



SATISFACTION FROM LEISURE ACTIVITIES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL RESILIENCE: A STUDY ON TEACHERS

Abdullah Çuhadar^{1*}, Yusuf Er¹

¹ Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Faculty of Applied Sciences, Recreation Management Department
Karaman, TÜRKİYE

Abstract: Since the teaching profession has a stressful structure, both the happiness teachers feel from the time they allocate for themselves (leisure satisfaction) and their ability to withstand difficulties (psychological resilience) are very important. Given this background, this study aimed to determine teachers' leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience levels, and to investigate the relationship between these two variables. The study also examined whether leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience differ according to gender, age, marital status, education level, years of service, adequacy of leisure time, and regular sports participation. While the population of the study consists of teachers working in primary, secondary and high schools in Karaman province and district centres, the sample group consists of 405 teachers. "Personal Information Form", "Leisure Satisfaction Scale" and "Brief Psychological Resilience Scale" were used as data collection tools. Skewness and kurtosis tests were used to determine the distribution of the data. "t-test", "ANOVA" and "Pearson Correlation" analyses were used in data analysis. According to the findings obtained; it was determined that there were significant differences in some sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction levels in age, marital status, working years and regular sports practice variables, and in psychological resilience levels in working years and regular sports practice. Finally, in the correlation analysis, it was determined that there was a significant and positive relationship between leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience scales.

Keywords: Leisure, psychological resilience, well-being, teachers

SERBEST ZAMAN AKTİVİTELERİNDEN ELDE EDİLEN DOYUM VE PSİKOLOJİK SAĞLAMLIK: ÖĞRETMENLER ÜZERİNE BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Öz: Öğretmenlik mesleği stresli bir yapıya sahip olduğundan, öğretmenlerin hem kendilerine ayırdıkları zamandan duydukları mutluluk (serbest zaman doyum) hem de zorluklara dayanma güçleri (psikolojik sağlamlık) oldukça önemlidir. Bu noktadan hareketle çalışmanın amacı, öğretmenlerin serbest zaman doyum ve psikolojik sağlamlık düzeylerini belirlemek ve bu iki değişken arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Ayrıca çalışmada, serbest zaman doyum ve psikolojik sağlamlığın cinsiyet, yaş, medeni durum, eğitim düzeyi, çalışma yılı, boş zaman süresinin yeterliliği ve düzenli spor yapma durumuna göre farklılaşıp farklılaşmadığı da incelenmiştir. Araştırmanın evrenini Karaman il ve ilçe merkezlerindeki ilkököl, ortaokul ve liselerde görev yapan öğretmenler oluşturmakta iken örneklem grubu 405 öğretmenden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmada veri toplama aracı olarak "Kişisel Bilgi Formu", "Serbest Zaman Doyum Ölçeği" ve "Kısa Psikolojik Sağlamlık Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Verilerin dağılımını belirlemek için çarpıklık-basıklık testleri kullanılmıştır. Veri analizi kısmında "t-testi", "ANOVA" ve "Pearson Korelasyon" analizleri kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen bulgulara göre; serbest zaman doyum düzeylerinin bazı alt boyutlarında yaş, medeni durum, çalışma yılları ve düzenli olarak spor yapma değişkenlerinde, psikolojik sağlamlık düzeylerinde ise çalışma yılları ve düzenli olarak spor yapma durumlarında anlamlı farklılık olduğu belirlenmiştir. Son olarak gerçekleştirilen korelasyon analizinde serbest zaman doyum ile psikolojik sağlamlık ölçekleri arasında anlamlı ve pozitif yönde bir ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Serbest zaman, psikolojik sağlamlık, iyi oluş, öğretmenler



* Corresponding Author: Abdullah Çuhadar, E-mail: cuhadarabdullah42@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The individual and social value of the concept of time is increasingly gaining importance in contemporary society. Time represents both an objective phenomenon measurable through chronometric instruments and a subjective experience that carries different meanings among individuals. Perceived as a temporal dimension in individual life, this phenomenon exhibits a non-repetitive and abstract structure with uncertain starting and ending points. Considering this context, it can be stated that the time phenomenon of humans may have subjective differences, and when measured with chronometric measurement tools, it constitutes a time period having objective values (Hacıoğlu et al., 2003). Ağarı (2023) defines a fundamental characteristic of time as a sequential and irreversible progression. According to this perspective, time is a phenomenon that can neither be stopped nor reversed, representing a continuous flow from the past to the future. The concept of leisure, which has gained increasing importance in social life, has become a critical component in terms of the quality of life of individuals today. In industrialized and industrializing societies, the areas of use of leisure time are expanding in parallel with the decrease in working hours (Güngörmüş, 2007). Leisure, an idea that the Industrial Revolution has brought about as part of industrial development, has become more widespread and shaped the characteristics of modern society (Gül, 2014; Hacıoğlu et al., 2017; Demirel et al., 2025). Leisure satisfaction, which is accepted as one of the basic components of subjective well-being, is defined as the positive emotional state and cognitive perceptions that individuals experience after the activities they participate in freely (Beard & Ragheb, 1980; Amestoy et al., 2008). Leisure satisfaction is conceptualized as a value-based emotional satisfaction structure that emerges when individuals' expectations are met, which is situational and continuous (Ardahan & Yerlisu Lapa, 2010). Leisure satisfaction is directly related to the subjective quality that individuals perceive in the processes of participation in leisure activities and reflects the level of satisfaction that individuals obtain from these activities (Kovacs, 2007).

