

The Examination of Teachers' Levels of Organizational Happiness

Hatice Vatansever Bayraktar¹ & Sinan Girgin²

¹ Phd., Assoc. Prof, Primary School Education, Education Faculty, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Turkey

² Phd Student, Educational Management and Supervision Department, Social Studies Institute, Okan University, Istanbul, Turkey

Correspondence: Hatice Vatansever Bayraktar, Assoc. Prof. Dr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0458-3405>, Education Faculty, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Turkey. E-mail: hatice.bayraktar@izu.edu.tr

Received: April 30, 2020 Accepted: August 18, 2020 Online Published: September 11, 2020

doi:10.5539/jel.v9n5p170 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v9n5p170>

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the levels of organizational happiness of teachers working in primary, secondary, and high schools and to determine whether there is a significant difference in terms of some demographic characteristics. The screening model was employed in the study. The study population consists of teachers working in the Küçükçekmece, Bağcılar, Avcılar, and Esenyurt districts during the 2017–2018 academic year. The sample of the study comprises 297 teachers working in the Küçükçekmece, Bağcılar, Avcılar, and Esenyurt districts and selected via the convenience/incidental sampling method. In the study, the “*Personal Information Form*” created by the researchers and the “*School Happiness Scale*” developed by Bulut (2015) were used as data collection tools. The SPSS packaged software was used in the data analysis. According to the results of the data analysis, teachers' general happiness perceptions and organizational happiness perceptions were observed to be high according to the subdimensions of management processes, attitudes towards the teaching profession, communication, commitment and economic provision of the School Happiness Scale. Teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness differed significantly according to the level of education taught by teachers in the subdimensions of management processes and economic provision of the School Happiness Scale. Teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness differed significantly according to professional seniority in the management processes subdimension of the School Happiness Scale. Teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness differed significantly in the subdimensions of management processes, attitudes towards the teaching profession, commitment, and economic provision of the School Happiness Scale and according to the branch variable in the overall total. Teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness did not differ significantly according to the variables of gender, educational status, age, and seniority in the school where they worked.

Keywords: teacher, organizational happiness, level of happiness

1. Introduction

The concept of happiness, which has increasing importance nowadays, has maintained its significance since the beginning of history, and individuals alone and societies altogether have made efforts to achieve happiness. This concept, which is the meaning of life for everyone, has been the subject of studies and explanations in many disciplines such as psychology, medicine, and economy. Furthermore, many scientists, thinkers, and social researchers have discussed and defined happiness in different ways and with different approaches (Akduman & Yüksekbilgili, 2015). Some thinkers explained the concept based on religious terminology, while others defined it from a hedonist and eudaemonic perspective. Farabi used happiness in the sense of “conscientious comfort” and “path to follow by acquiring virtues” (Özgen, 2005). Descartes defined happiness as follows, “*Happiness is full spiritual satisfaction and inner contentment*” (Türkben, 2010). According to the Turkish Language Association, happiness is defined as “pleasure, gladness, prosperity, delightfulness, well-being, bliss, felicity achieved for fully and continuously fulfilling all the longing” (TLA, 2020). Hills and Argyle (2002) described happiness as a pleasant and desired characteristic that depends on the personal attitude and instincts and results from positive feelings and satisfaction with life. Ekman and Friesen (2003) defined happiness as “*a spiritual state containing feelings such as enjoying, feeling excited and relaxing and a general positivity beyond these feelings.*” Veenhoven (2008) expressed happiness as a person's enjoying life as a whole in the general sense. Franklin (2010) defined happiness as “*a positive feeling that has a long effect on people and consists of a series of satisfied pleasures.*”

According to Pryce-Jones (2011), happiness is “the mentality enabling the person to achieve his potential.”

The happiness of people working in an organization may lead to other positive situations. For example, employees with more intense positive feelings in the organization can be more productive for their organization, create better outputs, and, consequently, display their potential at a higher level. Different studies have reported that employees in organizations where organizational happiness is ensured are more productive (Bryson, Forth, & Stokes, 2015). The happiness of teachers is a crucial factor in the efficiency of education and teaching. In light of this information, it can be said that the most significant output of a school with happy and productive teachers will be healthy, productive, and happy individuals, who will form a good society (Gavin & Mason, 2004).

Upon examining the studies conducted on the subject, the studies titled “*Analyzing Levels of Happiness of Individuals with Ordinal Logistic Analysis*” made by Akın and Şentürk (2012), “*Effects of Leisure Time Spent on Internet to University Students’ Happiness and Life Satisfaction Levels*” by Göral (2013), “*Analyzing the Relation of Happiness with Authenticity and Self-Compassion Among Candidate Teachers*” by Duman (2014), “*Perceptions of High School Teachers’ Organizational Happiness: A Norm Study*” by Bulut (2015), “*The Relationship Between School Administrators’ Happiness Level and Their Self-Efficacy Levels*” by Duran (2016), “*The Political Skills of Teachers as a Factor Predicting School Happiness*” by Özgenel and Bozkurt (2020), “*Measurement of Organizational Happiness*” by Eckhaus (2018), “*Happiness at Work*” by Fisher (2010), “*Organizational Happiness*” by Juul (2018), “*Organizational Happiness Index (OHI): A Study of a Public University in Malaysia*” by Omar, Ramdani, Mohd and Hussein (2018), “*Workplace happiness: organizational role and the reliability of self-reporting*” by Huang (2016), “*Çalışma Mutluluğu: Kavram ve Kapsam*” by Turan (2018), “*Happiness and well-being at work*” by Stoia (2015), “*The Relationship Between Teacher Perceptions of Diversity Management Perspectives and Organizational Happiness*” by Arslan (2018), “*Analysis of Secondary School Teachers’ Perceptions of Organizational Happiness*” by Çetin and Polat (2019), “*A Study on Lifelong Learning Tendencies and Happiness Levels of Teachers (Kocaeli Sample)*” by Kabal (2019), “*Relation Between Institutional Contentment of Students And Teachers In Spatial Arrangement On School*” by Sancak (2019), “*Investigation of The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence Levels And Happiness of Sports Executives Due to Local Administrations and Youth Services Sports Directorate*” by Serter (2019), “*The Relationship Between Learning School and School Happiness*” by Uğur (2019) were encountered. However, there is no study that studies the happiness levels of teachers working in primary, secondary and high schools in Istanbul. In this respect, it is thought that the study will contribute to the field. In this context, the main objective of this study was indicated as “*to examine the levels of teachers’ perceptions of organizational happiness and the differentiation status of their happiness perceptions according to gender, educational status, age, professional seniority, seniority in the school where they work, branch, and the level of education taught.*” The sub-goals determined within the scope of this main objective are as follows:

- 1) What is the level of teachers’ organizational happiness?
- 2) Does the level of teachers’ organizational happiness differ according to gender, educational status, age, professional seniority, seniority in the school where they work, branch, and the level of education taught?

