Meriç, E. (2023). Patience as a predictor of teachers' classroom management skills. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET), 10*(2). 959-982.

Received : 21.12.2022
Revised version received : 25.02.2023
Accepted : 26.02.2023

PATIENCE AS A PREDICTOR OF TEACHERS' CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS

(Research article)

Erdal Meriç

Ordu University Fatsa Vocational School, Ordu, Turkey

ekinerdal@gmail.com

Biodata:

Erdal Meriç, Ph.D. is a lecturer at Ordu University, Fatsa Vocational School. His areas of interest are educational administration, school administration, classroom management and organizational behavior.

PATIENCE AS A PREDICTOR OF TEACHERS' CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS

Erdal Meriç

ekinerdal@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to examine the relationship between teachers' patience levels and their classroom management skills. The study was conducted by using a relational survey model with quantitative method. The study group was selected randomly and consisted of 355 teachers working in public schools in Ordu province. Teacher Patience Scale and Classroom Management Skills Scale were used as data collection tools. As a result of the study, patience level of teachers was "very high" in both general patience and teaching dimensions. In addition, teachers' patience was "high" in the interaction dimension. Similarly, teachers reported "very high" level classroom management skills in both general and all sub-dimensions. Moreover, it was found that the sub-dimensions of patience were moderately and significantly related to the general classroom management skills, explaining approximately 46% of the total variance in classroom management skills. Similarly, it was determined that the sub-dimensions of patience were also moderately and significantly related to all sub-dimensions of classroom management skills. The study concluded that as teachers' patience levels increased, their classroom management skills also improved.

Keywords: Patience, classroom management skills, teacher

1. Introduction

Classroom is a social environment and living space where students and physical resources interact to carry out educational activities (Çalık, 2012), and it is the heart of the education system. In other words, just as the heart is the center of the human body system, the classroom is the center of the education system (Balay, 2015). The students, teachers, programs, and materials needed for education are located in the classroom, and the foundations of positive student behavior, which are the goals of education, are laid in the classroom environment (Başar, 1999; Çalık, 2012). Therefore, it is crucial to manage these diverse and varied elements in the classroom effectively.

Classroom management is the first and fundamental step of educational administration, and the quality of educational administration is largely dependent on the quality of classroom management (Başar, 1999). Classroom management, which is defined as the effective coordination of classroom resources to achieve predetermined educational goals (Meriç, 2019), is a process that includes the teacher's thoughts, plans, and actions aimed at creating a regular and effective learning environment (Watson, 2010; Wolff, Jarodzka & Boshuizen, 2021). Teachers need to be equipped in many ways to manage this comprehensive and complex process effectively.

Classroom management directly affects the quality of teaching. In this sense, positive behavior cannot occur in students without effective classroom management (Terzi, 2002). In other words, effective classroom management has a positive impact on student achievement (İlğan & Kıranlı, 2008; Khan, Shah & Ullah, 2021; Marzano & Marzano, 2003). Therefore,

the success of students, schools, and ultimately an education system is directly related to the success of teachers in classroom management (Ağaoğlu, 2009; Dicke et al., 2015; Phelps, 1991; Uğurlu, Usta & Köybaşı, 2018).

Research on classroom management has often focused on how to handle common classroom situations, but the qualifications that teachers must possess for effective classroom management are often overlooked (Wolff et al., 2021). However, the qualifications of a teacher, who is the practitioner of classroom management, have a significant impact on the quality of classroom management (Yüksel, 2013). In other words, the success of classroom management is related to the teacher's having classroom management skills, which represent the qualities they need to have to create an effective and productive learning environment.

According to Garrod and Maziar (1988), classroom management skills for a teacher include to fulfill their responsibilities regarding content knowledge, planning and implementing activities, using resources efficiently, and teaching (cited in Ilgar, 2007). In other words, classroom management skills are the skills that enable a teacher to manage their classroom in an organized manner (Khan et al., 2021). Sanford and Emmer (1988) categorized classroom management skills as managing instruction, classroom procedures and routines, organizing the physical layout of the classroom, and managing student behavior. Possessing these skills is crucial for teachers to create an effective learning environment.

In addition, to create and maintain supportive learning environment, teachers must be skilled in classroom management (Jackson, Simoncini & Davidson, 2013). In literature, many factors affecting teachers' classroom management skills are mentioned. Some of these factors are: characteristics of students and teachers, school structure, and rules (Şahin & Altunay, 2011), educational programs, physical environment, discipline approach of teacher, communication and time management skills (Ada, 2000; Oğuz, 2016), pre-service training, professional competencies, management processes, and classroom management (Yeşilyurt & Çankaya, 2008), relationships with families and the environment, professional experience and personal characteristics (Güven & Karslı, 2014). Denizel Güven and Cevher (2005) attributed success in classroom management to teachers' personality traits and this to being patient. Similarly, Evertson, (1989), Paliç and Keleş (2011) and Dirlikli, Sakallı and Akgün (2015) also pointed out that one of the teacher qualifications required for effective classroom management is "patience".

Patience is the tendency of the individual to wait calmly in the face of disappointment, distress or pain that occurs in different conditions and time periods (Schnitker, 2012). As in most professions that require intense communication with people, it is important to be patient in the teaching profession (Meriç, 2022; Murphy, Delli & Edwards, 2004; Okoro & Chukwudi, 2011; Sezer, 2016; Sezer, 2018; Shishavan & Sadeghi, 2009). While performing their profession, teachers interact with all stakeholders of education. In this context, teachers may encounter negative situations in communication with their students, colleagues, school administrators, and parents. To approach these difficult situations with patience and tolerance is crucial. Because education is a long-term job, the expected outputs from education show its effect in the long term. For this reason, it takes a long time to achieve success and to obtain desired professional products. Therefore, it is important for teachers to be patient and maintain their profession with this awareness in order to be successful (Meriç, 2022).

Considering the interests, needs, expectations and individual differences of students (Meriç & Erdem, 2020), it is possible to say that teachers who are patient in the professional process can change their behavior in a positive way by approaching their students more calmly and

tolerantly. They can overcome difficulties by decisively struggling with negative situations that may arise in the education process. Thus, they can carry out their profession more successfully thanks to an effective classroom management. Although many factors affecting teachers' classroom management skills are mentioned in the literature, no research has been found to determine the relationship between patience and classroom management skills. From this point of view, the relationship between teachers' patience level and classroom management skills was found to be worth investigating, and this research was carried out to examine the relationship between teachers' patience levels and classroom management skills. Within the framework of this general purpose of the study, answers to the following research questions were sought:

1. What is the level of teachers' patience and classroom management skills?

2. Do teachers' patience and classroom management skill levels show a significant difference in terms of gender, marital status, graduated faculty, education level, job seniority, and the education level they teach?

3. To what extent does patience predict classroom management skills in teachers?

2. Method

2.1. Research Model

This research, which was carried out with the quantitative method, was structured with the relational survey model. The relational survey model aims to determine the presence or degree of co-variance between two or more variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

2.2. Study Group

The study group consisted of 355 teachers working in public schools in Altınordu, Fatsa, Ünye, Çamaş and Korgan districts of Ordu province. Participants were determined by simple random sampling technique. Of the teachers in the study group 212 (59.7%) were female, 143 (40.3%) were male, 315 (88.7%) were married and 40 (11.3%) were single teachers. While 296 (83.4%) of the teachers graduated from the faculty of education, 59 (16.6%) of the teachers graduated from a different faculty other than the faculty of education. When examined in terms of educational level, 313 (88.2%) of the teachers are undergraduate graduates, while 42 (11.8%) teachers are graduates. 60 (16.9%) of the teachers have 1-10 years, 160 (45.1%) 11-20 years and 135 (38%) have a total of 21 years or more. Looking at the education level they teach, 80 (22.5%) of the teachers work at pre-school, 89 (25.1%) at primary school, 93 (26.2%) at middle school and 93 (26.2%) at high school.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

Data were collected through two scales and the details of these scales are given below.

