Study of Variables Predicting Teachers' Organizational Happiness Levels with Ordinal Logistical Regression Analysis

Mehmet Sabir Çevik [i]
National Ministry of Education

Methi Çelik [ii]
National Ministry of Education

Abstract

This study aims to determine the variables that predict teachers' organizational happiness levels. The study is quantitative in the predictive correlational type, which is one of the general screening models. The data of the study were analysed with ordinal logistic regression. The sample group of the study consists of 605 teachers working in pre-school, primary, secondary and high schools in Çankaya district of Ankara province with the stratified sampling method. "Organizational Happiness Scale" and "Empowering Leadership Scale" were used as assessment tools in the study. The organizational happiness level of teachers, which is the dependent variable of the study, was defined as a three-category variable in the form of low, medium and high with the K-means clustering algorithm. In the study, it was determined that only marital status, socio-economic level of the school and empowering leadership behaviours predicted teachers' organizational happiness levels significantly. The order of importance regarding the predictive level of the predictor variables, from the largest to the smallest, is the school with a high socio-economic level, the school with a medium level of empowering leadership behaviours, marital status and socio-economic level. Based on the results obtained, various suggestions have been made in the research to improve the socio-economic environment of schools as educational organizations and to support the behaviour of school administrators to empower teachers.

----

[i] **Mehmet Sabir Çevik,** Dr., Siirt City Centre Yunus Emre Primary School, National Ministry of Education, ORCID: 0000-0002-8817-4747

Correspondence: sahici1980@gmail.com

[ii] **Methi Çelik, Dr.,** Çankaya District Directorate of National Education, National Ministry of Education, ORCID: 0000-0003-3806-4985

INTRODUCTION

Organizations need many material and moral resources in their life cycle. While the main material resources in organizations are equipment and materials; the main element of moral resources is human. The fact that organizations consist of people has made the human element more important in organizational processes. The human element, unlike other elements, contains negative emotions such as "hopelessness, pessimism, intolerance and selfishness", as well as positive emotions such as "sacrifice, love, respect, honesty and helpfulness". Well-being in the individual sense is one of the positive emotions that come to the fore due to the concept, content and characteristics of the concept expressed as "organizational happiness" in relation to the organization. As a matter of fact, Frey and Stutzer (2013) draw attention to the general happiness level of individuals in organizational happiness, Chaiprasit and Santidhiraku (2011) to the network of relations between employees, Paschoal and Tamayo (2008) to the self-realization of organizational members, Warr (2011) to the feeling of satisfaction in individuals, Arslan (2018) to the emergence of personal potential, while Bessant and Tidd (2007) to the concept of organizational happiness by associating it with increased productivity. Therefore, the issue of organizational happiness is among the current issues in terms of organizational efficiency and effectiveness (Robertson and Cooper, 2011).

One of the questions that organizations are trying to find answers is how to make employees happier. This is because organizational happiness allows employees to perform better and is a key to organizational effectiveness (Nelson and Knight, 2010; Wright, Bonett and Sweeney, 1993). In other words, members of the organization want to work in organizations where they are happy and provided with good conditions (Gavin and Mason, 2004). Therefore, various studies can be mentioned to determine the variables or factors that affect the organizational happiness of individuals. In the light of the data obtained within the framework of the research findings, it is claimed that organizational decisions and practices (Fisher, 2010), organizational trust and commitment (Pryce Jones, 2010), life satisfaction (Walker and Schimmack, 2008), attitude towards work (Salas-Vallina, López-Cabrales, Alegre and Fernández, 2017), organizational virtue (Ozen, 2018), organizational socialization (Tosten, Avci and Sahin, 2017), stress (Lapierre and Allen, 2006), labour demands (Macky and Boxall, 2008), organizational justice (Greenberg and Colttqui, 2005; Ledford, 1999) are effective on organizational happiness. Some studies report that many demographic factors such as economic, social, personality and cognitive factors are effective in the formation and development of organizational happiness (Macleod, Coates and Hetherton, 2008; Savi, 2010; January, 2010). De Jonge and Schaufeli (1998) and Eckhaus (2018) state that besides demographic variables, one of the main antecedents of organizational happiness is the leadership style depicted by organizational managers. Özgenel and Canulansı (2021), on the other hand, see organizational happiness as one of the issues that leaders should care about the most because it increases work efficiency. Therefore, it can be said that one of the basic antecedents of organizational happiness levels of organizational members in general, and of teachers working in educational organizations in particular, is the "empowering leadership" style as a type of leadership expected from school administrators as well as demographic variables.

Empowering leaders enable the employees to realize their own potential, focus on the development of leadership characteristics by assigning appropriate duties and responsibilities to the employees (Pearce and Sims, 2002; Sims, Faraj and Yun, 2009). Empowering leadership practices involve the common sharing of power by providing the necessary organizational support to employees (Amundsen and Martinsen, 2014). Empowering leadership behaviours pave the way for the establishment of positive attitudes and behaviours among the employees of the organization, preventing bureaucratic restrictions within the organization and increasing the feelings of trust of the employees. Moreover, empowering leadership behaviours also help organizational employees to make sense of their work (Ahearne, Mathieu, & Rapp, 2005; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). The literature shows that empowering leadership behaviours exhibited both in educational organizations and in other organizations outside of educational organizations have positive effects on positive organizational outcomes such as "organizational justice, school effectiveness, organizational citizenship, job performance, job satisfaction, psychological contract, organizational commitment and organizational trust" (Argon, 2014; Bolat, Bolat and Seymen, 2009; Çelik and Konan, 2020; Dijke, Cremer, Mayer

and Quaquebeke, 2012; Gümüş, 2013; Günbayı, Dağlı and Kalkan, 2013; Hassan, Glenn, Mahsud, Yukl and Prussia , 2013;Kıral, 2020; Koçak and Burgaz, 2017; Somech, 2005; Sweetland and Hoy, 2000; Vecchio, Justin and Pearce, 2010). When all these research studies are reviewed, it can be concluded that empowering leadership behaviours can have an impact on teachers' organizational happiness levels as a positive organizational variable.

The main building blocks of educational organizations are teachers. The fact that teachers feel happy in the schools where they work can contribute to being more beneficial to their students and those around them. In other words, a happy teacher can make extra efforts for the school by acting in accordance with the purpose and vision of the school (Bulut & Demirhan, 2020). School happiness can be determinant in terms of teachers' socio-emotional development (Talebzadeh & Samkan, 2011), quality of educational organizations (Karnak, 2020) and academic success (Bulut, 2015). On the other hand, organizational happiness of teachers is also necessary for learning-teaching processes and classroom practices (Uzun & Kesicioğlu, 2019). According to Bogler (2001), the decisions and practices of school administrators in the management processes and their attitudes or behaviours towards teachers can ensure the organizational happiness of teachers. Bird and Markle (2012) point out that happy teachers and happy schools provide life satisfaction in teachers and create healthy communication channels with colleagues and parents. In a nutshell, the happiness of teachers can be considered as a very important factor in the education process. In light of this information, it can be said that the most important output of a school with happy and productive teachers will be healthy, productive and happy individuals who will create a good society (Gavin and Mason, 2004). In the literature, there is no research finding that examines the effects of demographic variables and empowering leadership behaviours on teachers' organizational happiness levels. Therefore, it is thought that determining the effects of various demographic and organizational variables on teachers' organizational happiness levels will contribute to the field. It is because studies examining the effects of many variables on teachers' organizational happiness can contribute to the production of more valid information. Current study is also thought to be important because it reveals demographic variables, as well as whether the empowering leadership behaviours of school administrators have an impact on teachers' organizational happiness levels. Accordingly, the study aims to determine whether some demographic variables and empowering leadership behaviours significantly reduce teachers' organizational happiness levels.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Organizational Happiness

The concept of happiness means that individuals experience more positive emotions than negative emotions and have higher levels of satisfaction with life (Fisher, 2010). The concept of happiness, which corresponds to the concept of well-being, can also be defined as the emotional, psychological, social and personal satisfaction of individuals (Snyder and Lopez, 2006). The concept of organizational happiness is that employees in organizational life experience positive emotions more intensely or more often (Brief and Weiss, 2002). According to Daniels (2000), organizational happiness is the sum of all emotions experienced in the organization. Weserat, Sharif and Majid (2015) use the concept of organizational happiness in terms of the level of satisfaction of employees in business life. Similarly, Bakker and Demerouti (2013) define organizational happiness as the level of satisfaction of the work of employees and the tasks they carry out within the organization. In fact, it can be understood that the explanations and definitions about organizational happiness in the literature indicate the positive feelings of the members of the organization towards the job they work, the positive general opinion about their profession and their organization, and the state of satisfaction towards the organization that they are happy to be an employee of.

