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Abstract

This study aimed to examine the differences in the perception of humor styles and classroom management skills of PE teachers according to age, gender and seniority. Data related to PE teachers' humor styles were collected through Humor Styles Questionnaire developed by Martin et al. (2003), and adapted to Turkish by Yerlikaya in 2003, while data regarding classroom management skills were obtained via “Classroom Management Skills Scale” initially developed by Denkdemir in 2007. The study sample was composed of 162 physical education teachers employed in secondary and high schools in Bartın province. In the analyzes of the data One Way ANOVA, Tukey’s HSD and independent samples t-test were used. According to analyze results, there were significant differences in the self-enhancing humor sub-dimension and classroom management skills according to age. Besides, there were significant differences in the classroom management skills according to gender and seniority, and humor styles of the teachers significantly differed in the affiliative humor sub-dimension, according to seniority. In conclusion, this paper demonstrated original and interesting results on associations in PE teachers humor styles and classroom management skills. However, further research is still recommended.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The information society of today requires teachers who know how to reach and use information, create new knowledge through thought processes, and by doing research and solve problems. The quality of teachers is observed in classrooms that are regarded as the workshop of education systems. Effective classroom management is defined as the identification and sustainability of learning rules and necessary opportunities to enable learning to take place in classroom environments, minimizing the barriers against effective studying, using teaching times appropriately, and ensuring student participation in activities (Basar, 2001). In this context, classroom management is crucial for sharing qualifications and student development. Teachers need to form good relationships with students for effective classroom management.

In cases where classroom management is insufficient, effective teaching takes place as a result of teachers' high-quality in-class communication and efforts (Marzano et al., 2003). Therefore, various
methods should be used in teaching instead of following a single method for all classes. Developing the skill to select methods is only possible when teachers are informed of and able to use various methods (Aydın, 2008).

Literature shows that it is required to present the conditions of safety and organizational arrangements, use the teaching areas and facilities productively, present the start and finish times clearly, observe student-centred practices and ensure appropriate inspections for effective classroom management and for ensuring efficient and accurate acquisitions in physical education classes (Arbogast and Chandler, 2005; Giardina and Dejong, 2000; Unlu and Aydos, 2008; Kucukahmet, 2007). In this sense, an accurate teaching method, which takes the needs of physical education teachers and students into consideration and focuses on physical circumstances, time, and qualities that need to be developed will undoubtedly be more useful to realize the goals. Effective learning requires effective and impressive communication between teachers and students. It is one of the teachers’ responsibilities to create a lively classroom atmosphere for students who take responsibility, share, discuss and learn by having fun (Akkaya, 2011). Based on its positive features, it is believed that humor can be used in education. In simple terms, humor is an element of comedy just like wit, entertainment, ridicule, satire, and irony (Recepoglu and Ozdemir, 2008). According to Erozkan (2009) sense of humor is an emotion that generates individual differences in observing, perceiving, and communicating anything humorous (Erozkan, 2009). Martin et al. (2003) define this feeling as individual differences in entertainment, playfulness, hilarity, and similar behaviors, experiences, attitudes, and skills (Martin et al., 2003). Although there are different views in the literature related to the definition of humor, these views generally point to various qualities of humor such as the ability to interpret and understand humorous events, see fun aspects of events and situations and create entertaining events. In this context, humor is defined as the ability to see, perceive, and comprehend funny things (Vernon et al., 2008). Studies that were undertaken within this framework present that humor can be effective in increasing teachers’ motivation, productivity, and job satisfaction. Besides, it helps to decrease their stress and tension, making students more active, making the learning process more fun, and strengthening the social relationships between teachers and students (Yerlikaya, 2003; Fırlar and Celik, 2010; Korkmaz et al., 2007; Martin, 2007; Ozden, 2011; Ozdemir et al., 2011; Sayar, 2012; Yardumcu, 2010).

It is believed that studies mentioned above contribute to facilitating physical education teachers’ selection and use of methods since they present answers to questions regarding the methods of humor used by teachers in classroom environments, the most productive humor methods that can be used in classrooms, the methods that can create problems and methods of humor that generate the highest enjoyment towards classes. In this framework, this study aimed to investigate physical education teachers’ classroom management skills and humor styles. To acknowledge the specified aims in the study, answers to the questions below were sought:

- Is there any difference in physical education teachers’ scores in classroom management skills and humor styles based on age, gender, and seniority?
2. METHOD

2.1. Research Model
The study utilized a quantitative relational screening model to present the relationship between Turkish physical education teachers' humor styles and classroom management scores.

