

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

ÖFKE DÜZEYİ, ÖFKE TARZLARI İLE SOSYAL PAYLAŞIM ARASINDA YORDAYICI İLİŞKİLER

Fikri KELEŞOĞLU¹
Hülya AKSAKAL KUC²
Mehmet ATASAYAR³

CORRESPONDENCE

¹ Dr, Adapazarı Counseling
and Research Center,
fikrikelesoglu55@gmail.com.
ORCID: 0000 0002 3736 0179

² Dr, Serdivan Special
Education Preschool,
aksakal54@gmail.com.
ORCID: 0000 0001 2345 6789

³ Expert Psychological
Counselor, Adapazarı
Counseling and Research
Center,
mehmetata42@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000 0002 0363 7993

Research Article

ABSTRACT

Anger and anger expression style consists of a fundamental emotion and the behaviour of the component varying between individuals. Social sharing is a basic need inherent in human beings. Determining the effect of social sharing in anger and anger expression styles will make it possible to observe the dynamic relationship in this regard. The present study aims to analyze the predictor relations between the anger expression styles of undergraduate students of Sakarya University and their social sharing. The population of the study is the undergraduate students of Sakarya University in the 2019-2020 academic year. The sample of the study is 310 students selected through random sampling method. Personal Information Form, State-Trait Anxiety Inventory and Social Sharing Scale were used as the data-gathering instruments. SPSS Version 22.0 program was used in the data analysis. Apart from descriptive statistical parameters (arithmetic average, standard deviation as well as maximum and minimum frequencies), Independent Sample t-test and the one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) were conducted and Simple Regression analysis was implemented. The analysis revealed a significant difference between gender variance and social sharing, state anger and anger-out subscales, parental attitudes and state anger and anger-out subscales. According to the regression analysis results, social sharing level is explained significantly in the anger-in and state anger subscales. The results obtained were evaluated in the context of social work practices, psychology, sociology and psychological counselling and guidance services and recommendations were presented.

Keywords: Gerichtsdolmetscher/-übersetzer, Rechtsübersetzung, Übersetzungswissenschaft, translatorische Kompetenz

ÖZ

Öfke ve öfke ifade tarzı bireylerarası farklılık gösteren temel bir duygu ve davranış bileşenini oluşturur. Sosyal paylaşım ise insan doğasında var olan temel bir ihtiyaçtır. Öfke ve öfke ifade şekillerinde sosyal paylaşımın etkisinin bilinmesi, bu konudaki dinamik ilişkiyi görmeyi de sağlayacaktır. Bu bağlamda yürütülen araştırmanın amacı, Sakarya Üniversitesi'nde öğrenim gören lisans öğrencilerinin öfke ifade tarzları ile sosyal paylaşım arasındaki yordayıcı ilişkileri analiz edilmektir. Araştırmanın evrenini 2019-2020 eğitim-öğretim yılında öğrenimini Sakarya Üniversitesi'nde sürdüren lisans öğrencileri oluştururken, örnekleme ise random yöntemiyle seçilen 310 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Çalışma verileri için Kişisel Bilgi Formu, Durumluk ve Süreklilik Öfke Ölçeği ile Sosyal Paylaşım Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Verilerin değerlendirilmesinde SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) Version 22.0 programı kullanılmıştır. Tanımlayıcı istatistiksel parametrelerin (aritmetik ortalama, standart sapma, minimum, maksimum ve frekanslar) yanı sıra, Bağımsız Örneklem t-testi, Tek yönlü varyans analizi (ANOVA) ve Basit regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre, cinsiyet değişkeni sosyal paylaşım, sürekli öfke ve öfke dışta alt boyutlarında; anne baba tutumlarıyla sürekli öfke ve öfke dışta alt boyutlarında anlamlı farklılık bulunmuştur. Bunun dışında yapılan regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre sosyal paylaşım düzeyi öfke içte ve sürekli öfke alt boyutlarını anlamlı biçimde açıklamaktadır. Elde edilen sonuçlar sosyal hizmet uygulamaları, psikoloji, sosyoloji ve psikolojik danışma ve rehberlik hizmetleri bağlamında değerlendirilmiş ve önerilere yer verilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öfke, öfke kontrolü, öfke ifade tarzı, sosyal paylaşım

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

INTRODUCTION

Emotions, ranging from joy to sorrow, are the fundamental dynamics affecting both the individuals and their surroundings (Köknel, 1999). Recognizing, knowing and canalizing these dynamic elements in the right way will make the human, having a sensitive structure, more powerful and more effective in her/his life. The fundamental characteristic of human beings differentiating them from other creatures is the control they have on their emotions, opinions and behaviours as well as canalizing them to the fields according to the needs (Elkin and Karadağı, 2016; Yanık et al, 2017). However, the reflections of different emotions such as sorrow, joy and anger vary between humans. The control of emotions and opinions according to the place, time and situation is necessary for the individual to find inner peace as well as a determining factor for the having compatible relationships between both with family and social surroundings (Duran and Eldeleklioğlu, 2005).

Although it is hard to classify the emotions, the fundamental emotions can be listed as fear, anger, joy, hope, sorrow, intimacy, wonder and hatred. It is possible to categorize the emotions as strong-weak and positive-negative emotions (Cüceloğlu, 1991). Anger is usually considered as a negative emotion. It is generally related with concepts such as violence, bullying and aggression (Yöndem and Bıçak, 2008). Yazgan-İnanç et al. (2004) classified the emotions into three groups. *Positive emotions* such as love, happiness and affection were classified into the first group. The second group consists of *restrictive/hindering emotions* such as concern, anxiety and guilt. The third group consists of *hostility emotions* such as anger, jealousy and hatred.

Anger level and its expression style affect the individual as well as the people the individual communicates with. Anger style may also cause communication mistakes and problems. Anger can be analyzed in physiological, cognitive and behavioural dimensions (Kısaç, 1997; Temel et al., 2015). In the *physiological dimension*, anger is characterized by the acceleration in the heartbeat and an increase in the bloodstream after the adrenaline secretion, which is described as the general stimulation state, usually observed in the excited state (Balkaya, 2004). In the *cognitive dimension*, anger is usually associated with thoughts and perceptions; it is revealed with anger reactions when a situation that threatens, inhibits, belittles, hurts or harm the self is detected (Nelson-Jones, 1982, Veysel vd. 2015). In the *behavioural dimension*, anger can be expressed or suppressed. The expressed anger usually causes destructive and negative consequences for interpersonal relationships (Kısaç, 1999). Despite accepted as a normal emotion, gaining skills for the recognition and expression of anger is vital for the relationships (Firestone et al., 2003).

