



European Journal of Educational Management

Volume 6, Issue 1, 31 – 44.

ISSN: 2642-2344

<https://www.eujem.com/>

Relationship between Happy School, General Self Efficacy, Academic Self-Efficacy and Life Satisfaction

İzzet Döş* 

Independent Researcher, TURKEY

Received: October 11, 2022 • Revised: January 26, 2023 • Accepted: March 5, 2023

Abstract: In this study, the relationship between the happy school variable, which determines the happiness levels of secondary school students in their schools, and academic self-efficacy, general self-efficacy and life satisfaction were examined. The relationship between variables was examined in this correlation study. The population of the study consisted of high school students studying in Anatolian high school in the city center of Kahramanmaraş (Turkey). 315 students selected from these schools constituted the study sample. Data were collected with life satisfaction, academic self-efficacy, general self-efficacy, and happy school scales. Regression and path analyses were conducted for the data analysis. Study results suggest that each variable has a positive significant relationship with the other variables and that general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy and life satisfaction predicted happy schools. In the study, a linear model was created considering that a happy school is affected by general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy and life satisfaction. High fit indices were obtained with the model. These indices suggest that the model is an acceptable model which is fit.

Keywords: *Academic self-efficacy, general self-efficacy, happy school, life satisfaction, school and happiness.*

To cite this article: Döş, İ. (2023). Relationship between happy school, general self efficacy, academic self-efficacy and life satisfaction. *European Journal of Educational Management*, 6(1), 31-43. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eujem.6.1.31>

Introduction

Happiness is the state of people feeling good. People who are happy enjoy their lives and have high levels of life satisfaction. They see the problems they encounter differently; they tackle with problems in a calm manner and interpret the background better. Happy people live the moment, take pleasure from that moment, spread positive energy to their environment, see the glass from the full side and are optimistic.

People have shown interest to the concept of happiness since the Ancient Greece period. Socrates, one of the first age philosophers, linked the primary existence goal of people and the reason for existence on earth to happiness (Aydın, 2012). According to Aristotle, all people seek happiness, happiness is the purpose of people's life. Happiness is the spirit's activity worthy of perfectness (Büyükdüvenci, 1993). Ibn Miskeveyh considers happiness as a fact of humans' spiritual and moral features. Happiness cannot be attributed to the body because the body and what belongs to it are temporary. However, happiness is a development process and a way of maturation. Thus, happiness gains meaning and actualizes only in the spirit. No other aim can surpass happiness. A person who has attained his happiness goal has completed the final aim of life, because a more valuable aim or target cannot be considered beyond happiness (Keskin, 2011).

Happiness is more associated with life satisfaction and is a state of being positive (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Wilson defines a happy person as, "young, healthy, well-educated, with a high income, extrovert, optimist, carefree, religious, married to a person with high self-confidence, with high professional motivation, modest, sympathetic towards both genders (Diener et al., 1999). Myers and Diener (1995) define happiness as: happiness is an imaginary unreal state, ancient people attributed it to the dead, and today it is attributed to children by adults and to adults by children. Happiness depends on the extent to which people possess their desires. For example, many people want money and tend to be happier as they earn money. Study findings support the hypothesis which claims that people who possess their desires are happier than those who don't (Larsen & McKibban, 2008). Individuals living in areas where people have, on average, higher education, a higher level of well-being, and life expectancy tend to be happier and more satisfied with their lives (Allik et al., 2018).

* Correspondence:

İzzet Döş, Independent Researcher, Kahramanmaraş, Turkey. ✉ id27tr@gmail.com



Household income, father's income, father's education, mother's education, academic performance, school friends and family are among the factors affecting happiness (Mohd Hashim & Mohd Zaharim, 2020). There are also studies that reveal that some types of consumption are related to happiness (Veenhoven et al., 2021). Happy people are better at social relationships with regards to those who belong to upper classes, who are more romantic and who are unhappy. They are more extrovert, agreeable, less alarming and gain lower psychopathological scores in Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Diener & Seligman, 2002). According to one other definition, happiness is the judgement that individuals attribute to every good quality and positive life conditions. Researchers in general have tried to discuss happiness by asking how people feel (Blanchflower & Oswald, 2004).

Different studies about happiness and other variables have been conducted. It is seen that variables such as gender, religion, marital status, education, and health affect happiness significantly. On the other hand, an increase in the income level brings temporary happiness but individuals return to their previous states after they adjust to it (Gökdemir-Dumludağ, 2011). Intelligent people receive better education, earn more money and are more apt at leadership. Intelligence contributes to labor productivity but does not enable people to be happier and more satisfied with their jobs (Robbins & Judge, 2012). Studies on job satisfaction suggest that job satisfaction depends mostly on genetic structure. Whether a person is happy or not can be determined by the gene structure, that is, the level of happiness and the state of being happy are directed by the genes (Arvey et al., 1994; Ilies & Judge, 2003). According to another study, men are happier than women and married individuals are happier than single ones. It was observed that students and pensioners are generally happy, and that individuals "between ages 18-24" and "65 and above" have higher levels of happiness (Şentürk, 2011). According to a similar study, high income is related to high level of happiness; happiness is at the highest levels among women, married people, and people with high educational status and people whose parents aren't divorced. Jobless people and people who have married twice had lower happiness levels. Happiness is like the letter "U" with regards to age and is at its lowest level during the forties (Blanchflower & Oswald, 2004). In a study conducted on students who attend Quran course it was stated that religion is a significant factor in increasing happiness. It was stated that performing religious orders makes people happy, that people feel themselves relieved after praying and that reciting Quran redeems people from anxiety and sorrow (Acaboğa, 2007). Schools themselves and the success of students play important roles in children's happiness. Incurring responsibilities on students eases learning and increases school success. Duties and responsibilities given to students contribute to their happiness (Kaplan & Maehr, 1999). Happiness also has neurological effects. A relationship was detected between feelings of happiness, sadness and disgust and the activities of the thalamus and prefrontal cortex of the brain. The activities of these three feelings in the brain have been observed. It was stated that there were specific locations for these feelings in the brain and that these locations were distinguished as positive and negative feelings (Lane et al., 1996).