To manage contemporary life's demanding pace and stressors, effective leisure utilization serves as a crucial factor in maintaining and enhancing psychological resilience. The construct of psychological resilience traces its etymological roots to the Latin term "resiliens" (Doğan, 2015), with the Oxford English Dictionary characterizing it as "the capacity for rapid adaptation or rapid recovery to challenging conditions" (Soanes & Stevenson, 2006). Earvolino-Ramirez (2007) positions psychological resilience as a developmental adaptation mechanism demonstrated by individuals when confronting persistent adversities and traumatic circumstances. This conceptualization suggests that resilience encompasses both post-adversity recovery and the enhancement of personal capacity through experiential learning. Jackson et al. (2007) characterize psychological resilience as a fundamental adaptive trait manifested during challenging life circumstances and hardships. Kahvecioğlu (2016) frames psychological resilience as an individual attribute facilitating adaptive responses to environmental stressors, life challenges, and risk situations while enabling healthy coping mechanisms. The original Latin term "resilience" denotes characteristics of flexibility and the ability to restore original form (Greene, 2002). Turkish research demonstrates varied terminological usage for psychological resilience, with scholars employing 'dayanıklılık', 'psikolojik sağlamlık', and 'kendini toparlama gücü' interchangeably (Dursun & Özkan, 2019).

Research has demonstrated that leisure activities play a significant role in developing and maintaining psychological resilience. Engagement in leisure activities provides individuals with opportunities to experience positive emotions, develop coping strategies, and build social support networks, all of which are essential components of psychological resilience (Iwasaki, 2008). Furthermore, satisfaction derived from leisure activities has been associated with enhanced well-being and the capacity to cope with stress (Coleman & Iso-Ahola, 1993).

Teachers, who face high levels of occupational stress and burnout, may particularly benefit from leisure satisfaction as a protective factor that strengthens their psychological resilience. Understanding this relationship is crucial for developing interventions aimed at promoting teacher well-being and retention in the profession.

Given this conceptual foundation, this study aimed to examine teachers' leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience levels, and to investigate the relationship between these two variables. The study also examined whether leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience differ according to gender, age, marital status, education level, years of service, adequacy of leisure time, and regular sports participation. Since the teaching profession has a stressful structure, both the happiness teachers derive from their leisure time and their ability to cope with difficulties are important factors.

Based on the theoretical framework and previous research, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H₁: There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience.

H₂: Teachers' leisure satisfaction levels differ significantly according to demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, education level, years of service, adequacy of leisure time, and regular sports participation).

H₃: Teachers' psychological resilience levels differ significantly according to demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, education level, years of service, adequacy of leisure time, and regular sports participation).

It is considered that the findings of the research are important in terms of encouraging participation in leisure activities for the actions to be developed to minimize the professional burnout of teachers and to increase their psychological resilience.

METHOD

Research Model

This research adopted the relational survey model, one of the quantitative research designs, since it focuses on examining the relationships between variables. The correlational survey model is an approach to determine the existence, direction and degree of mutual change between two or more variables. Under this model, correlational analyses can generally be conducted in two main forms correlational relationships, which examine the co-variance between variables, and comparative relationships, which reveal differences between groups. This methodological approach is effective in detecting trends and patterns between the concepts under study (Creswell, 2017).

Research Sample

Teachers were selected as the study population due to the highly stressful nature of the teaching profession, which is characterized by heavy workloads, emotional demands, and increasing responsibilities. Previous research has indicated that teachers experience elevated levels of occupational stress and burnout, making it crucial to understand factors that may enhance their psychological resilience and well-being. Furthermore, teachers serve as role models for students, and their psychological well-being can directly impact educational outcomes and the learning environment. Therefore, investigating the relationship between leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience among teachers has both theoretical and practical significance. The study population consisted of teachers working in primary, secondary, and high schools in Karaman province and district towns.

Simple random sampling method, which is one of the probability-based sampling methods, was used in the selection of the sample. This method is the random random selection of sampling units from the population list (Büyüköztürk et al. 2017). Simple random sampling method is a sampling technique in which all elements of the universe have equal and independent probability of selection (Karasar, 2008). From this point of view, the sample of the study is composed of teachers having a duty in primary and secondary schools and high schools in Karaman province and district towns. Teachers were determined by simple random sampling method.

Table 1. Demographic information of the participants

Variables	Groups	N	%
Gender	Woman	207	51.1
	Male	198	48.9
Age	22-25	34	8.4
	26-29	77	19.0
	30-33	72	17.8
	34-37	72	17.8
	38 and above	150	37.0
Marital Status	Married	256	63.2
	Single	149	36.8
Education Level	Undergraduate	305	75.3
	Postgraduate	100	24.7
Year of Operation	1-3 Years	73	18.0
	4-6 Years	73	18.0
	7-9 Years	56	13.8
	10 years and over	203	50.1
Sufficiency of Weekly Leisure	Sufficient	204	50.4
	Inadequate	201	49.6
Doing Sports Regularly	Yes	134	33.1
	No	271	66.9

The majority of the teachers analysed within the scope of the research were women (51,1%). In terms of age group, 37.0% of the teachers were 38 years old and above. In terms of marital status, it is understood that 63,2% of the teachers are married. When the level of education was analysed, 75.3% of them were undergraduate graduates. More than half of the participants (50.1%) have 10 years or more working experience. In terms of weekly leisure, 50.4% of the participants stated that their leisure was sufficient. When the status of doing sports regularly was analysed, 66.9% of the participants stated that they did not do sports regularly (Table 1).

