

JAKUB HLADÍK, MICHAELA JURTIKOVÁ

*Tomas Bata University  
Zlín, Czech Republic*

## COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES OF CZECH AND ENGLISH TEACHERS TO MULTICULTURAL SUBCOMPETENCIES

**ABSTRACT.** Hladík Jakub, Jurtíková Michaela, *Comparison of Attitudes of Czech and English Teachers to Multicultural Subcompetencies* [Analiza porównawcza postaw czeskich i angielskich nauczycieli odnoszących się do kompetencji wielokulturowych]. *Studia Edukacyjne* nr 28, 2013, Poznań 2013, pp. 325-344. Adam Mickiewicz University Press. ISBN 978-83-232-2731-1. ISSN 1233-6688

The study is a research probe into attitudes of Czech and English teachers regarding multicultural competence. The authors delineate theoretical foundations which define multicultural competence and its possible further division. The aim of the empirical part of the study is to present the results of a comparative research probe aimed at identifying the importance attributed to particular multicultural competences by Czech and English teachers. The authors use a methodological approach in the interface of qualitative and quantitative research strategies, namely the Q-methodology. ANOVA was used to determine differences in attitudes toward multicultural subcompetencies between Czech and English teachers. Furthermore, the Pearson correlation coefficient was used to analyse correlations between the groups of teachers.

**Key words:** multicultural competence, Q-methodology, multicultural education, intercultural competence, Czech teachers, English teachers

### Theoretical foundations

The issue of multicultural competence has not yet been sufficiently taken into account in the Czech educational literature. The previously conducted research on multicultural environment did not specialise either in constructing the notion of multicultural competence, nor in international comparison in this field. The theory of multicultural education in the Czech Republic therefore lacks empirical data that would help develop the theory and practice of multicultural education both as an educational discipline and as a study subject.

Multicultural competence was first mentioned in the early 80s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in the USA in connection with counseling psychology. Sue et al. first

described three components of multicultural competence: awareness, knowledge and skills. The interest in multicultural competence grew in the 90s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The theoretical models began to be empirically investigated and critically evaluated at the end of 90s.<sup>1</sup>

There are many definitions of multicultural competence in literature. Multicultural competencies have been defined by by Ponterotto et al. (1998)<sup>2</sup>, Byram (1997)<sup>3</sup>, Pope and Reynolds (1997)<sup>4</sup>, Chen and Starosta (1996)<sup>5</sup>, Sue et al. (1992)<sup>6</sup>, Collier (1989)<sup>7</sup> or Koester and Olebe (1989).<sup>8</sup> Deardorff (2006, p. 247) defined multicultural competence: “*as the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations, which is based on intercultural knowledge, skills and attitudes.*”<sup>9</sup>

The authors identify themselves with the definition and support the fact that **multicultural competence is a set of knowledge, attitudes and skills enabling an individual an effective communication** (i.e. mainly non-conflictual and cooperative) **in a multicultural environment**.

Multicultural competence consists of partial requirements for the object (this can be for example a pupil, student, teacher etc.). It is related to conflict-free and cooperative behaviour in a multicultural environment. Hence we speak of subcompetencies forming a functional unit – a model of multicultural competence. Models of multicultural competences are linked to socio-cultural

<sup>1</sup> J. Hladík, *Konstrukce a modely multikulturních kompetencí*, Pedagogická orientace, 2010, 20 (4), p. 26-46.

<sup>2</sup> J.G. Ponterotto et al., *Teacher multicultural attitude survey*, Educational and Psychology Measurement, 1998, 58 (6), p. 1002-1016.

<sup>3</sup> M. Byram, *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*, Clevedon 1987.

<sup>4</sup> R.L. Pope, A.L. Reynolds, *Student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills*, Journal of College Student Development, 1997, (3), p. 266-277.

<sup>5</sup> G.M. Chen, W.J. Starosta, *Intercultural Communication Competence: A Synthesis*, Communication Yearbook, 1996, 19, p. 353-383.

<sup>6</sup> D.W. Sue et al., *Multicultural Counseling Competencies and Standards: A Call to the Profession*, Journal of Counseling and Development, 1992, (70), p. 477-486.

<sup>7</sup> M.J. Collier, *Cultural and intercultural communication competence: Current approaches and directions for future research*, International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1989, 13, p. 287-302.

<sup>8</sup> J. Koester, M. Olebe, *The behavioral assessment scale for intercultural communication effectiveness*, International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1989, 12, p. 233-246.

<sup>9</sup> Deardorff (as well as Fantini later) uses the term intercultural competence. There is no space to analyse the difference between the terms multicultural competence and intercultural competence. Such terminological dichotomy occurs in specialised literature and the actual contents of both terms very often overlap. However, the term intercultural is used in the paper in the context of learning and communication as the terms are fully established and their use is consistent. For simplicity, we will use the term multicultural competence and intercultural competence as a synonym. The term multicultural competence is used in the singular, reflecting a holistic approach to the concept (D.K. Deardorff, *Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization*, Journal of Studies in International Education, 2006, 3, p. 241-266).

specifics of each country, therefore they can not be adopted fully. There is no model that would be generally valid and the structure of which would be adopted by experts unanimously. The models differ mainly in components of multicultural competence. There is also a difference in the conception of interaction amongst particular components of multicultural competence.