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

The screening model was employed in the study. Screening studies usually make a description of the subject investigated (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2012).

2.2 Population and Sample

The study population consists of teachers working in the Küçükçekmece, Bağcılar, Avcılar, and Esenyurt districts. The sample of the study comprises teachers working in the Küçükçekmece, Bağcılar, Avcılar, and Esenyurt districts and selected via the convenience/incidental sampling method. While determining participants, the convenience/incidental sampling method, one of the non-random sampling methods, was used. The convenience/incidental sampling method represents the selection of a sample from accessible units, on which implementation will be easy, due to time and labor force limitations (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç-Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2012). Of 297 individuals, 201 (67.7%) were women, and 96 (32.3%) were men according to the frequency and percentage distributions of the demographic characteristics of the sample. Of the participants, 180 (60.6%) were at the age of 24–34, 101 (34.0%) at the age of 35–45, and 16 (5.4%) at the age of 46 and above. Of the participants, 257 (86.5%) had a bachelor’s

degree, and 40 (13.5%) were postgraduates. It was found that 88 (29.6%) of the participants had professional seniority of 0–5 years, 105 (35.4%) of 6–10 years, 57 (19.2%) of 11–15 years, and 47 (15.8%) had professional seniority of 16 years and above. It was determined that 203 (68.4%) of the participants had seniority in the school of 0–5 years, 57 (19.2%) of 6–10 years, 23 (7.7%) of 11–15 years, and 14 (4.7%) of 16 years and above. Of the participants, 83 (27.9%) were teachers in verbal branches, 62 (20.9%) were mathematics/science teachers, 63 (21.2%) were teachers in other branches, and 89 (30.0%) were primary school teachers. Of the participants, 141 (47.5%) worked in primary schools, 57 (19.2%) in secondary schools, and 99 (33.3%) worked in high schools.

2.3 Data Collection Tools

In the study, the Personal Information Form and the Organizational Happiness Scale were used as data collection tools.

Personal Information Form: In the personal information form, there are seven questions about gender, age, educational status, professional seniority, seniority in the school, branch, and the level of education taught.

Organizational Happiness Scale: The happiness levels of teachers concerning their schools were measured by the “Organizational Happiness Scale” developed and studied for validity and reliability by Bulut (2015). The scale consists of the subdimensions of “Management Processes (1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10-11-12-13-14-15-16-17), Attitudes Towards the Teaching Profession (18-19-20-21-22-23-24-25-26), Communication (27-28-29-30), Commitment (31-32-33-34), and Economic Provision (35-36-37-38).” The Organizational Happiness Scale was prepared in the form of “(1) I Strongly Disagree - (5) I Strongly Agree.”

2.4 Data Analysis

The SPSS packaged software was used in the data analysis and the significance level was taken as 0.05 among the variables. In data analysis, arithmetic mean and standard deviation were calculated, the t-test analysis of the levels of teachers’ organizational happiness was performed according to the variables of gender and educational status, and the ANOVA analysis was conducted according to the variables of age, professional seniority, seniority in the school, branch and the level of education taught.

3. Results

In this section, results and interpretation of the study data are presented.

3.1 Levels of Teachers’ Organizational Happiness

Descriptive statistics related to the levels of teachers’ organizational happiness are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistical analysis results of the levels of teachers’ organizational happiness

Organizational Happiness Scale	\bar{X}	sd
Management Processes	3.80	0.59
Teaching Profession	4.12	0.62
Communication	4.12	1.00
Commitment	3.82	0.70
Economic Provision	3.47	0.80
General Organizational Happiness	3.87	0.52

When Table 1 is examined, it is observed that the levels of teachers’ organizational happiness take the arithmetic mean value of $\bar{X} = 3.80$ in the management processes subdimension, $\bar{X} = 4.12$ in the subdimension of attitudes towards the teaching profession and communication, $\bar{X} = 3.82$ in the commitment subdimension, $\bar{X} = 3.47$ in the economic provision subdimension, and $\bar{X} = 3.87$ in the subdimension of the total level of organizational happiness. Teachers’ general happiness perceptions and organizational happiness perceptions were observed to be high according to the subdimensions of management processes, attitudes towards the teaching profession, communication, commitment, and economic provision of the Organizational Happiness Scale.

3.2 Examination of the Levels of Teachers’ Organizational Happiness According to the Gender Variable

The differentiation status between the organizational happiness levels of teachers according to their gender was evaluated by the t-test, and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The t-test analysis of the levels of teachers' organizational happiness according to the gender variable

Organizational Happiness Scale	Gender	N	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p
Management Processes	Female	201	3.79	.54	295	-.482	.630
	Male	96	3.83	.69			
Teaching Profession	Female	201	4.17	.56	295	1.935	.054
	Male	96	4.02	.71			
Communication	Female	200	4.16	1.10	295	1.056	.292
	Male	96	4.03	.77			
Commitment	Female	200	3.84	.66	295	.930	.353
	Male	96	3.76	.78			
Economic Provision	Female	200	3.48	.77	295	.217	.829
	Male	96	3.45	.86			
General Organizational Happiness	Female	201	3.89	.49	295	1.113	.267
	Male	96	3.82	.59			

When Table 2 was examined, no significant difference could be detected between the levels of organizational happiness regarding the subdimensions of management processes ($t(297) = -.482, p > 0.05$), attitudes towards the teaching profession ($t(297) = 1.935, p > 0.05$), communication ($t(297) = 1.056, p > 0.05$), commitment ($t(297) = .930, p > 0.05$), and economic provision ($t(297) = .217, p > 0.05$), and the total level of organizational happiness ($t(297) = 1.113, p > 0.05$) according to teachers' gender.