Psychoanalysis approach considers the *furiosness and aggression* states, associated with the anger, as inherent impulses. In addition, the psychoanalytic approach gives importance to the childhood years within this context. Apart from various theoretical frameworks put forward in order to explain states and styles of anger, it is generally accepted that the expression style of anger is a learned behaviour. Social learning theory and experimental studies conducted within this context revealed that taking someone as a model is the determining factor in the possible behavioural results of anger as well as violence and aggression (Burger, 2006). In addition, Avcı's (2006) study on the violent behaviours of the teenagers revealed the significant relationship between the state anger of their families and their anger styles. Significantly higher levels of anger-in and anger-out, as well as state anger, were found in the families of teenagers who were observed to have frequent violence behaviour. There are various definitions of anger as a positive and negative mood. Köknel (1999) defines anger as a constructive and promotive emotion having protective and developing functions for continuing one's existence and earning respect. According to Spielberger (1991), anger is a mood varying between furiousness, irritability and intense rage (Spielberger, cited in Bridewell and Chang, 1997). Hankins and Hankins (1988) have chosen to start from explaining the features of the anger when defining this emotion and listed these features as follows: 1) Anger is an unplanned behaviour. It arises automatically due to the experience and mood. 2) It is universal. 3) Anger arises as a result of criticism and hindering; and afterwards, the individual becomes open to criticism and attack. 4) The expression style of anger varies in different individuals and societies. Individual differences observed in many areas are also seen in the moods. The determining cause of anger type and level varies from person to person. However, *hindering* is one of the most basic causes of anger. In addition, provocation, disrespect to the individual rights and self-integrity and the punishment of anger behaviours are among the causes of anger (Morgan, 2000; Averil, 1983; Baltaş and Baltaş, 1999). Anger, as a mood, is reflected in the relationships and shapes the behaviour. Although the behaviour is accepted as the expression of emotion and thoughts, in fact, this constitutes the visible part of the iceberg for the behaviour of the individual.

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

The invisible part of the iceberg consists of past experiences, environmental conditions and personality traits of the individual. A behaviour shaped through the relationships of these components with other systems arises. Therefore, when looking for solutions to the problems individuals face in their professional relations, not considering the problem only from individual pathology or personality is a significant point for a solution (Danış, 2006). When anger is considered with its results, the studies conducted revealed that intensive anger constitutes a risk for maladaptive behaviours such as crimes, substance abuse and problems in interpersonal relationships (Deffenbacher et al., 1994; Averil, 1983). All these risks face the individual as disturbing the harmony of life and restricting social sharing. Professions trying to produce services in social life such as social work approach human as a value and make sharing worthy of this value. Analysis of human as a social being is a focus of interest for the profession (Yıldırım and Yıldırım, 2008). Social sharing and response levels of angry individuals towards their surroundings are affected by social and psychological barriers. Social work profession works for the liberation and removal of exactly these barriers (Thompson, 2016). Social sharing can be evaluated as a result of emotional experience, and individuals need to share with other people despite its re-stimulation of emotions and even renewing the same emotions (Zech et al., 2003). However, this sharing becomes difficult in emotions such as fear, anger and sorrow while it is easier for emotions such as happiness and joy. People usually prefer not to share their emotions when they feel guilt or shame (Finkenauer and Rime, 1998). The determining factor in sharing is not the existence of a partner for an individual to share with, but the existence of someone sincere and supportive of emotions. Sharing the intense emotions increases the intimacy between people and facilitates the sustainability of the relationships (Pennebaker et al., 2001). However social sharing is affected by the environmental dynamics of the individual. Each individual has cultural and social environments, which constitutes two levels. While norms and values consist of the cultural environment, interpersonal relationships constitute the social environment (Danış, 2006). This aspect of human may make it necessary for the multiple application roles for the professional and interventions at different levels in the professional relationship process (Sheafor and Horejsi, 2015). The study is significant in revealing and analyzing the predictive relationship between the anger of individuals, anger expression styles and social sharing, as well as shaping the professional support relationships based on the findings.

METHODOLOGY

Research Model

The study analyzed the predictivity between the state-trait anger and anger styles as well as social sharing of undergraduate students. In addition, the data obtained from data collection tools were analyzed for the difference in reference to the demographic data. As a descriptive research aiming to determine the status, the study employed the survey method. The study was conducted through the obtained data and interpreted in accordance with the literature.

Sample Group

The population of the research is the undergraduate students of Sakarya University in the 2019-2020 academic year. The sample of the research is 310 students of the same university selected through random sampling method.

Data Collection Tools

“Personal Information Form” prepared by the researchers for gathering demographic data, “State-Trait Anger Inventory” developed by Spielberg (1988) for measuring the state anger and anger styles, and “Social Sharing Scale” developed by Demirci Danışık (2005) for measuring the level of social sharing were used as the data-gathering instruments.

Personal information form

Information form was prepared by the researchers of the study in order to determine certain characteristics of undergraduate students involved in the sample of the study. The form included various questions such as gender, grade, parental attitudes, number of siblings, the residential area where the participant was raised, etc.

State-Trait Anger Inventory

State-Trait Anger Inventory was prepared by Spielberger in 1983. It was adapted into Turkish by Özer (1994). Points are

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

calculated based on the subscales in the inventory; in other words, total points are not calculated. The inventory was developed as a Likert-type scale and anger emotion and expression are scored between 1 and 4. The inventory consists of 34 items. First ten items measure the state/trait anger, 24 items aim to measure "suppressed, external and internal" anger expression styles. A high point of state anger (10 items), one of the subscales, indicates the high level of anger. A high point of anger control (8 items) indicates the easy control of anger. A high point of anger-out (8 items) indicates the easy expression of anger. A high level of anger-in (8 items) indicates suppressed anger (Savaşır and Şahin, 1997).

Social Sharing Scale

Social sharing scale was developed by Demirci Danişık in 2005. It is a Likert-type scale. It consists of 11 items. The items in the scale are scored between 1 to 4 as never, sometimes, frequently and always.

Data Analysis

In order to determine whether the points the students received changed according to the structures with two variables (gender), *Independent Sample T-test* was conducted. In addition, *One-way ANOVA - F test* was conducted in the groups with more than two variables (*grade, parental attitudes, number of siblings and residential area where the participant was raised*). Simple regression analysis was conducted to define the predictivity between the dependent and independent variables.

FINDINGS

This chapter presents findings as to whether a significant relationship was found between demographic information of the sample group and the findings obtained from the data collection tools.

Table 1 The Comparison of Demographic Characteristics of Sample Group with the Points They Received from the Social Sharing Scale and Subscales of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory

Dimensions	Gender	N	\bar{x}	SD	t.	p
Social Sharing	Female	241	31.9378	5.01584	5.024	.000
	Male	68	28.5735	4.34111		
Trait-Anger	Female	242	21.6281	5.18157	-2.313	.021
	Male	68	23.3529	6.25518		
Anger Control	Female	242	21.0413	4.47936	-.698	.486
	Male	68	21.4853	5.16444		
Anger-in	Female	241	16.8838	3.92362	-1.186	.236
	Male	68	17.5147	3.68738		
Anger-out	Female	241	16.4108	4.04780	-2.162	.031
	Male	68	17.6471	4.56059		

Table 1 presents N numbers according to the gender variable of the sample group, the arithmetic average of the scores they obtained as well as the standard deviations. In addition, the difference in the scores they obtained in the subscales of the Social Sharing Scale and State-Trait Anger Inventory were analyzed with Independent Sample T-Test based on the gender variable.

