



An Investigation of Teachers Job-Related Affective Well-Being in Terms of Their Personal Variables and School Principals' Leadership Styles¹

Research Article

Emel TUZEL ISERI²

²Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0001-5638-0450

To cite this article: Iseri Tuzel. E. (2019). An Investigation of Teachers Job-Related Affective Well-Being in Terms of Their Personal Variables and School Principals' Leadership Styles, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 11 (3), 145-172.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 06.04.2019

Available online:
10.06.2019

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the teachers' perceptions of job-related affective well-being in primary schools in terms of their personal variables and the leadership styles of the school principal. This research used relational survey method with 230 teachers working in 14 different primary schools in Tokat province central districts. 'Multi-Factor Leadership Scale' which factor analysis made and adapted Turkish culture by Akdoğan (2002) and "Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale" which was adapted Turkish language by Kuşdil, Bayram, Aytaç and Bilgel (2004) were used in data collection. As a result of the research, it was determined that the teachers' positive feelings about their jobs were higher than their negative feelings related to their jobs. However, it was determined that they experienced high pleasure /low arousal and low pleasure / low arousal emotions more. According to the teachers' perceptions, the leadership style levels of school principals are listed as transformational, transactional and laissez-faire. The perception of affective well-being related to job of primary school teachers was significantly higher than the branch teachers. As the duration of work at the same school increases, the teachers' job related affective well-being decreases significantly. It has been determined that school principals' transformational leadership and its sub-dimensions of charismatic / inspiring, intellectual stimulation and individual support behaviors, and rewarding leadership style, which is the sub-dimension of transactional leadership increases both the teachers' general positive feelings and pleasure levels and high pleasure / high arousal and high pleasure / low arousal emotions related to their job. School principals' laissez-faire leadership and transactional leadership and its sub-dimension of passive dimension of management behaviors increases teachers' low pleasure / high arousal, low pleasure / low arousal emotions and generally increases negative feelings related to their job.

© 2019 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:

Job-related affective well-being, leadership styles, teachers.

²This study is an expanded and revised version of the oral presentation at the 1st Eurasian Congress on Positive Psychology.

¹ Corresponding author's address: Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, A-115, Taşlıçiftlik Yerleşkesi, Tokat/TURKEY
Telephone: 00 90 356 252 1616
e-mail: emel.tuzel@gop.edu.tr, emeltuzel@hotmail.com
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2019.03.011>

Introduction

Leadership

Leadership is one of the most important topics in the field of management and also in the field of education and school management (Şişman, 2014). Probably leadership, one of phenomena which is the most observed the least understood in the world (Burns, 1978), has a number of different definitions for example the researchers have defined that one of the group members coordinates or directs group activities in order to carry out organizational goals (Yukl, 2010). When the definitions about leadership are examined, it is seen to be generally highlighted the features such as a power derived from personal characteristics, the power of decision making and implementation, group routing and coordination, influencing the group for common purposes, the process of interaction between individual and the group, and ability to modify existing goals, structure, rules and procedures (Şişman, 2004). In spite of many different definitions of leadership, it can be said that all leadership definitions focus on the ability to influence others, which are the basic characteristics of leadership.

When the leadership literature was examined, it was observed to be studied behavioural and situational leadership theories such as respectively The Theory of the Great Men (Bass and Bass, 2008) examining the characteristics of leaders shaping history in the development of leadership theories, Path-goal theory based on determining the style or behaviour of a leader ideally adapting to the working environment and running to reach a goal in the 1970s (House and Mitchell, 1970), the leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of Graen and Cashman (1975) focusing on the dual relationship between the leader and the followers (Krishnan, 2005) and the transfer of benefits between the leader and his followers (Hoyt and Goethals, 2009), normative decision theory (Vroom and Yetton, 1973; Vroom and Jago, 1974) emphasizing the importance of providing a foundation for effective problem-solving and decision-making by matching the desired decision process with the relevant characteristics of specific problems or decisions to be taken. In addition, transformational and charismatic leadership theories gained importance in the late 1980s.

Transformational leadership examines leadership in terms of characteristics and behaviours (Karip, 1998). By taking human and exchange to the centre transformational leadership aims to achieve a transformation on people, thus change the organization and adapt to the environment (Celep, 2004). Transformational and charismatic leadership theories emphasize emotions and values unlike "traditional leadership" theories that emphasize rational processes (Yukl, 1999).

In the study in 1978, Burns discusses political leadership in two ways: transactional and transformational leadership (Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership occurs when a leader enters a process of change with subordinates. Transformational leadership is associated with changes in followers' beliefs, values, and needs (Burns, 1978; Macit, 2003). Bass (1985) has adapted the conceptions of Burn to organization; by developing a leadership model has mentioned three forms of leadership: transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership (Macit, 2003).

Bass (1990) summarizes the general characteristics of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leader behaviour in the following table in the table below;

Table 1. Transformational and Transactional Leadership Characteristics

Transformational leader	Charisma: provides a sense of vision and mission, gives pride, gains confidence and respect
	Inspiration: conveys high expectations, uses symbols to focus efforts, and expresses important goals for simple purposes.
	Intellectual stimulation: promotes intelligence, rationality, and careful problem solving
	Individualized consideration: gives personal attention, treats each employee individually, coaches, advises.
Transactional leader	Contingent reward: contracts exchange of rewards for effort, promises rewards for good performance, recognises accomplishments.
	Management by exception (active): watches and searches for deviations from rules and standards, takes corrective action
	Management by exception (passive): intervenes only if standards are not met.
	Laissez-faire: abdicate responsibilities, avoids making decisions.

Source: Bass (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision, *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.

Dimensions of the leader's behaviour and characteristics qualified as transactional leadership are mostly about normal functioning while transformational leadership are related to organizational change (Karip, 1998). Leaders with Laissez-faire leadership behaviours are observed to display administrative behaviours that refrain from making decisions and taking responsibility. With this feature, it is possible to say that laissez-faire leadership behaviour is an undesirable administrative behaviour pattern.

Since school adapt to an ever-changing environment and maintain its presence, school culture should be in a structure that can keep up with change and transformation. According to Celep (2004) in order to create this culture in school it is necessary to start with the school management that shapes the school culture. In order to create continuous learning, developing and high schools, it is important to demonstrate the behavioural leadership behaviours in school administrations (Celep, 2004). Güneş and Buluç (2012) have pointed out that the results of the study conducted on different leadership styles are important that transformational leadership improves performance and efficiency of employees in educational institutions.

In the literature, there are many studies on the effect of different leadership styles of school administrators on organizational functioning and teacher behaviours. Some of the examples are: Organizational learning of school and leadership styles of managers (Akan ve Sezer, 2014; Korkmaz, 2008); bureaucratic structure of the school (Buluç, 2009b); mobbing at school (Cemaloğlu, 2007); teachers' perception on organizational justice (Oğuz, 2011); the transfer of authority at school (Baloğlu, Karadağ ve Gavuz, 2009); organizational cynicism (Demirçelik and Korkmaz, 2017); organizational support of teachers (Terzi and Çelik, 2016); teacher performance (Akçekoce and Bilgin, 2016; Korkmaz, 2005); school performance (İbrahim and Al-Taneiji, 2012), the organizational commitment of teachers (Akan and Yalçın, 2015; Bektaş, Çoğaltay and Sökmen, 2014; Buluç, 2009a; Demirtaş and Şama, 2016; Soba, Akman and Eroğlu, 2018); teacher autonomy (Yazıcı and Akyol, 2017), teacher motivation (Finnigan, 2010), job satisfaction of teachers (Karadağ, Başaran and Korkmaz, 2009), school culture (Martin, 2009).

Well-being

The happiness defined as proudness of a complete and continuous access to all aspirations, blessing, prosperity, felicity (TLA, 2018) is dealt with the concept of subjective well-being in psychology literature (Doğan, Eryılmaz and Ercan, 2014). According to Diener (1984), subjective well-being is a general evaluation of individuals' life satisfaction and positive-negative affections (Öztürk-Serter and Yamaner, 2017). Well-being is often defined as more experiencing positive emotions, less experiencing negative emotions, higher satisfying with life (Argyle, Martin and Crosland, 1989; Diener, 1984; as cited in Doğan, Eryılmaz and Ercan, 2014).

According to Telef's (2013) citation from Roothman, Kirsten and Wissing (2003), psychological well-being can be conceptualized regarding emotional, physical, cognitive, spiritual, personal and social processes. According to Doğan and Salmaz (2012), generally the individuals who often experience positive feelings such as confidence, courage, determination, cheer, joy and excitement are common; who rarely experience negative feelings such as fear, anxiety, hate, grudge, uneasiness and anger and who are satisfied with different areas of life such as marriage, health, work life and sexuality can be described as happy.

Avey, Luthans, Smith and Palmer (2010) have point out that there is a relationship between well-being and outcomes of individual and personal life. According to Polatçı (2011), psychological well-being should be not only considered as absence of a mental disorder but also as factors that will provide psychological well-being as positive factors such as getting a taste of life, happiness and meeting needs. In other words, psychological well-being is not only a state of being happy, but also is a concept giving meaning to good and productive life and associated with humanism (Ertürk, Keskinılıç-Kara and Zafer-Güneş, 2016). It is predicted that high levels of psychological well-being will have a positive impact on individual performance in the studies carried out in the last decade (Keleş, 2017; Polatçı, 2011).

Well-being provides the positive employee outcomes such as higher employee satisfaction, better performance, better relationships with teammates, less stress and more personal development (Hamill, 2019). Davies (2016) pointed out it has been observed that employees wanted to work just like a machine without their feelings have begun to wear out mentally and physically and become sick, so the issue of health and happiness of employees is on the agenda at the World Economic Forum (Cited by Karahan ve Eyüboğlu, 2018 from Davies, 2016). In addition, the projects and studies are being carried out in various European Union countries in order to increase the well-being in the business environment (Anttonen et al., 2008).

In relation to the well-being, several variables such as work engagement (Doğan, Eryılmaz and Ercan, 2014), workplace ostracism (Yakut and Yakut, 2018), perceived quality of work life (Karasakaloğlu, 2016), perceived organizational support (Akbaş-Tuna and Boylu, 2006), employee silence (Günay, Çetinceli and Özdemir, 2018), turnover intention (Yıldız-Bağdoğan, 2018), work stress (Qaiser, Ishtiaq and Makhdoom, 2018), workplace incivility (Küçük and Çakıcı, 2018), organizational citizenship behavior (Yurcu, 2014) and mobbing (Aykaç, 2016) have been investigated in the literature. Studies investigating the relationship between the leadership behaviours of managers on various business lines and sectors and the well-being of employees (Dierendonck, Haynes, Borril and Stride, 2004; Günay, Çetinceli and Özdemir, 2018; İnceoğlu, Thomas, Chu, Plans and Gerbasi, 2018; Kuoppala, Lamminpää, Liira and Vaino, 2008; Mehari, 2015; Özdemir, 2016; Sivanathan, Arnold and Baling, 2004; Usta, 2016) are also in the literature.

