. Yielding						1	0.25*	0.07	0.08	0.09	-0.05
7. Reinforcing homogeneity							1	0.29*	0.46*	0.43*	0.17*
8. Color-blindness								1	0.49*	0.47*	0.42*
9. Fairness									1	0.59*	0.52*
10. Access										1	0.36*
11. Integration and learning											1

\*p&lt;0.01

In order to examine the relationship between school administrators' perceptions of multicultural personality, diversity perspectives, and conflict management strategies, a simple linear regression analysis was applied. Since the total score for the Multicultural Personality Scale can be calculated, the simple linear regression analysis was conducted for the prediction level of multicultural personality on the other two variables separately. First, the results of the simple linear regression analysis applied to examine the relationship between school administrators' perceptions of multicultural personality traits and their perceptions of diversity perspectives are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4.** *Simple Linear Regression Analysis Results about the Multicultural Personality's Prediction of the Diversity Approaches*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4			Model 5		
	B	$\beta$	SE	B	$\beta$	SE	B	$\beta$	SE	B	$\beta$	SE	B	$\beta$	SE
Constant	1.714		0.50	1.377		0.38	0.568		0.38	1.171		0.42	1.004		0.34
Reinforcing homogeneity	0.477	0.182	0.14												
Color blindness				0.780	0.375	0.10									
Fairness							0.913	0.425	0.11						
Access										0.736	0.324	0.12			
Integration and learning													0.858	0.443	0.09
R <sup>2</sup>	0.033*			0.140*			0.181*			0.105*			0.196*		
F	11.880			56.333			76.056			40.596			84.076		

\*p&lt;0.001

When the data in Table 4 are examined. Model 1 was significant ( $F=11.880$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and multicultural personality predicted the 3% of reinforcing homogeneity ( $R^2=0.033$ ,  $t=3.447$ ). The  $\beta$  value of the model shows that a one-unit change in multicultural personality led to an 18% change in reinforcing homogeneity. The Model 2 was significant ( $F=56.333$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), as well, and multicultural personality predicted the 14% of color blindness ( $R^2=0.140$ ,  $t=7.506$ ). The  $\beta$  value of the model shows that a one-unit change in multicultural personality led to a 38% change in color blindness. When the

Model 3 was examined. It was seen that the model was significant ( $F=76.056$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and multicultural personality predicted 18% of fairness approach ( $R^2 = 0.181$ ,  $t=8.721$ ). The  $\beta$  value of the model shows that a one-unit change in multicultural personality led to a 43% change in fairness. The next model, Model 4, was significant ( $F=40.596$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and multicultural personality predicted the 10% of access ( $R^2 = 0.105$ ,  $t=6.371$ ). The  $\beta$  value of the model shows that a one-unit change in multicultural personality led to a 32% change in access. Lastly, Model 5 was also significant ( $F=84.076$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and multicultural personality predicted 20% of integration and learning approach ( $R^2 = 0.196$ ,  $t=9.169$ ). The  $\beta$  value of the model shows that a one-unit change in multicultural personality led to a 44% change in integration and learning.

Similarly, simple linear regression analysis was applied to examine the relationship between school administrators' perceptions of multicultural personality traits and their perceptions of conflict management strategies (Table 5).

**Table 5.** Simple Linear Regression Analysis Results for Multicultural Personality's Prediction of the Conflict Management Strategies

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4			Model 5		
	B	$\beta$	SE	B	$\beta$	SE	B	$\beta$	SE	B	$\beta$	SE	B	$\beta$	SE
Constant	2.231		0.34	1.515		0.38	1.369		0.35	1.907		0.44	2.224		0.061
Problem solving	0.379	0.221	0.09												
Compromise				0.438	0.220	0.10									
Avoiding							0.626	0.331	0.10						
Forcing										0.315	0.138	0.12			
Yielding													0.157	0.061	0.14
$R^2$	0.045*			0.049*			0.109*			0.019			0.004		
F	16.118			17.622			42.342			6.686			1.280		

\* $p<0.001$

When the data in Table 5 are examined. Model 1 was significant ( $F=16.118$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and multicultural personality predicted the 5% of problem-solving ( $R^2 = 0.045$ ,  $t=4.015$ ). The  $\beta$  value of the model shows that a one-unit change in multicultural personality led to a 22% change in problem-solving. The Model 2 was significant ( $F=17.622$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), as well, and multicultural personality predicted the 5% of compromise ( $R^2 = 0.049$ ,  $t=4.198$ ). The  $\beta$  value of the model shows that a one-unit change in multicultural personality led to a 22% change in compromise. When the Model 3 was examined, it was seen that model was significant ( $F=42.342$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and multicultural personality predicted 11% of avoiding approach ( $R^2 = 0.181$ ,  $t=8.721$ ). The  $\beta$  value of the model shows that a one-unit change in multicultural personality led to a 33% change in avoiding. However, model 4 ( $F=6.686$ ,  $p=0.101>0.05$ ), which examines the prediction level of multicultural personality on forcing, and Model 5, which examines the prediction level of multicultural personality on yielding ( $F=1.280$ ,  $p=0.259>0.05$ ) was not found to be significant.

After finishing simple linear regression analysis, multiple linear regression analysis was applied to examine the relationship between diversity approaches and each conflict management strategy. Since the total score for both scales cannot be calculated, the multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to analyze the prediction level of diversity approaches of conflict management strategies. The results are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6.** Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results on Predicting Conflict Management Strategies through Diversity Approaches

Models	Variables	Standard error	$\beta$	t	p	F	R	R <sup>2</sup>
Model 1-Problem Solving	Constant	0.24		10.30	0.00	10.282	0.37	0.13
	<b>Reinforcing homogeneity</b>	0.04	0.19	3.23	<b>0.00</b>			
	Color-blindness	0.06	0.10	1.56	0.12			
	Fairness	0.06	0.04	0.48	0.63			
	<b>Access</b>	0.05	0.18	2.64	<b>0.01</b>			
	Integration and learning	0.06	-0.10	-1.59	0.11			
Model 2-Compromise	Constant	0.27		6.43	0.00	12.273	0.40	0.16
	<b>Reinforcing homogeneity</b>	0.04	0.14	2.49	<b>0.01</b>			
	Color-blindness	0.06	-0.03	-0.48	0.66			
	<b>Fairness</b>	0.07	0.22	3.06	<b>0.00</b>			
	<b>Access</b>	0.06	0.17	2.58	<b>0.01</b>			
	Integration and learning	0.06	-0.06	-1.05	0.29			
Model 3- Avoiding	Constant	0.26		7.99	0.00	9.150	0.35	0.12
	<b>Reinforcing homogeneity</b>	0.04	0.21	3.56	<b>0.00</b>			
	<b>Color-blindness</b>	0.06	0.13	2.01	<b>0.05</b>			
	Fairness	0.07	0.01	0.08	0.94			
	Access	0.06	0.04	0.61	0.54			
	Integration and learning	0.06	0.09	1.45	0.15			
Model 4-Forcing	Constant	0.32		6.74	0.00	7.961	0.33	0.11
	<b>Reinforcing homogeneity</b>	0.05	0.25	0.00	<b>0.00</b>			
	Color-blindness	0.08	-0.02	-0.26	0.80			
	Fairness	0.08	0.06	0.80	0.14			
	Access	0.07	0.06	0.80	0.42			
	Integration and learning	0.07	0.09	-1.51	0.13			
Model 5-Yielding	Constant	0.36		6.28	0.00	4.783	0.26	0.07
	Reinforcing homogeneity	0.06	0.25	4.14	<b>0.00</b>			
	Color-blindness	0.09	-0.01	-0.07	0.95			
	Fairness	0.09	-0.01	-0.14	0.89			
	Access	0.08	0.04	0.50	0.62			
	Integration and learning	0.09	-0.07	-1.17	0.24			