Warr (2007) examines organizational happiness under the headings of "positive emotions, negative emotions and realization of potential" in order to better understand it as a whole. Positive emotions; includes positive emotions such as pleasure, joy, satisfaction, contentment and happiness (Frey and Stutzer, 2001). Positive emotions are important for employees to be energetic in the

workplace and to perform their work with joy and happiness. It is because individuals with positive feelings can enjoy their work and life more (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996). The extent of negative emotions refers to feelings such as inability to be happy, hatred, lovelessness, anger, doubt and pessimism (Bulut, 2015). Negative emotions can cause dissatisfaction, sadness and anxiety in employees (Warr, 2007). Another dimension of organizational happiness, the realization of potential is related to the cognitive aspects of the individual. Realization of potential is when employees perform according to their abilities and use their potential in jobs they enjoy (Golparvar and Abedini, 2014). According to Paschoal and Tamayo (2008), the more appropriate work an individual does according to their own competencies, the happier they will be, and happiness is proportional to individuals' ability to use their own potential. Therefore, it can be said that the positive feelings dimension of organizational happiness corresponds to the desired feelings in the employees, the negative feelings dimension corresponds to the dissatisfied feelings, and the dimension of realization of the potential corresponds to acting according to the potential.

Organizational happiness is a highly determining variable in achieving organizational goals. In other words, the organizational performance of happy individuals is greater than that of unhappy individuals, and happy individuals identify more with their work (Wesarat, Sharif and Majid, 2015). Individuals who can identify with their work show the ability to act both energetically and dynamically in the workplace (Kjerulf, 2015). According to Arslan and Polat (2017), the fact that the positive emotions of the employees are more dominant than the negative emotions in organizational life can benefit organizations in different ways. For example, while creativity and organizational effectiveness are high in organizations with happy employees; lower rates of indifference and absenteeism (Helliwell, Layard and Sachs, 2013). In addition, (Frey & Stutzer, 2001; Gavin & Mason, 2004) organizations that want to achieve organizational happiness are expected to share work according to their employees' capacities and potential. It is because success is achieved in organizations with happy employees in a shorter time, and all employees can easily come together in the face of difficulties and show the ability to act together.

Empowering Leadership

The increasing acceleration of international competition, entrepreneurship and creativity on a global scale has paved the way for the emergence of new concepts in management and business (Koçel, 2001). The concept of empowerment has become one of these concepts and while becoming one of the indispensable issues for organizations over time (Appelbaum and Honeggar, 1998). Empowerment provides the employees of the organization with the opportunity to take their own actions and decisions (Erstad, 1997). Shah and Ward (2003) define empowerment as practices that lead to the continuous improvement of all aspects of organizational employees. The concept of "empowering leadership" was tried to be explained by the researchers in line with the meanings loaded into the concept of empowerment. For instance; Lee, Willis, and Tian (2017) define "empowering leadership" as the behaviour exhibited to support and empower subordinates; Ahearne, Mathieu, and Rapp (2005) define it as a practice that encourages autonomy in work environments by providing trust among employees; İmamoğlu and Turan (2019) define it as sharing the management power with the employees; Pearce, Conger and Locke (2008) define it as the development of leadership skills of employees by giving responsibility and authority; Vu (2020) define it as the exercise and transfer of legitimate power to subordinates. It can be said that the common point of the definitions of empowering leadership is to share the authority and responsibility with the subordinates and to ensure the autonomy of the members of the organization. Under the classification of empowerment leadership by Konczak, Stelly and Trusty (2000), responsibility, independent decision-making, information sharing, authorisation, coaching and skills development for innovative performance stand out. Responsibility is expressed as obligations to fulfil the duties undertaken by the employees of the organization (Cevahir, 2004). Independent decision making is when employees have the authority to make decisions without the approval of a senior organization manager (Brower, 1995). Information sharing is the ability of organizational employees to access the information they need without any restrictions (Konczak et al., 2000). Authorisation is the opportunity provided to the employees of the organization for the realization of a job (Steel and Konan, 2020). Coaching for innovative

performance is supporting the professional development of organizational members in various ways (McConnell, 1994). Skills development is that organization managers provide appropriate conditions and opportunities to improve the skills of employees (Konczak et al., 2000). It can be concluded that all these classifications are aimed at supporting all aspects of employees and ensuring appropriate conditions in organizational life.

Empowering leadership behaviours in organizations are considered to be important because they provide positive individual and organizational results (Zhang and Bartol, 2010). In the literature, it has been determined that empowering leadership behaviours are effective on variables such as organizational justice (Dijke et al., 2012), job satisfaction (Bixby, 2016); Dağlı & Kalkan, 2021), self-efficacy (Ahearne et al., 2005; Dağlı & Kalkan, 2021), organizational commitment (Cevahir, 2004; Gümüş, 2013; Konczak et al., 2000), information sharing (Srivastava, Bartol & Locke, 2006), psychological contract (Koçak & Burgaz, 2017), psychological empowerment (Arslantaş, 2007), organizational citizenship (Zhu, 2011) and organizational performance (Somech, 2005; Şama & Kolamaz, 2011). In the context of educational organizations, there are studies showing that empowering leadership behaviours are effective on school effectiveness, teacher motivation, academic success, professional burnout, job satisfaction, school climate, organizational citizenship and organizational commitment (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Çelik & Konan, 2020; Davis & Wilson, 2000; Kaya & Altınkurt, 2018; Lee & Nie, 2015; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000; Yangaiya & Magaji, 2015). It can be considered that empowering leadership style in educational organizations is an important factor that can predict teachers' organizational happiness levels.

This study aims to determine the variables that predict teachers' organizational happiness levels. In line with this main objective, answers will be sought to the following questions.

1. Does gender, marital status, education level, type of school, professional seniority, duration of service at the school, age, education background, branch, socio-economic level of the school (SED), type of employment, number of teachers at school, whether they have received professional or personal development seminars in the last 6 months, and empowering leadership variable significantly predict the probability of teachers' happiness levels falling into lower or higher categories?

2. What is the order of importance of the predictive variables regarding the level of prediction?

METHOD

Research model

The study is quantitative in the predictive correlational type, which is one of the general screening models. Predictive correlation type studies are studies that examine whether a variable predicts another variable based on the relationships between variables (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz and Demirel, 2012; Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). In the study, ordinal logistic regression analysis of the predictor variables, which allows to explain the predicted variable, was used within the framework of the predictive correlational model. Ordinal logistic regression analysis is logistic regression analysis used since the predicted variable is categorical and ordinal (Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In this context, the predictor variables such as gender, marital status, education level, school type, educational status, branch, socio-economic level (SED) of the school, type of employment, whether or not to take a personal or professional development seminar were included in the analysis as discrete variables; and professional seniority, length of service at school, age, number of teachers at school, and empowering leadership variables were analysed as continuous variables. The dependent variable of teachers' organizational happiness level was defined in the study as a three-category variable as low, medium and high by the K-means clustering algorithm.