In the business life, well-being is dedicated by Anttonen et al. (2008) that employees are safe, healthy and productive in their work under good leadership and they find their work meaningful and rewarding. Aydın, Yılmaz and Altinkurt (2013) state that well-being is one of the variables of positive psychology and they points out the importance of positive psychology in the field of education management and focusing on the development and disclosure of positive emotions in leadership studies. In this context, the relationship between school principals' leadership styles and teachers' well-being about their jobs were investigated in this study.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this study is to examine primary school teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being in terms of their personal variables and the school principals' leadership styles they work with. With this purpose, the study has sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the levels of teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being?
2. What are the school leadership's transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership levels?

3. Do teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being vary according to their demographic variables?
4. Is there a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being and the leadership styles of school principals?
5. Are the leadership styles of school principals a significant predictor of perceptions on affective well-being?

Method

Research Model

This study was designed as a descriptive relational survey model. Relational survey model is a research model that aims to determine the presence and / or degree of a change between two or more variables (Karasar, 2013).

The Study Group

The study was conducted on a total of 230 teachers who work in 14 different elementary schools in the central districts of the province of Tokat, are easy to reach, selected by sampling method, and volunteers to participate in study. Teachers' personal variables of within the scope of the research are given in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Teachers' Personal Variables

Personal Variables		f	%
Gender	Female	101	56.1
	Male	129	43.9
Marital status	Single	46	20.0
	Married	177	77.0
	Widow / Divorced	7	3.0
Age (Min 21- Max 60; \bar{x} =35.76, Ss=7.98)	21-30	67	29.13
	31-40	100	43.48
	41-50	54	23.48
	51-60	9	3.91
Branch	Class	61	26.5
	Other branches	169	73.5
Term of duty at the school where they are still working (Min 1- Max 27; \bar{x} =4.67, Ss=4.81)	1-5 years	165	71.74
	6-10 years	45	19.57
	11-15 years	10	4.35
	16-20 years	5	2.17
	21 years and above	5	2.17
Professional seniority (Min 1- Max 45; \bar{X} =12.13, Ss=8.10)	1-5 years	55	23.91
	6-10 years	50	21.74
	11-15 years	62	26.96
	16-20 years	32	13.91
	21 years and above	31	13.48
Graduation	Education institute	6	2.6
	Higher Teacher School	4	1.7
	Faculty Of Arts And Sciences	31	13.5
	Faculty Of Education	166	72.2
	Other	23	10.0
Status of graduate	Graduate	191	83.0
	Postgraduate	39	17.0

As shown in Table 2, 56.1% of the participants were female. 77% of them were married; the mean age was 35.76 years, ranged between 21-60 years and the majority were between 41-50 years old (43.48%); 73.5% of them were branch teachers; length of service at the school where they were currently working varied between 1-27 years, the average was 4.67 years, the majority was between 1 to 5 years (71.74%); professional seniority varied between 1-27 years, the average was 12.13 years and the majority was between 11-15 years (%26.96), and 72.2% of them graduated from the faculty of education and the majority of them (83%) had bachelor's degree.

Data Collection Tools

The data of the study were collected with a measuring tool which consists 'Personal Information Form', 'Multi-Factor Leadership Scale' and 'Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale'. The description of the measurement tool has been given below.

Personal Information Form: The questionnaire prepared by the researcher was used to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants (gender, age, subject, length of service, professional seniority, graduation, status of postgraduate).

Multi-Factor Leadership Scale: The scale prepared By Bass (1985) in order to reveal leadership styles according to multiple factors was adapted to Turkish and conducted factor analysis studies by Akdoğan (2002). In the original scale the likert type was ranging from 0-4. But Akdoğan (2002) has changed this type as 5-point likert type (Always (5), Usually (4), Sometimes (3), Rarely (2) and Never (1)) by Akdoğan. Based on the opinions of foreign language experts cultural adaptation has been made and the statements are rearranged. In the scale, leadership styles consist of 7 factors under 3 general factors (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) and are measured with a total of 36 items. While transformational leadership has sub-factors: factor charismatic / inspirational, intellectual stimulation and individual support, transactional leadership factor has sub-factors: management (active) with exceptions and management (passive) with exceptions related to the award. Laissez-faire dimension was measured by a single factor. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient calculated for transformational leadership sub-factor was .9358, 7291 was for transformational leadership, and .7251 was for laissez faire leadership.

Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale: Katwyk Van, Fox, Spector, and Kelloway (2000) developed the scale to measure the feelings affecting the well-being of the individual. The scale was adapted to Turkish language by Kuşdil, Bayram, Aytaç, and Bilgel (2004). It has a 5-point Likert type scale: Always (5), Usually (4), Sometimes (3), Rarely (2), and Never (1), consists of 20 items. Out of 20 items, 10 items measure positive emotions and 10 item measure negative emotions. The scale involves four dimensions: High pleasure / high arousal (HPHA) that measures feelings such as joy, happiness, excitement, enthusiasm, and inspiration; high pleasure / low arousal (HPLA) that measures feelings such as peace, contentment, pleasure, pride, satisfaction; low pleasure / high arousal (LPHA) that measures feelings such as disgust, fear, frustration, resentment, feeling threatened; low pleasure / low arousal (LPLA) that measures feelings such as boredom, confusion, depression, fatigue,. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients for negative emotions were calculated as .93 and .94 for positive emotions. For the internal consistency of the dimensions, the Cronbach Alpha coefficients were found as .89 for HPHA, .88 for HPLA, .82 for LPHA, and .82 for LPLA.

Data analysis: SPSS 22.0 package program was used in the analysis of the data obtained, Frequency (f), percentage (%), mean score (\bar{x}), standard deviation (Ss) values were calculated and T-test, Kruskal Wallis H test, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and simple linear and multiple regression analyzes were performed.

Dependent Variables of Study: the level of the teachers' job-related affective well-being HPHA, HPLA, LPHA and LPLA; negative emotions, positive emotions, total level of affective well-being) was determined.

Independent Variables of the Study: The leadership styles of school principals (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) were determined.

Findings

1. The first sub-problem of the study has been determined 'What are the levels of teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being?' The values of the mean score (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (S) of the teachers' perceptions of affective well-being in order to solve this sub-problem are given in Table 3.

Table 3. The Levels of Teachers Perspective on Job-Related Affective Well-Being

	\bar{x}	S
High Pleasure / High Arousal (joy. pleasure. excitement. enthusiasm. inspiration)	3.76	.71
High Pleasure / Low Arousal (peace. contentment. satisfaction. pride. satisfaction)	3.92	.63
Job-Related Positive Emotions	3.84	.63
Low Pleasure / High Arousal (disgust. fear. frustration. resentment. feeling threatened)	1.62	.60
Low Pleasure / Low Arousal (boredom. confusion. depression. fatigue. tedium)	2.09	.65
Job-Related Negative Emotions	1.85	.58
The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Affective Well-Being	3.99	.52

As shown in table 3, the job-related positive emotions of teachers ($\bar{x}=3.84$, $S=.63$), are higher than their negative feelings ($\bar{x}=1.85$, $S=.58$) However, high pleasure / low arousal levels ($\bar{x}=3.92$, $S=.63$) in the positive emotions of teachers are higher than the high pleasure / high arousal levels ($\bar{x}=3.76$, $S=.71$). In other words, teachers feel positive feelings with low arousal such as peace, contentment, pleasure, pride, satisfaction more than job- related positive emotions with high arousal such as joy, pleasure, excitement, enthusiasm, inspiration. When teachers' job related negative emotions are examined, it is seen that they feel negative feelings including low pleasure / low arousal ($\bar{x}=1.62$, $S=.60$) such as disgust, fear, frustration, resentment, feeling threatened than job-related negative feelings including low pleasure / low arousal ($\bar{x}=2.09$, $S=.65$) such as boredom, confusion, depression, fatigue.

2. The second sub-problem of the research has been determined as 'What are the levels of the leadership styles of school principals such as transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire?' The average score (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (S) values of the teachers' leadership perceptions about school principal that they are working with to solve this sub-problem are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Leadership Styles of School Principals According to Teacher Perceptions

Leadership Styles	\bar{x}	S
Charismatic / Inspirational	3.65	.71
Intellectual Stimulation (Ex.: Creating new perspectives against problems)	3.66	.86
Individual Support	3.71	.81
Transformational Leadership (Ex.: Aims to move the institution forward. creates a vision. is an active leader)	3.67	.76
Contingent Reward (Ex.: Supporting diligent employees)	3.43	.71
Management by Exception (Active) (Ex.: Try to reduce errors. highlight institution standards and procedures. and focus on errors)	3.07	.54
Management by Exception (Passive)	2.13	.86

(Ex.: Wait until errors occur and interfere with chronic errors)		
Transactional Leadership	2.87	.38
(Ex.: Tries to maintain the current functioning of the institution. is the administrator)		
Laissez-Faire Leadership	2.00	.84
(Ex.: Does not take responsibility. is invisible. does not decide)		

As it is shown in Table 4 according to the teachers' perceptions, the school principals whom work with mostly show the characteristics of transformational leadership ($\bar{x}=3.67$, $S=.76$) while they demonstrate least the characteristics of laissez-faire leadership ($\bar{x}=2.00$, $S=.84$). It has been determined that school principals has mostly showed individual support provider leadership among transformational leadership behaviours ($\bar{x}=3.71$, $S=.81$). While according to the teachers' perceptions, transactional leadership behaviour that school principals has mostly showed have been calculated as contingent reward leadership ($\bar{x}=3.43$, $S=.71$). Accordingly, school principals show the transformational leadership that aims to move the institution forward, creating vision and active leadership behaviours while they show a minimum level of leadership behaviours, which avoids taking responsibility, is invisible and avoids decision making. In this context, it can be said that the leadership behaviours of the school principals determined according to the teachers' perceptions are more desirable leadership behaviours.