The research probe we present here is based on several models of multicultural competence. The starting point was the model designed by Pope, Reynolds and Mueller (2004).<sup>10</sup> In 1997 Pope and Reynolds published a collection of 32 multicultural subcompetencies explicitly for academic and non-academic university staff. It is based on a three-pronged model of multicultural competence applied in the 80s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in psychological counseling in the U.S. As stated the model consists of three components: multicultural awareness, knowledge and skills.<sup>11</sup> The research in hand operates with these three components complemented by a fourth component: multicultural pedagogical skills.

Multicultural awareness includes attitudes, beliefs, values, assumptions and also realising the necessary determinants for effective communication in a culturally diverse society. It is assumed that individual's consciousness cannot at the beginning of the educational activities display inappropriate elements such as bias, stereotypes or prejudice. Multicultural knowledge includes individual's knowledge of different cultures. The initial assumption is based on correcting the knowledge about different cultures that may be wrong and incomplete. Multicultural skills enable effective and meaningful interaction, such as consensus, as a necessity of communication between different cultural groups. Multicultural skills are based on awareness and knowledge aimed at appropriate and effective changes in multicultural reality. Multicultural skills account for behaviour that reflects multicultural awareness and knowledge. The center of these skills is the art of cross-cultural communication and understanding of how each culture affects the form and contents of communication.<sup>12</sup> Multicultural pedagogical skills have been defined as a set of specific behaviours of teachers in multicultural educational reality oriented towards psychodidactic skills.

Also Fantini's model of Intercultural Communication Competence (2000) served to identify partial subcompetencies used in the research. Multicultural competence contains five dimensions according to this concept: awareness, attitudes, skills, knowledge and proficiency in the host tongue. Fantini's effort to link the intercultural area and language area is manifested here.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> R.L. Pope, A.L. Reynolds, J.A. Mueller, *Multicultural competence in student affairs*, San Francisco 2004.

<sup>11</sup> J. Hladík, *Konstrukce a modely*.

<sup>12</sup> R.L. Pope, A.L. Reynolds, *Student affairs core competencies*.

<sup>13</sup> J. Hladík, *Konstrukce a modely*.

## Research Objective

The research objective was to determine the importance attributed to individual multicultural subcompetencies by Czech and English teachers. We researched whether there are differences in the order in which Czech and English teachers rank the importance of multicultural subcompetencies and which they regard as the most and the least important.

## Sample

The research was conducted involving eight elementary school teachers ( $n = 8$ ) in Primary School Smetanovy sady Holešov (The Czech Republic) and the same number of teachers ( $n = 8$ ) in Houndsfield Primary School in London (Great Britain). The schools were chosen deliberately as the cultural composition of their pupils differs and the teachers work in different multicultural situations. In comparison with their English colleagues, Czech teachers work in a rather homogenous cultural environment. The Czech teachers from the sample are confronted only in theory with multicultural reality and it occurs when including multicultural issues in education (teaching **about** multicultural reality). English teachers, on the other hand, work in a very culturally pluralistic environment (teaching **in** multicultural reality). We wondered whether this difference can affect the view of both groups of teachers on the importance of multicultural subcompetencies. We are aware of the small scope of the sample. However, the method applied (Q methodology) allows us to work with small groups.<sup>14</sup> We do not wish to generalise the results and their interpretation applies only to the research sample. The results are to be understood as a research probe into the issue with a prospect of future implementation of other comparative measurements on a larger scale.

## Method

Q methodology was used as a method of data collection. It is an interface approach of qualitative and quantitative research strategies, in which respondents rate the individual objects (Q types) from the least important to the most important. Q type ranking is performed so as to preserve a normal

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. M. Chráska, *Metody pedagogického výzkumu*, Praha 2007, or F.N. Kerlinger, *Základy výzkumu chování*, Praha 1972.

distribution of data. In this research, Q types represented various types of multicultural subcompetencies expressed in a statement. These subcompetencies comprise of explicit knowledge, abilities and skills that teachers who emphasize multicultural issues in their teaching should acquire. Based on studies of the selected models of multicultural competences, which are listed in the theoretical foundations of this study, we defined sixty multicultural subcompetencies. Based on these models and the authors' own experience, the subcompetencies were divided into four categories: multicultural knowledge (13 Q types), multicultural skills (12 Q types), multicultural awareness (13 Q types) and multicultural pedagogical skills (22 Q types). Individual subcompetencies (Q types) are listed in the Appendix. The complex of multicultural competence is formed by a set of subcompetencies represented by explicitly expressed requirements on the knowledge, skills and abilities of a teacher in a culturally heterogeneous classroom or a teacher who at least teaches multicultural issues. The respondents were given sixty cards with different Q types, which they were to sort into ten groups, from the least important to the most important. The teachers could assign only two Q types to the absolutely least and most important groups of multicultural competences. Towards the average value the number of Q types increases. The classification scheme follows the Gaussian curve on which the center is formed by a group of ten Q types and in the direction from the center the number of Q types in the group decreases. The particular groups of Q types were assigned values from 0 (least important) to 10 (most important).

The data analysis was performed by the program Statistica Base 9.0. Also ANOVA was used to determine the difference between groups of teachers where parameters of normality of data distribution and homogeneity of variances in groups have been met. The closeness of relationships between groups were analysed by using Pearson's coefficient of correlation.

