

Teachers' Beliefs about Their Anger in Relation to Certain Aspects of Teaching

Prejeto 04.11.2021 / Sprejeto 15.05.2022

Znanstveni članek

UDK 37.091.2:159.942

KLJUČNE BESEDE: jeza, prepričanja, poučevanje, samouravnavanje čustev, učitelj

POVZETEK – Med poučevanjem učitelji doživljajo in izražajo različna čustva. Kadar učenčevu vedenje ocenijo kot neustrezno, največkrat doživljajo jezo. Raziskovali smo učiteljeva prepričanja o izražanju jeze pri poučevanju, ki vplivajo na to, kaj bo učitelj jezilo, kako se bo jezil in v katerih okoliščinah bo svojo jezo izrazil, uravnaval ali potlačil. V vzorec empirične raziskave je bilo vključenih 100 učiteljev četrtega in petega razreda več slovenskih osnovnih šol. Podatke smo pridobili s pomočjo dveh avtorsko zasnovanih vprašalnikov. Ugotovili smo, da učitelji v povprečju izkazujejo največje strinjanje s trditvijo, da se učenci od učitelja učijo, kako naj tudi sami izražajo jezo. Mlajši učitelji, stari do 40 let, se bolj kot starejši učitelji, stari več kot 40 let, strinjajo, da s svojo jezo učence lahko prestrašijo, pa tudi, da bi jezo morali pred učenci prikriti. Manj kot se učitelji čutijo dolžni svojo jezo učencem utemeljiti in manj kot se strinjajo s tem, da bi bilo izražanje lastne jeze navzven lahko neprimerno, pogosteje ocenjujejo, da pri svojem pedagoškem delu uporabljajo pozitivne pedagoške pristope, npr. učence hvalijo, spodbujajo, jim predstavijo kriterije ocenjevanja idr.

Received 04.11.2021 / Accepted 15.05.2022

Scientific paper

UDC 37.091.2:159.942

KEYWORDS: anger, beliefs, emotional self-regulation, teaching, teacher

ABSTRACT – In teaching, teachers experience and express different emotions. Anger is one of them and it is usually experienced when teachers consider students' behavior to be inappropriate. The aim of the study was to explore teachers' beliefs about expressing anger during teaching; what the triggers of teachers' anger are; the way in which they experience and manifest anger; in which circumstances they express it; how they regulate or suppress it, etc. One hundred Slovenian elementary teachers of the fourth and fifth grade participated in the study. The data was collected using two questionnaires, especially designed for the purpose of the study. The results show that most teachers believe that students learn how they should express anger from their example. Younger teachers, under 40, believe, more than their older colleagues, that their anger can scare students, and that their anger should be concealed. The less teachers feel obliged to justify their anger to students and the less they agree that an outward expression of anger in the classroom can be inappropriate, the more they report using positive educational approaches, e.g., congratulating, encouraging students, presenting grading criteria instead of anger.

1 Introduction

In the past, the teachers' role was simpler than today – they only had to pass on their knowledge to their students. Based on empirical findings regarding the insufficient applicability of the knowledge gained in school for solving concrete issues in life (Izhodišča kurikularne preнове, 1996), the need has arisen for more complex and interdisciplinary knowledge, for knowledge on different levels or “pillars of knowledge” (Delors, 1996), and for taking into consideration the new challenges in education. In the 1990s Slovenia embarked on restructuring elementary and secondary education, as well as tertiary education for teachers, aiming to raise awareness among all stakeholders in the education system that the role of modern-day teachers has changed substantially. In

this context, Hattie (2018, p. 15) highlights particularly the mission of teachers to develop self-regulated learning in children, helping “students become their own teachers”. The most common new roles and competences of today’s teachers include a proficiency in using modern information technology; the ability to differentiate and adapt education to the individual’s needs and differences (e.g., according to ability, different special needs of students, and multicultural differences among students). It is also important to promote cooperation with other teachers and staff, as well as with parents, but also an inclination towards professional evaluation and critical reflection on their own work (Wing On and Ling Tan, 2018). “It is not enough for the teachers to develop the competences necessary for teaching, but rather they must know how to reflect constructively on their experiences, and build their professional knowledge in this way too” (Erčulj and Škodnik, 2013, p. 18, translated into English).

Hattie (2018) emphasized that teachers should talk to their colleagues about teaching in order to reflect and analyze the different effects their teaching can have on students. The fundamental task of a teacher is to teach the students of a particular class or several classes. In general, teaching is defined as an interactive process, above all involving a dialogue between the teacher and the student or class that arises in a specific activity, e.g., a discussion on the subject matter being covered (Chitiga, 2017; Hattie, 2018; Marentič Požarnik and Plut Pregelj, 2009).

Kramar (2009, p. 20, translated into English) defines professional teaching as “performing different but mutually consistent activities of methodologically dealing with coherent units of content or issues, which takes place in an orderly didactical environment as a process of acquiring new knowledge and achieving educational goals.” For Blažič et al. (2003, p. 27, translated into English) teaching means “directly helping students understand selected and adapted knowledge, abilities, skills, values and experiences, and involving them in direct learning contact with learning reality, as well as efficient leadership of their active and autonomous learning.” The contemporary views on teachers’ work, besides the educational, psychological or didactical elements in the definitions of teaching, underline also the social and emotional aspects of their professional role (e.g., Prosen, Smrtnik Vitulić and Poljšak Škraban, 2013). Teaching is supposed to be one of the most emotionally demanding professions, where employees face numerous positive and negative emotions in their work (Sutton and Wheatley, 2003; Frenzel, 2014).

Emotions are complex psychophysiological processes that involve cognitive processes (e.g., recognizing and understanding emotions; regulating emotions in a specific situation; looking through the eyes of another person), physiological changes in the autonomic nervous system, physical expressions, and the urge to act. The final purpose of emotions is adapting to the changes detected and achieving the aims that the individual finds important (Ortony and Turner, 1990; Lazarus, 1991; Roseman, 2013). When an individual assesses that someone (or something) is hindering or preventing them from achieving their desired goal(s), which they identified as important, they usually feel anger. This definition also confirms Lazarus’s view that an individual experiences anger when “a demeaning offence against me and mine” has been committed (Lazarus, 1991, p. 222). Previous studies on emotions in the classroom have shown that anger is one of the most common emotions teachers experience and express in the classroom (e.g., Sutton and Wheatley, 2003; Hosotani and Imai-Matsumura, 2011; Prosen, Smrtnik Vitulić

and Poljšak Škraban, 2013). What causes teachers' anger, how they regulate their anger, and how they express it in front of their students can depend entirely on the beliefs about anger the teacher has formed when growing up, on their experience while studying to become a teacher, and on their experience in practicing this profession.