Research Instruments

The data collection instruments used in the study were the researcher-developed Participant Form, the Leisure Time Satisfaction Scale and the Brief Psychological Resilience Scale. The participant form includes questions about gender, age, marital status, education level, working years, adequacy of leisure and regular exercise.

Participants' satisfaction with leisure activities was measured with the leisure satisfaction scale. This scale originated from Beard and Ragheb (1980) and was translated to Turkish by Gökce and Orhan (2011). The scale consists of a total of 24 items and evaluates leisure satisfaction in six different dimensions. These sub-dimensions are Psychological (1-4 items), Educational (5-8 items), Social (9-12 items), Physiological (13-16 items), Relaxation (17-20 items) and

Aesthetic (21-24 items). The scale has a 5-point Likert-type rating format ranging from 1 "Almost Never True" to 5 "Almost Always True". When the reliability of the scale was examined, the total internal consistency coefficient was reported as .90 in the adaptation study conducted by Gökçe and Orhan (2011). The internal consistency coefficients of the sub-dimensions were calculated as .77 for Psychological, .77 for Educational, .76 for Social, .79 for Physiological, .80 for Relaxation and .79 for Aesthetic. In the present study, the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient, which was calculated to test the validity of the scale, was found to be .938, which is considered excellent reliability (George & Mallery, 2003).

The brief psychological resilience scale was developed by Smith et al. (2008) to reveal the self-healing potential and psychological resilience status of the individual. It was adapted into Turkish by Doğan (2015). It consists of 5-point Likert scale and 6 items and is a self-report measurement tool. It is scored as "not at all appropriate" (1), "not appropriate" (2), "somewhat appropriate" (3), "appropriate" (4), "completely appropriate" (5), and items 2, 4 and 6 of the 6 items are reversed and coded, but must first be translated into the scoring key. If the scores obtained after this coding result in a high score, it indicates a high level of psychological resilience, and if it results in a low score, it indicates a low level of psychological resilience. In the study, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was calculated as 0.918 in order to test the construct validity of the scale.

The participant form, Leisure Time Satisfaction Scale and Brief Psychological Resilience Scale used in the study were approved by the ethics commission of "Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University" with the decision number "04-2025/153".

Data Analysis

Personal information form and related scales were obtained from teachers working in Karaman province and district between 25.04.2025-10.05.2025 via Google forms. Within the scope of the research, 405 teachers were reached. The data obtained were analysed with SPSS 23.0 software. In the analysis process, homogeneity results were taken into consideration in order to decide which tests to be performed. Hair et al. (2013) state that the skewness and kurtosis test results being between ± 1 values for determining the homogeneity of the data is a sufficient indicator for parametric test results. Therefore, according to the Skewness and Kurtosis test results, it was understood that the data showed normal distribution (Table 2).

Table 2. Skewness kurtosis test results

Scales and Sub-Dimension	N	Avarage	Sd	Skewness	Kurtosis
L.T.S.S Psychological	405	3.36	.842	-.460	.064
L.T.S.S Educational	405	3.53	.835	-.449	.101
L.T.S.S. Social	405	3.41	.814	-.521	.488
L.T.S.S. Physiological	405	3.84	.793	-.760	.898
L.T.S.S. Relaxation	405	3.13	.889	-.260	-.109
L.T.S.S. Aesthetic	405	3.44	.817	-.507	.415
Brief Psychological Resilience Scale	405	3.23	.881	-.213	-.180

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were performed for gender, marital status, education level, regular sports practice and adequacy of leisure, age and working years. Bonferroni correction was applied in post-hoc tests to control for Type I error in multiple comparisons. After the homogeneity assumption (skewness-skewness) was met, "Pearson correlation" analysis was performed to determine the relationship between the scales.

RESULTS

In this part of the study, the results of statistical analyses of teachers' leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience are presented in tables and then explanations are made.

Table 3. Examination of the difference between the scale scores of the participants in terms of gender variable

L.T.S.S	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	p
Psychological	Woman	207	3.34	0.87	-.474	.63
	Male	198	3.38	0.80		
Educational	Woman	207	3.53	0.87	-.017	.98
	Male	198	3.53	0.79		
Social	Woman	207	3.42	0.81	.383	.70
	Male	198	3.39	0.81		
Physiological	Woman	207	3.88	0.82	1.04	.29
	Male	198	3.79	0.75		
Relaxation	Woman	207	3.03	0.93	-2.21	.27
	Male	198	3.23	0.83		
Aesthetics	Woman	207	3.48	0.86	1.02	.30
	Male	198	3.40	0.75		
B.P.R.S.	Gender	N	X	Sd	t	P
Brief Psychological Resilience Scale	Woman	207	3.20	0.97	0.69	.40
	Male	198	3.27	0.77		

*p<0.05

An independent samples t-test on all sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience levels with gender variable revealed that there was no significant difference ($p>0.05$) (Table 3).