## **Results and Discussion**

In this section of the study we will provide the top ten most and least important multicultural subcompetencies recorded in Czech and English teachers. Also the results of comparison between the two groups will be presented.

The following table shows ten multicultural subcompetencies which were assessed as the most important ones by Czech teachers from the perspective of importance of their acquisition.

Table 1

The most important multicultural subcompetencies by Czech teachers

| Order   | Q-type   | Average rating**       | Standard deviation |
|---------|--|------------------------|--------------------|
| 1.      | Q – 9 The teacher is aware of his/her own behaviour and its impact on others. (MA)*  | 7,50 (5,36; 23. – 28.) | 1,77               |
| 2.      | Q – 40 The teacher is able to create a positive social climate in class. (MPS)   | 7,25 (8,00; 1.)        | 2,31               |
| 3.      | Q – 20 The teacher is capable of making a serious contact with culturally different individuals. (MS)  | 7,13 (5,36; 23. – 28.) | 1,81               |
| 4.      | Q – 52 The teacher can create a class climate without bias. (MPS)  | 6,88 (5,13; 31.)       | 3,36               |
| 5.      | Q – 44 The teacher is able to take into account the differences resulting from cultural and linguistic differences when assessing the students' results. (MPS) | 6,75 (5,36; 23. – 28.) | 1,58               |
| 6. – 8. | Q – 7 The teacher accepts different world views and opinions and is willing to admit that his/her own point of view may not be the only and correct one. (MA)  | 6,5 (4,75; 33. – 35.)  | 2,39               |
| 6. – 8. | Q – 26 The teacher is able to appreciate and respect the diverse cultures of students. (MS)  | 6,5 (5,25; 29. – 30.)  | 1,51               |
| 6. – 8. | Q – 56 The teacher is able to educate himself/herself further in the field of multicultural education. (MS)  | 6,50 (3,88; 45. – 48.) | 2,39               |
| 9.      | Q – 25 The teacher is aware of how his/her own values might affect students. (MA)  | 6,38 (4,38; 40. – 41.) | 2,33               |
| 10.     | Q – 22 The teacher is able to gain the trust and respect of culturally diverse individuals. (MS)   | 6,25 (5,86; 15.)       | 1,39               |

\* In brackets: the category the Q type belongs to: MA - multicultural awareness, MK - m. knowledge, MS - m. skills, MPS - m. pedagogical skills.

\*\* Average rating: 0 = least important, 10 = most important. In brackets: the average ranking and placement of the given Q-type by English teacher.

Three monitored categories of Q types have been recorded here: multicultural awareness, multicultural skills and multicultural pedagogical skills. The Czech teachers considered multicultural subcompetencies relating to the area of multicultural awareness (Q types 9, 7, 25) as the most important. They also gave great importance to multicultural pedagogical skills (Q types 40, 52, 44) and multicultural skills (Q types 20, 26, 56, 22).

Multicultural knowledge does not appear in the top ten most important subcompetencies. The Czech teachers from the sample therefore do not view multicultural knowledge as important as the other three categories.

The comparison with English teachers, which can be done from the third column of the table, shows that some Q types which Czech teachers rated as important were rated as not very important by English teachers. The discrepancy in ranking is recored in Q types 7, 56 and 25.

Q types that fall into the category of multicultural knowledge (Q types 12, 53, 14, 15, 16) and multicultural pedagogical skills (Q types 29, 48, 47) were seen as the least important.

The least important multicultural subcompetencies Q types 53 and 48 were considered unimportant by Czech teachers but by contrast English teachers rated them among ten most important.

Table 2

The least important multicultural subcompetencies by Czech teachers

| Order     | Q-type  | Average rating <sup>ab</sup> | Standard deviation |
|-----------|---|------------------------------|--------------------|
| 60. – 59. | Q – 12 The teacher has the knowledge of how cultural differences affect verbal and nonverbal communication. (MK) <sup>a</sup>                         | 3,75 (5,00; 32.)             | 2,96               |
| 60. – 59. | Q – 53 The teacher knows the theoretical concepts related to ethnic and racial issues. (MK)   | 3,75 (6,50; 7. – 9.)         | 2,87               |
| 58.       | Q – 24 The teacher is capable of differentiating between individual differences, cultural differences and universal similarities of individuals. (MS) | 3,63 (3,88; 45. – 48.)       | 2,33               |
| 57. – 56. | Q – 15 The teacher knows the characteristics of different cultures and knows how to pass on such knowledge. (MK)                                      | 3,50 (4,63; 36. – 38.)       | 0,93               |

cd. tab. 2

|           |  |                        |      |
|-----------|--|------------------------|------|
| 57. – 56. | Q – 29 In the case of significant cultural differences among students the teacher is able to allocate the student someone who knows the specifics of their culture and language. (MPS) | 3,50 (2,50; 59.)       | 2,67 |
| 55. – 54. | Q – 14 The teacher knows how race, ethnicity, language, nationality or religion influence experience of an individual. (MK)  | 3,25 (6,13; 14.)       | 2,05 |
| 55. – 54. | Q – 16 The teacher knows the ways of developing identity and aculturation process of individuals who are culturally disadvantaged. (MK)  | 3,25 (3,63; 51. – 54.) | 1,16 |
| 53.       | Q – 19 The teacher is able to discern the effects of cultural differences in communication and is able to communicate effectively across these differences. (MS)                       | 3,00 (5,25; 29. – 30.) | 0,93 |
| 52.       | Q – 48 The teacher can teach a group of immigrants. (MPS)  | 2,00 (6,75; 4. – 5.)   | 2,20 |
| 51.       | Q – 47 The teacher is able to exercise their profession abroad (MPS)   | 1,50 (5,38; 23. – 28.) | 2,26 |

\* In brackets: the category the Q type belongs to: MA - multicultural awareness, MK - m. knowledge, MS - m. skills, MPS - m. pedagogical skills.