3. The third sub-problem of the research has been as 'Do teachers' perspective on job-related affective well-being change according to their demographic variables?' The findings of the relationships between the teachers' demographic variables and teachers' perspective on job-related affective well-being are shown in tables 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

a) Gender

Table 5. The Levels of Teachers Perspective on Job-Related Affective Well-Being (T-Test) According To Gender

Job-Related Affective Well-Being	Gender	n	\bar{x}	S	t	df	p
High Pleasure / High Arousal	Male	129	3.7951	.67187	.813	228	.417
	Female	101	3.7188	.74789			
High Pleasure / Low Arousal	Male	129	3.9008	.59693	-.538	228	.591
	Female	101	3.9461	.67933			
Job-Related Positive Emotions	Male	129	3.8479	.58879	.184	228	.854
	Female	101	3.8325	.68243			
Low Pleasure / High Arousal	Male	129	1.6281	.61899	.352	228	.726
	Female	101	1.6002	.56617			
Low Pleasure / Low Arousal	Male	129	2.0680	.67596	-.603	228	.547
	Female	101	2.1206	.62847			
Job-Related Negative Emotions	Male	129	1.8481	.60216	-.160	228	.873
	Female	101	1.8604	.55044			
The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being	Male	129	3.9999	.50483	.201	228	.841
	Female	101	3.9860	.54049			

As seen in table 5 teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being positive emotions ($t_{(228)}=.184$, $p>.05$) and sub-dimensions (HPHA: $t_{(228)}=.813$, $p>.05$; HPLA $t_{(228)}=-.538$, $p>.05$), negative emotions related to work ($t_{(228)}=-.160$, $p>.05$) and sub-dimensions (LPHA: $t_{(228)}=.352$, $p>.05$; LPLA: $t_{(228)}=-.603$, $p>.05$) and total level of perception of well-being ($t_{(228)}=.201$, $p>.05$) did not differ significantly in terms of gender. In other words, the levels of teachers' affective job-related well-being do not change according to their gender.

b) Marital Status**Table 6.** The Levels of Teachers Perspective on Job-Related Affective Well-Being According to the Marital Status of Teachers (Kruskal Wallis H-Test)

Perspective on Job-Related Affective Well-Being	Marital Status	n	Mean Rank	X²	p
High Pleasure / High Arousal	Married	177	113.10	1.102	.576
	Single	46	124.60		
	Widow/Divorced	7	116.29		
	Total	230			
High Pleasure / Low Arousal	Married	177	113.60	.984	.612
	Single	46	123.93		
	Widow/Divorced	7	108.14		
	Total	230			
Job-Related Positive Emotions	Married	177	113.20	1.143	.565
	Single	46	124.86		
	Widow/Divorced	7	112.14		
	Total	230			
Low Pleasure / High Arousal	Married	177	117.27	3.234	.198
	Single	46	103.83		
	Widow/Divorced	7	147.43		
	Total	230			
Low Pleasure / Low Arousal	Married	177	115.85	.605	.739
	Single	46	111.62		
	Widow/Divorced	7	132.14		
	Total	230			
Job-Related Negative Emotions	Married	177	116.78	2.090	.352
	Single	46	106.43		
	Widow/Divorced	7	142.64		
	Total	230			
The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being	Married	177	114.10	1.131	.568
	Single	46	123.35		
	Widow/Divorced	7	99.36		
	Total	230			

As seen in Table 6, teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being, job-related positive emotions ($X^2_{(2)}=1.143$, $p>.05$) and sub-dimensions (HPHA: $X^2_{(2)}=1.102$, $p>.05$; HPLA: $X^2_{(2)}=.984$, $p>.05$), job-related negative emotions ($X^2_{(2)}=2.090$, $p>.05$) and sub-dimensions (LPHA: $X^2_{(2)}=3.234$, $p>.05$; LPLA: $X^2_{(2)}=.605$, $p>.05$) and the total of job-related well-being perceptions ($X^2_{(2)}=1.131$, $p>.05$) have not showed a significant difference in terms of marital status. In other words, teachers' affective well-being levels do not change according to their marital status.

c) Age, Length of Service at School, Professional Seniority

Table 7. Levels of Teachers' Perceptions on Job-Related Affective Well-Being According to Age, Length of Service at School (LS), Professional Seniority (The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient)

	Age	LS	Seniority	HPHA	HPLA	Positive	LPHA	LPLA	Negative	Total W-B
Age	1	.524**	.917**	.002	.001	.001	-.022	-.077	-.055	.031
LS		1	.563**	-.140*	-.114	-.136*	.011	.006	.009	-.087
Seniority			1	.022	.000	.013	-.015	-.074	-.050	.035
HPHA				1	.771**	.947**	-.376**	-.514**	-.484**	.844**
HPLA					1	.934**	-.311**	-.442**	-.410**	.795**
Positive						1	-.367**	-.510**	-.477**	.872**
LPHA							1	.715**	.919**	-.734**
LPLA								1	.933**	-.829**
Negative									1	-.846**
Total W-B										1

**p<.01, *p<.05

As seen in Table 7, teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being according to length of service at school (LS), have negatively showed significant differences in positive emotions ($r=-.136$) and high pleasure / high arousal subscale ($r=-.140$). In other words, the more length of service at school increases the more job-related emotions including high pleasure / high arousal, and positive emotions significantly decrease. It has been seen that there is no meaningful relationship between age and professional seniority variables and teachers' positive, negative and total perceptions on job-related affective well-being.

d) Branch

Table 8. The Levels of Teachers Perspective on Job-Related Affective Well-Being (T-Test) According to Their Branches

Job-Related Affective Well-Being	Branch	n	X	S	t	df	p
High Pleasure / High Arousal	Classroom	61	4.0061	.58633	3.221	228	.001*
	Branch	169	3.6733	.72562			
High Pleasure / Low Arousal	Classroom	61	4.1279	.54164	3.033	228	.003*
	Branch	169	3.8459	.64876			
Job-Related Positive Emotions	Classroom	61	1.5311	.63549	-1.299	228	.195
	Branch	169	1.6464	.57897			
Low Pleasure / High Arousal	Classroom	61	1.9693	.62358	-1.703	228	.090
	Branch	169	2.1351	.66178			
Low Pleasure / Low Arousal	Classroom	61	4.1584	.43620	2.933	228	.004*
	Branch	169	3.9344	.53553			
Job-Related Negative Emotions	Classroom	61	1.7502	.57110	-1.632	228	.104
	Branch	169	1.8908	.57871			
The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being	Classroom	61	4.0670	.51194	3.336	228	.001*
	Branch	169	3.7596	.65009			

As seen in Table 8, teachers' job-related positive emotions in high pleasure / high arousal ($t_{(228)}=3.221$, $p<.01$) and high pleasure / low arousal ($t_{(228)}=3.033$, $p<.05$) sub-dimensions; job-related negative emotions in low pleasure / low arousal ($t_{(228)}=2.933$, $p<.05$) sub-dimensions and total levels of job-related well-being

perception ($t_{(228)}=3.336$, $p<.01$) are significantly higher level in classroom teachers than branch teachers. On the other hands, total levels of classroom teachers' perception on job-related well-being with the related sub-dimensions are higher than the branch teachers.

e) Graduation

Table 9. The Levels of Teachers Perception on Job-Related Affective Well-Being According to Graduation of Teachers (Kruskal Wallis H-Test)

	Graduation	n	Mean Rank	X ²	p
High Pleasure / High Arousal	Education Institute	6	117.00	.677	.954
	Higher Teacher School	4	91.13		
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	31	116.56		
	Faculty of Education	166	115.17		
	Other	23	120.26		
	Total	230			
High Pleasure / Low Arousal	Education Institute	6	134.83	.932	.920
	Higher Teacher School	4	116.38		
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	31	119.65		
	Faculty of Education	166	115.03		
	Other	23	108.13		
	Total	230			
Job-Related Positive Emotions	Education Institute	6	122.92	.578	.965
	Higher Teacher School	4	96.13		
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	31	119.94		
	Faculty of Education	166	115.14		
	Other	23	113.52		
	Total	230			
Low Pleasure / High Arousal	Education Institute	6	104.42	1.299	.861
	Higher Teacher School	4	84.38		
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	31	120.44		
	Faculty of Education	166	116.11		
	Other	23	112.72		
	Total	230			
Low Pleasure / Low Arousal	Education Institute	6	102.25	3.426	.489
	Higher Teacher School	4	75.25		
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	31	103.94		
	Faculty of Education	166	117.64		
	Other	23	126.13		
	Total	230			
Job-Related Negative Emotions	Education Institute	6	102.08	1.702	.790
	Higher Teacher School	4	80.63		
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	31	110.73		
	Faculty of Education	166	117.12		
	Other	23	119.80		
	Total	230			
The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being	Education Institute	6	125.67	.782	.941
	Higher Teacher School	4	126.88		
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	31	121.74		
	Faculty of Education	166	114.60		
	Other	23	108.98		
	Total	230			

As seen in Table 9, teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being, job-related positive emotions ($X^2_{(2)}=.578$, $p>.05$) and sub-dimensions (HPHA: $X^2_{(2)}=.677$, $p>.05$; HPLA: $X^2_{(2)}=.932$, $p>.05$), job-related negative emotions ($X^2_{(2)}=1.702$, $p>.05$) and sub-dimensions (LPHA: $X^2_{(2)}=1.299$, $p>.05$; LPLA: $X^2_{(2)}=3.426$, $p>.05$) and the total of job-related well-being ($X^2_{(2)}=.782$, $p>.05$) have not showed a significant difference in terms of Alma meter. In other words, teachers' affective well-being levels do not change according to their graduation.

f) Postgraduate

Table 10. The Levels of Teachers Perspective on Job-Related Affective Well-Being (T-Test) According to Status of Postgraduate

