

Diversity Management and Respect for Diversity at Schools

Ahmet Saylık*

Ankara University, Turkey

Mahmut Polatcan**

Ankara University, Turkey

Numan Saylık***

Van Ipekyolu Center of Science and Art, Turkey

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to examine employees' individual attitudes towards diversity management and respect for diversity in secondary education in views of secondary school administrators and teachers, and to explore the relationship between these concepts. According to the results of the study, administrators and teachers in secondary schools display positive individual attitudes and behaviours towards diversity. School administrators and teachers' organizational norms and values associated with diversity are positive. However, there is a low positive relationship between respect for diversity and diversity management.

Key words: Diversity, Diversity Management, Respect for Diversity.

* Ankara University Institute of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration and Policy, Turkey

**Ankara University Institute of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration and Policy, Turkey

*** Teacher, Van Ipekyolu Center of Science and Art, Turkey

Introduction

With the rise of globalization, factors such as culture, beliefs and interaction among people have enabled coexistence of differences. Because of the increase in diversity and complicity in manpower, the concept of diversity has started to play an important role in organizational life (Bhadury, Mighty & Damar, 2000; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). Numerous researchers have interpreted diversity in different ways. Cox & Smolinski (1994) suggest diversity is the representation of different identities in the same organizational system. Cox (2001) defines diversity as the exchange of social and cultural identities when people gather in the same organization or a job. Ely & Thomas (2001) point out that diversity needs to be perceived as a work attitude and perspective where members of different groups of identities meet. Esty, Griffin & Hirsch (1995) describe diversity as approving and understanding values and ritual differences among people in terms of age, category, ethnicity, physical and mental skills, race and sexual orientation. According to Kreitner (2001), diversity is the representation of individual differences and similarities in majority. In other words, diversity is a mixture of different identities, backgrounds, experiences, beliefs, value judgements, ages, genders, demographic structures, professional experience, physical abilities, educational levels, family status, and personal dispositions and so on in any group, community or organization (Foxman & Easterling, 1999). As a result, diversity can be described as organizational or individual differences that are innate or acquired through socialization.

Diversity management is used as a synonym of organizational culture. Conceptually, organizational culture is the lingual applications and symbols of hidden values and beliefs of a group in an organization. Globally, aspects of diversity are viewed as ethnicity, gender, age, race, social status and even identity (Villum, 2007). Diversity management is defined as organizational process planning through the improvement of organizational environment of all employees with differences and similarities that could contribute to the organization's strategic competitiveness (Thomas, 2004). Diversity management, according to Barak (2014), means voluntary organizational actions in which employees are more extensively involved with the help of policies and programs of various formal and informal organizations. In other words, diversity management in an organization is the efficient and conscious improvement of a strategic, communication based administrative process shaped by values with a focus on future to create added value for the company, which includes approving and employing differences and similarities (Keil at all, 2007). Diversity management focuses on maximizing the skills of all employees in order to contribute to organizational goals. Ignoring diversity causes loss of productivity, time and money. Probable outcomes of inability to manage diversity are as follows: non-healthy tension between people caused by age, ability, ethnicity, race and gender differences; loss of productivity caused by conflicts; legal acts and complaints; preventing women from work and so on (Aoun & Gibeily, 2007).

Diversity management has emerged in the USA, a multinational country. Demographic changes such as women's participation in workforce, organizational restructuring, legal equality of opportunity, new and creative approaches in human management and administrative applications have brought changes in organizations (Green, Lopez, Wysocki, & Kepner, 2002). The aim of diversity management is to increase work power, satisfy employees, and strengthen communication between employees and increase employee performance (Weech-Maldonado, Dreachslin, Dansky, De Souza, & Gatto, 2002). America, from the 1900s, has turned into a more combined culture which encompasses people with different races, gender, religion, ethnicity, group and beliefs from the dominant, white European culture (Foxman & Easterling 1999). It emerged as social protests, human rights movements and the movement of freedom in the 1950s; judicial rules, human rights and equal opportunity laws in the 1960s and the 1970s; economic and demographic changes in the 1980s and the 1990s (Brazzel, 2003). Research on diversity is largely based on four aspects: personal (education, skill and abilities), internal (gender, race, ethnicity, intelligence and sexual orientation), external (culture, nation, religion, marital status) and organizational aspect (status, department, union member/non-member) (Digh, 1998; How, 2007; Johnson, 2003; Simmons-Welburn, 1999; cited by Kreitz, 2007).