\*\* Average rating: 0 = least important, 10 = most important. In brackets: the average ranking and placement of the given Q-type by English teachers.

The following ranking of importance of multicultural subcompetencies has been recorded from English teachers.

Table 3

The most important multicultural subcompetencies by English teachers

| Order | Q-type  | Average rating <sup>**</sup> | Standard deviation |
|-------|---|------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1.    | Q – 40 The teacher is able to create a positive social climate in class. (MPS)*                                     | 8,00 (7,25; 2.)              | 1,51               |
| 2.    | Q – 35 The teacher can help the students with problems that occur during their adaptation to the new culture. (MPS) | 7,13 (6,25; 10. – 11.)       | 2,53               |



cd. tab. 3

|         |   |                        |      |
|---------|---|------------------------|------|
| 3.      | Q - 39 The teacher is involved in fight against inequality, racism and discrimination. (MA)   | 6,88 (4,13; 46.)       | 2,42 |
| 4. - 5. | Q - 46 The teacher is ready to work with the whole family of a student from a different culture. (MPS)  | 6,75 (4,00; 47. - 49.) | 2,60 |
| 4. - 5. | Q - 48 The teacher can teach a group of immigrants. (MPS)   | 6,75 (2,00; 59.)       | 2,55 |
| 6.      | Q - 50 The teacher can build a positive relationship with a student as the basis for effective multicultural education. (MK)                                | 6,63 (5,50; 19. - 23.) | 2,72 |
| 7. - 9. | Q - 13 The teacher is able to communicate verbally and nonverbally with children of different cultures. (MK)  | 6,5 (4,63; 35. - 38.)  | 1,60 |
| 7. - 9. | Q - 45 The teacher believes that cooperation with families of pupils from different cultures is important. (MPS)  | 6,5 (4,75; 33. - 34.)  | 2,45 |
| 7. - 9. | Q - 53 The teacher knows the theoretical concepts related to ethnic and racial issues. (MK)   | 6,5 (3,75; 51. - 52.)  | 2,98 |
| 10.     | Q - 1 The teacher believes that cultural differences are significant and learning about people who are culturally diverse is necessary and beneficial. (MK) | 6,38 (4,75; 33. - 34.) | 2,07 |

\* In brackets: the category the Q type belongs to: MA - multicultural awareness, MK - m. knowledge, MS - m. skills, MPS - m. pedagogical skills.

\*\* Average rating: 0 = least important, 10 = most important. In brackets: the average ranking and placement of the given Q-type by Czech teachers.

English teachers rated Q types of multicultural pedagogical skills very high. Five of these Q types (40, 35, 46, 48, 45) are amongst the top ten most important competences. There are also three Q types (39, 50, 1) from the category of multicultural awareness. Q type 13 represents a category of multicultural skills and Q type 53 belongs to the category of multicultural knowledge. It can also be seen that there is a difference between the perception of importance of Q types 53 and 48. Whereas English teachers perceived them as very important Czech teachers on the other hand reported that these subcompetencies did not matter.

Q types identified among the ten least important by English teachers were 60, 57, 29, belonging to the category of multicultural pedagogical skills along

with Q types 16, 58, and 11 which belong to the area of multicultural knowledge. In the category of multicultural awareness, two Q types (2 and 28) have been recorded. Q types 21 and 38 belonging to the category of multicultural skill were also rated as least important by English teachers. Q types 16 and 29 were identically classified among the ten least important subcompetences by both English and Czech teachers.

Table 4

The least important multicultural subcompetencies by English teachers

| Order     | Q-type  | Average rating**        | Standard deviation |
|-----------|---|-------------------------|--------------------|
| 60. – 57. | Q – 2 The teacher is willing to see cultural diversity as necessary and important for their professional growth. (MA)*                              | 3,63(4,5; 39. – 42.)    | 2,50               |
| 60. – 57. | Q – 16 The teacher knows the ways of developing identity and aculturation process of individuals belonging to culturally disadvantaged groups. (MK) | 3,63 (3,25; 56. – 57. ) | 2,45               |
| 60. – 57. | Q – 21 The teacher is able to link the results of their current intercultural education with their previous knowledge. (MS)                         | 3,63 (5,50; 19. – 23.)  | 1,69               |
| 60. – 57. | Q – 28 The teacher sees the differences between him/her and the students from other cultures as natural. (MA)                                       | 3,63 (4,50; 39. – 42.)  | 1,92               |
| 56.       | Q – 38 The teacher is able to recognise a possible conflict arising between him/her and the students of different cultures. (MS)                    | 3,38 (5,00; 29. – 31.)  | 1,85               |
| 55.       | Q – 58 The teacher knows various approaches to multicultural education and their application possibilities. (MK)                                    | 3,25 (6,13; 12. – 13.)  | 2,38               |
| 54.       | Q – 57 The teacher can explain to the cultural majority students how to behave to classmates of different cultures, ethnicity and race. (MPS)       | 3,13 (5,50; 19. – 23.)  | 2,42               |