Job-related Affective Well-Being	Status of Postgraduate	n	\bar{x}	S	t	df	p																																																																				
High Pleasure / High Arousal	No present	191	3.7696	.70070	.381	228	.704																																																																				
	Present	39	3.7223	.73780				High Pleasure / Low Arousal	No present	191	3.9307	.63728	.528	228	.598	Present	39	3.8718	.61983	Job-Related Positive Emotions	No present	191	3.8501	.62660	.478	228	.633	Present	39	3.7971	.65428	Low Pleasure / High Arousal	No present	191	1.6218	.58754	.335	228	.738	Present	39	1.5867	.63894	Low Pleasure / Low Arousal	No present	191	2.1003	.66399	.470	228	.639	Present	39	2.0462	.61295	Job-Related Negative Emotions	No present	191	1.8611	.57966	.438	228	.662	Present	39	1.8164	.58067	The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being	No present	191	3.9945	.51419	.046	228	.963
High Pleasure / Low Arousal	No present	191	3.9307	.63728	.528	228	.598																																																																				
	Present	39	3.8718	.61983				Job-Related Positive Emotions	No present	191	3.8501	.62660	.478	228	.633	Present	39	3.7971	.65428	Low Pleasure / High Arousal	No present	191	1.6218	.58754	.335	228	.738	Present	39	1.5867	.63894	Low Pleasure / Low Arousal	No present	191	2.1003	.66399	.470	228	.639	Present	39	2.0462	.61295	Job-Related Negative Emotions	No present	191	1.8611	.57966	.438	228	.662	Present	39	1.8164	.58067	The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being	No present	191	3.9945	.51419	.046	228	.963	Present	39	3.9903	.55277								
Job-Related Positive Emotions	No present	191	3.8501	.62660	.478	228	.633																																																																				
	Present	39	3.7971	.65428				Low Pleasure / High Arousal	No present	191	1.6218	.58754	.335	228	.738	Present	39	1.5867	.63894	Low Pleasure / Low Arousal	No present	191	2.1003	.66399	.470	228	.639	Present	39	2.0462	.61295	Job-Related Negative Emotions	No present	191	1.8611	.57966	.438	228	.662	Present	39	1.8164	.58067	The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being	No present	191	3.9945	.51419	.046	228	.963	Present	39	3.9903	.55277																				
Low Pleasure / High Arousal	No present	191	1.6218	.58754	.335	228	.738																																																																				
	Present	39	1.5867	.63894				Low Pleasure / Low Arousal	No present	191	2.1003	.66399	.470	228	.639	Present	39	2.0462	.61295	Job-Related Negative Emotions	No present	191	1.8611	.57966	.438	228	.662	Present	39	1.8164	.58067	The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being	No present	191	3.9945	.51419	.046	228	.963	Present	39	3.9903	.55277																																
Low Pleasure / Low Arousal	No present	191	2.1003	.66399	.470	228	.639																																																																				
	Present	39	2.0462	.61295				Job-Related Negative Emotions	No present	191	1.8611	.57966	.438	228	.662	Present	39	1.8164	.58067	The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being	No present	191	3.9945	.51419	.046	228	.963	Present	39	3.9903	.55277																																												
Job-Related Negative Emotions	No present	191	1.8611	.57966	.438	228	.662																																																																				
	Present	39	1.8164	.58067				The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being	No present	191	3.9945	.51419	.046	228	.963	Present	39	3.9903	.55277																																																								
The Total of Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being	No present	191	3.9945	.51419	.046	228	.963																																																																				
	Present	39	3.9903	.55277																																																																							

As seen in Table 10, teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being, job-related positive emotions ($t_{(228)}=.478$, $p>.05$) and sub-dimensions (HPHA: $t_{(228)}=.381$, $p>.05$; HPLA: $t_{(228)}=.528$, $p>.05$), job-related negative emotions ($t_{(228)}=.438$, $p>.05$) and sub-dimensions (LPHA: $t_{(228)}=.335$, $p>.05$; LPLA: $t_{(228)}=.470$, $p>.05$) and the total of job-related well-being ($t_{(228)}=.046$, $p>.05$) have not showed a significant difference in terms of alma meter. In other words, teachers' affective well-being levels do not change according to their status of post graduate.

4. The fourth sub-problem of the study has been decided as 'Is there a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions on affective well-being and the leadership styles of school principals?' In order to solve this problem, findings of the relationships between teachers' perceptions on affective well-being and leadership styles of school principals are given in Table 11.

Table 11. Relationships Between Teachers' Perceptions on Affective Well-Being and The Leadership Styles of School Principals (Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients)

	1. HPHA	2. HPLA	3. LPHA	4. LPLA	5. T.W.B	6. NEG.	7. POS.	8. Carism.	9. Intellect.	10. Individual	11. Transform.	12. C. Reward.	13. M.A. Act.	14. M.A. Pas.	15. Transact.	16. Laissez-F.
1	1															
2	.771**	1														
3	-.376**	-.311**	1													
4	-.514**	-.442**	.715**	1												
5	.844**	.795**	-.734**	-.829**	1											
6	-.484**	.933**	.919**	.933**	-.846**	1										
7	.947**	.934**	-.367**	-.510**	.872**	-.477**	11									
8	.222**	.258**	-.129	-.139*	.235**	-.145*	.254**	1								
9	.278**	.293**	-.157*	-.121	.267**	-.149*	.303**	.866**	1							
10	.253**	.258**	-.132*	-.108	.236**	-.129	.271**	.856**	.867**	1						
11	.265**	.284**	-.147*	-.128	.259**	-.148*	.291**	.947**	.959**	.953**	11					
12	.220**	.224**	-.085	-.060	.186**	-.077	.235**	.687**	.646**	.650**	.692**	1				
13	-.031	.122	.086	.047	-.013	.071	.044	.259**	.177**	.207**	.222**	.249**	11			
14	-.080	-.091	.259**	.210**	-.195**	.252**	-.091	-.565**	-.579**	-.566**	-.598**	-.401**	.598**	11		
15	.062	.129	.183**	.143*	-.037	.175**	.099	.126	.051	.078	.086	.440**	.086	.679**	11	
16	-.130*	-.088	.290**	.190**	-.214**	.256**	-.117	-.645**	-.688**	-.657**	-.697**	-.447**	-.697**	.029	.285**	11

As shown in Table 11, it has been found that there are low level, positive and significant relationships between transformational leadership ($r = .265$; $r = .284$; $r = .291$) and its sub-dimensions including charismatic/inspirational ($r = .222$; $r = .258$; $r = .254$), intellectual stimulation ($r = .278$; $r = .293$; $r = .303$), individual support ($r = .253$; $r = .258$; $r = .271$) and sub-dimension of transactional leadership including the contingent reward leadership ($r = .220$; $r = .224$; $r = .235$) and respectively high pleasure / high arousal, high pleasure / low arousal

and job-related positive well-being. Laissez-faire leadership affects the high pleasure / high arousal levels ($r=.130$) at a low level but negatively. Accordingly, it is possible to say that teachers' high pleasure/ high arousal, high pleasure / low arousal dimension and the job-related positive emotions are positively affected by the school principals' transformational leadership and sub-dimensions and the contingent reward leadership dimension of transactional leadership; levels of high pleasure/high arousal is negatively affected by the laissez-faire leadership behaviours of school principals.

It has been found that there are low level, positive and significant relationships between respectively transactional leadership ($r=.183$; $r=.143$; $r=.175$) with low pleasure / high arousal, low pleasure / low arousal, and job-related negative emotion and management by exception (passive) ($r=.259$; $r=.210$; $r=.252$) and laissez-faire leadership ($r=.290$; $r=.190$; $r=.256$). It was seen that there are also negative and significant relationships between transformational leadership and low pleasure / low arousal ($r=-.147$) and negative emotions related to work ($r=-.148$). Accordingly, teachers' low pleasure/ high arousal, low pleasure / low arousal dimensions and job-related negative emotion levels are affected by transactional leadership and management by exception (passive) of school principals. In other words, it can be said that the school principals' relevant leadership behaviours increase teachers' job-related negative feelings.

It has been found that there are low level, positive and significant relationships between total levels of teachers perceptions on job-related well-being and the school principals' transformational leadership ($r=.259$) and its sub-dimensions including charismatic / inspirational ($r=.235$), intellectual stimulation ($r=.267$), individual support ($r=.236$) and sub-dimension of transactional leadership including the contingent reward leadership ($r=.186$). In other words, as school principals show behaviours in the relevant leadership styles, total level of teachers' job-related well-being is increasing. However, there are negative, low level, significant relationships between school principals' management by exception (passive) ($r=.195$) and laissez-faire leadership ($r=-.214$) behaviours and total level of teachers' job-related well-being. In other words, the school principals' leadership behaviours that management by exception (passive) and laissez-faire negatively affect total level of teachers' perceptions on job-related well-being and decrease their well-being level.

5. The fifth sub-problem of the study has been decided as 'Are the leadership styles of school principals a significant predictor of teachers' affective well-being?'. In order to solve this sub-problem the results of the multiple linear regression analysis related the leadership style of school principals as predictor of teachers' positive and negative perceptions on affective well-being are given in Table 12 and Table 13.

Table 12. Predictor of School Principals' Leadership Styles on Teachers' Perceptions on Job-Related Well-Being (Multiple Linear / Simple Linear Regression Analysis)

Leadership Styles	Variables	B	Standard Error	β	t	p	Binary r	Partial r
Transformational Leadership (Multiple Linear Regression Analysis)	Stable	3.047	.210	-	14.490	.000	-	-
	Charismatic /Inspirational	-.050	.123	-.056	-.402	.688	-.027	-.025
	Intellectual Stimulation	.221	.106	.301	2.080	.039	.137	.132
	Individual Support	.045	.109	.058	.414	.679	.028	.026
	R=.304. R ² =.093. F ₍₃₋₂₂₆₎ =7.694. p=.00							
Transactional Leadership (Simple Linear Regression Analysis)	Stable	3.150	.321	-	9.830	.000	-	-
	Contingent Reward	.216	.066	.243	3.283	.001	.213	.212
	Management by Exception (Active)	-.020	.079	-.017	-.253	.800	-.017	-.016
	Management by Exception (Passive)	.006	.053	.008	.108	.914	.007	.007
R=.236. R ² =.056. F ₍₃₋₂₂₆₎ =4.441. p=.00								
Laissez-Faire Leadership (Simple Linear Regression Analysis)	Stable	4.015	.106	-	37.709	.000	-	-
	Laissez-Faire Leadership	-.087	.049	-.117	-1.775	.077	-	-
R=.117. R ² =.014. F ₍₁₋₂₂₈₎ =3.152. p=.077								

When Table 12 is examined, it has been observed that there are moderate and significant relationships between the transformational leadership style of the school principals ($R=.304$, $p < .01$) and the levels of the teachers' perceptions on positive affective well-being. These predictive characteristics explain 9% of the variance of the levels of teachers' perceptions on positive affective well-being ($R^2=.093$). According to standardized regression coefficients, the relative importance of school principals' behaviours in transformational leadership dimensions on teachers' perceptions on positive affective well-being has been ranged as intellectual stimulation ($\beta=.301$), individual support ($\beta=.058$) and charismatic / inspiring leadership ($\beta=-.056$).

When the t-test results for the significance of the regression coefficient are analysed, it has been seen that intellectual stimulation ($t=2.080$, $p<.05$) seems to be a significant predictor of teachers' perceptions on positive affective well-being. However, leadership styles in charismatic / inspiring ($t = -.402$, $p>.05$) and individual support ($t=.414$, $p>.05$) dimensions have no significant predictive value on levels of teachers' perceptions on positive affective well-being.