As it can be seen in Table 6, in the first multiple regression model, it was examined how much the school administrators' diversity perspectives predicted the problem-solving dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of conflict management strategies, and this model was found to be significant ( $F= 10.282$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), and it was also found that diversity perspectives predicted problem-solving strategy ( $F= 10.282$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).  $R=0.365$ ,  $R^2=0.133$ ); reinforcing homogeneity was found to be the first in the relative importance of all predictive variables on the problem-solving sub-dimension ( $\beta = 0.19$ ). The second multiple regression model examined how much of the difference perspectives predicted the compromise dimension. The analysis was significant ( $F= 12.723$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and the degree to which the difference perspectives predicted the compromise strategy was also significant ( $R= 0.40$ ,  $R^2= 0.16$ ). Reinforcing homogeneity was found to be third in relative importance on the compromise sub-dimension of all predictive variables ( $\beta = 0.14$ ).

The third multiple linear regression analysis conducted within the scope of the study examined the relationship between diversity perspective and avoiding strategy, and it was found that it was significant ( $F= 9.150$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), and the degree of predicting the avoiding strategy was also significant ( $R= 0.35$ ,  $R^2=0.12$ ). It was seen that reinforcing homogeneity was the first in relative importance on the avoiding sub-dimension of all predictive variables ( $\beta = 0.21$ ). Within the scope of the fourth multiple regression model of the research, the relationship between diversity perspectives and forcing strategy was examined. The results show that the multiple regression analysis performed is significant ( $F= 7.961$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and the degree of predicting the forcing strategy of the diversity perspectives is also significant ( $R= 0.33$ ,  $R^2= 0.11$ ). In addition, the results of the analysis reveal that reinforcing homogeneity is the first in the relative importance of all predictive variables on the forcing sub-dimension ( $\beta = 0.25$ ). Within the scope of the fifth and last multiple regression model of the research, the results showed that the model was significant ( $F= 4.783$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and it showed a significant relationship ( $R= 0.26$ ,  $R^2= 0.07$ ). It reveals that reinforcing homogeneity is the first in the relative importance of all predictive variables on the fit sub-dimension ( $\beta = 0.25$ ).

The qualitative data of the research were analyzed in line with the remarkable and unexpected findings from the data obtained in the quantitative dimension of the research designed in explanatory sequential design.

### **3.2. Findings on Qualitative Data**

The first of the unexpected results obtained in the quantitative dimension of the research is that school administrators prefer color blindness the most among the diversity perspectives. The reasons obtained in line with the opinions of the school administrators regarding this issue were grouped under two themes as the reasons related to the administrator and the reasons related to the education system (Table 7).

**Table 7.** *Reasons for School Administrators to Prefer Color Blindness Approach at the Highest Level*

Themes	Categories	Participants
The reasons related to the administrator	Lack of knowledge	(M2), (M8), (M9), (M10)
	Avoiding responsibility	(M6), (M11)
	Fear of loss of reputation	(M6), (MY1)
	To support those the administrators feel close to	(M5)
	Personal characteristics of the administrator	(M7)
The reasons related to the education system	Inability to see the differences due to the influence of the education system	(M1), (M3), (M8)
	Maintaining school order	(MY1), (M10)
	Lack of planning	(M8), (M9)
	Workload	(M8), (M9)

When the opinions of the school administrators in Table 7 on the reasons related to the administrator are examined, it is possible to say that the school administrators see the lack of knowledge about the characteristics and differences that a leader administrator should have, their tendency to avoiding responsibility, their fear of loss of reputation, administrators' tendency to support the ones they feel close to and their personal characteristics as the reason for preferring color blindness. Below are some example utterances of school administrators:

*"Because this is something that requires professionalism. Administrators, guidance counselors and, if necessary, teachers should also be trained. An infrastructure must be created so that it is not ignored. When they don't know these things and don't know what to do, people inevitably don't want to be forced".* (M8)

*"Sometimes our administrators may hesitate to take responsibility. Or they think that ignoring the problem will solve it. They leave it to time. But as you say, this can cause color blindness. He pretends it didn't happen."* (M11)

*"The existing wheels are working somehow. Whatever the school is, whether it is a well-known school or a successful school, they do not accept it, because they think that when something different happens to a system that works like this, it will slow down the system and sometimes prevent it. They think their school and themselves will be discredited."* (MY1)

*"The administrator sees what he knows correctly. He does not pay attention to those who are not close to him. He says he continues with the one closest to him. I think that means moving on with whom is close to him."* (M5)

*"I take it personally. It's a matter of taking initiative, a matter of being able to lead, a matter of worrying. I see it that way a little (...) I also think that it is a matter of creation."* (M7)

School administrators emphasize that dealing with diversities requires knowledge and ability. They underline that school administrators may prefer not to consider differences because they prefer to avoid taking responsibility. It is also stated in the statements of school administrators that school administrators have the potential to see differences as a threat to their organizations or to lose their current position. In addition to these, although it is less described by school administrators, it is possible to say that some school administrators manage the organization only by considering what they see close to themselves and the school administrator's lack of leadership ability is the reason why color blindness is preferred among the diversity perspectives.

When the opinions of school administrators on the reasons related to the education system are examined, the influence of the education system, maintaining the existing school order, lack of planning, extreme workload on school administrators are seen among the reasons to prefer color blindness. Some of the utterances are presented below:

*"A strategy has not been adopted in national education, let alone in national education, there should be a country policy regarding this. Administrators are struggling because there is no politics, they do not know what to do, frankly."* (M8)

*"While you were explaining this, something came up in my mind again. When I think about the examples around a little bit, principals will explain with fancy sentences that s/he sees differences as richness when you talk to them in theory, but in practice, it does not mean much. The school has an existing systematic and the administrators do not want it to be spoiled. Differences also hinder this systematic in their eyes."* (MY1)

*"(...) every school should have its own plan. The country will have a general framework plan, and the school will apply that plan to itself. However, there is no such plan. Since it does not exist, we cannot include it in the process even though we know the differences."* (M8)

*"Moreover, administrators work so hard that they may not notice the differences. We really can't spend too much time scrutinizing 'which one has what talent, how much time I spent with him, how much I can benefit from it'."* (M9)

The school administrators see the current education system's pushing school administrators not to consider differences and the lack of an education policy regarding this issue as the most important reason for the adoption of the color blindness approach regarding the education system. School administrators also stated that some administrators try to preserve the current functioning of the school in some way, there is no planning regarding the differences in the current education system, and the heavy workload on school administrators due to the fact that there are many important issues to deal with, especially bureaucratic affairs, the reasons for the adoption of the color blindness approach to the education system.

The second and unexpected result obtained in the quantitative dimension of the study is the finding that school administrators mostly prefer to avoiding among the conflict management strategies. As reasons for this issue, school administrators emphasized the principal's approach to conflicts and the characteristics of the conflict parties (Table 8).