cd. tab. 4

|     |   |                        |      |
|-----|---|------------------------|------|
| 53. | Q – 11 The teacher is informed about changes that may occur in the values and behaviour of individuals. (MK)  | 3,00 (4,38; 43. – 45.) | 2,20 |
| 52. | Q – 29 In case of significant cultural differences among students the teacher is able to allocate the student someone who knows the specifics of their culture and language. (MPS)    | 2,50 (3,50; 54. – 55.) | 1,85 |
| 51. | Q – 60 The teacher can explain to the cultural majority students how to communicate with students of other ethnicities and cultures, in order to respect their cultural traits. (MPS) | 2,25 (5,88; 16. –17.)  | 2,31 |

\* In brackets: the category the Q type belongs to: MA - multicultural awareness, MK - m. knowledge, MS - m. skills, MPS - m. pedagogical skills.

\*\* Average rating: 0 = least important, 10 = most important. In brackets: the average ranking and placement of the given Q-type by Czech teachers.

When evaluating of the most important multicultural subcompetences, both Czech and English teachers agreed on *teacher’s ability to create positive social climate in class* belonging to the category of multicultural pedagogical skills. The average value of this subcompetence was 7.25 in Czech teachers and 8.00 in their English counterparts. Czech teachers perceive this subcompetence as the second most important while English teachers as the single most important one. In case of the least important multicultural subcompetencies a consensus was recorded among Czech and English teachers on subcompetencies relating to *ways of identity development and the process acculturation of individuals belonging to culturally disadvantaged groups* (multicultural knowledge) and *skills to assign a student from a very different cultural background someone who knows their culture and language* (multicultural pedagogical skills).

The evaluation of the two teacher groups also shows visible differences. English teachers rated among the ten most important multicultural subcompetencies the following: *the teacher should be able to teach a group of immigrants* (multicultural pedagogical skills) and *knowledge of theoretical concepts related to ethnic and racial issues* (multicultural knowledge). Czech teachers reported these two multicultural subcompetencies among the ten least important.

**Analysis of differences between groups.** We also tried to verify whether the rating of Czech and English teachers showed statistically significant differences. In the four categories surveyed, the following statistically significant differences were found. ANOVA was used to analyse the differences.

**Multicultural knowledge.** A statistically significant difference in the following multicultural subcompetencies was recorded for: *the teacher knows how race, ethnicity, language, nationality or religion influence experience of an individual* (Q-14),  $p = 0.008$ . *The teacher knows the cultural background of students who come from different countries* (Q-27),  $p = 0.013$ . *The teacher knows various approaches to multicultural education and application possibilities* (Q-58),  $p = 0.015$ .

**Multicultural skills.** Statistically significant differences between groups of teachers was noted in these multicultural subcompetencies: *The teacher is able to discern the effects of cultural differences in communication and is able to communicate effectively across these differences* (Q-19),  $p = 0.000$ . *The teacher is able to link the results of their current intercultural education with their previous knowledge* (Q-21),  $p = 0.043$ . *The teacher is able educate himself/herself further in the field of multicultural education* (Q-56),  $p = 0.022$ .

**Multicultural awareness.** In this category, a single factor analysis of variance showed statistically significant differences in three subcompetencies: *Teacher believes that cultural differences are not in conflict with effective communication and the meaningful relationships between culturally different groups* (Q-8),  $p = 0.021$ . *The teacher is aware of his/her own behaviour and its impact on others* (Q-9),  $p = 0.044$ . *The teacher is involved in fight against inequality, racism and discrimination* (Q-39),  $p = 0.020$ .

**Multicultural pedagogical skills.** In this category, we also noticed a few statistically significant differences between the rating of Czech and English teachers. *The teacher can explain to the cultural majority students how to communicate with students of other ethnicities and cultures, in order to respect their cultural traits* (Q-60),  $p = 0.006$ . *The teacher is able to teach a group of immigrants* (Q-48),  $p = 0.001$ . *The teacher is able to practise his/her profession abroad* (Q-47),  $p = 0.003$ . *The teacher can explain to the cultural majority students how to behave to classmates of different cultures, ethnicity and race* (Q-57),  $p = 0.047$ . *The teacher is ready to work with the entire family of a student from a different culture* (Q-46),  $p = 0.032$ .

**Analysis of correlations between groups.** A further analysis was conducted to determine how close the relationship between the assessment of various multicultural subcompetencies by Czech and English teachers is. Tightness of the relations was examined by Pearson's correlation coefficient in four areas of the surveyed multicultural competence.

Table 5

Correlation between Czech and English teachers - Multicultural knowledge

| Variables        | Czech teachers | English teachers |
|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Czech teachers   | 1,000          | - 0,443*         |
| English teachers | - 0,443        | 1,000            |

\* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The calculation of Pearson’s correlation coefficient indicates central tendency between Czech and English teachers in rating of relating subcompetencies in the area of the multicultural knowledge. However the dependency is negative. The higher rating (i.e. the assigned importance of multicultural subcompetencies) by one group, the lower rating by the other group.