Beliefs are mental constructs that we form in different fields of our activity based on our knowledge and experience; however, scholars provide somewhat differing definitions. Beliefs can be part of the so-called *hidden curriculum*, which Lepičnik Vodopivec and Teršek (2021, p. 5) define as the “sum of all the unplanned, subconscious and unintentional elements” that may play an important role in students' socialization even if teachers may not be aware of this. Borg (2011) defines beliefs as facts that an individual considers true and may internalize, which is why they can be a basis for their actions and behavior. According to the author (*ibid.*), beliefs have a strong emotional and value component, which makes them difficult to change. Borg conceptually equates beliefs with attitudes; on the other hand, Ule (2009) points out that beliefs are based only on a cognitive component, whereas attitudes also include an emotional (affective) and a behavioral (action) component. A deeper conceptual discourse on the phenomenon of beliefs will not take place in this article; instead, we will focus on their psychological and educational role when it comes to work in the classroom. Teachers' beliefs about their professional work develop also under the influence of social and professional expectations, and can differ greatly among teachers. As a result, they affect teachers' actions and behavior in the classroom. In this respect, teachers also have very different views on which emotions they can express in front of their students, as well as when and how they should be expressed (Cross and Hong, 2009; Schutz and DeCuir-Gunby, 2009).

According to Sutton (2004), general emotional rules outline the playing field within which some emotions are acceptable for teachers personally and others are not, as well as which emotions are acceptable in the process of teaching. Which modes of expressing anger are appropriate is therefore dictated by the social norms within a particular culture, and influenced by different social factors like race, social position, gender, etc. Teachers can accept and internalize the emotional rules of society or the social environment as their own internal normative rules, based on which they either respond to a particular behavior of students or not. When teachers assess that their anger is inappropriate in a given situation, they suppress or conceal it, and then choose a more socially acceptable emotion to express (Hochschild, 1983; Zembylas, 2005). Several studies on teachers' beliefs and modes of expressing negative emotions in the classroom (e.g., Frenzel et al., 2009; Hosotani and Imai-Matsumura, 2011; Sutton, 2004; Sutton and Knight, 2006, as cited in Sutton, Mudrey-Camino and Knight, 2009; Yin and Lee, 2012) shows that the main differences among teachers lie in their dilemma whether they should conceal their anger in front of their students or express it outwardly. They can conceal it by either suppressing it, or by self-regulating it and expressing a different, socially more acceptable emotion. On the other hand, anger is expressed outwardly either by self-regulating it and choosing an appropriate mode of expressing it, or by expressing it in the exact same way as they experience it at that moment. Teachers may also believe that expressing negative emotions in the classroom is pedagogically ineffective, so they find it important to search for effective modes of emotional self-regulation. Such views were found in studies of Japanese (Hosotani and Imai-Matsumura, 2011), Chinese (Yin and Lee, 2012) and American elementary school teachers (Sutton, 2004;

Sutton and Knight, 2006, as cited in Sutton et al., 2009). The teachers who took part in the studies reported that they felt guilty or frustrated after having expressed anger in relation to students. This is the reason they believe that anger should be concealed, since this is the only way that they can maintain good relationships with their students. Teachers also believe that expressing negative emotions, such as anger, is mostly ineffective during teaching.

Nevertheless, research on teachers' emotions shows that teachers are often worried about how they will express their emotions in front of students. Many of them believe that an outward expression of anger can have a negative effect on their relationships with students (Hosotani and Imai-Matsumura, 2011; Liljestrom, Roulston and Demarrais, 2007). On the other hand, teachers who believe that anger should be expressed outwardly, think that expressing both positive and negative emotions in the classroom makes sense and is beneficial; they argue that anger will lead students to experience emotions themselves, because they want to remain authentic (Hosotani and Imai-Matsumura, 2011). Only 36% of American teachers (Sutton and Knight, 2006, as cited in Sutton et al., 2009) believe that expressing anger in front of their students allows them to use certain teaching strategies more effectively, manage the class of students better, and create an appropriate working environment for all students. In the study by Gong et al. (2013), a Chinese first-grade teacher presented an interesting argument in favor of an outward expression of anger: "If I don't express when I am angry, students will not feel my anger and think that as the teacher I tacitly approve of their disruptive behavior." We can therefore assume that for this teacher anger was a positive mode of expressing their negative emotion experienced in a particular challenging situation, which allowed them to establish the appropriate conditions to continue the teaching process.

2 The study and method

Aims of the study

The aim of the study was to examine what beliefs teachers have regarding their expression of anger in the classroom. Moreover, we wanted to know how teachers' beliefs about expressing anger in the classroom differ according to the grade they teach, the number of students in the class, the teachers' age and their level of education. We also aimed to determine how teachers' beliefs about expressing anger in the classroom statistically correlate with certain educational aspects of teaching (e.g., the teacher's explanation, instructions, grading), as well as the social and emotional aspects of teaching, e.g., the teacher-student relationships, how students perceive the teacher, etc.

Method

The study was based on the descriptive, causal and non-experimental method using the quantitative research paradigm.

Participants

The research sample consisted of 100 teachers at different public elementary schools in Slovenia. 45 teachers in the sample taught in the 4th grade (ages 9–10), 49 teachers taught in the 5th grade (ages 10–11), and 6 teachers taught mixed classes of 4th- and 5th-grade students.

Research instruments

Data on teachers' beliefs was collected using two questionnaires that were prepared specifically for the purpose of this study, because no standard questionnaires were available. The *Questionnaire on the expression of teachers' anger in the classroom* included statements that teachers could form based on their experience and personal views on the topic. It was partly derived from a Slovenian translation of the *Anger appropriateness questionnaire* (McPherson, Kearney and Plax, 2003), with more statements added, based on a review of the literature on teachers' beliefs about their emotions in the classroom (e.g., Gordon, 1997; Hosotani and Imai-Matsumura, 2011; Sutton, 2004; Zembylas, 2003). A pilot study on 4th- and 5th-grade students of one elementary school in Slovenia took place before this study. The questionnaire encompassed 10 statements, for which teachers marked their agreement on a five-point Likert scale (from 1 – totally disagree; to 5 – totally agree). The reliability coefficient of the questionnaire for teachers was 0.60, which is an acceptable reliability. Data on teaching was collected with the *Questionnaire on teaching*, which combined statements related to specific educational aspects of teaching (e.g., the teacher's explanation, instructions, grading) and to the social and emotional aspects of teaching (e.g., the teacher-student relationship). The statements for this questionnaire were derived from sources addressing the different aspects of teaching highlighted by relevant authors in this field (e.g., Brophy, 1979; Evans, 1970; Kyriacou, 1997; Peklaj et al., 2009; Tomić, 2003). The questionnaire consisted of 22 statements that participants rated on a five-point frequency scale (from 1 – never; to 5 – every teaching lesson). The reliability coefficient for the entire scale of this questionnaire was 0.59, which indicates a poorer reliability of the instrument, so we relied on its content validity and decided to use it anyway.