3.3 Examination of the Levels of Teachers' Organizational Happiness According to the Educational Status Variable

The differentiation status between the organizational happiness levels of teachers according to their educational status was evaluated by the t-test, and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The t-test analysis of the levels of teachers' organizational happiness according to the educational status variable

Organizational Happiness Scale	Educational Status	N	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p
Management Processes	Undergraduate	257	3.79	.56	295	-.815	.416
	Postgraduate	40	3.88	.79			
Teaching Profession	Undergraduate	257	4.11	.60	295	-.472	.638
	Postgraduate	40	4.16	.71			
Communication	Undergraduate	256	4.13	1.03	295	.258	.797
	Postgraduate	40	4.08	.84			
Commitment	Undergraduate	256	3.79	.69	295	-1.360	.175
	Postgraduate	40	3.96	.77			
Economic Provision	Undergraduate	256	3.47	.78	295	.036	.972
	Postgraduate	40	3.46	.92			
General Organizational Happiness	Undergraduate	257	3.86	.50	295	-.524	.601
	Postgraduate	40	3.91	.64			

According to Table 3, there was no significant difference between the levels of organizational happiness regarding the subdimensions of management processes ($t(297) = -.815, p > 0.05$), attitudes towards the teaching profession ($t(297) = -.472, p > 0.05$), communication ($t(297) = .258, p > 0.05$), commitment ($t(297) = -1.360, p > 0.05$), and economic provision ($t(297) = .036, p > 0.05$), and the total level of organizational happiness ($t(297) = -.524, p > 0.05$) according to teachers' educational status.

3.4 Examination of the Levels of Teachers' Organizational Happiness According to the Age Variable

The differentiation status between the organizational happiness levels of teachers according to their age was analyzed by the one-way analysis of variance, and the results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. ANOVA analysis of the levels of teachers' organizational happiness according to the age variable

Organizational Happiness Scale		Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F	p
Management Processes	Intergroup	1.064	2	.532	1.489	.227
	Intragroup	105.092	294	.357		
	Total	106.156	296			
Teaching Profession	Intergroup	.131	2	.066	.169	.845
	Intragroup	113.973	294	.388		
	Total	114.104	296			
Communication	Intergroup	.201	2	.100	.098	.907
	Intragroup	300.049	293	1.024		
	Total	300.250	295			
Commitment	Intergroup	.084	2	.042	.084	.920
	Intragroup	148.051	293	.505		
	Total	148.135	295			
Economic Provision	Intergroup	.736	2	.368	.568	.567
	Intragroup	189.923	293	.648		
	Total	190.659	295			
General Organizational Happiness	Intergroup	.087	2	.044	.156	.855
	Intragroup	82.092	294	.279		
	Total	82.180	296			

When Table 4 was examined, no significant difference could be found between the levels of organizational happiness regarding the subdimensions of management processes ($F(2-294) = 1.489, p > 0.05$), attitudes towards the teaching profession ($F(2-294) = .169, p > 0.05$), communication ($F(2-294) = .098, p > 0.05$), commitment ($F(2-294) = .084, p > 0.05$), and economic provision ($F(2-294) = .568, p > 0.05$), and the total level of organizational happiness ($F(2-294) = .156, p > 0.05$) according to teachers' age.

3.5 Examination of the Levels of Teachers' Organizational Happiness According to the Professional Seniority Variable

The differentiation status between the organizational happiness levels of teachers according to their professional seniority was evaluated by the one-way analysis of variance, and the results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA analysis of the levels of teachers' organizational happiness according to the professional seniority variable

Organizational Happiness Scale		Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F	p	Significant Difference
Management Processes	Intergroup	3.188	3	1.063	3.024	.030	0-5/6-10; 0-5/11-15; 16 and above / 11-15
	Intragroup	102.968	293	.351			
	Total	106.156	296				
Teaching Profession	Intergroup	2.125	3	.708	1.853	.138	-
	Intragroup	111.979	293	.382			
	Total	114.104	296				
Communication	Intergroup	2.123	3	.708	.693	.557	-
	Intragroup	298.127	292	1.021			
	Total	300.250	295				
Commitment	Intergroup	1.043	3	.348	.690	.559	-
	Intragroup	147.092	292	.504			
	Total	148.135	295				
Economic Provision	Intergroup	1.783	3	.594	.919	.432	-
	Intragroup	188.876	292	.647			
	Total	190.659	295				
General Organizational Happiness	Intergroup	1.244	3	.415	1.501	.214	-
	Intragroup	80.936	293	.276			
	Total	82.180	296				

When Table 5 was examined, no significant difference could be found between the levels of organizational happiness regarding the subdimensions of attitudes towards the teaching profession ($F(3-293) = 1.853, p >$

0.05), communication ($F(3-293) = .693, p > 0.05$), commitment ($F(3-293) = .690, p > 0.05$), and economic provision ($F(3-293) = .919, p > 0.05$), and the total level of organizational happiness ($F(3-293) = 1.501, p > 0.05$) according to teachers' professional seniority. However, a significant difference was found between the subscale scores of the management processes subdimension ($F(3-293) = 3.024, p < 0.05$) according to the professional seniority of teachers. This difference was indicated in the significant difference column of the table. When the subscale scores of the management processes subdimension were examined according to the professional seniority variable of teachers, a significant difference was observed in favor of those with professional seniority of 0–5 years between teachers with professional seniority of 0–5 years and 6–10 years, in favor of those with professional seniority of 0–5 years between teachers with professional seniority of 0–5 years and 11–15 years, and in favor of those with professional seniority of 16 years and above between teachers with professional seniority of 16 years and above and 11–15 years.