Population and sample

The population of the research consists of 7617 teachers working in preschool, primary, secondary and high schools in Ankara province Çankaya district in 2021-2022 education year. The sample of the study was determined by *the stratified random sampling method*, which is one of the probability sampling methods. Stratified random sampling method is the inclusion of all groups in the population in the sampling with their ratios in the population (Neuman & Robson, 2014). The reason for choosing the stratified random sampling method in the research is to ensure that all groups in the population are represented in the sample. The sample size was also determined by using the sample sizes table. Accordingly, it was determined that the population of 7617 teachers could be represented by 366 teachers at 5% sampling error and α=.05 significance level (Rea ve Parker, 1997). In determining the layer weight, the number of teachers working in different education levels (preschool, primary school, secondary school and high school) in Ankara province Çankaya district was taken into consideration. In this context, the layer weight of the study was calculated as 366/7617=0.0480. Table 1 contains the population by layer weight and the number of teachers in the sample.

Table 1. The Number of Teachers in The Population and Sample of The Study

Levels of Teaching	Universe Number of Teacher	Number of Teachers Required to Sampling by Layer Weight	Sample Number of Teacher
Pre school	156	8	63
Primary School	1720	82	134
Secondary School	2448	118	210
High School	3293	158	198
Total	7617	366	605

*The number of participants that should be in the sample was determined according to the 0.0480 layer weight.

As can be seen in Table 1, the number of sample participants of the study should be 366. However, in order to increase the generalizability of the research, the scale was distributed to 655 teachers. Of the scales distributed, 605 were found to be suitable for analysis. Accordingly, it is seen that the sample size of 605 people is quite sufficient in terms of layer weight. Other information about the research is provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Information on The Study (n=605)

Variant	Category	n (%)	$\overline{X}$	Ss	Median
Gender	Female	476 (78.7)			1.00
	Male	129 (21.3)			
Marital Status	Married	510 (84.3)			1.00
	Single	60 (9.9)			
	Divorced	35 (5.8)			
Teaching Grade (Level)	Pre school	63 (10.4)			3.00
	Primary School	134 (22.1)			
	Secondary School	210 (34.7)			
	High school	198 (32.7)			
Type of School	Formal	590 (97.5)			1.00
	Private	15 (2.5)			
Education Background	Bachelor's Degree	483 (79.8)			1.00
	Postgraduate	122 (20.2)			
Department	Pre-school	61 (10.1)			3.00
	Elemantary School Teacher	112 (18.5)			
	Branch Teacher	432 (71.4)			
Socio-Economic Level of the School (SELS)	Low	83 (13.7)			2.00
	Medium	431 (71.2)			
	High	91 (15.0)			
Type of Employment	Tenured	583 (96.4)			1.00
	Contract	22 (3.6)			
Status of Taking Professional or Personal Seminars in the Last 6 Months	I got it	480 (79.3)			1.00
	No	125 (20.7)			

Professional Seniority	20.98	8.73	22.00
Duration of Teaching at the School	6.58	5.13	5.00
Age	45.54	8.41	47.00
Number of Teachers	43.00	19.69	44.00
Empowering Leadership	3.46	.77	3.58

[*]IQR: Interquartile Range

As table 2 shows, it has been determined that while 476 (78.7%) of teachers are female and 129 (21.3%) are male; 510 (84.3%) are married, 60 (9.9%) are single and 35 (5.8%) are divorced; 63 (10.4%) are preschool, 134 (22.1%) are in elementary schools, 210 (34.7%) are in secondary schools and 198 (32.7%) are in high school; 590 (97.5%) are employed in state and 15 (2.5%) are in private education institutions; 483 (79.8%) undergraduates and 122 (20.2%) graduates; 61 (10.1%) are preschool teachers, 112 (18.5%) are classroom teachers, and 432 (71.4%) are branch teachers; 83 (13.7%) are in low socio-economic school, 431 (71.2%) are in medium-level schools and 91 (15%) are in high socio-economic level schools; 583 (96.4%) permanent teachers and 22 (3.6%) contract teachers; 480 (79.3%) of them received professional or personal seminars in the last 6 months, 125 (20.7%) of them did not receive professional or personal seminars in the last 6 months. In addition, the average professional seniority of the teachers was calculated as 20.98 (Sd=8.73, Median=22.00), and the average of service time at the school where they were assigned was 6.58 (Sd=6.58, Median=5.13), the mean age was 45.54 (Ss=8.41, Median=47.00), the average number of teachers at the school was 43 (Ss=19.69, Median=44.00), and the mean of empowering leadership behaviours was 3.46 (Ss=.77, Median=3.58).

Data Collection Tools

The data of this study were collected through the "Organizational Happiness Index (OHI) and the Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ)". At the front of the scales is the "Personal Information Form" developed by the researchers for the demographic information of the teachers (gender, marital status, teaching level, school type, education status, branch, socio-economic level of the school (SED), form of employment, occupational or personal seminar taking status in the last 6 months, professional seniority, duration of service at the school in charge, age and number of teachers in the school).

Well-Being at Work Scale (WBWS): WBWS was developed by Demo and Paschoal (2013) to measure teachers' organizational happiness levels. Arslan and Polat (2017) adapted this scale from English to Turkish. WBWS consists of 3 dimensional and 29 substances. The "positive emotions" dimension of the scale consists of 9 items (items 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17 and 19), the "negative emotions" dimension of the scale consists of 12 items (items 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20 and 21) and "realizing the potential" consists of 8 items (items 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29) and all items in the "negative emotions" dimension are scored in reverse. While the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the whole scale is .96, which is 5-point Likert type and answered as "(1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Quite, (4) Frequently, and (5) Always"; the reliability coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha was reported as .94 for positive emotions, .95 for negative emotions, and .92 for potential realization. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) results of WBWS were also found to be within statistically appropriate ranges (x2/sd=3.95, RMSEA =.09, SRMR=.061, CFI=.97, GFI=.77, NNFI=.97). (Arslan & Polat, 2017). Within the scope of this study, the reliability and validity study of WBWS was retested. Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was determined as .96 for the whole scale, .95 for positive emotions, .95 for negative emotions, and .93 for potential realization. The CFA results of the scale also confirm the 3-dimensional structure of 29 items (x^2/sd=4.37, RMSEA=.074, SRMR=.053, CFI=.93, TLI=.92) (Byrne, 2010; Hoyle & Panter, 1995; Kline, 2011).

Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ): ELQ was developed by Konczak, Stelly, and Trustyt (2000) to measure the empowering leadership behaviours of managers. Konan and Çelik (2018) adapted the scale into Turkish for educational institutions. The "authorisation" dimension of the ELQ, which consists of 3 dimensions and 17 items, consists of 3 items (items 1, 2 and 3), the "responsibility" dimension consists of 3 items (items 4, 5 and 6) and the "support" dimension consists

of 11 items (items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17). The scale is 5-point Likert-type and is answered as "(1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, (4) Often, and (5) Always". The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the ELQ was determined as .76 in the empowerment dimension, .82 in the responsibility dimension, and .80 in the support dimension of the scale. In addition, the CFA results of the ELQ were found to be within statistically appropriate ranges (x^2/sd=2.54, RMSEA=.054, SRMR=.032, CFI=.95, GFI=.92, NNFI=.98) (Konan & Çelik, 2018). For this study, the reliability and validity study of the ELQ was re-examined. Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .94 in the whole scale, .89 in the empowerment dimension, .75 in the responsibility dimension and .96 in the support dimension. The CFA results of the ELQ for this study also show that the 3-dimensional 17-item structure (x^2/sd=4.82, RMSEA=.079, SRMR=.046, CFI=.96, TLI=.95) was confirmed (Byrne, 2010; Hoyle & Panter, 1995; Kline, 2011).