Happy schools can be defined as schools in which students feel themselves happy and comfortable (Döş, 2013). According to a study conducted in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries, 80% of the students found themselves as a part of the school and felt themselves happy in their schools (OECD, 2018). In other words, schools can be turned into entertaining places for children. Students spend a considerable amount and the most productive times of their lives at schools. Almost all countries give due importance and make major investment in education. Each individual, citizen, parent and student expects this investment to turn into significant outputs. Schools are the most crucial tools which promote these significant and prospective outputs. Thus, students being happy and in a good state are important variables for the school to carry out its duties.

Literature Review

General Self Efficacy

Self-efficacy is a term defined by Bandura. Self-efficacy is an individual's belief that they can effectively demonstrate expected outcomes and required behaviors in an area (Bandura, 1977, 1986). A person who has the required skills for coping with issues related to self-efficacy but has low self-efficacy will be unable to evoke these skills. The concept of self-efficacy includes elements such as planning an action, being aware of and organizing the necessary skills, and the level of motivation resulting from the review of the gains to be obtained with the difficulties (Yıldırım & İlhan, 2010). General self-efficacy reflects the judgment that assumes that people can perform operations related to various fields. However, self-efficacy has been mainly considered as a term conceptualized in certain conditions (Bandura, 1997).

General self-efficacy is conceptualized as a fixed and general belief that an individual can organize the necessary resources to cope with the difficulties they encounter. Accordingly, general self-efficacy is a belief that associates an individual's competencies with heredity (Scherbaum et al., 2006).

General self-efficacy emphasizes the notion of judging perceived skills that are required for carrying out a special duty. It can contribute to extensively evaluating personal duties in the working environment, the acquired knowledge, and skills. Self-efficacy is related to concepts such as the sale of life insurance, career choice, education, success, research yields of researchers and conforming to new technologies (Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Wood & Bandura, 1989).

Many studies underline four major psychological processes that affect personal beliefs and human relations related to self-efficacy. These are cognitive processes, motivational processes, emotional processes and choice processes. These involve drawing conclusions from physical and emotional states which demonstrate social persuasive skills and personal endurance and weaknesses signaling that high level experiences are competent in carrying out assigned actions (Bandura, 1994). Self-efficacy perceptions in humans emerge from four sources. These are as follows (Bandura, 1995):

Lived experiences develop a strong sense of self-efficacy. As an individual achieves success, a strong belief in personal effectiveness is formed. A sense of failure from previous experiences can impede effectiveness. A sense of effectiveness is not in itself a matter of adopting habits. On the contrary, the sense of self-efficacy involves gaining cognitive, behavioral, and self-regulatory tools to ever-changing living conditions.

A second way of enhancing self-efficacy feelings is through indirect experiences, in other words, through the experiences of others. People believe that their competences will increase as they witness the success of people like them. Similarly, when people witness the failure of people similar to them, their level of motivation decreases. Individuals' perceptions of efficacy are strongly influenced by the similarity of the person they model themselves for.

Social persuasion and people acquiring their needs for success is the third way of empowering their beliefs. Individuals who are verbally persuaded that they have the necessary skills to fulfill the given tasks can show and maintain more effort than individuals who have doubts and personal inadequacy in the face of difficulties. To the extent that persuasion motives lead people to strive for success in the perception of self-efficacy, self-affirmation beliefs also enable the development of skills and personal efficacy.

And finally, personal efficacy judgements depend on the emotional and psychological states that people are in. People believe that stress behaviors and tension are due to their weak performances. People attribute their exhaustions and their pains, which are signs of physical weakness, to activities that require strength and durability. Individuals' mood also affects their judgement of self-efficacy. While positive mood increases the sense of efficacy, feeling of hopelessness decreases it.

According to researches and the theory, self-efficacy differs according to how people feel, think and act. Here, depression, anxiety and incapability are related to the perception of low self-efficacy. Low self-efficacy also involves low self-esteem and the pessimist thoughts related to the individual's success and developments. It was stated that having a strong sense of self-efficacy facilitates cognitive processes, academic success, an effective decision making and gaining success in various organizations. Self-efficacy has a major influence on motivation factors and self-efficacy can either increase or decrease self-efficacy (Scholz et al., 2002).

Academic Self-Efficacy

Academic self-efficacy is defined as the belief of an individual of having the competency to carry out and perform a duty. It is the confidence of a student to conduct an academic work. In other words, it is the judgement of confidence related to their performance and success in academic studies (Bandura, 1977; Zimmerman, 1995). Individuals have self-efficacy perceptions related to many behaviors. One of the most important among these is academic self-efficacy. Academic self-efficacy was defined according to the self-efficacy theory.

In terms of academic work, self-efficacy refers to the level differences between tasks, such as increasingly difficult math questions. Generality, like different academic topics, refers to the transformation in self-efficacy belief between actions. The power of perception of efficacy is measured by the degree of certainty of an individual to fulfill the given task (Zimmerman, 1995). Zimmerman's statements regarding academic self-efficacy are (Zimmerman, 1995):

1-Self-efficacy is the judgement related to the capability to carry out activities independent of the individual's physical and psychological characteristics. Students judge their ability to perform given tasks without considering who they are as human beings or how they feel about themselves in general.

2-The belief of self-efficacy is a multidimensional concept. Thus, the belief of efficacy is related to many cases of various fields. For this reason, the belief of efficacy related to Mathematics is different from that of English.

3-Many inadequate processes can facilitate or weaken skill delivery. Measures of self-efficacy are context dependent, as many inadequate influences facilitate or weaken the demonstration of skills. For example, students may exhibit lower self-efficacy beliefs when learning in competitive classrooms than in cooperative classrooms.