2.2. Study Group
The study group was composed of 168 physical education teachers employed in secondary and high schools in Bartın province central district in the 2014–2015 academic years. However, 6 of the surveys were not included in the evaluation due to missing parts. Therefore 162 surveys were considered in the analysis.

Table 1. Distribution of the personal information of the participants

| Characteristic Features | Groups | f    | %   |
|-------------------------|--------|------|-----|
| Age                     | 22–27  | 16   | 9.9 |
|                         | 28–33  | 57   | 35.2|
|                         | +34    | 89   | 54.9|
| Total                   | 162    | 100  |     |
| Female                  |        | 46   | 28.4|
| Male                    | 116    | 71.6 |
| Total                   | 162    | 100  |     |
| Seniority               | 1-5    | 16   | 9.9 |
|                         | 6-10   | 61   | 37.7|
|                         | +11    | 85   | 52.5|
| Total                   | 162    | 100  |     |

It was identified that 89 of the participating teachers were in the age range of 34 and higher, 116 of the participating teachers were males, and 46 were females, 16 worked for 1-5 years, and 85 worked for +11.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

2.3.1. Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ)
Data related to physical education teachers’ humor styles were collected via the Humor Styles Questionnaire developed by Martin et al. (2003) and adapted to Turkish by Yerlikaya (2003). The questionnaire includes four sub-dimensions (two negative and two positive use of humor): Affiliative humor, Self-Enhancing humor, Aggressive humor, and Self-Defeating humor. Each sub-dimension consists of 8 items. The questionnaire with 32 items is a 7-point Likert type scale that ranges from completely disagree (1) to agree (7) completely. During scoring, items 1-7-9-15-16-17-22-23-25-29-31 are reverse coded. Therefore, each sub-dimension produces a score between 7 and 56. Higher scores in each sub-dimension point to higher use of the specified humor style. Internal consistency coefficients of the questionnaire were reassessed based on the data obtained in the current study, and respective Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients were obtained for the sub-dimensions: .78, .83, .64, and .65 (Yerlikaya, 2003).

2.3.2. Classroom Management Skills Scale
Denkdemir initially developed the scale in 2007. The scale has 14 items and one dimension. The
answers given to the scale are evaluated with a 5 Likert type scale (Completely agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, or Completely disagree). Cronbach's alpha calculated for the scale was 0.95, and the scale was determined to be highly reliable (Denkdemir, 2007).

2.4. Data Analysis

Frequencies, percentages, arithmetic means, and standard deviation analyses were used in the descriptive analysis of the obtained data. A normality test was done to determine whether the data had a normal distribution. Accordingly, we decided to use parametric tests. An Independent Samples T-test was used to determine the differences based on gender, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to observe the differences related to age and seniority variables. The significance level was \( p<0.05 \). Lastly, the Tukey test was conducted as a second-degree test.

3. FINDINGS

| Variables            | Sum of squares | sd  | Mean squares | F   | p  |
|----------------------|----------------|-----|--------------|-----|----|
| **Affiliative Humor**|                |     |              |     |    |
| Between groups       | 13.765         | 3   | 6.883        | 1.492 | .513 |
| Within groups        | 2226.488       | 159 | 14.003       |     |    |
| Total                | 2240.253       | 162 |              |     |    |
| **Self-Enhancing Humor** |            |     |              |     |    |
| Between groups       | 10.805         | 3   | 5.402        |     |    |
| Within groups        | 1345.448       | 159 | 8.462        | 2.638 | .029 |
| Total                | 1356.253       | 162 |              |     |    |
| **Aggressive Humor** |                |     |              |     |    |
| Between groups       | 4.924          | 3   | 2.462        |     |    |
| Within groups        | 897.181        | 159 | 5.643        | .436 | .647 |
| Total                | 902.105        | 162 |              |     |    |
| **Self-Defeating Humor** |            |     |              |     |    |
| Between groups       | 41.884         | 3   | 20.942       |     |    |
| Within groups        | 1486.814       | 159 | 9.351        | 2.240 | .110 |
| Total                | 1528.698       | 162 |              |     |    |
| **Classroom Management** |             |     |              |     |    |
| Between groups       | 16.343         | 3   | 8.172        |     |    |
| Within groups        | 13542.373      | 159 | 85.172       | 3.696 | .009 |
| Total                | 13558.716      | 162 |              |     |    |

\( p>0.05 \)