Data collection and analysis

Face-to-face and online forms were used to collect the research data. Before the assessment tools were filled in, teachers were told about the purpose and content of the research, and participated on a voluntary basis. Teachers were informed that there was no risk factor in any process of the research and that the results to be obtained would be used for scientific purposes. The ethical research principles were followed by declaring to the teachers that they could stop participating in the research at any time.

In the study, 655 scales were distributed to the teachers working in preschool, primary, secondary and high schools according to the layer weight of the study (366/7617=0.0480). In order to make the scale forms ready for analysis, 34 scale data with erroneous or missing data were determined. In the study, it was observed that the missing data showed a random distribution and less than 5%. Therefore, new values were assigned according to the serial averages via the EM expectation maximization algorithm instead of the missing data in the scale. In addition, 16 data of which Z score was not in the range of -3 and +3 were also deleted in the study. Thus, analyses were carried out with 605 scale data.

After the study, data were made available for analysis and the general assumptions of ordinal logistic regression were checked. Accordingly, it was observed that each of the subgroups formed as a result of transforming the organizational happiness variable, which is the dependent variable, into a categorical variable, was of sufficient sample size, there were no missing and extreme values, and the participants were included in only one category. In the study, it was also tested whether there was a multicollinearity problem between the predictor variables. The correlation coefficients between the predictor variables vary between .34 and .88, the VIF values between 1.04 and 2.88, the tolerance values between .35 and .97, and the Durbin-Watson value being 1.29, which means that there is no multicollinearity problem. Since the relationships between the predictor variables are less than .90, VIF values are less than 10, Durbin-Watson values are less than 4, and tolerance values are greater than .20, indicating that there is no multicollinearity problem. These results prove that the assumptions of ordinal regression analysis are met.

The explanatory power of the model established for ordinal regression analysis was interpreted with McFadden, Cox & Snell and Nagelkerke R^2 values. In addition, the dependent variable by teachers' organizational happiness level was defined as a three-category variable as low, medium and high with the K-means clustering algorithm and heterogeneous data were divided into homogeneous sub-sets. Table 3 shows the results of the K-means clustering analysis.

Table 3. K-Means Clustering Analysis Results

Variant	Cluster	n	%	$\overline{X}$	Ss
Predicted Variable	Low	151	25	2.16	.38
(Organizational	Medium	261	43.1	3.79	.33
Happiness)	High	193	31.9	4.21	.35

As seen in Table 3, organizational happiness level, which is the dependent variable, is divided into 3 sets. The number of teachers with low happiness level in the first set was 151 (25%; $\overline{X}$ =2.16; Ss = .38), the number of teachers with moderate happiness level in the second set was 261 (43.1%; $\overline{X}$ =3.79; Ss = .33), and the number of teachers with high happiness level in the third set was 193 (31.9%; $\overline{X}$ =4.21; Ss = .35). Thus, the organizational happiness level of teachers was divided into 3 categories as "low, moderate and high" and included in the model.

All data analyses of the study were performed with Jamovi 2.2.5 statistical package programs and the research findings were interpreted according to the significance levels of .01 and .05.

FINDINGS

Findings on model fit values

Within the scope of ordinal logistic regression analysis in the study, the fit values of the model established in order to determine whether the predictor variables significantly predict the probability of the teachers' happiness level to be in the lower or higher categories are provided in Table 4.

Table 4. Model Fit Values

			General Model Test		
Deviation	AIC	BIC	χ^2	df	p
1150	1192	1284	149	19	< .001

As can be seen in Table 4, according to the initial model established without the dependent variables of the research, the model in which all the dependent variables of the research were included was found to be significant (χ^2 = 149; df=19; p< .001). In other words, adding the dependent variables of the study to the model is significant and the model for the research increases fit.

The results of the Omnibus test, which shows whether each predictor variable is included separately in the initial model and is a significant predictor variable for the dependent variable, are provided in Table 5.

Table 5. Omnibus Test Results Of The Study

Predictive Variables	χ^2	df	p
Gender	0.01893	1	0.891
Marital Status	10.69763	2	0.005[*]
Teaching Grade (Level)	7.62043	3	0.055
Type of School	0.93899	1	0.333
Professional Seniority	0.75720	1	0.384
Duration of Teaching at the School	1.29671	1	0.255
Age	0.00177	1	0.966
Educational Background	0.18510	1	0.667
Department	1.63097	2	0.442
Socio-Economic Level of the School (SELS)	11.74269	2	0.003[*]
Employment	3.98e-4	1	0.984
Number of teachers at School	0.41772	1	0.518
Status of Taking Professional or Personal Seminars in the Last 6 Months	0.66285	1	0.416
Empowering Leadership	88.39922	1	< .001[*]

[*]p<.01

As can be seen in Table 5, when the χ² values obtained for the predictor variables were examined, it was determined that when the predictive variables of marital status (p=0.005<.01), socio-economic level of the school (p=0.003<.01) and empowering leadership (p<.001) were added to the initial model, the intended model differed significantly from the initial model. However, it was found that marital status did not differ significantly from the initial model of the intended model in variables other than the socio-economic level of the school and empowering leadership.

Findings on Pseudo R^2 Values

In the study, pseudo R^2 values, which express the ratio of predictor variables to explain the predicted variable, were also calculated. Pseudo R^2 values represent the variance rate explained in logistic regression analyses, and this means that the research model shows a good fit as these values grow numerically (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). Table 6 shows the pseudo R^2 values.

Table 6. Pseudo R^2 Values

Negelkerke	McFadden	Cox veSnell
.154	.115	.079

As can be seen from Table 6, the predictor variables of the study explain the dependent variable at a rate of 15.4% according to Negelkerke's R^2, 11.5% according to McFadden's R^2, and 7.9% according to CoxveSnell's R^2. Accordingly, the rate of explaining the dependent variable of the predictor variables varies between 7.9% and 15.4%.

Findings on The Parameters of The Research Model

The findings of the ordinal regression analysis of the predictor variables regarding the organizational happiness level of teachers are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Ordinal Regression Analysis Findings On Model Parameters

Predictor variables / Thresholds	B	SE	Z	p	Exp(B) Odds Oranı	95% Confidence Interval Lower	Upper
Low-Medium	2.72	0.771	3.53	< .001*	15.2		
medium-high	4.98	0.792	6.29	< .001*	145.2		
Gender:							
male –female	0.02839	0.20679	0.1373	0.891	1.029	0.6860	1.54
Marital Status							
Single – Married**	0.85010	0.28192	3.0154	0.003*	2.340	1.3547	4.10
Divorced – Married	0.50020	0.34555	1.4476	0.148	1.649	0.8414	3.28
Level of Teaching:							
Primary– Pre School	0.77856	1.00286	0.7763	0.438	2.178	0.2992	17.00
Secondary– Pre School	0.66051	0.96428	0.6850	0.493	1.936	0.2817	13.90
High School – Pre school	0.15775	0.96819	0.1629	0.871	1.171	0.1691	8.47
Type of School:							
Private – Formal/Government	-0.60454	0.62716	-0.9639	0.335	0.546	0.1562	1.85
Proffesional Seniority	0.01831	0.02099	0.8721	0.383	1.018	0.9771	1.06
Teaching Period at School/ Length	-0.01947	0.01710	-1.1387	0.255	0.981	0.9483	1.01
Age	9.17e-4	0.02138	0.0429	0.966	1.001	0.9600	1.04
Educational Background							
Post -graduate – Bachelor's Degree	0.09143	0.21247	0.4303	0.667	1.096	0.7225	1.66
Department/Branch:							