Diversity management is employed in research and theory in order to manage organizational change, as well as in the area of application of behavioural sciences. Diversity in organizations is applied to remove certain difficulties caused by people's racial differences, sexual orientation and gender. The aim here is to bring lifelong learning, modesty, compassion, social justice, and respect for differences and to improve health and efficiency in organizations (Brazzel, 2003). Social, economic and political factors have increasingly caused a great difference in the current work power. Organizations are attempting to redesign their practices in order to attain organizational goals with constantly decreasing sources. Such a disposition entails the need for efficient diversity management in team work (Bhadury, et al, 1999). Cox & Smolinski (1993) have listed the aims of diversity management as follows:

1. To create a climate where all members can be aware of their individual achievement and organizational contributions
2. To benefit from potential advantages of diversity and minimize probable obstacles
3. To create a climate where people from different cultural backgrounds in terms of values, working styles, priority of purpose and behavioural norms can cooperate with maximum performance

Balay, Kaya and Yılmaz (2014) report that managing diversity is beneficial to organizational administrators involved in the environment. Efficient diversity management in organizational and professional life gives a way to increased productivity, competition and job satisfaction, lower costs, improved creativity, strengthened organizational synergy, increased organizational adaptation skills and better employee attendance. Inefficient diversity management causes the following organizational deteriorations: disturbed working discipline, increased communication problems and disagreements, and reduced organizational commitment. In such cases, managers will try alternative solutions that might have a damaging effect on organizations.

In the context of well-managed diversity, respect for diversity is considerably significant both for organizational goals and individual happiness (Memduhoğlu, 2007). In the literature, it is suggested that respect is the product of two different attitudes. Parekh (2006) reports that these two attitudes are: "respect for dignity" and "respect for diversity". Taylor (1996; cited by Öksüz & Güven, 2012) similarly mentions two other attitudes: "equal dignity" and "diversity policy". It can be thought that both classifications are similarly related. Here, dignity and respect for dignity describe the assumption that individuals are humans and thus they need to have equal rights whereas respect for diversity is associated with understanding and tolerance for differences arising from being minorities.

Respect, as a fundamental moral value, is closely related to concepts such as tolerance and understanding. Respect is a widely-used term in relation to diversity. Balint (2006) states that respect is believed to be a kind of response which is employed in several organizational policies such as ethnic tensions, discrimination, prejudice, social adaptation and democratic equality. Keogh (1998) indicates that classroom environments similarly provide different emotional, social and academic atmospheres and these factors influence students' social and emotional learning and classroom climate respectively. According to Parekh (2006), respect for diversity means positive attitudes towards recognition and protection of the rights of cultures or people in minority and conformity with them.

Almost in every part of the world, young pupils with different learning capacities, difficulties, knowledge, cultures, languages and experiences attend the same classrooms as their peers (Karangwa, Miles & Lewis, 2010; Mowat, 2010; Schirmer & Casbon 1995). Teachers' role in the learning process through such differences is considerably significant. However, teachers themselves need to have respect and flexibility for diversity in the first place in order to teach young children human rights in the classroom, school and society, their own and other people's cultural values and respect for them (Banks, 2001; Eryaman, 2006, 2007; Hahn, 2005).

The purpose of the study was to examine the level of respect for diversity and diversity management in state secondary schools and to explore the level of the relationship between these two concepts. To this end, answers to the following questions were sought after:

1. According to the participants, what is the level of respect for diversity and diversity management in schools?
2. Do the participants' views about respect for diversity and diversity management in schools significantly vary according to gender, seniority, title, marital status, immediate area of work location, branch/field and educational level?
3. Is there a relationship between respect for diversity and diversity management in schools in views of secondary school administrators and teachers?

