The Role of Anger, Life Satisfaction, and Coping with Stress in Predicting Empathic Tendencies of School Administrators

Gülşen Büyükşahin Çevik [1]

Abstract

The current study aims to examine the extent to which anger expression styles, life satisfaction, and levels of coping with stress in school administrators predict their levels of empathic tendency. Also, it aims to examine school administrators' views on empathy, anger, life satisfaction, and social support. Both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used to collect data. This type of research design is called mixed or triangulation method. Research participants included school administrators employed in the city of Adıyaman. Quantitative data group participants were totally 252 ($\bar{x}_{age}$ = 42.30, Ss = 6.23, range = 30-59) school administrators including 241 males (95.6%) and 11 females (4.4%). 241 (95.6%) participants were married and 11 (4.4%) were single. It was found that 67.5% (170) of the participants had BA degrees; 25% (63) had MA degrees; 7.1% (18) had associate degrees; and one participant (0.4%) had a PhD. Within the qualitative data collection in the current research, totally 10 ($\bar{x}_{age}$ = 43.70, Ss = 5.1, range = 36-51) school administrators including 8 males and 2 females were interviewed through semi-structured interview form. All participants in this group were married. 4 participants had BA and 6 had MA degrees. The data was collected through the "Empathic Tendency Scale", "The State-Trait Anger Scale", "Satisfaction with Life Scale", "Ways of Coping Inventory", and "Semi-structured Interview Form". Descriptive statistics, Pearson Moment Product Correlation, and Hierarchical Linear Multi Regression Analyses were used to analyze the qualitative data in the current research. Data analysis was conducted through IBM SPSS 15.0 software package. Descriptive statistics, Pearson Moment Product Correlation, and Hierarchical Linear Multi Regression Analyses were used to analyze the qualitative data in the current research. Data analysis was conducted through IBM SPSS 15.0 software package. Four different regression models were obtained through hierarchical multiple regression analysis results based on Empathic Tendency Scale scores within the quantitative research data. According to this, a review of R^2 values indicated that Empathic tendency, Anger-in sub-dimension of The State-Trait Anger Scale (STAS) explained within the 13%; this increased up to 21% with the

[1] Adıyaman University, Faculty of Education, Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Turkey, gbuyuksahin@gmail.com

addition of Satisfaction with Life Scale in the analysis and up to 26% with the addition of Anger-control as sub-dimension of STAS. It went up to 29% with the addition of receiving social support sub-dimension of Ways of Coping Inventory (WCI) in the analysis. It was seen that qualitative findings supported the quantitative findings. Based on qualitative findings, thus, leading factor among those affecting empathic skills was *anger*. *Stress*, *life style*, and *life experiences* followed this. Things that made the school administrators the angriest included *teachers coming in the classroom late*, *do not teach*, *staff ignoring their responsibilities*, and *teachers not fulfilling their responsibilities*. Also, majority of the school administrators were found to be unable to *empathize* in anger. It was found that when in anger school administrators *Postpone appointment*, *tried to understand what was going on*, *left the environment briefly*, *tried to control anger*, *tried not to talk*, and *raised their voices*.

Introduction

Empathy is described as an individual's ability to imagine themselves into other people's places, to realistically understand and feel others' emotions and thoughts, and to convey these to the person in communication (Rogers, 1975). Hence, Dökmen (2005) stated that empathic ability required entering into an individual's subjective world and trying to understand the individual through his/her perspective and it included accurately perceiving individual's emotions and thoughts and conveying the understood emotions and thoughts to the other person. Conway and Swift (2000) empathy defined it as viewing through another's perspective. Similarly, Goleman (1996) emphasized the importance of tone, mimics, gestures, facial expression, and non-verbal expressions in understanding others' emotions. Davis (1983), on the other hand, explained empathy with a four-dimension model (cognitive, affective, imaginary participation, and personal). Also, Marshall, Hudson, Jones, and Fernandez (1995) stated that empathy took place in four stages in the model that they proposed. Based on their model, the first stage in empathy was about getting to know individuals emotionally. This stage involves knowing about individuals through social interactions built. The second stage is about perspective taking. This stage includes understanding another's perspective. The third stage was named affective repetition. The third stage involves sharing similarities of his/her and others' feelings of experiences, on some levels. The last stage was the decision response. This stage is about providing the person with orientation through assisting his/her basic emotions and socialization behaviors when the assisted person's decision is or is not revealed. A review of research on empathy shows that empathy is associated with many variables; individuals effectively using empathy do effective problem solving (Özcan, Oflaz, & Türkbay, 2003); and these are the individuals well adjusting in the community with high social awareness (Dökmen, 2005).

One of the important functions of empathy is about reducing aggressive behaviors (Björkqvist, Österman, & Kaukiainen, 2000; Kaukiainen et al., 1999; Shechtman, 2002). It was reported that individuals with high levels of empathy could control anger in interpersonal relationships and this led to socially positive developments (Preston & Hofelich, 2011). Anger is described to be an emotional reaction that swings between a simple irritation and a high-level rage (Spielberger, 1991). Individuals' social and cognitive attitudes and value judgements were reported to lead to anger revealed (Burns, 2006). It was, also, reported that high-level anger led to more stress and health problems (Baltaş & Baltaş, 1997). On the other hand, although anger is often not desirable, it was also reported to have a healthy function for the individual to self-motivate and overcome obstacles (Cornell, Peterson, & Richards, 1999). According to Abrams (2010), anger is a regular emotion that can be defined as neither a good nor a bad concept. Thus, anger could be functional when experienced healthily; however, it was described

as a harmful emotion when not controlled (Burger, 2006). On the other hand, Cooper and Sawaf (2000) stated that particularly administrators were required to have skills to manage emotions. Casiadi (2017) examined school principal's communication styles and conflict management strategies, based on teachers' perceptions, and found a positive relationship between school principals' communication styles and conflict management strategies. In addition, it was stated that angry behaviors in interpersonal relationships within organizations must be empathized about and factors leading to anger must be found out (Doğan, Güler, & Kelleci, 2001; Doğan, Üngüren, & Algür, 2010; Ornstein, 1999). Research on school administrators revealed that anger control was associated with conflict management (Gündüz, Tunç, & İnandı, 2013); anger and prejudgment prevented communication (Güngör & Taşdan, 2016); and those experiencing anger experienced more conflict and lacked communication skills (Kahraman, 2000). Similar studies found a positive relationship between empathic tendency and anger control (Doğan et al., 2010; Gezer, Orcan, & Çetin, 2014). Similarly, negative relationships were found between aggression and empathy (Çankaya & Ergin, 2015; LeSure-Lester, 2000; Strayer & Roberts, 2004). Thus, based on the studies conducted, it may be said that there is a relationship between anger and empathy; individuals effectively using empathy were more successful controlling their anger; and they could be better in interpersonal relationships.

Empathy was reported to be conceptually complicated in terms of its social and affective consequences. Empathy, by nature, requires shared emotions and a social context in interpersonal relationships (Lacono, Ellenbogen, Wilson, Desormeau, & Nijjar, 2015). Empathy was reported to be a requirement for a healthy life and life satisfaction in interpersonal relationships (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Preston & De Waal, 2002). Empathy was reported to be associated with affective and cognitive variables (Eisenberg & Eggum, 2009) as it involves understanding others' emotions (De Waal, 2008). It was found out that these benefits of empathy increased life satisfaction and contributed in social relationships (Shanafelt et al., 2005). Life satisfaction, on the other hand, was stated to involve an individual's evaluations and perception of life (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). In addition, life satisfaction was reported to include tendency to change life, satisfaction with the past and future, relationships in the immediate environment, and individual's perspective of his/her life (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). Satisfaction domains in life were stated to be professional and family lives, leisure time activities, being healthy, money, and an individual's own self (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). On the other hand, Chacko (1983) stated that the factor effecting the life satisfaction most was the income and that high income increased life satisfaction. Studies on life satisfaction with school administrators showed that there was a positive relationship between professional seniority, the type of school that one was employed, physical conditions of the working environment and the perception of financial situation (Kubilay, 2013) and that there was a significant difference between life satisfaction and the income obtained (Yılmaz & Altınok, 2009). Similarly, it was found that as seniority, age (Önemlitürk, 1997), and education level (Kılıç, 2005) increased, empathic skills increased. Also, many studies on the relationship between life satisfaction and professional satisfaction of school administrators are available (Heller Judge & Watson, 2002; Iverson & Maguire, 1999; Kubilay, 2013; Ünal, Karlıdağ, & Yoloğlu, 2001). Mamur (2014) found positively significant relationships between life satisfaction of public employee administrators and their professional satisfaction, personal satisfaction, environmental satisfaction, and social satisfaction. Katman (2010) found that empathic tendency levels of school administrators were high. Helmer (2013) found a positive relationship between school principals' use of communication skills and teachers' motivation and students' academic achievements. Bayar (2015) found that school administrators' methods of resolving conflicts included avoiding, making concessions, reconciliation, trying to impose superiority, and collaboration. Similar studies found positively significant relationships between empathic skills and life satisfaction (Ardahan, 2012; Baştuğ, 2009; Deniz & Yılmaz, 2004; Duy & Yıldız, 2014; Kırtıl, 2009; Koçak & İçmenoğlu; 2012; Shanafelt et al., 2005; Özdemir, 2015; Thomas et al., 2007; Totan, 2015). A review of studies indicated that variables that could be associated with life satisfaction of school administrators included income, professional satisfaction, being healthy, and evaluations on work and family. It can also be said that there was a high-level

relationship between empathy and life satisfaction. Thus, it may be said that positive consideration and perception of his/her own work and life in a school administrator would influence his/her communication with teachers, students at his/her institution and with parents. Thus, s/he can empathize better. It is thought that effective use of empathy in school administrators will play a significant role in communicating with students, at first, and then, with teachers, staff, and parents; and it can help solve problems and resolve conflicts.

