



The Relationship between Teachers' Work Engagement and Classroom Management Styles

Ayşe YAKUT YÖN¹, Ümit DİLEKÇİ²

¹ Ministry of National Education, Batman, Türkiye  0009-0001-6266-692X

² Batman University, Batman, Türkiye  0000-0002-6205-1247

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received 26.09.2025

Received in revised form

19.11.2025

Accepted 17.01.2026

Article Type: Research

Article



ABSTRACT

This study reveals the levels of work engagement and the adoption of classroom management styles among physical education and sports teachers, investigates the association between these two variables, and compares them by demographics. To this end, the study, grounded in a quantitative paradigm, employed descriptive, correlational, and causal-comparative designs. The study population includes 429 physical education and sports teachers working in the central district of Batman, while the sample comprises 202 teachers conveniently selected from this population. Data were collected using a "Personal Information Form," the "Engaged Teacher Scale," and the "Classroom Management Styles Scale." Before data analysis, the distribution was evaluated, and the findings showed that it did not follow a normal distribution. Thus, outliers were identified and removed, resulting in the exclusion of data from nine participants. Subsequent analyses were conducted on data from 193 participants. The findings can be summarized as follows: The most frequently adopted classroom management style among physical education and sports teachers was the "protective" style, while the least adopted was the "laissez-faire" style. Furthermore, the findings revealed high levels of work engagement among the participants. Statistically significant but very low positive correlations were identified between the adoption of the protective classroom management style and emotional engagement, cognitive engagement, and overall work engagement, as well as between social engagement with students and the adoption of the democratic classroom management style. Comparisons based on demographic variables indicated that gender significantly affected emotional engagement, educational level significantly influenced emotional, cognitive, and overall work engagement, and marital status impacted the adoption level of the autocratic classroom management style. The findings were discussed in relation to the existing literature, and several recommendations were made based on the results.

Keywords:

Teacher, work engagement, classroom management

1. Introduction

The concept of "*role embracement*," first defined by Goffman (1959), is among the earliest notions articulated in relation to work engagement. According to Goffman, role embracement refers to an individual's natural commitment to role activity and their acceptance of that role, a process that necessitates a certain degree of attention and effort. Building on Goffman's perspective on role embracement, Kahn (1990) developed a theoretical framework to understand differences in individuals' work performance and the contexts in which such differences emerge. Within this framework, he coined the term 'work engagement' to refer to *the integration of organizational members' selves—encompassing both emotional and cognitive dimensions—into their current work roles*. McBain (2007) further conceptualized this concept as *individuals' commitment toward the organization in which they are employed and the efforts they exert to ensure organizational success*. Employees with

*This study was derived from the first author's master's thesis completed under the supervision of the second author.

¹ Corresponding author's address: Batman University, Batman, Türkiye

e-mail: dilekciuumit@gmail.com

Citation: Yakut Yön, A. & Dilekçi, Ü. (2026). The relationship between teachers' work engagement and classroom management styles. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 13(1), 11-27. <https://dx.doi.org/10.52380/ijpes.2026.13.1.1589>

high levels of work engagement perform their responsibilities with enthusiasm and dedication, generate creative solutions to challenges, and demonstrate excellence in their work performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Kahn argues that when individuals utilize their physical, emotional, and cognitive energies within their work roles, they simultaneously develop a dynamic and meaningful connection with those roles. Work engagement, therefore, goes beyond mere commitment to one's job; it encompasses the capacity to be fully present while performing work tasks and to contribute meaningfully to the job itself (Dilekçi et al., 2025). In this sense, work engagement carries critical significance not only for the individual's inner world but also for organizational sustainability. Consequently, work engagement generates a long-term and enduring positive impact within organizations (Dilekçi & Limon, 2020). Roberts and Davenport (2002) emphasized the importance of work engagement by stating that it arises from the motivation that an individual generates internally, manifesting as both willingness and a sense of attachment to one's work. Employees who are engaged with their jobs establish a sense of congruence between themselves and their work, thereby achieving higher levels of motivation (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). They tend to demonstrate superior performance, surpassing other individuals or groups in productivity, and become more capable of meeting organizational demands (Rich et al., 2010). In this regard, the teachers' work engagement in educational institutions can be considered crucial for both individual professional fulfillment and organizational success (Dilekçi et al., 2025; Hakanen et al., 2006). Teachers who are engaged in their work are expected to approach their professional responsibilities with greater sincerity, cultivate stronger relationships with their students, and foster more effective learning environments within the classroom.

The classroom is characterized as a shared sphere of life in which educational activities take place and where teachers and students engage in reciprocal communication (Demirtaş, 2006). Within the classroom, students with diverse characteristics experience both individual and group learning processes (Balci, 2014). As educational activities unfold over the course of weeks, a significant portion of students' lives is spent in the classroom, where teachers and students participate in classroom life in accordance with predetermined objectives and curricula (Aydin, 2017). The classroom represents a developmental environment in which students, following the family setting, first establish social relationships, express their individual differences, and acquire various competencies (Demirtaş, 2015). According to Şışman (2002), the classroom is a social space where individuals with different types of intelligence and abilities come together to achieve designated goals. As is well established, the classroom constitutes a critical environment of interaction between teachers and students, thereby playing a decisive role in the teaching–learning process. Accordingly, it can be asserted that the creation, maintenance, and effective management of a conducive classroom environment are essential for achieving the intended objectives of learning and instruction (Demirtaş, 2006). Consequently, classroom management can be regarded as one of the core competencies of the teaching profession and as playing a highly critical role in the effectiveness of the educational process (Evertson & Weinstein, 2006). Teachers' classroom management strategies or methods are evaluated as the level of consistent behaviors exhibited by educators in organizing relationships and learning processes within the classroom (Emmer & Stough, 2001; Marzano et al., 2003). Drawing upon leadership research, teachers' management styles have been classified in various ways within the field of educational administration. In the present study, however, the subdimensions of the scale developed by Bosworth (1997) and adapted into Turkish by Aktan and Sezer (2018) served as the basis for classification. These include "authoritarian," "protective," "democratic," and "indifferent" classroom management styles. In the authoritarian classroom management style, the pressure and restrictions imposed by the teacher on students are emphasized (Bosworth, 1997). The teacher sets strict boundaries and adopts a rigid understanding of discipline, expecting obedience from students. Control rests entirely with the teacher (Erdoğan, 2017). Within this approach, the teacher's primary concern is to maintain order and preserve authority. Students' individual preferences and participation are limited, while the teacher's directives constitute the focal point of classroom interaction. These styles are categorized as "authoritarian," "protective," "democratic," and "'laissez-faire'" classroom management styles. In the authoritarian classroom management style, the emphasis lies on the pressure and restrictions imposed by the teacher upon students (Bosworth, 1997). The teacher establishes strict boundaries, adopts a rigid disciplinary stance, and expects obedience from students; control rests entirely in the teacher's hands (Erdoğan, 2017). In this approach, the teacher's primary objective is to maintain order and preserve authority. Consequently, students' individual preferences and participation remain limited, though the teacher's directives dominate the dynamics of classroom interaction. The protective classroom management style, on