2.3.1. Teacher Patience Scale (TPS)

Teacher Patience Scale (TPS) was developed by Meriç and Erdem (2022) and used to determine the patience levels of teachers. The dimensions of the TPS, which consists of 11 items in total, are named as "Teaching" (6 items) and "Interaction" (5 items). The scale was prepared in the form of a five-point Likert scale ranged from Never (1) to Always (5). High scores obtained from the scale indicate that teachers' patience levels are high.

The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the overall TPS was found to be .81 and .82 in the two different study groups, respectively. The Cronbach Alpha scores of the sub-dimensions were .74 and .80 in the teaching dimension, respectively: In interaction dimension, the scores were found as .73 and .70. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed by the researchers in order to test the two-dimensional structure that emerged as a result of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) for the validity of the scale. As a result of CFA, it was observed that two-dimensional structure of TPS was kept, and the model showed a generally acceptable and excellent fit level.

For this study, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient calculated. The reliability of the TPS was found as .83 for the overall TPS, .79 for the teaching dimension, and .77 for the interaction dimension. CFA was performed for the construct validity of the TPS, and it was determined that the item load values of the scale ranged from .61 to 1.16, the two-dimensional structure of the scale was preserved, and the model generally showed a perfect fit level (X^2/sd=2.73, CFI=.95, TLI=. 94, IFI=.95, RMSEA=.05, SRMR=.05, RMR=.02).

2.3.2 Classroom Management Skills Scale (CMSS)

Classroom Management Skills scale was developed by Yüksel (2013). The scale consists of 37 items and five sub-dimensions. The dimensions of CMSS were named as "Communication" (10 items), "Learning-Teaching Process" (10 items), "Motivation" (7 items), "Behavioral Management" (6 items), and "Physical Layout of the Classroom" (4 items). The scores a five-point Likert scale, range from Never (1) to Always (5). High scores obtained from the scale indicate that teachers have high levels of classroom management skills. Necessary permission was obtained from the researcher who developed the scale to use it.

In the analysis conducted by Ergen (2016) to test the reliability of CMSS, the internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be .90 and the two half-test reliability coefficients were .82. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to verify the five-dimensional structure, and it was found that the five-dimensional structure of CMSS was maintained, and the model showed an acceptable and excellent fit.

In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found as .95 for the overall scale, and .88, .87, .86, .75, and .61 for the subscales, respectively. A Cronbach's alpha coefficient above .60 is considered to indicate high reliability of the scale (Kayış, 2009). Item 29 (I ignore students' undesirable (negative) behaviors if they are not persistent), which is included in the behavior management dimension of the scale, was removed due to its negative effect on the reliability of the scale. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to test the construct validity of CMSS, and it was found that the item loadings ranged from .65 to 1.42, the five-dimensional structure of the scale was maintained, and the model showed an acceptable and excellent fit (X^2/sd=1.82, CFI=.92, TLI=.91, IFI=.92, RMSEA=.05, SRMR=.05, RMR=.01).

2.4. Data Collection and Analysis

Ethical approval was obtained from the Ordu University Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee with decision number 2022-208 on October 27, 2022, and research permission was obtained from the Ordu Provincial Directorate of National Education with letter number 63301195 on November 10, 2022.

Data were collected electronically during the first semester of the 2022-2023 academic year. Firstly, school principals were informed about the research by contacting schools selected through simple random sampling. School principals who voluntarily agreed to participate were sent a link including data collection tools created by the researcher through Google Forms. Secondly, school principals shared the link with teachers through the WhatsApp groups, and teachers who voluntarily agreed to participate filled out the scales. IP address restrictions were applied to ensure that each participant participated in the research only once.

SPSS and AMOS software packages were used to analyze data. The raw data were transferred to the SPSS program, and checked whether there was any missing data in the data set. For one-tailed outliers, z-scores were examined, and 9 data sets with z-scores outside the range of -3 to +3 were removed from the data set. For two-tailed outliers, Mahalanobis distance was examined, and 4 data sets with values less than .001 were removed from the data set. Therefore, 13 data sets were considered outliers and removed from the data set, the remaining 355 data sets were analyzed.

To test the univariate normality of the dataset, skewness and kurtosis values were examined, and scatter plot matrices were examined to test the multivariate normality. For the Teacher Patience Scale the skewness value was .083, and the kurtosis value was -.713 for the overall scale. For the Classroom Management Skills Scale, the skewness value was found as -.469 and the kurtosis value was -.757 for the overall scale. As a result of analysis, it was assumed that the dataset conformed to normal distribution due to the skewness and kurtosis values being between -1.5 and +1.5 and the scatter plots being elliptical, and parametric tests were used for the analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

In the comparison of variables, Independent Samples t-Test was used for binary groups, and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Independent Samples was used for more than two groups. When comparing groups using t-test and ANOVA, it was checked whether the variances were homogeneous or not. In case of a difference between groups in ANOVA, Post Hoc tests were conducted to determine which groups the difference originated from, and the LSD test was used for groups with homogeneous variances, while the Games-Howell test was used for groups with non-homogeneous variances. In this research two sub-dimensions Teacher Patience Scale was determined as predictor (independent) variables, while the total and five sub-dimensions of the Classroom Management Skills Scale were determined as separate dependent variables. Multiple linear regression analysis was performed using the standard enter method to determine the prediction level of the dependent variable by the predictor variables. Before regression analysis, the basic assumptions of the model were checked, and as a result of examining the scatter plot matrix, it was seen that the data met the multivariate normality and there was a linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables, and there was no multicollinearity problem among the independent variables (VIF <10; TV> .10; CI <30) and no autocorrelation (1.5 <DW <2.5). Descriptive statistics techniques such as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were also used in the analysis of the data. A significance level of .05 and .01 was used for statistical analysis in this study.

3. Findings

3.1. Findings on Teachers' Patience and Classroom Management Skill Levels

As part of the first problem of this study, the means score, and standard deviation values of teachers' patience and classroom management skills are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statics for Patience and Classroom Management Skills

Variables	N	M	SD
Patience	355	4.34	.36
Teaching	355	4.51	.37
Interaction	355	4.13	.49
Classroom Management Skills	355	4.55	.32
Communication	355	4.68	.33
Learning-Teaching Process	355	4.48	.39
Motivation	355	4.54	.39
Behavior Management	355	4.53	.39
Physical Layout of the Classroom	355	4.45	.40

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that the mean scores of teachers' general patience levels is M=4.34 and the standard deviation value is SD=.36. In the teaching dimension of patience, the mean score is M=4.51, the standard deviation SD=.37; in the interaction dimension, it is seen that the mean score is M=4.13, the standard deviation value is SD=.49. The average scores show that teachers' general patience and patience levels in the teaching dimension are very high. In addition, the patience levels in the interaction dimension are high.

