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Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine whether there is a significant relationship between classroom teachers’ EI and their classroom management approaches, and whether EI significantly predicts classroom management approaches. Correlational model was used in the study. The sample of the study was composed of 233 primary school teachers working at 22 primary schools in Hatay city’s central province Antakya (Turkey). The data have been collected by administering the “The Emotional Intelligence Scale”, and the “The Classroom Management Inventory”. The results revealed that EI is a positive predictor of teacher-centered classroom management with weak predictive power. There is a low-level, positive, and significant relationship between primary school teachers’ EI levels and teacher-centered classroom education approach. Research results also indicate that EI significantly predicts student-centered classroom management. There is a medium-level, positive, and significant relationship between primary school teachers’ EI levels and their student-centered classroom management approaches.
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INTRODUCTION

One of the main subjects of this study, which investigates the relationship between the level of emotional intelligence and classroom management approaches of primary school teachers, is emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence (EI) was first studied by Thorndike within the framework of the concept of social intelligence. Thorndike defined social intelligence as “understanding and managing others” (Rastegar, Memarpour, 2009). EI is also a part of Gardner's view of social intelligence, which he refers to as personal intelligences. Like social intelligence, personal intelligences (divided into inter-and intra-personal intelligence) include knowledge about others. One aspect of personal intelligence relates to feelings and is quite close to what we call EI (Gardner, 1983; cited in Salovey and Mayer, 1990). The concept of EI was formally defined in 1990 in two articles (Mayer, DiPaolo, and Salovey, 1990; Salovey and Mayer, 1990). Just 5 years later, the concept was popularized in a best-selling book entitled Emotional Intelligence (Goleman, 1995) and featured on the cover of TIME magazine (Gibbs, 1995) (cited in Mayer, Cobb, 2000).

EI involves the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Salovey and Mayer, 1990). According to this definition, the EI model covers four abilities. The first of these abilities is “perception of emotion” which includes the ability to identify and differentiate emotions in the self and others. A basic aspect of this ability is identifying emotions accurately in physical states (including bodily expressions) and thoughts. The second ability, “emotional facilitation of thinking,” concerns emotion acting on intelligence; it describes emotional...
events that assist intellectual processing. This ability, “using emotion to facilitate thought,” is measured by two tests that assess people’s ability to describe emotional sensations and their parallels to other sensory modalities using a non-feeling vocabulary (sensations) and identify the feelings that might facilitate or interfere with the successful performance of various cognitive and behavioral tasks (facilitation). The third ability concerns the ability to understand emotions and to use emotional knowledge. Understanding emotions is the ability to comprehend emotion language and to appreciate complicated relationships among emotions. For example, understanding emotions encompasses the ability to be sensitive to slight variations between emotions, such as the difference between happy and ecstatic. Furthermore, it includes the ability to recognize and describe how emotions evolve over time, such as how shock can turn into grief. The last ability concerns “managing emotions” to enhance emotional and intellectual growth. Managing emotions consists of the ability to regulate emotions in both ourselves and in others. (Brakett et al., 2011; Mayer and Salovey, 1997; Salovey and Grewal, 2005).

EI qualifications according to Bar-On (2012) are self-regard, interpersonal relationship, impulse control, problem solving, emotional self-awareness, flexibility, reality-testing, stress tolerance, assertiveness, and empathy. These ten factors appear to be the key components of emotional-social intelligence (Bar-on, 2012). Goleman also defines EI as the kind of intelligence that includes self-consciousness, determination, curbing instincts, and sharing other people’s feelings (Goleman, 2007).