3.6 Examination of the Levels of Teachers' Organizational Happiness According to the Seniority in the School Variable

The differentiation status between the organizational happiness levels of teachers according to the seniority in the school variable was evaluated by the one-way analysis of variance, and the results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. ANOVA analysis of the levels of teachers' organizational happiness according to the seniority in the school variable

Organizational Happiness Scale		Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F	p
Management Processes	Intergroup	1.731	3	.577	1.619	.185
	Intragroup	104.425	293	.356		
	Total	106.156	296			
Teaching Profession	Intergroup	1.483	3	.494	1.286	.279
	Intragroup	112.622	293	.384		
	Total	114.104	296			
Communication	Intergroup	4.482	3	1.494	1.475	.221
	Intragroup	295.767	292	1.013		
	Total	300.250	295			
Commitment	Intergroup	3.655	3	1.218	2.462	.063
	Intragroup	144.480	292	.495		
	Total	148.135	295			
Economic Provision	Intergroup	3.332	3	1.111	1.731	.161
	Intragroup	187.327	292	.642		
	Total	190.659	295			
General Organizational Happiness	Intergroup	1.381	3	.460	1.669	.174
	Intragroup	80.799	293	.276		
	Total	82.180	296			

When Table 6 was examined, no significant difference could be detected between the levels of organizational happiness regarding the subdimensions of management processes ($F(3-293) = 1.619, p > 0.05$), attitudes towards the teaching profession ($F(3-293) = 1.286, p > 0.05$), communication ($F(3-293) = 1.475, p > 0.05$), commitment ($F(3-293) = 2.462, p > 0.05$), and economic provision ($F(3-293) = 1.731, p > 0.05$), and the total level of organizational happiness ($F(3-293) = 1.669, p > 0.05$) according to teachers' seniority in the school.

3.7 Examination of the Levels of Teachers' Organizational Happiness According to the Branch Variable

The differentiation status between the organizational happiness levels of teachers according to the branch variable was evaluated by the one-way analysis of variance, and the results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. ANOVA analysis of the levels of teachers' organizational happiness according to the branch variable

Organizational Happiness Scale		Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F	p	Significant Difference
Management Processes	Intergroup	7.615	3	2.538	7.547	.000	Verbal - Mathematics-Science Verbal - Other Verbal -Primary
	Intragroup	98.541	293	.336			
	Total	106.156	296				
Teaching Profession	Intergroup	3.370	3	1.123	2.972	.032	Verbal - Mathematics-Science Verbal - Other
	Intragroup	110.734	293	.378			
	Total	114.104	296				
Communication	Intergroup	4.456	3	1.485	1.466	.224	-
	Intragroup	295.794	293	1.013			
	Total	300.250	295				
Commitment	Intergroup	6.336	3	2.112	4.349	.005	Verbal - Mathematics-Science Verbal - Other Verbal -Primary
	Intragroup	141.799	293	.486			
	Total	148.135	295				
Economic Provision	Intergroup	13.916	3	4.639	7.664	.000	Primary - Verbal Primary - Mathematics-Science Other - Mathematics-Science
	Intragroup	176.742	293	.605			
	Total	190.659	295				
General Organizational Happiness	Intergroup	3.596	3	1.199	4.469	.004	Verbal - Mathematics-Science Verbal - Other Primary -Mathematics-Science
	Intragroup	78.584	293	.268			
	Total	82.180	296				

When Table 7 was examined, no difference was found in the communication dimension ($F(3-293) = 1.466$, $p > 0.05$) according to the branch variable of teachers. However, a significant difference was detected between the level of organizational happiness regarding the subdimensions of management processes ($F(3-293) = 7.547$, $p < 0.05$), attitudes towards the teaching profession ($F(3-293) = 2.972$, $p < 0.05$), commitment ($F(3-293) = 4.349$, $p < 0.05$), and economic provision ($F(3-293) = 7.664$, $p < 0.05$), and the total level of organizational happiness ($F(3-293) = 4.469$, $p < 0.05$).

There was a significant difference among teachers in verbal branches, mathematics-science teachers, teachers in other branches, and primary school teachers when the subdimensions of "*management processes*" and "*commitment*" were examined according to the branches of teachers. This difference was in favor of teachers in verbal branches.

There was a significant difference among teachers in verbal branches, mathematics-science teachers, and teachers in other branches when the subdimension of "*attitudes towards the teaching profession*" was examined according to the branches of teachers. This difference was in favor of teachers in verbal branches.

There was a significant difference among primary school teachers, teachers in verbal branches, and mathematics-science teachers when the subdimension of "*economic provision*" was examined according to the branches of teachers. This difference was in favor of primary school teachers. A significant difference was found between teachers in other branches and mathematics-science teachers. This difference was in favor of teachers in other branches.

A significant difference was found among teachers in verbal branches, mathematics-science teachers, and teachers in other branches when the total level of organizational happiness was examined according to the branches of teachers. This difference was in favor of teachers in verbal branches. A significant difference was found between primary school teachers and mathematics-science teachers. This difference was in favor of primary school teachers.

3.8 Examination of the Levels of Teachers' Organizational Happiness According to the Level of Education Taught Variable

The differentiation status between the organizational happiness levels of teachers according to the variable of the level of education taught was evaluated by the one-way analysis of variance, and the results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. ANOVA analysis of the levels of teachers' organizational happiness according to the level of education taught variable

Organizational Happiness Scale		Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F	p	Significant Difference
Management Processes	Intergroup	4.458	2	2.229	6.444	.002	Secondary School- Primary School; High School- Primary School
	Intragroup	101.698	294	.346			
	Total	106.156	296				
Teaching Profession	Intergroup	1.010	2	.505	1.313	.271	-
	Intragroup	113.094	294	.385			
	Total	114.104	296				
Communication	Intergroup	.042	2	.021	.020	.980	-
	Intragroup	300.208	293	1.025			
	Total	300.250	295				
Commitment	Intergroup	2.195	2	1.097	2.203	.112	-
	Intragroup	145.941	293	.498			
	Total	148.135	295				
Economic Provision	Intergroup	10.367	2	5.184	8.424	.000	Primary School-Secondary School; Primary School High school
	Intragroup	180.292	293	.615			
	Total	190.659	295				
General Organizational Happiness	Intergroup	.099	2	.049	.177	.838	-
	Intragroup	82.081	294	.279			
	Total	82.180	296				