According to analyze results, there were no significant differences in the Affiliative humor style sub-dimension \( (p>0.05) \) whereas meaningful differences were detected in Self-Enhancing humor style sub-dimension based on age \( [F=2.638; p<0.05] \). According to Tukey’s result, this difference was in favor of the individuals in the 22-27 age range \( (X=34.81\pm3.22) \). Besides, the classroom management skills of the participants showed significant differences according to age \( [F_{(162)}=3.696; p<0.05] \). According to the Tukey test, it was found that the difference was in favor of the 28-33 age range \( (X=73.47\pm9.44) \) compared to other age groups.

| Variables     | Gender | N   | \( \bar{X} \) | ss   | t  | p  |
|---------------|--------|------|---------------|------|----|----|
| **Affiliative Humor** | Female | 46   | 7.17          | 3.45 | .227 | .821 |
|               | Male   | 116  | 7.02          | 3.84 |    |    |
Table 3 shows statistically significant differences in classroom management skills mean scores based on the t-test \( T(160) = 2.27; p<0.05 \) in favor of female teachers \( (X=9.86\pm9.57) \).

Table 4. ANOVA results according to seniority

| Variables         | Sum of Squares | sd  | Mean squares | F    | P     |
|-------------------|----------------|-----|--------------|------|-------|
| Affiliative Humor | Between groups | 0.074 | 3 | 0.037 |      |       |
|                   | Within groups  | 0.17 | 159 | 4.089 | 3.00 | 0.027 |
|                   | Total          | 0.25 | 162 |      |      |       |
|                   | Between groups | 8.32 | 3  | 4.162 |      |       |
|                   | Within groups  | 7.93 | 159 | 8.226 | 2.93 | 0.056 |
|                   | Total          | 6.25 | 162 |      |      |       |
| Aggressive Humor  | Between groups | 2.77 | 3  | 6.386 |      |       |
|                   | Within groups  | 9.33 | 159 | 5.593 | 1.14 | 0.322 |
|                   | Total          | 2.10 | 162 |      |      |       |
| Self-Defeating Humor | Between groups | 3.50 | 3  | 6.754 |      |       |
|                   | Within groups  | 5.18 | 159 | 9.404 | 1.78 | 0.172 |
|                   | Total          | 8.69 | 162 |      |      |       |
| Classroom Management | Between groups | 8.94 | 3  | 19.471|      |       |
|                   | Within groups  | 9.77 | 159 | 3.143 | 2.58 | 0.034 |
|                   | Total          | 8.71 | 162 |      |      |       |

ANOVA test results showed a significant difference in the Affiliative humor style sub-dimension \( [F=3.003; \ p<0.05] \). Tukey test results showed that this difference was in favor of teachers with 6-10 years \( (X=32.04\pm3.05) \) at work. Besides, there was a statistically significant difference \( [F=2.538; \ p<0.05] \) in the classroom management skills of the participants. Tukey test results showed that when compared to other groups, this difference was in favor of teachers with 6-10-year seniority \( (X_{6-10\text{year}}=73.57\pm9.20) \).

4. DISCUSSION

The present paper aimed to analyze PE teachers’ humor styles and classroom management skills. Findings related to the study were discussed and presented below by supporting them with the findings in the literature. According to results showed in Table 2, there was a statistically significant difference in physical education teachers’ affiliative humor styles based on the age variable in favor of the 22-27 age range. The finding shows that young teachers in this age range use more humor in an affiliative and tolerant manner that contributes to their relationships with others and to develop social relationships. According to Cetin (2009), young people may be expected to have more needs related to
socialization and being more popular and likable (Cetin, 2009). Therefore, it can be argued that although young teachers like being in the same atmosphere and the same events, they regard themselves differently. This may contribute to the positive and adaptable impacts experienced by young teachers. Hence, affiliative humor is defined as the characteristic of human beings with self-realization (Aydın, 2008). Studies that support our findings (Erozkan, 2009; Sayar, 2012; Cetin, 2009; Ay et al., 2013; Tumkaya, 2006; Sepetci, 2010; Yerlikaya, 2007; Cengiz et al., 2018) present meaningful relationships between age and affiliative humor. However, Yilmaz’s (2011) study results are different from our findings (Yilmaz, 2011). These differences may be based on the objective quality of humor that is specific to individuals. Besides, studies in the literature also found that the age factor is not a determinant in terms of humor styles (Akkaya, 2011; Recepoglu and Ozdemir, 2008; Erozkan, 2009; Cetin, 2009; Fidanoglu, 2006; Avsar, 2008). Besides, analyze results showed that the classroom management skills of the teachers significantly differed according to age (Table 2). Increases in the age in the school environment may generate better comprehension of the self and others in the framework of events that are experienced. Hence, it may be thought that teachers may develop more sensitive and extroverted interpersonal relationships with age (Erozkan, 2009). According to Martin et al. (2003), the affiliative humor style has a positive impact on individuals’ psychological well beings, and individuals with that type of humor style are cheerful and happy with good moods. It is also predicted that there are positive relationships between considering the needs of self and others, coping with stress, self-development, and psychological well being and humorous attitudes, discourses, and behaviors (Akkaya, 2011).

