Examining University Students' Anger and Satisfaction with Life

Gülşen Büyükşahin Çevik
Adıyaman University, Faculty of Education
Department of Psychological Counselling and Guidance, 02040, Adıyaman, Turkey

Abstract
The current research aims to study university students' levels of anger and satisfaction with life, based on gender, years of attendance, accommodation, and whether they experience adjustment problems. The current research participants included a total of 484 individuals ($\overline{X}$ age=22.56; SD=1.72; range=19-37), with 269 (55.6%) males and 215 (44.4%) females, attending the Adiyaman University during 2015-2016 academic years in Turkey. The data was collected through the "Personal Information Form", "State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory" and "Satisfaction with Life Scale". Descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation, multi-variate variance analysis (One-Way MANOVA), and Tukey HSD test among post-hoc multiple comparison tests were used in the data analysis. The results showed that satisfaction with life was found to have a positive relationship with anger control and negative relationships with all anger dimensions. Another finding in the current research was about the lack of significant difference in student's levels of satisfaction with life, based on gender. Anger scores not differing on years of attendance. However, scores of satisfaction with life were on significant levels, based on years of attendance. Another finding of the current research indicated that anger-out and trait anger dimensions of satisfaction with life did not differ on accommodation (home, dormitory). On the other hand, the group effect of the anger-in scores were found to be on significant levels. As such, anger-in scores of individuals living in the dormitories were found to be higher than those of individuals living in homes.
Keywords: University Students, Anger and Life Satisfaction,

1. Introduction

Individuals experience some basic emotions in interpersonal conflicts and disagreements. One of these basic emotions is anger (Lazarus, 1991; Nair, 2008). According to Abrams (2010), anger is a normal emotion because a concept could not be defined as good, neither as bad. According to Spielberg (1991), anger is defined as an emotional status varying from simple-level angriness to a high-level rage. Individuals experiencing high-level anger were reported to deal with more stress and health problems (Baltaş & Baltaş, 1997). Thus, increasing anger and aggression has been reported to be no use for problem solving. That is why coping through anger control was emphasized to be important in relation to mental health (Özmen, 2009). In research on anger, experimental studies were found to be important in terms of reducing anger (Cenkseven, 2003; Gürbüz, 2008). In another study, Karslı (2008) found that self-perception of anger behaviors, satisfaction with life, and interpersonal satisfaction predicted the stress symptoms. Durak-Batıgün, Hisli-Şahin and Karslı-Demirel (2011) found that patients with higher symptoms of stress had problematic interpersonal relationships and more intensive anger. Those patients were also found to have angry behaviors and no satisfaction with interpersonal relationships and life. Korkut (2012) found that traumatic experiences during childhood negatively affected the anger expression and satisfaction with life in adolescence. Bostancı, Çoban, Tekin, and Özen (2006) revealed that situations leading to anger in university students involved not being taken seriously, being treated unfairly, and being criticized. In addition, females were found to be angered more than males were in situations leading to anger and they were also found to have more passive aggressive and inward reactions than males did. In a similar study, Annak (2002) found that male students controlled anger better than female students did. Yöndem and Bıçak (2008) found significant differences in anger levels and expression styles in relation to major and gender. Anger levels in male students were found to be significantly higher than those of female students. Şahin (2015) did not find a significant difference in trait anger, anger expression dimensions, and satisfaction with life, based on gender. Illiterate individuals were found to have higher trait anger and inward anger and lower anger control scores than university graduates did. In their study, Tambağ and Öz (2005) found that female passive-aggressive anger scores and male outward anger scores were significantly high. Researchers stated that counseling and education programs at schools would be provided in order to raise awareness about approaches towards female adolescents among families, due to pressure, limitation, and control over female children in the community. Küçükköse (2015) found that trait anger, anger expression styles, and stress levels predicted the subjective well-being. In another study, researchers Diong, Bishop, Enkelmann, Tong, Why, Ang, and Kahader (2005) determined a negative relationship between anger level and psychological well-being. In a similar study, Chung and Kim (2017) revealed that both anger and the anger particular to being a mother predicted mothers' satisfaction with life. They also found that satisfaction with life had a positive relationship with anger control and a negative relationship with the anger expression. As can be seen in the studies conducted, anger occurs following conflicts experienced in interpersonal relationships and it may impact the satisfaction with life.