When Table 8 was examined, no significant difference was found between the levels of organizational happiness regarding the subdimensions of attitudes towards the teaching profession ($F(2-294) = 1.313, p > 0.05$), communication ($F(2-293) = .980, p > 0.05$), commitment ($F(2-293) = .112, p > 0.05$), and the total level of organizational happiness ($F(2-294) = .838, p > 0.05$) according to the level of education taught by teachers. However, there was a significant difference in teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness in the subdimensions of management processes ($F(2-293) = 6.444, p < 0.05$) and economic provision ($F(2-294) = 8.424, p < 0.05$) of the School Happiness Scale according to the level of education taught. In the economic provision subdimension, this significant difference was in favor of primary school teachers working in primary schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in secondary schools, and in favor of primary school teachers working in primary schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in high schools. In the management processes subdimension, this significant difference was in favor of branch teachers working in secondary schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in secondary schools, and in favor of branch teachers working in high schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in high schools.

4. Conclusion, Discussion, and Recommendations

According to the results of the data analysis, teachers' general happiness perceptions and organizational happiness perceptions were observed to be high according to the subdimensions of management processes, attitudes towards the teaching profession, communication, commitment and economic provision of the School Happiness Scale. Teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness differed significantly according to the level of education taught by teachers in the subdimensions of management processes and economic provision of the School Happiness Scale. In the economic provision subdimension, this significant difference was in favor of primary school teachers working in primary schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in secondary schools, and in favor of primary school teachers working in primary schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in high schools. In the management processes subdimension, this significant difference was in favor of branch teachers working in secondary schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in secondary schools, and in favor of branch teachers working in high schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in high schools. Teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness differed significantly according to professional seniority in the management processes subdimension of the School Happiness Scale. Teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness differed significantly in the subdimensions of management processes, attitudes towards the teaching profession, commitment, and economic provision of the School Happiness Scale and according to the branch variable in the overall total. Teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness did not differ significantly according to the variables of gender, educational status, age, and seniority in the school where they worked.

Teachers' general happiness perceptions and organizational happiness perceptions were observed to be "high" according to the subdimensions of "management processes, attitudes towards the teaching profession, communication, commitment and economic provision" of the School Happiness Scale. When the subdimensions were ordered in terms of the high level, attitudes towards the teaching profession and communication ranked first, commitment ranked second, management processes ranked third, and economic provision ranked fourth. In their studies, Arslan (2018), Akin and Şentürk (2012), Bulut (2015), Çetin (2019), Çetin and Polat (2019), Demircan (2019), Duman (2014), Duran (2016), Göral (2013), Kabal (2019), Sancak (2019), Serter (2019), Öztürk (2015), Uğur (2019), and Yılmaz (2019) also reported that the happiness of participants was at a high level. Birdoğan-Kuvvet (2019) and Düzgün (2016), on the other hand, revealed in their studies that the happiness of participants was at a medium level. No studies revealing low levels of happiness in teachers were encountered in the literature. As a result, it can be stated that teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness are high, they feel happy in schools, they are pleased with their conditions, and they are glad to have become teachers.

There was no significant difference in teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness according to the gender variable. In their studies, Bekil (2019), Birdoğan-Kuvvet (2019), Bulut (2015), Çetin and Polat (2019), Demir (2017), Demir and Murat (2017), Demirel (2018), Duman (2014), Duran (2016), Korkut (2019), Öztaş (2018), Saygın (2008), Sevindik (2015), Şahin (2015), Şengül and Demirel (2016), and Yazıcı (2015) reported no difference between individuals' levels of happiness in terms of the gender variable. According to the gender of teachers, their levels of organizational happiness may differ since schools offer the same conditions to both female and male teachers and they work under similar conditions and similar difficulties. Another reason for the absence of a significant difference between gender and happiness may be the relationship of happiness with inner processes and personality traits rather than demographic characteristics. Unlike this study, Akin and Şentürk (2012), Akyol (2016), Düzgün (2016), Şentürk (2011) and Yıldız-Akyol (2016) found men's levels of happiness to be higher than those of women, whereas Atay (2012), Çirkin and Göksel (2016), Çolak (2018), Erdoğan (2017), Gülcan (2014), Kangal (2013), and Şaşmaz (2016) found women's levels of happiness to be higher compared to men. These differences may result from the population, sample, and the structure of the data collection tools used.

No significant difference was found in teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness according to the educational status variable. In their studies, Düzgün (2016), Kurnaz (2015), Ögüt (2018), Öztaş (2018), Selim (2008), Sönmez (2016), Tingaz (2013) and Yılmaz (2019) stated that there was no difference between individuals' levels of happiness in terms of the educational status factor. Within the scope of the study, it could have been thought that teachers' awareness, experiences, and their contribution to life would increase. Therefore, they would have more reasons to become happy as their educational levels increased. This may have resulted from the facts that the study was conducted on teachers, the educational levels of teachers would be at least a bachelor's degree, and the options of educational status were limited only to two options, undergraduate and graduate, as the demographic variable. Among the studies conducted, some studies are not parallel with these results. In his study, Kangal (2013) revealed that university or college graduates were happier than primary school graduates, primary education and high school graduates, and people who could not graduate from any school. According to the study carried out by Sevindik (2015), individuals with a bachelor's degree were happier than those with a master's degree. In the study, Korkut (2019) found that the group which declared they were the happiest group comprised teachers with associate degrees and the group with the lowest perception of organizational happiness consisted of teachers who had a master's degree. As the educational level increases, a relative decrease is observed in the perception of organizational happiness.