**Table 8.** *Reasons for School Administrators to Choose Avoiding at the Highest Level*

Themes	Categories	Participants
Administrator's approach to conflicts	Believing that conflicts will harm the organization	(M1), (M8), (M10), (M11)
	Paying attention to staying away from issues that may cause conflict	(M4), (MY2)
Characteristics of the conflict parties	The fact that the conflicted person is not open to finding a solution	(M1, M3, M6, M9)
	Lack of knowledge and experience to manage the conflict process	(MY2, M4, M5)

When the statements of the school administrators regarding the approach of the administrators to the conflicts presented in Table 8 are examined, it is seen that they try to stay away from these processes by trying to understand the issues that may cause conflict in advance. Some utterances of school administrators are as follows:

*"I would put avoidance in third place. Like I said, we have to from time to time. We live it. Because after a while, it starts to become harmful to your institution. Imagine you are the administrator of a successful organization. You would have avoided it, of course."* (M1)

*"As I mentioned before, I try to understand beforehand the issues that will create conflict in my school and stay away from these issues. Because the dynamics are so different it is not easy to resolve the conflict and then you have to avoid it."* (M4)

The school administrators underlined that they believe that the conflicts will harm the organization, that they will undermine the success of their organizations, and therefore they are directed to prefer the avoidance strategy according to the content of the conflict.

When the opinions of school administrators on the characteristics of the conflict parties are examined, it is seen that the parties to the conflict not choosing to find solutions in the conflict processes, and the lack of knowledge and experience to manage the conflict process as the reasons that lead school administrators to avoidance strategy. Some of the related utterances are as follows:

*"(...) Some problems you have to avoid. You come across such a person that no matter what you do, he does not approach the solution. Avoiding is your only option."* (M9)

*"When conflict occurs, they expect you resolve it. This process is mutual. But do both parties have information on this issue? Do you have experience? How did they resolve their past conflicts? All these factors may also lead administrators to avoid it."* (M5)

The school administrators emphasized that sometimes people that have conflicts do not want to solve the situation, they insist on arguing which leads administrators to avoid the conflict. Also, they



mentioned that if parties in conflict do not know how to solve them, the impact of their previous experiences still affects them, school administrators can do nothing but avoid.

Another question addressed in the qualitative dimension of the research is the reasons why school administrators with multicultural personalities prefer avoiding of the conflict management strategies at the highest level. School administrators explained this situation with reasons related to the administrator, reasons related to the education system, reasons related to the school and the nature of the conflict (Table 9).

**Table 9.** *Reasons for School Administrators with high level of Multicultural Personality to Prefer Avoiding at the Highest Level*

Themes	Categories	Participants
Reasons related to the administrator	Avoiding responsibility	(M5), (M6), (M10), (M11)
	Fear of loss of reputation	(M6), (M7)
	The influence of past experiences	(MY1), (M10)
	Personal characteristics of the administrator	(M3), (M8)
	Lack of knowledge	(M3), (M11), (MY2)
Reasons related to the education system	Legal regulations	(M2), (MY1)
	The effect of unqualified appointment	(M7)
	Feeling unsafe	(M2), (M10)
	The overall impact of the education system	(M3), (MY1), (M8)
	Workload	(MY1), (M9)
Reasons related to the school	Type of schools	(M1), (M9)
	School's stakeholders	(M5), (M8)
	Tendency to maintain school climate	(M3)
Reasons related to the nature of the conflict	Personality traits of conflict parties	(M1, M3, M6, M9)

When the reasons related to the administrator, which is the first of the reasons why school administrators with multicultural personality prefer to avoid the highest level of avoidance, are examined, it is seen that school administrators who prefer to avoid conflict avoid taking responsibility, are afraid of loss of reputation, are under the influence of past experiences, and their personal characteristics and lack of knowledge cause them ignoring the current problem. Some of the example utterances are presented below:

*"I think that the administrators did not want to take responsibility, they made such a decision because of an approach such that 'they should stay away from me, and solve it among themselves'." (M5)*

*"The biggest reason people run away is the problems with their position. Fear of not losing it, that it might be taken away from me or that bigger things might happen to me." (M7)*

*"There are old, classical methods. In my opinion, the strategy that has been used for years in the resolution of conflicts is avoidance and it is thought to give a solution. But we don't always see the whole picture. This is because it is known that this problem can be solved like this. It has not been dug deep." (MY1)*

*"Feeling (conflict) is also a matter of leadership quality. It's also about personality. Some people do not dare to do such things or cannot find the strength for themselves. He may not have self-confidence. That's why he prefers to avoid it or delegate it to someone else, rather than going over the issue." (M8)*

*"There may also be a lack of knowledge of school administrators. It could also be because they don't know how to manage conflicts." (M11)*

It is seen that school administrators who do not have the knowledge and skills to manage conflict, which is one of the characteristics that an effective leader should have, would prefer to avoid. In addition, school administrators emphasized the effect of school administrators' experiences in the past years and the tendency of school administrators' characters to avoid avoidance strategy as the reason for preferring avoidance in the conflict process.

When the opinions of school administrators on the reasons related to the education system are examined, some of the utterances are presented below:

*"We are having a lot of problems because of the system. Let me give a simple example. When the school principal is involved in a negative situation, the school administration is alone when the police come (...) It's all because of the system." (MY1)*

*"There was a great slaughter in the National Education in 2015, even a little earlier. Many administrators changed during that period. We called it the executive slaughter. Many administrators were brought to certain levels without taking any exams or interviews. So, they faced the problem of 'I could get in trouble at any moment' and they avoided conflict." (M7)*

*"The school gate is open 24 hours a day. To everyone. The person comes and knocks on your door comfortably. We haven't forgotten the administrator who was shot with a shotgun. They want to stay away from conflict because it is not a safe environment. Because the person says 'I have a family'." (M2)*

*"It may also be a systemic reason. The overall structure of the education system is not very supportive." (MY1)*

*"(...) It is something that tires the administrator as well. Administrators already have a workload, and we probably don't want to worry about them, we don't want to waste our energy. That's why we ignore some things. But these problems can break out in another way. That's why most of us may be avoiding them." (M9)*

When the utterances are examined, it is seen that they emphasized in the existing laws, school administrators are left alone in any problem that may arise, that the expectations of the laws and the education system from the school administrator are almost exclusively about paperwork and that these should be changed. In addition, the school administrator who knows that the appointments made in a certain period are made without any exam or interview, therefore, the school administrators who are appointed in this period try to avoid conflicts because they believe that they will easily lose their current position, and that everyone can easily enter the school and reach the principal or vice principals due to insufficient school security. School administrators who stated that they were afraid to experience conflicts stated that they did not want to tire their minds for the avoidance solution, as the legislation and processes in the education system brought a high workload to the school administrator.

As it can be seen in Table 9, the next theme is reasons related to schools. The type of school, schools' stakeholders and administrators' tendency to maintain school climate. Some of the example utterances are as follows:

*"There are different kinds of schools. Maybe we have administrators who had to solve it this way in some schools. I didn't study at any kind of school, but at the school where I did, luckily, I didn't have to use avoidance. Nothing will be resolved."* (M1)

*"Solving is much more difficult. We work with both students and parents. Everyone has very different perspectives. Consider your student's parent. Someone has a different view, he has a view on life, he has a perception. The other is different. It's not that easy to bring them together."* (M8)

*"I think they avoided in order to maintain the current climate, a positive organizational climate, relatively positive."* (M3)

When the opinions of school administrators on school-related reasons are examined, it is seen that different school types have different dynamics, and therefore, some school administrators may prefer to avoid conflicts in school. In addition, it is seen that school administrators emphasize that the school has many stakeholders, that each of them will have different perspectives to conflict, and that school administrators may prefer to avoid conflicts in order to maintain a positive school climate in their opinion.