Method

Research Model

The research has the descriptive method. The method attempts to define a given case, individual or object as the research subject in their own terms and the way they are (Karasar, 2009). Perceptions of respect for diversity and diversity management in schools and views about their relationship are specified and evaluated based on the model.

Population and Sample

The population of the study consists of secondary (high) school administrators and teachers in Siirt central province (a province located in the south eastern part of Turkey). A total of 481 teachers and 100 administrators work in these schools. 42 school administrators and 278 teachers in the secondary schools were reached in the scope of the study. The sample was randomly selected. Information on personal features of the participants is given in Table 1.

Table 1. *Personal information of the sample group*

	Variable	N	%
Gender	Female	105	32,8
	Male	215	67,2
Age	20-25 years	35	10,9
	26-30 years	109	34,1
	31-35 years	91	28,4
	36-40 years	58	18,1
	41 and above	27	8,4
Marital Status	Married	195	60,9
	Single	125	39,1
Title	Administrator	42	13,1
	Teacher	278	86,9
Educational Level	Bachelor's degree/ Associate deg.	243	75,9
	Postgraduate (master)	77	24,1
Professional Seniority	1-5 years	166	51,9
	6-10 years	58	18,1
	11-15 years	52	16,3
	16-20 years	27	8,4
	21 and above	17	5,3
School Type	Anatolian	128	40,0
	Science and Anatolian Teacher	29	9,1
	Vocational	114	35,6
	Islamic Divinity High School	49	15,3
Location	District /Village/Town	42	13,1
	City	224	70,0
	Metropolis	54	16,9
Branch	Social	109	34,1
	Maths-Science	79	24,7
	Vocational	69	21,6
	Other (Foreign Languages, tour guide department etc.)	63	19,7
	Total	320	100

In Table 1, 105 of the participants are female and 215 are male. This difference is caused by the high number of male school administrators. Most of the participants are married. It is obvious from the distribution of seniority groups that junior teachers (1-5 years) are in majority. This case is thought to be the result of the initial teacher appointments to the eastern and south-eastern provinces of Turkey. The proportion of those who live in urban areas seems to be more than that of those in rural areas. Accordingly, more than 85% of the participants have lived most of their life in cities and metropolises. It is clear that the number of social field teachers is more than the number of vocational or maths-science teachers.

Data Gathering Instruments

For data gathering, “Personal Information Form”, the “Diversity Management Scale” and the “Respect for Diversity Scale” were incorporated in the research. The scale features are explained below.

Diversity Management Scale (DMS). The “Diversity Management Scale”, developed by Balay and Sağlam (2004) and reorganized by Memduhoğlu (2007), was employed in the study as a data gathering instrument. The study investigated to what extent each scale item was perceived by school administrators and teachers. The 28-item-scale had the following factors: “individual attitudes and behaviours”, “organizational values and norms”, and “administrative applications and policies”. Factor loadings of the scale ranged from .46 to .84. Item total correlations ranged from .49 to .67 in the first factor, from .45 to .63 in the second factor and from .61 to .78 in the third factor. Total variant

of the three factors was found 58.1%. Cronbach Alpha coefficient for reliability was found .77 for the first factor, .83 for the second and .95 for the third factor. The scale was a 5-point Likert type scale. High scale scores indicated positive perceptions and well-managed diversity in schools. In this study, the alpha value of DMS was found “ $\alpha=.93$ and item test correlations ranged from .33 to .79. The following calculations were obtained as a result of the study: $\alpha=.84$ and item test correlations from .66 to .73 for individual attitudes and behaviours; $\alpha=.69$ and item test correlations from .38 to .69 for organizational values and norms; $\alpha=.96$ and item test correlations from .71 to .86 for administrative applications and policies. It could be suggested that the scale is reliable.