On the other hand, a school administrator is partly responsible for the stress of teachers, students, parents, and other staff at work as well as s/he tries to control his/her own stress at work. That is because the schools are organizational structures involving interpersonal relationships. Thus, it is important for a school administrator to both discover social support sources for his/her own stress and build social support in the organizational structure within his/her responsibility. Stress as a whole was described as a phenomenon encountered when facing experiences perceived to be physical or psychological threat in an individual's life (Atkinson, Atkinson, & Hilgard, 1995). The importance of social support sources in effectively coping with stress was emphasized in research (Akbağ, 2000; Oral, 1994; Patterson & McCubin, 1987). In addition, a relationship between administrators' empathic tendency and methods of coping with stress (Bellini, Baime, & Shea, 2002) and referring to religion and seeking external assistance (Aytaç, 2014; Karakaş, 2014) as sub-dimensions of coping with stress was found. In a similar study, a negative relationship was found between confident approach to oneself, as a sub-dimension of coping with stress, and empathy (İşçen, 2006). Uysal Dönmez (2015) examined teachers' views of elementary school administrators' empathic orientations and found that teachers with 1.5 years in service had more negative views of school administrators' empathic orientations than those with longer years in service had. Based on the views of teachers employed in elementary school, a medium-level positive relationship was determined between leadership behaviors of elementary school principals and teachers' views of school principals' empathic orientations. Altıntaş (2014) stated that top-level administrators experienced less stress than mid-level administrators as they follow the rules they set within a large outline. It was also stated that the stressors in the workplace included variables such as routine activities, non-clarity in professional roles, status of the work, conflicting roles, mismatching personality and role, structure of the organization, professional relationships, professional development, and participation in the work, work load, promotion, and unsafety at work. However, it was found that those who had stress management training better managed their stress (Özçelik, Gülsün, Özçelik, & Öztosun, 2012). Similarly, Yaman, Bayrakçı, and Yaman (2002) investigating school administrators' personality variables and stressors determined that personality characteristics such as introversion and extraversion were significantly effective on stressors. Sökmen (2005) found that longer working hours, rumors at work place, decision requirements, and conflicts with superiors constituted stressors. Cam (2004) similarly found that working environment and superior-subordinate relationships were stressors in the professional life. Hisli Şahin, Basım, and Akkoyun (2011) revealed that those having A-type personality characteristics (quick-tempered, multi-tasking, competitive, etc.) with higher anger scores had significantly higher perceived stress scores than those with B-type personality characteristics (distributing activities in time, open to collaboration, etc.) In addition, it was also found that those with A-type personality characteristics used non-functional methods of coping with stress more. In a similar study, Aktaş (2001) found that top-level administrators in public organizations exhibited A-type personality characteristics and experienced high-level stress. Many studies (Maslach & Leiter; 1997; Sürgevil, 2005) pointing out to the relationship between exhaustion and stress are available. In Uzun's (2011) research, a negative relationship between organizational stress and emotional attachment was found. Based on a review of relevant studies conducted, it may be said that social support sources and training about stress are important in coping with stress effectively. Close relationships built with social support can also be considered effective in understanding others' emotions and thoughts in interpersonal relationships, in terms of putting oneself in others' places. Also, close relationships built with social support are considered to be able to positively affect empathy in

terms of understanding various perspectives, effectively coping with stress, and finding out alternative solutions in problem solving.

Consequently, the current study examined the role of anger, life satisfaction, and coping with stress in predicting about school principals' empathic tendencies. Using empathic skills healthily is an important variable for communication skills. School principals must resolve conflicts or solve various problems by communicating with students, teachers, parents, and many staff members. It is important for school principals to use empathic skills effectively, control anger, and cope with stress in terms of these conflicts or problems. At the same time, school principals are expected to use empathic skills for their own lives.Thus, the current study is considered important in terms of thought to be associated with empathy variables (anger, life satisfaction, and coping with stress) that predict empathy. The results of this study may be useful in planning in-service training for school principals by the Ministry of National Education. In addition, psychological counselors, psychologists, and psychiatrists may be inspired about interventions in relation to variables predicting school principals' empathic orientations and empathy.

Purpose of the Study

The current study aims to examine the extent to which anger expression styles, life satisfaction, and levels of coping with stress in school administrators predict their levels of empathic tendency. Also, it aims to examine school administrators' views on empathy, anger, life satisfaction, and social support. For these purposes, the following research questions were put forward:

1. Do school administrators' anger expression styles predict their levels of empathic tendency?
2. Does school administrators' life satisfaction predict their levels of empathic tendency?
3. Do school administrators' levels of coping with stress predict their levels of empathic tendency?
4. What are school administrators' views of the relationship between on empathy, anger, life satisfaction, stress, and social support?

Method

The following section is dedicated to information about research participants, instruments and statistical methods used to analyze data, and limitations. Both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used to collect data. This type of research design is called mixed or triangulation method. Triangulation involves using various research methods on one topic within the same study (Denzin, 1994). Triangulation method was included in the current research as it involved based on both quantitative and qualitative data. In this method, the purpose is to reveal the variables that affect research findings, to support qualitative and quantitative research findings that were closer to each other, and to have the research problem understood better by interpreting the findings obtained on both (Creswell, 2014).

Research Participants

Research participants included school administrators employed in the city of Adıyaman. Quantitative data group participants were totally 252 ($\bar{x}_{age}$ = 42.30, Ss = 6.23, range = 30-59) school administrators including 241 males (95.6%) and 11 females (4.4%). 241 (95.6%) participants were married and 11 (4.4%) were single. It was found that 67.5% (170) of the participants had BA degrees; 25% (63) had MA degrees; 7.1% (18) had associate degrees; and one participant (0.4%) had a PhD. Participants' service years in administration ranged as follows: ($\bar{x}_{years\ in\ service}$ = 17.29, Ss = 6.75, range = 3-38). Within the qualitative data collection in the current research, totally 10 ($\bar{x}_{age}$ = 43.70, Ss = 5.1, range = 36-51) school administrators including 8 males and 2 females were interviewed through semi-structured interview form. All participants in this group were married. 4 participants had BA and 6 had

MA degrees. Participants' service years in administration ranged as follows: ($\bar{x}$ years in service = 14, Ss = 4.66, range = 5-21). All participant school administrators had permanent employment statuses.

Instruments

Empathic Tendency Scale (ETS)

Empathic Tendency Scale (ETS) was developed by Dökmen (1988) to measure individuals' empathic skills associated with life. Each item is scored ranging from 1 to 5 and, thus, the extent to which individuals agree with the view included on an item is revealed. ETS includes 8 items with negative statements and 12 items with positive statements. Scale scores range between 20 and 100. High scores on items indicate high-level empathic abilities and low scores on items mean low-level empathic abilities. The reliability of the scale was calculated by Dökmen (1988). Also, Split-half reliability of the scale for the scores that students obtained on odd-numbered and even-numbered items of the scale was found as .86 The scale Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was .72. The reliability for the ETS was conducted by Dökmen (1988). The reliability of the relationship between ETS and the sub-dimension of *Understanding Emotions* of Edwards Personal Preference Inventory was found to be .68. Cronbach's alpha reliability level of the scale was found as .78 in the study conducted by Aytaç (2014). Based on the validity and reliability studies are examined, ETS can be considered valid and reliable.