4-The fourth feature of self-efficacy measures related to the power dimension is that they depend on efficacy criteria rather than prescriptive or different criteria for performance. For example, students measure their certainty not according to their expectations of being more successful than other students, but according to their ability to solve math problems with different difficulty levels.

5- Self-efficacy is measured before students take the actions in question. This ancient feature provides a tentative scheme for assessing the role of self-efficacy in causal constructs.

Life Satisfaction

Life satisfaction is defined as the universal evaluation of an individual's living standards according to the criteria that the individual determines (Shin & Johnson, 1978). Researchers state that life satisfaction is highly related to adjustment and mental health (Sells, 1969). Life satisfaction is the cognitive judgment by which the person determines the criteria and makes consciously about his life. Although there is a consensus about the important factors of good life, such as health and successful relationships, individuals may attach different importance to these factors (Pavot & Diener, 1993).

Such assessments are thought to depend on an individual's perception of "what is a standard or norm," but derive from internal rather than external judgments about the lives of particular individuals. In fact, life satisfaction is based on the individual's thoughts on how his life should be compared to his living conditions (Paolini et al., 2006).

According to the relationships between life satisfaction and the other variables, life satisfaction has a positive relationship with wellbeing, in other words, happiness (Cha, 2003; Diener, 2009). According to a study on university students, life satisfaction is directly proportional with income levels of students and is inversely proportional with hopelessness, depression and chronic anxiety. It was observed that level of hopelessness, education satisfaction, chronic anxiety and studying the department willingly are the most significant predictors of life satisfaction (Gündoğar et al., 2007). According to another study, there is a negative relationship between school managers' loneliness and life satisfaction levels (Yılmaz & Altınok, 2009). According to a study on university students girls have higher life satisfaction levels than males with regards to the gender variable; life satisfaction levels of university students who have strong religious beliefs and attach great importance to religion are higher than students who have either weak or no religious beliefs. Life satisfaction levels of university students who have low loneliness levels are significantly higher than university students who have high loneliness levels (Tuzgöl Dost, 2007). According to another study on satisfaction, having close relationships with mothers, close friends and siblings, the living environment and organizing life were observed to be closely related to life satisfaction (Chow, 2005).

Purpose

Schools are places where students spend a considerable amount of time in, and it is important for them to feel happy in this setting. With this respect, this study examines school happiness of students and their relationships with the other variables. It is believed that studies on happiness are rather few, and that the data are not at a sufficient and satisfactory level in giving information (Frey & Stutzer, 2005). Students perceiving the long time they spend at school as of good quality and livable is crucial for educational outputs. From this point of view, it is believed that revealing the relationship between school happiness and the terms and variables that students get directly influenced from in the school setting will bring about significant results.

The aim of this research is to reveal the relationships between high school students' perception of happy school and general self-efficacy, life satisfaction and academic self-efficacy. The following questions were explored according to this purpose.

1. What is the relationship between the variables of happy school, general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy, and life satisfaction?
2. Are general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy and life satisfaction significant predictors of happy school?
3. What are the model fit indices between general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy, life satisfaction, and happy school?

Methodology

Research Design

This is a correlation study in which the relationship between happy school, general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy and life satisfaction variables were examined. The correlational research method, which is one of the relational research methods, is the research in which the relationship between two or more variables is examined without any interference with these variables (Büyüköztürk et al., 2013).

Independent variables of this study were academic self-efficacy, general self-efficacy and life satisfaction. Happy school perception levels of students were determined as the dependent variable. The theoretical model which explains linear structural relations between the variables was tested in the study. Path analysis was used to reveal the causal patterns among the variables within the scope of the study. The correlations between variables that were determined according to causative models based on the theory produced empirical results. In the structural equation modeling, which examines the relationships between more than two variables, causative effects are determined by examining the relationships between variables (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006).

Population and Sample

The universe of the research consisted of students studying in Anatolian high schools in the city center of Kahramanmaraş (Turkey). There are 18 academic high schools in the city center and 11338 students study in these institutions.

The sample of this study consisted of six high schools which were selected with the cluster sampling method among these schools. There were 315 students in the study sample. 151 (47.9%) participants were female, and 164 (52.1%) participants were male. 44 (14%) students were in year 9; 76 (24.1%) were in year 10; 102 (32.4%) were in year 11 and 93 (29.5%) were in year 12.

Data Collection Instruments

The happy school scale: The happy school scale is a scale which aims at determining the school happiness levels of students. The happy school scale was developed by the researcher. The scale consists of 18 items and three sub-dimensions called love, sociability, and emotionality. As a result of the analysis made, the reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.95. The measurement tool, designed as a Likert type scale, was scored as “totally agree”, “partially agree”, “no idea”, “disagree” and “strongly disagree”.

The draft version of the scale was applied to the students studying in high schools located in the center of Kahramanmaraş (Turkey). The number of students participating in the pilot application was 606. 300 (49.5%) of the students participating in the pilot program were girls and 306 (50.5%) were boys. 318 of the students (52.5%) were high school students and 288 (47.5%) were vocational high school students. 282 of the students (46.5%) were 9th grade; 179 (29.5%) were 10th Grade; 86 (14.2%) were 11th grade students and 59 (9.7%) were 12th grade students.

After conducting the draft form of the Happy School Scale (HSS), the collected data was transferred to computers. Item analysis was performed for the HSS scale, and item analysis studies were performed with correlation-based analysis, and item-scale correlations were examined with Pearson correlation coefficient. As a result of the analysis, items with a significant correlation of 0.30 and above with scale scores were examined.

Explanatory and confirmatory factor analysis was performed for the construct validity of the scale. In reliability studies, internal consistency coefficient and item analyzes were included. LISREL 8.7 and SPSS 15.00 package program were used in statistical processing of the data.