Goleman (2007, p.28) argued that EI determines one’s potential for learning the practical skills that are based on two competencies (personal and social competencies). Personal competency has three domains; self-awareness, self-regulation, and self-motivation, while the social competency comprised of two domains, namely; empathy, and social skills. Self-awareness is defined by one’s ability to know one’s internal states, preferences, resources, and intuitions. It has three sub-domains: emotional awareness, accurate self-assessment and self-confidence. The second domain, self-regulation, is marked by one’s ability to manage one’s internal states, impulses and resources. The following indicators depict this ability: self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, and innovation. The third domain, self-motivation, illustrates emotional tendencies that guide or facilitate reaching goals. Its indicators are achievement drive, commitment, initiative and optimism. Social competencies describe how one determines his or her ability to handle relationship (personal as well as professional). The first domain, empathy, which marked this competency, is explained by five sub-domains, specifically; understanding others, developing others, service orientation, leveraging diversity and political awareness. Eight sub-domains explain the social skills and they are; influence, communication, conflict management, leadership, change catalyst, building bonds, collaborating and cooperation and team capabilities. As is seen, EI includes abilities like identifying the feelings of others, managing feelings, reasoning, problem solving, decision making, and communication (Brackett et al., 2006). Therefore, this study postulates that EI might be related to classroom management approaches.

Classroom management is the ways teachers organize and structure their classrooms for the purpose of maximizing student cooperation and engagement and minimizing disruptive behavior (Arends, 1997, 285). Some researchers (Freiberg and Lamb, 2009; Garrett, 2008) have studied the field of classroom management as teacher and student centered approaches depending on preferences in educational approaches. According to Brophy (1999; as cited in Garrett, 2008), the understanding of classroom management has been related to behavioral learning-teaching approach by individuals for years. This understanding based on the behavioral model covers the use of techniques which enables the formation of student behavior under the control of stimulants. These behavioral approaches in classroom management are referred to as the understanding of traditional or teacher-centered classroom management.

In the traditional model of classroom management, based on behaviorism, discipline is teacher-directed. There are fixed rewards and consequences for student behavior. Fear of predetermined consequences and desire to earn rewards are used to motivate students and keep them compliant and obedient (Freiberg and Lamb, 2009). In teacher-centered classrooms the teacher is the sole leader, management is a form of oversight, teacher takes responsibility for all the paperwork and organization, discipline comes from the teacher, a few students are the teacher’s helpers, teacher makes the rules and posts them for the students, consequences are fixed for all students, rewards are mostly extrinsic, students are allowed limited responsibilities, and few members of the community enter the classroom (Rogers and Freiberg, 1994; as cited in Freiberg and Lamb, 2009)

After decades of use, the behaviorist model has not caused significant changes in student behavior. Fifty years of research demonstrates that person-centered, pro-social classroom management may provide that alternative (Freiberg and Lamb, 2009). The views on good education have changed in the recent years. Today educators are encouraged to apply educational approaches based on constructivist learning principles (Brophy, 1999; Dollard and Christensen, 1996). According to this change, some school reformers and researchers propose a shift in the classroom management approach. For example, Rogers and Freiberg (1999) suggest that such a shift requires teachers to adopt a person-centered, rather than a
teacher-centered, orientation toward classroom management, which features shared leadership, community building, and a balance between the needs of teachers and students (as cited in Garrett, 2008).

In a person-centered classroom, learners begin the process of becoming self-disciplined. Self-discipline is knowledge about yourself and the ability to determine the appropriate actions needed to grow and develop as a person, without someone monitoring you (Freiberg and Lamb, 2009). In person-centered classrooms, leadership is shared, management is a form of guidance; students are facilitators for the operations of the classroom, discipline comes from the self, all students have the opportunity to become an integral part of the management of the classroom, rules are developed by the teacher and students in the form of a classroom constitution or compact, consequences reflect individual differences, rewards are mostly intrinsic and students share in classroom responsibilities (Rogers and Freiberg, 1994; as cited in Freiberg and Lamb, 2009).

Person-centered classrooms facilitate higher achievement, and have more positive learning environments with stronger teacher–student relationships than teacher-centered or traditional classrooms. A person-centered classroom creates a balance between the wants of the teacher (the W) and the efforts and needs of the students (the E), forming a collective classroom WE, including all persons in a classroom. A person-centered classroom is balanced between the needs of the teacher and the learner. Movement from teacher to person-centered is a gradual progression of building trust and developing shared responsibility for the management of the classroom (Freiberg and Lamb, 2009).