The State-Trait Anger Scale (STAS)

The State-Trait Anger Scale (STAS) was developed by Spielberg and adapted into Turkish language by Özer (1994). The scale includes 34 items on sub-dimensions such as anger expression, anger-control, anger-out, and anger-in. STAS is a Likert-type scale with items scored between 1 and 4. Upon validity and reliability studies, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient values were found as follows: .79 for anger expression, .84 for anger control, .78 for anger-out, and .62 for anger-in. Factor loads for anger control, anger-in, and anger-out were respectively found as follows in the factor analysis within the validity study conducted by Özer (1994): .80- .90, .69–.91, .58–.76. The internal consistency coefficients of the scale ranged between the following values: .80-.90 for anger control, .58-.76 for anger-in, .69-.91for anger-out. Correlation coefficients of the scale were: .83 for anger, .71 for anger-in, .80 for anger-out, and .82 for anger control in the test-retest reliability study by Bilge (1997). A positively significant relationship (r=. 41; p<01) was found between Aggression Inventory and STAS scores in the criterion validity study conducted by Gök (2009). Based on the validity and reliability studies are examined, STAS can be considered valid and reliable.

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) was developed in order to reveal individuals' satisfaction with life. STAS is a single-dimension scale with total five items scored as 1= Never Satisfying, 2= Not Satisfying, 3= Somewhat Not Satisfying, 4= neither Satisfying nor Not Satisfying, 5= Somewhat Satisfying, 6= Satisfying, and 7= Very Satisfying. The scale was adapted into Turkish language by Köker (1991). In the validity study conducted by Köker (1991), five experts were consulted with through *face validity* technique. Experts were asked to translate the scale into Turkish language and statements defined by five of the experts commonly were included on the scale. Reliability of the scale was checked through test-retest technique and the correlation between the two administrations was found to be .85. Total score on the scale was included in the scale score calculation. High score on the scale indicates increased satisfaction with life. Reliability study for the scale showed that test-retest reliability was .85 and item-test correlations ranged between .71 and .80. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the scale was found to be .81 for internal consistency in the study conducted by Kubilay (2013) on school administrators. Based on the validity and reliability studies, SWLS can be considered valid and reliable.

Ways of Coping Inventory (WCI)

WCI, developed by Folkman and Lazarus (1980) to measure individuals' styles of coping with stress, was adapted into Turkish language by Şahin and Durak (1995). The scale includes items that

measure two main styles of coping with stress: *problem-oriented/active* and *emotion-oriented/passive* styles. Active styles included sub-dimensions of *receiving social support*, *optimistic approach*, and *self-confident approach*. Passive styles consisted of sub-dimensions of *helpless approach* and *submissive approach*. WCI, with total five sub-dimensions such as *self-confident approach*, *helpless approach*, *optimistic approach*, *submissive approach*, and *receiving social support*, includes a total of 30 items. Factor analysis was conducted with three different samples in reliability and validity study by Şahin and Durak (1995). The first factor analysis for the scale was conducted through Principal Axis method with university students (N=575). Hence, the scale was found to have an eight-factor structure and through the factor analysis with Screen Test, it was found that the scale could be reduced to 5 factors. In the second factor analysis, Principal Axis method was used with public and private bank employees (N=426) to find a 7-factor structure. In the third factor analysis, Principal Axis method was used with individuals aged 14 to 45 (N=232) to find 5 factors with Eigen values above 1. Internal consistency coefficients for WCI sub-dimensions ranged as follows: .62 to .80 for self-confident approach, .64 to .73 for helpless approach, .49 to .68 for submissive approach, and .45 to .47 for receiving social support (Şahin & Durak, 1995). Based on the validity and reliability studies are examined, WCI can be considered valid and reliable.

Semi-structured Interview Form

A Semi-Structured Interview Form with nine open-ended items was developed by the researcher to collect findings in relation to qualitative data. According to Türmüklü (2000), semi-structured interview technique is more flexible and it helps prepare for the interview. Also, it was stated that, based on the course of interview within the research, the researcher could direct the interview with different questions and this could help the interviewee to elaborate in his/her responses.

To check whether the interview form was consistent with the purpose of research, the meaning and the content of research questions and to provide the content validity, three qualitative research experts were consulted with. Based on their views, the interview form was restructured. Later, a pilot interview was conducted with three school administrators to finalize the interview form upon checking for unclear language and meaning. The researcher was present alone during the interviews to ask questions in a one-on-one style and responses to the interview questions were recorded. Then, the recorded responses were transferred to the computer system.

Data Collection

To collect the qualitative data in the current research, school administrators were informed in meetings organized for them; and scales were administered on volunteering school principals. Scales were later, on convenient days, administered on those school principals that did not attend the meetings. Average administration duration for the scales was approximately 30-35 minutes. To collect the quantitative data in the current research, the researcher informed the school administrators and volunteering school principals were interviewed based on appointments. The quantitative data collection took place in school principals' rooms. Interview with each participant was seen to last approximately 40-45 minutes.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, Pearson Moment Product Correlation, and Hierarchical Linear Multi Regression Analyses were used to analyze the qualitative data in the current research. Data analysis was conducted through IBM SPSS 15.0 software package. Significance level was set to .05 in order to find whether the difference between averages was significant.

Content analysis and descriptive analysis, used within quantitative research methods, were used to analyze the quantitative data in the current research. In addition, participants' descriptive expressions were directly quoted to support the content analysis. Yıldırım and Şimşek (2003) stated that basic purpose in content analysis was to reach concepts and relationships that could explain the collected data. In content analysis, first of all, the obtained data are coded. Upon examining data coded,

meaningful categories and conceptual meanings are found. In the current research, all collected data were, first, coded to obtain meaningful wholes. Later, categories or themes gathering the codes associated with one another to create a meaningful whole were obtained. Findings were finalized when the view of a quantitative research expert on conceptualizing the coding and the themes was obtained in order to provide reliability. Yıldırım and Şimşek (2003) emphasized that the use of a descriptive analysis was important in terms of providing the validity of qualitative findings. In order to pay attention to individuals' views, quotations by individuals are completely included. Thus, organized and interpreted findings are presented to the reader. Another purpose of including descriptive content in the current study was to inform the reader about the codes of participant views. In order to provide the validity of qualitative findings, on-to-one quotations of participants' views were included. Within the descriptive content associated with school administrators, coding was conducted as M1, M2, M3,..., M10. In addition, frequency (f) values were added next to codes to indicate the number of school administrator participants sharing the same views. To provide the reliability of findings associated with the quantitative dimension of the current study, the formula proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994) was used. This formula is as follows: Reliability= (Agreement) / (Agreement + Disagreement).Assistance was obtained from an expert that did research on coding. Later, the percentage of agreement was calculated through the comparison of coding conducted individually by the researcher and the expert. Thus, the interrater agreement percentage in the current study was found to be .92. Interrater agreement over 70% indicates reliability for the study.

Limitations

The data collected in the current study are limited to those obtained through Empathic Tendency Scale, The State-Trait Anger Scale, Satisfaction with Life Scale, Ways of Coping Inventory, and Semi-Structured Interview Form and the school principals participating in the qualitative and quantitative dimensions of the current study.

Results

Findings associated with the qualitative and quantitative dimensions of the current study are presented separately in the following section.

Results associated with the quantitative dimension of the current study

Some assumptions needed to be met in order for the hierarchical linear multiple regression analysis to be used in the current study. According to Kalaycı (2008), these assumptions are as follows: a) data are distributed normally, b) there is a linear relationship between the variables, c) the average of the error terms is zero, and d) there is no auto-correlation problem (Durbin-Watson values between 1.5 and 2.5), e) multicollinearity among the independent variables (relationship among more than two variables, found at a level higher than .80). İn the current study, data were distributed normally; when Mahalonobis values calculated for the outlier analysis was less than the value in the table, the assumption of multi-variable normality was met. Subjects with a Mahalonobis value over the Chi Square value in the table are defined to be outliers and they can be excluded in the data set. For these operations, a significance level of .001 is recommended to be set (Büyüköztürk, 2004). Thus, nine data with outlying values were excluded in the data set. Also, Mahalanobis distance values were calculated and values above 1.83 were excluded in the set (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Measurements involving participants with lost data were not included in the data. Measurements for six participants were excluded in the data. The dispersion traffic among the variables indicated a linear relationship. In addition, it was seen that Durbin-Watson value was 1.92 and there was no auto-correlation problem. Also, no multicollinearity among the independent variables was found and VIF values ranged between .93 and .99; thus, there was no multi-linearity problem. Table 1 below includes descriptive statistics associated with the research findings and Pearson correlation coefficient values. Based on that, the skewness and kurtosis values were seen to range between .02 and .70. Data between the recommended

values of +1 and -1 indicated that there was not an important conflict in terms of normality (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In addition, as some sub-dimensions associated with scales were not found significant in the regression analysis; those sub-dimensions were not included in the analysis.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics associated with the Research Findings and Pearson Correlation Coefficient Values