According to the table, the arithmetic average of the scores the female students obtained from Social Sharing Scale was 31.93 while the arithmetic average of the scores the male students obtained from Social Sharing Scale was 28.57. A significant difference was observed between the groups ($t_{(307)}=5.024$; $p=.000$; $p<0.05$). According to the obtained data, the social sharing level of the female students was significantly higher than the male students.

According to the table, the arithmetic average of the scores the female students obtained from State Anger was 21.62 while the arithmetic average of the scores the male students obtained from State Anger was 23.35. A significant difference was observed between the groups ($t_{(308)}=-2.313$; $p=.021$; $p<0.05$). According to the obtained data, the state anger level of the male

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

students was significantly higher than the female students.

According to the table, the arithmetic average of the scores the female students obtained from Anger Control was 21.04 while the arithmetic average of the scores the male students obtained from Anger Control was 21.48. A significant difference was not observed between the groups ($t_{(308)}=-.698$; $p=.486$; $p>0.05$). When the obtained data are analyzed based on the arithmetic average, the anger control level of male students was observed to be higher than the anger control level of female students.

According to the table, the arithmetic average of the scores the female students obtained from Anger-in was 16.88 while the arithmetic average of the scores the male students obtained from Anger-in was 17.51. A significant difference was not observed between the groups ($t_{(307)}=-1.186$; $p=.236$; $p<0.05$). When the obtained data are analyzed based on the arithmetic average, the anger-in level of male students was observed to be higher than the anger-in level of female students.

According to the table, the arithmetic average of the scores the female students obtained from Anger-out was 16.41 while the arithmetic average of the scores the male students obtained from Anger-out was 17.64. A significant difference was observed between the groups ($t_{(307)}=-2.162$; $p=.031$; $p<0.05$). According to the obtained data, the anger-out level of male students was found to be significantly different from the anger-out level of female students.

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

Table 2 The Evaluation of Social Sharing Levels of Students in the Sample Group and Their Levels of State and Trait Anger Scale Subscales in terms of Grade Variable

Dimensions	Grade	N	\bar{x}	Sd	f	p	Significant Difference
Social Sharing	Freshman	27	31.0741	4 304	.250	.910	-
	Sophomore	33	32.0000				
	Junior	46	31.0000				
	Senior	193	31.1088				
	Other	10	31.5000				
Trait-Anger	Freshman	27	22.3704	4 305	.583	.675	-
	Sophomore	33	21.8788				
	Junior	46	21.9130				
	Senior	194	22.1289				
	Other	10	19.5000				
Anger Control	Freshman	27	21.8519	4 304	.681	.606	-
	Sophomore	33	20.9697				
	Junior	46	21.6522				
	Senior	194	20.8763				
	Other	10	22.5000				
Anger-in	Freshman	27	17.8148	4 304	.626	.645	-
	Sophomore	33	16.5758				
	Junior	46	17.3913				
	Senior	193	16.9430				
	Other	10	16.2000				
Anger-out	Freshman	27	16.8889	4 304	.275	.894	-
	Sophomore	32	16.3438				
	Junior	46	17.1087				
	Senior	194	16.6495				
	Other	10	15.9000				

Table 2 presents the results of variance analysis related to the general average of Social Sharing Scale the students in the sample group received and their levels of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory based on their grade variable.

According to the results of the data analysis, the levels of Social Sharing Scale of the sample groups don't differ significantly based on their grade ($f_{(0,05;4-304)} = 250$; $p > 0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of social sharing was seen in sophomore students while the lowest level of social sharing was observed in junior students.

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

According to the results of the data analysis, the levels of State Anger don't differ significantly based on their grade ($f_{(0,05;4-305)}; 583$; $p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of state anger was seen in freshman students while the lowest level of state anger was observed in other students.

According to the results of the analysis, the levels of Anger Control of the sample groups don't differ significantly based on their grade levels ($f_{(0,05;4-305)}; 681$; $p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the lowest level of anger control was seen in senior students while the highest level of anger control was observed in other students.

According to the results of the data analysis, the levels of Anger-in don't differ significantly based on their grade ($f_{(0,05;4-305)}; 626$; $p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of anger-in was seen in freshman students while the lowest level of anger-in was observed in other students.

According to the results of the analysis, the levels of Anger-out of the sample groups don't differ significantly based on their grade levels ($f_{(0,05;4-305)}; 275$; $p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of anger-out was seen in junior students while the lowest level of anger-out was observed in other students.

Table 3 The Evaluation of Social Sharing Levels of Students in the Sample Group and Their Levels of State and Trait Anger Scale Subscales in terms of Parental Attitudes

Dimensions	Grade Level	N	\bar{x}	Sd	f	p	Significant Difference
Social Sharing	Authoritarian	64	31.0625	305	1.103	.348	-
	Democratic	117	31.6410				
	Indifferent	13	29.0769				
	Protective	115	31.0609				
Trait-Anger	Authoritarian	64	23.1406	306	2.788	.041	Authoritarian - democratic, indifferent-democratic, indifferent - protective
	Democracy	118	21.4746				
	Indifferent	13	24.9231				
	Protective	115	21.5913				
Anger Control	Authoritarian	64	20.2188	306	1.633	.182	-
	Democracy	118	21.7712				
	Indifferent	13	21.3077				
	Protective	115	20.9826				
Anger-in	Authoritarian	63	17.3175	305	.729	.535	-
	Democracy	118	16.7203				
	Indifferent	13	18.1538				
	Protective	115	17.0435				
Anger-out	Authoritarian	63	18.0635	305	3.140	.026	Authoritarian - democratic, Authoritarian - protective,
	Democracy	118	16.2712				
	Indifferent	13	17.2308				
	Protective	115	16.2870				

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

Table 3 presents the results of variance analysis related to the general average of Social Sharing Scale the students in the sample group received and their levels of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory based on their parental attitude variable.

According to the results of the analysis, the levels of Social Sharing Scale of the sample groups don't differ significantly based on the parental attitudes ($f_{(0.05;3-305)}: 1,103$; $p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of social sharing was seen in democratic parental attitude while the lowest level of social sharing was observed in indifferent parental attitude.

According to the results of the data analysis, the levels of State Anger of the students in the sample group differ significantly based on the parental attitude ($f_{(0.05;3-306)}: 2.788$; $p>0.05$). LSD multiple comparison test was conducted in order to understand from which subscales the difference arises. According to these results, differentiation was observed between authoritarian - democratic parental attitudes ($p=.049$), indifferent - democratic parental attitudes ($p=.030$) and indifferent-protective parental attitudes ($p=.037$).

According to the results of the data analysis, the levels Anger Control Anger of the students in the sample group don't differ significantly based on the parental attitude ($f_{(0.05;3-306)}: 1.633$; $p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of social sharing was seen in democratic parental attitude while the lowest level of social sharing was observed in indifferent parental attitude.

According to the results of the analysis, the levels of Anger-in of the sample groups don't differ significantly based on the parental attitudes ($f_{(0.05;3-305)}: 729$; $p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of anger-in was seen in authoritarian parental attitude while the lowest level of anger-in was observed in democratic parental attitude.