Teachers develop four pro-social classroom management dimensions that foster person-centered classrooms: (a) social–emotional emphasis—teachers demonstrate caring for students’ social and emotional needs, and for who they are as people; (b) school connectedness—teachers ensure that students feel a strong sense of belonging to the school, their classroom, and their peers; (c) positive school and classroom climate—students feel safe in school, developing trust for their peers and their teacher; and (d) student self-discipline—students learn through responsible consequences and a shared respect and responsibility (Freiberg and Lamb, 2009).

The relation between EI and classroom management approaches

People from all professions—educators, psychologists, human resources professionals, and corporate executives—began to incorporate EI into their daily vernacular and professional practices (Brackett, Rivers, Salovey, 2011). According to Goleman (2007), EI is signi-

ficant for teachers. The indispensable role of teachers, who are aware of their own emotions, who succeed in controlling negative emotions and instincts, who are able to establish an efficient communication with their students, and who are able to use these pieces of information in their ideas and acts, in a successful educational system has been underlined (Tuyan, Beceren, 2004). Teachers with high EI create classrooms that are physically and psychologically safe. If children are frightened about their physical safety, their learning will be dramatically impeded (Powell and Powell, 2010). This study specifically anticipates a relationship between EI and student-centered classroom management approaches because individuals with EI are able to relate to others with compassion and empathy, have well-developed social skills, and use this emotional awareness to direct their actions and behavior. Teachers with high EI excel in their jobs because they are always open to new ideas and welcome feedback about their teaching from students. This will open a communication pathway that enables students to feel more attached to their teachers. One of the sub-domains of EI that stresses relational issues is the skills to develop bonds, understanding others etc. Subsequently, teachers with high EI will not make hasty decisions even in critical situations (for example: when students display disruptive behavior, or when they encounter ethical a dilemma). This will promote a better understanding between the teacher and the student, and students will feel nurtured and supported by their teachers. EI qualifications are empathy, problem solving, flexibility, stress tolerance, trustworthiness, and leadership (Ishak, 2004; Bar-On, 2012).

In student-centered classroom management approaches, on the other hand, the teacher gets to know his/her students, share their ideas. Student-centered classrooms and their management approaches allow teachers and students to see one another as people. Students take on responsibilities and have responsible freedom and choice within the classroom. Teachers establish caring interpersonal relationships with students. The climate is warm and productive in a person-centered classroom where students feel safe to express their ideas/opinions and make mistakes. Teachers help students to develop socially, emotionally, and academically, using responsible consequences with the goal of self-discipline. Person-centered teachers share leadership and teachers and students determine shared norms and begin to establish trust in the classroom (Freiberg and Lamb, 2009). It can be stated that teachers with high EI levels and teachers who use student-centered classroom management approaches act similarly according to these explanations. Consequently, necessary measures can be taken in light of the findings of this study by determining whether there is a relationship between teachers’ EIs and student and teacher-centered classroom management approaches.


Literature review

An ample number of studies have been conducted to determine the teachers’ EI levels (Akbaş, 2006; Birol et al., 2009; Paul et al., 2012; Yahyazadeh-Jeloudar et al., 2011) and their classroom management approaches (Bila, 2006; Çankaya et al., 2010; Garrett, 2008; Ünal and Ünal, 2012; Yaşar, 2008). Further, there are also many studies that investigate the relationship between teachers’ EI and different variables. For example, there are studies that analyze the relationship between teachers’ EI and their job satisfaction, organizational commitment and burnout (Anari, 2012; Brackett et al., 2010; Chan, 2006; Cobb, 2004; Doğan, 2009; Mousavi et al., 2012; Öztürk and Deniz, 2008; Yahyazadeh-Jeloudar et al., 2012), their critical thinking tendencies (Torun, 2011), problem solving skills (Güler, 2006), coping with stress (Güler, 2008; Şirin, 2007), conflict management strategies (Buğa, 2010), self efficacy (Alavinia and Kurosh, 2012; Moafian and Ghanizadeh, 2009; Nikoopour et al., 2012; Penrose et al., 2007; Rastegar and Memarpour, 2009; professional development (Lenka and Kant, 2012), performance management (Birol, Atamtürk, Silman, Şensoy, 2009), positive affectivity (Gawali, 2012), teachers’ success (Moafian and Ghanizadeh, 2010) and attachment Styles (Hamarta et al., 2009).