the other hand, is characterized by the teacher's excessively directive and interventionist attitude toward students. In this style, the teacher strives to prevent students from making mistakes and adopts a precautionary stance to shield them from potential problems (Aktan & Sezer, 2018). In the protective classroom management style, the teacher's primary aim is to ensure students' safety and to maintain a classroom environment free from negative influences. However, this approach may inadvertently restrict the development of students' independent decision-making and problem-solving skills. The democratic classroom management style, by contrast, reflects an approach in which the teacher assumes a guiding role, actively encourages students' participation in decision-making processes, and establishes classroom rules collaboratively (Evertson & Weinstein, 2006). Within this model, the concept of discipline is not grounded in punishment but rather in jointly developed rules and natural consequences that emerge through students' involvement in the process (Charles, 2011). The democratic management approach strengthens students' sense of responsibility in addition to cultivating a classroom climate built upon mutual respect and cooperation. This approach fosters a structure that supports not only students' academic achievement but also their social competencies (Evertson & Weinstein, 2006). The laissez-faire classroom management style refers to an approach in which the teacher adopts a passive, unresponsive, and distant stance in managing the classroom (Wolfgang, 2005). In this style, the teacher refrains from intervening in classroom behaviors and fulfills essential responsibilities—such as maintaining discipline, providing student guidance, and managing the instructional process—only at a minimal level (Aktan & Sezer, 2018). Such a passive approach weakens teacher-student interactions and leads to ambiguity in classroom rules, resulting in a disorganized learning process (Başar, 2011). The laissez-faire classroom management, coupled with the weakening of the teacher's authority, may also negatively affect students' willingness to assume responsibility. In such an environment, as the learning process is largely left to students' initiative, both academic achievement and the sustainability of classroom discipline become severely compromised.

Work engagement is defined by Schaufeli et al. (2002) as a state in which individuals exhibit high levels of energy, mental resilience, and dedication toward their work. Employees with strong work engagement perform their tasks within the scope of their responsibilities with enthusiasm and commitment, generate creative solutions to the challenges they encounter, and demonstrate superior job performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). For employees in educational institutions, work engagement is of particular importance, and research findings in the literature indicate that it contributes to positive organizational outcomes (Dilekçi et al., 2025). Within the context of this study, teachers who display high levels of engagement are expected to demonstrate more consistent, well-structured, and proactive behaviors in the classroom, thereby fostering healthy relationships with their students. It can be argued that this condition particularly facilitates teachers' adoption of democratic and collaboration-oriented classroom management approaches. Conversely, low levels of work engagement are thought to incline teachers toward laissez-faire or authoritarian attitudes in classroom management, weakening their interactions with students. In this regard, teachers' levels of work engagement may be considered a variable that determines the quality of the classroom management styles they adopt. A review of the existing body of literature has revealed no studies directly examining the relationship between work engagement and classroom management styles. Accordingly, the present study is expected to contribute to the literature. The aim of this research, therefore, is to investigate the relationship between teachers' work engagement and their classroom management styles, based on teachers' perspectives. To this end, the study seeks to address the following research questions:

- *What are teachers' perceptions regarding their levels of engagement and their classroom management styles?*
- *Is there a significant relationship between teachers' levels of engagement and their classroom management styles?*
- *Do teachers' levels of engagement and their classroom management styles show significant differences with respect to the variables of gender, school level, educational background, marital status, and years of professional experience?*

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

The main purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between physical education and sports teachers' levels of engagement and their adoption of different classroom management styles. The present

study also seeks to identify participants' levels of engagement and their preferred classroom management styles and to compare these in relation to various demographic variables. In this context, the current research employed three distinct quantitative research designs. Given its focus on analyzing relationships between variables, the study incorporates a "correlational survey" design (Babbie, 2010); in terms of identifying the levels of the variables, it employs a "descriptive survey" design (Marczyk et al., 2005); and with regard to conducting comparisons based on demographic variables, it utilizes a "causal-comparative" design (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). The overall research design can be illustrated as follows.

2.2. Population and Sample of the Study

The population of the present study consists of 429 physical education and sports teachers employed in the province of Batman during the 2024–2025 academic year. The sample of the study comprises 202 physical education and sports teachers who were selected from this population through "*convenience sampling*" (Babbie, 2010). Convenience sampling is one of the sampling methods based on selecting individuals who are easily accessible and willing to participate in the research. When researchers encounter temporal and spatial constraints that prevent them from reaching the entire population, the sample is formed from the units with the highest accessibility (Cohen et al., 2018). Considering the sample size table proposed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970), the number of participants reached in this study can be regarded as sufficient to represent the population.

Of all the physical education and sports teachers who participated in the study, 87 were female (43.1%) and 115 were male (56.9%); 119 were married (58.9%) and 83 were single (41.1%). A total of 120 participants were employed in secondary schools (59.4%), while 82 were working in high schools (40.6%). Regarding educational background, 155 participants held a bachelor's degree (76.7%), and 47 participants held a master's degree (23.3%). In terms of professional seniority, 51 participants had 0–5 years of experience (25.2%), 88 had 6–10 years (43.6%), 46 had 11–15 years (22.8%), 10 had 16–20 years (5.0%), and 7 had 21 years or more (3.5%). Finally, the average age of the participating physical education and sports teachers was 33.64 years.

2.3. Data Collection Instruments

The data collection instrument employed in this study consists of three sections. The first section includes the "*Personal Information Form*," developed by the researcher to identify participants' demographic characteristics. The second section comprises the "*Engaged Teacher Scale*," while the third section contains the "*Classroom Management Styles Scale*". Detailed information regarding the scales used in the study is presented below.

Engaged Teacher Scale: The scale was originally developed by Klassen et al. (2013) within the North American cultural context and was adapted into Turkish by Yerdelen et al. (2018). This self-report scale consists of 16 items organized into a four-factor structure. The scale comprises the following dimensions: *emotional engagement* (4 items), *social engagement: colleagues* (4 items), *cognitive engagement* (4 items), and *social engagement: students* (4 items). Responses are rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from "(0) Never," "(1) Rarely," "(2) On Occasion," "(3) Sometimes," "(4) Often," "(5) Frequently," to "(6) Always." The developers established the factor structure of the scale through first- and second-order confirmatory factor analyses and demonstrated its reliability using Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficients. As a result of the first-order confirmatory factor analysis, the goodness-of-fit indices for the scale were calculated as follows: $\chi^2(98) = 32.29$, $p < .05$; CFI = .98; GFI = .93; NFI = .96; SRMR = .036; RMSEA = .059; 90% CI = .049–.069, with factor loadings ($> .50$). Similarly, the second-order confirmatory factor analysis yielded goodness-of-fit indices of $\chi^2(100) = 40.06$, $p < .05$; CFI = .98; GFI = .93; NFI = .96; SRMR = .040; RMSEA = .060; 90% CI = .050–.070, with factor loadings ($> .50$). The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients for the scale were reported as follows: $\alpha = .88$ for the overall scale, $\alpha = .87$ for both the emotional engagement and cognitive engagement subscales, $\alpha = .81$ for the social engagement: students' subscale, and $\alpha = .85$ for the social engagement: colleagues' subscale. In this context, the scale can be considered a valid and reliable measurement instrument (DeVellis, 2017).