Regarding the reasons related to the nature of the conflict, the administrators mentioned personality traits of parties. The sample utterance is presented below:

*"I actually think technically: Conflict is a good thing. But the maturity of the two groups is very important. How they reach to the conclusion is very important. This can be very beneficial for the school, on the contrary, it can turn into a fight."* (M9)

For the personality traits category of the conflict parties, school administrators emphasized that the parties in conflict are not inclined to solve problems, understand the other person and respect differences, and encounter people who are psychologically prone to conflict as it be seen in their utterances.

The last dimension, which is considered in the qualitative dimension of the research, is the reasons why school administrators with multicultural personality prefer the approach of supporting homogeneity to a certain extent, among the diversity approaches in all conflict management strategies, in line with the findings obtained in the quantitative dimension. School administrators

discussed the reasons for this situation in two themes: reasons related to the administrator and reasons related to the education system (Table 10).

**Table 10.** *The Reasons why School Administrators with Multicultural Personalities Prefer Supporting Homogeneity from Diversity Approaches in Conflict Management Process to a certain extent*

Themes	Categories	Participants
Reasons related to the administrator	Asking opinions of other administrators	(M3), (M10)
	Fear of loss of reputation	(M2), (M6)
	The influence of past experiences	(M4), (MY1)
	Personal characteristics of the administrator	(M2), (MY2), (M9), (M11)
	Lack of knowledge	(M4), (M9)
	The older generation impact	(M2), (M11)
Reasons related to the education system	The overall impact of the education system	(M3)
	Workload	(M7), (MY1)

As it can be seen in Table 10, the school administrators' views on the reasons related to the administrator were gathered under the categories of asking opinions of other administrators, fear of loss of reputation, the influence of past experiences, personal characteristics of them, their lack of knowledge and older generations' impact. Some of the sample utterances are:

*"Could this conflict resolution job be a chronic problem as soon as school principals enter the system, rather than managing differences multiculturalism? Like gene transfer. That's how it is when you're a administrator. All administrators talk to each other. What the system brings to you. The suggestions of the people in the upper level may be the branch administrators or the district administrators."* (M3)

*"(...) We are also obsessed with staying stubbornly in some positions, we put tremendous pressure on it. We have an understanding that if you leave this seat, you will be finished. This pushes us towards uniformity even more, seeing everyone the same."* (M6)

*"I honestly do not think that many school administrators have much knowledge and experience on how to approach conflicts. How do they solve it? The administrators from the past do it the way they do, how they learn from their own administrators. They're diving headlong into it, so to speak."* (M4)

*"I think this is related to how open school administrators are to adopting differences in terms of personality and outlook on life. Even though they are multicultural, they prefer to ignore the differences."* (M11)

*"They may not have noticed. Or they may not know how to solve this problem in general, even if they realize it. So, when we meet, we may not know how to solve it. I don't think we know either situation very well, either." (M9)*

*"Management is a multidimensional concept that includes keeping up with the times. This is essential for an administrator. The person who sees differences in school as wealth has a mission and vision. This person does not refuse. But on the other hand, the 25-26-year-old administrator says that he has reached a certain age, will he deal with it from this age onwards." (M2)*

School administrators described that most school administrators asked their colleagues for their opinions on a problem they encountered, and they preferred to follow the same path because most of the school administrators they received opinions from were prone to homogeneity. In addition to these, school administrators who stated that school administrators who do not want to lose their position would not attach the necessary importance to differences, emphasized that in this case, their previous experiences, experiences and what they saw from their own administrators had an effect. Another point described by school administrators is that the current school administrators have insufficient knowledge about the subject and how to manage diversities and conflicts, and the administrators should be supported with in-service training on these issues. Finally, school administrators described the fact that school administrators, who are actively working as school principals, stay away from the differences that are the necessity of the age.

When the opinions of school administrators about the reasons related to the education system are examined, it can be seen that they underlined the overall impact of education system and workload. Some of the example utterances are:

*"(...) It's about being indebted to someone. Is this why school principals often avoid it? It even ignores the differences. He cannot pull himself out of the system in such a place. You will solve a problem of the school, but you cannot control the parent. I think that because you have such an organic bond, he avoids it because of this. You enter the system; they say never mind." (M3)*

*"It may be because it is seen as a workload, this is an extra job. 'Who will deal with it? Who will sit down and talk to them? Who will give their energy and time?' Dealing with and solving them requires serious effort and time." (MY1)*

It is seen that the administrators describe the existence of stakeholders that they are attached to and cannot act independently from them in order to manage the school. In addition, it is seen that school administrators describe the fact that the bureaucratic workload on them may have pushed the school administrators to ignore the differences.

#### **4. Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions**

This study examines the relationship between school administrators' multicultural personality traits, diversity perspectives and conflict management strategies. Within the scope of the research, it was first tried to describe how the multicultural personality traits of school administrators were. It was observed that school administrators' perceptions of multicultural personality traits were above the average. Another finding obtained in the quantitative dimension of the study is that school administrators have the highest average of cultural empathy, one of the sub-dimensions of multicultural personality. This dimension was followed by social initiative, openness, emotional stability and flexibility sub-dimensions, respectively. Van Oudenhoven and van der Zee (2002) obtained similar findings with the quantitative dimension of this study in their study on students. In the study of Van Oudenhoven and van der Zee (2002), it is seen that the highest averages of the students belong to the cultural empathy, and the lowest averages belong to the flexibility sub-dimension. Çalışkan and Işık (2016) found that the highest average of the sub-dimensions of multicultural personality belongs

to the dimension of cultural empathy, and the lowest average belongs to the dimension of emotional stability. It is possible to explain the difference in the averages of the sub-dimensions by the fact that the work area of the sample from which the data is collected is different from the education sector.

Secondly, the perceptions of school administrators regarding diversity perspectives were examined in the quantitative dimension of the study, and it was seen that the highest average belonged to the color-blindness approach. Integration and learning, fairness, access and reinforcing homogeneity approaches followed respectively. The school administrators divided the reasons for choosing color-blindness into two as reasons related to the administrator and related to the education system. School administrators, emphasized the lack of knowledge, fear of loss of reputation, unwillingness to take responsibility, their tendency to support the people they feel close to, and their personality traits under the influence of the education system. They mentioned ensuring the continuity of the current order in the school, not having a plan for differences and the burden of their workload as the reasons related to the education system.

The school administrators' tendency to support the people they feel close to, which is one of the reasons why they prefer the color-blindness approach, is similar to the findings of the study conducted by Başkan et al. (2019). Başkan et al. (2019) stated that school administrators prefer to work with those they feel close to. Jansen et al. (2016) found that the color-blindness approach provides job satisfaction in the majority group of employees, but in cases where a multicultural approach is adopted by the minority group, job satisfaction and social self-esteem. They found that they could feel as part of the group. It is possible to say that this finding of Jansen et al. (2016) coincides with the reasons why school administrators in this study want to maintain the current order at school and tend to support people close to them.

The finding that school administrators prefer color-blindness the most among the diversity perspectives is similar to the studies in the related literature. For example, in their study examining the relationship between diversity perspectives in schools and teachers' happiness, Arslan and Polat (2021) found that teachers preferred the color-blindness approach the most, similar to the school administrators in this study. In the related study of Arslan and Polat (2021), the approach to color-blindness is followed by integration and learning, reinforcing homogeneity, fairness and access, respectively. The finding that school administrators use the approach of reinforcing homogeneity at lowest level differs from the related studies in the literature. For example, Arslan and Polat (2021) stated that teachers preferred the approach of reinforcing homogeneity in the third place among 5 perspectives. It is possible to say that the reason why the teachers in the study of Arslan and Polat (2021) preferred the reinforcing homogeneity among the diversity perspectives in the third place is that the problems faced by school administrators and teachers and arising from the differences of individuals differ from each other in terms of type and content.