Table 4. Examination of the difference between the scale scores of the participants in terms of age variable

L.T.S.S	Age	N	\bar{X}	Sd	f	p	Bonferroni
Psychological	22-25	34	3.22	0.96	7.53	.00	5>3
	26-29	77	3.25	0.80			
	30-33	72	3.05	0.85			
	34-37	72	3.28	0.80			
	38 and above	150	3.64	0.76			
Educational	22-25	34	3.33	0.96	5.679	.00	5>3
	26-29	77	3.50	0.84			
	30-33	72	3.24	0.84			
	34-37	72	3.47	0.76			
	38 and above	150	3.75	0.77			
Social	22-25	34	3.30	0.90	3.186	.01	5>3
	26-29	77	3.37	0.77			
	30-33	72	3.21	0.90			
	34-37	72	3.34	0.70			
	38 and above	150	3.58	0.79			
Physiological	22-25	34	3.61	0.98	4.052	.00	5>1
	26-29	77	3.77	0.81			
	30-33	72	3.68	0.84			
	34-37	72	3.76	0.72			
	38 and above	150	4.03	0.70			

Table 4. Examination of the difference between the scale scores of the participants in terms of age variable (cont.)

L.T.S.S	Age	N	\bar{X}	Sd	f	p	Bonferroni
Relaxation	22-25	34	3.04	1.08	.806	.52	
	26-29	77	3.20	0.84			
	30-33	72	3.00	1.01			
	34-37	72	3.09	0.88			
	38 and above	150	3.20	0.80			
Aesthetics	22-25	34	3.27	1.03	1.555	.18	
	26-29	77	3.37	0.85			
	30-33	72	3.40	0.80			
	34-37	72	3.36	0.78			
	38 and above	150	3.56	0.75			
B.P.R.S.	Age	N	\bar{X}	Sd	f	p	Bonferroni
Brief Psychological Resilience Scale	22-25	34	3.21	1.04	1.927	.10	
	26-29	77	3.08	0.97			
	30-33	72	3.11	0.85			
	34-37	72	3.24	0.78			
	38 and above	150	3.37	0.83			

*p<0.05

As a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) between the variable of age and the levels of leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience, it was found that there was a significant difference between the age group and the psychological, educational, social and physiological sub-dimensions of the leisure satisfaction scale ($p<0.05$), while there was no significant difference between the levels of psychological resilience ($p>0.05$) (Table 4). According to the results of the Bonferroni test performed to determine from which groups the significant difference arose; it was determined that the average scores of the participants in the age range of 38 and above were higher than the participants in the other age range.

Table 5. Examination of the difference between the scale scores of the participants in terms of marital status

L.T.S.S	Marital Status	N	X	Sd	t	p
Psychological	Married	256	3.41	0.83	1.66	.09
	Single	149	3.27	0.84		
Educational	Married	256	3.56	0.83	1.11	.26
	Single	149	3.47	0.84		
Social	Married	256	3.46	0.82	1.50	.13
	Single	149	3.33	0.78		
Physiological	Married	256	3.90	0.77	2.07	.03
	Single	149	3.73	0.81		
Relaxation	Married	256	3.13	0.88	-0.034	.97
	Single	149	3.13	0.90		
Aesthetics	Married	256	3.47	0.81	1.03	.30
	Single	149	3.38	0.82		
B.P.R.S.	Marital Status	N	X	Sd	t	p
Brief Psychological Resilience Scale	Married	256	3.27	0.88	1.26	.20
	Single	149	3.16	0.87		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the independent samples t-test conducted to determine the difference between the marital status variable and the levels of leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience of the participants, it was found that there was a significant difference only in the 'physiological' sub-dimension of the leisure satisfaction scale ($p<0.05$), while there was no

significant difference between married and single individuals in the level of psychological resilience ($p > 0.05$) (Table 5). Looking at the mean scores in the 'Physiological' sub-dimension, where there was a significant difference, it was found that the mean scores of married individuals (3.90) were higher than those of single individuals (3.73).

Table 6. Examination of the difference between the scale scores of the participants in terms of education level

L.T.S.S	Education Level	N	X	Sd	t	p
Psychological	Undergraduate	305	3.35	0.86	-.464	.64
	Postgraduate	100	3.40	0.76		
Educational	Undergraduate	305	3.53	0.84	.132	.89
	Postgraduate	100	3.52	0.79		
Social	Undergraduate	305	3.41	0.83	0.86	.93
	Postgraduate	100	3.40	0.74		
Physiological	Undergraduate	305	3.87	0.78	1.74	.08
	Postgraduate	100	3.72	0.81		
Relaxation	Undergraduate	305	3.09	0.88	-1.57	.11
	Postgraduate	100	3.25	0.89		
Aesthetics	Undergraduate	305	3.43	0.83	-,421	.67
	Postgraduate	100	3.47	0.76		
B.P.R.S.	Education Level	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	p
Brief Psychological Resilience Scale	Undergraduate	305	3.24	0.91	0.24	.80
	Postgraduate	100	3.21	0.78		

* $p < 0.05$

According to the results of the independent samples t-test conducted to determine the difference between the participants' education variable and the levels of leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience; it was determined that there was no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) between the sub-dimensions of the leisure satisfaction scale and psychological resilience levels according to the education variable (Table 6).

