

The Effect of Teachers' Free Time Facilitators on Job Satisfaction and Related Factors

Gökhan DOKUZOĞLU^{1A}, Hasan GÜLER^{2B}, Ünsal ALTINIŞIK^{2C}

¹ Yazıkent Mürşide Akçay Ortaokulu, Aydın, TÜRKİYE

² Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Sport Science Faculty, TÜRKİYE

Correspondence Address: Gökhan DOKUZOĞLU e-mail: gkhndkz9@gmail.com

* This research was presented as an verbal paper at the The 17th FIEPS European Congress.

Conflicts of Interest: The author(s) have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Copyright and Licence: The authors who publish in the journal reserve the copyright of their work licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0.

Ethical Statement: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles were followed while conducting and writing this study and that all sources used were properly cited.

(Date Of Received): 16.07.2024 (Date of Acceptance): 05.05.2025 (Date of Publication): 31.08.2025

A: Orcid ID: 0000-0001-5407-4927 B: Orcid ID: 0000-0003-2565-7271 C: Orcid ID: 0000-0002-5078-294X

Abstract

This study was conducted to determine the effect of leisure facilitators on the job satisfaction of teachers working in public schools. A total of 201 teachers participated in the study voluntarily. In the study, demographic information was used in the first part, in the second part, the Leisure Facilitators Scale (LFS) developed by Kim, Heo, Chun, and Lee (2011) and adapted in Turkish by Gürbüz, Öncü, and Emir (2015), and in the third part, the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale developed by Weiss et al. (1967) and adapted in Turkish by Baycan (1985) were used as data collection tools. SPSS 25.0 package programme was used for data analysis. Statistically, frequency analysis, reliability coefficient calculations, Pearson correlation analysis, hierarchical regression analyses and Manova analysis were performed. The analyses were performed according to the 95% confidence interval. As a result of the analysis between the participants' leisure facilitators and age variable, a significant difference was found between the dimensions of personal facilitators and interpersonal facilitators. There was a significant difference between the participants' job satisfaction and gender variable in the extrinsic satisfaction sub-dimension. As a result of the analysis between the leisure facilitators and the branch variable, it was determined that there was a significant difference only in the structural facilitators sub-dimension. As a result of the analysis between leisure time facilitators and professional experience variables, it was found that there was a significant difference only in the personal facilitators sub-dimension. It was determined that there was a significant differentiation between personal facilitators and structural facilitators sub-dimensions and leisure time evaluation variables ($p<0.05$). As a result, it was found that leisure facilitators had a significant and positive effect on intrinsic satisfaction ($p<0.05$).

Keywords: Leisure, Leisure Facilitators, Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, Teacher.

Özet

Öğretmenlerin Serbest Zaman Kolaylaştırıcılarının İş Doyumu Üzerindeki Etkisi ve İlişkili Faktörler

Bu çalışma devlet okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin serbest zaman kolaylaştırıcılarının iş doyumunu üzerindeki etkisinin belirlenmesi amacıyla yapılmıştır. Araştırmaya 201 öğretmen gönüllü olarak katılmıştır. Araştırmada veri toplama aracı olarak birinci bölümde demografik bilgiler, ikinci bölümünde Kim, Heo, Chun ve

Lee (2011) tarafından geliştirilen ve Türkçe geçerlilik güvenirliğini Gürbüz, Öncü ve Emir (2015) tarafından yapılan serbest zaman kolaylaştırıcıları Ölçeği (SZKÖ) ve üçüncü bölümde Weiss ve diğerleri (1967) tarafından geliştirilen, Türkçe geçerlilik güvenirliğini Baycan (1985) tarafından yapılan Minnesota İş Doyum Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde SPSS 25.0 paket programı kullanılmıştır. İstatistiksel açıdan, frekans analizi, güvenirlik katsayısı hesaplamaları pearson korelasyon analizi ve hiyerarşik regresyon analizleri ve Manova analizi yapılmıştır. Analiz yapılırken %95 güven aralığına göre analiz yapılmıştır. Katılımcıların serbest zaman kolaylaştırıcıları ile yaş değişkeni arasında yapılan analizi sonucu kişisel kolaylaştırıcılar ve kişilerarası kolaylaştırıcılar boyutları arasında istatistiksel yönden anlamlı farklılaşma olduğu, Katılımcıların iş doyumları ile cinsiyet değişkeni arasında dışsal doyum alt boyutunda anlamlı farklılaşma olduğu, serbest zaman kolaylaştırıcıları ile branş değişkeni arasında yapılan analizi sonucu sadece yapısal kolaylaştırıcılar alt boyutunda anlamlı farklılaşma olduğu, serbest zaman kolaylaştırıcıları ile mesleki tecrübe değişkeni arasında yapılan analizi sonucu sadece kişisel kolaylaştırıcılar alt boyutunda arasında istatistiksel yönden anlamlı farklılaşma olduğu, serbest zaman kolaylaştırıcıları ile serbest zaman değerlendirme değişkeni arasında yapılan Manova analizi sonucu kişisel kolaylaştırıcılar ve yapısal kolaylaştırıcılar boyutları arasında istatistiksel yönden anlamlı farklılaşma olduğu görülmektedir ($p<0.05$). Sonuç olarak araştırmada bulgularında serbest zaman kolaylaştırıcılarının işsel doyum üzerinde anlamlı ve pozitif bir etkisinin olduğu tespit edilmiştir ($p<0.05$).

Anahtar Kelimeler: Serbest Zaman, Serbest Zaman Kolaylaştırıcıları, Doyum, İş Doyumu, Öğretmen.