Another variable of the research is the conflict management strategies used by school administrators. In the quantitative part of the study, it was found that the most preferred conflict management is avoiding. This strategy was followed by problem solving, compromise, forcing and yielding, respectively. In the qualitative dimension of the study, the opinions of school administrators about the fact that school administrators prefer to avoid conflicts mostly, which is a remarkable finding obtained in the quantitative dimension of the research, were collected. It was seen that school administrators explained this situation with the differentiation of the administrator's approach to conflicts and the characteristics of the conflict parties. School administrators stated that some administrators stay away from conflicts as they see conflicts as a factor that will harm the organization. Some school administrators stated that school administrators try to stay away from issues that may cause conflict.

The finding of school administrators' preferences of avoiding mostly coincides with the literature. Özkara and Tunç (2020) stated that according to the opinions of teachers, school



administrators mostly use avoiding strategy and this strategy is followed by problem solving, compromise, forcing and yielding strategies, respectively. Koçak and Başkan (2013), on the other hand, stated that, unlike the findings of this study, the school principals mostly preferred the compromise strategy in the management of the conflicts that the teachers experienced among themselves, and this strategy was followed by the strategies of problem solving, avoiding, forcing and yielding, respectively.

Another interesting finding obtained in the quantitative part of the study, school administrators with multicultural personality were found to choose avoiding strategy mostly. The school administrators mentioned it was because of the reasons related to the administrator, the education system, the school and the nature of the conflict. They also underlined that the ones who avoid responsibility and do not want to lose their reputation may avoid conflicts due to their past experiences, personality traits and lack of knowledge. School administrators emphasized that school administrators who do not feel safe and who have a heavy workload will avoid conflicts even if they have multicultural personalities. In addition, they stated that current legal regulations oblige the administrator to deal with paperwork which can be one of the reasons for avoiding conflicts. School administrators, who stated that the type of school where the conflict took place and its stakeholders would lead school administrators to avoid conflicts even if they have multicultural personalities, stated that the personality traits of the conflict parties were effective in choosing the avoidance strategy. Vallone et al. (2022) stated that teachers with low social initiative and flexibility prefer the avoidance strategy in their study examining the relationship between multicultural personality traits and intercultural conflict management strategies. The reasons for not wanting to lose one's reputation and avoiding responsibility can be said to coincide with the lack of social initiative and lack of flexibility as stated by Vallone et al. (2022).

The last finding of the quantitative dimension of the research was related to the level of the perceptions of multicultural school administrators regarding diversity perspectives to predict their preferences for conflict management strategies. It is an interesting finding that school administrators with multicultural personality adopt a certain percentage of reinforcing homogeneity in all conflict management strategies. In the qualitative aspect of the research, school administrators explained this situation with reasons related to the administrator and the education system. They stated that their colleagues, whom the school administrators consult, are also prone to support homogeneity and, with the influence of the older generation, reinforcing homogeneity is adopted as one of the diversity perspectives while managing conflicts. School administrators also stated that their fear of loss of reputation, lack of knowledge and personality traits, which they count among the reasons for preferring color-blindness and avoiding, were also effective in preferring the reinforcing homogeneity to a certain extent. They also emphasized that the overall impact of the workload and the education system also had an impact on this. Podsiadlowski et al. (2013) stated there are some organizations that adopt this approach, and differences can pose a threat to these organizations and that considering differences can harm organizations; therefore, the administrators of these organizations can adopt the aforementioned perspective, which coincide with school administrators' views. School administrators stated that they prefer the avoiding with the approach of supporting color-blindness and homogeneity due to their personal characteristics, lack of knowledge, general structure of the education system, workload, and not feeling safe with the perspective of the other party to conflicts. It is possible to say that they should be supported in the management of conflicts related to diversities.

As any other researches, this one has some limitations. Firstly, this research is limited to the data obtained in 2019-2020 academic year. Also, the data were gathered from only school administrators who worked in Kocaeli district. Lastly, the data were limited to the scales used. If it is necessary to offer suggestions for researchers and practitioners in line with the findings obtained as a result of the research, the researchers can conduct other researches in which the data would be gathered from other stakeholders of schools, such as teachers. Also, studies can be conducted in



different districts in order to understand the big picture in Türkiye. Similar studies can be conducted in other countries to enrich the literature. When it comes to practitioners, first of all, it is necessary to support school administrators and teachers with in-service training on diversities and conflict management, to solve the security problems in schools with the legal regulations to be made, to increase the activities that will bring together individuals with differences in schools, social activities. It is recommended to organize informative seminars and to conduct researches in which the opinions of other stakeholders of the school are collected in order to deal with the situation more comprehensively.

### References

- Ateş, A., & Ünal, A. (2021). The relationship between diversity management, job satisfaction and organizational commitment in teachers: A mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 21(1), 18-32.
- Arslan, Y., & Polat, S. (2016). Farklılık Yaklaşım Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17 (2), 95-106.
- Arslan, Y., Polat, S. (2021). Do diversity perspectives affect happiness at work? A study of teachers in Turkey. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(3), 621-639.
- Aseery, M., Mahran, S., & Felemban, O. (2023). The relationship between emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies from the nurse managers' perspective. *Cureus*, 15(3).
- Bakaç, N., Okçu, V., & Erdem M. (2018). Farklılıkların yönetimine ilişkin okul yöneticilerinin ve öğretmenlerin görüşleri. *AJELI-Anatolian Journal of Educational Leadership and Instruction*, 7(2), 19-56.
- Bettmann, E. H., & Moore, P. (1994). Conflict resolution programs and social justice. *Education Urban Society*, 27 (1), 11-22.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş., Demirel, F. (2012). Örneklem yöntemleri. In *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi, pp. 79-100.
- Chun, E., & Evans, A. (2023). *Conducting an institutional diversity audit in higher education: A practitioner's guide to systematic diversity transformation*. Taylor & Francis.
- Cox, T. H., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 5(3), 45-56.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2011). Choosing a mixed method design. In *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications, 53-107.
- Çalışkan, S., Işık, İ. (2016). Are you ready for the global change? Multicultural personality and readiness for organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 29(3), 404 – 423.
- Dana, D. (2001). *Conflict resolution: Mediation tools for everyday worklife*. NewYork: McGraw-Hill.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Evers, A., Beersma, B., Kluwer, E. S., & Nauta, A. (2001). A theory-based measure of conflict management strategies in the work place, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 645-668.
- De Dreu, C. K., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 88(4), 741-749.
- Denzin, N.K. (1978). *Sociological methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Desivilya, H. S., & Yagil, D. (2005). The role of emotions in conflict management: The case of work teams. *International Journal of conflict management*, 16(1), 55-69.
- Düzyol, S., & Ada, Ş. (2021). Öğretmenlerin politik becerileri ile çatışma yönetimi stratejilerini kullanımları arasındaki ilişki. *Iğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 28, 452-469.
- Dwyer, C., & Buckle, J. L. (2009). The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(1), 54-63.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Garson, G. D. (2015). *Missing value analysis and data imputation*. Ashebora: Statistical Hall, J. (1996). *Conflict management survey: A self-assessment of your management of the dynamics of conflict*. The Woodlands, TX: Telometrics International
- Hubbard, E. (2004). *The manager's pocket guide to diversity management*. Massachusetts: Human Resource Development Press, Inc.
- Jangsiriwattana, T., & Duangkumnerd, V. (2023). Enhancing knowledge sharing in organizations through the proactive personality of employees. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 28.