Another variable associated with individual's anger level is satisfaction with life. Satisfaction with life was defined as individual's perception and evaluation of own life (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin, 1985). In addition, the satisfaction with life involves individual's willingness to change his or her life, satisfaction with the past or future, relationships in the immediate environment, and all views of own life (Diener, Suh, Lucas & Smith, 1999). Satisfaction areas in an individual's life were stated to be the professional and family life, leisure activities, health, money, and the individual's self (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Individuals with high satisfaction with life were found to be aggregable with family and friends and to have higher academic achievement levels (Gilman & Huebner, 2006). On the other hand, individuals with low satisfaction with life were found to have high levels of perceived stress, depression, and loneliness (Extremera, Duran &Rey, 2009; Kapıkıran & Yağcı, 2012). Ayyash-Abdo (2007) determined that subjective well-being had a positive relationship with self-esteem and optimism and that personality predicted satisfaction with life. Also, a positive relationship between satisfaction with life and self-esteem was revealed (Leung & Zang, 2000; Ullman & Tatar, 2001). A review of studies involving university students indicates that attitude toward major (Recepoğlu, 2013) and accommodation (Özgür, Babacan Gümüş, and Durdu, 2010) influenced the satisfaction with life. Tuzgöl-Dost (2007) determined in their study with university students that females had higher satisfaction with life than males did and that students with high SES had higher levels of satisfaction with life. Studies on satisfaction with life have been found on an increase (Kabasakal & Uz Baş, 2013; Yıldız, 2016; Yıldız & Baytemir, 2016; Yıldız & Duy, 2015; Yıldız, & Karadaş, 2017).) in the relevant literature. Gündoğar, Sallan-Gül, Uskun, Demirci, and Keçeci (2007), looking into the university students' satisfaction with life, found that the predictors of satisfaction with life were hopelessness, satisfaction with education, state-trait anxiety, placement within a desired major, job expectation, and reason for education in a major. Ülker-Tümlü and Recepoğlu (2013) found that satisfaction with life had a medium-level positive relationship with psychological endurance. In a similar study, Kabasakal and Uz Baş (2013) revealed that problem solving skill in candidate teachers significantly predicted the satisfaction with life. They found, in their research, that level of satisfaction with life significantly differed on the dimensions of monthly income and family income level and that it did not differ on gender. Huebner, Drane, and Valois (2000) determined that satisfaction with life did not significantly differ on gender. Çam and Artar (2014) found that satisfaction with life in females was higher than that of males. In Özgür, Babacan, Gümüş, and Durdu's (2010) research with university students, students living in homes were found to have higher levels of satisfaction with life. They revealed that majority of the students (80%) were happy living in homes and 17% of them were *pleased* to be living in dormitories.

A review of studies indicated that one of the general problems experienced by university students was accommodation (Özgür, Babacan, Gümüş, and Durdu, 2010) and the students could keep companionship of friends living in homes or dormitories within their interpersonal relationships during university life. Thus, anger or anger situations experienced by university students in interpersonal relationships gain importance. In addition, research on the relationship of anger experienced with the satisfaction with life is thought to be important. A review of research involving university students has not included any study investigating anger and levels of satisfaction with life combined, based on gender, years of attendance, accommodation, and adjustment problems experienced. Hence, studying anger and satisfaction with life based on these variables may be necessary and important in terms of contributing in expert (psychiatrist, psychological counselor, and psychologist) interventions into university students' levels of anger and satisfaction with life. Also, research on university students' anger and satisfaction with life based on these variables is limited in Turkey; in this sense, it may be considered to contribute in the relevant local literature.

1.1.The Purpose of the Research

The current research aims to study university students' levels of anger and satisfaction with life, based on gender, years of attendance, accommodation, and whether they experience adjustment problems. Following questions were put forward within this general purpose:

1. Is there any relationship between university students' satisfaction with life and anger levels?
2. Do university students' levels of satisfaction with life and anger differ on gender?
3. Do university students' levels of satisfaction with life and anger differ on years of attendance?
4. Do university students' levels of satisfaction with life and anger differ on accommodation (home or dormitory)?
5. Do university students' levels of satisfaction with life and anger differ on whether they experience adjustment problems?

2. Method

2.1. Research Design

This research is a descriptive research aimed at examining the present situation. Descriptive research is the way to determine what is the one (Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2013).

2.2. Participants

The current research participants included a total of 484 individuals ($\overline{X}$ age=22.56; SD=1.72; range=19-37), with 269 (55.6%) males and 215 (44.4%) females, attending the Adiyaman University during 2015-2016 academic years in Turkey. 272 (56.2%) of the participants were in their junior year and 212 (43.8%) attended their senior years. To reveal the effects of home or dormitory accommodation on students, junior and senior students that had been in the university for a while (at least 2-3 years) were included in the research. 233 students (48.1%) attended the Faculty of Education, 175 (36.2%) studied in the Faculty of Finance and Management Sciences, 48 (9.9%) attended the Faculty of Science and Letters, and 28 (5.8%) studied in the Faculty of Engineering.