INTRODUCTION

In our country, which has a population of approximately 84 million according to the data of the Ministry of National Education in November 2022, 1.201.138 teachers are working in Turkey in the 2022-2023 academic year, including public and private institutions (33). One of the most essential aspects of education and training is the teacher. The efficiency of the teacher is closely related to his/her job satisfaction (1).

Job satisfaction is an employee's attitude towards all aspects of work in the working environment (Bin, 2015). More specifically, it means the degree to which a person feels that his/her job-related needs are fulfilled (43).

Several factors affect job satisfaction. Malinen and Savolainen (32) classified the variables affecting job satisfaction in teachers in three dimensions organisational aspects (working conditions, relationships, perceived autonomy and support), cognitive factors (efficacy beliefs) and emotional factors (stress, burnout). Factors affecting job satisfaction are associated with many factors such as wages, financial and social rights, and the working environment (20). Besides, job satisfaction is a highly researched area in various disciplines such as organisational psychology, general psychology, economics and sociology (16).

Teachers' attitudes towards the profession, their ambition to work, the attitude of the school administration, and economic factors are among the important factors affecting job satisfaction. Moreover, the leisure time that teachers allocate for themselves outside of work is also a factor affecting their job satisfaction. Leisure is defined as the activities that are outside the compulsory occupations of the individual and that are completely free, without the purpose of providing any material gain, varying according to the individual and applied entirely to individual preferences (6). Individuals can relax both mentally and physically by dealing with the negativities that develop in their professional life with leisure activities outside of work life. For this reason, facilitating as well as removing the constraints on teachers' participation in these activities plays an important role (7). These facilitators are explained in the literature with the concept of leisure facilitators (26). Swinton et al. (38) have defined leisure facilitators as individual facilitators such as friends and family who encourage participation in activities, and structural facilitators such as gender, money, and sex.

The ability of teachers, who usually spend their time in schools, to relax both mentally and physically and to increase their professional satisfaction is closely related to their participation in activities outside their work life. In this context, our study aimed to examine the effect of teachers' leisure facilitators on job satisfaction and related factors.

METHOD

This study was conducted to determine the effect of leisure facilitators on the job satisfaction of teachers working in public schools. In the method section of the study, information about the research model, population and sample size, data collection process and data analysis were given.

Research Model

This research aimed to determine the relationship between teachers' leisure facilitators and job satisfaction by using the relational survey model following the survey model. Relational survey model aims to determine the existence and/or degree of change between two or more variables (Karasar, 2015; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

Study Group

The study group of our research consists of permanent teachers, 82 female and 119 male, between the ages of 22-65, working in public schools in Aydın province in the 2022-2023 academic year.

Data Collection Method

The data was delivered to the teachers participating in the research through Google forms, which allow faster data collection at less cost. The survey form of the research was based on voluntary participation and 201 participants completed the survey.

Data Collection Tools

The questionnaire used in the research consisted of three parts. The first part consisted of demographic information, then the Leisure Facilitators Scale, and the last part consisted of the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale.

Leisure Facilitators Scale (LFS)

While the scale developed by Kim et al. (29) to measure leisure time facilitators and whose Turkish validity and reliability was tested by Gürbüz et al. (27) consists of 27 items and 3 sub-factors in its original form, it consists of 16 items and three dimensions in its Turkish form. The internal consistency coefficient was calculated as 0.86 in the Turkish adaptation of the scale with a 5-point Likert rating. In this study, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as 0.92 for the 'Personal Facilitators' dimension, 0.85 for the 'Interpersonal Facilitators' dimension, and 0.87 for the 'Structural Facilitators' dimension.

Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale

In order to reveal the participants' job satisfaction level, Weiss et al. (44) and Turkish validity and reliability tests were conducted by Baycan (10). The scale consists of 20 items and two sub-dimensions. In the Turkish validity and reliability study of the scale, which has a 5-point Likert rating, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.77. In our research, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as 0.92 for internal satisfaction and 0.85 for external satisfaction.

Statistical Analysis

SPSS 25.0 package program was used to analyze the data. From a statistical perspective, frequency analysis, reliability coefficient calculations, correlation coefficient calculations to determine the relationship between dependent independent variables, hierarchical regression analysis to calculate the effect of the dependent variable on the independent variable, and Manova analysis for difference test calculations were performed.

Ethical approval and institutional permission

In this article, the journal writing rules, publication principles, research and publication ethics, and journal ethical rules were followed. The responsibility belongs to the authors for any violations that may arise regarding the article. "Ethics Committee approval dated 21.03.2023 and decision number 7 was obtained from Aydın Adnan Menderes University Institute of Social Sciences Ethics Committee for this study.

FINDINGS

Table 1. Demographic Variables

Variables		f	%
Gender	Female	82	40,8
	Male	119	59,2
Age	30 and below	25	12,4
	31-35	42	20,9
	36-40	56	27,9
	41-45	34	16,9
	46 and older	44	21,9
Branch	Special talent	61	30,3
	Verbal	50	24,9
	Numeric	32	15,9
	Language	19	9,5
Job experience	Class-pre-school	39	19,4
	5 years and below	22	10,9
	6-10 years	50	24,9
	11-15 years	45	22,4
	16-20 years	35	17,4
Leisure Evaluation	21 years and above	49	24,4
	Sports activities	43	21,4
	Artistic and cultural activities	10	5
	Book reading	37	18,4
	Social activities	66	32,8
	Social media	22	10,9
Other		23	11,4
Total		201	100

(Special talent= Special talent group course teachers; Verbal= Teachers of verbal group courses, Numeric= Teachers of numerical group courses; Language= Teachers of foreign language group courses, Class-pre-school= Pre-school group teachers)

In Table 1, the highest percentages in categorical variables were given in the descriptive statistics obtained from the participants. According to these results, male participants in the gender variable were (59,2%), special ability group branch in the branch variable was (27,2%), 6-10 years in the professional experience variable was (24,9%) and social cultural activities in the leisure time evaluation variable was (32,8%).