Elementary School Teacher. – Pre School Teacher.	-1.22608	1.03498	-1.1846	0.236	0.293	0.0353	2.26
in field teacher. – pre school teacher	-0.84867	0.96546	-0.8790	0.379	0.428	0.0593	2.93
Socio-Economic Level of the School (SED):							
Medium – low**	0.61868	0.24198	2.5567	0.011*	1.856	1.1571	2.99
high – low	1.08223	0.32142	3.3670	< .001*	2.951	1.5769	5.57
Employment :							
Contract – tenured	0.00947	0.47336	0.0200	0.984	1.010	0.3983	2.56
Number of teachers at school	-0.00358	0.00553	-0.6462	0.518	0.996	0.9857	1.01
Status of receiving seminars							
No – Yes I got it	-0.16426	0.20179	-0.8140	0.416	0.849	0.5709	1.26
Empowering Leadership	1.04066	0.11624	8.9530	< .001*	2.831	2.2614	3.57

*p< .05; **Reference Category; SE: Standard Error

As seen in Table 7, only marital status (p< .05), socio-economic level of the school (p< .05) and empowering leadership behaviours (p< .05) were found to be significant predictors of teachers' organizational happiness levels. It was determined that gender (p> .05), education level (p> .05), school type (p> .05), professional seniority (p> .05), duration of service at school (p> .05), age (p> .05), educational status (p> .05), branch (p> .05), type of employment (p> .05), number of teachers at school (p> .05) and status of receiving seminars (p> .05) were not significant predictors of teachers' organizational happiness levels.

Based on the odds ratio values reported in Table 7, single teachers are 2.340 times more likely to have a high level of organizational happiness than male teachers; the probability of teachers with a medium socio-economic level of school to be at a high level of organizational happiness is 1.856 times more than teachers with a lower socio-economic level, it is 2.951 times more likely that teachers with a high socio-economic level of school will have a high level of organizational happiness than teachers with a low socio-economic school. In the empowering leadership variable, a one-unit increase increases the likelihood of teachers' organizational happiness to be at a high level 2.831 times.

The change rate in the dependent variable in Table 7 can also be expressed as a percentage (%). In this context, the percentage change in the dependent variable can be interpreted using the formula [(Exp (B) -1) x 100] (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk, 2021). Therefore, as can be seen from Table 7, it was determined that the probability of single teachers' organizational happiness being at a high level increased by 134% compared to male teachers [(2.340-1) x 100=134]; the organizational happiness of the teachers whose school is at the middle socio-economic level increases by 85.6% compared to the teachers whose school is at the low socio-economic level [(1.856-1) x 100=85.6]; the organizational happiness of the teachers whose school is at a high socio-economic level increases by 195.1% compared to the teachers whose school is at a low socio-economic level [(2.951-1) x 100=195.1]; on the other hand, a one-unit increase in the empowering leadership variable increased the probability of teachers' organizational happiness being at a high level [(2.831-1) x 100=183.1] by 183.1%.

When the significance of regression coefficients is examined in Table 7, the order of importance regarding the predictive level of the predictor variables is as follows: school with high socio-economic level from large to small (Odds Ratio=2.951), empowering leadership behaviours (Odds Ratio= 2.831), marital status (Odds Ratio=2.340) and school with medium socio-economic level (Odds Ratio= 1.856).

RESULTS, ARGUMENT AND SUGGESTIONS

This study aims to determine whether marital status, education level, school type, professional seniority, duration of service at the school, age, educational background, branch, socio-economic level (SED) of the school, type of employment, number of teachers at the school, whether or not they have taken a professional or personal development seminar in the last 6 months, and empowering leadership

behaviours are effective on the possibility of teachers' organizational happiness levels to fall into lower or higher categories. In addition, the order of importance regarding the predictive level of predictive variables was also tried to be determined in the study.

Teachers' organizational happiness levels are grouped in three categories as low, medium and high. As a result of the research, it was found that only marital status, school socio-economic level (SED) and school administrators' empowering leadership behaviours had a significant effect on the likelihood of teachers' organizational happiness levels falling into the lower or upper categories. In other words, it was concluded that marital status, school socio-economic level (SED) and other variables other than school administrators' empowering leadership behaviours did not have a decisive effect on the likelihood of teachers' organizational happiness levels falling into the upper or lower categories.

In the study, it was observed that the likelihood of high levels of organizational happiness of single teachers in terms of marital status was significantly higher than that of married teachers. This result can be interpreted as that single teachers feel happier and more peaceful than married teachers in the schools they work in, that they can use their potential more in their professions and that their general satisfaction is higher. The fact that single teachers do not have important responsibilities such as family and children and that single teachers are at a relatively younger age may have had a more significant effect on the level of happiness towards school. In the literature, there are different research results on whether marital status is a determinant variable on organizational happiness. For example, in addition to the studies reporting that marital status has a significant effect on organizational happiness as in this study (Diener, Gohm, Suh & Oshi, 2000; Fritz,Walsh & Lyubomirsky, 2017; Kabal, 2019; Kangal, 2013; Korkut, 2019; Myers, 2000; Sancak, 2019; Segraves, 1982), there are also research results indicating that the marital status does not make a significant difference on organizational happiness (Arslan, 2021; Bayram, 2020; Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004; Bulut, 2020; Düzgün, 2016; Güzel, 2021; Moçoşoğlu & Kaya, 2018; Pazar, 2021; Sancak, 2019; Suhail and Chaudhry, 2004; Uğur, 2019). However, in the significant difference found in the marital status variable in the literature, it was determined that married participants were generally happier than single participants (Diener, Gohm, Suh & Oshi, 2000; Kangal, 2013; Korkut, 2019; Myers, 2000; Sevim, 2021; Stavrova, Fetchenhauer & Schlösser, 2012). Myers (2000) attributes the higher organizational happiness levels of married participants than single participants to the fact that spouses provide social support to each other and motivate each other in the face of adversity, and Korkut (2019) attributes the needs of married couples to love, respect, trust and loyalty. The fact that the present study was conducted in schools may have caused the level of organizational happiness in single teachers to be even higher, contrary to the literature. It is because the teaching profession is a profession that requires sacrifice, attention and extra effort. The fact that single teachers are more inclined to sacrifice, care and extra effort may have increased their level of happiness towards school.

Another important result of the study is that the socio-economic level (SED) of the school has a significant effect on the organizational happiness level of teachers. Accordingly, it was determined that the organizational happiness level of teachers working in secondary and high socio-economic schools was higher than that of teachers working in low socio-economic schools. The socio-economic level of the school is closely related to the socio-economic level of parents and the environment. In other words, the interests of the parents or the environment and the opportunities offered by the school may have made the working conditions of the teachers suitable. It is estimated that appropriate working environments positively affect teachers' organizational happiness. In the literature, it is stated in the research conducted by Özdemir and Kış (2019) that the socio-economic level of the school is effective on the organizational happiness levels of teachers; Aytaş (2021), on the other hand, reports that the socio-economic level of the school is not a determining variable on teachers' organizational happiness levels. Although Özdemir and Kış's (2019) study revealed that the socio-economic level of the school had an effect on teachers' organizational happiness, it is noteworthy that unlike the current research, teachers working in schools with low socio-economic levels have higher levels of organizational happiness. Özdemir and Kış (2019) explain this situation with the sincerity that occurs between teachers in these schools due to the fact that teachers are assigned to schools in environments

where their first appointment places are mostly low in terms of socio-economic level. However, the general socio-economic levels of the school and students are also associated with many positive outcomes, especially academic achievement (Ataş & Karadağ, 2017; Hanushek, 2010; Jehangir, Glas and Berg, 2015; Kim, 2018; OECD, 2011, UNESCO, 2006). Similarly, Frey & Stutzer (2002) and Warr (2017) emphasize the importance of socio-economic level and environmental conditions in ensuring organizational happiness. Therefore, the fact that the socio-economic level of the school is effective on the organizational happiness of teachers in the research means that the study is supported by the literature.