Research procedure and data analysis

Data was collected with a paper-pencil survey, where respondents remained anonymous but were coded. The collected data was entered and arranged in MS Excel and then transferred to the IBM SPSS 22.0 statistics software. Exploratory factor analysis was performed on the databases of both questionnaires using the principal components method and varimax rotation.

The analysis of the *Questionnaire on the expression of teachers' anger in the classroom* yielded three factors consisting of only two items, which was not acceptable for the validity of the content. Using these factors would exclude too many statements from the analysis, including the statement that “*Students learn from their teacher how*

they themselves should express anger”, which was the statement with which the teachers in this survey agreed the most. Based on the factor analysis, we established that we would need to exclude more than half of the statements from this questionnaire to form content blocks, so the factorial structure of the questionnaires was excluded. Hence, the presentation of the results is based on “statement by statement” analyses.

To determine the differences in beliefs about teachers' expression of anger in the classroom according to age and education level, we used the Kruskal-Wallis H test in SPSS (Green and Salkind, 2005). Moreover, we conducted a post-hoc test – the Mann-Whitney test – for comparing differences between two independent samples.

The statement that “*Teachers who get angry a lot have themselves to blame for that*” yielded un-homogeneous variances, so we had to use a more robust method – the median test for differences between independent groups (Corder and Foreman, 2014). The correlations between different variables in both questionnaires were calculated using Kendall's Tau coefficient, with the level of statistical significance set to $p < 0.05$.

3 Results and discussion

The main aim of the study was to examine the beliefs teachers have regarding their expression of anger in the classroom. As can be seen from Table 1, teachers agree most (according to the assessment scale the score could be interpreted as “mostly agree”) that students learn how they should express anger from their example. They agree least (on average, they “partly disagree”) that it is better if a teacher conceals their anger in the classroom.

The answers of the respondents indicate a high level of awareness of their own responsibility in relation to students in moments when they show them that they are angry. They are aware that they are role models of behavior and emotional expression, which students may copy in their self-regulation of emotions, and in reacting constructively or not when they experience anger (Gong et al., 2013; Sutton, 2004).

Based on the results of this study, we can assume that teachers are positively inclined towards expressing emotions, since they partly disagree with the statement that it is better to conceal them ($M = 1.62$). They believe anger may not be inappropriate ($M = 2.19$) and does not necessarily have a negative effect ($M = 2.32$). These teachers might be expressing their emotions in front of their students intentionally in order to show them exactly what feelings they are experiencing when a particular event causes them to get angry while teaching. According to Smrtnik Vitulič (2006, p. 6, translated into English), children at this age can already understand that “some people are more and some are less eager to conceal their expressions from others in order to keep their privacy,” which is why students can read a teacher's genuine expression of emotions, including anger, as an initiative to create a sincere and more personal relationship with students.

As part of the second research aim, we wanted to determine the statistically significant differences in teachers' (self-perception of) beliefs about expressing anger in the classroom according to the grade they teach, the class size, the teachers' age and their level of education. Based on a statistical calculation of the Mann-Whitney test, we established no statistically significant differences between 4th- and 5th-grade teachers. For

this reason, we have not presented this statistical data. The calculations further showed that there were also no statistically significant differences if they teach a class of 5 to 20 students or a class of 21 to 29 students, nor are there any differences according to their level of education. Table 2 presents only the results of the calculations that actually confirmed statistically significant differences.

Table 1

Teachers' beliefs about their expression of anger in the classroom – descriptive statistics

	<i>Statement</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
B10	Students learn from their teacher how they themselves should express anger.	4.11	1.20
B7	A teacher may only get angry when he/she has a valid reason (e.g., if a student breaks the agreed rules).	3.81	1.31
B9	A teacher may only get angry when he/she explains to the student or class why he/she is angry.	3.76	1.23
B2	The teacher is responsible if he/she gets angry at a student or the class.	3.40	1.35
B3	Teachers who get angry a lot have themselves to blame for that.	3.31	1.38
B4	When a teacher shows he/she is angry, this can scare the students.	3.18	1.21
B1	When a teacher shows a student that he/she is angry, this can have a negative effect on the student or the class.	2.32	1.17
B8	It is inappropriate for a teacher to express his/her anger in the classroom.	2.19	1.17
B6	When a teacher is angry at a student or the class, it is best if he/she conceals it.	1.62	0.90

Key: Agreement rating scale: 1 – Totally disagree, 2 – Partly disagree, 3 – Undecided, 4 – Mostly agree, 5 – Totally agree; *M*: arithmetic mean; *SD*: standard deviation.

Note: To ensure satisfactory reliability, we excluded statement B5 from the questionnaire – “It is right that a teacher shows that he/she is angry at a student or the class.”

To explore the differences regarding teachers' age more precisely, we used the Mann-Whitney test. Some statistically significant differences were found in the teachers' beliefs about their expression of anger in the classroom for the statement “When a teacher shows he/she is angry, this can scare the students.” ($p = 0.05$). We found statistically significant differences between teachers aged 23–40 and those in the age group 41–50 when it comes to the belief that teachers can scare students by expressing anger ($\chi^2 = 4.953$; $p = 0.03$). Moreover, statistically significant differences in this belief were also found between the age groups under 40 and over 50 ($\chi^2 = 3.736$; $p = 0.05$). We can, therefore, establish that teachers who are younger than 40, in comparison to teachers who are older than 40, agree more with the statement that teachers expressing their anger can scare students. Compared to their older colleagues (over 40), younger teachers (aged between 23 and 40) are more aware of the potential effect that an outward expression of anger can have on their students (as illustrated by the awareness that they can scare students when they show their anger); this may have something to do with the content of their studies.

Table 2

Differences in teachers' beliefs about expression of anger according to teachers' age

Statement	Age	N	MR	Me	df	F (n.e.L)	p (n.e.L)	χ^2	p
B1	23–40	29	53.88	2	2	2.291	0.11	4.873	0.09
	41–50	33	39.55	2					
	over 50	31	48.50	2					
B2	23–40	29	47.79	4	2	0.117	0.89	0.252	0.88
	41–50	33	48.09	4					
	over 50	31	45.10	4					
B3	23–40	29	55.83	4	2	2.370	0.10	5.068	0.08
	41–50	33	44.50	4					
	over 50	31	41.40	2					
B4	23–40	29	56.43	4	2	2.741	0.07	5.837	0.05
	41–50	33	41.56	2					
	over 50	31	43.97	3					
B6	23–40	29	56.10	2	2	2.975	0.06	6.134	0.05
	41–50	33	42.45	1					
	over 50	31	43.32	1					
B7	23–40	29	51.09	4	2	1.069	0.35	2.344	0.31
	41–50	33	41.64	4					
	over 50	31	48.89	4					
B8	23–40	29	50.41	2	2	0.757	0.47	1.655	0.44
	41–50	33	48.42	2					
	over 50	31	42.29	2					
B9	23–40	29	47.93	4	2	0.122	0.89	0.262	0.88
	41–50	33	47.97	4					
	over 50	31	45.10	4					
B10	23–40	29	49.97	5	2	2.079	0.13	4.388	0.11
	41–50	33	51.48	5					
	over 50	31	39.45	4					