No significant difference could be detected in teachers' perceptions of organizational happiness according to the age variable. In their studies, Akyol (2016), Aydemir (2008), Birdoğan-Kuvvet (2019), Çolak (2018), Demirel (2018), Duran (2016), Öztaş (2018), Sevindik (2015), Şahin (2011), and Topuz (2013) concluded that the level of happiness did not differ significantly according to the age groups. In this study, the fact that the age factor did not create any significant difference in happiness may have resulted from the inclusion of many internal and instantaneous factors in the concept of happiness. Individuals want to be happy in every period, independently of their age, and they make an effort for it. Whether female or male, no individuals avoid happiness because they are young or old. There are physical and mental needs to be fulfilled during every age period. It can be said that fulfilling these needs will make individuals happy, no matter what age period they are in. Among the studies conducted, some studies are not parallel with these results. In the study, Şentürk (2011) reported that the happiness levels of individuals aged "between 18-24" and "65 and

above” were high. In their study, Eryılmaz and Ercan (2011) stated that the age factor created a difference in the happiness level. Individuals aged “between 14–17” and “between 26–45” are happier than individuals aged “between 19–25”. In the study conducted, Gülcan (2014) found a significant relationship between age and happiness. The happiness scores of individuals aged “between 19–22” were determined to be higher compared to individuals aged “between 23–25”.

There was a significant difference in teachers’ perceptions of organizational happiness only in the management processes subdimension of the School Happiness Scale according to professional seniority. A significant difference was observed in favor of those with professional seniority of “0–5 years” between teachers with professional seniority of “0–5 years” and “6–10 years”, in favor of those with professional seniority of “0–5 years” between teachers with professional seniority of “0–5 years” and “11–15 years”, and in favor of those with professional seniority of “16 years and above” between teachers with professional seniority of “16 years and above” and “11–15 years”. According to the management processes subdimension, this can be said to be significant for teachers in the first five years and being in the profession for “16 years and above”, and they are happier in terms of this subdimension. Being a new teacher with low professional seniority and experiencing high-level excitement and the professional self-confidence of teachers with high seniority due to their experiences may have created a positive effect on their happiness. Çetin and Polat (2019) stated that the organizational happiness of secondary school teachers with professional seniority of “1–10 years” was higher than that of teachers with professional seniority of “11–20 years”. In his study, Korkut (2019) expressed that the perception of organizational happiness of teachers with seniority of “1–5 years”, who were in their early years, was lower than the perception of organizational happiness of groups with professional seniority of “6–10 years”, “16–20 years”, and “21+ years”, which suggested that organizational happiness would be gained over time and required a long time depending on other psychological factors. In his study, Bulut (2015) revealed that the organizational happiness of new teachers who had worked for a year was higher than that of teachers working for more years. In the study conducted, Düzgün (2016) reported that the seniority years of teachers created a significant difference in their happiness. Teachers with professional seniority of “20 years and above” constituted the happiest group with the highest seniority participating in the study. In their studies, Birdoğan-Kuvvet (2019) and Özdemir and Kış (2019) stated that professional seniority did not affect happiness.

No significant difference could be detected in teachers’ perceptions of organizational happiness according to the seniority in the school variable. In their studies, Bulut (2015), Çetin and Polat (2019), Duran (2016) and Düzgün (2016) indicated no difference between individuals’ levels of happiness in terms of the seniority in the school factor.

When the teachers’ perceptions of organizational happiness were examined, it was observed that teachers in verbal branches and primary school teachers were happier. Teachers in verbal branches and primary school teachers can express themselves in a better way, and this may affect their happiness. In the study conducted by Bulut (2015), it was concluded that teachers in verbal branches were happier than teachers in mathematics-science branches. As a result of the study carried out by Tingaz and Hazar (2014), the happiness scores of preservice physical education teachers and preservice primary school mathematics teachers were compared, and a significant difference was found between them. The happiness scores of preservice physical education and sports teachers were found to be higher than those of preservice primary school mathematics teachers. Özdemir and Kış (2019) stated that branch teachers received higher happiness scores than primary school teachers and explained this situation by the fact that it was tiring for primary school teachers to work with a young age group. Furthermore, they also mentioned the presence of positive feelings caused by branch teachers’ allocating more time to themselves in the academic sense and professional satisfaction. In their studies, Duran (2016) and Uğur (2019) reported no significant difference between individuals’ levels of happiness in terms of the branch variable.

Teachers’ perceptions of organizational happiness differed significantly according to the level of education taught in the subdimensions of management processes and economic provision of the School Happiness Scale. In the economic provision subdimension, this significant difference was in favor of primary school teachers working in primary schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in secondary schools, and in favor of primary school teachers working in primary schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in high schools. In the management processes subdimension, this significant difference was in favor of branch teachers working in secondary schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in secondary schools, and in favor of

branch teachers working in high schools between teachers working in primary schools and teachers working in high schools. In his study, Bulut (2015) reported that teachers working in science high schools were happier than teachers working in vocational high schools. Moçoşoğlu and Kaya (2018) concluded in their study that the organizational happiness scores of teachers working in primary school were higher than those of teachers working in secondary school, which was shown to result from the long time spent with the same students by primary school teachers, and thus, the creation of a warmer atmosphere. Furthermore, as is stated, the fact that primary school teachers had their own classrooms might have affected their happiness by leading to a more intense sense of belonging and owning. Bekil (2019) and Uğur (2019), on the other hand, expressed that the type of the school where teachers worked did not have any impact on happiness.

Based on these results, the following recommendations can be made:

This study was conducted to determine teachers' levels of organizational happiness perception. It could not adequately reveal what situations organizational happiness is experienced in and what the expectations related to the organization are. For this reason, studies can be carried out by interviewing teachers, in a mixed design, including their answers to these questions and allowing for a more extensive and detailed description of the current situation. Researchers can investigate the relationship between leadership styles and organizational happiness.

Acknowledgment

This article was previously presented as a paper in 3rd International Social, Human and Educational Sciences Congress, on 17-18 December 2018, in Istanbul, Turkey.