- Jannesari, M., Stoermer, S., & Selmer, J. (2024). Self-initiated expatriates in China: multicultural personality traits, frequency of interaction and host country nationals' satisfaction with SIE performance. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 35(18), 3053-3080.
- Jansen, W. S., Vos, M. W., Otten, S., Podsiadlowski, A., & van der Zee, K. I. (2016). Colorblind or colorful? How diversity approaches affect cultural majority and minority employees. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 46(2), 81-93.
- Khan, K., & Javaid, Z. K. (2023). Analyzing Employee Performance through Workforce Diversity Management: Role of Workforce Diversity Characteristics. *Foundation University Journal of Business & Economics*, 8(2), 85-101.
- Kirchmeyer, C., & Cohen, A. (1992). Multicultural groups: Their performance and reactions with constructive conflict. *Group Organization Management*, 17(2), 153-170.
- Koçak, S., & Başkan, G. A. (2013). Okul müdürleri tarafından kullanılan çatışma yönetim yöntemlerinin etkililik düzeyleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 44(44), 212-224.
- Kurtulmuş, M. (2016). The effect of diversity management on teachers' organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, 6(3), 277-302.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. California: SAGE, Publications.
- Marczyk, G., DeMatteo, D., & Festinger, D. (2005). *Essentials of research design and methodology*. New York: John Wiley Sons Inc.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2. ed.)*. London
- Mor, K., Gündemir, S., & van der Toorn, J. (2024). Celebrating the "invisible": The role of organizational diversity approaches on attracting and retaining LGBTQ+ talent. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1-25.
- Özkara, E., & Tunç, B. (2020). Okul yöneticilerinin çatışma yönetim stratejileri ile okul kültürü arasındaki ilişkinin öğretmen görüşlerine göre incelenmesi. *Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 53(3), 1023-1050.
- Özmen, F., & Aküzüm, C. (2010). Okulların kültürel yapısı içinde çatışmalara bakış açısı ve çatışma çözümünde okul yöneticilerinin liderlik davranışları. *Sosyal ve Beşerî Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(2), 65-75.
- Patton, MQ. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *HSR: Health Services Research*. 34 (5) Part II, 1189-1208.
- Podsiadlowski, A., Gröschke, D., Kogler, M., Springer, C., & van der Zee, K. (2013). Managing a culturally diverse workforce: Diversity Perspectives in Organizations. *International Journal of Intercultural Research*, 37(2), 159-175.
- Polat, S. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının çok kültürlü eğitime yönelik kişilik özellikleri. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1 (1), 154-164.
- Polat, S., & Metin, M. A. (2012). The relationship between the teachers' intercultural competence levels and the strategy of solving conflicts. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 1961-1968.
- Popescu, A. D., Borca, C., & Baesu, V. (2014). A study on multicultural personality. *Cross-Cultural Management Journal*, 16(1), 147-156.
- Poquiz, M. R., Hassan, R., & Ahmed, S. (2023). Gender diversity management practices in the hotel industry: An analysis of the Philippine hotel industry. *International Journal of Management*, 1(1).
- Rahim, M. A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(2), 368-376.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics (Vol. 5)*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

- Tekin, Ö. A., Turan, S. N., Özmen, M., Turhan, A. A., & Kökcü, A. (2012). Beş faktör kişilik özellikleri ve örgütsel çatışma yönetimi arasındaki ilişkiler: Ankara'daki beş yıldızlı otel işletmeleri üzerine bir uygulama. *Journal of Yasar University*, 27(7), 4611-4641.
- Toma, C., & Martin, A. (2024). Diversity management approaches for organizational justice: Insights from Belgian hospitals. *Working Papers CEB*, 24.
- Tozkoparan, G. (2013). Beş faktör kişilik özelliklerinin çatışma yönetim tarzlarına etkisi: Yöneticiler üzerinde bir araştırma. *AİBÜ-İİBF Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 9 (2), 189-231.
- Tracey, J. B., Le, V., Brannon, D. W., Crystal-Mansour, S., Golubovskaya, M., & Robinson, R. N. (2023). The influence of diversity management initiatives on firm-level diversity: evidence from the restaurant and foodservice industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 35(11), 4010-4030.
- Türnüklü, A. (2007). Liselerde öğrenci çatışmaları, nedenleri, çözüm stratejileri ve taktikleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 49(49), 129-166.
- Vallone, F., Dell'Aquila, E., Dolce, P., Marocco, D., & Zurlo, M. C. (2022). Teachers' multicultural personality traits as predictors of intercultural conflict management styles: Evidence from five European countries. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 87, 51-64.
- Van Der Zee, K. I., & Van Oudenhoven, J. P. (2000). The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire: A multidimensional instrument of multicultural effectiveness. *European journal of personality*, 14(4), 291-309.
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P., & Van der Zee, K. I. (2002). Predicting multicultural effectiveness of international students: The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26, 679-694.
- Vestal, B. D. (2011). *An investigation of preferred conflict-management behaviors in small-school principal*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A and M University.
- Yakunina, E. S., Weigold, I. K., Weigold, A., Hercegovac, S., & Elsayed, N. (2012). The multicultural personality: Does it predict international students' openness to diversity and adjustment?. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36(4), 533-540.
- Yıldızoğlu, H. (2013). *Okul yöneticilerinin beş faktör kişilik özellikleriyle çatışma yönetimi stili tercihleri arasındaki ilişki*. Unpublished master thesis, Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

## Geniş Özet

### Giriş

Gelişen teknoloji, iletişim ve ulaşım araçları, farklı kültürlerden gelen bireylerin bir arada yaşamalarını, eğitim almalarını ve çalışmaları mümkün kılmaktadır. Bu durum, kültürel farklılıklardan kaynaklanan çatışmaların etkili bir şekilde yönetilmesini zorunlu hale getirmektedir. Çatışma, bir grup üyeleri arasındaki mevcut veya algılanan farklılıklardan kaynaklanan gerilim süreci olarak tanımlanabilir. Araştırmalar, organizasyon yöneticilerinin zamanlarının yarısını çatışma süreçleriyle ilgilenmekle geçirdiklerini göstermektedir. Bu bağlamda, organizasyonel çatışma yönetim stratejilerinin kullanılması gerekliliği ortaya çıkmıştır. Kültürel kişilik, bireylerin farklı kültürlerle etkileşim süreçlerinde aktif rol alabilme, çok kültürlü bir ortamda profesyonel olarak başarılı olma ve bu ortama kişisel olarak uyum sağlama yeteneğini etkileyen bir kavramdır. Van der Zee ve Van Oudenhoven (2000) tarafından geliştirilen Kültürel Kişilik Modeli, kültürel kişiliği beş boyutta ele almaktadır: kültürel empati, açıklık, duygusal istikrar, sosyal inisiyatif ve esneklik. Bu kişilik özellikleri, bireylerin çatışmaları nasıl yöneteceğini de etkilemektedir.

Bu araştırmanın amacı, okul yöneticilerinin çok kültürlü kişilik özellikleri, farklılık yaklaşımları ve çatışma yönetimi stratejileri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Araştırma, açıklayıcı sıralı karma desende tasarlanmıştır. Çalışmanın örneklemi 475 okul yöneticisinden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmanın

nicel boyutunda, okul yöneticilerinden veri toplamak için Kültürel Kişilik Ölçeği, Farklılık Yaklaşımları Ölçeği ve Çatışma Yönetimi Stratejileri Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Nitel boyutta ise nicel boyutta elde edilen bulguların derinlemesine anlaşılabilmesi için yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme formu oluşturulmuş ve 13 okul yöneticisi ile görüşmeler yapılmıştır.