Classroom Management Styles Scale: The scale was originally developed by Bosworth (1997) and adapted into Turkish by Aktan and Sezer (2018). The 12-item scale measures four classroom management styles:

"authoritarian" (3 items), "protective" (3 items), "democratic" (3 items), and "laissez-faire" (3 items). Responses are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from "(5) Strongly Agree," "(4) Agree," "(3) Neutral," "(2) Disagree," to "(1) Strongly Disagree." The developers examined the construct validity of the scale using exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, while its reliability was tested via Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficients. The exploratory factor analysis revealed a four-factor structure, and the confirmatory factor analysis supported this structure with goodness-of-fit indices: $\chi^2/df = 115.05/48$ (2.39), $p = .00$; RMSEA = .068; CFI = 1.00; GFI = .99; NNFI = 1.00. The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficients ranged between $\alpha = .69$ and $.71$. These findings indicate that the scale is a valid and reliable measurement instrument (DeVellis, 2017).

2.4. Data Collection and Analysis Processes

Both online and face-to-face methods were used during data collection. The online data collection was administered via Google Forms. Participants completed the data collection instruments entirely voluntarily.

The data analysis for the study was conducted using SPSS version 25. Upon preparing the dataset for analysis, the distribution of the data was first examined through skewness and kurtosis coefficients. The skewness and kurtosis values for the data collected from 202 physical education and sports teachers, particularly for the social engagement: colleagues, social engagement: students, and overall engagement scales, exceeded the ± 2.00 range (George & Mallery, 2019), indicating a deviation from normal distribution. Therefore, following Field's (2013) recommendation, boxplots were used to identify outliers for the relevant variables. The analysis revealed that data from nine participants represented outliers. After excluding these outliers, the analysis was repeated, and the skewness and kurtosis values for the research variables fell within the ± 2.00 range, as presented in Table 1, indicating a normal distribution. Subsequent analyses were conducted on the dataset comprising 193 participants.

Table 1. Skewness and Kurtosis Values

Dimension/Scale	<i>n</i>	Skewness	S.D.	Kurtosis	S.D.
Authoritarian classroom management	193	-.33	.17	-.16	.35
Protective classroom management	193	-.91	.17	.70	.35
Democratic classroom management	193	-.21	.17	-.26	.35
Laissez-faire classroom management	193	.64	.17	.38	.35
Emotional engagement	193	-.46	.17	-.24	.35
Social engagement: <i>colleagues</i>	193	-.40	.17	-.51	.35
Cognitive engagement	193	-.51	.17	-.26	.35
Social engagement: <i>students</i>	193	-.57	.17	-.46	.35
Engagement (Total)	193	-.25	.17	-.48	.35

Since the data met the assumption of normality, the arithmetic mean (\bar{x}) and standard deviations (SD) were calculated to determine participants' levels of the research variables, and independent samples t-tests were used to compare the scores of two independent groups. However, although the data conformed to normality, the Kruskal-Wallis H test was employed to conduct comparisons based on the variable of professional seniority. Specifically, there were 10 participants in the 16–20 years of experience category and 7 participants in the 21 years and above category. Given that the number of participants in other seniority categories was substantially higher, a non-parametric test was applied in accordance with Huck's (2019) recommendation. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to examine the relationships between variables (Mills & Gay, 2019). The interpretation criteria for these coefficients were as follows (Singh, 2007): $r \leq .20$, very low; $r = .21–.40$, low; $r = .41–.69$, moderate; $r \geq .70$, high. Statistical significance was set at $p < .05$.

2.5. Ethical

The data collection process was conducted in accordance with the approval of the Ethics Committee of Batman University (numbered 2023/06-07, dated 08/11/2023) and the permission of the Batman Provincial Directorate of National Education (numbered E-71214596-604.02-93889325, dated 08/01/2024).

3. Findings

This section presents the analysis results of the data obtained within the scope of the study. In line with the research questions, statistical analyses were conducted, and participants' responses were evaluated within

the framework of the identified variables. The findings are systematically presented in accordance with the study's objectives and hypotheses, accompanied by the significance levels and interpretations of the data. Relationships and differences among the main variables of the study are also illustrated and explained using tables.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

	Dimension/Scale	n	Min.	Max.	\bar{x}	SD
Classroom Management Styles	Authoritarian classroom management	193	1,00	5,00	3,44	,88
	Protective classroom management	193	1,67	5,00	4,13	,70
	Democratic classroom management	193	1,00	5,00	3,29	,91
	Laissez-faire classroom management	193	1,00	5,00	2,77	,85
Engaged Teacher	Emotional engagement	193	3,00	6,00	5,00	,67
	Social engagement: <i>colleagues</i>	193	3,25	6,00	4,99	,67
	Cognitive engagement	193	3,00	6,00	5,05	,67
	Social engagement: <i>students</i>	193	4,00	6,00	5,27	,56
	Engagement (Total)	193	3,75	6,00	5,08	,53

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the scores obtained by physical education and sports teachers on the Classroom Management and Engagement Scales. According to the findings, the arithmetic mean for participants' scores on the authoritarian classroom management style was ($\bar{x}=3,44$; $SS=.88$), indicating agree; for the protective classroom management style ($\bar{x}=4,13$; $SS=.70$), indicating agree; for the democratic classroom management style ($\bar{x}=3,29$; $SS=.91$), indicating neutral; and for the laissez-faire classroom management style, ($\bar{x}=2,77$; $SS=.85$), also indicating neutral. These results suggest that the classroom management style most frequently adopted by physical education and sports teachers is the protective style, whereas the style least frequently employed is the laissez-faire style.

Table 2 also presents the arithmetic means of participants' scores on the Engaged Teacher Scale. The findings indicate that the mean scores for the emotional engagement dimension were ($\bar{x}=5,00$; $SS=.67$), corresponding to "Frequently"; for social engagement (colleagues), ($\bar{x}=4,99$ $SS=.67$), corresponding to "Frequently"; for cognitive engagement, ($\bar{x}=5,05$; $SS=.67$) corresponding to "Frequently"; for social engagement (students), ($\bar{x}=5,27$; $SS=.56$) corresponding to "Always"; and for the overall scale, ($\bar{x}=5,08$; $SS=.53$) corresponding to "Frequently."