In the study, it was determined that one of the variables that affect the likelihood of teachers' organizational happiness levels being in the upper category is the empowering leadership behaviours of school administrators. Accordingly, the fact that school administrators authorize teachers, support them in solving problems, provide appropriate environments in decision-making, and exhibit supportive behaviours about new ideas may result in an increase in teachers' organizational happiness levels. According to Perace & Sims (2002), empowering leaders enable the development of leadership qualifications in employees by sharing tasks according to their potential. Similarly, Zhang & Bartol (2010) point out that empowering leadership creates positive emotions in organizational employees and facilitates integration with work. In the context of educational organizations, it is stated that empowering leadership is important in the construction of effective schools, academic achievement, positive school climate and teacher motivation (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Çelik & Konan, 2020; Kaya & Altınkurt, 2018; Lee & Nie, 2015; Yangaiya & Magaji, 2015). In addition to the studies in the literature showing that empowering leadership is related to positive organizational outcomes (Dijke, Cremer, Mayer and Quaquebeke, 2012; Gümüş, 2013; Hassan, Glenn, Mahsud, Yukl and Prussia, 2013; Kıral, 2020; Koçak and Burgaz, 2017; Somech, 2005; Sweetland and Hoy, 2000), there are also studies showing that various leadership styles significantly predict organizational happiness (Arslan, 2021; Aytaç, 2021; Cerit, 2010; Eker, 2021; Sevim, 2021; Şahin and Özgenel, 2020). Therefore, it can be seen as an expected result that empowering leadership significantly predicts organizational happiness in teachers. As a matter of fact, the high order of importance regarding the predictive level of empowering leadership in the current research supports this inference.

The present study has some limitations. First of all, the study is limited only to teachers working in Çankaya district of Ankara province. Therefore, the results of the study should be evaluated according to the participant groups with similar characteristics. Another limitation is the inclusion of the organizational happiness scale, which is the dependent variable of the study, in the analysis by taking only the general total, and the evaluation of teachers working in preschool, primary school, secondary school and high school together. Despite these limitations, various suggestions can be made to practitioners and researchers. Married teachers can be provided with conditions in which they can take more initiative in the schools where they work. In order to improve the socio-economic level of schools, social and cultural awareness studies for parents can be organized, and economic investments can be prioritized in low or disadvantaged regions. School administrators can encourage teachers for all activities by considering the suggestions of teachers. School administrators can increase teachers' authority for an empowering school environment. As suggestions for researchers, the research can be repeated with a wider and more comprehensive group of participants. The organizational happiness scale, which is the dependent variable of the study, can also be analysed according to sub-dimensions. Qualitative or mixed method researches can be used to comprehend the results of the study in detail and in a comprehensive manner. It can also be suggested to compare the results obtained by designing the study in a longitudinal manner with the results of cross-sectional research.

CRediT Author Statement: Author 1: Conceptualization and Methodology, Writing-Original draft preparation, Visualization, Investigation, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Writing - Review & Editing, Validation. Author 2: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Resources, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation.

Ethical Statement: The authors followed the all ethical standards and the participants participated in the research freely with full information about what it means for them to take part, and that they gave consent before they took part in the research.

REFERENCES

Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J. E., & Rapp, A. (2005). To empower or not to empower your sales force? An empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behavior on customer satisfaction and performance. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 945-955. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.945

Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, Ø. L. (2014). Empowering leadership: Construct clarification, conceptualization, and validation of a new scale. *Leadership Quarterly, 25*(3), 487-511. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.009

Appelbaum, S. H., & Honeggar, K. (1988). Empowerment: a constrasting overview of organizations in general and nursing in particular an examination of organizational factors, managerial behaviors, job design, and structural power. *Empowerment in Organizations*, *6*(2), 29-50.

Argon, T. (2014). Eğitim kurumlarında insan kaynaklarının desteklenmesi: Yönetici desteğine yönelik öğretmen görüşleri. *International Journal of Human Science, 11*(2), 691-729.

Arslan, N. (2021). *Öğretmenlerin okul müdürlerinin hizmetkâr liderlik davranışlarına ilişkin algıları ile örgütsel mutlulukları arasındaki ilişki*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Siirt Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Siirt.

Arslan, Y. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin farklılıkların yönetimi yaklaşımlarına ilişkin algıları ile örgütsel mutluluk algıları arasındaki ilişki.* (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.

Arslan, Y., & Polat, S. (2017). Adaptation of well-being Work scaletoTurkish. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 23*(4), 603-622. doi: 10.14527/kuey.2017.019

Arslantaş, C. C. (2007). Güçlendirici lider davranışının psikolojik güçlendirme üzerindeki etkisini belirlemeye yönelik görgül bir araştırma. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(2), 227-239.

Ataş, D., & Karadağ, Ö. (2017). An analysis of Turkey's PISA 2015 results using two-level hierarchical linear modelling. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13*(2), 720-727.

Aytaş, M. S. (2021). *Öğretmen algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel mutluluk algıları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Şanlıurfa örneği.* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Harran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Şanlıurfa.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2013). Job demands-resources model. *Revista de Psicologa del Trabajoy de las Organizaciones, 29*(3), 107-115.

Bayram, S. (2020). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel affedicilik algıları ile örgütsel mutluluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Rize.

Bessant, J., & Tidd, J. (2007). *Innovation and entrepreneurship*. London: Wiley.

Bird, J. M., & Markle, R. S. (2012). Subjective well-being in school environments: Promoting positive youth development through evidence-based assessment and ıntervention. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 82*(1), 61-66. DOI: 10.1111/j.1939- 0025.2011.01127.x

Bixby, K. M. (2016). *The mediation of empowering leadership on psychological empowerment with organizational commitment and job satisfaction* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Anderson University, USA.

Blanchflower, G. D., & Oswald, J. A. (2004). Well-being over time in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Public Economics, 88*(8), 1359-1386.

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(5), 662-683.

Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*(3), 277-289.

Bolat, O. İ., Bolat, T., & Seymen, O. A. (2009). Güçlendirici lider davranışları ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı arasındaki ilişkinin sosyal mübadele kuramından hareketle incelenmesi. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 12*(21), 215-239.

Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the work place. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 279-307.

Brower, M. J. (1995), Empowering teams: What, why, and how.*Empowerment In Organizations*, *3*(1), 13-25.

Bulut, A. (2015). *Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel mutluluk algılarının incelenmesi: Bir norm çalışması*. (Yayımlanmış doktora tezi). Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Gaziantep.

Bulut, A. (2020). *Eğitim kurumlarında yönetsel tarz ve örgütsel mutluluk arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Uşak.

Bulut, A., & Demirhan, G. (2020). Eğitim kurumlarında yönetsel tarz ve örgütsel mutluluk. *Anadolu Kültürel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, *4*(2), 162-176.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural equation modeling with Amos: Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Taylor and Francis Group.

Çelik, O. T., & Konan, N. (2020). Okul müdürlerinin güçlendirici liderliği ile öğretmenlerin özyeterliği ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 46*(206)- 241-261.

Cerit, Y. (2010). The effects of servant leadership on teachers' organizational commitment in primary schools in Turkey. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 13*(3), 301-317.

Cevahir, H. (2004). *Güçlendirici liderlik davranışları ile örgütsel bağlılık ve iştatmini arasındaki ilişki üzerine bir araştırma*(Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisanstezi). Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G., & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2021). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: SPSS ve lisrel uygulamaları.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review, 13*(3), 471-482. doi:10.2307/258093

Dağlı, E., Kalkan, F. (2021). Okul müdürlerinin güçlendirici liderlik davranışlarım ile öğretmenlerin öz yeterlik algıları ve iş doyumu düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 46*(208), 105-123.

