

Leisure satisfaction and job satisfaction: A research on academics

Mustafa Can Koç^{1*} and Yusuf Er²

¹Faculty of Sport Sciences, Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.

²School of Applied Sciences, Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey.

Accepted 10 June, 2020

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between leisure satisfaction and job satisfaction of academics in sports sciences faculties. The study group consists of a total of 201 participants, including 151 men and 50 women, from academics who work in faculties of sports sciences. In addition to the personal information form, the "Leisure Satisfaction Scale" consists of 6 sub-scales and 39 questions. In addition, the 14-item job satisfaction (IS) scale was used in the study. In the data evaluation, number, percentage, mean, standard deviation, Kruskal-Wallis H Test, Mann Whitney-U Test, and Spearman Rank Differences Correlation Analysis were used as descriptive statistical methods. The results obtained were given in the tables. According to the results of the study, the participants' leisure and job satisfaction scores did not show a statistically significant difference according to gender, marital status, possession of enough leisure, age, title, weekly course hours and service life variables ($p > 0.05$) and there was a positive and low-level relationship between leisure satisfaction and job satisfaction.

Keywords: Academics, leisure satisfaction, job satisfaction.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: cankoc_01@hotmail.com.

INTRODUCTION

The adoption of today's sports science and physical education programs into a professional structure started in the 19th century. Denmark is known as the first country where physical education was taught in schools in 1814. In Turkey, the first example of this was conducted by Selim Sirri Tarcan (Meb, 2006), who started in 1911 at Galatasaray High School with a gymnastics class. Since then, the division into sub-specialties and sub-fields such as training sciences, physical education, sports management, and recreation has occurred (Wuest and Bucher, 2006). The acceleration of recreation and leisure activities started after the 1960s (Gokce, 2015).

A good understanding of the concept of time also played an important role in the emergence of these studies. In fact, each phase of the period from birth to death is important for man. This situation is expressed with the concept of time in the literature. According to Eren (1993), time is defined as the measure of the life of all living and non-living beings and an abstract concept which is unrepeatable, non-disposable, unobtainable, but which is only used and lost, measured according to the

movement of objects in space and divided into sections. Similarly, time is an invaluable unique resource, but it cannot be collected like money and stored as raw materials and has to be spent voluntarily or involuntarily. For, time is reported to be an abstract concept that cannot be regained (Mackenzie, 1985). Time is the period during which an action is carried out, will be carried out and is being carried out and an endless abstract concept used to list the occurring events (Karakucuk, 1997). In the light of these definitions, it can be said that time has an important place in the whole life process of the human, has to be used voluntarily or involuntarily by individuals and expresses an abstract process. Time is divided into several classes in terms of meeting the needs of man.

Jensen (1995) divided an individual's life into three classes. These classes are:

1. Time for existence--biological requirements, such as sleeping, eating, sanitation, and the like (10 hours daily),
2. Time for subsistence--economic requirements such as

working on one's job (9 hours daily),

3. Leisure time--the time remaining after a minimum level of existence and subsistence has been accomplished (5 hours daily).

Among these classes, the concept of leisure time, other than the time spent for existence and subsistence, can be considered as the most valuable time frame for individuals to renew themselves after the other two classes. The concept of leisure in the literature is expressed synonymously with the concept of *Leisure Time* in English and researchers who present their views on the historical development of the term base the term on the words "licere" in Latin and "loisir" in French (McLean et al., 2008). Leisure has been defined as an entirely voluntary engagement in the form of resting, relaxing, enhancing knowledge and etiquette, fulfilling the psychological and physiological tastes, fulfilling the moral belief by contributing to social service, developing creative abilities with no purpose of interest in all these activities (Yetim, 2005). Thus, we can emphasize the importance of using leisure effectively and efficiently so that individuals can be healthier and more productive in terms of physical, spiritual, mental and social aspects. From this point of view, the concept of leisure satisfaction has been studied in the literature. Leisure satisfaction is based on the perception of one's leisure activities or individual positive feelings and is defined as positive feelings that individuals gain as a result of participating in leisure activities and meeting their individual needs (Du Cap, 2002; Seigenthaler, 1997). If an individual spends a significant part of his time in his routine life and continues this routine for at least 20 to 25 years, it is essential for his organic and psychological existence to enjoy the life (Telman and Unsal, 2004). The term satisfaction was first introduced in the 13th century. This term is derived from the word "satis", which means satisfactory or sufficient in Latin (Kaya, 2013). Satisfaction expresses a situation that only the relevant person can perceive and is one of the considerable factors in meeting the inner peace of the person (Iskan and Timuroglu, 2007). Since the term job satisfaction is invisible and can only be perceived, its emotional aspect outweighs (Tas, 2011). "Job satisfaction is interpreted as employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their jobs" (Budak, 2006; Saglam and Berberoglu, 2010; Ungoren et al., 2009). Job satisfaction is an important issue related to the physical and emotional well-being of employees (Oshagbemi, 1997). Job satisfaction includes positive or negative feelings regarding the internal and external factors of the employees (Odom et al., 1990). If the work done by the individual affects the individual's feelings and value judgments apart from providing personal needs, it means that job satisfaction begins (Aksu, 1995). Job satisfaction explains the feelings, attitudes, and choices of individuals about their jobs (Chen, 2008). Job satisfaction is a result of employee's perception of how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important (Tella et al.,