Table 6

Correlation between Czech and English teachers – Multicultural skills

| Variables        | Czech teachers | English teachers |
|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Czech teachers   | 1,000          | 0,143*           |
| English teachers | 0,143          | 1,000            |

\* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 7

Correlation between Czech and English teachers – Multicultural awareness

| Variables        | Czech teachers | English teachers |
|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Czech teachers   | 1,000          | -0,112*          |
| English teachers | - 0,112        | 1,000            |

\* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 8

Correlation between Czech and English teachers – Multicultural pedagogical skills

| Variables        | Czech teachers | English teachers |
|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Czech teachers   | 1,000          | 0,025*           |
| English teachers | 0,025          | 1,000            |

\* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In the other three monitored areas of multicultural competence, we noticed a very low correlation between the rating of Czech and English teachers. Both groups evaluated the importance of multicultural subcompetencies independently.

The research focused on the comparison of ratings of importance of multicultural subcompetencies between Czech and English teachers. The data were obtained using Q-methodology. The respondents (N = 16) ranked sixty multicultural subcompetencies to match the profile of Gaussian curve.

All four examined areas of multicultural competence were represented among the ten most important multicultural subcompetencies in Czech and English teachers (multicultural knowledge, multicultural awareness,

multicultural skills, multicultural pedagogical skills). Subcompetencies related to multicultural knowledge, however, was recorded only once and in English teachers (7. – 9. position). Czech teachers do not give the importance to multicultural knowledge. Both groups agreed that the subcompetence *the ability of the teacher to create a positive social climate in class* belongs amongst the most important ones. This subcompetence does not bind exclusively to a multicultural class or to multicultural education. It can be understood as a universal competence of all teachers, regardless their multicultural situation. As for the importance of subcompetencies closely related to the multicultural reality of school, no consensus was found in the top ten positions between Czech and English teachers. In case of the ten least important multicultural subcompetencies, Czech and English teachers agreed on low importance of *knowledge and ways of identity development and an aculturation process of individuals belonging to disadvantaged groups and an ability to assign a student from very different cultural contexts someone who knows their culture and language*. Both Czech and English teachers agree that these two subcompetencies are of a very little importance.

Statistically significant differences in ratings among a group of Czech and English teachers have been reported in fourteen multicultural subcompetencies. In the case of multicultural knowledge, Czech teachers compared to their English colleagues, do not feel significance of knowledge related to multicultural influence determinants (race, ethnicity, language, nationality, religion) on individual's experience (Q-14,  $p = 0.008$  and Q-27,  $p = 0.013$ ). The multicultural reality in Czech schools is very different from English schools. Czech teachers work in culturally and racially almost homogeneous environment. They do not feel the need to get acquainted with how the anthropological and cultural concepts such as race, ethnicity, language, nationality and religion affect the pupil. An opposite tendency is seen in relation to knowledge of various approaches to multicultural education (Q-58,  $p = 0.015$ ). English teachers do not view such knowledge as important as Czech teachers. Building knowledge of teachers in multicultural education belongs among the current trends in teacher education in the Czech Republic. Such knowledge takes the form of education of the majority of students "about minorities." English teachers do not teach a majority "about minorities" but they teach "with minorities." In other words English teachers do not teach "about" multicultural reality as Czech but "in" multicultural reality. Hence their opinion that theoretical knowledge of various approaches and concepts of multicultural education is not as important. Also in the area of multicultural skills, the teachers' assessment was affected by different multicultural environment in which they teach. Due to the fact that Czech

teachers do not come in contact with pupils of different cultures as often as their English counterparts, they do not consider the ability of intercultural communication important (Q-19,  $p = 0.000$ ). The skills related to their own intercultural learning and education in the field of multicultural education however are seen more important by Czech teachers than by English teachers (Q-27,  $p = 0.043$  and Q-56,  $p = 0.022$ ). The tendency of Czech teachers to prepare for a greater cultural pluralism in Czech education based on migration forecasts can be detected.

An analysis of correlations in the three areas of multicultural competence (multicultural skills, multicultural areness, multicultural pedagogical skills) did not show a significant correlation in the evaluation of multicultural subcompetencies by Czech and English teachers. In the case of multicultural knowledge, a medium dependence ( $r = -0.443$ ) between the groups was demonstrated. It is a negative dependence. The knowledge that Czech teachers consider important, is considered unimportant by English teachers and vice versa. The following table shows the difference in perception of the importance of individual subcompetencies in this category.