### Bulgular

Araştırma kapsamında ilk olarak tanımlayıcı istatistikler incelenmiştir. Elde edilen veriler, okul yöneticilerinin çok kültürlü kişilik özelliklerinin ( $M=3.60$ ,  $SD=0.28$ ) ortalamasının üzerinde olduğunu göstermiştir. Okul yöneticilerinin çok kültürlülüğün alt boyutlarına ilişkin algılarının aritmetik ortalamaları sırasıyla şu şekildedir: Kültürel empati ( $M=3.88$ ,  $SD=0.36$ ), sosyal girişim ( $M=3.85$ ,  $SD=0.48$ ), açıklık ( $M=3.48$ ,  $SD=0.46$ ), duygusal denge ( $M=3.33$ ,  $SD=0.42$ ) ve esneklik ( $M=3.11$ ,  $SD=0.42$ ). Farklılık yaklaşımlarına ilişkin veriler incelendiğinde, okul yöneticilerinin farklılık yaklaşımlarına ilişkin algıları sırasıyla şu şekildedir: Renk körlüğü ( $M=4.19$ ,  $SD=0.57$ ), tümleştirme ve öğrenme ( $M=4.10$ ,  $SD=0.53$ ), eşitlik ( $M=3.86$ ,  $SD=0.59$ ), erişim ( $M=3.82$ ,  $SD=0.62$ ) ve homojenliğin desteklenmesi ( $M=3.43$ ,  $SD=0.72$ ). Son olarak, okul yöneticilerinin çatışma yönetimi stratejilerine ilişkin algıları sırasıyla şu şekildedir: Kaçınma ( $M=3.63$ ,  $SD=0.52$ ), problem çözme ( $M=3.56$ ,  $SD=0.49$ ), uzlaşma ( $M=3.09$ ,  $SD=0.55$ ), hükmetme ( $M=3.04$ ,  $SD=0.63$ ) ve uyma ( $M=2.79$ ,  $SD=0.71$ ).

Çok kültürlü kişiliğin farklılık yaklaşımlarını yordama düzeyinin incelenmesi için basit doğrusal regresyon analizi uygulanmıştır. Sonuçlar incelendiğinde Model 1'in anlamlı olduğu görülmüştür ( $F=11,880$ ,  $p<0,001$ ) ve çok kültürlü kişilik, homojenliğin desteklenmesinin %3'ünü açıklamaktadır ( $R^2=0,033$ ,  $t=3,447$ ). Modelin  $\beta$  değeri, çok kültürlü kişilikteki bir birimlik değişikliğin, homojenliğin desteklenmesinde %18'lik bir değişikliğe yol açtığını göstermektedir. Model 2 de anlamlıdır ( $F=56,333$ ,  $p<0,001$ ) ve çok kültürlü kişilik, renk körlüğünü %14 oranında açıklamaktadır ( $R^2 = 0.140$ ,  $t=7.506$ ). Modelin  $\beta$  değeri, çok kültürlü kişilikteki bir birimlik değişikliğin, renk körlüğünde %38'lik bir değişikliğe yol açtığını göstermektedir. Model 3 incelendiğinde, modelin anlamlı olduğu ( $F=76,056$ ,  $p<0,001$ ) ve çok kültürlü kişiliğin eşitlik yaklaşımının %18'ini açıkladığı görülmüştür ( $R^2 = 0.181$ ,  $t=8.721$ ). Modelin  $\beta$  değeri, çok kültürlü kişilikteki bir birimlik değişikliğin eşitlik yaklaşımında %43'lük bir değişikliğe yol açtığını göstermektedir. Bir sonraki model, Model 4 de anlamlıdır ( $F=40,596$ ,  $p<0,001$ ) ve çok kültürlü kişilik, erişimi %10 oranında açıklamaktadır ( $R^2 = 0.105$ ,  $t=6,371$ ). Modelin  $\beta$  değeri, çok kültürlü kişilikteki bir birimlik değişikliğin erişimde %32'lik bir değişikliğe yol açtığını göstermektedir. Son olarak, Model 5 de anlamlıdır ( $F=84,076$ ,  $p<0,001$ ) ve çok kültürlü kişilik, tümleştirme ve öğrenme yaklaşımının %20'sini açıklamaktadır ( $R^2 = 0.196$ ,  $t=9.169$ ). Modelin  $\beta$  değeri, çok kültürlü kişilikteki bir birimlik değişikliğin tümleştirme ve öğrenme yaklaşımında %44'lük bir değişikliğe yol açtığını göstermektedir.

Çok kültürlü kişiliğin çatışma yönetimi stratejilerini yordama düzeyinin incelenmesi için yapılan basit doğrusal regresyon analizi sonucunda Model 1'in anlamlı olduğu görülmüştür ( $F=16,118$ ,  $p<0,001$ ) ve çok kültürlü kişilik, problem çözmenin %5'ini açıklamaktadır ( $R^2 = 0,045$ ,  $t=4,015$ ). Modelin  $\beta$  değeri, çok kültürlü kişilikteki bir birimlik değişikliğin problem çözmede %22'lik bir değişikliğe yol açtığını göstermektedir. Model 2 de anlamlıdır ( $F=17,622$ ,  $p<0,001$ ) ve çok kültürlü kişilik, uzlaşmanın %5'ini açıklamaktadır ( $R^2 = 0,049$ ,  $t=4.198$ ). Modelin  $\beta$  değeri, çok kültürlü kişilikteki bir birimlik değişikliğin uzlaşmada %22'lik bir değişikliğe yol açtığını göstermektedir. Model 3 incelendiğinde, modelin anlamlı olduğu ( $F=42,342$ ,  $p<0,001$ ) ve çok kültürlü kişiliğin kaçınma yaklaşımının %18'ini açıkladığı görülmüştür ( $R^2 = 0,181$ ,  $t=8.721$ ). Modelin  $\beta$  değeri, çok kültürlü kişilikteki bir birimlik değişikliğin kaçınmada %33'lük bir değişikliğe yol açtığını göstermektedir. Ancak, çok kültürlü kişiliğin hükmetmeyi ne kadar açıkladığını inceleyen Model 4 ( $F=6,686$ ,  $p=0,101>0,05$ ) ve çok kültürlü kişiliğin uyum sağlamayı ne kadar açıkladığını inceleyen Model 5, ( $F=1,280$ ,  $p=0,259>0,05$ ) anlamlı bulunmamıştır.

Nitel bulgular, okul yöneticilerinin farklılık ve çatışma yönetimi yaklaşımlarına ilişkin derinlemesine bir anlayış sunmaktadır. Görüşmelerden elde edilen veriler, yöneticilerin çoğunlukla kaçınma stratejisini tercih ettiklerini ve renk körlüğü yaklaşımını benimsediklerini göstermiştir. Yöneticiler, bu tercihlerin ardında yatan nedenleri, eğitim sistemi, iş yükü, kişilik özellikleri ve okullardaki paydaşların özellikleriyle ilişkilendirmiştir. Özellikle, eğitim sisteminin mevcut yapısı ve yoğun iş yükü, yöneticilerin farklılıkları yönetmek yerine çatışmalardan kaçınma eğiliminde olduklarını ortaya koymaktadır.