Table 2. Distribution of Scores of Leisure Facilitators and Job Satisfaction Scales

Dimensions	n	Mean	Sd	Skewness	Kurtosis
Personal Facilitators	201	4,08	,71	-,723	1,202
Interpersonal Facilitators	201	3,53	,89	-,265	-,379
Structural Facilitators	201	3,97	,68	-,701	1,254
Intrinsic Satisfaction	201	3,72	,69	-,535	,885
Extrinsic Satisfaction	201	3,37	,72	,009	-,111

According to Table 2, it was seen that the participants had high scores in the sub-dimensions of the leisure facilitators scale. The highest mean among these dimensions was Personal Facilitators. In the scores of the sub-dimensions of the job satisfaction scale, it was seen that the intrinsic satisfaction score was high and the extrinsic satisfaction score was at a medium level.

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Analysis Results for Variables

	1-	2-	3-	4-	5-
1- Personal Facilitators	1 -				
2- Interpersonal Facilitators	,766** ,000	1 -			
3- Structural Facilitators	,444** ,000	,406** ,000	1 -		
4- Intrinsic Satisfaction	,438** ,000	,448** ,000	,644** ,000	1 -	
5- Extrinsic Satisfaction	,479** ,000	,403** ,000	,766** ,000	,702** ,000	1 -
p<0,01** p<0,05*					

According to the results of Table 3, a moderate significant and positive relationship was found between participants' Intrinsic satisfaction and personal facilitators ($r=.438$); interpersonal facilitators ($r=.448$); and a highly significant and positive relationship was found between Intrinsic Satisfaction and structural facilitators ($r=.644$). A moderate significant and positive relationship between participants' extrinsic satisfaction and personal facilitators ($r=.479$) and interpersonal facilitators ($r=.403$); there is a highly significant and positive relationship between Intrinsic satisfaction and structural facilitators ($r=.766$).

Table 4. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results to Determine the Effect of Leisure Facilitators on Intrinsic Satisfaction

Model 1	Independent variable	Dependent variable	R2	F	Beta	t	p
Model 1	Constant	Intrinsic Satisfaction	,193	48,768	-	7,645	,000
	Personal Facilitators				,444	6,983	,000
Model 2	Constant	Intrinsic Satisfaction	,229	30,690	-	7,611	,000
	Personal Facilitators				,276	3,395	,001
	Interpersonal Facilitators				,261	3,213	,002
Model 3	Constant	Intrinsic Satisfaction	,247	22,818	-	6,306	,000
	Personal Facilitators				,141	1,438	,152
	Interpersonal Facilitators				,171	1,934	,055
	Structural Facilitators				,251	2,374	,019

Hierarchical regression analysis was performed to explain the effect of leisure facilitators on job satisfaction. While personal facilitators explained 19.3% of intrinsic satisfaction in the first model; when interpersonal facilitators were added to the second model, the rate of explaining the variance increased to 22.9%. Moreover, when structural facilitators were added to the model, 24.7% of the variance was explained (Table 4).

In the first model, a 1-unit increase in the personal facilitators variable caused a significant increase of .444 in intrinsic satisfaction ($\beta=.444$); in the second model, a 1-unit increase in the personal facilitators variable caused a significant increase of .276 in intrinsic satisfaction ($\beta=.276$) and a 1-unit increase in the interpersonal facilitators variable caused an increase of .261 on intrinsic satisfaction ($\beta=.261$); In the third model, a 1-unit increase in the structural facilitators variable caused a significant increase of .251 on intrinsic satisfaction ($\beta=.251$). In the third model, no significant relationship was detected between personal facilitators and interpersonal facilitators and intrinsic satisfaction ($p>0.05$).

Table 5. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results to Determine the Effect of Leisure Facilitators on Extrinsic Satisfaction

Model 1	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	R ²	F	Beta	t	p
	Constant	Extrinsic Satisfaction	,160	39,227	-	6,280	,000
	Personal Facilitators	Extrinsic Satisfaction			,406	6,263	,000
Model 2	Constant	Extrinsic Satisfaction	,217	28,647	-	6,251	,000
	Personal Facilitators	Extrinsic Satisfaction			,200	2,443	,015
	Interpersonal Facilitators	Extrinsic Satisfaction			,320	3,906	,000
Model 3	Constant	Extrinsic Satisfaction	,215	19,214	-	5,558	,000
	Personal Facilitators	Extrinsic Satisfaction			,159	1,588	,114
	Interpersonal Facilitators	Extrinsic Satisfaction			,293	3,232	,001
	Structural Facilitators	Extrinsic Satisfaction			,076	,704	,482

Hierarchical regression analysis was performed to explain the effect of leisure facilitators on job satisfaction. While personal facilitators explained 16% of intrinsic satisfaction in the first model when interpersonal facilitators were added to the second model, the rate of explaining the variance increased to 21.7%, and when structural facilitators were added to the model, the rate of explaining the variance decreased to 21.5% (Table 3).

In the first model, a 1-unit increase in the personal facilitators variable caused a significant increase in extrinsic satisfaction as .406 ($\beta=.406$); in the second model, a 1-unit increase in the personal facilitators variable caused a significant increase in extrinsic satisfaction as .200 ($\beta=.200$) and a 1-unit increase in the interpersonal facilitators variable caused an increase in extrinsic satisfaction as .320 ($\beta=.320$). In the third model, 1 unit increase in the interpersonal facilitators variable caused a significant increase of .293 in extrinsic satisfaction ($\beta=.293$). In the third model, no significant relationship was detected between personal facilitators and structural facilitators and extrinsic satisfaction ($p>0.05$).