Respect for Diversity Scale (RDS). The “Respect for Diversity Scale”, developed by Öksüz and Güven (2012), aimed to explore levels of respect for diversity. The 30-item-scale had the following factors: “knowledge based diversity”, “social category diversity”, and “value diversity”. Item test correlations calculated for item validity ranged from 0,30 to 0,83. Additionally, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found 0,94 and similar scale correlation was 0,70. As a result of factor analysis, total variant of the scale was found 59.24%. The scale was a 5-point Likert type scale. Cronbach Alpha coefficient was found .81, and corrected item correlations ranged from .20 to .47. The following calculations were obtained as a result of the study: $\alpha=.72$ and item test correlations from .26 to .45 for knowledge based diversity; $\alpha=.55$ and item test correlations from .20 to .32 for social category diversity; $\alpha=.51$ and item test correlations from .20 to .30 for value diversity. As a result of the findings, it could be suggested that the scale items are reliable.

Data Analysis

Parametric analysis methods were employed in the study because the scale items showed continuity, the data were homogeneously distributed, the sample was ($n>50$), the equality of mod=median was ensured and the distortion and kurtosis coefficients were between (+1,-1). Descriptive statistics (arithmetic mean and standard deviation) were used for the data analysis and prediction was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the views about certain variables and t-test and variant analysis (ANOVA) were implemented for the non-related samples. $p<.05$ significance level was concerned in testing the difference among group averages.

Results

In this section, the views of high school administrators and teachers about the scale items, factors and some demographic variables of the Diversity Management Scale and the Respect for Diversity Scale are mentioned.

Findings of Diversity Management (DM) Perceptions and Respect for Diversity (RD) Perceptions in Schools

Average and standard deviation values of the participants for the statements of respect for diversity are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Mean scores of the statements of respect for diversity

Factor	\bar{X}	Sd
Knowledge based diversity	4,23	0,55
Social category diversity	4,18	0,61
Value diversity	3,80	0,64
Total	4,11	0,50

It is clear from Table 2 that the school administrators and the teachers thought respect for diversity in their own schools was high (\bar{X} = 4.11). The participants had “high” (\bar{X} = 4.23) positive attitudes in “knowledge based diversity”. The most agreed item in the factor was as follows: “*I make friends with someone with a physical disability*” (\bar{X} = 4.78) and the least agreed item was: “*I don’t find those unattractive who do not have age-appropriate outfit*” (\bar{X} = 3,57). The school administrators and the teachers agreed with the items and all the other items of this factor above average. The participants strongly (\bar{X} = 4,18) agreed with the statements in social category diversity. The most agreed item of this factor was as follows: “*If I had power, I would remove some colours from the rainbow*” (\bar{X} = 4,55). The participants agreed with the statements of value diversity above average (\bar{X} = 3,80). They strongly agreed with the following: “*Votes of those with higher levels of education should be of more significance*” (\bar{X} = 4,25). They moderately (\bar{X} = 2,70) agreed with the following: “*I don’t make friends with those who tend to have same-sex sexual preference*”. As a result, it could be concluded that the school administrators and the teachers had positive views in the RDS.

Table 3. Mean scores of the statements in DM factors

Factors	\bar{X}	Sd
Individual attitudes and behaviours	3,90	0,99
Organizational values and norms	3,82	1,20
Administrative applications and policies	3,61	1,04
Total	3,71	0,94

It is clear from the weighted average of the scale factors in Table 3 that the participants considered diversity in high schools well managed “to a great extent” (\bar{X} = 3,71). When the average of the first factor is examined, it is obvious that the participants thought attitudes and behaviours towards employee diversity in high schools were positive “to a great extent”. Accordingly, the participants agreed with the following at a “high” level: “Development of skills and experience of high school staff is supported; staff shares experiences in personal problem solving, different views and behaviours are welcomed and normally reacted” It is clear from the average of the second scale factor that the participants thought organizational values and norms towards diversity in high schools were positive “to a great extent” (\bar{X} = 3.82). From this point of view, they strongly agreed with the statements such as ability to express ideas in the scope of religion and freedom of conscience between colleagues, respect for different life styles, empathy, and openness to communication with different people and to exchange of ideas for improvement of personal understanding and negatively considered behaviours. According to the average of the third scale factor, the participants agreed with the idea that administrative applications and policies for diversity were positive in high schools and diversity based administration was employed “above average” (\bar{X} = 3,61). Relatively, the least agreed statements were in this factor. As a result, it could be concluded that the participants “strongly” agreed with the ideas that school administrators perceived diversity as a source of richness and they neither discriminated between staff with regards to gender or status nor favoured anyone, and they treated all employees fairly.