2.3. Instruments

2.3.1. State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory

State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory was developed by Spielberger (1991) and adapted into Turkish language by Özer (1994). The scale includes 34 items on sub-dimensions such as trait anger, controlled anger (anger control), anger vented out (anger-out), and suppressed anger (anger-in). The inventory 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 trait anger, .84 for anger control, .78 for anger-out, and .62 for anger-in. Factor loads for anger control, anger-in, and anger-out sub-scales were respectively found as follows in the factor analysis conducted by Ozer (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.

2.3.2.Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) was developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) 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). Reliability of the scale was checked through test-retest technique and the correlation between the two administrations was found to be .85 and item-test correlations ranged between .71 and .80.

2.3.3.Personal Information Form (PIF)

Personal Information Form was used to collect data associated with personal information in the current research. There are questions about sex, faculty, class level, accommodation (home or dormitory) and social adjustment problems in the form.

2.4. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation, multi-variate variance analysis (One-Way MANOVA), and Tukey HSD test among post-hoc multiple comparison tests were used in the data analysis. To determine whether the difference between the means was significant, the significance level was set as .05.

3. Results

Table 1 includes the kurtosis skewness, and descriptive statistics of the scores that university students obtained on the scales. Correlation values among the research variables were also included in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and pearson correlation coefficient values associated with the research variables

Variables	$\overline{X}$	SD	Kurtosis	Skewness	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. SWLS	21,35	7,02	-,63	-,36						
2. Trait anger	21,45	5,09	-,08	,49	-,07					
3.Anger-in	16,64	3,58	-,3	,16	-,087	,46**	,73**			
4.Anger-out	15,64	3,9	,58	,65	-,017	,64**	,37**	,44**		
5.Anger control	21,59	4,3	-,35	-,03	,13**	-,35**	,37**	-,00	-,36**	

N=484 p<.01

Table 1 indicates the kurtosis (between -.08 and -.63) and skewness (between -.03 and .65) values of the scales. Thus, the assumed values between +1 and – 1 meant that the normality assumption was not violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The linearity and normality assumptions must be met within the data in order to be able to use one-way MANOVA in the analysis. Hence, to determine the outliers, Mahalanobis distance values were calculated. Consequently, data may be said to be distributed normally and multivariate normality assumption may be considered met if Mahalanobis distance value calculated for determining the outliers is less than the table values found. Data with a Mahalanobis value more than the Chi square table value are set as

Journal of Education and Practice
www.iiste.org
ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper)   ISSN 2222-288X (Online)
Vol.8, No.7, 2017

outliers and excluded in the data set. For these, a significance level of .0001 is recommended (Büyüköztürk, 2004). Thus, data associated with 20 participants with outliers were excluded in the set. Also, the distribution graphic indicated a linear relationship. In addition, for the one-way MANOVA to be used, another important assumption, the covariance Matrix value (Box M Test) must be higher than .05; namely, the variance must be homogeneous. Obtained values indicated a homogeneous variance. Homogeneity of the variance was also examined through Levene test and variance in all groups was found to be homogeneous. Years of attendance (anger-out score) and experiencing adjustment problems (anger-in score) without homogeneity were not included in the analysis. A review of Table 1 indicated the following: satisfaction with life ($\overline{X}$ =21.35), trait anger score ($\overline{X}$ =21.45), anger-in score ($\overline{X}$ =16.64), anger-out score ($\overline{X}$ =15.64) and anger control score ($\overline{X}$ =21.59). Table 1 also indicated that satisfaction with life had a positive relationship with anger control and negative relationships with other anger dimensions.

The difference between university students' satisfaction with life and anger scores, based on gender, was analyzed through one-way MANOVA and the results were included in Table 2.

Table 2. MANOVA results associated with satisfaction with life and anger scores of groups based on gender

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P	η²
1.SWLS	12,703	1	12,703	,257	,612	-,002
2.Traid anger	4,155	1	4,155	,160	,690	-,002
3.Anger-in	9,401	1	9,401	,733	,392	-,001
4.Anger-out	144,749	1	144,749	9,680	,002*	,018
5.Anger control	210,266	1	210,266	11,569	,001*	,021

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Covariance Matrix values were not found on significant levels in the analyses (Box M Test= 12.66; p=.63). Also, Levene test indicated that the assumption of variance homogeneity was met (p>.05). A review of Table 2 indicated that, through one-way multi-variant variance analysis (MANOVA), the group effect of satisfaction with life based on gender was not found on significant levels [Wilks' λ = .91, $F_{(1.482)}$= .257, p>.05]. Namely, no significant-level difference between students' satisfaction with life was found on gender. Similarly, trait anger scores were found to not differ on gender [Wilks' λ = .91, $F_{(1.482)}$= .160, p>.05]. Anger-in scores were not found to be on significant levels [Wilks' λ = .91, $F_{(1.482)}$= .733, p>.05].