Table 7. Investigation of the difference between the scale scores of the participants in terms of years of employment

L.T.S.S	Year of Operation	N	\bar{X}	Sd	f	p	Bonferroni
Psychological	1-3 Years	73	3.45	0.88	9.644	.00	4>2
	4-6 Years	73	2.97	0.72			
	7-9 Years	56	3.16	0.86			
	10 years and over	203	3.52	0.81			
Educational	1-3 Years	73	3.63	0.92	4.034	.00	1>2
	4-6 Years	73	3.27	0.76			
	7-9 Years	56	3.41	0.86			
	10 years and over	203	3.62	0.79			
Social	1-3 Years	73	3.46	0.86	5.398	.00	4>2
	4-6 Years	73	3.09	0.80			
	7-9 Years	56	3.36	0.83			
	10 years and over	203	3.52	0.76			
Physiological	1-3 Years	73	3.95	0.94	8.288	.00	4>2
	4-6 Years	73	3.46	0.74			
	7-9 Years	56	3.74	0.80			
	10 years and over	203	3.96	0.70			
Relaxation	1-3 Years	73	3.24	0.98	1.447	.22	
	4-6 Years	73	2.95	0.77			

Aesthetics	7-9 Years	56	3.13	0.97	5.721	.00	1>2
	10 years and over	203	3.16	0.86			
	1-3 Years	73	3.54	0.94			
	4-6 Years	73	3.09	0.72			
	7-9 Years	56	3.47	0.86			
	10 years and over	203	3.52	0.75			
B.P.R.S.	Year of Operation	N	\bar{X}	Sd	f	p	Bonferroni
Brief Psychological Resilience Scale	1-3 Years	73	3.32	0.91	3.869	.01	1>2
	4-6 Years	73	2.92	0.88			
	7-9 Years	56	3.22	0.93			
	10 years and over	203	3.31	0.83			

*p<0.05

As a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) carried out between years of employment and levels of leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience, it was found that there was a significant difference ($p<0.05$) between years of employment and the psychological, educational, social, physiological and aesthetic sub-dimensions of the leisure satisfaction scale and levels of psychological resilience (Table 7). According to the results of the Bonferroni test, which was used to determine the groups from which the significant difference originated, it was determined that there was a significant difference in favour of teachers who had worked for 10 years or more in the psychological, social and physiological sub-dimensions, in favour of teachers who had worked for 1-3 years in the educational and aesthetic sub-dimensions, and in favour of teachers who had worked for 1-3 years in the psychological resilience level.

Table 8. Examination of the difference between the adequacy of the participants' weekly leisure and the scale scores

L.T.S.S	Adequacy of weekly leisure	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	p
Psychological	Adequate	204	3.36	0.81	.009	.99
	Inadequate	201	3.36	0.86		
Educational	Adequate	204	3.54	0.82	0.32	.74
	Inadequate	201	3.51	0.85		
Social	Adequate	204	3.38	0.77	-0.68	.49
	Inadequate	201	3.44	0.85		
Physiological	Adequate	204	3.88	0.74	1.14	.25
	Inadequate	201	3.79	0.83		
Relaxation	Adequate	204	3.06	0.87	-1.54	.12
	Inadequate	201	3.20	0.89		
Aesthetics	Adequate	204	3.38	0.79	-1.49	.13
	Inadequate	201	3.50	0.83		
B.P.R.S.	Adequacy of weekly leisure	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	p
Brief Psychological Resilience Scale	Adequate	204	3.29	0.83	1.27	.20
	Inadequate	201	3.18	0.92		

*p<0.05

According to the result of the independent samples t-test conducted to determine the difference between the participants' weekly leisure adequacy variable and the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction and short psychological resilience levels, it was determined that there was no significant difference ($p>0.05$) between teachers with sufficient and insufficient weekly leisure (Table 8).

Table 9. Investigation of the difference between the scale scores of the participants in terms of their regular sports practice

L.T.S.S	Doing Sports Regularly	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	p
Psychological	Yes	134	3.56	0.89	3.35	.00
	No	271	3.26	0.79		
Educational	Yes	134	3.66	0.85	2.31	.02
	No	271	3.46	0.81		
Social	Yes	134	3.49	0.82	1.43	.15
	No	271	3.37	0.80		
Physiological	Yes	134	3.87	0.84	0.62	.53
	No	271	3.82	0.76		
Relaxation	Yes	134	3.55	0.75	7.07	.00
	No	271	2.92	0.87		
Aesthetics	Yes	134	3.55	0.89	1.87	.06
	No	271	3.38	0.77		
B.P.R.S.	Doing Sports Regularly	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	p
Brief Psychological Resilience Scale	Yes	134	3.38	0.87	0.69	.01
	No	271	3.16	0.87		

*p<0.05

As a result of the independent samples t-test between the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience levels of the variable of doing sports regularly; it was determined that there was a significant difference ($p<0.05$) between the psychological, educational, relaxation sub-dimensions of the leisure satisfaction scale and psychological resilience levels (Table 9). When the mean scores of the sub-dimensions in which a significant difference occurred were examined, it was determined that the scores of the individuals who regularly did sports were high.