Variables	$\overline{X}$	Ss	Skewness	Kurtosis	1	2	3	4
1. Empathic Tendency Scale (ETS)	73.22	7.36	.25	-.02				
2. Anger-in (STAS)	15.46	3.33	.17	-.12	-.37**			
3. Anger-control (STAS)	22.75	3.45	-.18	.46	.33**	-.18**		
4. Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)	23.92	5.68	-.70	.03	.30**	-.09	.18**	
5.Ways of Coping Inventory (WCI)	6.69	1.58	-.23	.38	.15**	-.06	.10	-.02

N=252, **$p<.01$

As can be seen in Table 1, ETS average was $\overline{X}=73.22$ the Anger-in average as the sub-dimension of STAS was $\overline{X}=15.46$, and the Anger-control average as the sub-dimension of STAS was found to be $\overline{X}=22.75$. The average of SWLS was $\overline{X}=23.92$ and average of receiving social support as a sub-dimension of WCI was $\overline{X}=6.69$. A negative relationship (r = -.37) between ETS and Anger-in sub-dimension of STAS and a positive relationship (r =.33) between ETS and Anger-control sub-dimension of STAS were found. A positive relationship (r =.30) between ETS and SWSL and a positive significant relationship (r = .15) between ETS and receiving social support as sub-dimension of WCI were found. It was also seen that negative relationships between Anger-in and Anger-control (r = -.18) as sub-dimensions of STAS, between Anger-in and SWSL (r = -.09), and between Anger-in and receiving social support as sub-dimension of WCI (r = -.06) were found. A positive relationship (r = .18) between Anger-control as sub-dimension of STAS and SWSL and a positive relationship (r = .10) between Anger-control as sub-dimension of STAS and receiving social support as sub-dimension of WCI were found. Also, there was a negative relationship (r = -.02) between SWSL and receiving social support as a sub-dimension of WCI.

Table 2 Results of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis

Dependent Variable	Model	Predictor Variables	B	SH$_B$	β	t	F	R	R	ΔR2
	1	Constant	85.96	2.04		41.94				
		Anger-in	-.82	.13	-.37	-6.35	40.40**	.37	.13	.13
	2	Constant	76.48	2.74		27.82				
		Anger-in Satisfaction with Life	.35	.07	.27	4.91	34.15**	.46	.21	.20
Empathic Tendency	3	Constant	65.11	3.84		16.95				
		Anger-in Satisfaction with Life Anger-control	.49	.12	.23	4.11	29.86**	.51	.26	.25
	4	Constant	58.57	4.35		13.45				
		Anger-in Satisfaction with Life Anger-control Social support	.75	.25	.16	3.02	25.42**	.54	.29	.28

Table 2 indicates that four different regression models were obtained through the hierarchical multiple regression analysis associated with the school administrators' scores on Empathic Tendency Scale. A review of R^2 values indicates that Anger-in sub-dimension of The State-Trait Anger Scale (STAS) explained the 13% [$F_{(1.250)}$=40.40** p< .001] of the variance on Empathic Tendency Scale; this increased up to 21% [$F_{(2.249)}$=34.15** p< .001] with the addition of Satisfaction with Life Scale in the analysis and up to 26% [$F_{(3.248)}$=29.86** p< .001] with the addition of Anger-control as sub-dimension of STAS on Empathic Tendency Scale. It went up to 29% [$F_{(4.247)}$=25.42** p< .001] with the addition of receiving social support sub-dimension of Ways of Coping Inventory (WCI) in the analysis. It was seen that the variable being the most predictive of school administrators' empathic tendency levels was Anger-in sub-dimension of The State-Trait Anger Scale (STAS).

Findings associated with the qualitative dimension of the current study

Themes of (1) empathy, (2) anger, (3) life satisfaction, and (4) stress were found from code to path through content-analysis of findings obtained in the interviews with school principals through semi-structured interview form. Also, descriptive quotes belonging to the participant were included. Thus, categories such as the definition of empathy, use of empathic skills, the variables affecting the empathic skills and codes of theme of empathy are included in Table 3.

Table 3. Categories and Codes of Theme of Empathy

Theme	Category	Codes
1.Empathy	1.Definition of Empathy	1. Himself/herself in other' position
		2. Understanding feelings
		3. Understanding thoughts
		4. Getting rid of single-sided perspective
		5. Knowing reactions
		6. Valuation
		7. Communication
	2. Using the Empathic Skills	1. Considered themselves efficient in empathizing
		2. Partly used those skills
		3. Her/him incompetent.
	3. Variables Affecting Empathic Skills	Personal
		1. Anger
		2. Living experience
		3. Stres
		4. İnterpersonal relationships
		5. Mood
		6. Self-esteem
		7. Condescending attitude
		8. Prejudgments
		9. Personal development
		10.Personal characteristics
		Business-education
		1. Education level
		2. Work environment
		3. Years in service
		4. Subordinate-superior relationships
		5. Job satisfaction
		6. Passion to succeed
		Cultural
		1. Life style
		2. Family
		3. Geographical region
		4. Ethnic identity

1st Theme - Category 1: Definition of Empathy

A review of responses by school administrators provided for the question of '*In your opinion, what is empathy?*' showed the following definitions: 'himself/herself in other' position' (f:11), 'understanding feelings' (f:4), 'understanding thoughts' (f:3). Besides these, some other definitions included: 'getting rid of single-sided perspective' (f: 2), 'knowing reactions' (f:1), 'valuation (f: 1), and 'communication (f:1).

M5 (Male; age: 42) among the school administrators expressed his/her view as follows: *it is about putting oneself in others' position; the ability to have a wide angle of perspective. It is about being able to get rid of the single-sided perspective. It is the indication of valuing the other*.

M1 (Male; Age:36), a school principal, stated his view as follows: *...It is about understanding others' feelings and thoughts and behaviors. Understanding and sensing. It is about imagining oneself in others' position…*

1st Theme - Category 2: Using the Empathic Skills

A review of responses by school administrators provided for the question of '*What do you think of yourself using the empathic skills?*' showed that half of them 'considered themselves efficient in empathizing' (f:5) and others that followed thought that 'they partly used those skills' (f:4). One individual was found to consider her/him incompetent.

M1 (Male; age: 36) among the school administrators expressed his/her view as follows: *to be impartial, I do not consider myself competent. In my opinion, majority of the empathizers have difficulty empathizing due to their own emotions and thoughts*.

M2, another school administrator (Female; age: 46), stated her view as follows: *…I sometimes try to empathize. I am thinking sometimes I act without empathizing. I consider myself at least a bit competent…*

1st Theme - Category 3: Variables Affecting Empathic Skills

A review of responses by school administrators provided for the question of 'What are the variables that affect your empathic skills?' showed that the leading personal variables that affects the empathic skills was 'anger' (f:4). Following this are: 'living experiences' (f:4), 'stress' (f:3), 'interpersonal relationships' (f:2), 'mood' (f:1), 'self-esteem' (f:1), 'condescending attitude' (f:1), 'prejudgments' (f:1), 'personal development' (f:1), 'personal characteristics' (f:1).

The business-education variables that affects the empathic skills was ''education level' (f:3), 'work environment' (f:2), 'years in service' (f:1), 'subordinate-superior relationships' (f:1), 'job satisfaction' (f:1), and 'passion to succeed' (f:1).

The cultural variables that affects the empathic skills was 'life style' (f:3), 'family' (f:2), 'geographical region' (f:1), and 'ethnic identity' (f:1).

M4 (Male; age: 46) explaining the factors affecting empathic skills stated that: *I have difficulties empathizing in the face of frequently experienced similar activities, frequently faced negative experiences or events. Incidents closer to me, I mean geographically, influence me more and I empathize more. Various life styles and ethnic identities influence empathy. Pains in my family and in the nation are more important for me.*

M8, another school administrator (Make; age: 51), stated his view as follows:*…as my years in service multiply, I find it difficult to empathize…*

Another school administrator, M6 (Male; age: 38), stated his view as follows:*…stress and anger impact my empathic abilities. I get very emotional when I am angry. I find it difficult to empathize due to my intense emotions…*

Table 4 includes the categories and codes of anger theme. This indicates the categories and codes of 'incidents that make one the angriest at school' and 'reaction when angry'.