On the other hand, anger-in scores were found to be on significant levels [Wilks' λ = .91, $F_{(1.482)}$= 9.68, p<.01]. Thus, female mean ($\overline{X}$ =15.16) was lower than male mean ($\overline{X}$ =16.26). Eta square value was also found to indicate a low-level relationship (η²= .018). Similarly, the group effect of anger control scores, based on gender, was found on significant levels [Wilks' λ = .91, $F_{(1.482)}$= 11.56, *p<.01]. Thus, female mean ($\overline{X}$ =21) was found to be lower than male mean ($\overline{X}$ =22.33). Eta square value was also found to indicate a low-level relationship (η²= .021).

The difference between university students' satisfaction with life and anger scores, based on years of attendance, was analyzed through one-way MANOVA and the results were included in Table 3.

Table 3. MANOVA Results associated with Satisfaction with Life and Anger Scores of Groups based on Years of Attendance

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P	η²
1.SWLS	240,007	1	240,007	4,905	,027	008
2.Trait anger	4,411	1	4,411	,169	,681	-,002
4.Anger-in	13,742	1	13,742	1,072	,301	,000
5.Anger control	,235	1	,235	,013	,911	-,002

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Covariance Matrix values were not found on significant levels in the analyses (Box M Test= 8.56; p=.58). Also, Levene test indicated that the assumption of variance homogeneity was met (p>.05). However, anger-out dimension was not included in the analysis as it did not meet Levene test assumptions (p>.05). A review of Table 3 indicated that anger scores based on years of attendance was not found on significant levels [Wilks' λ = .98, p>.05]. On the other hand, the group effect of satisfaction with life scores, based on years of attendance, was found to be on significant levels [Wilks' λ = .98, $F_{(1.482)}$= 4.905, p<.05]. Thus, a review of difference among groups indicated that means of senior students ($\overline{X}$ =22.15) were significantly higher than

those of junior students ($\overline{X}$ =20.73). Eta square value was also found to indicate a lower-level relationship (η²= .008).

The difference between university students' satisfaction with life and anger scores, based on accommodation, was analyzed through one-way MANOVA and the results were included in Table 4.

Table 4. MANOVA Results associated with Satisfaction with Life and Anger Scores of Groups based on Accommodation

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P	η²
1.SWLS	,036	1	,036	,001	,978	-,002
2.Trait Anger	85,191	1	85,191	3,294	,070	,005
3.Anger-in	85,278	1	85,278	6,731	,010*	,012
4.Anger-out	7,245	1	7,245	,475	,491	-,001
5.Anger control	42,028	1	42,028	2,269	,133	,003

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Covariance Matrix values were not found on significant levels in the analyses (Box M Test= 22.3; p=.1). Also, Levene test indicated that the assumption of variance homogeneity was met (p>.05). A review of Table 4 indicated that, through one-way multi-variant variance analysis (MANOVA), the group effect of satisfaction with life based on accommodation was not found on significant levels [Wilks' λ = .96, $F_{(1.482)}$= .001 p>.05]. Also, the group effects of trait anger scores [Wilks' λ = 96, $F_{(1.482)}$= 3.29 p>.05], anger-out scores [Wilks' λ = 96, $F_{(1.482)}$=2.26, p>.05], and anger control [Wilks' λ = 96, $F_{(1.482)}$= 2.26, p>.05] dimensions were not found on significant levels. The group effect of anger-in scores, on the other hand, was found to be on significant levels [Wilks' λ = 96, $F_{(1.482)}$= 6.73, p<.05]. Hence, anger-in scores of students living in homes ($\overline{X}$ =16.25) were found to be lower than those of students living in dormitories ($\overline{X}$ =17.09). Eta square value was also found to indicate a lower-level relationship (η²= .012).

The difference between university students' satisfaction with life and anger scores, based on the experience of adjustment problems in the university, was analyzed through one-way MANOVA and the results were included in Table 5.