Table 10. Correlation table for leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience level

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. L.T.S.S. (Psychological)	r	1						
	p							
2. L.T.S.S. (Educational)	r	,720**	1					
	p	,000						
3. L.T.S.S. (Social)	r	,599**	,686**	1				
	p	,000	,000					
4. L.T.S.S. (Physiological)	r	,659**	,621**	,613**	1			
	p	,000	,000	,000				
5. L.T.S.S. (Relaxation)	r	,431**	,427**	,477**	,361**	1		
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000			
6. L.T.S.S. (Aesthetics)	r	,549**	,539**	,575**	,626**	,452**	1	
	p	,003	,003	,000	,000	,049		
7. Brief Psychological Resilience Scale	r	,402**	,381**	,413**	,415**	,334**	,375**	1
	p	,001	,000	,004	,001	,000	,000	

*p<0.05

Table 10 shows a correlation analysis of the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience level. Findings indicate that there were significant and positive associations between the psychological resilience and all the sub dimensions of leisure

satisfaction. A low level positive and significant relationship was found between psychological resilience level and psychological sub-dimension ($r = ,402, p < .01$). A significant relationship was found between the educational sub-dimension and the level of psychological resilience and the correlation coefficient was determined as ,381 ($p < .01$). There was a significant relationship between the social sub-dimension and the level of psychological resilience at a moderate level ($r = ,413, p < .01$) and a significant relationship with the physiological sub-dimension at a moderate level ($r = ,415, p < .01$). Significant and positive relationships were also found between the relaxation sub-dimension and the level of psychological resilience ($r = ,334, p < .01$) and between the aesthetic sub-dimension and the level of psychological resilience ($r = ,375, p < .01$). These results show that as individuals' satisfaction with leisure activities increases, their level of psychological resilience also increases.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine whether teachers have significantly different satisfaction with leisure and psychological resilience according to gender, age, marital status, education level, years of service, the perception of adequacy of leisure, and the condition of regular sport.

When examining the participants when compared by gender variable, no difference was found in terms of the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience scale between males and females ($p > 0.05$). When the findings of similar studies in the literature are evaluated, Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa (2010), Hadi et al. (2021) and Ayyıldız (2015) show compatibility with the results obtained by. On the other hand, the findings of this study are in contrast with the results obtained by Karlı et al. (2008), Serdar and Ay (2016), Vong Tze (2005), Kabanoff (1982), Vong Tze (2005), Çakır (2017) and Ngai (2005).

When the teachers participating in the study were examined according to the age variable, a significant difference was found in the psychological, educational, social, physiological sub-dimension of the leisure satisfaction scale and psychological resilience levels in favour of the group aged 38 and over ($p < 0.05$). In the study conducted by Öztaş (2018), a statistically significant relationship was found between the age variable and the "aesthetic" sub-dimension of leisure satisfaction. According to the research of Gökçe (2008), age variables of the participants had a statistically significant difference on leisure satisfaction "psychological", "physiological", "relaxation" and "aesthetic" sub-dimensions, and total leisure satisfaction scores. Unlike our findings, in another study, while Erdemli and Yaşartürk (2020) stated that there was no difference in leisure satisfaction level scale score and its sub-dimensions. In the study conducted by Yaşartürk et al. (2019), the relationship between age variable and leisure satisfaction levels was examined and no statistically significant difference was found as a result of the comparisons made ($p > 0.05$).

According to the marital status variable of the teachers involved in the research, it was found that there is a significant difference in the "Physiological" sub-dimension and psychological resilience level in the "leisure time satisfaction scale" sub-dimensions ($p < 0.05$). Significant difference was found in the "relaxation" subscale in favour of single teachers when marital status was considered by Köksal (2019). In a study conducted by Knowles (2002), it was found that married couples had both quantitatively more leisure before marriage and significantly higher levels of individual satisfaction. When the literature is examined, there are studies indicating that marital status does not create a statistically significant difference on individuals' leisure satisfaction levels (Yetim, 2014; Gökçe, 2008).

When the teachers included in the research are evaluated according to the education level variable; statistically the difference in sub-dimensions and psychological resilience statuses of the leisure satisfaction are not found concerning the education level ($p>0.05$). When the results of the research are evaluated, it is thought that the concepts of leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience level may be more related to various factors such as personality traits, life experiences and leisure interests rather than the education variable. In the study conducted by Köksal (2019), it was determined that the main effect of the education level variable on the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction did not create a statistically significant difference. Differing from the results of our research, Sevil and Şimşek (2019) study was conducted with 608 individuals in Eskişehir province and according to the education level variable, there was a significant difference in leisure satisfaction.

When evaluated according to the working year variable of the teachers participating in the study, it was determined that there was a significant difference in the "Psychological", "Educational", "Social", "Physiological", "Aesthetic" sub-dimensions of the leisure satisfaction scale and psychological resilience levels ($p<0.05$). There was also significant differences in that favor teachers that have worked 10 years or more in the psychological, social and physiological sub-dimensions, that favor teachers that have been working for 1-3 years in the educational and the aesthetic sub-dimensions and that favor teachers that have been working for 1-3 years in psychological resilience levels. Based on the data obtained, it shows that the teaching profession requires various needs in different periods and some strengths emerge. While experienced teachers were found to stand out in leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience levels, relatively young teachers were found to be more active in areas related to innovation and development.

There was not found a meaningful difference between the sub-dimensions of the leisure scale and psychological resilience in terms of the adequacy of the weekly leisure of the teachers in the analysis of participants in the study ($p>0.05$). It was determined that there was a significant difference in the "Psychological", "Educational", "Relaxation" and psychological resilience levels in the sub-dimensions of the leisure satisfaction scale when evaluated according to the variable of doing sports regularly ($p<0.05$). From this point of view, it is thought that teachers' habit of doing sports regularly is an important factor that directly contributes to both finding their leisure more satisfying in terms of psychological, educational and relaxing aspects and increasing their psychological resilience. In their study, Choi and Yoo (2017) examined the relationship between the types of activities that individuals engage in during their leisure and their attitudes towards leisure satisfaction. The results showed that physical activity participation increases leisure satisfaction through its positive effects on individuals' physical and psychological health. In the research carried out on teacher by Akay and Yaşartürk (2023), it is seen that the leisure satisfaction of teachers, who participated in sports activity regularly, is higher than those who do not participate and that this difference is statistically significant.