The factor structure of the scale was tried to be revealed by exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Bartlett test and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test results were taken into account for the suitability of the data for factor analysis (Albayrak, 2006; Kalaycı, 2010; Seçer, 2013).

One of the oblique rotation methods is varimax rotation, in this study varimax rotation was used for the scale. Cases with a factor load of less than 0.30 from the items in the scale were not taken into account, and factor analysis studies were repeated by excluding items that load more than one factor, respectively.

After rotation, a four-factor structure was obtained. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was applied on the same data structure to determine the extent to which these structures were compatible. In order to evaluate the validity of the model in CFA, Chi-square Fit Test (χ^2), Adjusted Goodness Fit Index (AGFI), Goodness Fit Index (GFI), Root Mean Squared Errors Approximate (RMSEA), Root Mean Residual (RMR) and Comparative Fit Index (CFI) were used.

After all these analyzes, scale reliability and its sub-components was obtained with the help of Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient. In the item analysis, it was observed that the item scale scores were high, and the lowest observation was .52 (item 17). The correlations of the items were found to be between .52 and .81.

As a result of the Bartlett test for the suitability of the data of the 24-item scale for factor analysis, the chi-square statistics were found to be significant ($\chi^2=8889.19$, $p<.05$). The KMO value was found to be at an excellent level (.96>.50). These two findings showed that the data set was suitable for factor analysis. As a result of principal component factor analysis, 3 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.00 were found before rotation. The total variance explained by the three factors is 58,522%. The total variance explained by each factor was 27,614%, 15,822%, and 15,086% respectively. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient calculated to determine the reliability of the scale was found to be .952. Results gained from the scale are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Analysis Results Regarding the Happy School Scale

Items	Item-Scale Correlation	Factor Loads		
		1	2	3
3. A nice feeling arises inside my when I come to school	0.808	.783		
2. I feel good when I come to my school	0.793	.783		
1. I feel more joyful when I come to my school	0.761	.747		
4. I freshen up and rest when I come to my school	0.756	.732		.345
7. I think my school is a fun place	0.759	.704		
6. I forget my fears when I come to my school	0.699	.675		
5. I feel myself distant from disappointing things when I come to my school	0.681	.637		
9. I feel myself at home when I'm at school	0.698	.621		.355
8. I experience happy moments at my school that I'll remember in the future	0.691	.559	.488	
11. I like my school	0.794	.557	.443	.369
19. I feel safe at my school	0.727	.499	.474	
16. I don't realize how time passes at school	0.756	.499	.345	.468
24. I express myself better at my school	0.736	.466	.457	.354
13. Talking with my teacher gives me pleasure	0.599		.771	
21. I always stand up for my teachers and principal	0.577		.694	
14. It hurts me when others criticize my school	0.574		.603	
12. There is nice friendship circle at my school	0.530	.447	.561	
18. I elaborately get ready for school	0.693	.350	.514	.377
23. I don't want schools to go on holiday	0.607	.346		6.88
20. I can write a poem about my school	0.528			.665
15. I can't wait to go to my school	0.784	.513		.583
10. I miss my school on holidays	0.710	.455		.560
22. My school clings me to life	0.768	.408	.436	.529
17. Our club activities are fun	0.523			.465
Announced variance		27.614	15.822	15.086
Total announced variance		27.614	43.436	58.522
Cronbach's Alpha		0.927	0.768	0.696

Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 11 formed the first factor with the name "love"; items 12, 13, 14, 18 and 21 formed the second factor with the name "sociability"; items 10, 17, 20 and 23 formed the third factor with the name "sensuality". Items 8, 15, 16, 19, 22 and 24, which had high values under more than one factor, were removed from the scale. As such, the scale has become a measurement tool with three factors and 18 items.

The construct validity of the scale was made through confirmatory factor analysis. A hypothesis or theory regarding the relationship between variables is tested by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (Büyüköztürk, 2007). CFA is used during scale development to reveal the latent nature of a measurement tool. The predetermined factor model determines the actual pattern of relationships between observed variables and compares how well that model performs for the data.

The most used fit indices for confirmatory factor analysis are comparative fit index (CFI), Root Mean Square Residual (RMR), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI). The values of these, namely GFI, AGFI and CFI, are acceptable if they are greater than 0.90, and if they are greater than 0.95, it is considered a good fit (Şimşek, 2007). Other fit indexes are Incremental Fit Index (IFI), Normed Fit Index (NFI), Relative Fit Index (RFI) and Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI). NFI, NNFI, IFI, RFI values above 0.90 are acceptable and values above 0.95 are considered excellent (Seçer, 2013).

In order to obtain evidence for the validity of the one-factor and three-component structure of HSS determined by EFA, the model obtained as a result of CFA performed on the same data was examined, and the fit indices calculated by confirmatory factor analysis are given in Table 2.

Table 2. The Goodness of Fit Indexes of the CFA Model

χ^2	sd	χ^2/sd	AGFI	GFI	NFI	CFI	IFI	RMR	RMSEA
761.63	132	5.76	0.84	0.88	0.96	0.97	0.97	0.049	0.089

Considering the model fit indices, NFI, CFI, RFI, IFI and NNFI values showed perfect fit; RMR and GFI values were found to be within acceptable limits.

χ^2 /sd a modification operation was conducted because the RMSEA values were not at the desired level. The modification was carried out between the items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 that are under the same factor (love), and between items 1-2; 2-3; 3-4 and 5-6. The new values gained from the operations are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The Goodness of Fit Indexes of the CFA Model after Modification

χ^2	sd	χ^2 /sd	AGFI	GFI	NFI	CFI	IFI	RMR	RMSEA
478.57	128	3.73	0.89	0.92	0.97	0.98	0.98	0.042	0.067

The values which were obtained after the modification were considered highly appropriate for all indexes. The model obtained after the modification is presented in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Model of the Happy School Scale (Standardized Values)

General self-efficacy: General self-efficacy is also defined as a person's general confidence in the face of new situations that are difficult to cope with or that they are not accustomed to in many areas. The scale which Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) developed and Aypay (2010) adapted into Turkish was used for the general self-efficacy variable. It consisted of 10 items under two sub-dimensions titled "effort and resistance" and "skills and confidence". The reliability coefficient found by the researcher for this scale is 0.83. The scale was scored on a five-point Likert scale as completely true, moderately true, true, false, and completely false. In this study, the reliability of the scale was found to be 0.88.