Table 5. MANOVA Results associated with satisfaction with life and anger scores of groups based on the experience of adjustment problems in the university

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P	η²
1.SWLS	1012,254	1	1012,254	21,390	,000***	,041
2.Traid anger	136,699	1	136,699	5,307	,022*	,009
3.Anger-out	91,542	1	91,542	6,077	,014*	,010
4.Anger control	73,141	1	73,141	3,962	,047*	,006

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Covariance Matrix values were not found on significant levels in the analyses (Box M Test= 94; p=.69). Also, Levene test indicated that the assumption of variance homogeneity was met (p>.05). However, anger-in dimension was not included in the analyses as it did not meet the assumptions of Leven test (p<0.05). A review of Table 5 indicated that, through one-way multi-variant variance analysis (MANOVA), satisfaction with life based on the experience of adjustment problems in the university was found on significant levels [Wilks' λ = .94, $F_{(1,482)}$= 21.39, p<.001]. Thus, the satisfaction with life of those experiencing adjustment problems ($\overline{X}$ =19.84) was found to be lower than that of students not experiencing adjustment problems ($\overline{X}$ =22.73). Eta square value was also found to indicate a medium-level relationship (η²= .041). Based on the experience of adjustment problems, the trait anger scores were found to be on significant levels [Wilks' λ = .94, $F_{(1.482)}$= 5.3, p<.05]. Hence, the trait anger scores of those experiencing adjustment problems ($\overline{X}$ =22) was found to be significantly higher than that of students not experiencing adjustment problems ($\overline{X}$ =20.94). The group effect of anger-out scores was also found to be significant [Wilks' λ = .94, $F_{(1.482)}$=6.07, p<.05]. This indicated that those experiencing adjustment problems ($\overline{X}$ =16.1) had significantly higher levels of anger-out scores than those without adjustment problems ($\overline{X}$ = 15.23). The group effect of anger control scores was also found to be

significant [Wilks' λ = .94, $F_{(1,482)}$=3.96, p<.05]. This indicated that those experiencing adjustment problems ($\overline{X}$ =21.18) had significantly lower levels of anger control scores than those without adjustment problems ($\overline{X}$ = 21.96). A low-level relationship was found based on the Eta square values of anger scores.

4. Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

The current research aimed to examine whether there was a relationship between anger and satisfaction with life and whether the levels of anger and satisfaction with life differed on gender, years of attendance, accommodation, and the experience of adjustment problems. Hence, satisfaction with life was found to have a positive relationship with anger control and negative relationships with all anger dimensions. In a similar research, Karslı (2008) found that anger behaviors, self-perception, life satisfaction, and interpersonal satisfaction predicted stress symptoms in both the patient and the healthy groups. Küçükköse (2015) determined that trait anger and anger expression predicted the subjective well-being. In addition, a negative, low-level significant relationship between subjective well-being and trait anger, anger-in, anger-out expression styles was found. Similarly, Diong et al. (2005) determined a negative relationship between anger level and psychological well-being. In another study, Chung and Kim (2017) found a positive relationship between satisfaction with life and anger control and a negative relationship between satisfaction with life and anger expression. Significant relationships were found between anger and satisfaction with life in the current research and similar studies. The positive relationship between satisfaction with life and anger control may be based on better coping with a conflict or stressful life event of, happier individuals better perceiving their lives and controlling anger in interpersonal relationships.

Another finding in the current research was about the lack of significant difference in student's levels of satisfaction with life, based on gender. However, Tuzgöl-Dost (2007) found that females' satisfaction with life was higher than that of males among university students. In Çam and Artar's (2014) study, females' satisfaction with life was found to be higher than that of males. In other studies supporting the findings of the current research, the scores of satisfaction with life were found to not differ on gender (Fugl-Meyer, Melin & Fugl-Meyer, 2002; Hampton & Marshall, 2000; Huebner, Drane & Valois, 2000). These findings indicate that satisfaction with life does not differ on gender. Various research results may be differing based on different samples. The lack of difference on gender in the current study may have been due to the lack of situations (such as an urban area, major, life conditions, etc.) positively or negatively impacting the satisfaction with life on gender. Another finding in the current study indicated that trait anger and anger-in scores did not significantly differ on gender. However, anger-out and anger control scores did differ. Hence, females' means of anger-out and anger control scores were found to be lower than those of males. Namely, it may be said that males let their anger out in the environment relatively more than females did and females found it relatively harder than males did to control their anger. In a similar study supporting the findings of the current research, Annak (2002) found that males controlled their anger better than females did. Yöndem and Bıçak (2008) concluded in their study that male students' anger levels were significantly higher than those of female students. Tambağ and Öz (2005) examined anger expression in terms of both gender and living with a family or at an orphanage. The researchers found that female passive-aggressive anger scores and male anger-out scores were high as indicated in other studies. Bostancı, Çoban, Tekin, and Özen's (2006) study involving university students indicated that females had more anger than males did in situations leading to anger. Males had more angry thinking than females did and females had more anxious behavior than males did. A review of interpersonal relationships sub-dimension indicated that females had more passive-aggressive and inner reactions than males did. Consequently, female anger-out and anger control mean scores were found to be lower than those of males. Hence, males may be letting their anger out due to their general characters or based on parents' attitudes. Females may be said to have more difficulty controlling their anger than males do.