Accordingly, for increasing teachers' perceptions on job-related positive affective well-being it can be said that school principals' behaviours in the intellectual stimulation dimension of transformational leadership have gained importance.

There is a low level and significant relationship ($R=.236$, $p<.01$) between school principals' transactional leadership style and levels of teachers' perceptions on positive affective well-being. These predictive characteristics explain 6% of the variance of levels of teachers' perceptions on positive affective well-being ($R^2=.056$). According to standardized regression coefficients, the relative importance of school principals' behaviours in transformational leadership dimensions on teachers' perceptions on positive affective well-

being has been ranged as contingent reward ($\beta=.243$), management by exception (active) ($\beta=-.017$) and management by exception (passive) ($\beta=.008$).

When the t-test results for the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the dimension of contingent reward dimension ($t=3.283$, $p<.01$) is a significant predictor of teachers' perceptions on positive affective well-being. However, leadership styles in management by exception (active) ($t=-.253$, $p>.05$) and management by exception (active) ($t=.108$, $p>.05$) dimensions are not a significant predictor of teachers' perceptions on positive affective well-being.

It has been observed that school principals' laissez-faire leadership styles has been low in terms of teachers' perceptions on positive affective well-being but not statistically significant predictors ($R=.117$, $p>.05$).

Table 13. Predictor of School Principals' Leadership Styles on Teachers' Perceptions on Job-Related Negative Well-Being (Multiple Linear / Simple Linear Regression Analysis)

Leadership Styles	Variables	B	Standard Error	β	t	p	Binary r	Partial r
Transformational Leadership (Multiple Linear Regression Analysis)	Stable	2.268	.200	-	11.317	.000	-	-
	Charismatic/ Inspirational	-.064	.118	-.078	-.541	.589	-.036	-.036
	Intellectual Stimulation	-.075	.101	-.112	-.746	.457	-.050	-.049
	Individual Support	.025	.104	.036	.245	.807	.016	.016
R=.153. R ² =.023. F ₍₃₋₂₂₆₎ =1.811. p=.15								
Transactional Leadership (Simple Linear Regression Analysis)	Stable	1.287	.293	-	4.398	.000	-	-
	Contingent Reward	.009	.060	.011	.146	.884	.010	.009
	Management by Exception (Active)	.056	.072	.053	.782	.435	.052	.050
	Management by Exception (Passive)	.171	.048	.253	3.549	.000	.230	.228
R=.258. R ² =.067. F ₍₃₋₂₂₆₎ =5.384. p=.00								
Laissez-Faire Leadership (Simple Linear Regression Analysis)	Stable	1.502	.095	-	15.784	.000	-	-
	Laissez-Faire Leadership	.176	.044	.256	4.006	.000	-	-
R=.256. R ² =.066. F ₍₁₋₂₂₈₎ =16.045. p=.000								

Table 13 has been examined that school principals' transformational leadership style and sub-dimensions have been low in terms of the levels of teachers' perceptions on negative affective well-being and a statistically insignificant relationship ($R=.153$, $p>.05$). In other words, it is not a significant predictor in terms of perceptions on negative affective well-being.

It is observed that the transactional leadership style of the school principals provides a low level but significant relationship in terms of the levels of teachers' perceptions on negative affective well-beings ($R=.258$, $p<.01$). These predictive characteristics explain 7% of the variance of the levels of teachers' perceptions on negative affective well-being ($R^2=.067$). According to standardized regression coefficients, the relative importance of school principals' behaviours in transactional leadership dimensions on teachers' perceptions on negative affective well-being has been ranged as management by exception (passive) ($\beta=.301$), management by exception (active) ($\beta=.053$) and contingent reward ($\beta=.011$).

When the t-test results for the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that management by exception (passive) ($t=3.549$, $p<.01$) dimension is a significant predictor on teachers' perceptions on negative affective well-beings. However, contingent reward ($t=.146$, $p>.05$) and management

by exception (active) ($t=.782$, $p>.05$) dimensions are not significant predictors on teachers' perceptions on negative affective well-beings.

It is seen that school principals' laissez faire leadership styles are low but statistically significant predictors on teachers' perceptions on negative affective well-beings. This predictive characteristic explains 7% of the variance of levels of teachers' perceptions on negative affective well-beings ($R^2=.066$).

Discussion and Conclusion

The thoughts about profession and the feelings about work of practitioner of an occupation are closely related with their behaviour in the organization and their professional performance. In this study, job-related affective well-being of teachers is examined in terms of their demographic variables and the leadership styles of the school principals they work with. The study results show that teachers' positive feelings about their jobs are higher than their negative feelings about their jobs. Ertürk, Keskinılıç-Kara and Zafer-Güneş (2016) who examined the level of well-being of teachers have stated that teachers have high levels of well-being. Although studies on attitude, which is generally defined as positive or negative emotional tendency of individuals on any situation, event, object, person, place or thought (Tavşancıl, 2006), is mostly carried out on prospective teachers (Atalmış and Köse, 2018; Gökçe and Sezer, 2012; Şahin and Şahin, 2017; Tekerek and Polat, 2011; Terzi and Tezci, 2007; Uyanık, 2017), there are also research results showing that teachers have high attitudes towards their profession (Polat, Arslan and Satıcı, 2016). When the quality of teachers' positive emotions have been examined, it has been revealed that high pleasure / low arousal defined with peace, contentment, pleasure, pride, satisfaction is higher than high pleasure / high arousal defined as joy, pleasure, excitement, enthusiasm, inspiration. When negative emotions of the teachers have been examined, it has been determined that low pleasure / high arousal levels defined by disgust, fear, frustration, resentment, feeling threatened are higher according to low pleasure / low arousal defined by boredom, confusion, depression, fatigue, tedium. Accordingly teachers have positive feelings about their work in general, it can be said that while the positive emotions are at lower arousal level, high arousal such as joy, pleasure, excitement, enthusiasm, inspiration are seen less frequently. On the other hand, job-related negative emotions of teachers are seen as less stimulated emotions rather than high stimulated emotions such as disgust, fear, frustration, resentment, feeling threatened.

According to teachers' perceptions, it has been determined that the school principals whom they work with show the leadership styles in order of: transformational, transactional and laissez-faire. Similar studies, Göksal (2017) found that teachers working in primary, secondary and high schools perceive their managers as transformational leaders while Şahin (2005) found that according to the views of teachers and school principals, primary school principals show transformational leadership behaviours at a higher level than transactional leadership behaviours. While transactional leaders do not interfere in the existing functioning of institutions, transformational leaders realize the change and transformation of the organization in the light of scientific data and technological developments. One of the main determinants of school success and quality education and training is the transformational leadership behaviours of school administrators. Transformational school principals act together with school teachers and other employees; they become a role-model for teachers by demonstrating characteristics with visionary and charismatic personalities to achieve the aims of the school (Avcı, 2015). Transformational leadership behaviours of administrators encourage employees, take action them, and increase their willingness to do business and enable them to do more than expected (Karcıoğlu and Kaygın, 2013). Considering the positive impact of transformational leadership on organizational behaviour such as decision-making and organizational learning (Karabağ-Köse and Güçlü, 2017), motivation and emotional commitment (Akbolat, Işık and Yılmaz, 2013), individual innovation (Şentürk, Durak, Yılmaz, Kaban, Kök and Baş, 2016), business ethics (Bolat and Seymen, 2003), organizational citizenship and organizational justice perception (Arslantaş and Pekdemir, 2007), job satisfaction (Kırkpınar and İşcan, 2018), organizational commitment (Çakinberk and Demirel, 2010; Kırkpınar

and İřcan, 2018) to increase, considering the positive impact on organizational behaviour, such as the intention to quit work (Tanrıverdi, Akova and Çifçi, 2016) and to reduce feelings of powerlessness, meaninglessness and isolation (Palta, 2018), according to the findings of this study, school principals shows high the transformational leadership behaviours such as aiming to move forward, creating vision, being active leadership and they show low laissez-faire leadership behaviours such as not taking responsibility, is not invisible and avoiding decision making so this meets their desirable behaviour in terms of leadership behaviour. On the other hand, according to the study findings, according to the teachers' perceptions, most of the school principals' transformational leadership dimensions were individual support, whereas in the transactional leadership award winning leadership defined as supporting of diligent employees are exerted.

Levels of teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being does not show a significant difference according to the variables such as gender, marital status, age, seniority, graduation while there is a significant difference according to their branches. This difference is that the total of classroom teachers' perceptions on job-related affective well-being is significantly higher than the branch teachers. High pleasure / low arousal defined by job-related positive emotions and level are higher in class teachers than in branch teachers. Accordingly, it can be said that the class teachers are happier in their jobs than branch teachers but they feel much tiredness / tedium. On the other hand, there are studies (Yakut and Yakut, 2018) showing that there is no significant difference on the well-being of teachers in the literature. Kangal (2013) evaluating data of the sex-related happiness (subjective well-being) in the Turkish house hold happiness profile survey carried out by Turkish Statistical Institute (TURKSTAT) in 2004-2010 states that women across the country are happier in terms of overall life satisfaction than men. However, study data show that the teacher does not demonstrate differentiation in the level of well-being between men and women. In other words the situation in favour of women in general life satisfaction is eliminated in the business environment. In a similar study, Yakut and Yakut (2018) have found that gender variables have not caused significant differences on the well-being of teachers.

It is possible to define exhaustion and fatigue of individuals in the works as a reduction in emotional and physical resources. The high performance of teachers in their profession depends on their psychological well-being (Kayabaşı, 2008). There are research findings that when professional seniority increases, teachers' exhaustion (Cemalođlu and Erdemođlu-řahin, 2007) and loneliness (Yakut and Certel, 2016) increase too. Similarly, another finding of this study is that the more length of service of teachers in the school increase, high pleasure / high arousal and the positive emotions decrease. Accordingly, it can be said that the level of pleasure and positive emotions of teachers have decreased as the duration of duty in the same school increases.