Table 9

The difference between Czech and English teachers in attitude to multicultural knowledge

| Q-type   | Average rating |                  |
|--|----------------|------------------|
|  | Czech teachers | English teachers |
| Q-58 Knows various approaches to multicultural education and their application possibilities in school and education.      | 6,13           | 3,25             |
| Q-59 Knows the goals, methods, teaching materials and curriculum needed for the implementation of multicultural education. | 6,00           | 3,75             |
| Q-11 Is informed of changes that may occur in the values and behaviour of individuals.                                     | 4,38           | 3,00             |
| Q-54 Knows the basic concepts of multicultural education (ohnic group, ethnicity, nation, minority, racism etc.)           | 4,50           | 4,13             |
| Q-53 Knows the theoretical concepts related to ethnic and racial issues.   | 3,75           | 6,50             |
| Q-27 Knows the cultural background of students who come from different countries.  | 4,00           | 6,26             |
| Q-14 Knows how race, ethnicity, language, nationality, or religion influence experience of an individual.                  | 3,25           | 6,13             |

|  |      |      |
|--|------|------|
| Q-55 Manifests didactic skills for the implementation of multicultural education.  | 4,00 | 5,75 |
| Q-10 Has knowledge of different cultures (e.g. history, traditions, values and customs).   | 4,63 | 5,50 |
| Q-17 Knows the differences between various groups and sees the importance of understanding equality and oppression.              | 5,00 | 5,50 |
| Q-12 Has knowledge of how cultural differences affect verbal and nonverbal communication.  | 3,75 | 5,00 |
| Q-15 Knows the characteristics of different cultures and knows how to pass on such knowledge.                                    | 3,5  | 4,63 |
| Q-16 Knows the ways of developing identity and aculturation process of individuals belonging to culturally disadvantaged groups. | 3,25 | 3,63 |

The knowledge of multicultural education that Czech teachers prefer is rather of a psychodidactic aspect. The knowledge of environmental and external influences on the educational process conditions is not regarded so important by Czech teachers. An opposite tendency has been recorded in English teachers.

It should be noted that there are limits to the research probe carried out. The research sample is not large ( $N = 16$ ). For this very reason we do not wish to generalise the results and we only apply them to the research sample. The results are to serve as a springboard for further international comparative analysis in the area of multicultural competence.

Another limiting factor is the definitions of multicultural subcompetence, their number and division into four areas. Their selection and division is based on specialised literature and authors' own experience as they teach multicultural education at a university. A standardised set of multicultural sub-competencies is still needed in the Czech Republic which would make future research in this area easier.

## Conclusion

Comparative studies focusing on comparing the levels of multicultural competence, its construction or a modelling method are currently missing in the Czech Republic. The research probe is to contribute to the knowledge



in this area. The Czech education has not yet been confronted with multicultural reality as education in the UK. Multicultural education in both countries has a different form. Despite the different situation in both countries several similar views on multicultural subcompetencies have been found.

International comparative research in the field of multicultural education is rather significant for Czech pedagogy. The results of comparative analyses based on empirical investigations are essential for understanding multicultural educational processes. Such studies should form a part of a systematic and comprehensive research in the field of multicultural education and multicultural competence.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Byram M., *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon 1987.
- Chen G.M., Starosta W.J., *Intercultural Communication Competence: A Synthesis*, Communication Yearbook, 1996, 19.
- Chráska M., *Metody pedagogického výzkumu*, Grada, Praha 2007.
- Collier M.J., *Cultural and intercultural communication competence: Current approaches and directions for future research*, International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1989, 13.
- Deardorff D.K., *Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization*, Journal of Studies in International Education, 2006, 3.
- Fantini A.E., *A Central Concern: Developing Intercultural Competence*, SIT Occasional Papers Series Addressing Intercultural Education, Training and Service, Spring 2000, <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.117.8512&rep=rep1&type=pdf#page=33>
- Hladík J., *Konstrukce a modely multikulturních kompetencí*, Pedagogická orientace, 2010, 20 (4), 26.
- Kerlinger F.N., *Základy výzkumu chování*, Academia, Praha 1972.
- Koester J., Olebe M., *The behavioral assessment scale for intercultural communication effectiveness*, International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1989, 12.
- Ponterotto J.G., Baluch S., Greig T., Rivera L., *Teacher multicultural attitude survey*, Educational and Psychology Measurement, 1998, 58 (6).
- Pope R.L., Reynolds A.L., *Student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills*, Journal of College Student Development, 1997, (3).
- Pope R.L., Reynolds A.L., Mueller J.A., *Multicultural competence in student affairs*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco 2004.
- Sue D.W. et al., *Multicultural Counseling Competencies and Standards: A Call to the Profession*, Journal of Counseling and Development, 1992, (70).

## Appendix

### List of Q types

| Q types |  |
|---------|--|
| Q-1     | The teacher believes that cultural differences are significant and learning about people who are culturally diverse is necessary and beneficial. (MA)*                 |
| Q-2     | The teacher is willing to see cultural diversity as necessary and important for their professional growth. (MA)  |
| Q-3     | The teacher is aware of the need to fight for social justice. (MA)   |
| Q-4     | The teacher is aware of their own cultural roots. (MA)   |
| Q-5     | The teacher is willing to change their own values, beliefs and prejudices. (MA)  |
| Q-6     | The teacher is open to changes and he/she believes that changes can be beneficial. (MA)  |
| Q-7     | The teacher accepts different world views and opinions and is willing to admit that his/her own point of view may not be the only and correct one. (MA)                |
| Q-8     | The teacher believes that cultural differences are not in conflict with effective communication and meaningful relationships between culturally different groups. (MA) |
| Q-9     | The teacher is aware of his/her own behaviour and its impact on others. (MA)   |
| Q-10    | The teacher has knowledge of different cultures (e.g. history, traditions, values and customs). (Mk)   |
| Q-11    | The teacher is informed about changes that may occur in the values and behaviour of individuals.(Mk)   |
| Q-12    | The teacher has the knowledge of how cultural differences affect verbal and nonverbal communication. (MK)  |
| Q-13    | The teacher is able to communicate verbally and nonverbally with children of different cultures. (MS)  |
| Q-14    | The teacher knows how race, ethnicity, language, nationality or religion influence experience of an individual. (MK)   |
| Q-15    | The teacher knows the characteristics of different cultures and knows how to pass on such knowledge. (MK)  |
| Q-16    | The teacher knows the ways of developing identity and aculturation process of individuals belonging to the culturally disadvantaged groups. (MK)                       |
| Q-17    | The teacher knows the differences between various groups and sees the importance of understanding equality and oppression. (MK)  |
| Q-18    | The teacher is able to identify cultural differences and openly discuss about them. (MS)   |
| Q-19    | The teacher is able to discern the effects of cultural differences in communication and is able to communicate effectively across these differences. (MS)              |