According to the results of the data analysis, the levels Anger-out of the students in the sample group don't differ significantly based on the parental attitude ($f_{(0.05;3-305)}: 3.140$; $p>0.05$). LSD multiple comparison test was conducted in order to understand from which subscales the difference arises. According to these results, differentiation was observed between authoritarian - democratic parental attitudes ($p=.006$) and authoritarian-protective parental attitudes ($p=.007$).

Table 4 The Evaluation of Social Sharing Levels of Students in the Sample Group and Their Levels of State and Trait Anger Scale Subscales in terms of the Residential Area where They were raised

Dimensions	Grade Level	N	\bar{x}	Sd	f	p	Significant Difference
Social Sharing	Village - Town	62	30.5000	2 306	1.202	.309	-
	District	86	30.8372				
	City Center / Metropolitan	158	31.6139				
Trait-Anger	Village - Town	62	21.5806	2 307	.330	.804	-
	District	87	22.0115				
	City Center / Metropolitan	158	22.2089				
Anger Control	Village - Town	62	21.7097	2 307	.719	.541	-
	District	87	20.6207				
	City Center / Metropolitan	158	21.2152				

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER
LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

Anger-in	Village - Town	62	16.7742	2 306	.577	.631	-
	District	87	16.7471				
	City Center / Metropolitan	157	17.2420				
Anger-out	Village - Town	62	16.6452	2 306	.229	.876	-
	District	86	16.4186				
	City Center / Metropolitan	158	16.8544				

Table 4 presents the results of variance analysis related to the general average of Social Sharing Scale the students in the sample group received and their levels of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory based on the residential area the participants were raised.

According to the results of the analysis, the levels of Social Sharing Scale of the sample groups don't differ significantly based on the residential area the participants were raised ($f_{(0,05;2-306)}: 1.202; p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of social sharing was seen in students raised in city center/metropolitan while the lowest level of social sharing was observed in students raised in village/town.

According to the results of the data analysis, the levels of State Anger don't differ significantly based on the residential area the participants were raised. ($f_{(0,05;2-307)}: 330; p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of state anger was seen in students raised in city center /metropolitan while the lowest level of state anger was observed in students raised in village/town.

According to the results of the analysis, the levels of Anger Control of the sample groups don't differ significantly based on the residential area the participants were raised. ($f_{(0,05;2-307)}: 719; p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of anger control was seen in students raised in village/town while the lowest level of anger control was observed in students raised in the district.

According to the results of the data analysis, the levels of Anger-in don't differ significantly based on the residential area the participants were raised ($f_{(0,05;2-306)}: 577; p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of anger-in was seen in students raised in city center /metropolitan while the lowest level of anger-in was observed in students raised in the district.

According to the results of the analysis, the levels of Anger-out of the sample groups don't differ significantly based on the residential area the participants were raised ($f_{(0,05;2-306)}: 229; p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of anger-out was seen in students raised in city center/metropolitan while the lowest level of anger-out was observed in students raised in the district.

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

Table 5 The Evaluation of Social Sharing Levels of Students in the Sample Group and Their Levels of State and Trait Anger Scale Subscales in terms of Number of Siblings Variable

Dimensions	Grade Level	N	\bar{x}	Sd	f	p	Significant Difference
Social Sharing	1	16	29.6250	4 304	.656	.623	-
	2	104	31.4135				
	3	112	31.2054				
	4	36	31.8056				
	5 and more	41	30.7073				
Trait-Anger	1	16	22.8125	4 305	.501	.735	-
	2	104	22.4038				
	3	112	21.8839				
	4	36	21.8889				
	5 and more	42	21.1429				
Anger Control	1	16	20.6875	4 305	1.090	.362	-
	2	104	20.9135				
	3	112	20.7768				
	4	36	22.3333				
	5 and more	42	21.8095				
Anger-in	1	16	16.3750	4 304	1.343	.254	-
	2	104	17.6923				
	3	111	16.7477				
	4	36	17.0000				
	5 and more	42	16.3571				
Anger-out	1	16	16.1875	4 304	.601	.662	-
	2	104	17.1154				
	3	111	16.6036				
	4	36	15.9722				
	5 and more	42	16.6190				

Table 5 presents the results of variance analysis related to the general average of Social Sharing Scale the students in the sample group received and their levels of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory based on the number of siblings variable.

According to the results of the analysis, the levels of Social Sharing Scale of the sample groups don't differ significantly based on the number of siblings ($f_{(0.05;4-304)}$; .656; $p>0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of social sharing was seen in students who have 4 siblings while the lowest level of social sharing was observed in students who are the only child.

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

According to the results of the data analysis, the levels of State Anger don't differ significantly based on the number of siblings ($f_{(0,05;4-305)} = 501$; $p > 0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of state anger was seen in students who are the only child while the lowest level of state anger was observed in students with 5 or more siblings. In addition, when the data are analyzed, an inverse proportion can be observed between the state anger status and the number of siblings.

According to the results of the data analysis, the levels Anger Control Anger don't differ significantly based on the number of siblings ($f_{(0,05;4-305)} = 1.090$; $p > 0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the lowest level of anger control was seen in students who are the only child while the highest level of anger control was observed in students with 4 siblings.

According to the results of the data analysis, the levels of Anger-in don't differ significantly based on the number of siblings ($f_{(0,05;4-305)} = 1.343$; $p > 0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of anger-in was seen in students who have 2 siblings while the lowest level of anger-in was observed in students who have 5 or more siblings.

According to the results of the analysis, the levels of Anger-out of the sample groups don't differ significantly based on the number of siblings ($f_{(0,05;4-305)} = 601$; $p > 0.05$). When the values of arithmetic averages are considered, the highest level of anger-out was seen in students who have 2 siblings while the lowest level of anger-out was observed in students who have 4 siblings.

Table 6 Simple Regression Analysis Results of Social Sharing Level of Sample Group towards the State Anger Stat

Dependent variable	Independent Variable	β	T	P	F	Model (p)	R ²
Trait-Anger	Fixed	34.194	28.902	.000	6.810	.010	.022
	Social Sharing	-.136	-2.610	.010			

As shown in the table, a significant relationship was found in the regression analysis conducted to determine the predictivity between state anger and social sharing point ($F=6.810$; $p < 0.05$). The predictivity between the state anger levels and the social sharing levels as the determinant of state anger were found to be weak ($R^2 = 0.022$). The state anger levels of the individuals decrease the total score of social sharing ($r = -.147$).

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

Table 7 Simple Regression Analysis Results of Social Sharing Level of Sample Group towards the Anger Control State

Dependent variable	Independent Variable	β	T	P	F	Model (p)	R ²
Anger Control	Fixed	29.296	21.793	.000	2.097	.149	.007
	Social Sharing	.090	1.448	.149			

As shown in the table, a significant relationship wasn't found in the regression analysis conducted to determine the predictivity between anger control and social sharing point ($F=2.097$; $p>0.05$). The predictivity between the anger control levels and the social sharing levels as the determinant of anger control level were found to be weak ($R^2=0.007$). The anger control levels of the individuals increase the total score of social sharing ($r=.082$).