Study findings show that school principals' transformational leadership and its sub-dimensions including charismatic / inspirational, intellectual stimulation and individual support and sub-dimension of transactional leadership including the contingent reward leadership style increase teachers' job-related general positive emotions and pleasure levels, both high pleasure / high arousal and high pleasure / low arousal. Considering, that the transformational leadership behaviours of administrators have positive psychological effects to employees such as enabling employees to encourage, taking action, increasing their willingness to do business and doing more than expected (Karciođlu and Kaygın, 2013), creating positive emotions and building trust (Avcı and Turunç, 2012; Çiçek, 2011) providing commitment (Çađrı, 2014; Çiçek, 2011; Yıldız-Bađdođan and Sapbalkan, 2017; Yiđitel, 2014), providing motivation (Çiçek, 2011; Eraslan, 2004), it can be mentioned that the effect of the school principals' transformational leadership behaviours on increasing teachers' job-related positive emotions are effective in ensuring that all these working behaviours in the desired direction are visible. In addition, the findings provide similarities with the study findings revealing the positive psychological effects of transformational leadership by administrators on different organizational behaviour issues. Example, as a result of the study Temel (2016) exhibited that transformative leadership behaviours of administrators provide psychological empowerment and organizational identification in employees, carry out psychological empowerment with the mediating role of organizational

identification and Erdoğan (2011) revealed transformational leadership and sub-dimensions increase the emotional commitment of employees. When the relative importance of transformational leadership sub-dimensions on the teachers' perception of positive affective well-being was examined, it was determined that the behaviours in the intellectual stimulation dimension gained importance. In terms of transactional leadership the same station is applicable for the contingent reward leadership sub-dimension.

Although it has been shown that laissez-faire leadership behaviours enable employees to have professional expertise, scientists to continue to work and employees with high expertise, knowledge and skills working in research and development units of companies to develop new ideas (Eren, 1991), there are studies showing that laissez-faire and transactional leadership increase organizational silence (Günay, 2012; Kılıç, Keklik and Yıldız, 2014) and as teachers' perceptions increase on laissez faire leadership styles towards their school principal, the levels of powerlessness, meaninglessness and isolation (Palta, 2018) increase as well. According to the findings of the study, school principals' laissez faire leadership styles and their behaviours of transactional leadership and management by exception (passive) sub-dimension of transactional leadership have an increasing effect on teachers' low pleasure / high arousal, low pleasure / low arousal and levels of general job related-negative emotions. In other words, these school principals' leadership styles cause the teachers to experience more unhappy emotions. When the relative importance of school principals' behaviours in transactional leadership dimensions on teachers' perceptions on negative affective well-being were examined, it was seen effect of behaviours of management by exception (passive) sub-dimension gained importance.

Suggestions

Based on the study results, the following suggestions can be presented:

School principals should demonstrate transformational leadership behaviours in which teachers can increase their level of happiness at work, and should not neglect that except contingent reward leadership sub-dimension of laissez-faire and transactional leadership, their other sub-dimensions have a negative effect on the positive emotions of the teachers about their work.

It is seen that although transactional leadership behaviours negatively affect the happiness of teachers, the reward power positively affects the positive feelings of the teachers about the school principals. Accordingly, it may be suggested that school principals give more importance to rewarding teachers.

In particular in order to increase the level of happiness and active work of subject teachers with lower levels of job-related well-being perception, school principals may be more careful in showing the transformational leadership behaviours that positively affect the affective perception of teachers. Rewarding can provide more time for subject teachers in terms of individual support, intellectual stimulation and inspiration.

It is remarkable that as the service duration at school increases positive emotions and reduced high pleasure / high arousal enabling to actively work. Therefore, the roles of teachers in the school can be arranged to be more energetic participants in order to stimulate the feelings of joy, enthusiasm and excitement. The implementations of job rotation can be optionally made. In order to increase their positive feelings towards the profession, they can be directed to in-service courses that they can motivate, and enrich themselves.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Öğretmenlerde İşe İlişkin İyi Oluşun Kişisel Değişkenleri ve Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stilleri Açısından İncelenmesi

Problem Durumu ve Araştırmanın Amacı

Okul yöneticisi okul kültürünü şekillendirir. Sürekli öğrenen, gelişen, performansı yüksek okullar meydana getirebilmek için, okul yönetiminde dönüşümsel liderlik davranışlarını göstermek önemlidir (Celep, 2004). Farklı liderlik stilleri üzerinde yapılan araştırma sonuçları, dönüşümcü liderliğin, eğitim kurumlarında çalışanların performans ve verimliliğini yükseltmesi açısından önemli olduğunu ortaya koymuştur (Güneş and Buluç, 2012).

Olumlu duyguların sık, olumsuz duyguların az yaşanması ve yaşamdan yüksek doyum alma iyi oluş şeklinde tanımlanmaktadır (Argyle, Martin ve Crosland, 1989; Diener, 1984'ten akt. Doğan, Eryılmaz ve Ercan, 2014). İyi oluş, daha yüksek iş tatmin, daha iyi performans, takım arkadaşları ile daha iyi ilişkiler, streste azalma ve daha fazla kişisel gelişim gibi olumlu işgören çıktıları sağlamaktadır (Hamill, 2019). Aydın, Yılmaz ve Altınkurt (2013) ise eğitim yönetimi alanında pozitif psikolojinin önemine ve liderlik çalışmalarında olumlu duyguların geliştirilmesi ve açığa çıkarılması üzerine odaklanılması gerektiğine dikkat çekmektedir. Bu bağlamda yapılan bu çalışmada öğretmenlerin kişisel değişkenleri ve okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri ile öğretmenlerin işlerine ilişkin iyi oluşları arasındaki ilişki araştırılmıştır. Bu amaçla;

1. Öğretmenlerin işlerine ilişkin duyuşsal iyilik algısı düzeyleri nedir?
2. Okul müdürlerinin dönüşümcü, sürdürümcü ve serbestlik tanıyan liderlik düzeyleri nedir?
3. Öğretmenlerin işe ilişkin duyuşsal iyilik algıları, sahip oldukları demografik değişkenlere göre değişmekte midir?
4. Öğretmenlerin işlerine ilişkin duyuşsal iyilik algısı ile okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki var mıdır? ve
5. Okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri öğretmenlerin duyuşsal iyilik algılarının anlamlı bir yordayıcısı mıdır? sorularına yanıt aranmıştır.

Yöntem

Bu çalışma ilişkisel tarama modelindeki betimsel bir araştırma olarak tasarlanmıştır. Çalışma, araştırmaya katılmaya gönüllü olan ve Tokat ili merkez ilçelerine bağlı 14 farklı ilköğretim okulunda görev yapmakta olan toplam 230 öğretmen üzerinde yapılmıştır. Araştırma verileri "Kişisel Bilgi Formu", "Çok Yönlü Liderlik Ölçeği" ve "İşe İlişkin Duyuşsal İyilik Algısı Ölçeği" aracılığıyla toplanmıştır.

Bulgular

Bulgular, öğretmenlerin işlerine ilişkin pozitif duygularının, işlerine ilişkin negatif duygularından daha yüksek düzeyde olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Buna karşın, öğretmenlerin pozitif duyguları kapsamındaki yüksek memnuniyet/düşük uyarım düzeyleri, yüksek memnuniyet/yüksek uyarım düzeylerinden daha yüksektir.

Öğretmen algılarına göre, okul müdürleri en fazla dönüşümsel liderlik davranışları sergilerken, en az serbestlik tanıyan liderlik davranışları göstermektedir. Okul müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderlik davranışlarından en fazla bireysel destek sağlayıcı; sürdürümcü liderlik davranışlarından ise ödüle bağlı liderlik davranışlarını sergiledikleri ortaya koyulmuştur.

Öğretmenlerin işlerine ilişkin duyuşsal iyilik algısı düzeylerinin cinsiyet, medeni durum, mezun oldukları kurum türü ve lisansüstü eğitim durumlarına göre anlamlı farklılık göstermediği belirlenmiştir.

Ancak çalıştıkları okuldaki görev süreleri arttıkça, işlerine ilişkin pozitif duyguları ve yüksek memnuniyet/yüksek uyarım, yüksek memnuniyet/düşük uyarım düzeylerinin azaldığı ortaya koyulmuştur.

Sınıf öğretmenlerinin yüksek memnuniyet/yüksek uyarım ve yüksek memnuniyet/düşük uyarım alt boyutlarındaki işe ilişkin pozitif duyguları; düşük memnuniyet/düşük uyarım boyutundaki işe ilişkin negatif duyguları ve işe ilişkin toplam iyilik algısı düzeyleri branş öğretmenlerine göre anlamlı olarak daha yüksek düzeydedir.

Öğretmenlerin yüksek memnuniyet/yüksek uyarım, yüksek memnuniyet/düşük uyarım ve işe ilişkin pozitif duygularının okul müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderlik ve alt boyutlarındaki liderlik davranışlarından olumlu yönde etkilendiği belirlenmiştir. Benzer biçimde okul müdürlerinin sürdürümcü liderliğin ödüle bağlı liderlik davranışları da öğretmenlerin yüksek memnuniyet/yüksek uyarım, yüksek memnuniyet/düşük uyarım ve işlerine ilişkin pozitif duygularını olumlu yönde etkilediği ortaya koyulmuştur. Öğretmenlerin yüksek memnuniyet/yüksek uyarım düzeyinin ise okul müdürlerinin serbestlik tanıyan liderlik davranışlarından olumsuz yönde etkilendiğini görülmüştür.

Öğretmenlerin düşük memnuniyet/yüksek uyarım ve düşük memnuniyet/düşük uyarım ve işe ilişkin negatif duygu düzeylerinin okul müdürlerinin sürdürümcü liderlik ve istisnalarla yönetim-pasif ve serbestlik tanıyan liderlik davranışlarından olumsuz yönde etkilendiği ortaya koyulmuştur. Bir diğer deyişle okul müdürlerinin bahsedilen liderlik davranışlarının öğretmenlerin işe ilişkin negatif duygularını artırdığı görülmektedir.

Öğretmenlerin işe ilişkin toplam iyilik algısı düzeyleri ile okul müdürlerinin dönüşümsel liderlik ve alt boyutları olan karizmatik/ilham verici, entelektüel uyarım, bireysel destek ve sürdürümcü liderliğin ödüle bağlı liderlik davranışları arasında düşük düzeyde olmakla birlikte pozitif yönde anlamlı ilişkiler ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bir diğer deyişle okul müdürleri belirtilen liderlik stillerindeki davranışları gösterdikçe, öğretmenlerin işlerine ilişkin toplam iyi oluş düzeyleri artmaktadır. Buna karşın okul müdürlerinin istisnalarla yönetim-pasif ve serbestlik tanıyan liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin işe ilişkin toplam iyilik algısı düzeyleri arasında negatif yönde düşük düzeyde anlamlı ilişkiler bulunmaktadır. Buna göre okul müdürlerinin pasif istisnalarla yönetim ve serbestlik tanıyan liderlik davranışlarının öğretmenlerin işe ilişkin toplam iyi oluş düzeylerini olumsuz yönde etkilediği ve iyi oluş düzeylerini düşürdüğü söylenebilir.