Alongside with the above mentioned ones, there are also a couple of studies that investigate the relationship between the teachers’ EI and classroom management approaches. Yahyazadeh-Jeloudar et al. (2011) have studied the relationship between secondary school teachers’ EI and their classroom discipline strategies. The results showed that there was a significant relationship between teachers’ EI and their classroom discipline strategies. Tunca (2010) too aimed at determining the effect of primary school teachers’ EI levels on their classroom management skills. According to the results of the study, primary school teachers' general EI levels were at an average level, while their classroom management skills were at a rather high level. The study also concluded that primary school teachers' EI levels affected their classroom management skills. Özmen (2009) too determined the relationship between the teachers’ EI levels and their perception of students' undesired behavior and their methods to cope with these. While there is a limited number of studies about teachers' EI and classroom management approaches, classroom management skills, and their perception of undesired behavior and their methods to cope with these (Yahyazadeh-Jeloudar et al., 2011; Tunca, 2010; Özmen, 2009), there is no study that investigates the relationship between EI and classroom management approaches. In light of these explanations, the aim of this study is to examine whether there is a significant relationship between classroom teachers’ EI and their classroom management approaches (teacher-centered classroom management, student-centered classroom management), and whether EI significantly predicts classroom management approaches.

METHOD

Research design

Since this study aims at determining the relationship between primary school teachers’ EI levels and their classroom management approaches, it uses the correlational model. The correlational model is “a model that aims at determining the level of covariance between two or more variables” (Karasar, 2003, 81).

The Participants

The sample of the study was composed of 233 primary school teachers working at 22 primary schools in Hatay city’s central province Antakya (Turkey). Cluster sampling technique was used in the sampling procedure of the study. This technique is used when the population can be subdivided into groups. In this procedure, it is not the units (the individuals) that are selected, but the clusters; all the units belonging to the clusters selected are then included in the sample. Clusters can be selected by means of a random procedure (Corbetta, 2003).

Instruments

The Emotional Intelligence Scale

One of the data collection tools used in this study is the EI scale developed by Schutte et al. (1998). The EI model of Salovey and Mayer (1990) provided the conceptual foundation for the items used in the scale. This 62-item scale was applied to 346 college students. A factor analysis of a larger pool of items suggested a one-factor solution of 33 items. The factor load of the items is 0.40 and more. Additional studies showed the 33-item measure to have good internal consistency (0.87) and test-retest reliability (0.78). The scale showed evidence of validity. Scores on the scale were related to eight of nine measures predicted to be related to the EI. These other measures assessed theoretically related constructs, including awareness of emotion, outlook on life, depressed mood, ability to regulate emotions and impulsivity. The scale also showed evidence of discriminant validity. It proved to be different from cognitive ability, as measured by the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT).

The Turkish adaptation and re-validity and reliability study of the Emotional Intelligence Scale was carried out by Özyer (2004). Özyer (2004) studied the test-retest
reliability of this scale on 33 participants. The test-retest reliability of the scale was found to be 0.81. An internal consistency analysis showed a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.92. For the discriminant validity of the scale, another scale which measured the cognitive intelligence of individuals was applied to 42 participants and their scores from the EI scale was compared and it was concluded that there was no relationship between the two. Respondents used a 5-point scale, on which a “1” represented “strongly disagree” and a “5” represented “strongly agree,” to indicate to what extent each item described them. There are questions in the survey, which aim at measuring EI, like “I like to share my emotions with others,” “I have control over my emotions,” and “I am aware of the non-verbal messages other people send.”