Table 8 Simple Regression Analysis Results of Social Sharing Level of Sample Group towards the Anger-in State

Dependent variable	Independent Variable	β	T	P	F	Model (p)	R ²
Anger-in	Fixed	33.995	26.181	.000	4.879	.028	.016
	Social Sharing	-.164	-2.209	.028			

As shown in the table, a significant relationship was found in the regression analysis conducted to determine the predictivity between anger-in and social sharing point ($F=4.897$; $p>0.05$). The predictivity between the anger-in and the social sharing levels as the determinant of the anger-in level were found to be weak ($R^2=0.016$). The anger-in levels of the individuals decrease the total score of social sharing ($r=-.125$).

Table 9 Simple Regression Analysis Results of Social Sharing Level of Sample Group towards the Anger-out

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

State

Dependent variable	Independent Variable	β	T	P	F	Model (p)	R ²
Anger-out	Fixed	29.779	25.104	.000	1.486	.224	.005
	Social Sharing	.084	1.219	.224			

As shown in the table, a significant relationship wasn't found in the regression analysis conducted to determine the predictivity between anger-out and social sharing point ($F=1.486$; $p>0.05$). The predictivity between the anger-out and the social sharing levels as the determinant of the anger-in level were found to be weak ($R^2= 0.005$). The social sharing total score increases as the anger-out levels of the individuals increase ($r= .070$).

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

This study analyzed the predictive relationships between the anger level, anger styles and social sharing of the undergraduate students.

The social sharing levels of female students participating in the study were observed to be significantly higher than the social sharing levels of male students. Kahramanol (2016) found that the search of females for social support, when faced with stressful situations, is higher than males.

The arithmetic averages anger control levels of female and male students were found to be close to each other (female students = 21.04; male students=21.48). This result shows no significant difference between groups in anger control. The arithmetic average of the scores the female students obtained from anger-in levels was 16.88 while the arithmetic average of the scores the male students obtained from anger-in levels was 17.51. No significant difference between groups was observed. As a result, it can be said that female and male students have similar anger control and anger-in level styles. Arman (2009) found no significant difference between anger-in and anger control point averages based on the gender variable of teachers working in primary and secondary schools.

The state anger level of the male students was found to be significantly higher than the female students. A significant difference was observed between female and male students when their points of anger-out levels were analyzed. According to the obtained data, the anger-out of male students was higher than the anger-out of female students.

Some differences were found between the genders on the anger reactions. It was found that males express their anger more directly while females express anger in indirect ways. Females were found to get angrier when they aren't taken seriously, when they face injustice, when the things don't go as they planned, when they are criticized or behaved selfishly. The anger thoughts of males were found to increase with negative self / self-perception (Keskin et al., 2011).

Savaşan (2009) analyzed the relationship between the anger of patients diagnosed with hypertension and their power of taking care of themselves. The study was conducted with the participation of 305 patients. According to the results, the suppression of anger was observed to be significantly higher in female patients than males patients. The expression of anger was found to be significantly higher in male patients than in female patients (Ekinci, 2013. Kaya et al. (2007) found that males expressed their anger more than females. Yöndem and Bıçak (2008) found no difference between genders in anger control. They found that the anger levels and anger expressions as well as experiencing the anger inside is higher in males than females. Arman (2009) found a significant differentiation in expressed anger based on the gender variable of teachers working in primary and secondary schools. Male teachers' arithmetic averages of expressed anger were higher than female teachers' arithmetic averages. Akgün Şahin (2009) found that the anger-out subscale points of male caregivers of chemotherapy patients were higher. Albayrak and Kutlu (2009) observed significant relationships between gender and anger

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

expression. Keskin et al. (2011) revealed that anger state points of males obtained from Anger State and Style Inventory was high enough to make a significant difference. Ekinci (2013) found significantly higher points of state anger, expressed anger and average points of total anger in male teachers than that of female teachers. Bal et al. (2018) found that the internal and anger-out of males were higher than that of females and the anger levels of males displayed more continuity. The high levels of state-trait anger of men may be associated with socio-cultural structure and the elements of male-dominant society. The audacious, fierce and aggressive characteristics of boys are considered reasonable in Turkish culture while girls are expected to be meek, obedient, and not speaking much and expressing their feelings (Keskin et al., 2011)

No significant relationship was found between the social sharing scale levels, state anger, anger control, anger-in and anger-out levels of undergraduate students in the sample group and their grade. In addition, no significant relationship was found between social sharing scale levels, anger control and anger-in levels and the parental attitudes. No significant relationship was found between social sharing scale levels, state anger, anger control, anger-in, anger-out and the residential area where the participants were raised and the number of siblings. Yöndem and Bıçak (2008) studied the anger levels and anger styles of trainee teachers based on the department, gender, age, grade, the residential area and income level variables. The study was conducted with the participation of 713 trainee teachers. Significant differences were observed in anger levels and anger styles based on the department and gender variables. No significant differences were found in grade, age, the residential area where participants spent their lives and income level (Cited in Diril, 2011; Ekinci, 2013).

The present study revealed a significant relationship between State Anger levels and parental attitudes ($f(0.05:3-306):2,788$; $p<0.05$). A differentiation was observed between authoritarian - democratic parental attitudes ($p=.049$), indifferent - democratic parental attitudes ($p=.030$) and indifferent-protective parental attitudes ($p=.037$). In addition, a significant relationship was observed between Anger-out levels and parental attitudes ($f(0.05:3-305):3,140$; $p<0.05$). A differentiation was observed between authoritarian - democratic parental attitudes ($p=.006$) and authoritarian-protective parental attitudes ($p=.007$). Parents with democratic attitudes allow their children to explain their ideas respect these ideas. These parents give their children the freedom to express themselves. The children raised with democratic parental attitudes become more successful in controlling their anger in social environments. On the other hand, parents with authoritarian attitudes don't reflect their love to their children. They want their children to do always what they want, and they don't have effective communication with their children. Most of the time, they give punishment to their children when they make mistakes. They don't ask the opinion of children in the decisions related to them. All of these and similar attitudes may cause state anger. The democratic attitudes of parents have a positive effect on various areas such as development, personality structure, academic achievements, social communication, interpersonal interaction, etc. Thus these attitudes decrease the anger and affect the expression style in a positive direction. Furthermore, the authoritarian parental attitudes were observed to have negative effects on development, personality structure, academic achievement, social communication, interpersonal interaction, etc. Hatunoğlu (1994) found a relationship between authoritarian and indifferent parental attitudes and aggressive behaviour of the 328 subjects, who were final year high students in Erzurum. The adolescents raised with authoritarian parental attitudes were found to have a higher level of aggressive tendencies than adolescents raised with democratic and indifferent parental attitudes. Yıldız and Erci (2011) analyzed the relationship between parental attitudes and adolescent aggression. They found a relationship between attitudes of parents and aggression of adolescents. A positively weak relationship was found between democratic attitude and adolescent aggression while a negatively weak relationship was found between authoritarian and indifferent parental attitudes and adolescent aggression ($p<0.01$). The adolescent aggression decreases as the perception of democratic attitude increases while the aggression increases as the perception of authoritarian and indifferent attitude increase. Yavuzer (1996) found that the majority of children committing crimes suffered from parental oppression and they were raised in environments exposed to physical violence. The nature of the relationship between parents and child was found to be associated with aggressive behaviour of the children. The intolerant behaviour of parents towards each other and their children result in intolerant behaviour in children (Cited in Adana and Arslantaş, 2011).