Daniels, K. (2000). Measures of five aspects of affective well-being at work. *Human Relations, 53*(2), 275-294. https://doi.org/10.1177/a010564

Davis, J., & Wilson, S. M. (2000). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. *The Clearing House*, *73*(6), 349-353.

De Jonge, J., & Schaufeli, W. B. (1998). Job characteristics and employee well-being: A test of Warr's Vitamin Model in health care workers using structural equation modelling. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 19*(4), 387-407.

Demo, G., & Paschoal, T. (2013). Well-Being at workscale: Exploratory and confirmatory validation in the United States comprising affective and cognitive components. *Proceeding XXXVII Encontro da ANPAD, 7-11September 2013*. Rio de Janeiro.

Diener, E., Gohm, L. C., Suh, E., & Oishi, S. (2000). Similarity of the relations between marital status and subjective well-being across cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31*(4), 419-436.

Dijke, M. V., Cremer, D. D., Mayer, D. M., & Quaquebeke, N. M. (2012). When does procedural fairness promote organizational citizenship behavior? Integrating empowering leadership types in relational justice models. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 117*, 235-248.

Düzgün, O. (2016). *Ortaokulda görev yapmakta olan öğretmenlerin mutluluk düzeyleri ile sınıf yönetimi becerileri arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Tokat.

Eckhaus, E. (2018). Measurement of organizational happiness. In: Kantola J., Barath T., Nazir S. (Eds) *Advances in human factors, business management and leadership. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, 594*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60372-8_26

Eker, R. (2021). *Okul müdürlerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışlarının okul mutluluğuna etkisinin öğretmen görüşlerine göre incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Erstad, M. (1997). Empowerment and organizational change. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *9*(7), 325-333.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using Spss* (Third edition). London: Sage Publications.

Fisher, C. D. (2010). Happiness at work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12, 384-412.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How todesignandevaluateresearch in education.* NY: McGraw-Hill.

Frey, B. S., & Stutzer, A. (2002). Happiness, Economy and Institution, *Forthcoming in the Economic Journal, 110*(466), 918-938.

Frey, B., & Stutzer, A. (2001). *Happiness and economics: How the economy andinstitutions affect human well-being.* New Jersey: Princeton University.

Frey, B., & Stutzer, A. (2011). *Recent developments in the economics of happiness.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Fritz, M. M., Walsh, L. C., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2017). Staying happier. In M. D. Robinson & M. Eid (Eds.), *The happy mind*: Cognitive contributions to well-being (pp. 95-114). New York: Springer.

Gavin, J. H., & Mason, R. O. (2004). The virtuous organization: The value of happiness in the workplace. *Organizational Dynamics, 33*(4), 379-392.

Golparvar, M., & Abedini, H. (2014). Relationship between meaning and spirituality atwork with job happiness positive affect and job satisfaction. *Management ScienceLetters, 4,* 255–268.

Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. A. (2005). *Handbook of organizational justice.* NJ: Erlbaum.

Gümüş, A. (2013). *İlkokul yöneticilerinde güçlendirici liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi: Psikolojik güçlendirmenin aracılık rolü (Ankara ili örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Günbayı, İ., Dağlı, E., & Kalkan, F. (2013). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin destekleyici davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 19*(4), 575-602.

Güzel, H. (2021). Psikolojik danışmanların psikolojik sağlamlıkları ile örgütsel mutlulukları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Rize.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6. bs.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hanushek, E. A. (2010). *Education production functions: Developed country evidence.* International Encyclopedia of Education, 401-411.

Hassan, S., Glenn, J., Mahsud, R., Yukl, G., & Prussia, G. E. (2013). Ethical and empowering leadership and leader effectiveness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 28*(2), 133-146.

Helliwell, J., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. (Eds.). (2017). *World Happiness Report 2017.* New York: Sustainable Development Solutions Network.

Hoyle, R. H., & Panter, A. T. (1995). Writing about structural equation models. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (pp. 158-176). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications Inc.

İmamoğlu, E. B., & Turan, A. D. (2019). Güçlendirici liderlik ile bilgi paylaşımı davranışı arasındaki ilişkide algılanan örgütsel desteğin aracı rolü: Bilişim sektöründe bir araştırma. *İşletme İktisadi Enstitüsü Yönetim Dergisi,87,* 27-48.

Jehangir, K., Glas, C., & Berg, S. (2015). Exploring the relation between socioeconomic status and reading achievement in PISA 2009 through an intercepts-and-slopes-as-outcomes paradigma. *International Journal of Educational Research,* 71,1-15.

Kabal, D. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin yaşam boyu öğrenme eğilimleri ve mutluluk düzeyleri üzerine bir çalışma (Kocaeli örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sakarya.

Kangal, A. (2013). Mutluluk üzerine kavramsal bir değerlendirme ve Türk hane halkı için bazı sonuçlar. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 12*(44), 214-133.

Karnak, B. (2020). *Öğretmenlerin mesleki profesyonellikleri ile örgütsel mutlulukları arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Denizli.

Kaya, Ç., & Altınkurt, Y. (2018). Öğretmenlerin psikolojik sermayeleri ile tükenmişlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkide psikolojik ve yapısal güçlendirmenin rolü. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *43*(193), 63-78.

Kim, Y. (2018). The effects of school choice on achievement gaps between private and public high schools: Evidence from Seoul high school choice program. *International Journal of Educational Development,* 60, 25-32.

Kıral, B. (2020). The relationship between the empowerment of teachers by school administrators and organizational commitments of teachers. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching, 7*(1), 248-265.

Kjerulf, A., (2015). *Sabah 9'dan akşam 6'ya happy hour*, İstanbul: Doğan Egmont Yayıncılık.

Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). New York: The Guildford Press.

Koçak, S., & Burgaz, B. (2017). Ortaöğretim kurumlarındaki psikolojik sözleşme üzerinde güçlendirici liderlik davranışlarının rolü. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 42*(191)-351-369.

Koçel, T. (2001). *İşletme yöneticiliği*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım.

Konan, N., & Çelik O. T. (2018). Güçlendirici liderlik ölçeğinin eğitim örgütleri için Türkçe'ye uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Kastamonu EducationJournal, 26*(4), 1043-1054. doi:10.24106/kefdergi.434140

Konczak, L. J., Stelly, D. J., & Trusty, M. L. (2000). Defining and measuring empowering leader behaviors: Development of an upward feedback instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60*(2), 301-313.

Korkut, A. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel mutluluk, örgütsel sinizm ve örgütsel adalet algılarının analizi*. (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Malatya.

Lapierre, L. M., & Allen, T.D. (2006). Work-supportive family, family-supportive supervision, use oforganizational benefits, and problem-focused coping: Implications for work-family

conflict andemployee well-being.*Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*(2), 169-181.

Ledford, G. E. (1999). Comment: Happiness and productivity revisited. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*(1), 25-30.

Lee, A. N., & Nie, Y. (2015). Teachers' perceptions of school leaders' empowering behaviours and psychological empowerment: Evidence from a Singapore sample. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *45*(2), 260-283.

Lee, A. N., & Nie, Y. (2013). Development and validation of the school leader empowering behaviours (SLEB) scale. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *22*(4), 485-495.

Lee, A., Willis, S., & Tian, A. W. (2017). Empowering leadership: A meta-analytic examination of incremental contribution, mediation, and moderation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(3), 306-325.

Leech, N. L., Barrett, K. C., & Morgan, G. A. (2005). *SPSS for intermediate statistics: Use and interpretation*: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Macky, K., & Boxall, P. (2008). High-involvement work processes, work intensification and employee well-being: A study of New Zealand worker experiences. *Asia Pacific Journal ofHuman Resources, 46*(1), 38-55.