It is seen that the mean scores of teachers' general classroom management skills is M=4.55 and the standard deviation value is SD=.32. The mean scores and standard deviation values for the sub-dimensions of classroom management skills are calculated (respectively) as follows: for the communication dimension, M=4.68, SD=.33; for the learning-teaching process dimension, M=4.48, SD=.39; for the motivation dimension, M=4.54, SD=.39; for the behavior management dimension, M=4.53, SD=.39; and for the physical layout of the classroom dimension, M=4.45, SD=.40. Averages show that teachers have very high level of classroom management skills in both general and all sub-dimensions.

3.2. Findings Regarding Teachers' Patience and Classroom Management Skills in Terms of Demographic Variables

Table 2. Patience and Classroom Management Skills Scores Related to Gender Variable

Variables	Gender	N	M	SD	df	t	p
Patience	Female	212	4.34	.35	353	-.003	.10
	Male	143	4.34	.37			
Teaching	Female	212	4.52	.36	353	.656	.51
	Male	143	4.49	.38			
Interaction	Female	212	4.12	.47	353	-.603	.55
	Male	143	4.15	.50			
Classroom Management Skills	Female	212	4.58	.31	353	2.128	.03*
	Male	143	4.51	.34			
Communication	Female	212	4.71	.32	353	2.179	.03*
	Male	143	4.64	.33			

Learning-Teaching Process	Female	212	4.51	.37	353	1.814	.07
	Male	143	4.44	.40			
Motivation	Female	212	4.57	.39	353	1.814	.07
	Male	143	4.49	.38			
Behavior Management	Female	212	4.56	.38	353	1.886	.06
	Male	143	4.48	.40			
Physical Layout of the Classroom	Female	212	4.47	.39	353	1.245	.21
	Male	143	4.41	.43			

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

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that the patience levels of teachers in the general, teaching, and interaction dimensions do not significantly differ in terms of gender variable (-.603<t<.656, p>.05).

However, it is found that the general classroom management skills and communication dimension of classroom management skills of teachers differ significantly by gender (2.128<t<2.179, p<.05), with female teachers having higher scores in both areas (M=4.58 and M=4.71, respectively) compared to male teachers (4.51<M<4.64). It was also determined that the classroom management skills of teachers in the dimensions of teaching-learning process, motivation, behavior management, and physical layout of the classroom do not significantly differ by gender (1.245<t<1.886, p>.05).

Table 3. Patience and Classroom Management Skills Scores Related to Marital Status Variable

Variables	**Marital Status**	**N**	**M**	**SD**	**df**	**t**	**p**
Patience	Married	315	4.34	.36	353	-.171	.86
	Single	40	4.35	.35			
Teaching	Married	315	4.50	.37	353	-.285	.78
	Single	40	4.52	.33			
Interaction	Married	315	4.13	.48	353	-.020	.98
	Single	40	4.14	.51			
Classroom Management Skills	Married	315	4.54	.33	353	-2.430	.02*
	Single	40	4.65	.26			
Communication	Married	315	4.67	.33	353	-2.726	.01*
	Single	40	4.79	.25			
Learning-Teaching Process	Married	315	4.47	.39	353	-1.988	.05
	Single	40	4.58	.31			
Motivation	Married	315	4.53	.39	353	-1.460	.15
	Single	40	4.62	.37			
Behavior Management	Married	315	4.51	.39	353	-2.507	.01*
	Single	40	4.67	.35			
Physical Layout of the Classroom	Married	315	4.44	.41	353	-.808	.42
	Single	40	4.49	.38			

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

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that both the general patience levels and the patience levels in the teaching and interaction dimensions of the teachers do not differ significantly based on marital status (-.285<t<-.020, p>.05).

However, it is observed that the general classroom management skills and the communication and behavior management skills of the teachers in the classroom management dimensions differ significantly based on marital status (-2.726<t<-1.460, p<.05). It is seen that single teachers have higher general classroom management skills (M=4.65) and communication (M=4.79) and behavior management (M=4.67) skills in comparison to married teachers (4.51<M<4.67). On the other hand, it has been determined that the classroom management skills of the teachers in the dimensions of learning-teaching process, motivation, and classroom physical arrangement do not differ significantly based on marital status (-1.988<t<-.808, p>.05).

Table 4. Patience and Classroom Management Skills Scores Related to Graduated Faculty Variable

Variables	Graduated Faculty	N	M	SD	df	t	p
Patience	Faculty of Education	296	4.33	.36	353	-.924	.36
	Other Faculty	59	4.38	.39			
Teaching	Faculty of Education	296	4.50	.37	353	-1.107	.27
	Other Faculty	59	4.55	.37			
Interaction	Faculty of Education	296	4.13	.48		-.505	.61
	Other Faculty	59	4.16	.51	353		
Classroom Management Skills	Faculty of Education	296	4.55	.32	353	-.677	.50
	Other Faculty	59	4.58	.34			
Communication	Faculty of Education	296	4.68	.32	353	-.616	.54
	Other Faculty	59	4.71	.35			
Learning-Teaching Process	Faculty of Education	296	4.47	.38	353	-1.377	.17
	Other Faculty	59	4.54	.40			
Motivation	Faculty of Education	296	4.54	.39	353	.160	.87
	Other Faculty	59	4.53	.37			
Behavior Management	Faculty of Education	296	4.52	.40	353	-.947	.34
	Other Faculty	59	4.57	.36			
Physical Layout of the Classroom	Faculty of Education	296	4.45	.38	353	.532	.60
	Other Faculty	59	4.42	.50			

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

When Table 4 is examined, there is no statistically significant difference in both the general patience and the patience levels in the teaching and interaction dimensions of teachers according to the faculty they graduated from (-1.107<t<-.505, p>.05).

It has been determined that there is no significant difference in both the general classroom management skills and all sub-dimensions of classroom management skills of teachers according to the faculty they graduated from when the table is examined (-1.377<t<.532, p>.05).

Table 5. Patience and Classroom Management Skills Scores Related to Education Level Variable

Variables	Educational Level	N	M	SD	df	t	p
Patience	Undergraduate	313	4.35	.36	353	2.047	.04*
	Graduate	42	4.23	.37			
Teaching	Undergraduate	313	4.52	.37	353	2.416	.02*
	Graduate	42	4.38	.36			
Interaction	Undergraduate	313	4.14	.48	353	1.154	.25
	Graduate	42	4.05	.50			
Classroom Management Skills	Undergraduate	313	4.57	.32	353	2.403	.02*
	Graduate	42	4.44	.34			
Communication	Undergraduate	313	4.70	.32	353	1.959	.05
	Graduate	42	4.59	.34			
Learning-Teaching Process	Undergraduate	313	4.49	.38	353	1.660	.10
	Graduate	42	4.39	.41			
Motivation	Undergraduate	313	4.55	.38	353	2.204	.03*
	Graduate	42	4.42	.39			
Behavior Management	Undergraduate	313	4.54	.38	353	1.895	.06
	Graduate	42	4.42	.41			
Physical Layout of the Classroom	Undergraduate	313	4.47	.39	353	3.381	.00**
	Graduate	42	4.25	.47			

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

When Table 5 is examined, it can be seen that both the general patience levels and the patience levels in the teaching dimension of teachers differ significantly according to their education level (2.047<t<2.416, p<.05). When the averages are examined, it is observed that undergraduate teachers have higher levels of both general patience (M=4.35) and patience in the teaching dimension (M=4.52) than graduate teachers (4.23<M<4.38). There was no significant difference found in the patience levels of teachers in the interaction dimension according to education level ($t_{(353)}$=-1.154, p>.05). In other words, the education level of teachers does not significantly differentiate their patience levels in the interaction dimension.