A limited number of studies investigated the anger expression styles of adolescent and parents together. Wolf and Foshee (2003) studied domestic violence, anger expression and violent crime by adolescents. A significant relationship was found between exposure to domestic violence and violent crime by adolescents. The study propounds that the adolescents learned the anger expression styles of their parents by being exposed or witnessing the violence and thus they are at risk for committing violent crimes. This description is based on the fundamentals of social learning theory. According to World Health Organization, there is a strong relationship between the violence in adolescence and a weak relationship between

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

parents and child, a high number of children in the family and lastly weak bonding between family members. A high number of these factors may adversely affect the social and emotional development of adolescents and their behaviours in the lack of social support. The adolescents may feel anger, curse their fates and become prone to violence when they don't get love and attention from their families and teachers, they are excluded by friends and they feel lonely (Haskan Avcı and Yıldırım, 2014).

Savi (2008) determined that as the problem-solving function of the family decreases, the number of behavioural problems the adolescents face increases. Social learning theory emphasizes that parents teach violence behaviour by being a model to children and they fail to teach conflict resolution skills without violence (Okan İbiloğlu, 2012).

The aggression levels of students perceiving the attitudes of their parents as authoritarian were observed to be significantly higher than the aggression levels of students perceiving the attitudes of their parents as democratic and protective (Avcı, 2006). Albayrak and Kutlu (2009) found that the levels of state anger and anger expressions of students describing their families as oppressive was higher than other students. In addition, the levels of state anger and anger expressions of students describing their families as understanding/interested was lower than other students (Taşçı Eser and Üstün, 2011). This result indicates that the authoritarian and repressive parents put strict rules while raising their children, don't let the children express themselves. In addition, the parents limit the relationship of children with their friend groups and put some strict and unreasonable rules increasing their anger levels (Albayrak and Kutlu, 2009)

In this study, a significant relationship was found in the regression analysis conducted to determine the predictivity between state anger and social sharing point. It was found that the social sharing of individuals decrease as their state anger levels increase.

This study has also found a significant relationship in the regression analysis conducted to identify the predictivity between anger-in and social sharing point. It was found that the social sharing of individuals decrease as their anger-in levels increase. Anger results mostly due to the interpersonal relationships and interactions while it may be felt outside of social interactions (Guerrero & Andersen, 2000). When the differences in the family environments of students with high and low levels of anger are analyzed, it was detected that the family members of students with high levels of anger are less keen on each other. In addition, it was found that family members don't express their emotions, they have more intense conflict in the family and the structure of their families is very irregular (Topbaş, 2018)

State anger level is a point of anger indicating the low threshold of anger and the individual get angry easily (Spielberger et al., 1988). The expression or suppression of anger are two unsuitable anger expression styles (Özmen, 2006; Spielberger et al., 1988). Individuals are found to have difficulty in using social skills to express them and to solve problems when they are angry (Davila & Beck, 2002). The individuals with quick temper are found to have difficulty in maintaining their social relationships (Monnier et al., 1988). The increase in the aggressive behaviour related to anger was found to be in association with negative interpersonal relationship style (Şahin and et al., 2011). The findings of the studies related to this subject revealed that high level of anger and inappropriate anger expression styles are factors increasing the problems in interpersonal relationships (Cited in Sepetçi, 2019: 46).

Some suggestions can be presented within the light of the findings obtained in this study as follows: The undergraduate students consisted the sample of current study. Considering that anger, anger expression styles and social sharing (thus the interpersonal relationship dimension) concern individuals of all ages, research can be replicated with participants from different age groups and professions.

Recognizing and noticing the anger, controlling and expressing it in suitable ways is an important skill that should be taught to all individuals, from different ages and different professions. Thus, in order to disseminate the studies concerning this subject, various training programs can be prepared under different titles. These programs can be planned as group works and thus can be applied to raise awareness of larger groups.

Parents' child-rearing style has an undeniable importance in the personality and development of certain skills in children. Thus, not only the parents but also students of all ages, especially the university students should be prompt to take part in these training programs, as they will be parents in the future. Education programs are needed to support and empower the students' personal development within the scope of university or department elective courses (Coping with stress, empathy, etc.).

Social and sports activities supporting the common lives of students can be given more importance in universities.

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER
LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

REFERENCES

- Adana, F., and Arslantaş, H. (2011). Anger in Adolescence, and School Nurse's Role in Management Of Anger, *Medos Medical and Dental Journal*, 12(1): 57 – 62 (In Turkish). (In Turkish).
- Akgün Şahin, Z. (2009). Kemoterapi Hastalarına Bakım Veren Aile Bireylerinin Gösterdikleri Tepkiler ile Öfke İfade Tarzlarının Belirlenmesi (Determining Reactions and Anger Expressions of Family Members Giving Care for Receiving Chemotherapy), (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Atatürk University Institute of Health Sciences, Erzurum. (In Turkish).
- Albayrak, B., Kutlu, Y. (2009). Ergenlerde Öfke İfade Tarzı ve İlişkili Faktörler (Anger Expression and Related Factors in Adolescents), Maltepe Üniversitesi (Maltepe University), Hemşirelik Bilim ve Sanatı Dergisi (Journal of Nursing Science and Art), 2(3), 57-69. (In Turkish).
- Arman, E., (2009), İlköğretimde ve Ortaöğretimde Çalışan Öğretmenlerin Öfke İfade Biçimlerinin İncelenmesi (*The Examination of Expression Styles of Anger of The Teachers Working in Primary and Secondary Schools*), (Unpublished Master Thesis). Ataturk University Institute of Social Sciences, Erzurum. (In Turkish).
- Avcı, R. (2006). Şiddet Davranışı Gösteren ve Göstermeyen Ergenlerin Ailelerinin Aile İşlevleri, Öfke ve Öfke İfade Tazları Açısından İncelenmesi (*An Investigation of Violent and Nonviolent Adolescent Families in Terms of Family Functioning, Anger and Anger Expression*) (Unpublished Master's Thesis) Ankara University Social Sciences Institute, Ankara. (In Turkish).
- Averil, R. J. (1983). Studies On Anger and Aggression: Implications for Theories of Emotion. *American Psychologist*, November, 38(11), 1145-1160.
- Bal, F., Faraji, H. and Gemici, M. (2018). Travma ve Öfke Tazları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (Examination of the Relationship between Trauma and Anger Styles), *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research*, Vol:5, Issue:26, 2470-2482. Access Date: 18.11.2019 (In Turkish).
- Balkaya, F. (2004). Özgürlüğe Uzanan Yolda Önemli Bir Rehber: Öfke (An Important Guide to Freedom: Anger), *Te mas: Geşalt Terapi Dergisi (Contact: Gestalt Therapy Journal)*, 1 (3), 109-126. (In Turkish).
- Baltaş, A. and Baltaş, Z. (1999). *Stres ve Başa Çıkma Yolları (Stress and Coping Ways)*, Ankara: Remzi Kitabevi. (In Turkish)
- Bridewell W. B. and Chang, C. E. (1997). Distinguishing Between Anxiety, Depression, and Hostility: Relations to Anger-In, Anger-Out, and Anger Control, *Personal Individual Differences*, 22(4), 587-590.
- Burger, J. M. (2006). *Kişilik (Personality)*, (Trans İ.D. Erguvan Sarıoğlu). İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları. (In Turkish).
- Cüceloğlu, D. (1991). *İnsan ve Davranışı (Human and Behavior)*, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi. (In Turkish).
- Davila, J. and Beck, J. G. (2002). Is Social Anxiety Associated with Impairment in Close Relationships? A Preliminary Investigation. *Behaviour Therapy*, 33, 427-446.