Table 4. Categories and Codes of Anger Theme

Theme	Categories	Sub-Categories	Codes
2.Anger	1. Incidents that make One the Angriest at School	1. Living problems with teachers	1. Coming in the classroom late 2. Not to teach 3. Irresponsible behavior 4. Lying 5. Without classroom management 6. Gossip
		2. Living problems with staffs	1. Irresponsible behavior 2. Not being punctual 3. Not careful hygiene
		3. Living problems with parents	1. Negative attitude
		4. Living problems with students	1. Not obeying the rules of economizing 2. Discipline incidents
		5.Personal problems	1. Targeting personality' 2. Being treated unfairly
		6. Audit related problems	1. Negative attitude
	2. Reaction during Anger	Constructive / Effective Reactions	1.Tried to understand 2.Tried to control anger 3.Tried to obtain information 4. Tried to solve the problem 5. Self-observation 6. Self-expression 7. Tried not to personalize
		Disruptive / Aggressive Reactions	1. Raised their voices 2. Acting outrageously 3.Smoking 4. Humiliating personalities 5. Hitting 6.Had varying moods
		Avoidance Reactions	1. Postpone appointment 2. Left the environment 3. Tried not to talk 4. Tried to hide anger 5. Did not comment 6. Not to Heart breaking
	3. Perception associated with Empathizing in Anger		1. Could not empathize in anger 2. Tried to empathize 3. Did not have difficulty empathizing

2nd Theme - Category 1: Incidents that make One the Angriest at School

An analysis of responses by school administrators provided for the question of 'What makes you the angriest at school?' showed that the things that made the school administrators the angriest included living problems with teachers: 'coming in the classroom late'(f:4), 'not to teach' (f:4), 'irresponsible behavior' (f:2), 'lying' (f:2). 'Without classroom management' (f:1) and 'gossip' (f:1). Living problems with staffs : 'Irresponsible behavior' (f:2), 'not being punctual' (f:1) and 'not careful hygiene'(f:1). Living problems with parents included: 'Negative attitude' (f:2) . Living problems with students included: 'Not obeying the rules of economizing(f:1) and discipline incidents(f:1). Personal

problems included: 'targeting personality'(f:3) and 'being treated unfairly' (f:1). Audit related problems included: Negative attitude (f:1).

M9 (Male; age: 50) stated the following about this question: *I get angry with teachers coming late to the classroom and not saving enough time for education and instruction, and teachers not fulfilling their professional responsibilities.*

M5 (Male; Age: 42) stated his view in response to this question as follows:…*parents' approaches; expectations; parents consider their children fit for the best, therefore, when children get low grades, they have a negative attitude, or inspectors' non-constructive criticism towards practice make me angry…*

Another administrator, M1 (Male; age: 36) stated his view as follows in response to this question:…*discipline cases about students make me very angry. Also, teachers going in classrooms late, not running instruction, teachers not being useful for students, and staff not using hygiene make me angry…*

2nd Theme - Category 2: Reaction during Anger

An analysis of responses by school administrators provided for the question of 'What do you do when in anger?' showed that constructive / effective Reactions of school administrators about anger: 'tried to understand' (f:4), 'tried to control anger' (f:3), 'tried to obtain information' (f:1), 'tried to solve the problem' (f:1), 'self-observation' (f:1), 'self-expression'(f:1), 'tried not to personalize' (f:1). Disruptive /aggressive reactions of school administrators : 'Raised their voices' (f:2), 'Acting outrageously'(f:1), 'smoking'(f:1), 'humiliating personalities' (f:1), 'hitting'and 'had varying moods'(f:1). Avoidance reactions of school administrators: 'Postpone appointment'(f:5), 'left the environment'(f:4), 'tried not to talk'(f:3), 'tried to hide anger'(f:1), 'did not comment'(f:1), and 'not heart breaking'(f:1).

M3 (Female; age: 42) stated her view in response to this question as follows:…*I try to control myself. I try to calm. I try to express myself and tell what I think. I try to calm without personalizing the matter towards the person I get angry with…*

M10 (Male; age: 47) stated his view in response to this question as follows: …*Sometimes when I get angry, I may behave carelessly. I look for ways to suppress my anger. I try to calm down. Sometimes things develop suddenly and may lead to negative consequences. When I cannot control my anger, I may humiliate the person and rarely show physical reaction…*

M6 (Male; age: 38) stated the following about this question: *I wait for my anger to calm. If possible, I leave the place. I do not communicate when it is inconvenient and I postpone to a convenient time.*

2nd Theme - Category 3: Perception associated with Empathizing in Anger

A review of responses by school administrators provided for the question of 'What do you think of yourself empathizing when in anger?' showed that majority of the school administrators 'could not empathize in anger' (f:7). However, there were also those who 'tried to empathize' (f:2) and those who 'did not have difficulty empathizing' (f:1).

M7 (Male; age: 39) stated the following about this question: *I can never empathize in anger, particularly if it is something targeting your personality, we cannot talk about empathy for a long time.*

M4 (Male; age: 46) stated his view in response to this question as follows:…*I do not have difficulty empathizing when I get angry. For instance, I try to imagine myself in the position of the person I quarrel with. I've seen many people impacted by anger. Therefore, I think it is important to empathize. I try to calm down because administration requires this…*

3rd Theme - Category 1: The Relationship between Life Satisfaction and Empathy

An analysis of responses by school administrators provided for the question of 'How do you think are your life satisfaction and empathy related?' showed that almost all school administrators 'were able to better empathize as they were satisfied with their own lives' (f:9). However, one participant stated that "s/he was not satisfied with his/her own life and this dissatisfaction made it harder to empathize".

M7 (Male; age:39) stated the following about this question: *I am not satisfied with my life. I cannot be pleased with my life when I see the injustice and inequality in my social environment and work place and I consider satisfaction, anxiety of future, and social unrest. The unrest in the community disturbs me and I cannot be satisfied with my life. All these influence empathy and make it hard to empathize.*

M6 (Male; age: 38) stated his view in response to this question as follows:…*I am pleased with my age, family, and social life. My satisfaction with life makes it easy for me to empathize. If you are a father, you tend to think and decide as your child does. I understand better. My happy life, family, and my peace within family make me understand my students better…*

Table 5 includes categories and codes associated with the theme of stress. Thus, codes and sub-categories associated with the category of 'the relationship between stress and empathy', 'social support', and 'the relationship between social support and empathy' were found.

Tablo 5. Categories, Sub-Categories, and Codes associated with the Theme of Stress

Theme	Categories	Sub-Categories	Codes
4.Stress	1. The Relationship between Stress and Empathy	1. Find it hard to empathize 2. S/he find empathize	1. Being over-emotional 2. Making unprepared decisions 3. Not wanting to communicate' 4. Being mentally pre-occupied 5. Stress pressurizing on personality' 6. Unfair work environment 7. Social tension 8. Anxiety about future 9. Unfinished works
	2.Social Support	1. Received social support	1. Spouses 2.Teachers 3. Assistant principals 4.Friends 5. Relatives 6. Siblings 7. Employees 8. Teaching staff 9. School administrators
		2. Not received social support	
	3. The Relationship between Social Support and Empathy	1. Improved empathy 2. Would not affect empathizing 3. Made it hard to empathize	

4ᵗʰ Theme - Category 1: The Relationship between Stress and Empathy

A review of responses by school administrators provided for the question of 'Do you find it hard to empathize in stressful situations? Why?' showed that almost all school administrators 'find it hard to empathize in stressful situations' (f: 9). However, one participant stated that "s/he did not find it hard to empathize in stressful situations". Factors that make it hard to empathize in stress included: 'being over-emotional' (f: 2), 'making unprepared decisions' (f: 2), 'not wanting to communicate' (f: 2), 'being mentally pre-occupied' (f: 1), 'stress pressurizing on personality' (f: 1), 'unfair work environment' (f: 1), 'social tension' (f: 1), 'anxiety about future' (f: 1), and 'unfinished works' (f: 1).

M10 (Male; age:47) stated the following about this question: *I find it hard to empathize in stressful situations. I do not want to communicate with people when I am distressed: I prefer to be left alone. If I am home, my wife helps me calm down.*

M2 (Female; age: 46) stated his view in response to this question as follows:…*due to being a woman…being married…a mother and a spouse, I fight much to empathize. I force myself to empathize. Working and being married, you need to be more positive. To hold on to life; empathy is part of this; no matter how stressed out and tired, I try to empathize…*

4th Theme - Category 2: Social Support

A review of responses by school administrators provided for the question of 'How do you think receiving social support affects empathic skills?' indicated that majority of school administrators (f: 7) thought that 'social support improved empathy'; two participants believed that 'not receiving social would not affect empathizing'; and one participant thought that 'not receiving social support made it hard to empathize'.