The Classroom Management Inventory

Another measurement tool used in the study is the “Classroom Management” survey developed by Yaşar (2008). The survey has five degrees in the Likert-type scale. The survey was organized in the form of “It does not define me at all (1), “It does not define me (2), “It neither defines me nor does not define me (3), “It generally defines me (4), “It defines me very well (5).” The survey includes 26 items covering two sub-scales concerning person-centered (1, 19, 21, 23, 27, 28, 2, 4, 6, 11, 13, 17, 18) and teacher-centered (3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26) classroom management approaches. The variance explained by two factors about the scale is 30%. The factor loads of the items in the survey are between .31 and .70. The scale’s Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability coefficient is .76 while the reliability coefficients of the sub-scales are .76 and .78 for the student-centered classroom management approach and teacher-centered classroom approach respectively. The survey includes questions, which were prepared to determine the teachers’ classroom management approaches, like “I frequently have group studies because they are necessary for the social and mental development of students,” “I delegate responsibilities to the students in the classroom in order to enable students to decide on their own,” “For example, if a student comes to the class late without any permission, I do not let the student in the class as punishment,” and “The students are not mature enough to choose the subject they want to learn according to their fields of interest.”

Data Analysis

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis was used for measuring the correlation between EI and classroom management approaches. Regression analysis was used for measuring the predictive levels of EI on classroom management approaches. SPSS version 11.5 was used in the analysis of data.

RESULTS

Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics regarding the scores of classroom teachers on the EI scale and the classroom management inventory sub-scales. Table 1 indicates that the mean of the EI Scale is 138.51. On one the hand, since one can get a score of maximum 165 from this scale, it can be argued that the EI levels of primary school teachers are high. On the other hand, the scores obtained from the sub-scales of the Classroom Management Inventory are 42.64 and 51.01 for teacher-centered classroom management and student-centered classroom management respectively. This result can be interpreted as primary school teachers prefer student-centered classroom management approaches more.

Pearson correlation coefficient was run to explore the relationship between the teachers’ EI levels and their classroom management approaches (Table 2). Table 2 reveals that there is a medium-level, positive, and significant relationship between the primary school teachers’ EI levels and the student-centered classroom management approach ($r=.420, p<.01$). According to this result, as the EI levels of the teachers increase, their rate of preference to choose the student-centered classroom management approach also increases. Alongside with this, it was seen that there was a low-level, positive, and significant relationship between the primary school teachers’ EI levels and teacher-centered classroom management approaches ($r=.231, p<.01$).

A regression analysis was also performed to investigate the predictive power of EI on classroom management approaches. When the analysis results are studied it is seen that emotional intelligence is a significant predictor of the teacher-centered classroom management approach [$R = .231, R^2 = .053, F = 13.04, p < .01$]. EI explains 5.3% of the variability in the teacher-centered classroom management approach. One unit increase in the EI levels of the teachers composing the sample enables .14 unit increase in the teacher-centered classroom management approach. EI is positive predictor of teacher-centered classroom management with weak predictive power (Table 3).

Table 4 shows that EI is a significant predictor of the student-centered classroom management approach [$R = .420, R^2 = .177, F = 49.57, p < .01$]. EI explains 17% of the variability in the student-centered classroom management approach. One unit increase in the EI levels of the teachers composing the sample enables .23 unit increase in the student-centered classroom management approach. The higher the Beta value, the greater the impact of the predictor variable is on the criterion variable. When tables 3 and 4 are studied, it is seen that
Table 1. Mean, standard deviation of the EI scale and the classroom management inventory sub-scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>138.51</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-centered class. man.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42.64</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered class. man.</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51.01</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Correlation between EI and classroom management approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher-centered classroom management</th>
<th>Person-centered classroom management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>.420**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 3. Results of Regression Analyses Predicting Scores of EI on teacher-centered classroom management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>13.04*</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>3.612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01

Table 4. Results of Regression Analyses Predicting Scores of EI on student-centered classroom management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>49.57*</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>7.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01

EI has the most impact on the teachers’ approaches to “student-centered classroom management” (β=0.231).

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The aim of this study is to examine if there is a significant relationship between primary school teachers’ EI levels and their classroom management approaches (teacher-centered classroom management, student-centered classroom management), and if EI significantly predicts classroom management approaches. The results revealed that EI is a positive predictor of teacher-centered classroom management with weak predictive power. There is a low-level, positive, and significant relationship between primary school teachers’ EI levels and teacher-centered classroom education approach. A teacher-centered educator is likely to be highly controlling, employing punitive sanctions, moralistic perceptions, highly impersonal relationships with students, attitudes of general mistrust, and a major focus on the maintenance of order (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1967; as cited in Garrett, 2008). Moreover, the teacher is the sole authority in teacher-centered classrooms and does not share responsibilities about classroom management with the students. In classrooms where the teacher’s focus is on controlling behavior, an emphasis on punishments and rewards is common. The decisions and rules come from an outside authority and are enforced by the power of the teacher over students (Evertson, Neal, 2006). When the fact that EI comprises of features regarding the perception, understanding, evaluation, expression, and management of emotions, at the end of the study it is expected that it will contradict...
the features of teacher-centered teachers and the relationship between EI and teacher-centered classroom management will be low.