Another finding in the current research was about anger scores not differing on years of attendance. However, scores of satisfaction with life were on significant levels, based on years of attendance. Thus, senior students' mean scores of satisfaction with life were found to be higher than those of junior students. In a similar study, Ozdemir and Dilekmen (2016) found the satisfaction with life to be higher on senior students. In another similar study, Deniz and Yılmaz (2004) found senior students' satisfaction with life to be higher than that of freshmen students. A senior student may be considered to be less under the effects of course-related stressors as most courses should be completed in senior year; due to getting closer to his/her professional targets and also better adjustment in the home or dormitory or in the university environment, such student may have higher levels of satisfaction with life.

Another finding of the current research indicated that anger-out and trait anger dimensions of satisfaction with life did not differ on accommodation (home, dormitory). On the other hand, the group effect of the anger-in scores were found to be on significant levels. As such, anger-in scores of individuals living in the dormitories were found to be higher than those of individuals living in homes. Thus, those living in dormitories

may be considered to suppress their anger more than those living in homes. In a similar study, Filiz and Çemrek (2014) determined that accommodation was among the basic problems of university students; 39% of the students lived in public dormitories; and they (21.4%) had inadequate conditions in public dormitories. Özgür, Babacan, Gümüş, and Durdu (2010) found that majority (80%) of the students were pleased to be living in homes and 17% of the students were pleased to be living in dormitories. Hence, studies indicated that students were not happy to be living in dormitories. Thus, due to not being satisfied and inadequate conditions (number of students, food, cleanliness, etc.), students may have suppressed their anger.

The group effects of satisfaction with life, based on the experience of adjustment problems in the university, were not on significant levels. Accordingly, the satisfaction with life of those experiencing adjustment problems was lower than that of those not experiencing adjustment problems. Also, the group effects of trait anger and anger-out scores were found to be on significant levels. The trait anger and anger-out scores of those experiencing adjustment problems were significantly higher than those not experiencing adjustment problems and anger control scores as well as satisfaction with life of those experiencing adjustment problems were significantly lower. Such result may be considered to indicate that individuals experiencing adjustment problems may have reflected their anger on interpersonal relationships in a dysfunctional manner in stressful situations; they may have had difficulty controlling their anger; and, thus, these may have affected their happiness or subjective well-being to lower their satisfaction with life. Yavuzer (1996) defined adjustment as being able to build and sustain better relationships with one's own and in the environment. Hence, the individuals with difficulty to adjust in environment may be letting their anger out and having difficulty controlling their anger to consequently negatively affect their levels of satisfaction with life. In a similar study involving university students, Erdoğan, Şanlı, and Şimşek-Bekir (2005) found that 82.4% of the students liked the life in the university; 63.4% were culturally improved in the university; 55.6% were socialized through university activities; 53.6% thought that they were socially improved in the university; 23.7% had difficulty adjusting in the university life; and some (20%) felt lonely. In another similar study, Aras (2015) revealed that the social adjustment of university students differed on the accommodation with the longest period of residence. Aktaş (1997) found that personal, social, and overall adjustment of senior students were significantly higher than those in their freshmen years were. Similarly, Özbay (1997) stated that the university required the students to sustain relationships in a new environment; dormitory and class atmosphere brought about interaction in a new social environment and required new social skills and effort.

The current research has some limitations. The scales used in the current research are limited to the characteristics that they measure. In addition, the current study was conducted with junior and senior students in Adiyaman University. Thus, it may be recommended for repetition with different samples. Following suggestions could be put forward based on the findings of the current research: 1. as the life satisfaction dimension had a positive relationship with anger control and negative relationships with all other anger dimensions, group psychological counseling sessions may be organized at university counseling centers to increase satisfaction with life, 2. as female anger-out and anger control scores were lower than the male average, rehabilitation activities may be planned within psychological counseling to be conducted, 3. as the anger-in scores of students living in dormitories were higher than those of students living in homes, activities (number of those living, food, cleanliness, etc.) to improve dormitory conditions may be organized, and 4. as the life satisfaction scores of students experiencing adjustment problems were lower than those of students not experiencing adjustment problems, orientation activities may be planned and effectively conducted starting from the first year of university education. In addition, the orientation may be shaped based on needs analysis of students' leisure and cultural activities, 5. as trait anger and anger-out scores of students experiencing adjustment problems were significantly high and anger control scores and life satisfaction of those students were significantly low, intervention, prevention, group psychological counseling, and psychological counseling services may be recommended in relation to anger and life satisfaction of students experiencing adjustment problems.