M2 (Female; age: 46) stated the following about this question: *my receiving social support positively reflects on my use of empathic skills. I share my problems with them. They make me take a different perspective and look through a different frame. I think this positively develops empathy.*

M8 (Male; age: 51) stated his view in response to this question as follows:…*I do not receive social support. I do not think receiving social support would impact me about the ability to empathize…*

4th Theme - Category 3: The Relationship between Social Support and Empathy

A review of responses by school administrators provided for the question of 'Do you get social support in your social environment?' indicated that majority of the school administrators (f: 7) received social support and some of them did not receive any (f: 3). Mostly spouses (f: 6) provided social support and teachers (f: 5), assistant principals (f: 4), friends (f: 3), relatives (f: 3), siblings (f: 2), employees (f: 2), teaching staff (f: 1), and school administrators (f: 1) followed.

M3 (Female; age: 42) stated the following about this question: …*I often receive social support from my relatives to solve various problems…*

M7 (Male; age: 39) stated his view in response to this question as follows:…*I cannot share my problems. I cannot obtain support even when I have anxiety. I do not receive it in such situations. I share things when I am more comfortable and joyous. I do not communicate as I do not obtain social support. Thus, if there is a negative impact, I think it is on me…*

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

The following discussion is based on the relevant literature associated with the qualitative and quantitative findings obtained in the current study. Qualitative research data indicated that majority of the school administrators defined empathy as 'an individual imagining himself/herself in others' positions', 'understanding others' feelings', and 'understanding others' thoughts'. Half the school administrators considered themselves competent in empathizing and thought that 'they partially used this'. One participant did not consider himself/herself competent. In a similar research, Turan, Yıldırım, and Aydoğdu (2012) stated that school administrators were required to be empathic and tolerant. Cooper (2011) emphasized that school administrators were required to empathize with the teaching staff and parents in order to provide students with a better future. It was also stated that school administrators represented the school and it is important for them to know about various disciplines and cultures for effectively empathizing. Doğan (2012) found a positively significant relationship between leadership styles of school administrators and their methods of resolving conflicts. Thus, based on the current research findings and results, it can be said that school administrators partially used empathy; however, they were not competent enough in using empathic skills. It is thought that their lack of adequate empathizing may be associated with differences in service years and education levels among students, parents, and teachers at school and administrators. Also, school administrators' lack

of adequate knowledge to cope with problems associated with students' developmental characteristics, staff, teachers, parents, or school is thought to make it difficult to empathize.

Four different regression models were obtained through hierarchical multiple regression analysis results based on Empathic Tendency Scale scores within the quantitative research data. A review of R^2 values indicated that Anger-in sub-dimension of The State-Trait Anger Scale (STAS) explained Empathic Tendency within the 13 %; this increased up to 21 % with the addition of Satisfaction with Life Scale in the analysis and up to 26 % with the addition of Anger-control as sub-dimension of STAS. It went up to Empathic Tendency 29 % with the addition of receiving social support sub-dimension of Ways of Coping Inventory (WCI) in the analysis. It was seen that qualitative findings supported the quantitative findings. Thus, leading factor among those affecting empathic skills was *anger*. *Stress*, *life style*, and *life experiences* followed this. Things that made the school administrators the angriest included *teachers coming in the classroom late, teachers not saving enough time for education and instruction, staff ignoring their responsibilities*, and *teachers not fulfilling their responsibilities*. Also, majority of the school administrators were found to be unable to *empathize* in anger. It was found that when in anger school administrators *postpone appointment*, , *tried to understand what was going on*, *left the environment briefly*, *tried to control anger*, *tried not to talk*, and *raised their voices*. In similar study, Çubukçu and Dönmez (2011) found that school administrators' methods of coping with violence included noticing the student by talking, exhibiting love, knowing about the students, and empathizing. Similarly, Goleman (1996) emphasized that it was hard to empathize and individuals noticed physical effects targeting them in situations where emotional reactions such as excessive anger were involved. In research supporting the results of this study, a relationship between empathic tendency and anger control was found (Doğan et al., 2010; Gezer et al., 2014;). Similar studies indicated that, in interpersonal communication, the angry party must be empathized with, understood, and the factors leading to anger must be discovered (Doğan et al., 2001; Doğan et al., 2010; Ornstein, 1999;). On the other hand, empathizer in educational settings must understand complicated cognitive and emotional inner-worldly self in people involved in the communication (Cooper, 2011). Also, regulating emotions of anger toward the person that an individual experiences issues with may constitute example for others in addition to helping empathize (Maxwell, 2008). Similarly, Yıldırım (2011) found out that negative aspects of being a school administrator included more nervousness, professional recession, family and psychological problems. According to the findings of similar studies and the results of the current research, being a school administrator brings along problems, conflicts, and responsibilities associated with students, teachers, parents, and the staff. Thus, it can be said that when any conflict or obstacle arises, anger control and empathizing by school principals may help resolve conflicts and solve problems. Consequently, it can be said that qualitative and quantitative research findings support each other; it was expected for anger to predict empathy; empathizing may be hard in anger; and anger control may influence empathy.

Another finding in the current research indicated that there was a positive relationship between SWLS and ETS and the model predicted the ETS for 21% upon adding the SWLS in the analysis. The qualitative findings of the current research support the quantitative findings. Thus, almost all school administrators were found to *have satisfaction with their lives and this satisfaction facilitated empathy*. In the other studies that support the findings of the current research, a positive relationship was found between empathic skills and satisfaction with life (Baştuğ, 2009; Deniz & Yılmaz, 2004; Kırtıl, 2009; Koçak & İçmenoğlu, 2012; Özdemir, 2015; Shanafelt et al., 2005; Thomas et al., 2007; Totan, 2015). In a similar study, A positive relationship was found between satisfaction with life and empathic tendency in studies investigating empathic skills as a sub-dimension of emotional intelligence (Kırtıl, 2009; Koçak & İçmenoğlu, 2012; Özdemir, 2015). In a similar research, Ardahan (2012) found a positive relationship between empathic awareness and satisfaction with life. Thus, it can be said that school administrators with positive evaluation and perception of their own lives and professions may positively influence their approach to teachers, students, and parents and that they may be able to use emphatic skills more effectively. In addition, positive perceptions of life may lead to a positive approach towards listening to

and understanding the feelings and thoughts of the individual in communication and problem-solving by creating a constructive evaluation within interpersonal communication as well.

Another finding of the study was about the positively significant relationship between social support as the sub-dimension of WCI and the ETS. It was found that adding the social support sub-dimension of Ways of Coping Inventory (WCI) in the analysis increased it up to Empathic Tendency 29 %. Also, the qualitative findings of the current research supported the quantitative findings. Hence, almost all school administrators *found it hard to empathize when distressed* and one participant *did not have difficulty empathizing in distress*. Factors leading to difficulty empathizing in distress included *being over-emotional*, *making uneducated decisions*, and *not wanting to communicate*. Another qualitative finding is about the majority of school administrators receiving social support and three participants not receiving it. Social support was mostly provided by spouses and teachers, assistant principals, friends, relatives, siblings, employees, teaching staff, and school administrators followed. It was seen that majority of the school administrators thought that *social support improved empathy*. In a similar study, Hatipoğlu (2013) determined a positive relationship between receiving socials support at work and empathic tendency. On the other hand, Hoffman (2001) stated that empathy included a process associated with individual's social and personality psychology. Blase (1984), investigating teachers' views in a similar research, found that school administrators were considered people arousing stress. In another similar study, Yıldırım (2011) revealed that negative aspects of being a school administrator included the increase in health problems, stress, and smoking. Koçak and Eves (2010), similarly, determined that perceived social support was effective on school administrators' professional performance. Also, Babaoğlan (2006) stated that social support was important for school administrators coping with stress at work and burnout . Besides, administrators supported by spouses were found to have lower scores on the depersonalization sub-dimension of burnout. Thus, it can be said that receiving social support improved empathic skills and helped cope with stress and burnout more effectively because the social support that could be provided by spouses, teachers, and etc. for the school administrators could help understand different perspectives and improve empathy. In addition, it can be said that the social support that school administrators receive in the family, among staff or in the work environment may contribute significantly in better managing schools, better empathize, and resolving organizational conflicts.

In conclusion, four different regression models were obtained through the hierarchical multiple regression analysis of school administrators' Empathic Tendency Scale scores. The variables predicting the empathy were found to have a negative relationship with Anger-in sub-dimension of STAS. They also were found to have a positive relationship between Empathic Tendency and Anger-control sub-dimension of STAS, social support sub-dimensions of SWLS and WCI. Hence, findings based on qualitative data were found to support findings based on quantitative data. Consequently, qualitative and quantitative data used together contribute in the strength of the current study. However, not being able to include the whole population for the quantitative dimension is among the poor qualities of this research. Based on the findings of current research, following suggestions may be put forward:

1. Psychological counseling sessions in psycho-educational groups can be organized to improve school principals' empathic skills.