Key: B1: When a teacher shows a student that he/she is angry, this can have a negative effect on the student or the class. B2: The teacher is responsible if he/she gets angry at a student or the class. B3: Teachers who get angry a lot have themselves to blame for that. B4: When a teacher shows he/she is angry, this can scare the students. B6: When a teacher is angry at a student or the class, it is best if he/she conceals it. B7: A teacher may only get angry when he/she has a valid reason (e.g., if a student breaks the agreed rules). B8: It is inappropriate for a teacher to express his/her anger in the classroom. B9: A teacher may only get angry when he/she explains to the student or class why he/she

is angry. B10: Students learn from their teacher how they themselves should express anger. N: sample size; MR: mean rank; Me: median; df: degrees of freedom; F (n.e.L): the ratio of variance between the groups to the variance within the group using the nonparametric Levene's test; p (n.e.L): the statistical significance level of the nonparametric Levene's test; p: the statistical significance value from the Kruskal-Wallis test.

Note: To ensure satisfactory reliability, we excluded statement B5: It is right that a teacher shows that he/she is angry at a student or the class.

Along with didactic skills, the current university program for elementary school teachers (lower grades of the Slovenian 9-year elementary school) also encourages students to develop a sensitivity to children's developmental and psychological needs, particularly in the fundamental educational subjects and special didactics. Higher education programs in the past, attended by older teachers, may not have included as much content on interpersonal relations, emotions, stress, etc. This might be the cause of the lack of the necessary knowledge on issues like emotional work in class, emotional self-regulation, and the impact of negative emotions on the teaching process.

Statistically significant differences according to teachers' age were also found for the statement "When a teacher is angry at a student or the class, it is best if he/she conceals it." ($p = 0.05$). For this statement, statistically significant differences were found between the age groups under 40 and 41–50 ($\chi^2 = 5.237$; $p = 0.02$), as well as between those under 40 and those over 50 ($\chi^2 = 3.745$; $p = 0.05$). The mean ranks for this statement indicate that teachers, aged between 23 and 40, agree more that teachers should conceal their anger than their colleagues who are over 40. Devjak, Devjak and Polak, (2014) found that future teachers are already unsure of themselves during their training at the undergraduate level, and have doubts whether they will be capable of a professionally appropriate response in different teaching situations. The authors point out (*ibid.*, p. 15, translated into English) that student teachers "have too little experience and confidence in their own knowledge, not to mention a fear of mistakes and lack of creativity." Similarly, the younger teachers in our research (under 40), who think they should conceal their anger from their students, might not believe they can use anger expressed in a constructive manner to achieve particular goals in teaching (e.g., prevent further disruptive behavior of students) because of their lack of confidence in themselves and in their educational approaches. Romi, Lewis and Roache, (2013) note that by not stressing a particular problem in the classroom, teachers leave the problem unresolved, which affects their teaching.

In our study, we further wanted to establish how teachers' beliefs about expressing anger in the classroom statistically correlate with certain pedagogical aspects of teaching (e.g., acknowledging students' ideas, class management, grading), as well as the social and emotional aspects of teaching (e.g., the teacher-student relationship, how students perceive teachers). Below we only present the statistically significant correlations on the level of $p < 0.05$ (Table 3).

There are only four negligible and four weak negative statistically significant correlation coefficients. We listed them in Table 3. We found that the less teachers are convinced they can scare students by expressing anger, the more often they will present their grading criteria for oral examinations ($r = -0.20$). Based on the correlation be-

tween these two variables, we can assume that teachers believe that if they give their students clear information on what is expected of them (the oral examination criteria) students will know when they have not achieved the educational objectives. Teachers who get angry because their students have not achieved the expected proficiency level, despite the criteria having been presented to the students in advance, believe that they will not scare the students by expressing anger, since they assume that the students know the reasons why their teacher is angry. Anger can therefore be a manifestation of the teacher's concern that the students do not know enough.

Table 3

Correlations between teachers' beliefs about their expression of anger in the classroom and their perceptions of certain aspects of teaching

<i>The more teachers believe that ...</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>... the more often they deem that ...</i>
“when a teacher shows he/she is angry, this can scare the students” (B4)	-0.20	...“he/she presents the grading criteria for oral examinations” (PE7)
“when a teacher is angry at a student or the class, it is best if he/she conceals it” (B6)	-0.19	...“he/she presents the grading criteria for oral examinations” (PE7)
	-0.05	...“he/she compliments and encourages students in their work” (PE17)
“a teacher may only get angry when he/she has a valid reason” (B7)	-0.21	...“he/she compliments and encourages students in their work” (PE17)
“it is inappropriate for a teacher to express his/her anger in the classroom (B8)”	-0.19	...“he/she poses questions that require a deep understanding of the subject matter” (PE5)
	-0.23	...“he/she presents the grading criteria for oral examinations” (PE7)
	-0.19	...“students feel comfortable around him/her” (SE12)
“a teacher may only get angry when he/she explains to the student or class why he/she is angry” (B9)	-0.21	...“he/she acknowledges students' ideas in his/her teaching”(PE1)

Key: Apart from those presented in the table, the educational (PE), and social and emotional aspects of teaching (SE) examined in this study included: PE2: I explain the subject matter in a way that it is easy to understand. PE3: I give clear and understandable instructions. PE4: If a student does not understand something, I provide additional explanations. PE6: The class session is based on students' independent work. PE8: I design examinations at an appropriate difficulty level. PE9: I give students the possibility to participate in the class session. PE10: I warn students that I am the one running the class session. PE11: It takes a lot of time before I start teaching a class. SE13: I stay true to my word. SE14: Students feel uncomfortable around me. SE15: I am unsatisfied with their work. SE18: I am patient with the students in class. SE19: I maintain respectful relations with the students in class. SE20: I notice when students do not feel well. SE21: I remind students of every detail. SE22: When students are in distress, they confide in me. *r* = correlation coefficient.

Note: To ensure satisfactory reliability, we excluded statement No. 16: Students are afraid of me. All the coefficient values above are statistically significant on the level of $p < 0.05$.