Sonuç ve Tartışma

Araştırma sonuçları öğretmenlerin işlerine ilişkin pozitif duygularının, işlerine ilişkin negatif duygularından daha yüksek düzeyde olduğunu göstermektedir. Ertürk, Keskinlik-Kara ve Zafer-Güneş (2016)'de öğretmenlerin iyi oluş düzeylerini yüksek düzeyde belirlemiştir.

Sınıf öğretmenlerinin işlerine ilişkin duyusal iyilik düzeylerinin branş öğretmenlerinden yüksek olduğu ancak daha fazla yorgunluk ve bıkkınlık hissettikleri belirlenmiştir. Araştırmanın bir diğer bulgusu, öğretmenlerin aynı okuldaki görev süreleri arttıkça, yüksek memnuniyet/yüksek uyarımları ve pozitif duygularında azalma meydana geldiği yönündedir.

Araştırma bulgularına göre okul müdürleri sırasıyla dönüşümsel, işlemsel ve serbestlik tanıyan liderlik davranışlarını göstermektedir. Okul müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderlik ve alt boyutları olan karizmatik/ilham verici, entelektüel uyarım ve bireysel destek davranışları ile sürdürümcü liderliğin alt boyutu olan ödüllendirici liderlik stilini, öğretmenlerin işlerine ilişkin hem yüksek memnuniyet/yüksek uyarım, hem de yüksek memnuniyet/düşük uyarım olmak üzere işlerine ilişkin genel pozitif duygularını ve mutluluk düzeylerini artırdığı belirlenmiştir. Bulgular yöneticilerin gösterdiği dönüşümcü liderliğin çalışanlar üzerindeki farklı örgütsel davranış konularındaki pozitif psikolojik etkilerini ve istedik çalışan davranışlarını artırdığı yönündeki (Avcı ve Turunç, 2012; Çağrı, 2014; Çiçek, 2011; Eraslan, 2004; Erdoğan, 2011; Karcıoğlu

ve Kaygın, 2013; Temel, 2016; Yıldız-Bağdoğan ve Sapbalkan, 2017; Yiğitel, 2014) araştırma bulguları ile benzerlik göstermektedir.

Serbestlik tanıyan ve sürdürümcü liderliğin örgütsel sessizliği artırdığı, öğretmenlerin algıladıkları serbestlik tanıyan liderlik düzeyi arttıkça güçsüzlük, anlamsızlık ve yalıtılmışlık düzeylerinin artış gösterdiği yönünde araştırmalar mevcuttur (Günay,2012; Kılıç, Keklik and Yıldız, 2014; Palta, 2018). Yapılan bu araştırmanın bulgularına göre de okul müdürlerinin serbestlik tanıyan liderlik stilleri ve sürdürümcü liderlik ile sürdürümcü liderliğin istisnalarla yönetim (pasif) alt boyutundaki davranışlarının, öğretmenlerin düşük mutluluk/yüksek uyarım, düşük mutluluk/düşük uyarım ve genel olarak işlerine ilişkin negatif duygu düzeyleri üzerinde artırıcı etkiliye sahip olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Öneriler

Okul müdürlerinin öğretmenlerinin işlerine ilişkin mutluluk düzeylerini arttırabileceği dönüşümsel liderlik davranışları üzerinde daha önemle durmaları ve öğretmenleri ödüllendirmeye daha fazla önem vermeleri önerilebilir

Okuldaki görev süresi uzadıkça pozitif duyguların ve aktif çalışmayı sağlayan yüksek mutluluk/yüksek uyarımın azalması göze çarpmaktadır. Bu nedenle isteğe bağlı rotasyon uygulamaları yapılabilir.

REFERENCES

- Akan, D. & Sezer, Ş. (2014). Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile okulların öğrenen örgüt olma düzeyi arasındaki ilişki, *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies*, 1(2), 126-151.
- Akan, D., & Yalçın, S. (2015). Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve İnsani Bilimler Dergisi: Teori ve Uygulama*, 6(11), 123-150.
- Akbaş-Tuna, A. & Boylu, Y. (2016). Algılanan örgütsel destek ve işe ilişkin duyuşsal iyi oluş halinin üretkenlik karşısı iş davranışları üzerine etkileri: Hizmet sektöründe bir araştırma, *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8(4), 505-521.
- Akbolat, M., Işık, O. & Yılmaz, A. (2013). Dönüşümcü liderlik davranışının motivasyon ve duygusal bağlılığa etkisi, *Uluslararası İktisadi ve İdari İncelemeler Dergisi*, 6(11), 35-50.
- Akçekoce, A. & Bilgin, K. U. (2016). Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stilleri ve Öğretmen Performansı, *Çağdaş Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(2), 1-23.
- Anttonen, H., Rasanen, T., Aaltonen, M., Husman, P., Lindstrom, K., Ylikoski, M., Jokiluoma, H., Van Den Broek, K., Haratau, T., Kuhn, K., Masanotti, G. & Wynne, R. (2008). *Well-being at work – New Innivations and good practices*. Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Helsinki, Finland. Retrieved April 3, 2019, from https://www.uml.edu/docs/EUPProgress_Booklet_tcm18-42662.pdf
- Arslantaş, C. & Pekdemir, I. (2007). Dönüşümcü liderlik, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve örgütsel adalet arasındaki ilişkileri belirlemeye yönelik görgül bir araştırma, *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(1), 261-286.
- Atalmış, E., H., & Köse, A. (2018). Turkish prospective teachers' attitudes towards the teaching profession: a metaanalysis study. *Journal of Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology*, 9(4), 393-413. DOI: 10.21031/epod.410287
- Avcı, U. & Turunç, Ö. (2012). Dönüşümcü liderlik ve örgüte güvenin kariyer memnuniyetine etkisi: Lider-üye etkileşiminin aracılık rolü, *Uluslararası Alanya İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(2), 45-55.
- Avcı, A. (2015). Dönüşümcü ve işlemci liderlik stilleri: Kavramsal çerçevesi ve eğitim örgütleri açısından etkileri, *FSM İlmî Araştırmalar İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5, 85-108.
- Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., Smith, R. M. & Palmer, N. F. (2010). Impact of positive psychological capital on employee well-being over time, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(1), 17-28.
- Aydın, A., Yılmaz, K. & Altınkurt, Y. (2013). Eğitim yönetiminde pozitif psikoloji. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 10(1), 1470-1490.
- Aykaç, F. (2016). *Mobbing, öznel iyi oluş ve mesleki doyum: Psikolojik danışmanlar üzerinde bir çalışma*, (Unpublished master dissertation). Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Tokat, Türkiye.
- Baloğlu, N., Karadağ, E. & Gavuz, Ş. (2009). Okul müdürlerinin çok faktörlü liderlik stillerinin yetki devrine etkisi: Bir doğrusal ve yapısal eşitlik modelleme çalışması, *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22(2), 457-479.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision, *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Bektaş, F., Coğaltay, N. & Sökmen, Y. (2014). Öğretmen algılarına göre okul müdürlerinin liderlik stillerinin örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki rolü, *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3, 122-130.
- Bolat, T. & Seymen, O. A. (2003). Örgütlerde iş et iğinin yerleştirilmesinde "dönüşümcü liderlik tarzı"nın etkileri üzerine bir değerlendirme, *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(9), 59-85.

- Buluç, B. (2009a). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin algılarına göre okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15(57), 5-34.
- Buluç, B. (2009b). İlköğretim okullarında bürokratik okul yapısı ile okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri arasındaki ilişki, *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 34(152), 71-86.
- Burns, J.M. (1978), *Leadership*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, NY.
- Celep, C. (2004). *Dönüşümsel liderlik*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2007). Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile yıldırma arasındaki ilişki, *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 77-88.
- Cemaloğlu, N. & Erdemoğlu-Şahin, D. (2007). Öğretmenlerin mesleki tükenmişlik düzeylerinin farklı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi, *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 15(2), 465-484.
- Çakınberk, A. & Demirel, E. T. (2010). Örgütsel bağlılığın belirleyicisi olarak liderlik: Sağlık çalışanları örneği, *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 24, 103-119.
- Çağrı, Ü. (2014). *Dönüşümcü liderlik özelliklerinin çalışanlarda örgütsel bağlılık üzerine etkisi*, (Unpublished PhD dissertation), İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Çiçek, M. (2011). Liderlikte farklı bir yaklaşım: Otantik liderlik tarzı ve transformasyonel liderlik biçimi ile karşılaştırılması, *Bartın Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 2(3), 59-71
- Demirçelik, E. & Korkmaz, M. (2017). The relationship between the leadership styles of school managers and organizational cynicism according to the perceptions of secondary school teachers, *OPUS – International Journal of Society Researches*, 7(12), 33-53.
- Demirtaş, E. & Şama, E. (2016). Okullarda dönüşümcü liderlik ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi, *Iğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10, 275-298.
- Dierendonck, D., Haynes, C. Borril, C. & Stride, C. (2004). Leadership behavior and subordinate well-being, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9(2), 165-175.
- Doğan, T., Eryılmaz, A. & Ercan, L. (2014). İşe bağlılığın öznel iyi oluş üzerindeki yordayıcı rolü: Akademisyenler üzerine bir çalışma, *Gazi Üniversitesi Endüstriyel Sanatlar Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 48-57.
- Eraslan, L. (2004). Liderlikte post-modern bir paradigma: Dönüşümcü liderlik, *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 45(4), 1-32.
- Erdoğruca, P. (2011). *Dönüşümcü (transformasyonel) liderlik ve örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki*, (Unpublished master thesis), Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Eren E.(2008). *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi*. (11.Baskı) .İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım.
- Ertürk, A., Keskinlikç Kara, S.B., & Zafer Güneş, D. (2016). Duygusal emek ve psikolojik iyi oluş: Bir yordayıcı olarak yönetsel destek algısı. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(4), 1723-1744.
- Finnigan, K. S.(2010). Principal leadership and teacher motivation under high-stakes accountability policies, *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 9(2), 161-189.
- Gökçe, F. & Sezer, G. O. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları, (Uludağ Üniversitesi Örneği), *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(1), 1-23.