Findings of Personal Variables

Findings of t-test which was performed to determine whether the participants’ views about diversity management and respect for diversity in their schools varied according to gender, marital status and title are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *T-test results according to gender, marital status and title*

	Variable	Level	N	\bar{x}	sd	Df	t	p
Gender		Female	105	123,30	11,24	318	3,51	.01
	RD	Male	215	117,35	15,48			
		Female	105	105,47	24,43	318	0,75	.45
	DM	Male	215	103,12	27,04			
Marital Status		Married	195	118,80	14,13	318	0,78	.44
	RD	Single	125	120,09	15,05			
		Married	195	104,82	25,50	318	0,79	.43
	DM	Single	125	102,43	27,28			
Title		Administrator	42	116,19	13,61	318	1,48	.14
	RD	Teacher	278	119,77	14,58			
		Administrator	42	106,07	26,24	318	1,58	.56
	DM	Teacher	278	103,55	26,22			

p<.05

According to Table 4, the views of the school administrators and the teachers about the level of respect for diversity in schools [$t_{(318)} = 3,510$; $p < .05$] varied according to gender. As a result, the female participants thought there was a “higher” level of respect for diversity in schools than the male participants. The views of the participants about the level of diversity management in schools [$t_{(318)} = 0,75$; $p > .05$] varied according to gender. Similarly, when the table is analysed, it is clearly seen that marital status and titles of the participants did not influence their views about respect for diversity and diversity management.

Table 5. ANOVA test results according to seniority, immediate area of work location, branch/field, number of teachers and number of students

	Variable	Level	N	\bar{x}	sd	Total square	df	Average square	F	P	Differ. (LSD)	
Seniority	RD	1-5 years	166	122,78	13,20	5174,94	4	1293,73	6,60	.00	1-2	
		6-10	58	117,12	14,72	61748,66	315	196,03			1-3	
		11-15	52	113,65	14,46	66923,60	319				1-4	
		16-20	27	118,81	13,54							
		21 and above	17	110,82	18,06							
	DM	1-5 years	166	105,66	25,06	4784,48	4	1196,12	1,76	.14		
		6-10	58	96,03	29,13	21407,47	315	679,61				
		11-15	52	107,27	28,44	218861,95	319					
		16 – 20	27	102,44	20,29							
		21 and above	17	105,29	25,16							
Where did you spend most of your life?	RD	Village-District	42	120,62	13,72	3080,35	2	1540,18	7,64	.00	3-2	
		City	224	117,62	15,01	63843,25	317	201,40				
		Metropolis	54	126,38	9,60	66923,60	319					
	DM	Village-District	107	106,85	27,72	1616,87	2	808,43	1,18	.30		
		City	175	104,37	25,65	217245,08	317	685,32				
		Metropolis	183	98,85	27,34	218861,95	319					
Branch / Field	RD	Social Fields	108	120,91	15,43	1419,54	3	473,18	2,28	.08		
		Science-Maths	80	117,74	13,83	65504,06	316	207,29				
		Vocational Fields	69	116,41	14,73	66923,60	319					
		Other	63	121,71	12,82							
	DM	Social Fields	108	99,18	27,50	3876,71	3	1292,24	1,89	.13		
		Science-Maths	80	117,52	25,96	214985,24	316	680,33				
		Vocational Fields	69	108,19	25,03	218861,95	319					
		Other	63	104,83	24,83							
School Type	RD	Anatolian	128	120,15	13,82	2830,02	3	943,34	4,65	.00	1-2	
		Science and Anatolian	29	111,41	13,80	64093,57	316	202,83			3-2	
		Vocational	114	121,54	13,46	66923,60	319				3-4	
		Islamic Divinity	49	116,57	17,08							
	DM	Anatolian	128	100,83	26,04	2220,07	3	740,02	1,07	.36		
		Science and Anatolian	29	103,38	21,57	216641,88	316	685,58				
		Vocational	114	196,32	27,29	218861,95	319					
		Islamic Divinity	49	106,53	26,35							