The less teachers agree that they should conceal their anger from students, the more often they compliment and encourage students in their work ($r = -0.05$), and they also present the assessment criteria for oral examinations more often ($r = -0.19$). In fact, teachers are obliged to inform students of their assessment criteria by the national Rules on knowledge assessment and grading and students' progress to a higher class standing in elementary schools (*Pravilnik o preverjanju in ocenjevanju znanja ter napredovanju učencev v osnovni šoli*, 2013). When they believe they have done everything in their duty and have acted fairly towards their students (e.g., encouraged them, presented the assessment criteria), teachers may see no need to conceal their anger. They may also consider it a sign of authenticity in their relationships with students, and they may express anger in order to give formative feedback. The latter is aimed at ensuring students' progress and includes acquainting them with the assessment criteria, and giving compliments for their effort and encouragements.

The analysis further shows that the less teachers believe they need a very good reason to get angry, the more often they compliment and encourage students ($r = -0.21$). Similarly, Chang (2013) points out that teachers get angry especially when students exhibit indifference to school work. Teachers in Chang's study saw students' irresponsiveness as a valid reason to get angry. This is probably also a possible interpretation of the results in our study, since the least expressed teachers' belief is that they can only get angry for a valid reason. This may indicate their greater emotional expressiveness in relation to students, which may consequently also be manifested in complimenting students more often.

The less teachers believe their anger would be inappropriate, the more often they ask the class questions that require a deep understanding of the subject matter ($r = -0.19$), and the more often they present the assessment criteria for oral examinations ($r = -0.23$). Both forms of pedagogical behavior confirm a strong dedication of teachers to encourage students' interaction within the classroom, which researchers of classroom interaction have been stressing for decades (e.g., Bratanić, 1991; Evans, 1970; Marentič Požarnik and Plut Pregelj, 1980). By posing higher-level questions, teachers encourage students to develop more complex mental processes (Hattie, 2018; Marentič Požarnik and Plut Pregelj, 2009), which enable students to develop their knowledge through their own efforts (Marentič Požarnik, 2018). The teachers in our study who strive for their students to achieve good learning outcomes probably believe that they can show their students clearly and openly how they feel when their expectations and assessment criteria are not introduced. Along with anger, they can also experience disappointment, which in a setting of good relationships with students is actually a manifestation of concern for the students' educational progress.

In the study, we have also discovered that the more teachers are convinced that it would be inappropriate for them to express anger at students, the rarer they see that students feel comfortable around them ($r = -0.19$). This finding was expected; only when mutual trust has been established in a relationship, can the individual express his/her emotions comfortably, and explain what they are experiencing openly. To interpret this, we must take a broader look at the individual's experience. Valenčič Zuljan (2000, p. 258, translated into English) refers to the findings of anthropological studies stressing that "early experiences have a very strong impact on one's actions, are very persistent, and are very difficult to change in adulthood. They remain in the memory of an indi-

vidual as experienced, picturesque images.” If we put this into the context of our study, we could conclude that teachers, who have learned already as children that it is inappropriate to express negative emotions, also transfer these experiences to their teaching process, creating an atmosphere in the classroom where student-teacher relationships are tense and cause frustration. Teachers who are not emotionally comfortable around students probably also do not believe that showing their students how they really feel would have a positive educational influence on them.

Finally, we found that the less teachers are convinced that they may only get angry when they explain to the student or class why they are angry, the more they acknowledge students' ideas in their teaching ($r = -0.21$). The importance that acknowledging and encouraging students' ideas is an important skill for effective teaching was stressed by researchers of classroom interaction already in the 20th century (e.g., Bratanić, 1991; Kyriacou, 1997; Marentič Požarnik and Plut Pregelj, 1980); nevertheless, contemporary authors emphasize the need to raise awareness about its importance (Hattie, 2018; Schleicher, 2019) even more.

4 Conclusions

Based on the results of our study, we can conclude that teachers are aware of their position as role models in the classroom and that students learn from them, not only science facts and how to resolve different knowledge-based problems, but also how they should express anger. In their relationships with students, teachers try to act responsibly. They are aware that by responding to problems in a classroom inappropriately, they would set a bad example for the students. The teachers involved in our study could probably be categorized as the teachers labeled by Hosotani and Imai-Matsumura (2011) as those who express their emotions outwardly, given that they disagree more than agree with the statement that they should conceal their emotions in front of their students.

We found that younger teachers (under 40) agree more than their colleagues over 40 that their anger can scare students and accordingly that they should conceal it. We can assume that younger teachers are more attentive to the psychological influence their behavior (e.g., expressing anger) can have on their students. Older teachers may be paying less attention to the possible negative impact of them expressing anger in front of students, or may have less insight into the research findings in this field. This may be a result of the fact that teachers' emotions and stress in the classroom have not been highlighted enough in teacher education in the past.

Moreover, the less teachers feel obliged to justify their anger, the less they agree that an outward expression of anger could be inappropriate, and the more often they use positive teaching approaches (e.g., complimenting and encouraging students, presenting assessment criteria). The teachers in our study, similarly to those in the research conducted by Frenzel et al. (2009), deem that by expressing their anger at students, they are showing clearly that the students' disruptive behavior during the teaching process will not be tolerated. This comes with a clear purpose – to establish more suitable conditions for an effective teaching process, which ensures an encouraging learning environment for students. Teachers who believe more that their anger expression will

not scare their students, also introduce their assessment criteria for oral examinations to students more often.

When managing the education process, teachers must respond appropriately to situations that cause them to experience anger in the classroom. Moreover, they need to be aware that their emotional response to students can be influenced by their beliefs about which emotions are professionally acceptable during teaching, as well as which modes and circumstances are appropriate for expressing them in the classroom. If teachers believe that anger is a “bad” emotion, their continued suppression or denial of anger can lead to their emotional burnout. Furthermore, if this issue is constantly ignored in their working environment, this can negatively affect teachers’ mental health, reduce their work satisfaction, increase absenteeism and, in extreme cases, lead them to abandon the teaching profession. To avoid this, it is advisable to offer teachers the possibility of joining supervision groups or teachers’ study groups, set up several peer-support networks, etc. Empowered in this way, teachers will be able to professionally self-regulate the emotions they experience in the classroom, including anger.