As a result of the correlation analysis, it was determined that there was a positive and statistically significant relationship between the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience levels of teachers ($p<.01$ and $p<.05$). From this point of view, it can be stated that with the increase in teachers' satisfaction from leisure activities, their psychological resilience levels also increased statistically significantly. It can be stated that the satisfaction obtained from leisure use is an important factor in increasing and strengthening the psychological resilience of teachers. The actions to be developed to minimise the professional

burnout of teachers and to increase their psychological resilience, encouraging participation in leisure activities is important.

It was found that some sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction were differed significantly in terms of age, marital status, duration of work, regular sports practice according to the findings of the present study. Especially the age variable indicates that leisure activities may have changed over time. The marital status is thought to act on social support and the way the individual utilises his/her leisure. It can be assumed that as the duration of employment increases, employees gain professional experience and as a result, they utilise their leisure in a more reasonable and satisfactory way. The fact that people who regularly do sports are more satisfied with their leisure can probably be attributed to the positive effects of physical exercise on physical and psychological well-being. In addition, it was observed that there were significant differences in terms of psychological resilience levels according to working time and regular sports practice. It can be thought that as the working time increases, individuals' ability to cope with stressful situations encountered in professional life improves and their psychological resilience strengthens. In addition, the higher psychological resilience levels of individuals who regularly do sports may be associated with the contributions of physical activity to individuals in coping with stress, self-regulation and emotional balance.

In general, the findings reveal that both how individuals utilise their leisure and their psychological resilience levels are significantly affected by demographic factors. In this direction, it is recommended to develop special programmes and policies for different age and occupational groups, taking into account variables such as age, marital status, working time and regular physical activity, so that individuals can spend their leisure more satisfactorily and increase their psychological resilience. In addition, promoting sports and active lifestyle should be considered as a supportive factor for both physical and psychological well-being of individuals.

Recommendations

The findings of this study suggest that individuals' leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience levels are significantly affected by various demographic variables. In this context, there are several practical implications, especially for professionals working in the fields of education, health and human resources. Firstly, regular participation in physical activity has been found to positively affect both leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience. Therefore, organisations should develop practices to encourage their employees to participate in regular physical activities. Providing gym facilities at workplaces, supporting exercise hours or establishing sports clubs for employees can be among the effective strategies in this direction. Secondly, a significant difference was found in the level of leisure satisfaction and psychological resilience according to years of employment. This finding indicates that employees with more work experience have better ability to cope with stress and use their leisure effectively. Therefore, it is recommended that orientation and training programmes for new employees should be designed to improve orientation, time management and stress management skills. Since people's leisure satisfaction can be affected by individual characteristics such as age, marital status, etc., leisure should be varied with various activities according to people's life stages and social roles. Local administrations, universities and NGOs can encourage this process by planning social, cultural and sportive activities for individuals of different ages and personal situations. In conclusion, multidimensional and individual-oriented approaches should be adopted in order for individuals to utilise their leisure in a more satisfying way and to increase their psychological resilience levels. It is thought that these findings will be guiding for both public and private sector practitioners.