MacLeod, A. K., Coates, E., & Hetherton, J. (2008). Increasing well-being through teaching goal-setting and planning skills: Results of a brief intervention. *Journal of Happiness Studies: An Interdisciplinary Forum on Subjective Well-Being, 9*(2), 185–196. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-007-9057-2

McConnel, J. (1993). On lemmings and leaders. *Journal For Quality and Participation,* 16, 10-14.

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.

Myers, D. G. (2000). The funds, friends, and faith of happy people. *American psychologist, 55*(1), 56-67.

Nelson, D. W., & Knight, A. E. (2010). The power of positive recollections: Reducing test anxiety and enhancing college student efficacy and performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *40*(3), 732-745.

Neuman, W. L., & Robson, K. (2014). *Basics of social research*. Toronto: Pearson Canada.

Ocak, M. (2010). Blend or not to blend: a study investigating faculty members perceptions of blended teaching. *World Journal on Educational Technology, 2*(3), 196-205.

OECD, (2011). *Against the odds: Disadvantaged students who succeed in school*. Available from https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/against- the-odds_ 9789264090873-en 04/03/2022 tarihinde alındı.

Özdemir, D. M., & Kış, A. (2019). Öğretmenlerin mutluluk düzeylerinin incelenmesi: Gaziantep İli örneği. *14. Uluslararası Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi Tam Metin Bildiri Kitabı* içinde (s.191-196). Ankara: Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi.

Ozen, F. (2018). The impact of the perception of organizational virtue on the perception of organizational happiness in educational organizations. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research, 13*(4), 124-140. doi: 10.29329/epasr.2018.178.7

Özgenel, M., & Canuylası, R. (2021). Okul müdürlerinin paternalist liderlik davranışlarının örgütsel mutluluğa etkisi. *Eğitim ve Teknoloji,3*(1) 14-31.

Paschoal, T., & Tamayo, A. (2008). Construction and validation of work well-being scale. *Avaliação Psicológica, 7*(1), 11-22.

Paschoal, T., & Tamayo, A. (2008). Construction and validation of work wellbeingscale. *Avaliação Psicológica*, 7(1), 11-22.

Pazar, B. (2021). *Öğretmen özerkliği ve örgütsel mutluluk arasındaki ilişki*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Pearce, C. L., & Sims Jr, H. P. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. Group dynamics: *Theory, Research, and Practice, 6*(2), 172-197.

Pearce, C. L., Conger, J. A., & Locke, E. A. (2008). Shared leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(5), 622-628.

Pryce Jones, J. (2010). *Happiness at work*. USA: Wiley Blackwell.

Rea, L. M., & *Parker*, R. A. (*1997*). *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide.* San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.

Robertson, I., & Cooper, C. (2011). *Well-being: Productivity and happiness at work.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Şahin, B., & Özgenel, M. (2020). Comparison of the predictive level of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership style on school happiness, *International Journal of Educational Studies and Policy,1*(1), 55-73.

Salas-Vallina, A., López-Cabrales, Á., Alegre, J., & Fernández, R. (2017). On the road to happiness at work (HAW). *Personnel Review*. 46(2), 314-338.

Şama, E., Kolamaz, C. (2011). Destekleyici ve geliştirici liderlik özellikleri ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki. *Türk Eğitim Blimleri Dergisi, 9*(2), 313-342.

Sancak, T. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin okullardaki mekân düzenlemelerine ilişkin memnuniyetleri ile mutluluk ve örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Savi, F. (2010). The personality traits of parents and parents reports of adolescents problems. *Cypriot Journal Of Educational Sciences, 5*(3),152-166.

Segraves, R. T. (1982). Chapter 2: The relationship of marriage to psychological well-being. In R. T. Segraves (Ed.*), Marital Therapy: A combined psychodynamic-behavioral approach* (pp. 21-57). New York, USA: Plenum Publishing Corporation.

Sevim, H. İ. (2021). Okullardaki dağıtımcı liderlik ile örgütsel mutluluk ve sinerjik iklim arasındaki ilişki. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kahramanmaraş.

Shah, R., & Ward, P. T. (2003). Learn manufacturing: Context, practice bundles, and performance. *Journal of Operations Management, 21*(2), 129-149. doi:10.1016/S0272-6963(02)00108-0

Sims, H. P., Faraj, S., & Yun, S. (2009). When should a leader be directive or empowering? How to develop your own situational theory of leadership. *Business Horizons, 52*(2), 149-158.

Snyder, C., & Lopez, S. (2006). *Positive psychological assessment.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Somech, A. (2005). Teachers' personal and team empowerment and their relations to organizational outcomes: Contradictory or compatible constructs? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *41*(2), 237-266.

Srivastava, A., Bartol, K. M., & Locke, E. A. (2006). Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance. *The Academy of Management Journal, 49*(6), 1239-1251. doi:10.2307/20159830

Stavrova, O., Fetchenhauer, D., & Schlösser, T. (2012). Cohabitation, gender, and happiness: A cross-cultural study in thirty countries. *Journal of Cross- Cultural Psychology, 43*(7), 1063-1081.

Suhail, K., & Chaudhry, R. H. (2004). Predictors of subjective well-being in an Eastern Muslim Culture. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 23*(3), 359-376.

Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). School characteristics and educational outcomes: Toward an organizational model of student achievement in middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *36*(5), 703-729.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6. bs.). New York: Pearson.

Talebzadeh, F., & Samkan, M. (2011). Happiness for our kids in schools: A conceptual model. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *29*, 1462-1471.

Tosten, R., Avci, Y. E., & Sahin, S. (2018). The relations between the organizational happiness and the organizational socialization perceptions of teachers: The sample of physical education and sport. *European Journal of Educational Research, 7*(1), 151-157. doi: 10.12973/eu-jer.7.1.151

Uğur, S. (2019). *Öğrenen okul ile okul mutluluğu arasındaki ilişki*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Van.

UNESCO, (2006). *EFA global monitoring report 2007: Strong foundations –early childhood care and education.* Paris: UNESCO.

Uzun, T., & Kesicioğlu, O. S. (2019). Okulöncesi öğretmenlerinin örgütsel mutluluğu ile iş tatminleri ve örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi. *Akdeniz Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 29, 39-52.

Vecchio, R. P., Justin, J. E., & Pearce, C. L. (2010). Empowering leadership: An examination of mediating mechanisms within a hierarchical structure. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21,* 530-542.

Vu, H. M. (2020). Employee empowerment and empowering leadership: A literature review. *Technium: Romanian Journal of Applied Sciences and Technology, 2*(7), 20-28.

Walker, S. S., & Schimmack, U. (2008). Validity of a happiness implicit association test as a measure of subjective well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*(2), 490-497.

Warr, P. (2007). *Work, happiness and unhappiness*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Warr, P. (2011). *Work, happiness, and unhappiness*. NJ: Psychology Press.

Warr, P. (2017). Happiness and Mental Health. *The Handbook of Stress and Health: A Guide to Research and Practice*, 57-74.

Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews,* Vol. 18, pp. 1–74). Elsevier Science/JAI Press.

Wesarat, P. O., Sharif, M. Y., & Majid, A. H. A. (2015). A conceptual framework of happiness at the workplace. *Asian Social Science, 11*(2), 78-88.

Wright, T. A., Bonett, D. G., & Sweeney, D.A. (1993). Mental health and work performance: Results of a longitudinal field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 66*(4), 277-284.

Yangaiya, S. A., & Magaji, K. (2015). The relationship between school leadership and job satisfaction of secondary school teachers: A mediating role of teacher empowerment. *People: International Journal of Social Sciences*, *1*(1), 1239-1251.

Zhang, X., & Bartol, K. M. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and follower creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(1), 107-128. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2010.48037118

Zhu, C. H. (2011). *The empirical research about the impact of empowering leadership to employees' organization citizenship behavior: The mediated moderation model* (Unpublished master's thesis). Shanghai University, Chinese.