Table 6. Manova Analysis Results of Teachers' Leisure Facilitators and Job Satisfaction Regarding Age Variable

Dimensions	Age	N	\bar{X}	SD	F	p	Bonferonni
Personal Facilitators	⁽¹⁾ 30 and below	25	4,39	,49	2,636	,035*	1>5
	⁽²⁾ 31-35	42	3,98	,78			
	⁽³⁾ 36-40	56	4,16	,66			
	⁽⁴⁾ 41-45	34	4,12	,76			
	⁽⁵⁾ 46 and older	44	3,87	,71			
Interpersonal Facilitators	⁽¹⁾ 30 and below	25	3,76	,75	2,621	,036*	1>5
	⁽²⁾ 31-35	42	3,55	,79			
	⁽³⁾ 36-40	56	3,65	,92			
	⁽⁴⁾ 41-45	34	3,63	,93			
	⁽⁵⁾ 46 and older	44	3,17	,92			
structural facilitators	⁽¹⁾ 30 and below	25	4,15	,46	1,880	,115	-
	⁽²⁾ 31-35	42	3,93	,77			
	⁽³⁾ 36-40	56	4,09	,66			
	⁽⁴⁾ 41-45	34	3,94	,76			
	⁽⁵⁾ 46 and older	44	3,77	,63			
Intrinsic Satisfaction	⁽¹⁾ 30 and below	25	3,77	,80	1,315	,266	-
	⁽²⁾ 31-35	42	3,53	,67			
	⁽³⁾ 36-40	56	3,75	,73			
	⁽⁴⁾ 41-45	34	3,67	,72			
	⁽⁵⁾ 46 and older	44	3,86	,54			
Extrinsic Satisfaction	⁽¹⁾ 30 and below	25	3,51	,85	,628	,643	-
	⁽²⁾ 31-35	42	3,35	,56			
	⁽³⁾ 36-40	56	3,43	,81			
	⁽⁴⁾ 41-45	34	3,32	,68			
	⁽⁵⁾ 46 and older	44	3,26	,68			
Wilks Lamda=,804 F=2,167							
p<0,05*							

In Table 6, as a result of the Manova analysis between the participants' leisure facilitators and the age variable, a statistically significant difference was detected between the dimensions of personal facilitators and interpersonal facilitators ($p < 0.05$). According to these results, it was seen that both personal facilitators and interpersonal facilitators scores of participants aged 30 and below were higher than participants aged 46 and older. No significant difference was found between the participants' job satisfaction and age variable ($p > 0.05$).

Table 7. Manova Analysis Results of Teachers' Leisure Facilitators and Job Satisfaction Regarding Gender Variable

Dimensions	Gender	N	\bar{X}	SD	F	p
Personal Facilitators	Female	82	4,15	,71	1,390	,240
	Male	119	4,03	,71		
Interpersonal Facilitators	Female	82	3,47	,91	,780	,378
	Male	119	3,58	,88		
Structural Facilitators	Female	82	4,07	,63	3,036	,083
	Male	119	3,90	,71		
Intrinsic Satisfaction	Female	82	3,65	,73	1,208	,273
	Male	119	3,76	,66		
Extrinsic Satisfaction	Female	82	3,23	,70	5,006	,026*
	Male	119	3,46	,71		
Wilks Lamda=,907 F=4,007						
p<0,05*						

According to Table 7, as a result of the Manova analysis between the participants' leisure facilitators and gender variable, no significant difference was detected ($p > 0.05$). A significant difference was seen between the participants' job satisfaction and gender variable in favour of male participants in the extrinsic satisfaction sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$).

Table 8. Manova Analysis Results of Teachers' Leisure Facilitators and Job Satisfaction Regarding Branch Variable

Dimensions	Branch	N	\bar{X}	SD	F	p	Bonferonni
Personal Facilitators	(1) Special talent	61	4,18	,73	2,303	,060	-
	(2) Verbal	50	3,83	,74			
	(3) Numeric	32	4,06	,69			
	(4) Language	19	4,22	,70			
	(5) Class-pre-school	39	4,20	,59			
Interpersonal Facilitators	(1) Special talent	61	3,69	,92	1,838	,123	-
	(2) Verbal	50	3,41	,83			
	(3) Numeric	32	3,25	,87			
	(4) Language	19	3,53	1,03			
	(5) Class-pre-school	39	3,69	,83			
Structural Facilitators	(1) Special talent	61	4,09	,75	2,417	,050*	1>2
	(2) Verbal	50	3,77	,70			
	(3) Numeric	32	3,83	,57			
	(4) Language	19	4,05	,79			
	(5) Class-pre-school	39	4,11	,49			
Intrinsic Satisfaction	(1) Special talent	61	3,93	,66	2,775	,028*	1>2
	(2) Verbal	50	3,54	,65			
	(3) Numeric	32	3,59	,84			
	(4) Language	19	3,59	,59			
	(5) Class-pre-school	39	3,78	,63			
Extrinsic Satisfaction	(1) Special talent	61	3,57	,62	3,232	,014*	1>2
	(2) Verbal	50	3,16	,78			
	(3) Numeric	32	3,24	,76			
	(4) Language	19	3,19	,64			
	(5) Class-pre-school	39	3,49	,69			
Wilks Lamda=,873 F=1,331							
p<0,05*							

As a result of the Manova analysis conducted between the participants' leisure facilitators and the branch variable in Table 8, a significant difference was detected only in the structural facilitators sub-

dimension ($p<0.05$). According to this result, it was revealed that the mean scores of the participants with special talent branches were higher than the participants with verbal group branches. As a result of the Manova analysis between the job satisfaction of the participants and the branch variable, a significant difference was detected in both intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction sub-dimensions ($p<0.05$). According to this result, it was revealed that the mean scores of the participants with special ability branches were higher than the participants with verbal group branches.