|      |   |
|------|---|
| Q-20 | The teacher capable of making a serious contact with culturally different individuals. (MS)   |
| Q-21 | The teacher is able to link the results of their current intercultural education with their previous knowledge. (MS)  |
| Q-22 | The teacher is able to gain trust and respect of culturally diverse individuals. (MS)   |
| Q-23 | The teacher is able to precisely define his/her own multicultural skills, their level and potential for development. (MS)   |
| Q-24 | The teacher is capable of differentiating between individual differences, cultural differences and universal similarities of individuals. (MS)                                  |
| Q-25 | The teacher is aware of how his/her own values might affect students.(MA)   |
| Q-26 | The teacher is able to appreciate and respect the diverse cultures of students. (MS)  |
| Q-27 | The teacher knows the cultural background of students who come from different countries. (MK)   |
| Q-28 | The teacher sees the differences between him/her and the students from other cultures as natural. (MA)  |
| Q-29 | In the case of significant cultural differences among students the teacher is able to allocate the student someone who knows the specifics of their culture and language. (MPS) |
| Q-30 | The teacher takes into account the distinct cultural characteristics of students in class. (MPS)  |
| Q-31 | The teacher is able to utilise their knowledge of student's culture in the multicultural classroom. (MPS)   |
| Q-32 | The teacher knows how to approach teaching in a multicultural classroom. (MPS)  |
| Q-33 | The teacher is aware that school success of students from different countries can vary greatly. (MPS)   |
| Q-34 | The teacher is aware of factors influencing students' adaptation to a new culture. (MPS)  |
| Q-35 | The teacher can help students with problems that occur during adaptation to a new culture. (MPS)  |
| Q-36 | The teacher is able to use a learning style and methods to meet the needs of a multicultural classroom. (MPS)   |
| Q-37 | The teacher employs teaching strategies which support the identity development in students from different cultures. (MPS)   |
| Q-38 | The teacher is able to recognise a possible conflict arising between him/her and the students of different cultures.(MS)  |
| Q-39 | The teacher is involved in the fight against inequality, racism and discrimination. (MA)  |
| Q-40 | The teacher is able to create a positive social climate in the class. (MPS)   |
| Q-41 | The teacher relates well with students of different ethnicity. (MPS)  |
| Q-42 | The teacher can positively affect students' attitudes towards multicultural society. (MPS)  |

|   |
|---|
| Q-43 The teacher is aware of the ethical dimension of multicultural education. (MPS)  |
| Q-44 The teacher is able to take into account the differences resulting from cultural and linguistic differences when assessing the students' results. (MPS)                        |
| Q-45 The teacher believes that cooperation with families of pupils from different cultures is important. (MPS)  |
| Q-46 The teacher is ready to work with the entire family of a student from a different culture. (MPS)   |
| Q-47 The teacher is able to practise their profession abroad. (MPS)   |
| Q-48 The teacher can teach a group of immigrants. (MPS)   |
| Q-49 The teacher can approach a child as an individual and shows a clear interest in them and their cultural roots. (MS)  |
| Q-50 The teacher can build a positive relationship with a student as the basis for effective multicultural education. (MA)  |
| Q-51 The teacher can explain to the cultural majority students how to communicate with students of other ethnicities and cultures, in order to respect their cultural traits. (MPS) |
| Q-52 The teacher can create a class climate without bias. (MPS)   |
| Q-53 The teacher knows the theoretical concepts related to ethnic and racial issues. (MK)   |
| Q-54 The teacher can explain to the cultural majority students how to behave to classmates of different cultures, ethnicity and race. (MK)  |
| Q-55 The teacher manifests didactic skills for the implementation of multicultural education. (MK)  |
| Q-56 The teacher is able to educate himself/herself further in the field of multicultural education. (MS)   |
| Q-57 The teacher can explain to the cultural majority students how to behave to classmates of different cultures, ethnicity and race. (MPS)   |
| Q-58 The teacher knows various approaches to multicultural education and their application possibilities. (MK)  |
| Q-59 The teacher knows the goals, methods, teaching materials and curriculum needed for the implementation of multicultural education. (MK)   |
| Q-60 The teacher can explain to the cultural majority students how to communicate with students of other ethnicities and cultures, in order to respect their cultural traits. (MPS) |

\* In brackets: the category the Q type belongs to: MA - multicultural awareness, MK - m. knowledge, MS - m. skills, MPS - m. pedagogical skills.