When Table 5 is examined, it is determined that the general classroom management skills of teachers and the motivation and physical layout of the classroom dimensions of classroom management skills differ significantly according to their education level (2.204<t<3.381, p<.05). It is observed that undergraduate teachers have higher levels of both general classroom management skills (M=4.57) and motivation (M=4.55) and physical layout of the classroom (M=4.47) dimensions of classroom management skills than graduate teachers (4.25<M<4.44). It was found that the communication, teaching-learning process, and behavior management dimensions of classroom management skills did not significantly differentiate according to education level among teachers (1.660<t<1.959, p>.05).

Table 6. Patience and Classroom Management Skills Scores Related to Job Seniority Variable

Variables	Job Seniority	M	SD	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Differ
Patience	1-10 years	4.26	.37	Intergroup	1.020	2	.510	3.964	.02*	3>1 3>2
	11-20 years	4.31	.35	Ingroups	45.284	352	.129			
	21 years and +	4.40	.36	Total	46.304	354				
	Total	4.34	.36							
Teaching	1-10 years	4.43	.38	Intergroup	.864	2	.432	3.216	.04*	3>1
	11-20 years	4.48	.38	Ingroups	47.226	352	.134			
	21 years and +	4.56	.34	Total	48.129	354				
	Total	4.51	.37							
Interaction	1-10 years	4.06	.51	Intergroup	1.229	2	.614	2.630	.07	---
	11-20 years	4.10	.47	Ingroups	82.242	352	.234			
	21 years and +	4.21	.49	Total	83.471	354				
	Total	4.13	.49							
Classroom Management Skills	1-10 years	4.51	.33	Intergroup	.313	2	.156	1.503	.22	---
	11-20 years	4.54	.33	Ingroups	36.645	352	.104			
	21 years and +	4.59	.31	Total	36.958	354				
	Total	4.55	.32							
Communication	1-10 years	4.66	.35	Intergroup	.340	2	.170	1.598	.20	---
	11-20 years	4.66	.34	Ingroups	37.445	352	.106			
	21 years and +	4.72	.30	Total	37.785	354				
	Total	4.68	.33							
Learning-Teaching Process	1-10 years	4.45	.41	Intergroup	.105	2	.052	.350	.71	---
	11-20 years	4.48	.38	Ingroups	52.805	352	.150			
	21 years and +	4.50	.38	Total	52.910	354				
	Total	4.48	.39							
Motivation	1-10 years	4.47	.40	Intergroup	.571	2	.285	1.925	.15	---
	11-20 years	4.52	.41	Ingroups	52.207	352	.148			
	21 years and +	4.58	.35	Total	52.778	354				
	Total	4.54	.39							
Behavior Management	1-10 years	4.50	.39	Intergroup	.304	2	.152	1.000	.37	---
	11-20 years	4.50	.39	Ingroups	53.413	352	.152			
	21 years and +	4.56	.39	Total	53.717	354				
	Total	4.53	.39							
Physical Layout of the Classroom	1-10 years	4.34	.45	Intergroup	1.050	2	.525	3.256	.04*	3>1
	11-20 years	4.44	.36	Ingroups	56.754	352	.161			
	21 years and +	4.50	.43	Total	57.804	354				
	Total	4.45	.40							

1-10 years n: 60 11-20 years n: 160 21 years and + n: 135

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

When examining Table 6, it is seen that there is a significant difference in the general patience levels of teachers in terms of job seniority ($F_{(2-352)}$=3.964, p<.05). According to the results of the LSD test conducted to determine the source of the difference between groups, it was determined that the general patience levels of teachers with 21 years or more of seniority (M=4.40) were higher than those with 11-20 years (M=4.31) and 1-10 years (M=4.26) of seniority. There is also a significant difference in the patience levels of teachers in the teaching dimension in terms of job seniority ($F_{(2-352)}$=3.216, p<.05). According to the results of the LSD test conducted to determine the source of the difference between groups, it was determined that the teaching dimension patience levels of teachers with 21 years or more of seniority (M=4.56) were higher than those with 1-10 years job seniority (M=4.43). Generally, as the job seniority of teachers increase, their patience levels also increase. No significant difference was found in terms of job seniority among the patience levels of teachers in the interaction dimension ($F_{(2-352)}$=2.63, p>.05).

According to Table 6, a significant difference was found in terms of job seniority among the classroom management skills in the physical layout of the classroom dimension of teachers ($F_{(2-352)}$=3.256, p<.05). According to the results of the LSD test conducted to determine the source of difference among groups, it was determined that the classroom management skills in the physical layout of the classroom dimension of teachers with job seniority of 21 years and above (M=4.50) were higher than those of teachers with a seniority between 1-10 years (M=4.34). As the job seniority of teachers increases, it is observed that the classroom management skills in the physical layout of the classroom dimension also increase. It was determined that there was no significant difference in terms of job seniority between the general classroom management skills of teachers and the classroom management skills in the other four sub-dimensions (.350<$F_{(2-352)}$<1.925, p>.05).

Table 7. Patience and Classroom Management Skills Scores Related to Education Level They Teach

Variables	Education Level They Teach	M	SD	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Differ
Patience	Pre-school	4.35	.36	Intergroup	.948	3	.316			
	Primary school	4.35	.35	Ingroups	45.356	351	.129			
	Middle school	4.25	.36	Total	46.304	354				
	High school	4.39	.37							
	Total	4.34	.36							
Teaching	Pre-school	4.54	.38	Intergroup	1.586	3	.529	3.987	.01*	4>3 1>3
	Primary school	4.49	.34	Ingroups	46.543	351	.133			
	Middle school	4.41	.39	Total	48.129	354				
	High school	4.58	.34							
	Total	4.51	.37							
Interaction	Pre-school	4.13	.47	Intergroup	.642	3	.214	.907	.44	---
	Primary school	4.18	.45	Ingroups	82.829	351	.236			
	Middle school	4.07	.48	Total	83.471	354				
	High school	4.15	.54							
	Total	4.13	.49							
Classroom Management Skills	Pre-school	4.56	.34	Intergroup	.499	3	.166	1.600	.19	---
	Primary school	4.58	.31	Ingroups	36.459	351	.104			
	Middle school	4.49	.31	Total	36.958	354				
	High school	4.57	.33							
	Total	4.55	.32							
Communication	Pre-school	4.70	.33	Intergroup	.579	3	.193	1.821	.14	---
	Primary school	4.69	.32	Ingroups	37.206	351	.106			
	Middle school	4.62	.34	Total	37.785	354				
	High school	4.73	.31							
	Total	4.68	.33							
Learning-Teaching Process	Pre-school	4.43	.40	Intergroup	.646	3	.215	1.445	.23	---
	Primary school	4.49	.38	Ingroups	52.264	351	.149			
	Middle school	4.46	.39	Total	52.910	354				
	High school	4.54	.39							
	Total	4.48	.39							
Motivation	Pre-school	4.63	.39	Intergroup	1.569	3	.523	3.585	.01*	1>3 2>3
	Primary school	4.57	.37	Ingroups	51.209	351	.146			
	Middle school	4.45	.38	Total	52.778	354				
	High school	4.52	.39							
	Total	4.54	.39							
Behavior Management	Pre-school	4.57	.39	Intergroup	1.098	3	.366	2.441	.06	---
	Primary school	4.57	.36	Ingroups	52.619	351	.150			
	Middle school	4.44	.37	Total	53.717	354				
	High school	4.53	.43							
	Total	4.53	.39							
Physical Layout of the Classroom	Pre-school	4.46	.40	Intergroup	1.333	3	.444	2.761	.04*	2>3
	Primary school	4.54	.36	Ingroups	56.471	351	.161			
	Middle school	4.37	.36	Total	57.804	354				
	High school	4.42	.47							