Academic self-efficacy: Academic self-efficacy is defined as the student's belief that he or she can successfully complete an academic task. In the variable of academic self-efficacy, the scale developed by Jerusalem and Schwarzer (1981) and adapted into Turkish by Yılmaz et al. (2007) was used. The scale is one-dimensional and consists of seven items. One item in the adapted scale was the reverse item, and the reliability of the scale was found to be .79. The scale was scored as "completely fits me, fits me, slightly fits me, does not fit me, and does not fit me at all". In this study, the reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be .75.

Life satisfaction: Life satisfaction is the level of joy and content that one feels about life. It's the general assessment of one's own life. This scale was introduced by Diener et al. (1985) and was adapted into Turkish by Yetim (1991). The scale consisted of one dimension and five items. Yetim found that the reliability of the scale was .78. Reliability of the scale in this study was 0.79.

Data Analysis

The total of the scales included in the analysis is 315. Because the research design was embraced with a total of three independent and one dependent variable, correlation analyses were conducted during the data analysis processes. First of all, the Pearson correlation was made to reveal the relationship between happy school, general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy and life satisfaction. Then, the happy school variable was accepted as the predicted (dependent) variable and the other variables were accepted as the predictive (independent) variable and linear multiple regression analyzes were performed. Finally, in the research, the theoretical model that explains the linear structural relationships between happy school, general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy and life satisfaction of high school students was tested. For this, structural equation modeling (SEM) was used in the research. The data were made with SPSS and Mplus statistical programs.

The most frequently used fit indices in structural equation models are Root Mean Square Residual (RMR), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). It is acceptable for the values of three of them, namely GFI, AGFI and CFI, to be greater than 0.90, and they are accepted as a good fit when their values are over 0.95 (Şimşek, 2007). Other fit indexes are Incremental Fit Index (IFI), Normed Fit Index (NFI), Relative Fit Index (RFI) and Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI). NFI, NNFI, IFI, RFI values above 0.90 are acceptable and values above 0.95 are considered excellent (Seçer, 2013).

Findings

First of all, a correlation analysis was made. The result of the Pearson correlation made to reveal the relationship between happy school, general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy, and life satisfaction is given in the Table 4 below.

Table 4. Results Regarding the Relationship between Happy School, General Self Efficacy, Academic Self-Efficacy, and Life Satisfaction

Variables	1	2	3	4
1- Happy School	1			
2-General self-efficacy	,289**	1		
3-Academic self-efficacy	,276**	,611**	1	
4-Life satisfaction	,224**	,338**	,266**	1

**p<0.01

According to Table 4, the relationship between all the variables is significant and positive. It can be asserted that the relationship between happy school and other variables is positive but rather low. It is seen that the general self-efficacy variable has a moderately positive and significant relationship with academic self-efficacy and life satisfaction. It is evident that life satisfaction has a positive but rather low level of relationships with the other variables.

Table 5. Correlation Results Regarding the Sub-Dimensions of the Scale

Sub-dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1- Happy school love factor	1						
2-Happy school sociability factor	,686**	1					
3-Happy school emotionality factor	,617**	,571**	1				
4-General self-efficacy effort and resistance factor	,286**	,222**	,194**	1			
5-General self-efficacy skill and confidence factor	,247**	,216**	,155**	,699**	1		
6-life satisfaction	,223**	,188**	,152**	,368**	,233**	1	
7-academic self-efficacy	,265**	,260**	,182**	,570**	,557**	,266**	1

**p<0.01

As seen in Table 5 above, in the correlations made regarding the sub-dimensions of the data collection tools used in the research, there were significant relationships between all the variables. There is a moderately significant and positive relationship between academic self-efficacy and the two sub-dimensions of general self-efficacy. Satisfaction with life revealed a weak relationship in all variables. It is seen that there is a weak relationship between the sub-dimensions of the happy school and other variables.

Table 6. Regression Analysis Results Regarding Happy School and Other Variables

Variables	B	Std. Er.	β	t	p
Constant	29,411	4,98		5,906	,00
General self-efficacy	0,327	0,147	0,154	2,228	,02
Academic self-efficacy	0,426	0,196	0,147	2,171	,03
Life satisfaction	0,422	0,181	0,132	2,325	,02

R= 0,339 R²=0,115 F = 13,42 p= 0,00

The regression analysis results between the happy school variable, which was taken as the dependent variable, and the other variables are given in Table 6. Students' life satisfaction, academic self-efficacy, and general self-efficacy levels explain 11% of their happiness levels at school. The remaining variance in happiness is explained by other different variables. According to this result, life satisfaction, academic self-efficacy, and general self-efficacy are effective in students' perception of themselves as happy in school life. Considering the values in the table above, the following relation can be written.

$$\text{Happy school} = 29.41 + 0.327 * (\text{general self-efficacy}) + 0.426 * (\text{academic self-efficacy}) + 0.422 * (\text{life satisfaction})$$

A linear model was developed according to the literature, and it was assumed that; life satisfaction, academic self-efficacy and general self-efficacy affected happy school. The figure given below was drawn out according to the analyses conducted on the structural equation model which consisted of the general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy, life satisfaction and happy school variables.