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

- Danış, M. Z. (2006). Davranış Bilimlerinde Ekolojik Sistem Yaklaşım (Ecological System Approach in Behavioral Sciences), *Aile ve Toplum Dergisi (Journal of Behavioral Sciences)*, 3(9), 45-53. (In Turkish).
- Deffenbacher, J. L. Thwaites, G. A Wallace, T. L and Oetting, E. T. (1994). Social Skills and Cognitive-Relaxation Approaches to General Anger Reduction. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol: 41, 386-396.
- Demirci Danışık, N. (2005). *Ergenlerin Sürekli Öfke İfade Tarzları ile Problem Çözme Becerileri Arasındaki İlişki (The Relation between Adolescents' Continual Anger-anger Expression and Problem Solving Skills)*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis) Abant İzzet Baysal University Institute of Social Sciences, Bolu. (In Turkish).
- Diril, A. (2011). *Lise Öğrencilerinin Bilişsel Esneklik Düzeylerinin Sosyodemografik Değişkenler ve Öfke Düzeyi ile Öfke İfade Tarzları Arasındaki İlişki Açısından İncelenmesi (An investigation of Cognitive Flexibility in Terms of Socio-Demographic Variables and Anger Level and Anger Styles in Adolescent)* (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences. Adana. (In Turkish).
- Duran O. and Eldeleklioğlu J. (2005). Öfke Kontrol Programının 15-18 Yaş Arası Ergenler Üzerindeki Etkililiğinin Araştırılması (Investigation of the Effectiveness of Anger Control Program on Adolescents Between 15-18 Years), *GÜ Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (GÜ Gazi Journal of Faculty of Education)*, 25(3), 267-280.
- Ekinci, N. (2013). Öğretmenlerin Öfke İfade Tarzları ile Tükenmişlik Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (*Investigation the Relationship of Teachers' Expression of Anger Style and Their Level of Fatigue*), (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Necmettin Erbakan University Institute of Educational Sciences, Konya. (In Turkish).
- Elkin, N and Karadağlı, F. (2016). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Öfke İfade Tarzı ve İlişkili Faktörler (University Students' Anger Expression Style and Related Factors), *Anatolian Clinic the Journal of Medical Sciences*, 21(1), 64-71. (In Turkish).
- Finkenauer, C. and Rime, B. (1998). Socially Shared Emotional Experiences vs. Emotional Experiences Kept Secret: Differential Characteristics and Consequences. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 17(3), 295-318.
- Firestone, R.W. Firestone, L.A. and Catlett, J. (2003). Coping with Anger, Passivity, and a Victimized Point of View, chap.16, 131-148. *Creating a Life of Meaning and Compassion: The Wisdom of Psychotherapy*. PsycBOOKS.
- Guerrero, L. K. & Andersen, P. A. (2000). Emotion in Close Relationships. C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds). *Close Relationships: A Sourcebook (171-183)*. USA: Sage.
- Hankins G. and Hankins, C. (1988). Prescription for anger: Coping with Angry Feelings and Angry People. New York: Warner.
- Haskan Avcı, Ö. and Yıldırım İ. (2014). Ergenlerde Şiddet Eğilimi, Yalnızlık ve Sosyal Destek (Violence Tendency, Loneliness and Social Support Among Adolescents), *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education)*, 29 (1), 157-168 (In Turkish).
- Hatunoğlu, A. (1994). "Ana-baba Tutumları ile Saldırganlık Arasındaki İlişkiler (*The Relationships Between the Parental Attitudes and the Violence*), Unpublished Master's Thesis, Atatürk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Erzurum. (In Turkish).

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

- Kahramanol, B. (2016). *Aleksitimi, Öfke ve Öfke İfade Tarzları ile Stresle Başa Çıkma Tarzları ve Psikolojik Belirtiler Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (The Relationship of Alexithymia, Anger and Anger Expression Styles with Coping Styles and Psychological Symptoms)*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara. (In Turkish).
- Kaya, M., Genç, M., Kaya, B., Pehlivan, E. (2007). Tıp Fakültesi ve Sağlık Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinde Depresif Belirti Yaygınlığı, Stresle Başa Çıkma Tarzları ve Etkileyen Faktörler, (Prevalence of Depressive Symptoms, Ways of Coping, and Related Factors Among Medical School and Health Services Higher Education Students), *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi (Turkish Journal of Psychiatry)*, 18(2), 137-146. (In Turkish).
- Keskin, G., Gümüş, A. B., Engin, E. (2011). Bir Grup Sağlık Çalışanında Öfke ve Mizaç Özellikleri: İlişkisel Bir İnceleme (Anger and Temperament Characteristics in a Group of Health Workers: A Relational Review), *Düşünen Adam: Journal of Psychiatry & Neurological Sciences*, 24(3), 199-208. (In Turkish).
- Kısaç, İ. (1997). *Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre Sürekli Öfke ve Öfke İfade Düzeyleri (Trait Anger Expression Levels of University Students According to Some Variables)* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation) Ankara University Social Sciences Institute, Ankara. (In Turkish).
- Kısaç, İ. (1999). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Sürekli Öfke ve Öfke İfade Biçimi Düzeyleri (Continuous Anger and Anger Expression Levels of University Students), *Mesleki Eğitim Dergisi (Journal of Vocational Education)*, 1,1:63-74. (In Turkish).
- Köknel, Ö. (1999). *Kaygıdan Mutluluğa Kişilik (Personality from Anxiety to Happiness)*, İstanbul: Altın Kitabevi. (In Turkish)
- Monnier, J., Stone, B. K., Hobfoll, S. E. & Johnson, R. J. (1998). How Antisocial and Prosocial Coping Influence the Support Process among Men and Women in the U.S. Postal Service, *Sex Roles*, 39, 1-20.
- Morgan, Clifford T. (2000). *Psikolojiye Giriş (Introduction to Psychology)*, (Publication Executive: Karakaş, Sibel) Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları. (In Turkish).
- Nelson-Jones, R. (1982). Danışma Psikolojisi Kuramları (Theories of Counseling Psychology), Editör: Fusun Akkoyun, Cassell Educational Limited,48. (In Turkish).
- Okan İbiloğlu, A. (2012). Aile İçi Şiddet (Domestic Violence), *Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar (Current Approaches in Psychiatry)*, 4(2):204-222. (In Turkish).
- Özer, A.K. (1994). Sürekli Öfke (SL-Öfke) ve Öfke İfade Tarzı (Öfke-Tarz) Ölçekleri Ön Çalışması (Preliminary Study of Continuous Anger (SL-Anger) and Anger Expression Style (Anger-Style) Scales), *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi (Turkish Journal of Psychology)*, 9(31), 26-35. (In Turkish).
- Özmen, A. (2006). Öfkeyle Başa Çıkma Eğitiminin ve Etkileşim Grubu Uygulamasının İçe Yönelik Öfke Üzerindeki Etkisi (The Effect of Anger Coping Training and Interaction Group Practice on Internal Anger), *C. Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (Journal of Social Sciences)*, 30(2), 175-185. (In Turkish).
- Pennebaker, J. W., Zech, E. ve Rime, B. (2001). Disclosing and Sharing Emotion: Psychological, Social and Health Consequences. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228474677_Disclosing_and_Sharing_Emotion_Psychological_Social_and_Health_Consequences Access Date 21.10.2019.