p<.05

It is clear from Table 5 that the views of the participant school administrators and the teachers about respect for diversity in schools did not vary according to branch and school type. Likewise, the levels of diversity management did not vary according to seniority, where they lived most, branch and school type.

It is seen in Table 5 that the views of the participants about respect for diversity varied according to seniority $F_{(4-315)} = 6,600$; $p < .05$]. Accordingly, the school administrators and the teachers in the experience range of 16 years and above had higher sense of respect than those in the other groups of seniority.

When Table 5 is analysed, it is obvious that the participants' level of respect for diversity varied according to the immediate area of work location [$F_{(2-317)} = 7,647$; $p < .05$ and school type [$F_{(3-316)} = 4,651$; $p < .05$]. Accordingly, the levels of respect for diversity of those who spent most of their lives in metropolitan cities were higher than the ones who lived mostly in cities. In addition, the participants from Anatolian High Schools had more positive views than the participants from Science or Anatolian Teacher High School, and the participants from vocational high schools had more positive views than the participants from both Science and Anatolian Teacher High School and Islamic Divinity High Schools.

Findings of the Relationship between Respect for Diversity and Diversity Management in Schools

Findings of the views of the school administrators and the teachers about the relationship between respect for diversity and diversity management are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. *Correlation values between respect for diversity (factors) and diversity management (factors) in schools*

	Respect for Diversity	Information	Social	Value
Diversity Management	,133*	,126*	,151**	,049
Individual	,258**	,260**	,239**	,128*
Organizational	,121*	,105*	,122*	,079
Administrative	,078	,076	,110*	,002

*: < 0.01 **: < 0.05

When Table 6 is analysed, it could be suggested that there is a low positive, significant relationship between respect for diversity and diversity management ($r=0,133$). Thus, it can be said that as respect for diversity increases, the level of diversity management increases.

Discussion and Conclusion

The study concludes that the participant school administrators and teachers agreed with respect for employee diversity in schools above average. Similarly, it could be suggested that the participant teachers “strongly” agreed with the ideas that school administrators saw diversity as a source of richness, they never discriminated in favour of staff titles and they treated all employees fairly. Thus, Morrison, Lumby & Sood (2006) argue that a different school administrator could understand different teachers, and a different teacher could understand different students and can appeal to them more successfully.

Secondary school teachers’ views about respect for diversity vary according to gender. Women, when compared to men, think that there is a “higher” level of respect for diversity in schools. On the other hand, teachers’ views about diversity management do not vary according to gender. According to Memduhoğlu (2007), discrimination against women appears in staff hiring, salary, promotion, benefits of educational opportunities, evaluation of performance, employee turnovers and retirement. According to research results, diversity management contributes to promotion of women, people from different ethnic origins and minorities (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995), increasing demographic diversity is welcomed by females (Ely, 1994), and it decreases employee absence and turnovers and provides female employees with more opportunities (Cox & Blake, 1991). Similarly, there is no significant difference in the views of the participants about respect for diversity and diversity management according to marital status and titles. Memduhoğlu & Ayyürek (2014) conclude in their study on pre-school teachers that diversity management does not significantly vary according to gender and title. Memduhoğlu (2011) confirms the views of school administrators and teachers significantly vary according to title, gender, seniority and area of work.