Irena Košir Lovšin, dr. Alenka Polak

Prepričanja učiteljev o njihovi jezi v odnosu do nekaterih vidikov poučevanja

Vzporedno s prenovno osnovnošolskega in gimnazijskega izobraževanja ter visokošolskega izobraževanja učiteljev smo v Sloveniji skušali že v 90-ih letih prejšnjega stoletja vse deležnike izobraževalnega sistema sistematično ozaveščati, da se je vloga učitelja v sodobnem času zelo spremenila. Hattie (2018, str. 15) poudarja predvsem učiteljevo poslanstvo – pri učencih razvijati samoregulacijsko učenje oz. “učencem pomagati, da postanejo sami sebi učitelji”. Med novimi vlogami in kompetencami sodobnega učitelja izstopa predvsem zmožnost obvladovanja sodobne informacijske tehnologije, zmožnost diferenciacije in individualizacije pedagoškega dela, npr. glede na sposobnosti, različne posebne potrebe učencev, multikulturne razlike med učenci, sodelovanje z drugimi učitelji in drugimi strokovnimi delavci ter starši, pa tudi usmerjenost učitelja v strokovno evalvacijo in kritično refleksijo lastnega dela (Wing On in Ling Tan, 2018). Temeljna dejavnost učitelja je poučevanje učencev posameznega oddelka ali več oddelkov. Poučevanje avtorji na splošno opredeljujejo kot interaktivni proces, ki vključuje pogovor med učiteljem in učenci v razredu med točno določeno opredeljeno dejavnostjo, npr. razpravo o obravnavani učni snovi (Chitiga, 2017; Hattie, 2018; Marentič Požarnik in Plut, 2009). Tudi Blažič idr. (2003, str. 27) v opredelitvi poučevanja izpostavljajo njegovo interaktivno naravo; opredeljujejo ga kot “učiteljevo neposredno pomoč pri usvajanju izbranih in prilagojenih spoznanj, sposobnosti, spretnosti, vrednosti in izkušenj, vključevanje (mladih) v neposredni učni kontakt z učno stvarnostjo in smotno vodenje pri čim bolj aktivnem in samostojnem učenju”. Kramar (2009, str. 20) ga opredeljuje z bolj didaktičnega vidika, in sicer kot “izvajanje različnih in med seboj usklajenih aktivnosti vsebinske in metodološke obravnave, z učnim načrtom opredeljenih vsebinsko in problemsko sklenjenih celot, ki potekajo v urejenem didaktičnem okolju

kot proces pridobivanja novega znanja in doseganja vzgojno-izobraževalnih ciljev". Ob upoštevanju različnih pedagoško, psihološko ali didaktično naravnanih opredelitev poučevanja s strani različnih avtorjev pa sodobni pogledi na delo učitelja izpostavljajo tudi pomembnost socialno-čustvenih vidikov njegove poklicne vloge (Prosen, Smrtnik Vitulić in Poljšak Škraban, 2013). Učiteljski poklic naj bi predstavljal enega izmed čustveno najzahtevnejših poklicev, pri katerem se zaposleni pri svojem delu soočajo s številnimi ugodnimi in neugodnimi čustvi (Sutton in Wheatley, 2003; Frenzel, 2014). Čustva so zapleteni psihofiziološki procesi, med katerimi so tako kognitivni procesi, npr. prepoznavanje in razumevanje čustev, uravnavanje čustev v dani situaciji, vživljanje v perspektivo druge osebe, kot tudi procesi, ki prispevajo k fiziološkim spremembam avtonomnega živčnega sistema, telesnim izrazom in potrebam po fizičnem delovanju. Končni cilj čustvovanja je prilagoditev na zaznane spremembe in doseganje posamezniku pomembnih ciljev (Ortony in Turner, 1990; Lazarus, 1991; Roseman, 2013). Kadar konkretni posameznik presodi oz. oceni, da ga nekdo ali nekaj ovira oz. blokira pri doseganju želenega, zanj pomembnega cilja ali več ciljev, običajno doživlja jezo (Lazarus, 1991). Na opisani proces pa vplivajo posameznikova prepričanja. Prepričanja učiteljev o samih sebi kot o strokovnjakih se oblikujejo pod vplivom družbenih in poklicnih pričakovanj. V teh prepričanjih se učitelji med seboj lahko zelo razlikujejo, njihova prepričanja pa tudi vplivajo na njihovo vedenje in ravnanje v razredu. V sklopu tega imajo učitelji zelo različna prepričanja tudi o tem, katera čustva lahko izrazijo pred učenci, ter o tem, kdaj in na kakšne načine naj jih izrazijo (Cross in Hong, 2009; Schutz in DeCuir-Gunby, 2009). Raziskave o učiteljevih prepričanjih v zvezi z izražanjem neugodnih čustev pri poučevanju (npr. Frenzel idr., 2009; Hosotani in Imai-Matsumura, 2011; Sutton, 2004; Sutton in Knight, 2006 v Sutton Mudrey-Camino in Knight, 2009; Yin in Lee, 2012) kažejo, da se učitelji v svojih prepričanjih o jezi običajno razlikujejo po tem, ali menijo, da naj bi svojo jezo pred učenci prikrili ali izrazili navzven. Prikrijejo jo lahko tako, da jo bodisi uravnavajo in izrazijo neko drugo, socialno bolj sprejemljivo čustvo, ali pa tako, da jo potlačijo. Jezo pa izrazijo navzven tako, da jo uravnavajo in izrazijo na primeren način, ali pa prav v takšni obliki, kot jo trenutno doživljajo. Učitelji so lahko tudi prepričani, da je izražanje neugodnih čustev pri poučevanju s pedagoškega vidika neučinkovito, zato se jim zdi pomembno spoznavati in prakticirati učinkovite načine za svoje čustveno uravnavanje.

Empirična raziskava, ki jo v prispevku predstavljamo, je temeljila na deskriptivni in kavzalno-neeksperimentalni metodi raziskovanja v okviru kvantitativne raziskovalne paradigme. Namen empirične raziskave je bil ugotoviti, katera so prepričanja učiteljev o izražanju jeze pri poučevanju. V raziskavi je sodelovalo 100 učiteljev 4. in 5. razreda javnih osnovnih šol v Sloveniji, ki izvajajo redni osnovnošolski program. 45 učiteljev omenjenega vzorca je poučevalo 4. razred (starost učencev 9–10 let), 49 učiteljev 5. razred (starost učencev 10–11 let) in 6 učiteljev kombinirane oddelke z učenci 4. in 5. razreda. Podatke o prepričanjih učiteljev in o njihovem poučevanju smo zbirali s pomočjo dveh vprašalnikov, ki sta bila delno povzeta, delno pa avtorsko zasnovana: "Vprašalnik prepričanj o izražanju učiteljeve jeze pri poučevanju" in "Vprašalnik o poučevanju". Ugotovili smo, da imajo učitelji najbolj izraženo prepričanje, da se učenci od njih učijo, kako naj tudi sami izražajo jezo. Najmanjše strinjanje so anketirani učitelji izrazili s trditvijo, da je bolje, da učitelj svojo jezo do učenca/-ke ali na razred prikrije. Na podlagi dobljenih rezultatov lahko sklepamo, da se učitelji dobro zavedajo svoje modelne

vloge v razredu oz. tega, da se učenci od njih učijo, kako naj jezo tudi sami izražajo. Učitelji skušajo torej v odnosu do učencev ravnati odgovorno, pri čemer se zavedajo, da z neustreznim odzivanjem na probleme v razredu lahko učencem predstavljajo slab zgled. Učitelji, sodelujoči v tej empirični raziskavi, najverjetneje sodijo med učitelje, ki sta jih Hosotani in Imai-Matsumura (2011) opredelili kot tiste, ki svoja čustva izražajo navzven, saj se v povprečju bolj ne strinjajo kot pa strinjajo, da bi svoja čustva morali pred učenci prikrivati.