Table 3. Relationships Between Engagement Levels and Classroom Management Styles

Dimension/Scale	Authoritarian classroom management	Protective classroom management	Democratic classroom management	Laissez-faire classroom
Emotional engagement	<i>r</i>	,07	,16*	-,03
	<i>p</i>	,31	,02	,70
	<i>n</i>	193	193	193
Social engagement: <i>colleagues</i>	<i>r</i>	,08	,12	,11
	<i>p</i>	,24	,11	,13
	<i>n</i>	193	193	193
Cognitive engagement	<i>r</i>	,03	,17*	,10
	<i>p</i>	,63	,02	,18
	<i>n</i>	193	193	193
Social engagement: <i>students</i>	<i>r</i>	-,03	,05	,15*
	<i>p</i>	,73	,46	,04
	<i>n</i>	193	193	193
Engagement (Total)	<i>r</i>	,05	,15*	,10
	<i>p</i>	,45	,03	,18
	<i>n</i>	193	193	193

Table 3 presents the correlations between physical education and sports teachers' levels of engagement and their classroom management styles. The findings can be summarized as follows: A very low, positive, and statistically significant correlation was found between the emotional engagement dimension of the Engaged Teacher Scale and the protective classroom management style ($r = .16$, $p < .05$). However, the relationships between emotional engagement and the authoritarian ($r = .07$, $p > .05$), democratic ($r = .03$, $p > .05$), and laissez-

faire ($r = .03, p > .05$) classroom management styles were not statistically significant. Furthermore, the findings revealed that the correlations between the social engagement (colleagues) dimension and the authoritarian ($r = .08, p > .05$), protective ($r = .12, p > .05$), democratic ($r = .11, p > .05$), and laissez-faire ($r = .04, p > .05$) classroom management styles were not statistically significant. On the other hand, a very low-level, positive, and statistically significant correlation was found between cognitive engagement and the protective classroom management style ($r = .17, p < .05$), whereas the correlations between cognitive engagement and the authoritarian ($r = .03, p > .05$), democratic ($r = .10, p > .05$), and laissez-faire ($r = .09, p > .05$) classroom management styles were not statistically significant. In a similar vein, a very low-level, positive, and statistically significant correlation was observed between the social engagement (students) dimension and the democratic classroom management style ($r = .15, p < .05$). However, the correlations of social engagement (students) with the authoritarian ($r = -.03, p > .05$), protective ($r = .05, p > .05$), and laissez-faire ($r = .05, p > .05$) classroom management styles were not statistically significant. Finally, a very low-level, positive, and statistically significant correlation was identified between the overall Engaged Teacher Scale and the protective classroom management style ($r = .15, p < .05$). In contrast, the correlations between the overall Engaged Teacher scale and the authoritarian ($r = .05, p > .05$), democratic ($r = .10, p > .05$), and laissez-faire ($r = .06, p > .05$) classroom management styles were not statistically significant.

Table 4. Comparison of Classroom Management Styles by Gender

Dimension	Gender	n	\bar{x}	S.D.	df	t	p
Authoritarian classroom management	Female	84	3,51	,85	191	1,06	,29
	Male	109	3,38	,90			
Protective classroom management	Female	84	4,22	,67	191	1,52	,13
	Male	109	4,06	,72			
Democratic classroom management	Female	84	3,42	,84	191	1,73	,09
	Male	109	3,19	,96			
Laissez-faire classroom management	Female	84	2,87	,86	191	1,45	,15
	Male	109	3,51	,85			

Table 4 compares the classroom management styles of physical education and sports teachers depending on gender. The findings indicate that male and female teachers do not differ significantly in their adoption of the authoritarian ($t_{(191)} = 1.06, p = .29$), protective ($t_{(191)} = 1.52, p = .13$), democratic ($t_{(191)} = 1.73, p = .09$), and laissez-faire ($t_{(191)} = 1.45, p = .15$) classroom management styles.

Table 5. Comparison of Engagement by Gender

Dimension/Scale	Gender	n	\bar{x}	S.D.	df	t	p
Emotional engagement	Female	84	4,87	,70	191	-2,33	,02
	Male	109	5,09	,64			
Social engagement: colleagues	Female	84	5,01	,69	191	,25	,80
	Male	109	4,98	,66			
Cognitive engagement	Female	84	5,07	,67	191	,45	,65
	Male	109	5,03	,67			
Social engagement: students	Female	84	5,33	,56	191	1,23	,22
	Male	109	5,23	,57			
Engagement (Total)	Female	84	5,07	,53	191	-,18	,86
	Male	109	5,08	,54			

Table 5 compares the engagement levels of physical education and sports teachers in the context of gender. The findings reveal that male and female teachers do not show significant differences in terms of social engagement (colleagues) ($t(191) = .25, p = .80$), cognitive engagement ($t(191) = .45, p = .65$), social engagement (students) ($t(191) = 1.23, p = .22$), and overall engagement ($t(191) = -,18, p = .86$). However, a statistically significant difference was observed in emotional engagement levels ($t(191) = -2.33, p = .02$), with male teachers ($\bar{x} = 5.09, S.D = .64$) reporting higher emotional engagement compared to female participants ($\bar{x} = 4.87, S.D = .64$).

Table 6. Comparison of Classroom Management Styles by School Level

Dimension	School Level	n	\bar{x}	S.D.	df	t	p
Authoritarian classroom management	Secondary School	118	3,41	,87	191	-,56	,57
	High School	75	3,48	,90			
Protective classroom management	Secondary School	118	4,17	,68	191	1,02	,31
	High School	75	4,07	,73			
Democratic classroom management	Secondary School	118	3,36	,91	191	1,22	,22
	High School	75	3,19	,92			
Laissez-faire classroom management	Secondary School	118	2,74	,88	191	-,59	,55
	High School	75	2,82	,80			

Table 6 gives the levels at which physical education and sports teachers adopt classroom management styles in the context of the type of school in which they are employed. The findings indicate that teachers holding bachelor's and master's degrees do not show significant differences in their adoption of autocratic ($t(191) = .01, p = .99$), protective ($t(191) = -1.16, p = .25$), democratic ($t(191) = -.53, p = .60$), or laissez-faire ($t(191) = -1.18, p = .24$) classroom management styles.

Table 7. Comparison of Engagement by School Level

Dimension/Scale	School Level	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	p
Emotional engagement	Secondary School	118	4,99	,73	191	-,28	,78
	High School	75	5,01	,58			
Social engagement: colleagues	Secondary School	118	5,01	,72	191	,48	,63
	High School	75	4,96	,59			
Cognitive engagement	Secondary School	118	5,04	,67	191	-,17	,87
	High School	75	5,06	,67			
Social engagement: students	Secondary School	118	5,28	,57	191	,41	,69
	High School	75	5,25	,55			
Engagement (Total)	Secondary School	75	5,08	,56	191	,12	,91
	High School	118	5,07	,49			

Table 7 compares the engagement levels of physical education and sports teachers in relation to the type of school at which they are employed. The findings reveal that teachers working in secondary schools and high schools do not differ significantly in their levels of emotional engagement ($t(191) = -.28, p = .78$), social engagement (colleagues) ($t(191) = .48, p = .63$), cognitive engagement ($t(191) = -.17, p = .87$), social engagement (students) ($t(191) = .41, p = .69$), or overall engagement ($t(191) = .12, p = .91$). In other words, physical education and sports teachers at the secondary and high school levels demonstrate similar levels of engagement.