The participants’ views about respect for diversity do not vary according to branch and school type. In a similar way, the levels of diversity management do not vary according to seniority, immediate area of work location, and branch and school type. The participants’ views about respect for diversity vary according to seniority. Accordingly, the school administrators and the teachers in the experience range of 16 years and above have higher sense of respect than the other school

administrators and teachers in the other groups of seniority. Öncer (2004) states in his study that school administrators in the experience range of 1-5 years believe it is essential to have administrative differentiation strategies more than those in the experience range of 6-10 years. The study of Balay, Kaya & Yılmaz (2014), entitled “the relationship between servant leadership competencies of educational managers and their ability of managing diversity”, concludes that there are significant differences in school administrators’ level of diversity management according to gender, task type, age, professional experience.

It has been observed that there are significant differences in respect for diversity according to immediate area of work location. The levels of respect for diversity of those who have spent most of their lives in metropolitan cities are higher than the ones who have lived mostly in cities. In addition, the participants from Anatolian High Schools have had more positive views than the ones from Science and Anatolian Teacher High School, and the participants from vocational high schools have presented more positive views than the ones from both Science and Anatolian Teacher High School and Islamic Divinity High Schools.

There is a low positive, significant relationship between respect for diversity and diversity management. Thus, it can be said that as respect for diversity increases, the level of diversity management increases.

Recommendations

According to the study, the following recommendations can be made for educators and researchers. For applicators:

1. There could be training programmes for school administrators and teachers in educational organizations about diversity management to make them aware of the diversity is a source of richness for organizations in the context of love, respect and tolerance.
2. Creating an environment in schools where teachers can perform their own skills in decision making without discrimination may help team work among teachers popularise, and introduce an understanding of diversity management.
3. Teachers and school administrators can be helped to improve their perspectives about respect for diversity by increasing cooperation among national and international schools.
4. School administrators can analyse socio-cultural features of teachers and other staff and can benefit from these features in decision-making process and practice.
5. Out of office social and cultural events can be organized for diversity awareness or better diversity understanding.

For researchers:

1. Further research on diversity management at primary education level is needed.
2. Contribution of diversity management to decision making process in organizations can be searched.
3. The relationship between respect for diversity and tolerance, and intercultural leadership can be investigated.
4. The relationship between leadership styles and respect for diversity and diversity management can be discussed.

References

- Aoun, G., & Gibeily, T. (2007). Managing diversity in the workplace. *Estudios empresariales*, (125), 60-66.
- Balay, R ve Sağlam, M. (2004). Eğitimde farklılıkların yönetimi ölçeğinin uygulanabilirliği, *Burdur: SDÜ Burdur Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(8), 32-46.

- Balay, R., Kaya, A. & Geçdoğan-Yılmaz, R. (2014). The relationship between servant leadership competences and diversity management skills among education managers. *Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 4(1), 229-249.
- Balint, P. (2006). Respect Relationships in Diverse Societies. *Res Publica*, 12(1), 35-57.
- Banks, J.A. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity: Implications on teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 5-16.
- Barak, E. M. (2014). *Managing diversity toward a globally inclusive workplace* (3.edt.). SAGE Publications.
- Bhadury, H., Mighty, E. J. & Damar, H. (2000). Maximizing workforce diversity in project teams: a network flow approach. *The International Journal of Management Science*, 28, 143-153.
- Brazzel, M. (2003). Historical and theoretical roots of diversity management. *Plummer, Deborah L.(éd.). Handbook of Diversity Management. New York: University Press of America.*
- Cox Jr, T., & Smolinski, C. (1994). Managing diversity and glass ceiling initiatives as national economic imperatives. Federal Publications, 1-35.
- Cox, T. H., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *The Executive*, 45-56.
- Cox Jr, T. (2001). *Creating the multicultural organization: a strategy for capturing the power of diversity*. Jossey-Bass.
- Ely, R. J. (1994). The effects of organizational demographics and social identity on relationships among professional women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 203-238.
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229-273.
- Eryaman, M. Y. (2006). Traveling beyond dangerous private and universal discourses: Radioactivity of radical hermeneutics and objectivism in educational research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(6), 1198-1219.
- Eryaman, M. Y. (2007). From reflective practice to practical wisdom: Toward a post-foundational teacher education. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 3(1), 87-107.
- Esty, K., Griffin, R., Hirsch, M. S. (1995). *Workplace diversity: A Manager's guide to solving problems and turning diversity into a competitive advantage*. Avon, Massachusetts: Adams Media Corporation.
- Foxman, E. & Easterling, D. (1999). The representation of diversity in marketing principles texts: an exploratory analysis. *Journal of Education for Business*, 74 (4), 285-288.
- Green, K. A., López, M., Wysocki, A., & Kepner, K. (2002). Diversity in the workplace: Benefits, challenges, and the required managerial tools. *University of Florida*, 1(4).
- Hahn, C. (2005). Diversity and human rights learning in England and United States, Osler, A. (Ed) in *Teachers, Human Rights and Diversity*, Trentham Books.
- Kamal, Y., & Ferdousi, M. (2009). Managing Diversity at Workplace: A Case Study ASA University Review, 3(2).
- Karangwa, E., Miles, S., ve Lewis, I. (2010). Community-level responses to disability and education in Rwanda. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 57, 267- 278.
- Karasar, N. (2009). Bilimsel araştırma teknikleri (18. baskı). *Ankara: Nobel Yayınları*.
- Keil, M., Amershi, B., Holmes, S., Jablonski, H., Lüthi, E., Matoba, K., & von Unruh, K. (2007). Farklılıkların yönetimi için eğitim el kitabı. International Society for Diversity Management – idm, www.idm-diversity.org.