- Göksal, G. Y. (2018). *Okul yöneticilerinin dönüşümcü liderlik özelliklerini gösterme düzeylerine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri (Aydın İli Bozdoğan İlçesi örneği)*, (Unpublished project of without thesis programme), Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Denizli.
- Graen, G., & Cashman, J. F. (1975). A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Günay, E. (2012). *Liderlik tarzları ve örgütsel sessizlik ilişkisi: Otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma*, (Unpublished master dissertation), Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Balıkesir.
- Günay, A., Çetinceli, K. & Özdemir, K. (2018). Etik liderlik, işgören sessizliği ve öznel iyi oluş arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi, *International Journal Of Economic And Administrative Studies*, (17. Uik Özel Sayısı), 675-686.
- Güneş, A. M. & Buluç, B. (2012). İlköğretim okullarında dönüşümcü liderlik ile örgütsel adalet arasındaki ilişki, *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10 (3), 411 – 437.
- Hamill, L. (2019). How employee well-being drives innovation at work, and how leadership can foster it, *Forbes Community Voice*. Retrieved February 27, 2019, from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbeshumanresourcescouncil/2019/01/16/how-employee-well-being-drives-innovation-at-work-and-how-leadership-can-foster-it/#3ec8ddd31400>
- House, R.J. & Mitchell, T.R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership, *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3, 1-97.
- Hoyt, C. L. & Goethals, G. R. (2009). Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory. In *Encyclopedia of Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, Edited by J. M. Levine and M. A. Hogg, 517-19. Vol. 2. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
- Ibrahim, A. S. & Al-Taneiji, S. (2012). Principal leadership style, school performance, and principal effectiveness in Dubai schools, *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 2(1), 41-54.
- İnceoğlu, İ. Thomas, G., Chu, C., Plans, D. & Gerbasi, A. (2018). Leadership behavior and employee well-being: An integrated review and a future research agenda, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 179-202.
- Karabağ-Köse, E. & Güçlü, N. (2017). Okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri, okullarda karara katılım ve örgütsel öğrenme arasındaki ilişkiler, *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(2), 209-224.
- Karadağ, E., Başaran, A. & Korkmaz, T. (2009). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin algıladıkları liderlik biçimleri ile iş doyumları arasındaki ilişki, *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12(21), 32-45.
- Karahan, G. & Eyüboğlu, E. (2018). Örgütsel iletişimde işe ilişkin duyuşsal iyilik algısı ile öznel mutluluk arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Türkiye’de havayolu şirketlerinde kabin memurları üzerine bir alan araştırması, *Social Sciences Research Journal*, 7(3), 210-232.
- Karasakaloğlu, B. (2016). İş yaşam kalitesi ve psikolojik iyi oluş ilişkisi: Konaklama işletmeleri çalışanları üzerine bir araştırma, *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 38, 277-294
- Karasar, N. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. (25th Edition). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Karcıoğlu, F., Kaygın, E. (2013). Dönüştürücü liderlik anlayışının yaratıcılığa ve yeniliğe etkisi, *KAU IIBF Dergisi*, 4(5), 99-111.

- Karip, E. (1998). Dönüşümcü liderlik. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 16, 443-465.
- Kayabaşı, Y. (2008). Bazı değişkenler açısından öğretmenlerin mesleki tükenmişlik düzeyleri, *Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20, 191-212.
- Keleş, H. N. (2017). Anlamli iş ile psikolojik iyi oluş ilişkisi, *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 5(1), 154-167.
- Kılıç, R.; Keklik, B. & Yıldız, H. (2014). Dönüştürücü, etkileşimci ve tam serbesti tanıyan liderlik tarzlarının örgütsel sessizlik üzerindeki etkisini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma, *Journal of Management & Economics*, 21(2), 249-268.
- Kırkpınar, S. & İşcan, Ö. F. (2018). Liderlik tarzlarının iş tatmini ve örgütsel bağlılığa etkileri, *Hacettepe Sağlık İdaresi Dergisi*, 21(1), 65-85
- Korkmaz, M. (2005). Duyguların ve liderlik stillerinin öğretmenlerin performansı üzerinde etkisi, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 43, 401-422.
- Korkmaz, M. (2008). Okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri ile öğrenen örgüt özellikleri arasındaki ilişki üzerine nicel bir araştırma, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 53, 75-98.
- Krishnan, V. R. (2005). Leader-member exchange, transformational leadership, and value system, *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies*, 10(1), 14-21.
- Kuoppala, J., Lamminpää, A., Liira, J., & Vaino, H. (2008). Leadership, job well-being, and health effects-A systematic review and a meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 50, 904-915.
- Küçük, Ö. & Çakıcı, A. (2018). İşyeri kabalığının öznel iyi oluş haline etkisi, *İş ve İnsan Dergisi*, 5(1), 75-87.
- Macit, M. (2003). Leadership and Bass transactional and transformational leadership theory. *S.Ü. İ.İ.B.F. Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 5, 87-114.
- Mehari, B. (2015). *Transformational leadership and well-being: The mediating role of trust in leadership, meaningfulness and job satisfaction*, (Unpublished master dissertation), Sweden: Linnaeus University Department of Psychology.
- Oğuz, E. (2011). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algıları ile yöneticilerin liderlik stilleri arasındaki ilişki, *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(1), 45-65.
- Özdemir, A. A. (2016). Çalışanların benlik yönelimlerinin liderlik ihtiyaçları ve psikolojik iyi oluş halleri üzerindeki rolü, *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 19(38), 23-32.
- Öztürk-Serter, G. & Yamaner, E. (2017). Pozitif psikoloji bağlamında öznel iyi oluş ve spor ilişkisi: Ergenler üzerine bir araştırma, *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15, 413-420.
- Palta, A. (2018). Öğretmenlerin işe yabancılaşma düzeyleri ve yöneticilerin liderlik stillerinin incelenmesi, *Ulakbilge*, 6(31), s.1670-1679.
- Polat, S., Arslan, Y. & Satıcı, A. (2016). Öğretmenlerin mesleki tutumları ile sınıf disiplin modeli tercihleri arasındaki ilişki, *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 36(3), 675-691.
- Polatçı, S. & Akdoğan, A. (2013). Psikolojik sermayenin performans üzerindeki etkisinde iş aile yayılımı ve psikolojik iyi oluşun etkisi, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17(1), 273-293.
- Qaiser, S., Ishtiaq, H. V. & Makhdoom, A. S. (2018). Relationship between perceived occupational stress and psychological well-being among secondary school heads in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, *PloS One*, 13(12), 1-22.

- Soba, M., Akman, E. & Eroğlu, E. (2018). Liderlik stilleri ve örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkinin İzmir Karabağlar İlçesinde bulunan devlet okulları üzerinden incelenmesi, *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10(4), 1123-1147.
- Şahin, C. & Şahin, S. (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları, öz-yeterlik inançları ve öğrenciyi tanıma düzeyleri, *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15(2), 224-238.
- Şentürk, F. K., Durak, M., Yılmaz, E., Kaban, T., Kök, N. & Baş, A. (2016). Dönüşümcü ve etkileşimci liderlik tarzlarının bireysel yenilikçiliğe etkisini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma, *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8(17), 173-198.
- Şişman, M. (2014). *Öğretim liderliği*, (5. Baskı). Pegem Akademi, Ankara.
- Vroom, V. H. & Jago, A. G. (1974). Decision making as a social process: Normative and descriptive models of leader behaviour, *Decision Sciences*, 5, 743-769.
- Sivanathan, N., Arnold, K. A. & Baling, J. (2004). Leading Well: Transformational Leadership and Well-Being, İçinde (Ed. P. A. Linley & S. Joseph). *Positive Psychology in Practice*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 241-255.
- Şahin, S. (2005). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin dönüşümcü ve sürdürümcü liderlik stilleri (İzmir İli örneği), *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 30(135), 39-49.
- Tanrıverdi, H., Akova, O. & Çifçi, İ. (2016). Açılış-otellerinde dönüşümcü, etkileyici, tam serbesti tanıyan liderlik tarzlarının ve çatışma yönetim stillerinin işten ayrılma niyeti üzerine etkisi, *KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 18(30), 114 – 123.
- Tavşancıl, E. (2006). *Tutumların ölçülmesi ve SPSS ile veri analizi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
- TLA (2018). Mutluluk. Retrieved February 27, 2019, from http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_gts&arama=gts&guid=TDK.GTS.5c76db5031f6f0.72322184
- Tekerek, M. & Polat, S. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin tutumları, 5th International Computer & Instructional Technologies Symposium, 22-24 September 2011, Fırat University, Elazığ- Turkey. Retrieved April, 03, 2019, from <http://web.firat.edu.tr/icits2011/papers/27760.pdf>
- Telef, B. B. (2013). Psikolojik iyi oluş ölçeği: Türkçeye uyarlama, geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması, *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(3), 374-384.
- Temel, E. (2016). *Dönüşümcü liderlik ve psikolojik güçlendirme arasındaki ilişkide örgütsel özdeşleşmenin aracılık rolü: Nazilli'deki kamu kurumlarında bir uygulama*, (Unpublished master dissertation), Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.
- Terzi, A. R. & Çelik, H. (2016). Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ve algılanan örgütsel destek ilişkisi, *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 87-98.
- Terzi, A. R. & Tezci, E. (2007). Necatibey Eğitim Fakültesi öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin tutumları, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 52, 593-614.
- Usta, I. (2016). *Liderlik davranışlarının çalışanların öznel iyi oluşları ve işe yabancılaşmaya etkisi: Bir alan araştırması*, (Unpublished PhD dissertation), Edirne: Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Uyanık, G. (2017). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: Boylamsal bir araştırma, *Karaelmas Journal of Educational Sciences* 5, 196-206.

- Vroom, V. H. & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision making*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Yakut, S. & Certel, H. (2016). Öğretmenlerde yalnızlık düzeyinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi, *Birey ve Toplum*, 6(11), 69-93.
- Yakut, S. & Yakut, İ. (2018). Öğretmenlerde psikolojik iyi oluş ve iş yerinde dışlanma ilişkisi, *Turkish Studies*, 13(18), 1357-1376.
- Yazıcı, A. Ş. & Akyol, B. (2017). Okul müdürlerinin liderlik davranışları ile öğretmen özerkliği arasındaki ilişki, *Uluslararası Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10, 189-208.
- Yıldız-Bağdoğan, S. (2018). Algılanan örgütsel destek, psikolojik iyi oluş ve işten ayrılma niyeti arasındaki ilişkilerin değerlendirilmesi, *İş, Güç, Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 20(3), 5-20.
- Yiğitel, S. (2014). *Öğretmen ve akademisyenlerin algıladıkları liderlik tarzları ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki*, (Unpublished master dissertation), İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations*, (7th edition). Pearson: Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River. New Jersey.
- Yurcu, G. (2014). *Konaklama işletmelerinde çalışanların örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının iş doyumuna ve öznel iyi oluşlarına etkisi*, (Unpublished PhD dissertation), Aydın: Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.