Table 8. Comparison of Classroom Management Styles by Educational Background

Dimension	Educational Background	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	p
Authoritarian classroom management	Bachelor's Degree	150	3,44	,86	191	,01	,99
	Master's Degree	43	3,43	,97			
Protective classroom management	Bachelor's Degree	150	4,10	,69	191	-1,16	,25
	Master's Degree	43	4,24	,72			
Democratic classroom management	Bachelor's Degree	150	3,27	,90	191	-,53	,60
	Master's Degree	43	3,36	,96			
Laissez-faire classroom management	Bachelor's Degree	150	2,73	,84	191	-1,18	,24
	Master's Degree	43	2,91	,89			

Table 8 compares the extent to which physical education and sports teachers adopt classroom management styles in relation to their educational background. The findings indicate that teachers holding bachelor's and

master's degrees do not show significant difference in their adoption of autocratic ($t_{(191)} = .01, p = .99$), protective ($t_{(191)} = -1.16, p = .25$), democratic ($t_{(191)} = -.53, p = .60$), or laissez-faire ($t_{(191)} = -1.18, p = .24$) classroom management styles.

Table 9. Comparison of engagement by educational background

Dimension/Scale	Educational Background	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	p
Emotional engagement	Bachelor's Degree	150	4,93	,69	191	-2,52	,01
	Master's Degree	43	5,22	,54			
Social engagement: colleagues	Bachelor's Degree	150	4,95	,68	191	-1,78	,08
	Master's Degree	43	5,15	,60			
Cognitive engagement	Bachelor's Degree	150	4,97	,69	191	-3,24	,00
	Master's Degree	43	5,33	,53			
Social engagement: students	Bachelor's Degree	150	5,26	,57	191	-,49	,62
	Master's Degree	43	5,31	,54			
Engagement (Total)	Bachelor's Degree	150	5,03	,54	191	-2,50	,01
	Master's Degree	43	5,25	,47			

Table 9 presents a comparison of physical education and sports teachers' engagement levels with respect to their educational background. The findings reveal no statistically significant differences between teachers holding bachelor's and master's degrees in terms of social engagement (colleagues) ($t_{(191)} = -1.78, p = .08$) and social engagement (students) ($t_{(191)} = -4.49, p = .62$). However, statistically significant differences were monitored in emotional engagement ($t_{(191)} = -2.52, p = .01$), cognitive engagement ($t_{(191)} = -3.24, p < .001$), and overall engagement ($t_{(191)} = -2.50, p = .01$). Descriptive statistics further demonstrate that teachers with a master's degree report higher levels of engagement compared to the participants with a bachelor's degree. Specifically, the mean scores of master's degree holders in emotional engagement ($\bar{x} = 5.22; SD = .54$) were higher than those of bachelor's degree holders ($\bar{x} = 4.93; SD = .69$). Likewise, master's graduates scored higher in cognitive engagement ($\bar{x} = 5.33; SD = .53$) compared to bachelor's graduates ($\bar{x} = 4.97; SD = .69$). Finally, in terms of overall engagement, master's graduates again reported higher mean scores ($\bar{x} = 5.25; SD = .47$) than bachelor's graduates ($\bar{x} = 5.03; SD = .54$). Taken together, these findings suggest that educational background influences physical education and sports teachers' levels of emotional, cognitive, and overall engagement.

Table 10. Comparison of Classroom Management Styles by Marital Status

Dimension/Scale	Marital Status	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	p
Authoritarian classroom management	Married	116	3,32	,89	191	-2,16	,03
	Single	77	3,60	,84			
Protective classroom management	Married	116	4,10	,76	191	-,82	,42
	Single	77	4,18	,61			
Democratic classroom management	Married	116	3,24	,92	191	-,89	,38
	Single	77	3,36	,91			
Laissez-faire classroom management	Married	116	2,71	,82	191	-1,19	,24
	Single	77	2,86	,90			

Table 10 presents a comparison of the classroom management styles of physical education and sports teachers based on marital status. The findings suggest that married and single teachers do not differ significantly in their adoption of protective ($t_{(191)} = -0.82, p = .42$), democratic ($t_{(191)} = -0.89, p = .38$), or laissez-faire ($t_{(191)} = -1.19, p = .24$) classroom management styles. However, a statistically significant difference was observed for the autocratic classroom management style ($t_{(191)} = -2.16, p = .03$). Examination of the mean scores suggests that single teachers tend to employ an autocratic approach ($\bar{x} = 3.60; SD = .84$) slightly more frequently than married participants ($\bar{x} = 3.32; SD = .89$).

Table 11. Comparison of Engagement by Marital Status

Dimension/Scale	Marital Status	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	p
Emotional engagement	Married	116	4,98	,66	191	-.39	,69
	Single	77	5,02	,69			
Social engagement: colleagues	Married	116	4,92	,72	191	-1,79	,08
	Single	77	5,10	,57			
Cognitive engagement	Married	116	4,98	,71	191	-1,69	,09
	Single	77	5,15	,59			
Social engagement: students	Married	116	5,21	,60	191	-1,81	,07
	Single	77	5,36	,49			
Engagement (Total)	Married	116	5,02	,57	191	-1,70	,09
	Single	77	5,16	,46			

Table 11 presents a comparison of the engagement levels of physical education and sports teachers based on marital status. The findings indicate that married and single teachers do not show significant differences in terms of emotional engagement ($t(191) = -.39$; $p = .69$), social engagement (colleagues) ($t(191) = -1.79$; $p = .08$), cognitive engagement ($t(191) = -1.69$; $p = .09$), social engagement (students) ($t(191) = -1.81$; $p = .07$), or overall engagement ($t(191) = -1.70$; $p = .09$). These results suggest that marital status does not have a significant impact on the engagement levels of physical education and sports teachers.