REFERENCES

- Ağarı, M. (2023). Zaman kavramı: Nedir-ne değildir. *Karabük Türkojji Dergisi*, 6(1).
- Akay, B., & Yaşartürk, F. (2023). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin serbest zaman doyumunu ile öz-yeterlik inançları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Trakya Eğitim Dergisi*, 13(1), 318–330. <https://doi.org/10.24315/tred.1032955>
- Amestoy, V. C., Rosal, R. S., & Toscano, E. V. (2008). The leisure experience. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37(1), 64–78.
- Ardahan, F., & Lapa, T. Y. (2010). Üniversite öğrencilerinin serbest zaman tatmin düzeylerinin cinsiyete ve gelire göre incelenmesi. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 21(4), 129–136.
- Ayyıldız, T. (2015). *Rekreatif dans faaliyetlerine katılan bireylerin serbest zaman tatmin düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Balcı, V. (2017). Ankara Üniversitesi öğrencilerinin serbest zamanlarında egzersize katılma sıklıkları ve nedenleri. *Spormetre*, 15(3), 119–128. https://doi.org/10.1501/Sporm_0000000316
- Beard, J. G., & Ragheb, M. G. (1980). Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 12(1), 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1980.11969416>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2017). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Choi, S. H., & Yoo, Y. J. (2017). Leisure attitude and satisfaction with leisure and life: Proposing leisure prioritization and justification. *World Leisure Journal*, 59(2), 140–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16078055.2016.1216886>
- Coleman, D., & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1993). Leisure and health: The role of social support and self-determination. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25(2), 111-128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1993.11969913>
- Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Araştırma deseni: Nitel, nicel ve karma yöntem yaklaşımları* (S. B. Demir, Çev.). Ankara: Eğiten Kitap.
- Çakır, V. O. (2017). Üniversite öğrencilerin serbest zaman doyum düzeyleri ile serbest zaman yönetimleri arasındaki ilişki. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(3), 17–27.
- Demirel, M., Bayrak, A., & Kaya, A. (2025). Serbest zaman akış deneyimi ve ciddi serbest zaman arasındaki ilişkinin demografik değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 23(1), 168-179. <https://doi.org/10.33689/spormetre.1551254>
- Doğan, T. (2015). Kısa Psikolojik Sağlık Ölçeği'nin Türkçe uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 3(1), 93–102.
- Dursun, A., & Özkan, M. S. (2019). Ergenlerin gelecek kaygıları ile psikolojik sağlamlıkları arasındaki ilişkide yaşam doyumunun aracı rolü. *Yaşam Becerileri Psikoloji Dergisi*, 3(5), 23–37. <https://doi.org/10.31461/ybpd.508996>
- Earvolino-Ramirez, M. (2007). Resilience: A concept analysis. *Nursing Forum*, 42(2), 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6198.2007.00070.x>
- Erdemli, E., & Yaşartürk, F. (2020). Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenliği bölümü öğrencilerinin serbest zaman doyum düzeyi ve problem çözme becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 9(3), 1871–1882. <https://doi.org/10.33206/mjss.605808>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Gökçe, H. (2008). *Serbest zaman doyumunun yaşam doymu ve sosyo-demografik değişkenlerle ilişkisinin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans tezi, Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Denizli.
- Gökçe, H., & Orhan, K. (2011). Serbest Zaman Doyum Ölçeği'nin Türkçe geçerlilik güvenilirlik çalışması. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 22(4), 139–145.
- Greene, R. R. (2002). *Resilience: Theory and research for social work practice*. Washington: NASW Press.
- Gül, T. (2014). Boş zaman ve rekreasyon olgusunun tarihsel gelişimi. A. Yaylı (Ed.), *Rekreasyona Giriş* içinde(ss. 70–81). Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Güngörmüş, H. A. (2007). *Özel sağlık-spor merkezlerinden hizmet alan bireyleri rekreasyonel egzersize güdüleyen faktörler*. Yayınlanmış Doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Hacıoğlu, N., Gökdeniz, A., & Dinç, Y. (2003). Boş zaman ve rekreasyon kavramlarının analizi. A. Gökdeniz (Ed.), *Boş zaman ve rekreasyon yönetimi: Örnek animasyon uygulamaları* içinde. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Hacıoğlu, N., Gökdeniz, A., & Dinç, Y. (2017). *Boş zaman ve rekreasyon yönetimi*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Hadi, G., Erdem, B., & Duman, E. (2021). Sportif rekreatif aktiviteye katılan bireylerin serbest zaman doyum düzeyleri ve optimal performans duygu durumlarının arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 32(1), 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.17644/sbd.702867>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2013). *Multivariate data analysis*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Iwasaki, Y. (2008). Pathways to meaning-making through leisure-like pursuits in global contexts. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 40(2), 231-249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2008.11950139>
- Jackson, D., Firtko, A., & Edenborough, M. (2007). Personal resilience as a strategy for surviving and thriving in the face of workplace adversity: A literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 60(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04412.x>
- Kabanoff, B. (1982). Occupational and sex differences in leisure needs and leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 3, 233–245. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030030304>
- Kahvecioğlu, K. (2016). *Özel yetenekli çocuğu olan ebeveynlerin psikolojik sağlamlıklarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans tezi, Beykent Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Karasar, N. (2008). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Karlı, Ü., Polat, E., Yılmaz, B., & Koçak, S. (2008). Serbest Zaman Tatmin Ölçeği'nin (SZTÖ–uzun versiyon) geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 19(2), 80–91.
- Knowles, S. J. (2002). *Marital satisfaction, shared leisure, and leisure satisfaction in married couples with adolescents*. Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans tezi, Oklahoma Christian University, United Kingdom.
- Kovacs, A. (2007). *The leisure personality: Relationships between personality, leisure satisfaction, and life satisfaction*. Yayınlanmış Doktora tezi, Indiana University School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.
- Köksal, G. (2019). *Serbest zaman doymu ve yaşam tatmini ilişkisi: Beden eğitimi öğretmenleri örneği*. Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Ngai, V. T. (2005). Leisure satisfaction and quality of life in Macao, China. *Leisure Studies*, 24(2), 195–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614360412331313502>
- Öztaş, İ. (2018). *Farklı kurumlarda çalışan memurların serbest zaman doymu ve mutluluk düzeylerinin belirlenmesi (Kırıkkale örneği)*. Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans tezi, Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ağrı.

Serdar, E., & Mungan Ay, S. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin katıldıkları serbest zaman etkinliklerinden tatmin olma ve algılanan özgürlük düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 1303–1414.

Sevil, T., & Şimşek, K. (2019). Yaşlıların boş zaman aktivitelerine katılımlarında algıladıkları boş zaman tatmininin demografik özelliklere göre analizi. *GSI Journals Series A: Advancements in Tourism, Recreation and Sports Sciences*, 1(2), 54–70.

Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 15(3), 194–200.

Soanes, C., & Stevenson, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Oxford dictionary of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Vong, T. N. (2005). Leisure satisfaction and quality of life in Macao, China. *Leisure Studies*, 24(2), 195–207.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02614360412331313502>

Yaşartürk, F., Akyüz, H., & Gönülateş, S. (2019). The investigation of the relationship between university students' levels of life quality and leisure satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7(3), 739–745.

Yetim, G. (2014). *Boş zaman ilgileniminin boş zaman tatmini ve sadakati üzerine etkisi: Eskişehir'deki fitness merkezleri üzerine araştırma*. Yayımlanmış Yüksek Lisans tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.