References

- Akduman, G., & Yüksekbilgili, Z. (2015). *İnsan kaynaklarında yeni bir vizyon mutluluk yönetimi*. Türkmen Kitapevi.
- Akın, H. B., & Şentürk, E. (2012). Bireylerin mutluluk düzeylerinin ordinal lojistik regresyon analizi ile incelenmesi. *Öneri*, 10(37), 183–193. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/maruoneri/issue/17895/187695>
- Akyol, Y. E. (2016). *Akademisyenlerde mutluluğun yordayıcıları olarak farkındalık ve stresle başa çıkma tutumları*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Arslan, Y. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin farklılıkların yönetimi yaklaşımlarına ilişkin algıları ile örgütsel mutluluk algıları arasındaki ilişki*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Kocaeli Üniversitesi.
- Atay, B. (2012). *Happiness in east europe in comparison with Turkey*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.
- Aydemir, R. E. (2008). *Dindarlık ve mutluluk ilişkisi* (İlk yetişkinlik dönemi). Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi.
- Bekil, M. (2019). *Öğretmenlerde mutluluğun yordayıcıları olarak sosyal bağlılık, özgecilik ve sosyal empati*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi.
- Birdoğan-Kuvvet, A. (2019). *Okul müdürlerinin öğretim liderlikleri ile sınıf öğretmenlerinin örgütsel mutlulukları arasındaki ilişki*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Bryson, A., Forth, J., & Stokes, L. (2015). *Does worker wellbeing affect workplace performance* (pp. 1–37). Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/p/iza/izadps/dp9096.html>
- Bulut, A. (2015). *Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel mutluluk algılarının incelenmesi: bir norm çalışması*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Gaziantep Üniversitesi.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Pegem Akademi.
- Çetin, S. (2019). *Ortaokul öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algı düzeyleri ile örgütsel mutluluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Kocaeli Üniversitesi.
- Çetin, S., & Polat, S. (2019). *Ortaokul öğretmenlerinin örgütsel mutluluk algılarının analizi* (p. 14). Uluslararası Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi Tam Metin Bildiri Kitabı, Ankara.
- Çirkin, Z., & Göksel, T. (2016). Mutluluk ve gelir. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 71(2), 375–400. https://doi.org/10.1501/SBFder_0000002397
- Çolak, E. (2018). *Sosyal Fayda Projelerinde Gönüllü Çalışan Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Mutluluk ve Psikolojik Yardım Aramaya Gönüllülük Düzeylerinin Değerlendirilmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Beykent

Üniversitesi.

- Demir, R. (2017). *Öğretmen adaylarının mutluluk, iyimserlik, yaşam anlamı ve yaşam doyumlarının incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gaziantep Üniversitesi. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.347656>
- Demir, R., & Murat, M. (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının mutluluk, iyimserlik, yaşam anlamı ve yaşam doyumlarının incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(7), 3. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.347656>
- Demircan, T. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri ile örgütsel mutlulukları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Uşak Üniversitesi.
- Demirel, C. (2018). *Yetişkinlerde bağlanma stillerinin mutluluk yaşam doyum ve depresyon ile ilişkisinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Işık Üniversitesi.
- Duman, S. (2014). *Öğretmen adaylarında özgünlük ve öz-duyarlılığın mutluluk ile ilişkisinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi.
- Duran, A. (2016). *Okul yöneticilerinin mutluluk düzeylerinin öz yeterlilikleriyle ilişkisi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi.
- Düzgün, O. (2016). *Ortaokulda görev yapmakta olan öğretmenlerin mutluluk düzeyleri ile sınıf yönetimi becerileri arasındaki ilişki*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi.
- Eckhaus E. (2018) Measurement of organizational happiness. In J. Kantola, T. Barath & S. Nazir (Eds.), *Advances in Human Factors, Business Management and Leadership* (AHFE 2017, Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, vol. 594). Springer, Cham
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (2003). *Unmasking the face*. Malor Books.
- Erdoğan, H. (2017). *Ortaokul yöneticilerinin öğretim liderliği ile öğretmenlerin iş doyumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi.
- Eryılmaz, A., & Ercan, L. (2011). Öznel iyi oluşun cinsiyet, yaş grupları ve kişilik özellikleri açısından incelenmesi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 4(36), 139–151. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tpdrd/issue/21456/229650>
- Fisher, C. D. (2010). Happiness at work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(4), 384–412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00270.x>
- Franklin, S. S. (2010). *The Psychology of Happiness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gavin, J. H., & Mason, R. O. (2004). The virtuous organization: The value of happiness in the workplace. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(4), 379–392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.09.005>
- Göral, Ş. (2013). *İnternet ortamında geçirilen boş zamanın üniversite öğrencilerinin mutluluk ve yaşam doyum değerlerine etkisi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Gülcan, A. (2014). *Genç yetişkinlerde iyimserliğin mutluluk ve yaşam doyum üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Fatih Üniversitesi.
- Hills, P., & Argyle, M. (2002). The oxford happiness questionnaire: Acompact scale for the measurement of psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33(7), 1073–1082. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(01\)00213-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00213-6)
- Huang, H. (2016). *Workplace happiness: organizational role and the reliability of self-reporting*. Unpublished Master's thesis. University of Maryland. Retrieved from https://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/handle/1903/18191/Huang_umd_0117N_16920.pdf?sequence=1
- Juul, L. K. (2018). *Organizational happiness*. ClearSight Publishing.
- Kabal, D. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin yaşam boyu öğrenme eğilimleri ve mutluluk düzeyleri üzerine bir çalışma (Kocaeli örneği)*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi.
- Kangal, A. (2013). Mutluluk üzerine kavramsal bir değerlendirme ve Türk hane halkı için bazı sonuçlar. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(44), 214–233.
- Korkut, A. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel mutluluk, örgütsel sinizm ve örgütsel adalet algularının analizi*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. İnönü Üniversitesi.
- Kurnaz, M. (2015). *İlk yetişkinlerde dini yönelim-mutluluk ilişkisi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi.