Table 12. Comparison of Classroom Management Styles by Professional Seniory

Dimension	Professional Seniory	n	Mean Rank	df	χ^2	p
Authoritarian classroom management	0-5 years	50	95,55	4	2,78	,59
	6-10 years	81	102,87			
	11-15 years	45	87,57			
	16-20 years	10	90,05			
	21 years and above	7	110,00			
Protective classroom management	0-5 years	50	88,23	4	2,03	,73
	6-10 years	81	100,93			
	11-15 years	45	97,87			
	16-20 years	10	96,65			
	21 years and above	7	109,07			
Democratic classroom management	0-5 years	50	96,26	4	,81	,94
	6-10 years	81	97,10			
	11-15 years	45	95,31			
	16-20 years	10	94,80			
	21 years and above	7	115,07			
Laissez-faire classroom management	0-5 years	50	94,48	4	2,71	,61
	6-10 years	81	96,64			
	11-15 years	45	102,21			
	16-20 years	10	108,55			
	21 years and above	7	69,14			

Table 12 presents a comparison of the classroom management styles adopted by physical education and sports teachers based on their professional seniority. The findings indicate that seniority does not significantly differentiate teachers' adoption of autocratic ($H(4) = 2.78$; $p = .59$), protective ($H(4) = 2.03$; $p = .73$), democratic ($H(4) = .81$; $p = .94$), or laissez-faire ($H(4) = 2.71$; $p = .61$) classroom management styles. These results suggest that the level of professional experience does not have a significant effect on teachers' preferred classroom management styles.

Table 13 covers a comparison of the engagement levels of physical education and sports teachers depending on their professional seniority. The findings reveal that teachers across different seniority ranges do not exhibit statistically significant differences in emotional engagement ($H(4) = 4.96$; $p = .29$), social engagement (colleagues) ($H(4) = 2.91$; $p = .57$), cognitive engagement ($H(4) = 4.74$; $p = .32$), social engagement (students) ($H(4) = 5.51$; $p = .24$), or overall engagement ($H(4) = 2.79$; $p = .59$). Based on these results, it can be inferred that professional seniority does not significantly affect the work engagement levels of physical education and sports teachers.

Table 13. Comparison of Engagement by Professional Seniory

Dimension	Professional Seniory	n	Mean Rank	df	χ^2	p
Emotional engagement	0-5 years	50	89,83	4	4,96	,29
	6-10 years	81	100,17			
	11-15 years	45	91,18			
	16-20 years	10	108,15			
	21 years and above	7	133,07			
Social engagement: <i>colleagues</i>	0-5 years	50	88,71	4	2,91	,57
	6-10 years	81	101,58			
	11-15 years	45	98,76			
	16-20 years	10	82,70			
	21 years and above	7	112,36			
Cognitive engagement	0-5 years	50	84,42	4	4,74	,32
	6-10 years	81	97,85			
	11-15 years	45	107,18			
	16-20 years	10	95,65			
	21 years and above	7	113,57			
Social engagement: <i>students</i>	0-5 years	50	90,62	4	5,51	,24
	6-10 years	81	107,62			
	11-15 years	45	89,32			
	16-20 years	10	91,20			
	21 years and above	7	77,36			
Engagement (Total)	0-5 years	50	87,30	4	2,79	,59
	6-10 years	81	101,99			
	11-15 years	45	96,59			
	16-20 years	10	95,25			
	21 years and above	7	113,64			

4. Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The current study aims to determine the levels at which physical education and sports teachers adopt work engagement and classroom management styles, to reveal the relationship between these two variables, and to compare them in terms of certain demographic factors. In this regard, the participants' views on the autocratic classroom management style were at the "agree" level; their views on the protective classroom management style were also at the "agree" level; their views on the democratic classroom management style were at the "neutral" level; and their views on the laissez-faire classroom management style were similarly at the "neutral" level. These findings indicate that physical education and sports teachers most frequently employ the protective classroom management style, although the laissez-faire style is the least frequently adopted. This suggests that teachers tend to prefer more structured, student-centered management approaches in ensuring classroom discipline and facilitating student interaction. The related body of the literature reveals that in the study by Katmiş and Doğru (2020), teachers most frequently adopted the democratic classroom management style, while the least preferred style was the laissez-faire approach. In the present study, the higher prevalence of the protective classroom management style among physical education and sports teachers compared to other styles may be attributed to the nature of physical education and sports classes, which are conducted in environments more exposed to external interventions and more prone to encountering undesired situations. Moreover, an examination of the Engaged Teacher Scale indicates that participants' responses were at the "frequently" level for the emotional engagement dimension, the "frequently" level for social engagement (colleagues), the "frequently" level for cognitive engagement, the "always" level for social engagement (students), and the "frequently" level for overall engagement. Based on the literature, there are several studies reporting similar findings to this research regarding teachers' overall engagement scale scores (Dilekçi et al., 2025; Dilekçi and Limon, 2020; Gün, 2017). Examination of the findings in the present study reveals that among physical education and sports teachers, the highest level of work engagement was observed in the student social engagement dimension, whereas the lowest level was recorded in the colleague social engagement dimension. This result suggests that while physical education and sports teachers demonstrate a student-centered approach in their social interactions, their engagement in relationships with colleagues is comparatively lower. The study highlights that teachers

establish particularly strong connections in student-related social interactions, yet exhibit a more limited level of engagement with colleagues. This indicates that teachers adopt a student-centered approach but may encounter various challenges in peer interactions. These findings underscore the need for structural arrangements and supportive practices aimed at enhancing teacher-to-teacher relationships and strengthening professional interaction processes.

The relationships between physical education and sports teachers' work engagement levels and their classroom management styles can be summarized as follows: A very low, positive, and statistically significant relationship was found between the emotional engagement dimension of the engagement scale and the protective classroom management style. Nevertheless, the relationships between emotional engagement and the autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire classroom management styles were not statistically significant. The findings also indicated that the colleague social engagement dimension of the engagement scale was not significantly related to any of the classroom management styles (autocratic, protective, democratic, or laissez-faire). On the other hand, a very low, positive, and statistically significant relationship was observed between cognitive engagement and the protective classroom management style, whereas its relationships with autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire styles were not significant. Likewise, the student social engagement dimension exhibited a very low, positive, and statistically significant relationship only with the democratic classroom management style; its relationships with autocratic, protective, and laissez-faire styles were not significant. Finally, the overall engagement score was positively and very weakly associated in a statistically significant way with the protective classroom management style, while its relationships with autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire styles were not significant. In short, the research findings suggest that physical education and sports teachers' engagement levels are only associated with their classroom management styles at a limited level.