Okul yöneticilerinin çatışma yönetimi ve farklılık yaklaşımları konusundaki tercihleri, eğitim sisteminin karmaşıklığı ve bürokratik yapısıyla doğrudan bağlantılıdır. Eğitim sisteminin mevcut yapısı, yöneticilerin zaman ve kaynak kullanımını optimize etmelerini zorlaştırmaktadır. Yöneticilerin, çatışma durumlarında daha aktif ve çözüme yönelik stratejiler geliştirmek yerine, kaçınma stratejisini benimsemeleri, bu yapısal zorlukların bir yansımasıdır. Eğitim sistemindeki yoğun bürokratik süreçler, yöneticilerin karşılaştıkları sorunları hızla ve etkin bir şekilde çözmelerini engelleyebilir. Bu durum, yöneticilerin çatışma durumlarını görmezden gelerek veya erteleyerek iş yüklerini hafifletme eğiliminde olmalarına yol açabilir.

Kaçınma stratejisi, kısa vadede yöneticilere rahatlama sağlasa da uzun vadede sorunların daha da karmaşık hale gelmesine neden olabilir. Yöneticiler, bu stratejiyi benimsediklerinde, çatışmaların kökenine inip kalıcı çözümler üretmek yerine, geçici çözümlerle durumu idare etme yolunu seçerler. Bu durum, okul ortamında gerilimlerin birikmesine ve ilerleyen dönemlerde daha büyük problemlere yol açabilir. Çatışmaların çözülmemesi hem öğretmenler hem de öğrenciler arasındaki ilişkileri olumsuz etkileyebilir ve eğitim kalitesini düşürebilir.

Renk körlüğü yaklaşımı, yöneticilerin farklılıklarla başa çıkma stratejilerinde belirgin bir rol oynamaktadır. Renk körlüğü, farklılıkları görmezden gelme ve herkesi aynı şekilde muamele etme eğilimidir. Bu yaklaşım, yüzeyde adil ve eşitlikçi bir politika gibi görünse de aslında bireylerin benzersiz ihtiyaçlarını ve deneyimlerini göz ardı eder. Okul yöneticileri, bu yaklaşımı benimseyerek, öğrencilerin ve personelin farklı kültürel ve sosyo-ekonomik geçmişlerini yeterince dikkate almamış olabilirler. Bu durum, bazı grupların ihtiyaçlarının göz ardı edilmesine ve potansiyel olarak dışlanmalarına neden olabilir.

Yöneticilerin renk körlüğü yaklaşımını benimsemelerinin ardında, eğitim sisteminin genellikle standartlaştırılmış ve homojenleştirilmiş bir yapıya sahip olması yatmaktadır. Eğitim politikaları ve programları, genellikle geniş bir öğrenci kitlesine hitap edecek şekilde tasarlandığından, bireysel farklılıkları göz ardı etme eğilimindedir. Bu durum, yöneticilerin de benzer bir yaklaşımı benimsemelerine neden olabilir. Renk körlüğü stratejisi, yöneticilere farklılıklarla ilgili potansiyel olarak karmaşık ve hassas konuları ele alırken güvenli bir yol sunar. Ancak, bu yaklaşım, uzun vadede, okul topluluğunun çeşitli ihtiyaçlarını karşılamada yetersiz kalabilir.

Eğitim sisteminin mevcut yapısı ve yoğun iş yükü, yöneticilerin farklılıkları yönetmek yerine çatışmalardan kaçınma eğiliminde olmalarına katkıda bulunan önemli faktörlerdir. Eğitim sisteminde, yöneticilerin görevleri ve sorumlulukları genellikle ağır ve zaman alıcıdır. Bu durum, yöneticilerin çatışma durumlarına etkili bir şekilde müdahale edebilmek için yeterli zamanı ve enerjiyi bulmalarını zorlaştırır. Yoğun iş yükü, yöneticilerin çatışma çözümü için gerekli olan analitik düşünme ve problem çözme süreçlerini uygulamalarını engelleyebilir. Bu nedenle, yöneticiler, çatışma yönetiminde daha kolay ve az zaman alıcı olan kaçınma stratejisine yönelebilirler.

Ayrıca, eğitim sistemindeki mevcut yapı, yöneticilerin profesyonel gelişimlerine ve çatışma yönetimi konusundaki eğitimlerine yeterli önem verilmediğini gösterebilir. Yöneticilerin, çatışma yönetimi ve farklılık konularında yeterince donanımlı olmamaları, bu konularla başa çıkmada daha az



etkili olmalarına neden olabilir. Bu durum, eğitim politikalarının ve uygulamalarının, yöneticilerin bu alandaki bilgi ve becerilerini artıracak şekilde yeniden gözden geçirilmesi gerektiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Eğitim sisteminde, yöneticilere yönelik çok kültürlü eğitim programlarının ve çatışma yönetimi eğitimlerinin yaygınlaştırılması, bu alandaki eksikliklerin giderilmesine katkı sağlayabilir.

Sonuç olarak, nitel bulgular, okul yöneticilerinin farklılık ve çatışma yönetimi yaklaşımlarının, eğitim sisteminin yapısı, iş yükü, kişilik özellikleri ve okul paydaşlarının özellikleriyle yakından ilişkili olduğunu göstermektedir. Yöneticilerin kaçınma stratejisi ve renk körlüğü yaklaşımını benimsemeleri, eğitim sisteminin ve iş yükünün yönetim süreçlerine olan etkisini yansıtmaktadır. Bu bulgular, eğitim sisteminin ve yöneticilerin profesyonel gelişimlerinin, daha etkili çatışma yönetimi ve farklılık yaklaşımlarını teşvik edecek şekilde geliştirilmesi gerektiğini ortaya koymaktadır.

### **Sonuç ve Öneriler**

Araştırma bulguları, okul yöneticilerinin çok kültürlü kişilik özelliklerinin, farklılık yaklaşımlarının ve çatışma yönetimi stratejilerinin birbirleriyle ilişkili olduğunu göstermektedir. Çok kültürlü kişilik özelliklerine sahip yöneticiler, farklılık yaklaşımlarında renk körlüğü ve homojenliği pekiştirme gibi stratejileri benimsemekte ve çatışma yönetiminde ise genellikle kaçınma stratejisini tercih etmektedirler. Bu bulgular, eğitim sisteminin ve iş yükünün, yöneticilerin çatışma yönetimi ve farklılık yaklaşımlarını etkileyen önemli faktörler olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır.

Bu bağlamda, eğitim kurumlarında yöneticilere yönelik çok kültürlü eğitim programlarının düzenlenmesi ve iş yükünün azaltılması, yöneticilerin çatışma yönetimi ve farklılık yaklaşımlarının daha etkili hale getirilmesi açısından önem taşımaktadır. Ayrıca, okul yöneticilerinin çok kültürlü kişilik özelliklerini geliştirecek eğitim programlarının yaygınlaştırılması, farklılık yaklaşımlarının ve çatışma yönetimi stratejilerinin daha olumlu yönde şekillenmesine katkı sağlayacaktır.

Araştırmanın bulguları, okul yöneticilerinin çok kültürlü kişilik özelliklerinin, farklılık yaklaşımlarının ve çatışma yönetimi stratejilerinin birbirleriyle ilişkili olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu ilişkilerin daha derinlemesine incelenmesi ve farklı eğitim ortamlarında benzer araştırmaların yapılması, eğitim yönetimi alanında önemli katkılar sağlayacaktır.

### **Declaration of Ethical Issues**

Ethics committee approval was obtained for the research at the meeting of Kocaeli University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee dated 21/11/2019 and numbered 2019/12.

### **Declaration of Contribution of Researchers**

The First Author contributed 70% and the Second Author contributed 30%.

### **Conflict Statement**

As the authors of the research, we declare that we have no conflict of interest/conflict declaration.



Bu eser Creative Commons Atıf-GayriTicari 4.0 Uluslararası Lisansı ile lisanslanmıştır.