	Total	4.45	.40
Pre-school n: 80	Primary school n: 89	Middle school n: 93	High school n: 93

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

When Table 7 is examined, a significant difference is observed in the patience levels of teachers in the teaching dimension based on the education level they teach ($F_{(3-351)}$ =3.987, p<.05). According to the results of the LSD test conducted to determine the source of the difference between the groups, it was determined that the patience levels of teachers in the teaching dimension who work in high school (M=4.58) and preschool (M=4.54) the education level they teach are higher than the teachers who work in middle school (M=4.41). It was found that the general patience levels of teachers and the patience levels in the interaction dimension did not significantly differ based on the education level they teach (.907<$F_{(3-351)}$<2.445, p>.05).

In Table 7, it is seen that teachers' classroom management skills in the motivation dimension significantly differed based on the education level where they teach ($F_{(3-351)}$=3.585, p<.05). According to the results of the LSD test conducted to determine the source of the difference, it was determined that the motivation dimension of classroom management skills of teachers working in preschool (M=4.63) and elementary school (M=4.57) levels were higher than those of teachers working in middle school level (M=4.45). Similarly, teachers' classroom management skills in the physical arrangement dimension also significantly differed based on the education level where they teach ($F_{(3-351)}$=2.761, p<.05). According to the results of the Games-Howell test conducted to determine the source of the difference, it was determined that the classroom management skills of teachers working in the elementary school level (M=4.54) were higher than those of teachers working in the middle school level (M=4.37). Overall, it was found that the classroom management skills of teachers working in middle school level were lower than those of teachers working in other education levels. It was also found that there was no significant difference in teacher' general classroom management skills and classroom management skills in the communication, teaching-learning process, and behavior management dimensions based on the education level where they teach (1.445<$F_{(3-351)}$<2.441, p>.05).

3. 3. Findings Regarding the Predictive Level of Patience in Classroom Management Skills in Teachers

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis conducted to determine the extent to which patience predicts classroom management skills in teachers, in line with the third sub-objective of the study, are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results for Patience as a Predictor of Classroom Management Skills in Teachers

Predicted Variables	**Predictive Variables**							
	Constant			***Teaching***			***Interaction***	
	t	p	β	t	p	β	t	p
Classroom Management Skills	11.289	.000**	.623	14.026	.000**	.101	2.266	.024*
[R=.676; R^2=.458] $F_{(2-352)}$=148.499; p=.000**								
Communication	13.209	.000**	.569	11.501	.000**	.010	.202	.840
[R=.573; R^2=.329] $F_{(2-352)}$=86.197; p=.000**								
Learning-Teaching Process	6.796	.000**	.600	13.042	.000**	.089	1.944	.053
[R=.647; R^2=.419] $F_{(2-352)}$=126.678; p=.000**								
Motivation	8.040	.000**	.534	1.925	.000**	.098	2.002	.046*
[R=.586; R^2=.344] $F_{(2-352)}$=92.207; p=.000**								
Behavior Management	7.591	.000**	.528	1.898	.000**	.124	2.561	.011*
[R=.596; R^2=.356] $F_{(2-352)}$=97.107; p=.000**								
Physical Layout of the Classroom	8.359	.000**	.372	7.035	.000**	.178	3.357	.001**
[R=.482; R^2=.232] $F_{(2-352)}$=53.148; p=.000**								

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

In Table 8, the teaching and interaction variables in the model are in a moderate and significant relationship with general classroom management skills (R=.676, p<.01). Teaching and interaction dimensions explain approximately 46% of the total variance in general classroom management skills (R^2=.458). The relative importance of the predictive variables on general classroom management skills is as follows; teaching (β=.623) and interaction (β=.101). When the t-test results are examined, it is seen that teaching [$t_{(14.026)}$, p<.01] and interaction [$t_{(2.266)}$, p<.05] are significant predictors of general classroom management skills.

In Table 8, teaching and interaction variables in the model are in a moderate and significant relationship with communication together (R=.573, p<.01). Instruction and interaction dimensions explain approximately 33% of the total variance in communication (R^2=.329). The relative importance of the predictive variables on communication is as follows; teaching (β=.569) and interaction (β=.010). When the t-test results are examined, it is seen that teaching [$t_{(11.501)}$, p<.01] is a significant predictor of communication, but interaction [$t_{(.202)}$, p>.05] is not a significant predictor of communication.

In Table 8, the teaching and interaction variables in the model are moderately and significantly related to the teaching-learning process (R=.647, p<.01). The teaching and interaction dimensions explain approximately 42% of the total variance in the teaching-learning process (R^2=.419). The relative importance of the predictive variables on the teaching-learning process is as follows; teaching (β=.600) and interaction (β=.089). When examining the t-test results, it can be seen that teaching is a significant predictor of the teaching-learning process [$t_{(13.042)}$, p<.01], while interaction is not a significant predictor [$t_{(1.944)}$, p>.05].

In Table 8, the teaching and interaction variables in the model are moderately and significantly related to motivation together (R=.586, p<.01). The teaching and interaction dimensions account for approximately 34% of the total variance in motivation (R^2=.344). The relative importance of the predictive variables on motivation is as follows; teaching (β=.534) and interaction (β=.098). When the t-test results are examined, it can be seen that both teaching [$t_{(1.925)}$, p<.01] and interaction [$t_{(2.002)}$, p<.05] are significant predictors of motivation.

In Table 8, the teaching and interaction variables together have a moderate and significant relationship with behavior management (R=.596, p<.01). The teaching and interaction dimensions explain approximately 36% of the total variance in behavior management (R^2=.356). The relative importance of the predictive variables on behavior management is as follows; teaching (β=.528) and interaction (β=.124). The t-test results revealed that, teaching [$t_{(1.898)}$, p<.01] and interaction [$t_{(2.561)}$, p<.05] are significant predictors of behavior management.

In Table 8, the teaching and interaction variables in the model are in a moderate and significant relationship with the physical layout of the classroom (R=.482, p<.01). Instruction and interaction dimensions explain 23% of the total variance in the physical layout of the classroom (R^2=.232). The relative importance of the predictive variables on the physical layout of the class is as follows; teaching (β=.372) and interaction (β=.178). When the t-test results are examined, it is seen that teaching [$t_{(7.035)}$, p<.01] and interaction [$t_{(3.357)}$, p<.01] are significant predictors of the physical layout of the classroom.

4. Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The results showed that teachers' general patience and patience scores in the teaching dimension were very high, and their patience scores in the interaction dimension were high. Similar to this result, in a study conducted by Meriç (2022) with the participation of classroom teachers, it was concluded that teachers' patience scores in general patience, teaching and interaction dimensions are very high. In another study conducted by Koç (2010) with the participation of religious culture and ethics teachers, teachers stated that they were completely sufficient in being a patient and tolerant teacher. The common results of the studies indicate that teachers are highly patient in their professional processes. The results obtained regarding classroom management skills showed that teachers have very high levels of both general classroom management skills and all sub-dimensions of classroom management skills. Many studies conducted in the field support this situation. In this context, in studies conducted by Denizel Güven and Cevher (2005) and Bilgin (2019) with the participation of preschool teachers; in studies conducted by Yalçınkaya and Tombul (2002), Babaoğlan and Korkut (2010), Yüksel (2013), Aküzüm and Özdemir Gültekin (2017), Ocakcı and Sabancı (2019), Ergen and Elma (2020), and Vatansever Bayraktar and Kendirci (2020) with the participation of classroom teachers; and in a study conducted by Sarı and Bayrakçı (2018) with teachers working in secondary education, it was concluded that they perceive themselves as highly competent in classroom management skills. On the other hand, Akın (2006) found in his study

that primary and secondary school teachers' classroom management skills were at a moderate level. The results obtained from the conducted studies indicate that teachers generally have sufficient levels of classroom management skills. When the results obtained from the literature and this research are evaluated together, it can be concluded that teachers' high levels of patience and classroom management skills are a positive situation in terms of teaching the desired behaviors to students and achieving the expected goals in education.

The results showed that, no significant difference was found among the patience scores of teachers in terms of gender variable. Similarly, in studies conducted by Karakaş (2016) with the participation of municipality employees and Karslı (2020) with university students, it was concluded that the patience scores of the participants did not differ according to gender variable. In contrast to these results, in a study conducted by Meriç (2022) with the participation of classroom teachers, it was found that male teachers had higher general patience and teaching dimension patience levels than females, while in the same study, it was determined that the interaction dimension patience levels of classroom teachers did not differ according to gender.

The general classroom management skills and communication dimension of classroom management skills of teachers differed significantly by gender, and female teachers were reported higher general classroom management skills and communication dimension of classroom management skills compared to male teachers. Although there are studies in the literature that show that female teachers have higher classroom management skills than male teachers (Ercoşkun & Ada, 2014; Uğurlu vd., 2019; Yalçınkaya & Tombul, 2002) which are consistent with this result, there are also studies that show that teachers' classroom management skills do not differ by gender (Güneş, 2021; Ocakcı & Sabancı, 2019; Özdemir, 2020). It was found that teachers' classroom management skills in the dimensions of learning-teaching process, motivation, behavior management, and physical layout of the classroom did not differ significantly by gender. In the study conducted by Aküzüm and Özdemir Gültekin (2017), the result that classroom management skills in the physical layout of the classroom and motivation dimensions did not differ by gender is consistent with this study, while it was found that female teachers had higher classroom management skills compared to male teachers in the dimensions of learning-teaching process and behavior management, which is different from this study.

The results showed that both the general patience and the patience levels in teaching and interaction dimensions of teachers did not significantly differ based on marital status. Similarly, Meriç (2022) also found that there were no significant differences in the general patience and patience levels in teaching and interaction dimensions of teachers based on marital status.

Single teachers were found to have higher general classroom management skills and in communication and behavior management dimensions classroom management skills compared to married teachers. In contrast, Ilgar (2007) found that married teachers had higher classroom management skills than single teachers and attributed this difference to married teachers' experience in managing their homes, families, having children, and raising them. On the other hand, the classroom management skills of teachers in the dimensions of learning-teaching process, motivation, and physical organization of the classroom did not differ significantly based on marital status. Similarly, a study conducted by Vatansever Bayraktar and Kendirci (2020) with the participation of classroom teachers found that classroom management skills did not differ based on marital status.

It has been found that there is no significant difference in the levels of patience and classroom management skills of teachers based on the faculty they graduated from. In other words, whether teachers graduated from an education faculty, or another faculty did not create a significant difference in their levels of patience and classroom management skills. Similarly, Şahin and Altunay (2011) also concluded in their study that classroom management behaviors did not change according to the faculties that teachers graduated from.

It has been determined that there is a significant difference in the levels of general patience and patience in the teaching dimension of teachers based on their educational level, and undergraduate teachers have higher levels of both general patience and patience in the teaching dimension compared to graduate teachers. This result is consistent with the findings of Meriç's (2022) research. The results obtained from both studies indicate that as the educational level increases, teachers' levels of general patience and patience in the teaching dimension decrease. There was no significant difference in the levels of patience in the interaction dimension of teachers according to their educational level.

It has been found that the general classroom management skills of teachers and classroom management skills in the motivation and physical layout of the classroom dimensions differ significantly according to their educational level, and that undergraduate teachers have higher general classroom management skills as well as motivation and physical layout of the classroom of the classroom management skills than graduate teachers. However, in a study conducted by Özdemir (2020) with the participation of classroom teachers and school administrators, although at a small effect level, the classroom management skills of graduate degree holders were found to be higher than those of undergraduate degree holders. The different results of the two studies may be due to the different participant groups. It was found that the communication, teaching-learning process, and behavior management dimensions of classroom management skills of teachers do not differ significantly according to their educational level. Similarly, in a study conducted by Sarı and Bayrakçı (2018), it was found that the classroom management skills of teachers did not differ significantly according to their educational level.

The study found that there is a significant difference between the general patience levels and the patience levels in the teaching dimension of teachers in terms of their job seniority, and teachers with 21 years or more of seniority have higher general patience levels than teachers with 11-20 years and 1-10 years of seniority. Similarly, the patience levels in the teaching dimension of teachers with job seniority of 21 years or more were also higher than those of teachers with 1-10 years of seniority. Generally, teachers with longer years of seniority had higher levels of general patience and patience in the teaching dimension. This result, showing that teachers behave more patiently in the education process as their professional experience increases, is consistent with the study of Meriç (2022). The common result obtained from both studies indicates that teachers behave more patiently in the educational process depending on their professional experience. No significant difference was found between the patience levels of teachers in the interaction dimension in terms of their job seniority.

The study also found that there is a significant difference between teachers' classroom management skills in the physical layout of the classroom dimension in terms of their job seniority, and teachers with 21 years or more of seniority have higher classroom management skills in the physical layout of the classroom dimension than teachers with 1-10 years of seniority. This result, indicating that teachers with longer years of seniority have higher classroom management skills in the physical layout of the classroom dimension, is consistent with the results of the study conducted by Aküzüm and Özdemir Gültekin (2017). The results obtained from both studies show that teachers with 21 years or more of seniority have higher classroom management skills in the physical layout of the classroom dimension. Similarly, the results of the study conducted by Özdemir (2020) also show that teachers' classroom management skill levels increase as their job seniority increase. The results also showed that there was no significant differentiation in the job seniority of teachers' general classroom management skills and classroom management skills in the other four sub-dimensions. In the literature, it is possible to come across research indicating that teachers' classroom management skills do not differentiate based on job seniority (Güneş, 2021; Sarı & Bayrakçı, 2018; Yalçınkaya & Tombul, 2002), which similar to this result.

It has been found that teachers' patience levels in the teaching dimension differ significantly based on the education level they teach in, and teachers working in high school and preschool education levels have higher patience levels in the teaching dimension than middle school teachers. However, there is no significant differentiation in teachers' general patience levels and patience levels in the interaction dimension based on the education level they teach in, but it is noteworthy that the group with the lowest patience level in general is middle school teachers.