2. Group psychological counseling sessions may be organized by social practitioners (psychological counselor, psychologist, social service expert, etc.) in relation to the variables (anger, life satisfaction, and social support) associated with empathy to develop school principals' empathic abilities.

3. Social support groups (teachers, school principals, parents, students, etc.) where school administrators can exchange ideas about situations challenging their empathy or leading to conflict and anger may be organized and regular meetings with those groups can be organized.

4. In order for school administrators to empathize more effectively, seminars on the variables of empathy, anger, life satisfaction, and social support and the relationships among these variables can be organized.

Following recommendations about future studies are based on the current research results:

1. Variables predicting the empathy with teachers can be investigated in another study,

2. Students can be asked about empathic skills of school principals and teachers in a study comparing the variables predicting their empathic skills.

3. A study examining whether school administrators have empathic abilities may be conducted with students.

4. Programs associated with anger, life satisfaction, and social support in various samples may be prepared and the effect of these programs on empathic abilities may be studied through experimental research.

References

Abrams, M. (2010). *Anger management in sport.* United Kingdom: Sheridan Books.

Akbağ, M. (2000). *Stres ile başa çıkma tarzlarının üniversite öğrencilerinde olumsuz otomatik düşünceler transaksiyonel analiz ego durumları ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.

Aktaş, A. M. (2001). Bir kamu kuruluşunun üst düzey yöneticilerinin iş stresi ve kişilik özellikleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, *56*(4), 1-23.

Altıntaş, E. (2014). *Stres yönetimi.* Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Ardahan, F. (2012). Duygusal zekâ ve yaşam doyumu arasındaki ilişkinin doğa sporu yapanlar örneğinde incelenmesi. *Pamukkale Journal of Sport Sciences*, *3*(3), 20-33.

Atkinson, R., Atkinson, R. C., & Hilgard, E. R. (1995). *Psikolojiye giriş* (K. Atakay, Trans.). İstanbul: Sosyal Yayınevi.

Aytaç, M. (2014). *Yöneticilerin empatik eğilimleri stresle başa çıkma durumları ve çatışma yönetim stratejileri arasındaki ilişkinin araştırılması* (Unpublished master's thesis). Üsküdar University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

Babaoğlan, E. (2006). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinde tükenmişlik* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of Social Sciences, Bolu.

Baltaş, A., & Baltaş, Z. (1997). *Stres ve başaçıkma yolları* (16th ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Baştuğ, G. (2009). Voleybol antrenör adaylarının empatik becerileri ile yaşam doyumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, *3*(3), 222-227.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529.

Bayar, A. (2015). Bir örgüt olarak okulda meydana gelen çatışma nedenleri ve çözüm yollarına yönelik okul müdürlerinin görüşleri. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, *5*(3), 130-141.

Bellini, L. M., Baime, M., & Shea, J. A. (2002). Variation of mood and empathy during internship. *Jama*, *287*(23), 3143-3146. doi:10.1001/jama.287.23.3143

Bilge, F. (1997). Danışandan hız alan ve bilişsel davranışçı yaklaşımlarla yapılan grupla psikolojik danışmanın üniversite öğrencilerinin kızgınlık düzeyleri üzerindeki etkileri. *Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, *2*(8), 9-16.

Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (2000). Social intelligence-empathy: Agression?. *Agression and Violent Behavior*, *5*(2), 191-200.

Blase, J. P. (1984). A data based model of how teachers cope with work stress. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *12*, 173-191.

Burger, M. J. (2006). *Kişilik* (İ. D. Erguvan Sarıoğlu, Trans.). İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları.

Burns, D. (2006). *İyi hissetmek, yeni duygudurum tedavisi* (H. A. Karaosmanoğlu, Trans.). Bilişsel Davranışçı Terapiler Serisi–3. İstanbul: Psikonet yayınları.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2004). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* (4th ed.). Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Cam, E. (2004). Çalışma yaşamında stres ve kamu kesiminde kadın çalışanlar. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, *1*(1).

Casiadi, S. (2017). *Öğretmenlerin okul müdürlerinin iletişim becerileri ve çatışma yönetimi konusunda görüşleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Çanakkale.

Chacko, T. (1983). Job and life satisfactions: a casual analysis of their relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*(1), 163-169.

Conway, T., & Swift, J. S. (2000). International relationship marketing. The importance of psychic distance. *European Journal of Marketing*, *34*(11/12), 1391-1413.

Cornell, D. G., Peterson, C. S., & Richards, H. (1999). Anger as a predictor of aggression among incarcerated adolescents. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *67*(1), 108-119.

Cooper, B. (2011). *Empathy in education: Engagement, values and achievement*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Cooper, R. K., & Sawaf, A. (2000). *Liderlikte duygusal zekâ-Yönetimde ve organizasyonda duygusal zekâ*. (Z. B. Ayman, & B. Sancar, Trans.). İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Çankaya, G., & Ergin, H. (2015). Çocukların oynadıkları oyunlara göre empati ve saldırganlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Hacettepe University Faculty of Health Sciences Journal*, *1*(2), 283-297.

Çubukçu, Z., & Dönmez, A. (2012). İlköğretim okul yöneticilerinin şiddet türlerine yönelik görüşleri ve şiddetle başa çıkma yöntemleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, *18*(1), 37-64.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *44*(1), 113-126.

Deniz, M. E., & Yılmaz, E. (2004). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin duygusal zeka yetenekleri ve yaşam doyumları arasındaki ilişki.* Paper presented at XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı, İnönü University, Malatya.

Denzin, N. K. (1994). Triangulation. In T. Husen & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Education* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Pergamon.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *49*(19), 71-75.

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, *125*(2), 276-302.

De Waal, F. B. M. (2008). Putting the altruism back into altruism: The evolution of empathy. *The Annual Review of Psychology*, *59*, 279-300.

Doğan, S. (2012). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile kullandıkları çatışma çözüm stratejileri arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *1*(4), 226-233.

Doğan, S., Güler, H., & Kelleci, M. (2001). Hastaların öfkeli davranışları karşısında hemşirelerin yaklaşımları. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, *5*(1), 26-32.

Doğan, H., Üngüren, E., & Algür, S. (2010). Öfke ve empati ilişkisine yönelik otel zincirinde bir araştırma. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *19*(3), 277-298.

Dökmen, Ü. (1988). Empatinin yeni bir modele dayanılarak ölçülmesi ve psikodrama ile geliştirilmesi. *A. Ü. Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, *2*(1-2), 155-190.

Dökmen, Ü. (2005). *İletişim çatışmaları ve empati*. Ankara: Sistem Yayıncılık.

Duy, B., & Yıldız, M. A. (2014). Farklı zorbalık konumunda olmak empatik eğilim ve yaşam doyumu bağlamında bir fark yaratır mı?. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *10*(3), 31-47.

Eisenberg, N., & Eggum, N. D. (2009). Empathic responding: Sympathy and personal distress. *The Social Neuroscience of Empathy*, *6*, 71-83.

Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1980). Analysis of coping in a middle aged community sample. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *21*, 219-239.

Gezer, E., Orcan, M., & Çetin, M. Ç. (2014). Türkiye genç güreş milli takımı sporcularının öfke düzeyleri ile empatik eğilimleri arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi. *Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, *8*(1), 105-111.

Goleman, D. (1996). *Emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Gök, M. (2009). *Aile içi şiddet ve öfke ifade tarzları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, Adana.

Gündüz, B., Tunç, B., & İnandı, Y. (2013). Okul yöneticilerinin öfke ve stresle başa çıkma yaklaşımları ile çatışma yönetimi stilleri arasındaki ilişki. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, *10*(1), 641-660.

Güngör, S., & Taşdan, M. (2016). Okul müdürlerinin perspektifinden ilköğretim okullarında iletişim engelleri. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 12*(1), 391-409.

Hatipoğlu, C. (2013). *Hekimlerde empati, iş doyumu, iş stresi düzeyleri ve birbirleri ile ilişkileri* (Unpublished dissertation). Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Tıp Fakültesi, Pamukkale.

Heller, D. A., Judge, T., & Watson, D. (2002). The confounding role of personality and trait affectivity in the relationship between job and life satisfaction. *Journal Organizational Behaviour*, *23*, 815-835.

Helmer, C. B. (2013). *Effect of prıncıpals' communıcatıon on female elementary school teachers' perception of morale and student learning* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas A&M University-Commerce, Texas.

Hisli Şahin, N., Basım, N., & Akkoyun, N. (2011). A-tipi kişilik ve stres ilişkisinde üç önemli bileşen: Öfke, etkisiz başa çıkma ve iş saplantısı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 26*(68), 31-44.