Table 9. Manova Analysis Results of Teachers' Leisure Facilitators and Job Satisfaction Regarding Professional Experience Variable

Dimensions	Experience	N	\bar{X}	SD	F	p	Bonferonni
Personal Facilitators	⁽¹⁾ 5 years and below	22	4,42	,51	2,790	,028*	1>5
	⁽²⁾ 6-10 years	50	4,12	,75			
	⁽³⁾ 11-15 years	45	4,04	,65			
	⁽⁴⁾ 16-20 years	35	4,18	,70			
	⁽⁵⁾ 21 years	49	3,86	,75			
Interpersonal Facilitators	⁽¹⁾ 5 years and below	22	3,69	,80	2,253	,065	-
	⁽²⁾ 6-10 years	50	3,66	,78			
	⁽³⁾ 11-15 years	45	3,50	,82			
	⁽⁴⁾ 16-20 years	35	3,73	1,11			
	⁽⁵⁾ 21 years	49	3,23	,87			
Structural Facilitators	⁽¹⁾ 5 years and below	22	4,16	,40	1,701	,151	-
	⁽²⁾ 6-10 years	50	4,03	,75			
	⁽³⁾ 11-15 years	45	3,98	,63			
	⁽⁴⁾ 16-20 years	35	4,03	,78			
	⁽⁵⁾ 21 years	49	3,76	,65			
Intrinsic Satisfaction	⁽¹⁾ 5 years and below	22	3,81	,73	,480	,751	-
	⁽²⁾ 6-10 years	50	3,66	,72			
	⁽³⁾ 11-15 years	45	3,63	,72			
	⁽⁴⁾ 16-20 years	35	3,74	,76			
	⁽⁵⁾ 21 years	49	3,79	,56			
Extrinsic Satisfaction	⁽¹⁾ 5 years and below	22	3,53	,78	,863	,487	-
	⁽²⁾ 6-10 years	50	3,44	,66			
	⁽³⁾ 11-15 years	45	3,30	,70			
	⁽⁴⁾ 16-20 years	35	3,41	,82			
	⁽⁵⁾ 21 years	49	3,25	,68			
Wilks Lamda=,847 F=1,632							
p<0,05*							

As a result of the Manova analysis conducted between the participants' leisure facilitators and the professional experience variable in Table 9, a statistically significant difference was observed only in the personal facilitators sub-dimension ($p<0.05$). According to these results, it was seen that the scores of the participants with 5 years and below professional experience were higher than the participants with 21 years and above. No significant difference was found between participants' job satisfaction and professional experience ($p>0.05$).

Table 10. Manova Analysis Results of Teachers' Leisure Facilitators and Job Satisfaction Regarding Leisure Evaluation Variable

Dimensions	Evaluation	N	\bar{X}	SD	F	p	Bonferonni
Personal Facilitators	(1) Sports activities	43	4,24	,61	3,671	,003*	1.3,4>6
	(2) Artistic and cultural activities	10	4,18	,64			
	(3) Book reading	37	4,18	,70			
	(4) Social activities	66	4,14	,59			
	(5) Social media	22	3,92	,71			
	(6)Other	23	3,55	,99			
Interpersonal Facilitators	(1) Sports activities	43	3,54	1,05	1,133	,344	-
	(2) Artistic and cultural activities	10	3,42	,76			
	(3) Book reading	37	3,46	,83			
	(4) Social activities	66	3,69	,79			
	(5) Social media	22	3,60	,86			
	(6)Other	23	3,20	1,01			
Structural Facilitators	(1) Sports activities	43	4,04	,74	2,953	,014*	1,3,4>6
	(2) Artistic and cultural activities	10	3,94	,88			
	(3) Book reading	37	4,03	,52			
	(4) Social activities	66	4,06	,57			
	(5) Social media	22	3,96	,56			
	(6)Other	23	3,47	,93			
Intrinsic Satisfaction	(1) Sports activities	43	3,75	,66	1,912	,094	-
	(2) Artistic and cultural activities	10	3,66	,52			
	(3) Book reading	37	3,86	,60			
	(4) Social activities	66	3,79	,69			
	(5) Social media	22	3,36	,60			
	(6)Other	23	3,57	,91			
Extrinsic Satisfaction	(1) Sports activities	43	3,47	,77	1,387	,231	-
	(2) Artistic and cultural activities	10	3,23	,53			
	(3) Book reading	37	3,41	,64			
	(4) Social activities	66	3,43	,75			
	(5) Social media	22	3,02	,72			
	(6)Other	23	3,32	,64			
Wilks Lamda=,804 F=1,721							
p<0,05*							

In Table 10, as a result of the Manova analysis between the participants' leisure time facilitators and the variable of leisure time evaluation, a statistically significant difference was observed between the dimensions of personal facilitators and structural facilitators ($p<0.05$). According to these results, it can be seen that both the personal facilitators' and structural facilitators' scores of the participants who do sports, read books, and participated in social activities during their leisure were higher than the participants who spend their leisure with other activities. No significant difference was found between the participants' job satisfaction and age variable ($p>0.05$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study aimed to determine the effect of leisure facilitators on the job satisfaction of teachers working in public schools. The research findings show that there is a significant relationship between leisure facilitators and job satisfaction, and that leisure facilitators affect job satisfaction.