The results showed that teachers' classroom management skills in the motivation and physical layout of the classroom dimensions differ significantly based on the education level they teach in, and teachers working in preschool and primary education levels have higher motivation dimension classroom management skills, while primary school teachers have higher classroom management skills in the physical layout of the classroom dimension than middle school teachers. However, there is no significant differentiation in teachers' general classroom management skills and their communication, teaching-learning process, and behavior management dimensions based on the education level they teach in. Overall, it has been found that teachers working in middle schools have lower classroom management skills than teachers in other educational levels. Considering psycho-social developmental periods, it can be said that middle school students are in their adolescence and various psychological and behavioral problems arise during this period, which negatively affects the patience levels and, consequently, the classroom management skills of middle school teachers and has a negative impact on the educational process.

As a result of the multiple linear regression analysis, it was found that the teaching and interaction variables were moderately, positively, and significantly related to general classroom management skills. This means that as teachers' patience levels increase, their overall classroom management skills also increase. It was also found that the teaching and interaction dimensions explain approximately 46% of the total variance in general classroom management skills. Similarly, as a result of the separate regression analysis conducted to determine the level at which the sub-dimensions of patience predict the sub-dimensions of classroom management skills, it was found that the teaching and interaction variables were moderately, positively, and significantly related to all sub-dimensions of classroom management skills. This means that as teachers' patience levels increase, their skills in all sub-dimensions of classroom management also increase. In this context, it was found that the teaching and interaction dimensions explain approximately 33% of the total variance in communication, approximately 42% of the total variance in the teaching-learning process, 34% of the total variance in motivation, approximately 36% of the total variance in behavior management, and 23% of the total variance in physical layout of the classroom.

The result that there are positive and significant relationships between teachers' patience and classroom management skills is supported by many studies in the literature that show that teachers' positive psychological states positively affect their classroom management skills. In this context, some studies have found positive and significant relationships between teachers' self-efficacy beliefs (Babaoğlan & Korkut, 2010), emotion regulation skills (Çağlar Gönlüaçık, Belenkuyu & Taş, 2022), professionalism (Zembat & İlçi Küsmüş, 2020), problem-solving skills (Zembat, Tunçeli & Akşin Yavuz, 2017), and job performance (Sönmez & Recepoğlu, 2019) and their classroom management skills.

Dicke et al. (2015) and Phelps (1991) stated that the success of an education system is directly related to the teacher's success in classroom management; while Khan et al. (2021), Marzano and Marzano (2003) and Sezer (2018) emphasized that effective classroom management has a positive impact on student achievement. Therefore, as teachers' competency in classroom management increases, their ability to manage students' educational efforts and lead them also increases (Çubukçu & Girmen, 2008). It is possible to say that patient teachers, who have a higher level of classroom management skills, can be more successful by creating a positive classroom climate while carrying out educational activities. Similarly, according to Meriç (2022), when teachers are patient, they behave more tolerantly towards their students in the education process, and approach individuals with different ideas and thoughts with tolerance. They support their students in challenging subjects, listen to them and show close interest in their problems, and work with determination and perseverance to create a good classroom atmosphere and ensure their students' success.

Teachers who are patient and understanding towards students create positive effects on students' academic, social, and emotional development (Sezer, 2018). Patient teachers demonstrate their adherence to etiquette rules when communicating with their students by listening to them attentively and giving feedback to them to ensure that they have understood and that appropriate actions will be taken. This demonstrates that communication is a two-way interaction process. The two-way communication established between teachers and students contributes to effective classroom management. When planning the teaching-learning process, teachers should consider students' developmental characteristics and individual differences. When teachers closely monitor their students and take a personal interest in them patiently, students' motivation for education and thus their success will increase. Successful students will develop positively not only cognitively but also behaviorally, which will contribute to effective classroom management. Teachers must be aware that physical arrangement of the classroom, such as seating arrangement, sound, temperature, and lighting, are crucial in providing effective classroom management, and rules that must be followed in the classroom should be determined with the participation of students.

References

Ada, S. (2000). Sınıf yönetimini etkileyen faktörler. *Marmara University Journal of Educational Sciences of Atatürk Faculty of Education,* 12, 1-8.

Akın, U. (2006). *Öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetimi becerileri ile iş doyumları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's dissertation). Gaziosmanpaşa University, Tokat.

Ağaoğlu, E. (2009). Sınıf yönetimi ile ilgili genel olgular. Z. Kaya (Ed.), *Sınıf yönetimi* içinde (s. 1-42). Pegem Akademi.

Aküzüm, C., & Özdemir Gültekin, S. (2017). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin iletişim becerileri ile sınıf yönetimi becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Electronic Journal of Educational Sciences, 6*(12), 91-107.

Babaoğlan, E., & Korkut, K. (2010). The correlation between level of classroom teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and classroom management ability perceptions. *Inönü University Journal of the Faculty of Education. 11*(1), 1-19. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/inuefd/issue/8703/108671

Balay, R. (2015). *2000'li yıllarda sınıf yönetimi* (6. Baskı). Pegem Akademi.

Başar, H. (1999). *Sınıf yönetimi.* Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Bilgin, H. (2019). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin rehberlik yeterlilikleri ile sınıf yönetimi becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Erken Çocukluk Çalışmaları Dergisi, 3*(2), 478-492. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.24130/eccd-jecs.1967201932178

Çağlar Gönlüaçık, M., Belenkuyu, C., & Taş, S. (2022). Examining the relationship between teachers' emotion regulation skills and classroom management competencies. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 14*(5), 1309-1323.

Çalık, T. (2012). Sınıf yönetimi ile ilgili temel kavramlar. L. Küçükahmet (Ed.), *Sınıf yönetimi* içinde (s. 1-16). Pegem Akademi.

Çubukçu, Z., & Girmen, P. (2008). Öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetimi becerilerine ilişkin görüşleri. *Bilig,* (44), 123-142.

Denizel Güven, E., & Cevher, F. N. (2005). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi becerilerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Pamukkale University Journal of Faculty of Education, 18,* 85-107. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/114757

Dicke, T, Elling, J, Schmeck, A., & Leutner, D. (2015). Reducing reality shock: The effects of classroom management skills training on beginning teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 48,* 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.01.013

Dirlikli, M., Sakallı, A. F., & Akgün, L. (2015). Matematik öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetiminde karşılaştıkları sorunlar. *International Journal of Education Sciences,* (5), 36-57. http://dx.doi.org/10.16991/INESJOURNAL.125

Ercoşkun, M. H., & Ada, Ş. (2014). Etkili sınıf yönetimi oluşturmada sınıf öğretmenlerinin yeni rollerinin nicel açıdan incelenmesi. *Atatürk University Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences, 18*(2), 171-194.

Ergen, Y. (2016). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetim becerileri, akademik iyimserlikleri ve mesleki bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki (Malatya ili örneği)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun.

Ergen, Y., & Elma, C. (2020). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetim becerileri, akademik iyimserlikleri ve mesleki bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki. *Bolu Abant Izzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education, 20*(2), 1222-1239. https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2020..-656449

Evertson, C. M. (1989). Improving elementary classroom management: A school-based training program for beginning the year. *The Journal of Educational Research, 83*(2), 82-90.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (7th Ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Güneş, A. M. (2021). Özel ve resmi okullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin tükenmişlik düzeyleri ve sınıf yönetim becerileri arasındaki ilişki. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Faculty of Education,* (58), 290-311.