References

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

Aktaş, Y. (1997). Üniversite öğrencilerinin uyum düzeylerinin incelenmesi: uzunlamasına bir çalışma. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*(13), 107-110.

Annak, Ş. (2002). *Özel bir okulda öğrenim gören lise son sınıf öğrencilerinin kızgınlık düzeyleri'nin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi.* Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Aras, E. (2015). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin kişisel ve sosyal uyum düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.

Ayyash-Abdo, H. & Alamuddin, R. (2007). Predictors of subjective well being among college youth in Lebanon. *The Journal of Social Psychology,* 147(3): 265-284.

Baltaş, A.& Baltaş, Z. (1997). *Stres ve başaçıkma yolları*. On Altıncı Baskı. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Bostancı, N., Çoban, Ş., Tekin, Z. & Özen, A. (2006). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Cinsiyete Göre Öfke İfade Etme Biçimleri, *Kriz Dergisi*, 14(3), 9-18.

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

Cenkseven, F. (2003). Öfke yönetimi becerileri programının ergenlerin öfke ve saldırganlık düzeylerine etkisi, *Eğitim Bilimleri ve Uygulama Dergisi, 2(4),* 153-167.

Chung, K.-S. Kim, M. (2017). Anger factors impacting on life satisfaction of mothers with young children in Korea: Does mother's age matter?, *Personality and IndividualDifferences* 104, 190–194.

Çam, Z. & Artar, M. (2014). Ergenlikte yaşam doyumu: okul türleri bağlamında bir inceleme, *Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(1),23-46.

Deniz, M. E. ve Yılmaz, E. (2004). *Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Duygusal Zekâ Yetenekleri ve Yaşam Doyumları Arasındaki İlişki.* XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı, İnönü Üniversitesi, Malatya.

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.

Diong, M.S., Bishop, G.D., Enkelmann, H.C., Tong, E.M.W.N. Why, Y.P.,Ang, J.C.H., Kahader, M. (2005). Anger, stress, coping, social support and health: Modelling the relationships, *Journal of Psychology & Health*, 20(4), 467-495.

Durak-Batıgün, A. Hisli-Şahin, N., Karslı Demirel, E. (2011). Bedensel hastalıkları olan bireylerde stres, kendilik algısı, kişilerarası tarz ve öfke ilişkisi, *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 2011;22(4):245-54.

Erdoğan, S. H., Şanlı, S.& Şimşek-Bekir, H. (2005) Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi öğrencilerinin üniversite yaşamına uyum durumları, *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi,* 13, (2)479-496 .

Extremera, N., Duran, A., & Rey, L. (2009). The moderating effect of trait meta-mood on perceived stres on life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 116–141.

Filiz, Z. & Çemrek, F. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin barınma sorunlarının uygunluk analizi ile incelenmesi, *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(2), 207-224.

Fugl-Meyer, A. R., Melin, R. & Fugl-Meyer, K. S. (2002). Life satisfaction in 18 to 64 year old Swedes: In relation to gender, age, partner and immigrant status. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medical*, 34, 239-246.

Gilman, R. & Huebner, E. S. (2006). Characteristics of adolescents who report very high life satisfaction. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 35*(3), 311-319.

Gündoğar, D., Sallan Gül, S., Uskun, E., Demirci, S. & Keçeci, D. (2007) Üniversite öğrencilerinde yaşam doyumunu yordayan etkenlerin incelenmesi, *Klinik Psikiyatri*, 10, 14-27.

Gürbüz, G. (2008). *Öfke denetimi eğitiminin lise son sınıf öğrencilerinin öfkeyle başa çıkmaları, yaşam doyumları ve depresyon düzeylerine etkisinin incelenmesi,* Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.

Hampton, N. Z., & Marshall, A. (2000). Culture, gender, self-efficacy and life satisfaction: A comparison between Americans and Chinese people with spinal cord injures. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 66(3), 21-29.

Heppner, P. P., Wampold, B. E., & Kivlighan, D. M., Jr. (2013). *Psikolojik danışmada araştırma yöntemleri [Research design in counseling]*. (D. M. Siyez, Trans.). Ankara, Turkey: Mentis Yayıncılık.