When the correlation analysis results for the variables of our study were analysed, a significant and positive relationship was detected between the participants' intrinsic satisfaction and interpersonal facilitators. In this context, it was concluded that teachers' leisure facilitators had a positive effect on their job satisfaction

levels, and as the ease of participation in leisure activities increased, job satisfaction also increased. When the literature was examined, some studies were in parallel with our study. In the study conducted by Bilgili (12), it was concluded that there was a low-level, positive and significant relationship between leisure facilitators and the job satisfaction scale. Turan et al. (41) found a negative relationship between life satisfaction and leisure time constraints in their study. Balaban and Saç (9) concluded that there was a significant and positive relationship between perceived freedom in leisure and life satisfaction.

As a result of the analysis conducted to determine the effect of leisure time facilitators on intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction, in the first model, the variable of personal facilitators caused a significant increase in intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction. In the second model, the variables of personal facilitators and interpersonal facilitators caused a significant increase in intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction. In the third model, the structural facilitators variable caused a significant increase in intrinsic satisfaction. In the third model, the interpersonal facilitators variable caused a significant increase in extrinsic satisfaction. Following these results, it can be said that the facilitation of leisure participation positively affects intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction. When the literature was reviewed, there were similar studies to our study. In the study conducted by Demir Erbil and Çopur (21), a significant and positive relationship was detected between the time management skills and job satisfaction of the participants. Lin et al. (31) concluded that the higher the impact of leisure time constraints and physical and mental health status, the higher the desire to leave the labour force. Working individuals cannot find time to participate in leisure activities and cannot effectively reduce the physical and mental pressure from the workplace that affects their desire to stay in the labour force. In this context, it can be seen that leisure constraints and willingness to stay in the labour force have a significant effect and leisure constraints have a significant effect on employees' willingness to stay in the labour force. When the relationship between physical activity in leisure and job satisfaction was examined by Dallmeyer and others (19), a relationship was observed between participation in physical activity in leisure and job satisfaction, and physical activities in leisure positively affected job satisfaction. Park (36) concluded that as leisure time facilitation increased, psychological satisfaction, life satisfaction and leisure time participation increased and this had positive effects on leisure satisfaction.

In our study, when leisure facilitators were analysed according to the age variable, a significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of personal facilitators and interpersonal facilitators. When we look at the difference, it can be seen that the personal facilitators and interpersonal facilitators scores of the participants aged 30 and below were higher than the participants 46 and older. It can be said that the energy given by young age, the desire to be in social environments, the desire to look healthy and physically good, and the desire to belong to a social group affect the scores of individuals in this age group. When the literature was examined, studies similar to our study were observed. In the study conducted by Siyahtaş et al. (2018) with university students, they found a significant difference in the age variable of leisure facilitators in the sub-dimension of personal facilitators. In the study conducted by Bilgili (12), a low-level and negative significant relationship was found between interpersonal facilitators and age variables. In the study conducted by Balaban and Saç (9), it was determined that there was a significant difference between the total mean scores regarding the freedom they perceived in leisure according to the age variable. In some studies on leisure facilitators, no significant difference was found in terms of age variable (25).

No significant difference was found between the job satisfaction of the participants and the age variable. It can be thought that the low change in the teaching profession, the practice of the profession in similar environments and environments and the similar levels of professional expectations cause the job satisfaction levels of teachers of different ages to be similar. These results show similarities with the results of other research. Azimi and Durdağı (8) found no significant difference between teachers' job satisfaction and age variable. In the study conducted by Çulha (18) with school psychological counsellors and principals, no significant relationship was found between job satisfaction and age variable. In the study conducted by Burhan (15), no significant difference was found between teachers' job satisfaction and age variable. Similarly, in studies on academics (14,12), a statistically significant difference was found according to the age variable.

As a result of the analysis between the participants' leisure facilitators and gender variable, no significant difference was detected. There are studies similar to our study in the literature. Our study is in parallel with the results of the study conducted by Akbulut et al. (3). In the study conducted by Akbulut (2) with individuals

working within the Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports, no significance was found between facilitating participation in activities and gender variables. A significant difference was found between the job satisfaction of the participants and the gender variable in favour of male participants in the extrinsic satisfaction sub-dimension. There were studies that were in parallel with our study. When the study conducted by Çulha (18) was examined, a significant difference was found between the job satisfaction of male and female participants. According to the results of Aliyev and Tunc's (5) research, the job satisfaction of psychological counsellors showed a significant difference according to gender. A significant difference was detected in favour of male participants. Moreover, when the results of the studies on teachers (40,30) were examined, no significant difference was found in the job satisfaction levels of teachers in terms of gender variable.

As a result of the analysis between the participants' leisure facilitators and the branch variable, a significant difference was found in the structural facilitators sub-dimension. According to this result, it was revealed that the mean scores of the participants with special talents were higher than the participants in the verbal group. The fact that the leisure time facilitator scores of the teachers in this group are higher than those of the teachers in the verbal group may be explained by the fact that the leisure facilitator scores of the teachers in this group were higher than those of the teachers in the verbal group due to the fact that the workload of the teachers in this group was not as heavy, the lessons were generally taught by teaching by doing and experiencing, the exam anxiety was not present in both the students and the teacher, the exam could be held in open environments and there was no expectation of the exam result. Again, for similar reasons, the fact that job satisfaction scores are higher than the teachers in the verbal group can be explained by these reasons. When we reviewed the literature, there were no studies covering the branch variable related to our main topic.