Figure 2. Structural Equation Model Regarding Study Variables (Standardized Values)

The diagram which resulted from the structural equation model of the variables is given in Figure 2. Fit indices were $\chi^2=1233.05$; $sd=729$; $\chi^2/sd=1.69$; $CFI=0.90$; $SRMR=0.05$ and $RMSEA=0.05$. According to the fit indices of the model, SRMR and CFI values are acceptable and RMSEA value indicates that there is a good fit. The χ^2/sd value is below 4 but this value is regarded as a desired value. These values prove that the model is an acceptable model with a good fit.

Discussion

The main purpose of this study is to test the theoretical model that explains the linear structural relationships between happy school and general efficacy, academic self-efficacy and life satisfaction of high school students. In addition to testing the created model, correlation and regression analysis between variables were examined.

One of the most important living places of students is schools. For a child, the second home after home is school (Döş, 2014). Schools are places of education that leave important traces in the development and life of the individual. In this study, it was tried to reveal the relationships between the happiness levels of students studying in secondary education institutions and general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy, and life satisfaction. The education period in secondary education institutions is the most important process in the education life of students because the knowledge and

acquisitions they gain from during this four-year period will directly affect their further forty-fifty years of life. In our country where higher education is difficult, a high-quality high school education is crucial for an individual to have a profession that will shape the further life full of difficulties. Therefore, it is important for high school students to be happier in their schools in terms of the efficiency and purpose of the schools.

One of the main purposes of the research was to develop the happy school scale and to test whether it was compatible with other variables. It was observed that the developed scale showed a high level of compliance in the context of scale development processes and analyses. The compatibility of the developed scale with other accepted and accepted concepts in the literature was also examined. In this context, it has been seen that there is a significant and positive relationship between the happy school variable and the other variables that are the subject of the research. The values that the developed scale tries to measure are compatible with other studies in the literature (Bonniwell et al., 2016; López-Pérez & Fernández-Castilla, 2018; Uusitalo-Malmivaara, 2012).

It was found that there is a positive and linear correlation between the happy school variable, which deals with students' school happiness levels, and general efficacy, academic self-efficacy, and life satisfaction. In this study, a relationship was found between life satisfaction and school happiness, and this relationship is in line with the findings of Wood et al. (1989). Judge et al. (2002) also stated in their research that there is a strong relationship between life satisfaction and happiness. It has also been stated that there is a relationship between happiness and life satisfaction, and that women generally have higher life satisfaction and happiness than men (Wood et al., 1989). Considering the studies conducted in the field of subjective happiness, it has been revealed that subjective happiness is in a positive relationship with life satisfaction, self-evaluation, and efficacy variables (Akin & Akin, 2015; Fountain et al., 2020; Freire & Ferreira, 2020; Tomlinson et al., 2017). This finding supports the relationship between happiness and life satisfaction of students in this study.

It is also stated that there is a relationship between happiness and self-efficacy, and that students with high self-efficacy experience more academic happiness and pride (Duran & Yıldırım, 2017; Lara et al., 2020; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). Studies have shown that there is a strong and positive correlation between general self-efficacy and life satisfaction and well-being (Loton & Waters, 2017; Tong & Song, 2004; Van Zyl & Dhurup, 2018).

According to studies, it was revealed that life satisfaction is highly correlated with the general efficacy and academic self-efficacy (Azizli et al., 2015; Çakar, 2012; Dewitz & Walsh, 2002; Marcionetti & Rossier, 2021; Moksnes et al., 2019). These findings are consistent with the results of this study.

Conclusion

In the light of these evaluations, students' happiness, life satisfaction, academic self-efficacy and self-efficacy are closely related. An increase in any variable affects other variables, and an increase in one supports a positive increase in the others. Another finding in this study is that there is a positive linear and close to high moderate relationship between academic self-efficacy and self-efficacy. This finding is also consistent with and supported by the theory in the literature.

A linear model was created for the study because it was assumed that life satisfaction, academic self-efficacy and general self-efficacy affected happy schools. Path analysis was conducted to examine the causative relationships between the variables and high fit indices were detected with the model which was developed. This model, created with these fit indices, was observed to be an acceptable model with a good fit. It was observed that life satisfaction, general self-efficacy, and academic self-efficacy predict the happy school and explain 11% of the students' school happiness levels. Most significant effect on the happy school was observed to be from general self-efficacy. This finding is in line with both theoretical and empirical study findings in the literature. It can be concluded from the study that the relationships with other variables affecting students' school happiness levels can be further examined and that models which can increase student happiness levels should be developed.

Recommendations

It is very important for parents, principals and teachers that students are happy at school. If the students are happy at school, they hope that their students will achieve their course. In this research happiness scale was developed and it has good indexes. It can be used to determine for students' happiness level at schools. Principals and teachers can use this scale to improve their approach to students and develop school management. Happy school scale has good relationship other variables. The relationship between happy school and general self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy, life satisfaction are significant and positive. Researchers can develop other kind of survey of happy school scale and can use different variables and samples.

Limitations

This study was conducted with a sample of high school students in a city. Exploring the study in different cultures and other samples may produce better results in the future. Further work is therefore needed to consolidate this happy school scale.