Huebner, E. S., Drane, J.W., & Valois, R.F. (2000). Levels and demographic correlates of adolescent life satisfaction reports. *School Psychology International, 21*, 281 –292.

Kabasakal, Z. & Uz Baş, A. (2013) Öğretmen adaylarında yaşam doyumunun yordayıcısı olarak problem çözme becerileri, *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi,*2 (1)27-35.

Karslı, E. (2008).Kişilerarası tarz, kendilik algısı, öfke ve psikosomatik bozukluklar. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Akara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Kapıkıran, Ş. & Yağcı, U. (2012). Ergenlerin yalnızlık ve yaşam doyumu: çalgı çalma ve müzik topluluğuna katılmanın aracı ve farklılaştırıcı rolü, *İlköğretim Online*, 11(3), 738-747.

Korkut, Ş. (2012). *Lise öğrencilerinde çocukluk örselenme yaşantıları ve öfke ifade biçimleri ile benlik saygısı ve yaşam doyumu arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi,* Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Küçükköse, İ. (2015). *Lise öğrencilerinin öznel iyi oluş düzeyleri ile sürekli öfke, öfke ifade tarzları ve stres düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*, Yayınlanmamaş Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Mevlana Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.

Köker, S. (1991). *Normal ve sorunlu ergenlerin yaşam doyumu düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Cognition and motivation in emotion. *American Psychologist*, *46*(4),352–367.

Leung, J. P. & Zhang, L.-W. (2000). Modelling life satisfaction of Chinese adolescents in Hong   Kong.

International Journal of Behavioral Development, 24(1), 99–104.

Nair, N. (2008). Towards understanding the role of emotions in conflict: A review and future directions. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *19*(4), 359-381.

Özdemir, M., Dilekmen, M. (2016).Eğitim Fakültesi öğrencilerinin duygusal zekâ ve yaşam doyumlarının incelenmesi, *Sakarya University Journal of Education,* 6 (1), 98-113.

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

Özgür, G., Babacan Gümüş, A. & Durdu, B. (2010). Evde ve yurtta kalan üniversite öğrencilerinde yaşam doyumu, *Psikiyatri Hemşireliği Dergisi*, 1(1):25-32.

Özmen , A.(2009).*Öfke ile Başa Çıkma.* 2. Basım Ankara : Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Recepoğlu, E. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının yaşam doyumları ile öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi, *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Özel Sayı (1), 311-326.

Seligman, M. E. P. & 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.

Şahin, G. (2015). *Ortapedik engelli bireylerin öfke ifade biçimleri, benlik saygıları ve yaşam doyumları*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Erzurum.

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

Tambağ H., Öz F.(2005). Aileleri ile birlikte ve yetiştirme yurtlarında yaşayan ergenlerin öfke   ifade   etme biçimleri. *Kriz Dergisi*, 1,11-21.

Tuzgöl Dost, M. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam doyumunun bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi, *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* (2) 22. 132-143.

Ülker-Tümlü, G. & Recepoğlu, E. (2013). Üniversite akademik personelinin psikolojik dayanıklılık ve yaşam doyumu arasındaki ilişki, *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi, 3(3),205-213.*

Özbay, G. (1997). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin problem alanlarını belirlemeye yönelik bir ölçek geliştirme geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması.* Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Trabzon.

Ullman, C., & Tatar, M. (2001). Psychological adjustment among Israeli adolescent immigrants: A report on life satisfaction, self-concept, and self-esteem. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 30,* 449-463.

Yavuzer, H. (1996). *Çocuk ve Suç* (8. B.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi.

Yıldız, M. A. (2016). Serial multiple mediation of general belongingness and life satisfaction in the relationship between attachment and loneliness in adolescents. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *16*(2), 553-578.

Yıldız, M. A.& Baytemir, K. (2016). Evli bireylerde evlilik doyumu ile yaşam doyumu arasındaki ilişkide benlik saygısının aracılık etkisi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 17*(1), 67-80.

Yıldız, M. A., & Duy, B. (2015). Sokakta çalışmak ve gelir düzeyi erinlerin benlik saygısı, yaşam doyumu ve depresyon düzeylerine etki eder mi? (Diyarbakır İli Örneği). *İlköğretim Online, 14*(2), 522‑537.

Yıldız, M. A., & Karadaş, C. (2017). Multiple Mediation of Self-Esteem and Perceived Social Support in the Relationship Between Loneliness and Life Satisfaction. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(3), 130-139.

Yöndem, Z. D. & Bıçak, B. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının öfke düzeyi ve öfke tarzları. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, Sayı: 5(2),1-15.