Research results also indicate that EI significantly predicts student-centered classroom management. There is a medium-level, positive, and significant relationship between primary school teachers’ EI levels and their student-centered classroom management approaches. EI has a better predictive value for student-centered classroom management. Thus, it can be asserted that the higher the EI levels of primary school teachers is, the more they will use/prefer student-centered classroom management. The development of interpersonal relationships is an essential component of a student-centered approach, since positive student-teacher relationships presumably lessen the need for control and become the foundation for all interaction in the classroom (Dollard and Christensen, 1996). Supporters of student-centered management propose that children "see their acceptable, caring behavior as vital to the maintenance of the group because they have a vested interest in the health of the group as a whole" (Bloom, Perlmutter and Burrell, 1999, p. 134; as cited in Garrett, 2008). All these approaches used in student-centered classroom management is about the teacher's EI level because teachers with developed EIs are sensitive to their students' needs and meet these needs; the relations between the teacher and the students are sincere, compassionate, and harmonious. These teachers take their students’ points of view into consideration, avoid unkind and sarcastic disciplinary attitudes, encourage cooperation among the students, and are aware of their students’ emotional needs (Reyes, Bracket, Rivers, White, Salovey, 2012).

Further, studies conducted on this subject also support the results of this study. The most comprehensive research review of 119 person-centered and student-centered learning studies (Corneliussen-White, 2007) spanned 56 years and found positive cognitive and affective learner outcomes in person-centered environments, including creativity/critical thinking, achievement (mathematics/verbal), student participation, student satisfaction and self-esteem, reduction in dropouts, increased motivation to learn, less disruptive behavior, and fewer absences (as cited in Freiberg and Lamb, 2009). In Yahyazadeh-Jeloudar’s (2011) study, the teachers’ classroom discipline strategies were related to their EI and a negative relationship was established for aggression and no statistically significant relationship was established between punishment and teachers’ EI. Tunca (2010) found that EI’s dimension of “optimism/ regulating mood” had the highest effect on classroom management skills and the more teachers’ level of optimism increased the more effective it was on their classroom management skills. According to the results of a study by Özmen (2009), teachers’ EI levels are adequate. As the teachers’ EI levels go up their rate of coming across undesired attitudes go down. The most frequent coping methods used by primary school teachers with adequate EI levels are covered by “constructive disciplinary actions.” These are listed as vis-à-vis conversation, warning students orally, reminding students of classroom rules, meeting with their parents, and telling the students that they were upset by their actions.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

This study also has certain limitations. Firstly, this study has a geographical limitation. It is only limited to 233 teachers working at primary schools in Hatay city’s central province in Turkey. Future studies can be conducted in other cities in Turkey and abroad with a larger sample group. Secondly, there is also a limitation regarding the selection of the teacher group since the participants selected for the study are primary school teachers. Therefore, studies can also be conducted with other teacher groups (middle, high school, college teachers). Thirdly, a relational design was used in this study determining the relationship between EI and classroom management approaches. Research designs based on cause and effect relationship can be used in further studies. Lastly, while this study is limited to student-centered and teacher-centered classroom management approaches, further studies can investigate the relationship between EI and different dimensions of classroom management (instructional management, behavior management).

Moreover, the results of this study reveal that EI is a predictor of teachers’ classroom management preferences. Thus, EI and classroom management can be theoretically and practically included in the programs of institutions educating teachers and in-service training activities. Teacher educators can act as role models to teacher candidates for the development of EI because, according to Goleman (2007), EI can be learnt and increased. Further, college administrations can offer social activities enabling the development of EI levels of teacher candidates.
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