As a result of the analysis between the participants' leisure facilitators and the professional experience variable, a statistically significant difference was observed in the personal facilitators sub-dimension. According to these results, it can be seen that the scores of the participants with 5 years and below professional experience were higher than the participants with 21 years and above. The high scores of the participants in the group corresponding to the low age group can be explained by the reasons such as being at a young age, being willing to enter social environments, being willing to be included in the social group, not having complete future plans and having children (or if they have children the child is young). When we examine the literature, there were studies parallel to our study. Similarly, when the studies conducted by Alexandris and Carroll (4) were examined, a significant difference was observed in the dimensions between the factors preventing their participation in recreational activities and the age factor. In the study conducted by Özkan (35), a significant relationship was found between leisure facilitators and age factors. At the same time, it was emphasised by various authors that leisure can increase mood (22).

No significant difference between the participants' job satisfaction and the professional experience variable. When we look at similar studies in the literature (34,39,41,17), it can be seen that there was no significant difference between the professional experience variable. In the study conducted by Bilge, Akman and Kelecioğlu (11), it was observed that those with more experience in professional service had higher job satisfaction than those with less experience.

As a result of the analysis between the participants' leisure facilitators and leisure evaluation variables, statistically significant differentiation was observed between the dimensions of personal facilitators and structural facilitators. According to these results, it can be seen that both personal facilitators and structural facilitators' scores of the participants who participated in sports activities, read books and participate in social activities during their leisure were higher than those of the participants who spend their leisure with other activities. The fact that doing sports, reading books and participating in social activities were common and dominant activities explains the high scores of the participants in this area.

No significant difference was observed between the participants' job satisfaction and the variable of leisure evaluation. When we look at the leisure evaluation levels of the participants, although it was seen that they were close to each other, the mean scores of the individuals who spent their leisure by doing sports and reading books were higher. When we examined the literature, although there were studies similar to our study, there were no studies covering the variable of job satisfaction and leisure evaluation.

Suggestions

- Recreational areas can be increased to improve the physical and mental health of teachers.
- Institutions affiliated with national education can plan suitable leisure areas for the staff working in the work environment or with the leisure sports places in the neighbourhood.
- Working individuals can be encouraged to spontaneously participate in leisure sports to reduce stress and improve physical and mental health problems.
- New studies can be planned by expanding the population and sample of the research.

REFERENCES

1. Adıgüzel, Z., Karadağ, M., ve Ünsal, Y. Fen ve teknoloji öğretmenlerinin iş tatmin düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2011; 2(4), 49-74.
2. Akbulut, B. A. Gençlik ve Spor İl Müdürlüğü Çalışanlarının Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılımını Kolaylaştıran Faktörlerin ve İş Yeri Rekreasyon Farkındalıklarının İncelenmesi (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Giresun Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Giresun, 2020.
3. Akbulut, V., Küçük Kılıç, S., Öncü, E. ve Gürbüz, B. Serbest zaman etkinliklerine katılımı neler kolaylaştırır? Sınıf öğretmeni adayları örneği 14. Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi. Antalya, Türkiye, 2016.
4. Alexandris, K., & Carroll, B. Demographic differences in the perception of constraints on recreational sport participation: Results from a study in Greece. *Leisure Studies*, 1997; 16(2), 107-125.
5. Aliyev, R. ve Tunç, E. (2015). Danışmanlıkta öz yeterlilik: örgütsel psikolojik sermayenin rolü, iş tatmini ve tükenmişlik. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2015; 190 , 97-105.
6. Arslan, S. Yetişkin Kent halkının belediyelerin serbest zaman eğitimi ile rekreasyon etkinliklerinin sunumuna ve yaşam kalitesine etkisine ilişkin görüşleri (Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi Örneği) (Doktora Tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2010.
7. Aydın, İ. Serbest zaman engelleri ile serbest zaman kolaylaştırıcılarını etkileyen faktörlerin çoklu göstergeler çoklu nedenler (ÇGÇN) Modeliyle İncelenmesi. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2021; 9(5), 1441-1454.
8. Azimi, M. ve Durdağı, A. Öğretmenlerin iş doyumu düzeyleri. *Ulusal Eğitim Akademisi Dergisi*, 2019; 3(2), 126-138.
9. Balaban, T., ve Saç, A. Rekreasyonel aktivitelere katılan bireylerin serbest zamanda algıladıkları özgürlük düzeyleri ile yaşam doyumları arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi: Antalya İli Örneği. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Edirne, 2020.
10. Baycan, F.A. Farklı gruplarda çalışan gruplarda iş doyumunun bazı yönlerinin Analizi (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, 1985.
11. Bilge, F., Akman, Y. ve Kelecioğlu, H. Öğretim elemanlarının iş doyumlarının incelenmesi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2005; 22(22), 47-60.
12. Bilgili, Ö. (2019). Akademik personellerin serbest zaman faaliyetlerindeki kolaylaştırıcıları ile motivasyon düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Bartın Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bartın, 2019.
13. Bin, A. S. & Shmailan, A. The relationship between job satisfaction, job performance and employee engagement: An explorative study. *Issues in Business Management and Economics*, 2015; 4(1), 1-8.
14. Budak, T. İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan kadrolu ve sözleşmeli öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları (Kocaeli İli Örneği) (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Maltepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, 2019.
15. Burhan, T. Devlete bağlı anaokulu ile özel anaokulunda çalışan öğretmenlerin öz yeterlik inancı ve iş doyumu düzeylerinin incelenmesi (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, 2016.
16. Cabrita, J., & Perista, H. Measuring job satisfaction in surveys – Comparative analytical report. European foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions, 2007.
17. Çanak, M. Ortaöğretim kurumlarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin iş doyumlarının incelenmesi. *Türkiye Sosyal Politika ve Çalışma Hayatı Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2014; 7(4), 9-26.
18. Çulha, Y. Okul psikolojik danışmanlarının müdürlerinin liderlik stillerini algıları ile kendi iş doyum ve tükenmişlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Yüksek Lisans Tezi) Maltepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, 2017.
19. Dallmeyer, S., Wicker, P. & Breuer, C.. The relationship between leisure-time physical activity and job satisfaction: A dynamic panel data approach. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 2023; 65(1), e12382.
20. Dave, N. & Raval, D. D. A research on the factors influencing job satisfaction of MBA faculty members in Gujarat state. *International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies*, 2014; 2(2).
21. Demir Erbil, D. ve Çopur, Z. Zaman yönetimi, çalışma yaşam kalitesi ve iş doyum ilişkisinin incelenmesi. *Zeugma I. uluslararası multidisipliner çalışmalar kongresi*, 167, 2018.
22. Dereceli, Ç. & Köse, B. Üniversite öğrencilerinin serbest zamanda temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarının ve boş zaman stratejilerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi . *Akdeniz Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6. Akademik Spor Araştırmaları Kongresi Özel Sayısı , 2022; 77-91 .