Hoffman, M. L. (2001). Toward a comprehensive empathy-based theory of prosocial moral development. In C. Bohart, & D. J. Tipek (Eds.), *Constructive and destructive behavior. Implications for family, school and society* (pp. 61-86). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Iverson, R. D., & Maguire, C. (1999). The relationship between job and life satisfaction: Evidence from a remote mining community. *The University of Melbourne, Department of Management Working Paper*, *14*, 1-25.

İşçen, P. (2006). *Onkologların çatışma eğilimlerinin, empatik becerilerinin, iş doyumlarının ve stresle başa çıkma tarzlarının incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul University, Institute of Health Sciences, İstanbul.

Kahraman, H. (2000). *Aile yaşamlarında şiddet olan ergenlerin ana-babalarıyla olan ilişkilerini ve kendilerini değerlendirmeleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ege University, Institute of Social Sciences, İzmir.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2008). *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri* (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.

Karakaş, A. C. (2014). *Gerçeklik terapisi yönelimli dini başa çıkma psikoeğitim programının affetme esnekliği, empati ve stresle başa çıkma üzerindeki etkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Sakarya University, Institute of Social Sciences, Sakarya.

Katman, H. A. (2010). *Okul yöneticilerinin empatik eğilimlerinin incelenmesi: Isparta il merkezi örneği* (Unpublished master's thesis). Süleyman Demirel University, Institute of Social Sciences, Isparta.

Kaukiainen, A., Björkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K., Österman, K., Salmivalli, C., Rothberg, S., & Ahlbom, A. (1999). The relationships between social intelligence, empathy, and three types of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, *25*(2), 81-89.

Kılıç, S. (2005). *İstanbul'daki okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin empatik beceri düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.

Kırtıl, S. (2009). *İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerinin duygusal zeka düzeyleri ile yaşam doyumu düzeylerinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İzmir.

Koçak, R., & Eves, S. (2010). Okul yöneticilerinin iş doyumları ile problem çözme becerileri arasındaki ilişki. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 7(1)*, 193-212.

Koçak, R., & İçmenoğlu, E. (2012). Üstün yetenekli öğrencilerin duygusal zekâ yaratıcılık düzeylerinin yaşam doyumlarını yordayıcı rolü. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, *4*(37), 73-85.

Kubilay, S. (2013). *Eğitim kurumlarında görev yapan yöneticilerin iş doyumu ve yaşam doyumu düzeylerinin incelenmesi: Niğde ili örneği* (Unpublished master's thesis). Erciyes University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Kayseri.

Lesure-Lester, G. E. (2000). Relation between empathy and aggression and behavior compliance abused group home youth. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, *31*, 153-161.

Lacono, V., Ellenbogen, M. A., Wilson, A. L., Desormeau, P., & Nijjar, R. (2015). Inhibition of personally relevant angry faces moderates the effect of empathy on interpersonal functioning. *Plos One*, *10*(2), e0112990. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0112990

Mamur, M. (2014). *Kamu kuruluşlarında yöneticilerin iş doyumu ve yaşam doyumu düzeyler üzerine bir araştırma: İstanbul ili Sultangazi ilçesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hasan Kalyoncu University, Institute of Social Sciences, Gaziantep.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The truth about burnout.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Marshall, W. L., Hudson, S. M., Jones, R., & Fernandez, Y. M. (1995). Empathy in sex offenders. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *15*(2), 99-113.

Maxwell, B. (2008). *Professional ethics education: Studies in compassionate empathy*. Germany: Springer Science.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage.

Köker, S. (1991). *Normal ve sorunlu ergenlerin yaşam doyumu düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

Oral, A. (1994). *Ergenlikte stres kaynakları ve baş etme yolları* (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

Ornstein, P. H. (1999). Conceptualization and treatment of rage in self psychology. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *55*(3), 283-293.

Önemlitürk, D. (1997). *Lise yöneticilerinin kendini gerçekleştirme ve empati düzeyleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Kocaeli University, Institute of Social Sciences, Kocaeli.

Özcan, C., Oflaz, F., & Türkbay, T. (2003). Dikkat eksikliği aşırı hareketlilik ve binişik karşıt olma-karşı gelme bozukluğu olan çocukların anne-babalarının empati düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması. *GATA Tıp Fakültesi, Çocuk ve Gençlik Ruh Sağlığı Dergisi*, *10*(3), 108-114.

Özçelik, N., Gülsün, M., Özçelik, F., & Öztosun, M. (2012). Yöneticilerin zaman yönetimi becerilerinin iş stresi üzerine etkisi. *Anatolian Journal of Clinical Investigation*, *6*(4), 231-238.

Özdemir, M. (2015). *Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin duygusal zekaları ile yaşam doyumlarının incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Atatürk University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Erzurum.

Özer, A. K. (1994). Continuous anger and the scales of anger expression ways preliminary study. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, *9*(31), 26-35.

Patterson, J. M., & McCubin, H. I. (1987). Adolescent coping style and behaviors: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Adolescents*, *10*, 163-186.

Preston, S. D., & De Waal, F. B. M. (2002). Empathy: Its ultimate and proximate bases. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *25*, 1-72.

Preston, S. D., & Hofelich, A. J. (2011). The many faces of empathy: Parsing empathic phenomena through a proximate, dynamic-systems view of representing the other in the self. *Emotion Review*, *20*(10), 1-10.

Rogers, C. R. (1975). *Empatik olmak değeri anlaşılmamış bir varoluş şeklidir* (F. Akkoyun, Trans.). *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, *16*, 1.

Seligman, M. E. P. ve Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Pscyhologist*, *55*(1), 4-5.

Spielberger, C. D. (1991). *State-trait anger expression inventory*. Orlando, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Strayer, J., & Roberts, W. (2004). Empathy and observed anger and aggression in five year-olds. *Social Development, 13*, 1-13.

Sökmen, A. (2005). Konaklama işletmeleri yöneticilerinin stres nedenlerinin belirlenmesinde cinsiyet faktörü: Adana'da ampirik bir araştırma. *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 1*, 1-27.

Shanafelt, T. D., West, C., Zhao, X., Novotny, P., Kolars, J., Habermann, T., & Sloan, J. (2005). Relationship between increased personal well-being and enhanced empathy among internal medicine residents. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 20*, 559-564.

Shechtman, Z. (2002). Cognitive and affective empathy in aggressive boys: Implications for counseling. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 24*, 211-222.

Sürgevil, O. (2005). *Tükenmişlik ve tükenmişliği etkileyen örgütsel faktörler: Akademik personel üzerinde bir uygulama* (Unpublished master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Social Sciences, İzmir.

Şahin, N. H., & Durak, A. (1995). Stresle başa çıkma tarzları ölçeği: Üniversite öğrencileri için uyarlanması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 10*(34), 56-73.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Thomas, M. R., Dyrye, L. N., Huntington, J. L., Lawson, K. L., Novotny, P. J., Sloan, J. A., & Shanafelt, T. D. (2007). How do distress and well-being relate to medical student empathy? A multicenter study. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 22*, 177-183.

Totan, T. (2015). Duygusal öz-yetkinlik ölçeğinin Türkçe formunun psikometrik niteliği. *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 6*(1), 46-57.

Turan, S., Yıldırım, N., & Aydoğdu, E. (2012). Okul müdürlerinin kendi görevlerine ilişkin bakış açıları. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi, 2*(3), 64-75.

Türnüklü, A. (2000). Eğitim bilim araştırmalarında etkin olarak kullanılabilecek nitel bir araştırma tekniği: Görüşme. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 24*, 543-559.

Uysal Dönmez, S. (2015). *İlkokul öğretmenlerinin görüşlerine göre okul müdürlerinin karizmatik liderlik davranışları ve empatik eğilimleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul Aydın University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

Uzun, Ö. (2011). Örgütsel stres ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi üzerine orta kademe otel yöneticileri üzerinde yapılan bir araştırma. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi, 6*(1), 181-213.

Ünal, S., Karlıdağ, R., & Yoloğlu, S. (2001). Hekimlerde tükenmişlik ve iş doyumu düzeylerinin yaşam doyumu düzeyleri ile ilişkisi. *Klinik Psikiyatri Dergisi, 4*(2), 113-118.

Yaman, M., Bayrakçı, M., & Yaman, Ç. (2002). Stres kaynakları ile yöneticilerin kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 9*, 141-155.

Yıldırım, N. (2011). Yöneticilik görevinin okul müdürlerine olumlu ve olumsuz katkıları. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 36*(161), 230-245.

Yılmaz, E., & Altınok, V. (2009). Okul yöneticilerinin yalnızlık ve yaşam doyum düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 15*(59), 451-469.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2003). *Nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (3rd ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.