References

- Acaboğa, A. (2007). *Din-mutluluk ilişkisi* [Religion-happiness relationship] [Master's thesis, University of Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Ulusal Tez Merkezi. <http://bit.ly/3JtXBL1>
- Akın, A., & Akın, Ü. (2015). Friendship quality and subjective happiness: The mediator role of subjective vitality. *Education and Science*, 40(177), 233-242. <https://doi.org/10.15390/eb.2015.3786>
- Albayrak, A. S. (2006). *Applied multivariate statistic techniques*. Asil Publishing.
- Allik, J., Mõttus, R., Realo, A., & Rozgonjuk, D. (2018). What makes young Russians happy and satisfied with their lives? *SAGE Open*, 8(3), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018803136>
- Arvey, R. D., McCall, B. P., Bouchard, T. J., Taubman, P., & Cavanaugh, M. A. (1994). Genetic influences on job satisfaction and work values. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 17(1), 21-33. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(94\)90258-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)90258-5)
- Aydın, A. (2012). *Philosophy, history of ideas*. Pegem Akademi Publishing.
- Aypay, A. (2010). The Adaptation Study of General Self-Efficacy (GSE) Scale to Turkish. *Inonu University Journal Of The Faculty Of Education*, 11(2), 113-131. <http://www.ajindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423903295.pdf>
- Azizli, N., Atkinson, B. E., Baughman, H. M., & Giammarco, E. A. (2015). Relationships between general self-efficacy, planning for the future, and life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 82, 58-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.03.006>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527692>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman
- Blanchflower, D. G., & Oswald, A. J. (2004). Well-being over time in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(7-8), 1359-1386. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727\(02\)00168-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(02)00168-8)
- Boniwell, I., Evgeny, N. O., & Martinez, C. (2016). Teaching happiness at school: Non-randomised controlled mixed-methods feasibility study on the effectiveness of Personal Well-Being Lessons. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 11(1), 85-98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1025422>
- Büyükdüvenci, S. (1993). Aristotle's concept of happiness. *Philosophy World*, (9), 41-45.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2007). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* [Data analysis handbook for social sciences]. Pegem Akademi Publishing.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* [Scientific research methods]. Pegem Akademi Publishing.
- Cha, K.-H. (2003). Subjective well-being among college students. *Social Indicators Research*, 62, 455-477. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022669906470>
- Chow, H. P. H. (2005). Life satisfaction among university students in a Canadian prairie city: A multivariate analysis. *Social Indicators Research*, 70, 139-150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-004-7526-0>
- Çakar, F. S. (2012). The relationship between the self-efficacy and life satisfaction of young adults. *International Education Studies*, 5(6), 123-130. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n6p123>.
- Dewitz, S. J., & Walsh, W. B. (2002). Self-efficacy and college student satisfaction. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 10(3), 315-326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10672702010003003>
- Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75. <https://bit.ly/3ZZcn1L>
- Diener, E. (2009). Subjective well-being. In E. Diener (Ed.), *The science of well-being: The collected works of Ed Diener* (pp. 11-58). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2350-6_2
- Diener, E., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). Very happy people. *Psychological Science*, 13(1), 81-84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00415>

- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276>
- Döş, İ. (2013). Mutlu okul [Happy school]. *Education and Science/ Eğitim ve Bilim*, 38(170), 266-280. <http://bit.ly/3J8WoHx>
- Döş, İ. (2014). *The evaluation of school organizations: School metaphors*. Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Duran, A., & Yıldırım, N. (2017). The relationship between school administrators' happiness levels and their self-efficacy levels. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6(4), 210-228. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n4p210>
- Fountain, A. C., Roberts, E. P., Schuster, G., Breitmeyer, A. M., & Stein, A. B. (2020). Dental faculty, student, and alumni perceptions of happiness and life satisfaction in dental school: foundations for resilience and well-being. *Journal of Dental Education*, 84(3), 336-342. <https://doi.org/10.21815/JDE.019.181>
- Freire, T., & Ferreira, G. (2020). Do I need to be positive to be happy? Considering the role of self-esteem, life satisfaction, and psychological distress in Portuguese adolescents' subjective happiness. *Psychological Reports*, 123(4), 1064-1082. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294119846064>
- Frey, B. S., & Stutzer, A. (2005). Happiness Research: State and Prospects. *Review of Social Economy*, 62(2), 207-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00346760500130366>
- Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(2), 183-211. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258770>
- Gökdemir-Dumludağ, Ö. (2011). An analysis of happiness and economic parameters [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Istanbul. <http://nek.istanbul.edu.tr:4444/ekos/TEZ/47636.pdf>
- Gündoğar, D., Gül, S. S., Uskun, E., Demirci, S., & Keçeci, D. (2007). Investigation of the predictors of life satisfaction in university students. *Clinical Psychiatry*, 10(1), 14-27. <http://bit.ly/3ZGeQ1d>
- Ilies, R., & Judge, T. A. (2003). On the heritability of job satisfaction: The mediating role of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 750-759. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.750>
- Jerusalem, M., & Schwarzer, R. (1981). Fragebogen zur Erfassung von "Selbstwirksamkeit" [Questionnaire to record "self-efficacy"]. In R. Schwarzer (Ed.), *Skalen zur Befindlichkeit und Persönlichkeit* [Scales of mood and personality]. Freie Universität, Institut fuer Psychologie.
- Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2002). Are measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy indicators of a common core construct? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(3), 693-710. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.3.693>
- Kalaycı, Ş. (2010). *SPSS applied multivariate statistic techniques*. Asil Publishing.
- Kaplan, A., & Maehr, M. L. (1999). Achievement goals and student well-being. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 24(4), 330-358. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.0993>
- Keskin, Z. (2011). *İbn Miskeveyh'in mutluluk anlayışı* [Ibn Miskawayh's understanding of happiness] [Master's thesis, University of Kayseri]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Ulusal Tez Merkezi. <http://bit.ly/3T597Qc>
- Lane, R. D., Reiman, E. M., Ahern, G. L., Schwartz, G. E., & Davidson, R. J. (1996). neuroanatomical correlates of happiness, sadness, and disgust. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 154(7), 926-933. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.154.7.926>
- Lara, R., Vázquez, M. L., Ogallar, A., & Godoy-Izquierdo, D. (2020). Optimism and social support moderate the indirect relationship between self-efficacy and happiness through mental health in the elderly. *Health Psychology Open*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2055102920947905>
- Larsen, J. T., & McKibban, A. R. (2008). Is happiness having what you want, wanting you have, or both? *Psychological Science*, 19(4), 371-377. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02095.x>
- Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2003). The role of self-efficacy beliefs in student engagement and learning in the classroom. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 119-137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/105735603088223>
- López-Pérez, B., & Fernández-Castilla, B. (2018). Children's and Adolescents' Conceptions of Happiness at School and Its Relation with Their Own Happiness and Their Academic Performance. *Journal of Happiness Study*, 19, 1811-1830. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9895-5>
- Loton, D. J., & Waters, L. E. (2017). The mediating effect of self-efficacy in the connections between strength-based parenting, happiness and psychological distress in teens. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, Article 1707. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01707>