Although literature presents no differences between female and male teachers’ classroom management skills in many studies, findings of this study pointed to differences in classroom management skills mean scores in favor of female teachers (Table 3). This finding presents an essential characteristic of female teachers in terms of self-perception, personality values, and social in-class behaviors. When we examine the literature, we can see that some studies support our findings (Erozkan, 2009; Cetin, 2009; Tumkaya, 2006; Sepetci, 2010; Yerlikaya, 2007). However, some studies (Akkaya, 2011; Sayar, 2012; Avsar, 2008; Altunkurt and Yilmaz, 2011; Erozkan and Yilmaz, 2006; Kahraman, 2008; Bebek et al., 2018) found that gender factor is a vital determinant in favor of males.

According to analyze results, there were not any significant differences in the humor styles of PE teachers according to gender (Table 3). Literature states that (Recepoglu and Ozdemir, 2008; Aslan, 2006; Guven, 2013; Oner, 2012; Recepoglu, 2008; Yerlikaya, 2009; Isik and Cengiz, 2018) gender is not an influential variable alone in terms of humor styles. These findings suggest that differences may always occur in perception among the humor based behavior of individuals that are presented in class. That use of humor can change according to the characteristics of teachers, cultural factors and situational conditions. This phenomenon is related to whether the individual regards humor as a tool of communication. The literature presents no convincing evidence that shows gender differences in the use of humor and points to direct relationships between humor and gender. In this context, expressions and friendly behaviors used in the realm of humor help enhance teachers’ self-respect while increasing student interest towards the lessons or the subjects (Akkaya, 2011). When teachers use humor positively for themselves or others, humor contributes to positive interpersonal relationships, self-development, coping with difficulties and level of subjective well being. Besides,
humor negatively affects low well-being levels that harm self-respect and increases anxiety and depression levels (Ozbay et al., 2012).

According to ANOVA and Tukey test results presented in Table 4, there were significant differences in affiliative humor style sub-dimension in favor of teachers with a 6-10-year service. When we examine the literature, we can see studies with similar or different results. For instance, in a study conducted on teachers, Sepetci (2010) stated that the affiliative humor style is used more by teachers with higher seniority (Sepetci, 2010). Yılmaz’s (2011) study also pointed out that school administrators with more seniority have more affiliative humor styles (Yılmaz, 2011). On the other hand, some studies (Akkaya, 2011; Özdemir et al., 2011; Recepoglu, 2008), found that seniority is not a determinant factor in the humor styles. According to Vernon et al. (2008), affiliative humor is a facilitator on human relationships (Vernon et al., 2008). Erickson and Feildstein (2007) state that affiliative humor has positive relationships with self-realization and psychological well being, whereas it has negative relationships with depression and anger (Erickson and Feildstein, 2007). According to Karagöz’s (2009), research findings there was a significant low-level relationship between affiliative humor and personal failure. Besides, increases in affiliative humor levels cause decreases in personal failure levels, albeit at low levels (Karagöz, 2009). According to Hampes (2006), affiliative humor decreases tension among individuals and acts as an entertaining and facilitating factor (Hampes, 2006). Lastly, there was a significant difference in the classroom management skills of the PE teachers in favor of teachers with 6-10-year service.

5. CONCLUSION
As a conclusion, significant differences were observed between physical education teachers’ humor styles and their classroom management skills based on age, gender and seniority. Considering the fact that academic and sportive achievement are regarded to be important by all sections of society, it can be argued that, in general, effective use of affiliative, cheerful and tolerant humor styles instead of the classical approach in classroom management will contribute to students’ academic and sportive achievement. It is believed that the study should be replicated on administrators, families and other teacher groups in order to develop the present results. The impact of coaches’, sportsmen’, referees’ and fans’ attitudes on humor styles and sportive achievement levels may also be studied.
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