This study compares the classroom management style adoption levels of physical education and sports teachers in relation to gender. The results indicate that male and female teachers do not show significant differences in their adoption of autocratic, protective, democratic, or laissez-faire classroom management styles. These findings suggest that the classroom management styles of physical education and sports teachers are not influenced by gender. Similarly, in a study conducted by Doğan Burç (2006), it was found that teachers' classroom management competencies and managerial behaviors did not differ based on the gender variable. In contrast, a study conducted by Ünlü and Aydos (2010) found that the classroom management styles of physical education teachers differed significantly according to gender. According to the findings of that study, female teachers scored higher in classroom management styles compared to male participants. These two studies (Doğan Burç, 2006; Ünlü & Aydos, 2010) indicate that the literature presents conflicting findings regarding whether the classroom management approaches of physical education and sports teachers are influenced by gender. Such discrepancies may stem from differences in the socio-cultural characteristics of the samples used in the studies or from variations in the data collection instruments. Additionally, societal perceptions of gender roles may also affect teachers' classroom management styles. In the present study, the engagement levels of physical education and sports teachers are compared based on gender. According to the findings, there is no statistically significant difference between male and female physical education and sports teachers in terms of social integration (colleagues), cognitive engagement, social integration (students), or overall engagement. Similar results have been reported in the literature (Gün, 2017; Sezen, 2014). However, a statistically significant difference was observed in emotional engagement, with male teachers exhibiting higher levels than female participants. This suggests that male teachers may be relatively more emotionally invested in their professional roles or may utilize their emotional resources more effectively within the professional context.

The present study compared the classroom management styles of physical education and sports teachers based on the school level in which they work. The findings indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between teachers working in secondary schools and high schools in their adoption of autocratic, protective, democratic, or laissez-faire classroom management styles. These results suggest that the school level does not affect the classroom management styles of physical education and sports teachers. Ünlü and Aydos (2010) examined the classroom management styles of physical education teachers in primary and secondary education institutions. Their findings similarly indicated that teachers' classroom management styles did not show significant differences based on the school level. This implies that teachers' classroom

management skills are not influenced by the type of school and that they tend to adopt similar approaches. Consequently, it can be inferred that teachers' classroom management styles are shaped more by individual characteristics and professional experience rather than the school level at which they work. This study examined the work engagement levels of physical education and sports teachers in relation to the school level in which they are employed. Based on the findings, it was shown that teachers working in secondary schools and high schools do not differ significantly in terms of emotional engagement, social engagement (colleagues), cognitive engagement, social engagement (students), or overall engagement. In other words, physical education and sports teachers demonstrate similar levels of engagement regardless of school level. A review of the literature shows that Gün (2017) similarly found that teachers' work engagement levels did not significantly vary according to the type of school.

The present study also examined the classroom management style adoption levels of physical education and sports teachers in relation to their educational background. The findings show that teachers with bachelor's and master's degrees do not differ significantly in their adoption of autocratic, protective, democratic, or laissez-faire classroom management styles. Similarly, Ekici et al. (2017) reported that preschool teachers' adoption of classroom management styles did not significantly vary according to their educational level. These findings suggest that the classroom management styles of physical education and sports teachers are not influenced by their level of education. Additionally, this study also compared the work engagement levels of physical education and sports teachers in terms of their educational background. The findings indicate that physical education and sports teachers with bachelor's and master's degrees do not differ significantly in their levels of social integration with colleagues or students. However, a statistically significant difference was found between these groups in terms of emotional engagement, cognitive engagement, and overall engagement. Considering the arithmetic means, it can be stated that teachers with a master's degree exhibit higher levels of work engagement compared to their counterparts with a bachelor's degree. Based on these results, it can be suggested that educational level may influence the emotional, cognitive, and overall work engagement of physical education and sports teachers. In contrast, Gün (2017) reported no significant differences in teachers' work engagement levels based on educational background. Consequently, while the current findings suggest that educational level may be a determining factor in teachers' work engagement, differences in the literature indicate that this issue entails further, in-depth investigation.

This study also compares the classroom management styles of physical education and sports teachers based on their marital status. The findings indicate that married and single teachers do not differ significantly in their adoption of protective, democratic, or laissez-faire classroom management styles. However, a statistically significant difference was found in the adoption of the autocratic classroom management style. Based on the mean scores, single teachers tend to employ an autocratic approach slightly more than married participants. Overall, these results suggest that marital status is not a determining factor in shaping the classroom management styles of physical education and sports teachers. However, the difference in the autocratic management style indicates that single teachers tend to adopt a stricter and more controlling approach in their classrooms compared to the married participants. This tendency may be attributed to such factors as experience, communication style, or other personal characteristics. In this study, the levels of work engagement among physical education and sports teachers were compared based on marital status. The findings reveal that married and single teachers do not differ significantly in terms of emotional engagement, social engagement with colleagues, cognitive engagement, social engagement with students, or overall engagement. Accordingly, it can be concluded that marital status does not have a significant effect on the work engagement levels of physical education and sports teachers. Nonetheless, the related literature reveals that there are studies with findings contrary to those of the present study. In the research conducted by Sezen (2014), a statistically significant difference was found in teachers' work engagement levels based on marital status. This difference may be attributed to factors such as the organizational structure of the educational institutions where participants work, their working conditions, or cultural differences.

In this study, the classroom management styles of physical education and sports teachers were compared in terms of seniority. The findings indicate that seniority does not significantly differentiate teachers' adoption of autocratic, protective, democratic, or laissez-faire classroom management styles. These results suggest that teachers' preferences for classroom management styles are not influenced by their seniority. The related

literature shows that in a study conducted by Ünlü and Aydos (2010), no significant relationship was found between physical education teachers' professional seniority and their classroom management styles. Therefore, the findings of the present study are consistent with existing literature and suggest that teachers' classroom management preferences may be shaped more by individual or situational factors rather than by seniority. Moreover, this study compares physical education and sports teachers' work engagement levels in relation to professional seniority. The findings indicate that physical education and sports teachers across different professional seniority levels do not differ significantly in terms of emotional engagement, social engagement (colleagues), cognitive engagement, social engagement (students), or overall engagement. Based on these results, it can be suggested that professional seniority does not have a significant effect on teachers' engagement levels. Based on the literature, inconsistent findings regarding the relationship between teachers' work engagement and professional seniority were found. Although Gün (2017) reported no statistically significant differences in teachers' engagement levels based on seniority, Sezen (2014) found statistically significant differences in engagement according to teachers' professional seniority.

According to the research findings, physical education and sports teachers tend to adopt the protective classroom management style at a higher level compared to other management styles, implying that teachers prioritize approaches aimed at maintaining structure, guidance, and order within the classroom. Therefore, it is considered important to expand in-service training programs that reinforce knowledge and skills related to the protective management style. On the other hand, the relatively low expression of the democratic classroom management style indicates that teachers may not fully embrace a student-centered, participatory, and responsibility-sharing approach. In this regard, planning professional development activities that enable teachers to apply democratic classroom management principles more effectively would be beneficial. Although the low level of the laissez-faire classroom management style is considered positive, teachers who may adopt this style should be identified in advance in their professional careers and provided with developmental services to prevent potential issues.

The findings regarding the level of engagement demonstrate that teachers exhibit a particularly high level of social engagement with students. This suggests that teachers establish strong relationships with their students and carry out their work in a more meaningful context. In order to sustain and expand this positive trend, practices within the school environment that encourage teacher-student interaction should be given priority. However, the relatively low level of social engagement with colleagues highlights an area for improvement in terms of collaboration and professional solidarity among teachers. To address this gap, activities such as joint planning sessions, professional learning communities, and collaborative projects are recommended to be supported and promoted.