- Moçoşoğlu, B., & Kaya, A. (2018). Okul yöneticileri ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizlik ile örgütsel mutluluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki: Şanlıurfa ili örneği. *Harran Education Journal*, 3(1), 52–70. <https://doi.org/10.22596/2018.0301.52.70>
- Omar, M. K., Ramdani, N. F. S. M., Mohd, I. H., & Hussein, N. (2018). Organizational happiness index (OHI): A study of a public university in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(11), 1984–1994. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i11/5562>
- Öğüt, N. (2018). *Kültürlerarası duyarlılık düzeyi ile etkin merkezilik, yaşam doyumu ve mutluluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Selçuk Üniversitesi.
- Özdemir, D. M., & Kış, A. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin mutluluk düzeylerinin incelenmesi: Gaziantep İli örneği*. 14. Uluslararası Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi Tam Metin Bildiri Kitabı, 2–4 Mayıs 2019, Ankara. Retrieved from <https://www.pegem.net/dosyalar/dokuman/ICES-UEBK-TamMetin.pdf>
- Özgen, M. K. (2005). *Farabî'nin mutluluk anlayışı*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Erciyes Üniversitesi.
- Özgenel, M., & Bozkurt, B. (2020). Okul mutluluğunu yordayan bir faktör: Öğretmenlerin politik becerileri. *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies*, 7(2), 130–149. <https://doi.org/10.33907/turkjes.701230>
- Öztaş, İ. (2018). *Farklı kurumlarda çalışan memurların serbest zaman doyum ve mutluluk düzeylerinin belirlenmesi* (Kırıkkale ili örneği). Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen Üniversitesi.
- Öztürk, A. (2015). Öğretmenlerin sahip oldukları yaşam amaçları ve sosyal desteğin öznel iyi oluş üzerindeki yordayıcı rolü. *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 338–347. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/goputeb/issue/34517/385026>
- Pryce-Jones, J. (2011). *Happiness at work. Maximizing Your Psychological Capital for Success*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Sancak, T. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin okullardaki mekân düzenlemelerine ilişkin memnuniyetleri ile mutlulukları ve örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi.
- Saygın, Y. (2008). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal destek, benlik saygısı ve öznel iyi oluş düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Selçuk Üniversitesi.
- Selim, S. (2008). Türkiye’de Bireysel mutluluk kaynağı olan değerler üzerine bir analiz: multinomial logit model. *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17, 345–358. <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/50493>
- Serter, K. (2019). *Yerel yönetimler ve gençlik hizmetleri spor müdürlüğü'nde görev yapan spor yöneticilerinin duygusal zekâ düzeyleri ile mutlulukları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Marmara Üniversitesi. <https://doi.org/10.35333/ERISS.2019.91>
- Sevindik, D. (2015). *Orta yaş bireylerde dindarlık-mutluluk ilişkisi: Denizli örneği*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi.
- Sönmez, M. (2016). *İletişim ve mutluluk ilişkisi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Stoia, E. (2015). *Happiness and well-being at work*. Literature Review. Retrieved from http://repositori.uji.es/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10234/161807/TFG_2015_StoiaE.pdf?sequence=1
- Şahin, G. N. (2011). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin kendini açma, öznel iyi oluş ve algıladıkları sosyal destek düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi.
- Şahin, Y. (2015). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin mutluluk, iyimserlik ve özgecilik düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi.
- Şaşmaz, Ş. C. (2016). *Çocuğu olan evli ve evli olmayan bireylerin psikolojik sağlamlık ve mutluluk düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Beykent Üniversitesi.
- Şengül, M., & Demirel, A. (2016). Türkçe öğretmenlerinin duygu dışavurum tarzları üzerine bir inceleme. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13(34), 116–133. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/22644>
- Şentürk, E. (2011). *Mutluluk düzeyinin sosyo-demografik özelliklerle lojistik regresyon analizi aracılığıyla incelenmesi ve Türkiye için bir uygulama*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Marmara Üniversitesi.
- TDK, Türk Dil Kurumu. (2020, February 3). *Büyük Türkçe sözlük: Güncel Türkçe sözlük*. Retrieved from http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_gts&view=gts

- Tingaz, E. O. (2013). *Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenliği ile bazı öğretmen adaylarının duygusal zekâ ve mutluluklarının karşılaştırılması*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Tingaz, E. O., & Hazar, M. (2014). Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenliği ile bazı öğretmen adaylarının duygusal zekâ ve mutluluklarının karşılaştırılması. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, 2(1), 745–756. <https://doi.org/10.14486/IJSCS144>
- Topuz, C. (2013). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde özgeciliğin öznel iyi oluş ve psikolojik iyi oluş ile ilişkisinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Fatih Üniversitesi.
- Turan, N. (2018). Çalışma mutluluğu: Kavram ve kapsam. *Uludağ Journal of Economy and Society/B.U.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 37(1), 169–212. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/38544545/%C3%87al%C4%B1%C5%9Fma_Mutlulu%C4%9Fu_Kavram_ve_Kapsam
- Türkben, Y. (2010). Descartes' in ahlak ve mutluluk anlayışı. *Hikmet Yurdu*, 3(5), 239–250.
- Uğur, S. (2019). *Öğrenen okul ile okul mutluluğu arasındaki ilişki*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi.
- Veenhoven, R. (2008). Healthy happiness: Effects of happiness on physical health and the consequences for preventive health care. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(3), 449–469. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9042-1>
- Yazıcı Ö. F. (2015). *Beden eğitimi öğretmeni adaylarının mutluluk ve zindelik düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi.
- Yıldız-Akyol, E. (2016). *Akademisyenlerde mutluluğun yordayıcıları olarak farkındalık ve stresle başa çıkma tutumları*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Yılmaz, Ö. (2019). *Farklı okul türlerinde görev yapan öğretmenlerin spiritüel iyi oluş düzeyleri ile mutluluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi.
- Yüksekbilgili, Z., & Akduman, G. (2016). Bireysel mutluluk ve işkoliklik ilişkisi. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 31, 95–112. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/kosbed/issue/25688/271103>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author, with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).