- Marcionetti, J., & Rossier, J. (2021). A longitudinal study of relations among adolescents' self-esteem, general self-efficacy, career adaptability, and life satisfaction. *Journal of Career Development*, 48(4), 475-490. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845319861691>
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education: Evidence based inquiry*. Brown and Company.
- Mohd Hashim, I. H., & Mohd Zaharim, N. (2020). Happiness among Malaysian adolescents: The role of sociodemographic factors and everyday events. *SAGE Open*, 10(3), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020940695>
- Moksnes, U. K., Eilertsen, M. E. B., Ringdal, R., Bjørnsen, H. N., & Rannestad, T. (2019). Life satisfaction in association with self-efficacy and stressor experience in adolescents—self-efficacy as a potential moderator. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 33(1), 222-230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.12624>
- Myers, D. G., & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy? *Psychological Science*, 6(1), 10-19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1995.tb00298.x>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2018). *PISA 2015: PISA results in focus*. <https://bit.ly/pisa-2015>
- Paolini, L., Yanez, A. P., & Kelly, W. E. (2006). An examination of worry and life satisfaction among college students. *Individual Differences Research*, 4(5), 331-339.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5(2), 164-172. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.5.2.164>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2012). *Örgütsel davranış [Organizational behavior]* (İ. Erdem, Trans.). Nobel Publication. (Original work published 2010)
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719>
- Scherbaum, C. A., Cohen-Charash, Y., & Kern, M. J. (2006). Measuring general self-efficacy, A comparison of three measures using item response theory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(6), 1047-1063. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164406288171>
- Scholz, U., Doña, B. G., Sud, S., & Schwarzer, R. (2002). Is general self-efficacy a universal construct? Psychometric findings from 25 countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 18(3), 242-251. <https://bit.ly/3FndlaG>
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). *General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE)* [Database record]. APA PsycTests. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t00393-000>
- Seçer, I. (2013). *Practical data analysis and reporting with SPSS and LISREL analysis*. Anı Publishing.
- Sells, S. B. (Ed.). (1969). *The definition and measurement of mental health* (No. 1873). US National Center for Health Statistics.
- Shin, D. C., & Johnson, D. M. (1978). Awoved happiness as an overall assessment of the quality of life. *Social Indicator Research*, 5, 475-492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00352944>
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-Efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 240-261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.240>
- Şentürk, E. (2011). *Mutluluk düzeyinin sosyo-demografik özelliklerle lojistik regresyon analizi aracılığıyla incelenmesi* [Socio Demographic analysis of individual's happiness level using logistic regression model: an application for Turkey] (Publication No. 28588365). [Master's thesis, University of Marmara]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Şimşek, Ö. F. (2007). *Introduction to structural equation modeling. Basic principals and LISREL applications*. Anı Publishing
- Tomlinson, R. M., Keyfitz, L., Rawana, J. S., & Lumley, M. N. (2017). Unique contributions of positive schemas for understanding child and adolescent life satisfaction and happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 18(5), 1255-1274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-016-9776-3>
- Tong, Y., & Song, S. (2004). A study on general self-efficacy and subjective well-being of low SES college students in a Chinese university. *College Student Journal*, 38(4), 637-642. <http://bit.ly/3LbfX4J>
- Tuzgöl Dost, M. (2007). Examining life satisfaction levels of university students in terms of some variables. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education*, 22(22), 132-143. <http://bit.ly/3JwFST6>
- Uusitalo-Malmivaara, L. (2012). Global and school-related happiness in Finnish children. *Journal Happiness Study*, 13, 601-619. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-011-9282-6>

- Van Zyl, Y., & Dhurup, M. (2018). Self-efficacy and its relationship with satisfaction with life and happiness among university students. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 28(5), 389-393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2018.1528760>
- Veenhoven, R., Chiperi, F., Kang, X., & Burger, M. (2021). Happiness and consumption: A research synthesis using an online finding archive. *SAGE Open*, 11(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020986239>
- Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Impact of conceptions of ability on self-regulatory mechanisms and complex decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(3), 407-415. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.3.407>
- Wood, W., Rhodes, N., & Whelan, M. (1989). Sex differences in positive well-being: A consideration of emotional style and marital status. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106(2), 249-264. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.106.2.249>
- Yetim, Ü. (1991). *Kişisel projelerin organizasyonu ve örüntüsü açısından yaşam doyumu* [Life satisfaction in terms of organization and patterns of individual projects] [Doctoral dissertation, Ege University]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Ulusal Tez Merkezi. <http://bit.ly/3Jx3eYL>
- Yıldırım, F., & İlhan, İ. Ö. (2010). The validity and reliability of the General Self-Efficacy Scale-Turkish form. *Turkish Psychiatry Journal/ Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 21(4), 301-308. <https://bit.ly/3l3qtQX>
- Yılmaz, E., & Altınok, V. (2009). Okul yöneticilerinin yalnızlık ve yaşam doyum düzeylerinin incelenmesi [Examining the loneliness and the life satisfaction levels of school principals]. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice/ Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15(59), 451-469. <https://bit.ly/3Lgi4nP>
- Yılmaz, M., Gürçay, D., & Ekici, G. (2007). Akademik Öz Yeterlik Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması [Adaptation of the Academic Self-Efficacy Scale to Turkish]. *H. U. Journal of Education/ Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 253-259. <https://bit.ly/3LghSF7>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp. 202-231). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527692.009>