Güven, S., & Karslı, M. D. (2014). Sınıf yönetiminin etkililiğini etkileyen faktörlere ilişkin okul müdürlerinin görüşleri. *Dicle University Ziya Gökalp Journal of Faculty of Education, 23,* 1-24.

Ilgar, L. (2007). *İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi becerileri üzerine bir araştırma* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). İstanbul University, İstanbul.

İlğan, A., & Kıranlı, S. (2008). Sınıf yönetimi ders başarısını yordayan değişkenler. *Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi, 33*(359), 23-31.

Jackson, C., Simoncini, K., & Davidson, M. (2013). Classroom profiling training: Increasing preservice teachers' confidence and knowledge of classroom management skills. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(8). http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n8.2

Karakaş, A. C. (2016). Belediye çalışanlarında sabır tutumunun yaşam kalitesi üzerine etkisi (Sakarya ili örneği). *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, 5*(8), 2742-2757. https://doi.org/10.15869/itobiad.266016

Karslı, N. (2020). Üniversite öğrencilerinde sabır ve dindarlık İlişkisi. *Recep Tayyip Erdogan University Journal of Divinity Faculty,* (17), 52-72. https://doi.org/10.32950/rteuifd.677871

Kayış, A., 2009. Güvenirlik Analizi. Ş. Kalaycı (Ed.), *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri* içinde (s. 403-419). Asil Yayıncılık.

Khan, G. A., Shah, R. U., & Ullah, H. F. (2021). Impact of teachers' classroom management skills on students' academic achievement at secondary level. *Pakistan Journal of Educational Research, 4*(4), 615-630. DOI: https://doi.org/10.52337/pjer.v4i4.403

Koç, A. (2010). Din kültürü ve ahlâk bilgisi öğretmenlerinin yeterlikleri. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi, 8*(19), 107-149.

Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership, 61*(1), 6-13.

Meriç, E. (2019). Sınıf yönetimi. E. Arslan (Ed.), *Erken çocuklukta davranış yönetimi* içinde (s. 171-187). Eğiten Kitap.

Meriç, E. (2022). *Öğretmenlerde sabır ve tükenmişlik ilişkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, Kırşehir.

Meriç, E., & Erdem, M. (2020). Prediction of professional commitment of teachers by the job characteristics of teaching profession. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 26*(2), 449-494. doi: 10.14527/kuey.2020.010

Meriç, E., & Erdem, M. (2022). Öğretmen sabır ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Trakya Journal of Education, 12*(2), 710-726. https://doi.org/10.24315/tred.928310

Murphy, P. K., Delli, L. A. M., & Edwards, M. N. (2004). The good teacher and good teaching: Comparing beliefs of second-education level students, preservice teachers, and inservice teachers. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 72*(2), 69-92. https://doi.org/10.3200/JEXE.72.2.69-92

Ocakcı, E., & Samancı, O. (2019). Birleştirilmiş sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi yeterlilikleri ve sınıf yönetimi ile ilgili görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Bolu Abant Izzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education, 19*(2), 604-620.

Oğuz, E. (2016). Sınıf yönetimini etkileyen faktörler. İ. Çınar (Ed.), *Sınıf yönetimi* içinde (s. 21-38). Eğiten Kitap.

Okoro, C. O., & Chukwudi, E. K. (2011). The ideal teacher and the motivated student in a changing environment. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 1*(3), 107-112.

Özdemir, G. (2020). Öğretmen ve yönetici bakış açısıyla öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetim becerisi. *IBAD Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (8), 336-349. https://doi.org/10.21733/ibad.749125

Paliç, G., & Keleş, E. (2011). Sınıf yönetimine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 17*(2), 199-220.

Phelps, P. H. (1991). Helping teachers excel as classroom managers. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 64*(4), 241-242. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.1991.9955857

Sanford, J. P., & Emmer, E. T. (1988). *Understanding classroom management: An observation guide.* Allyn and Bacon.

Sarı, B., & Bayrakçı, M. (2018). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi becerileri. *Abant Izzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education, 18*(4), 1960-1977.

Schnitker, S. A. (2012). An examination of patience and well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 7*(4), 263-280. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2012.697185

Sezer, Ş. (2016). Okul yöneticilerinin ideal öğretmen niteliklerine ilişkin bilişsel kurguları: Repertory grid tekniğine dayalı fenomenolojik bir çözümleme. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 41*(186), 37-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/EB.2016.6173

Sezer, Ş. (2018). Öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetimi tutumlarının öğrencilerin gelişimi üzerindeki etkileri: Fenomenolojik bir çözümleme. *Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty of Education, 33*(2), 534-549. doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2017031319

Shishavan, H. B., & Sadeghi, K. (2009). Characteristics of an effective english language teacher as perceived by Iranian teachers and learners of English. *English Language Teaching, 2*(4), 130-143.

Sönmez, E., & Recepoğlu, E. (2019). İlk ve ortaokullardaki öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetimi becerileri ile performasları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 27*(1), 421-432. doi:10.24106/kefdergi.3327

Şahin, İ., & Altunay, U. (2011). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi davranışları. *İlköğretim Online, 10*(3), 905-918, 2011. [Online]: http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr (Erişim Tarihi: 28.10.2022).

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th Ed.). Pearson.

Terzi, A. R. (2002). Sınıf yönetimi açısından etkili öğretmen davranışları. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi,* 155-156.

Toran, M. (2019). Does sense of efficacy predict classroom anagement skills? An analysis of the pre-school teacher's professional competency. *Early Child Development and Care, 189*(8), 1271-1283. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2017.1374258

Uğurlu, C. T., Usta, G., & Köybaşı, F. (2018). An investigation of teachers' classroom management skills in terms of gender variability: A meta-analysis study. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 10*(5), 71-90. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2018.05.006

Vatansever Bayraktar, H., & Kendirci, M. (2020). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi becerilerinin incelenmesi. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi,* (46), 207-232. http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/SOBIDER.43244

Watson, M. (2010). Approaches to behavior and classroom management: Integrating discipline and care. *Journal of Moral Education, 39*(4), 524-526. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2010.521408

Wolff, C. E., Jarodzka, H., & Boshuizen, H. P. A. (2021). Classroom management scripts: A theoretical model contrasting expert and novice teachers' knowledge and awareness of classroom events. *Educational Psychol Review, 33,* 131-148. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09542-0

Yeşilyurt, E., & Çankaya, İ. (2008). Sınıf yönetimi açısından öğretmen niteliklerinin belirlenmesi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(23), 274-295.

Yalçınkaya, M., & Tombul, Y. (2002). İlköğretim okulu sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi becerilerine ilişkin algı ve gözlemler. *Ege Journal of Education, 1*(2), 96-108.

Yüksel, A. (2013). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi (Afyonkarahisar ili örneği)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Ankara.

Zembat, R., & İlçi Küsmüş, G. (2020). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi becerileri ile mesleki profesyonellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 28*(4), 1725-1739. https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.3621

Zembat, R., Tunçeli, H. İ., & Akşin Yavuz, E. (2017). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi becerileri ile problem çözme becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Ahi Evran University Kırşehir Journal of Faculty of Education, 18*(3), 24-43.