V raziskavi nas je tudi zanimalo, kako se prepričanja učiteljev o izražanju jeze pri poučevanju razlikujejo glede na razred, ki ga posamezni učitelj poučuje, število učencev v razredu, starost učitelja in stopnjo njegove izobrazbe. Na podlagi statističnih izračunov z Mann-Whitneyevim testom smo ugotovili, da se učitelji četrtega in petega razreda v prepričanjih o izražanju jeze pri poučevanju statistično značilno ne razlikujejo. Ugotovili smo tudi, da se učitelji v svojih prepričanjih o izražanju jeze pri poučevanju statistično značilno ne razlikujejo glede na to, ali poučujejo v manjših oddelkih (od 5 do 20 učencev in oddelku) ali v večjih oddelkih (od 21 do 29 učencev in oddelku), niti glede na stopnjo svoje izobrazbe. Ugotovili pa smo, da se mlajši učitelji (stari manj kot 40 let) v primerjavi s starejšimi učitelji (starejši od 40 let) bolj strinjajo, da s svojim izražanjem jeze lahko učence prestrašijo, in pogosteje menijo, da bi morali svojo jezo prikriti. Sklepamo torej lahko, da so mlajši učitelji v primerjavi s starejšimi učitelji bolj pozorni na to, kakšne psihološke učinke ima lahko njihovo izražanje jeze na učence. Starejši učitelji so mogoče manj pozorni na morebitne negativne posledice, ki jih ima njihovo izražanje jeze v odnosu do učencev. Sklepamo lahko, da imajo starejše generacije učiteljev na tem področju manj strokovnega znanja, kar je verjetno posledica dejstva, da v preteklosti v izobraževanju učiteljev ni bilo študijskih predmetov in vsebin, ki bi obravnavale čustvene vidike poučevanja in stresa pri poučevanju.

V raziskavi smo želeli tudi ugotoviti, kako se prepričanja o učiteljevem izražanju jeze pri poučevanju statistično povezujejo z nekaterimi pedagoškimi vidiki poučevanja (npr. učiteljevo razlago, navodili, ocenjevanjem) in kako s socialno-čustvenimi vidiki poučevanja (npr. odnosom med učiteljem in učenci, doživljanjem učitelja). Ugotovili smo, da manj kot se učitelji čutijo dolžni razloge za svojo jezo učencem utemeljiti, pa tudi manj kot se strinjajo s tem, da bi bilo izražanje lastne jeze navzven lahko neprimerno, pogosteje ocenjujejo, da pri svojem pedagoškem delu uporabljajo pozitivno naravnane pedagoške pristope, npr. učence hvalijo in spodbujajo pri delu, predstavijo kriterije ustnega ocenjevanja. V pričujoči raziskavi učitelji ocenjujejo, da s tem, ko izražajo svojo jezo neposredno pred učenci, slednjim jasno pokažejo, da njihovega močnega vedenja ne sprejemajo, to pa počnejo s točno določenim ciljem – predvsem zato, da bi vzpostavili primernejše pogoje za nadaljnje poučevanje in spodbudno učno okolje za učenje vseh učencev.

Kot izvajalci izobraževalnega procesa se morajo učitelji ustrezno odzivati na situacije, ki med poučevanjem v njih sprožajo doživljanje jeze. Zavedati se morajo, da je njihovo čustveno odzivanje na vedenje učencev pod vplivom njihovih prepričanj o tem, katera čustva so pri poučevanju sprejemljiva ter na kakšen način in v katerih okoliščinah jih lahko primerno izrazijo. Če so učitelji prepričani, da je jeza "slabo" čustvo, lahko dolgotrajno večkratno tlačenje ali zanikanje tega čustva vodi v čustveno izgorelost, ki ob ignoriranju tega problema s strani delovnega okolja in/ali učencev slabša njihovo mentalno zdravje, zmanjša delovno zadovoljstvo in povzroči, da se v skrajnem

primeru odločijo zapustiti pedagoški poklic. V izogib temu je smiselno učiteljem ponuditi možnost vključevanja v supervizijske skupine, študijske skupine, vzpostavitev mreže kolegalne podpore ipd. Na tak način opolnomočeni učitelji bodo svoje čustveno doživljanje pri poučevanju, vključno z jezo, zmogli profesionalno in učinkovito uravnjavati.

REFERENCES

1. Blažič, M., Ivanuš Grmek, M., Kramar, M. et al. (2003). Didaktika – visokošolski učbenik. Novo mesto: Inštitut za raziskovalno in razvojno delo.
2. Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 39(3), 370–380.
3. Bratanič, M. (1991). Mikropedagogija: interakcijsko-komunikacijski aspekt odgoja: priručnik za studente i nastavnike. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
4. Brophy, J. E. (1979). Teacher Behaviour and Its Effects. Occasional Paper No. 25. Michigan: The Institute for Research on Teaching. Available at: <http://education.msu.edu/irt/PDFs/OccasionalPapers/op025.pdf> (retrieved 10.02.2019).
5. Chang, M. L. (2013). Toward a theoretical model to understand teacher emotions and teacher burnout in the context of student misbehavior. *Motivation and Emotion*, 37(4), 799–817.
6. Chitiga, M. (2017). They come in different shapes: a critical analysis of teacher types. *Journal of Educational Research*, 2(12), 31–49.
7. Corder, G. W. and Foreman, D. I. (2014). *Nonparametric Statistics: A Step-by-Step Approach*. New Jersey: Wiley. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9781118165881> (retrieved 10.02.2019).
8. Cross, D. I. and Hong, J. Y. (2009). Beliefs and professional identity: critical constructs in examining the impact of reform on the emotional experiences of teachers. In: Schutz, P. A. and Zembylas, M. (eds.). *Advances in teacher emotion research: The impact on teachers' lives* (pp. 273–296). New York: Springer.
9. Delors, J. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
10. Devjak, T., Devjak, S. and Polak, A. (2014). Dejavniki vpliva na izbiro pedagoškega poklica: motivi, pričakovanja in profesionalni razvoj. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, 29(1), 3–18.
11. Erčulj, J. and Škodnik, R. (2013). Spodbujanje refleksije pri učiteljih. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, 28(3–4), 17–31.
12. Evans, T. P. (1970). Flanders System of Interaction Analysis and Science Teacher Effectiveness. A paper presented to the 43rd annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching. Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 8. Available at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED059094.pdf> (retrieved 11.01.2019).
13. Frenzel, A. C. (2014). Teacher emotion. In: Pekrun, R. and Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (eds.). *International handbook of emotions in education* (pp. 494–519). New York, London: Routledge.
14. Frenzel, A. C., Goetz, T., Stephens, E. J. et al. (2009). Antecedents and effects of teachers' emotional experiences: an integrative perspective and empirical test. In: Schutz, P. A. and Zembylas, M. (eds.). *Advances in teacher emotions research: the impact on teachers' lives* (pp. 129–151). New York: Springer.
15. Gong, S., Chai X., Duan, T. et al. (2013). Chinese Teachers' Emotion Regulation Goals and Strategies. *Psychology*, 4(11), 870–877.
16. Gordon, T. (1997). *Trening večje učinkovitosti za učitelje*. Ljubljana: Svetovalni center za otroke, mladostnike in starše.
17. Green, S. B. and Salkind, N. J. (2005). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data*. 4th ed. New Jersey: Pearson.
18. Hattie, J. (2018). *Vidno učenje za učitelje: maksimiranje učinka na učenje*. Griže: Svetovalno izobraževalni center MI.
19. Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