- Keogh, B. K. (1998). Classrooms as well as students deserve study. *Remedial and Special Education*, 19, 313-314, 349.
- Konrad, A. M., & Linnehan, F. (1995). Formalized HRM structures: Coordinating equal employment opportunity or concealing organizational practices? *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 787-820.
- Kreitner, R. (2001). *Organizational Behaviour* (5th ed). New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Kreitz, P. A. (2007). Best practices for managing organizational diversity. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(2), 101-120.
- Memduhođlu, H. B. (2007). *Yönetici ve öğretmen görüşlerine göre Türkiye’de kamu liselerinde farklılıkların Yönetimi*, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Memduhođlu, H., B. (2011). Liselerde farklılıkların yönetimi: bireysel tutumlar, örgütsel değerler ve yönetsel politikalar *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(2), 37-53.
- Memduhođlu, H. B. & Ayyürek, O. (2014). Diversity management in preschools in the views of teachers and school administrators. *Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 4 (1), 175-188.
- Morrison, M., Lumby, J. and Sood, K. (2006). Diversity and diversity management: messages from recent research. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. 34 (3), 277–295; London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Mowat, J. G. (2010). Inclusion of pupils perceived as experiencing social and emotional behavioural difficulties (SEBD): affordances and constraints. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14, 631-648.
- Öksüz, Y. ve Güven, E. (2012). Farklılıklara saygı ölçeđi (fsö) : geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması, *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 5 (5), 457-473
- Öncer, A. Z. (2004). İşletmelerde bireysel, örgütsel, yönetsel farklılık kaynakları ve farklılaşma stratejileri: unilever unity projesi kapsamında bir araştırma. Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi), İstanbul.
- Parekh, B. (2006). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parekh, B. (2006). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schirmer, B. R., ve Casbon, J. (1995). Inclusion of children with disabilities in elementary school classrooms. *Reading Teacher*, 49, 66 - 69.
- Thomas, D. A. (2004). Diversity as strategy. *Harvard business review*, 82(9), 98-110.
- Weech-Maldonado, R., Dreachslin, J. L., Dansky, K. H., De Souza, G., & Gatto, M. (2002). Racial/ethnic diversity management and cultural competency: the case of Pennsylvania hospitals. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 47, 111-126.
- Villum, C. (2007). Diversity management a potential difference in organisational culture discrimination. *Master’s programme Culture, Communication and Globalization (English)*, 8.semester individual project. pg.15.
- Williams, K. Y. & O’Reilly, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research in organizational behavior*, 20, 77-140