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

- Savaşan, A. (2009). Hipertansiyonu Olan Hastalarda Öfke ve Öz-Bakım Gücü İlişkisi (The Relationship between Anger and Self-Care Agency in Patients with Hypertension), *Psikiyatri Hemşireliği Dergisi* (Journal of Psychiatric Nurses) 1(1):13-17. (In Turkish).
- Savi F. (2008). *12-15 Yaş Arası İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin Davranış Sorunları ile Aile İşlevleri ve Anne-Baba Kişilik Özellikleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi* (Between 12-15 Years Old Primary School Students' Behaviour Problems by the Relations Between Family Function and Mather-Fathers Personality Dimensions) (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Dokuz Eylül University Institute of Educational Sciences Counseling and Psychological Guidance Department, İzmir. (In Turkish).
- Sepetçi, M. (2019). *Yetişkinlerde Bilişsel Duygu Düzenleme, Kişilerarası İlişki Problemleri, Sürekli Öfke ve Öfke İfade Tarzları Arasındaki İlişkiler* (The Relationships of Cognitive Emotion Regulation, Interpersonal Relationship Problems, Trait Anger and Anger Expression Styles Among Adults), (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Maltepe University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul. (In Turkish).
- Sheafor, B. W and Horejsi, C. J. (2015). *Sosyal Hizmet Uygulaması Temel Teknikler ve İlkeler* (Social Work Practice Basic Techniques and Principles), Translation Ed. Çiftçi. B. 2. Edition. Ankara: Nika Yayınları. (In Turkish).
- Spielberger, C. D., Krasner, S. S. and Solomon, E. P. (1988). The Experience, Expression and Control of Anger. M. P. Janisse (Ed.), In *Individual Differences, Stress, and Health Psychology* (89-108). New York: Springer-Verlag
- Şahin, N. H., Batıgün, A. D. and Koç, V. (2011). Kişilerarası Tarz, Kendilik Algısı, Öfke ve Depresyon (Interpersonal Style, Self-Perception, Anger and Depression), *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi* (Turkish Journal of Psychiatry), 22(1), 17-25.
- Şahin, N. H. and Savaşır, I. (1997). *Bilişsel Davranışçı Terapilerde Değerlendirme: Sık Kullanılan Ölçekler* (Assessment in Cognitive Behavioral Therapies: Commonly Used Scales), Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları (Turkish Psychological Association Publications). (In Turkish).
- Taşçı Eser, D. and Üstün, B. (2011). Psikiyatrik Bozukluğu Olan Ergen ve Ebeveynlerinin Öfke İfade Biçimleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi, (Examining the Mode of Anger Expression in Adolescents with Psychiatric Disorders and their Parents), *Psikiyatri Hemşireliği Dergisi* (Journal of Psychiatric Nursing), 2(3):111-116 (In Turkish).
- Thompson, N. (2016). *Kuram ve Uygulamada Sosyal Hizmeti Anlamak* (Understanding Social Work in Theory and Practice), 3. Edition. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları. (In Turkish).
- Topbaş, M. (2018). *Öfke Duygusunun Saldırgan Davranışa Dönüşmesinde Kişilerarası İlişki Boyutlarının Rolünün İncelenmesi* (The Investigation of Dimension of Inter Personal Relationship on Conversion from Feeling of Anger to Aggressive Behaviours), (Unpublished Master's Thesis), İstanbul Aydın University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul. (In Turkish).
- Tosun, P., Sezgin, S. and Uray, N. (2019). Pazarlama Biliminde Duygu ve Duygu Durumu Kavramları İçin Baz Alınmış Teoriler (Theories About Emotions and Mood in Marketing), *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* (Electronic Journal of Social Sciences), Cilt/Volume:18, Sayı/Issue:72. (In Turkish).

PREDICTOR RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ANGER LEVEL, ANGER STYLES AND SOCIAL SHARING

- Veysel, T., Selahattin, A., Şahan B. S., Kazım N. and Öznur A. (2015). Öğretmenlerin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından Öfke Düzeylerinin ve Tarzlarının Belirlenmesi (Determination of the Teachers' Anger of Levels and Styles in Terms of Some Variables), *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi (The Journal of International Social Research)*, Cilt/Volume: 8, Sayı/ Issue: 40. (In Turkish).
- Wolf K, Foshee V. (2003). Family Violence, Anger Expression Styles and Adolescent Dating Violence, *Journal of Family Violence*, 18:309-316.
- Yanık, O., Timuroğlu M. K. and Naktiyok A. (2017). Duyguların Girişimcilik Niyeti Üzerindeki Etkisi (The Effect of Emotions on Entrepreneurial Intentions), *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi (Journal of Business Research Turk)*, 9/2, 461-477. (In Turkish).
- Yavuzer, H. (1996). *Çocuk ve Suç (Children and Crime)*, 8. Edition, Türkmen Kitabevi, İstanbul. (In Turkish).
- Yazgan-İnanç, B. Bilgin, M. and Kılıç-Atıcı, M. (2004). *Gelişim Psikolojisi: Çocuk ve Ergen Gelişimi (Developmental Psychology: Child and Adolescent Development)*, Adana: Nobel Kitabevi. (In Turkish).
- Yıldırım, N. and Yıldırım, K. (2008). *Sosyal Hizmet ve Yaklaşımlar (Social Work and Approaches)*, İstanbul: Sakarya Yayınları. (In Turkish).
- Yıldız, E. and Erci, B. (2011). Anne Baba Tutumları ile Adölesan Saldırganlığı Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (Investigation of the Relationship Between Parent Attitudes and Adolescent Aggression), *Düzce Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(3): 6-11. (In Turkish).
- Yöndem, Z. D. and Bıçak, B. (2008). Öğretmen Adaylarının Öfke Düzeyi ve Öfke Tarzları (Teacher Anger Level and Anger Styles), *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi (International Journal of Human Sciences)*, 5(2), Accessed from <http://www.insanbilimleri.com>. (In Turkish).
- Zech, E. Rime B. and Nils F. (2003). Social Sharing of Emotion, Emotional Recovery, and Interpersonal Aspects. Edt. P. Philippot and R. Feldman. *The Regulation of Emotion*, New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.