23. Ekinci, N. E., Kalkavan, A., Üstün, Ü. D. & Gündüz, B. Üniversite öğrencilerinin sportif ve sportif olmayan rekreatif etkinliklere katılmalarına engel olabilecek unsurların incelenmesi. Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 2014; 1(1), 1-13.
24. Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. How to design and evaluate research in education (Vol. 7, p. 429). New York: McGraw-hill, 2012.
25. Guthold, R., Ono, T., Strong, KL, Chatterji, S. ve Morabia, A. Fiziksel hareketsizlikte dünya çapında değişkenlik: 51 ülkeli bir anket. Amerikan Koruyucu Hekimlik Dergisi, 2008; 34 (6), 486-494.
26. Gürbüz, B., Çimen, Z. & Aydın, İ. Serbest zaman ilgilenim ölçeği: türkçe formu geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2018; 16(4), 256-265.
27. Gürbüz, B., Öncü, E. ve Emir, E. Serbest zaman kolaylaştırıcıları ölçeğinin türkçeye uyarlanması: geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. III. Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Kongresi, 5-7 Kasım, Eskişehir, 2015.
28. Karasar, N. Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2015.
29. Kim, B., Heo, J., Chun, S. & Lee, Y.. Construction and initial validation of the leisure facilitator scale. Leisure/Loisir, 2011; 35(4), 395-401.
30. Koruklu, N., Feyzioğlu, B., Kiremit, H. Ö. & Kaldırım, E. Öğretmenlerin iş doyumu düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2013; 1(25), 119-137.
31. Lin, H. H., Lin, J. W., Chen, C. C., Hsu, C. H., Lai, B. S. & Lin, T. Y. Effects of leisure obstacles, job satisfaction, and physical and mental health on job intentions of medical workers exposed to COVID-19 infection risk and workplace stress. In Healthcare, 2021; 9(11), 1569. MDPI.
32. Malinen, O. P. & Savolainen, H. The effect of perceived school climate and teacher efficacy in behavior management on job satisfaction and burnout: A longitudinal study. Teaching and teacher education, 2016; 60, 144-152
33. <https://www.meb.gov.tr/>. (Erişim tarihi: 11.03.2023)
34. Özdayı, N. Resmi ve özel liselerde çalışan öğretmenlerin iş tatmini, iş streslerinin karşılaştırmalı analizi (Doktora Tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, 1990.
35. Özkan, S. (2018). Kamu personelinin serbest zaman etkinliklerine katılımına engel teşkil eden faktörler ile serbest zaman etkinliklerine katılımı kolaylaştıran faktörlerin incelenmesi (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Kütahya Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Kütahya, 2018.
36. Park, S. Y. The effect of the leader's coaching leadership on the organizational and career intention of the staff. Master' s Thesis, Seoul Korea University, Korea, 2009.
37. Siyahtaş, A., Tükenmez, A. G. A., Hocaoglu, A. G. M. ve Donuk, B. Üniversitede öğrenim gören bireylerin serbest zaman engelleri ile kolaylaştırıcıları arasındaki ilişki. Journal Of Social And Humanities Sciences Research (Jshsr), 2018; 5(24), 1795-1805.
38. Swinton, A. T., Freman, P. A., Zabriskie, R. B. & Fields, P. J. Nonresident fathers' family leisure patterns during parenting time with their children. Fathering, 2008; 6(3), 205-225.
39. Taşdan, M. & Tiryaki, E. Özel ve devlet ilköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin iş doyumu düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması. Eğitim ve Bilim, 2010; 33(147), 54-70.
40. Tok, T. N. & Bacak, E. Öğretmenlerin iş doyumu ile yöneticileri için algıladıkları dönüşümcü liderlik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki. International Journal of Human Sciences, 2013; 1(10), 1135-1166.
41. Turaç, C. Okul etkililiğinin öğretmenlerin iş doyumuna etkisi (Doktora Tezi) Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya, 2017.
42. Turan, E. B., Gülşen, D. B. A. ve Bilaloğlu, M. Kadın çalışanların yaşam doyumu ile boş zaman engelleri arasındaki ilişki: akdeniz üniversitesi örneği. Gaziantep Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2019; 4(1), 104-114.
43. Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G. & Koestner, R. Reflections on self-determination theory. Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne, 2008; 49(3), 257.
44. Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W. & Lofquist, L. H. Manual for the minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. mineapolis: Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, 1967; 22, 1-19.