20. Hosotani, R. and Imai-Matsumura, K. (2011). Emotional experience, expression, and regulation of high-quality Japanese elementary school teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(6), 1039–1048.
21. Izhodišča kurikularne preнове. (1996). Ljubljana: Nacionalni kurikularni svet.
22. Kramar, M. (2009). *Pouk*. Nova Gorica: Educa, Melior.
23. Kyriacou, C. (1997). Vse učiteljeve spretnosti. Radovljica: Regionalni izobraževalni center.
24. Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotions and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
25. Lepičnik Vodopivec, J. and Teršek, B. (2021). Odnos zaposlenih v vrtcu in osnovni šoli do medvrstniškega nasilja. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, 36(1), 3–18.
26. Liljestrom, A., Roulston, K. and Demarrais, K. (2007). “There’s No Place for Feeling Like This in the Workplace”: Women Teachers’ Anger in School Settings. In: Schutz, P. A. and Pekrun, R. (eds.). *Emotion in education* (pp. 275–291). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Inc.
27. Marentič Požarnik, B. (2018). Psihologija učenja in pouka: od poučevanja k učenju. Ljubljana: DZS.
28. Marentič Požarnik, B. and Plut Pregelj, L. (1980). Kakršno vprašanje takšen odgovor: priročnik o pedagoško-psiholoških osnovah zastavljanja kvalitetnih vprašanj pri pouku. Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo.
29. Marentič Požarnik, B. and Plut Pregelj, L. (2009). Moč učnega pogovora: poti do znanja z razumevanjem. Ljubljana: DZS.
30. McPherson, M. B., Kearney, P. and Plax, T. G. (2003). The Dark Side of Instruction: Teacher Anger as Classroom Norm Violations. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 31(1), 76–90.
31. Ortony, A. and Turner, T. J. (1990). What’s basic about basic emotions? *Psychological Review*, 97, 315–331.
32. Peklaj, C., Kalin, J., Pečjak, S. et al. (2009). Učiteljske kompetence in doseganje vzgojno-izobraževalnih ciljev v šoli. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete.
33. Pravilnik o preverjanju in ocenjevanju znanja ter napredovanju učencev v osnovni šoli (2013). *Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia*, no. 81/06 (June 21, 2013). Available at: <https://www.uradni-list.si/glasilo-uradni-list-rs/vsebina/113609> (retrieved 10.04.2019).
34. Prosen, S., Smrtnik Vitulič, H. and Poljšak Škraban, O. (2013). Observing Teacher’s Emotional Expression in Their Interaction with Students. *New Educational Review*, 31(1), 75–85.
35. Romi, S., Lewis, R. and Roache, J. (2013). Classroom management and teachers’ coping strategies: inside classrooms in Australia, China and Israel. *Prospects*, 43(2), 215–231.
36. Roseman, I. J. (2013). Appraisal in the Emotion System: Coherence in Strategies for Coping. *Emotion Review*, 5(2), 141–149.
37. Schleicher, A. (2019). Šole za učence 21. stoletja. Močni vodje, samozavestni učitelji, inovativni pristopi. Ljubljana: Šola za ravnatelje.
38. Schutz, P. A. and DeCuir-Gunby, J. T. (2009). Inquiry on Emotions in Education. *Educational Psychologist*, 37(2), 125–134.
39. Smrtnik Vitulič, H. (2006). Značilnosti razumevanja posameznih področij temeljnih čustev pri otrocih in mladostnikih. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, 21(1), 3–19.
40. Sutton, R. E. (2004). Emotional regulation goals and strategies of teachers. *Social Psychology of Education*, 7(4), 379–398.
41. Sutton, R. E. and Wheatley, K. F. (2003). Teachers’ emotions and teaching: A review of the literature and directions for future research. *Educational Psychology Review*, 15(4), 327–358.
42. Sutton, R. E., Mudrey-Camino, R. and Knight, C. C. (2009). Teachers’ Emotion Regulation and Classroom Management. *Theory into Practice*, 48(2), 130–137.
43. Tomić, A. (2003). Izbrana poglavja iz didaktike. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Center za pedagoško izobraževanje.
44. Ule, M. (2009). *Socialna psihologija: analitični pristop k življenju v družbi*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
45. Valenčič Zuljan, M. (2000). Dejavniki, ki vplivajo na oblikovanje in spreminjanje študentovega in učiteljevega pojmovanja. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, 15(5–6), 57–73.
46. Wing On, L. and Ling Tan, J. P. (2018). The New Roles for Twenty-First-Century Teachers. In: Niemi, H., Toom, A., Kallioniemi, A. et al. (eds.). *The Teacher’s Role in the Changing Globalizing World* (pp. 11–31). Netherlands: Brill.

47. Yin, H-B and Lee, J. C-K (2012). Be passionate, but be rational as well: Emotional rules for Chinese teachers' work. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 56–65.
48. Zembylas, M. (2003). Caring for teacher emotion: reflections on teacher self-development. *Studies in Philosophy & Education*, 22(2), 103–125.
49. Zembylas, M. (2005). Discursive practices, genealogies, and emotional rules: A poststructuralist view on emotion and identity in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 935–948.

Irena Košir Lovšin (1985), univerzitetna diplomirana profesorica razrednega pouka, strokovna sodelavka v Univerzitetnem kliničnem centru Ljubljana.
Naslov/Address: Reboljeva ulica 12, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija/Slovenia
Telefon/Telephone: (+386) 040 571 376
E-mail: kosir.irena@gmail.com

Dr. Alenka Polak (1966), docentka za področje pedagoške psihologije na Pedagoški fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani.
Naslov/Address: Ulica Jana Husa 5, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija/Slovenia
Telefon/Telephone: (+386) 041 893 718
E-mail: alenka.polak@uni-lj.si