The data also revealed that the protective classroom management style is significantly associated with both cognitive and emotional engagement levels. This finding suggests that structured and directive classroom management approaches may enhance teachers' mental and emotional commitment to their work. Similarly, the positive relationship between the democratic classroom management style and social engagement with students indicates that student-centered approaches strengthen engagement in teacher-student interactions. In this context, raising teachers' awareness and competence in implementing democratic classroom management principles is likely to have a positive impact not only on the classroom environment but also on their emotional and social engagement levels.

Although no significant gender-based differences were found in classroom management styles, male teachers exhibited higher levels of emotional engagement. This finding implies that teachers' emotional engagement with their work may vary according to gender. Therefore, it would be beneficial to develop in-service training programs focused on emotional awareness and resilience that are inclusive of all teachers. Furthermore, the absence of significant differences in classroom management styles across school levels indicates that management approaches are distributed relatively homogeneously across school levels. Nevertheless, supporting this finding with larger samples and mixed-method research designs could contribute to a further understanding of the contextual dimensions of teacher behavior.

For future research, it is recommended to adopt mixed-method approaches to examine the relationship between physical education and sports teachers' classroom management styles and their work engagement levels more comprehensively. In addition to quantitative data, qualitative data collection techniques can

provide deeper insights into teachers' experiences, perceptions, and practices. Moreover, expanding the sample beyond a single geographic region to include teachers from diverse regions and socio-cultural backgrounds would enhance the generalizability of the findings and provide greater cultural context diversity. In addition, investigating classroom management styles from both the teachers' and students' perspectives would offer a more multidimensional understanding of the effects of management styles. Likewise, extending the assessment of work engagement to include evaluations from administrators and other stakeholders would allow for a more comprehensive analysis of its relationship with organizational variables such as school climate and job satisfaction. In the same time, longitudinal studies in this area could reveal how teachers' classroom management styles and levels of engagement change over time, thereby informing the design of more effective professional development interventions.

5. References

Aktan, S., & Sezer, F. (2018). Sınıf Yönetimi Stilleri Ölçeği'nin psikometrik özelliklerinin incelenmesi (Examining the psychometric properties of the Classroom Management Styles Scale). *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 26(2), 439-449. <https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.389803>

Aydın, A. (2017). *Sınıf yönetimi* (Classroom Management). Pegem.

Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research*. Cengage Learning.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810870476>

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273-285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>

Balcı, A. (2014). *Etkili okul ve okul geliştirme* (Effective school and school development). Pegem.

Başar, H. (2011). *Sınıf yönetimi* (Classroom Management). Pegem.

Bosworth, B. (1997). *What is your classroom management profile? Teacher talk-a publication for secondary education teachers*. Retrieved from <http://protectiveschools.org/drugstats/tt/v1i2/table.html>

Charles, C. M. (2011). *Building classroom discipline*. Pearson.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

Demirtaş, H. (2006). Yönetim kuram ve yaklaşımları eğitiminin ilköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi paradigmalarına etkileri (The effects of management theory and approaches training on primary school teachers' classroom management paradigms). *Eğitimde Politika Analizleri ve Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 1(1), 49-70.

Demirtaş, H. (2015). Sınıf yönetiminin temelleri (Fundamentals of classroom management). H. Kiran (Ed.), *Etkili sınıf yönetimi* (Effective classroom management) içinde (s. 1-30). Anı.

DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Sage.

Dilekçi, Ü., & Limon, İ. (2020). The mediator role of teachers' subjective well-being in the relationship between principals' instructional leadership and teachers' professional engagement. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 26(4), 743-798. <https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2020.017>

Dilekçi, Ü., Limon, İ., Manap, A., Alkhulayf, A. M. A., & Yıldırım, M. (2025). The association between teachers' positive instructional emotions and job performance: Work engagement as a mediator. *Acta Psychologica*, 254:104880, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.104880>

Doğan Burç, E. (2006). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi yeterlilikleri (Hatay İli Örneği)* (Primary school teachers' classroom management competencies (Hatay Province Example)) [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusulTezMerkezi/>

Ekici, F. Y., Günhan, G., & Anılan, Ş. (2017). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi becerileri (Preschool teachers' classroom management skills). *Uluslararası Bilimsel Araştırmalar Dergisi (IBAD)*, 2(1), 48-58.

Emmer, E. T., & Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education. *Educational Psychologist*, 36(2), 103-112. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3602_5

Erdoğan, İ. (2017). *Sınıf yönetimi* (Classroom management). Alfa.

Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Routledge.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. McGraw-Hill.

George, D., & Mallory, P. (2019). *IBM SPSS Statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429056765>

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Doubleday Anchor.

Gün, F. (2017). Öğretmenlerin eğitime inanma ve işe bütünlleşme düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Examining the relationship between teachers' belief in education and their level of integration into their work). *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi*, 10(4), 408-431. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5578/keg.10401>

Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(6), 495-513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001>

Huck, S. W. (2019). *Reading statistics and research*. Pearson.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256287>

Katmiş, M., & Doğru, Z. (2020). Physical education and sports teachers' classroom management styles. *International Journal of Physical Education Sport and Technologies*, 1(1), 9-23.

Klassen, R. M., Yerdelen, S., & Durksen, T. L. (2013). Measuring teacher engagement: Development of the engaged teachers scale (ETS). *Frontline Learning Research*, 1(2), 33-52. <https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v1i2.44>

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>

Marczyk, G., DeMatteo, D., & Festinger, D. (2005). *Essentials of research design and methodology*. John Wiley & Sons.

Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McBain, R. (2007). The practice of engagement: Research into current employee engagement practice. *Strategic HR Review*, 6(6), 16-19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14754390780001011>

Mills, G. E., & Gay, L. R. (2019). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Pearson.

Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468988>

Roberts D. R., & Davenport, T. O. (2002). Job engagement: Why it's important and how to improve it. *Employment Relations Today*, 29(3), 21-29. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ert.10048>

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>

Sezen, G. (2014). Öğretmenlerin işe bütünlleşme ve iş yaşamında yalnızlık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Examining the relationship between teachers' work engagement and their level of loneliness in the workplace) [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Sakarya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sakarya. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusaltTezMerkezi/>

Singh, K. (2007). *Quantitative social research methods*. Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9789351507741>

Şişman, M. (2002). *Eğitim bilimine giriş* (Introduction to educational science). Pegem.

Ünlü, H., & Aydos, L. (2010). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi davranışları (Physical education teachers' classroom management behaviors). *Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15(1), 45-56.

Wolfgang, C. H. (2005). *Solving discipline and classroom management problems: Methods and models for today's teachers*. John Wiley & Sons.

Yerdelen, S., Durksen, T., & Klassen, R. M. (2018). An international validation of the engaged teacher scale. *Teachers and Teaching*, 24(6), 673-689. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1457024>