2007). Akinci (2002) states that job satisfaction is a phenomenon that occurs when the characteristics of the job and the expectations of the employees are in harmony and that determines the satisfaction of the employees with their job. According to Gürbüz and Yüksel, job satisfaction arises from the attitudes of the employees in the business environment and from the positive or negative emotions it creates in the organization (Gurbuz and Yuksel, 2008). Considering the literature, related studies dealing with leisure time and job satisfaction are limited. For this reason, it is thought that this research we have done on academics, who have taken the role of locomotives in the development of the country and the upbringing of the young generation, will make a serious contribution to the literature. In light of this information, this study is aimed at determining the relationship between leisure satisfaction and job satisfaction of academics in sports science faculties.

METHODOLOGY

Research model

In accordance with the purpose of the research, relational screening model was used in the study. In relational screening studies, the relationships between two or more variables are often tried to be determined. In relational studies, questions such as the degree of co-variation between variables or the level of the situation examined are clarified with relational screening patterns (Gurbuz and Sahin, 2016).

Study group

The population of the study consists of academics in sports sciences faculties. The sample of the study consists of 201 sports scientists (151 men and 50 women), who were selected via the convenience sampling method. Also, the data was obtained through the Google Form. Convenience sampling is the inclusion of the people who are planned to be selected for the sample based on accessibility only (Gegez, 2007). The results are not likely to be generalized to academics in all universities due to the fact that they do not take too much time and considering the busy schedule of the individuals during the academic year, which is a limitation of our research.

The distribution of the participants in the study group according to demographic characteristics is given in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that 75.1% of the participants are female, 24.9% are men, and the participants range between 34 and 41 by 34.8% followed by 42 by 33.8% and 26-33 by 31.3% according to the age.

It is also observed that 66.2% are married, 33.8% are single, 7.0% are Prof. Dr., 20.4% are Assoc. Prof. and 29.4% are Asst. Prof. Dr., 24.4% are Lecturer, and 18.9%

Table 1. Frequency and percentage values of demographic variables.

	Variables	n	%
Gender	Male	151	75.1
	Female	50	24.9
	Total	201	100
Age	26-33	63	31.3
	34-41	70	34.8
	42 and above	68	33.8
	Total	201	100
Marital status	Married	133	66.2
	Single	68	33.8
	Total	201	100
Title	Prof. Dr.	14	7.0
	Assoc. Prof. Dr.	41	20.4
	Asst. Prof. Dr.	59	29.4
	Lecturer	49	24.4
	Research Assistant	38	18.9
	Total	201	100
Service life	1-5 years	68	33.8
	6-10 years	49	24.4
	11-15 years	28	13.9
	16 and above	56	27.9
	Total	201	100
Weekly course hours	0-10	43	21.4
	11-20	21	10.4
	21-30	67	33.3
	31 and above	70	34.8
	Total	201	100
Possession of enough leisure	Yes	94	46.8
	No	107	53.2
	Total	201	100

are Res. Asst.

In terms of service life, it is seen that 33.8% are in the range of 1-5 years, 24.4% 6-10 years, 13.9% 11-15 years and 27.9% 16 years and above. It is seen that the participants have 0-10, 11-20, 21-30, and 31.8 weekly course hours by 21.4, 10.4, 33.3 and 34.8%, respectively. Finally, it is observed that 46.8% of the participants possess enough leisure while 53.2% do not.

Data collection tools

In the research, apart from the personal information form, leisure satisfaction and job satisfaction scales were used as data collection tools.

Personal information form

The personal information form used to determine the demographic characteristics of the academics participating in the research includes questions such as age, gender, marital status, title, weekly class hours, service life and leisure.

Leisure satisfaction scale

The "Leisure Satisfaction Scale" developed by Beard and Ragheb (1980) and adapted into Turkish by Karli et al. (2008) consists of 6 sub-scales and 39 questions. The scale items are 5-point Likert type and in the form of

“almost never true for me”, “rarely true for me”, “sometimes true for me”, “often true for me” and “almost always true for me”. Items of the scale from “1 to 8” are of “Psychological Aspect”, items from “9 to 17” are of “Educational Aspect”, items from “18 to 25” are of “Social Aspect”, items from “26 to 29” are of “Relaxation Aspect”, items from “30 to 35” are of “Physiological Aspect” and items from “36 to 39” are of “Aesthetic Aspect”. In the original form of the scale, internal consistency coefficients for the sub-scales were determined as 0.86 for the psychological sub-scale, 0.84 for the educational sub-scale, 0.82 for the social sub-scale, 0.79 for the relaxation sub-scale, 0.82 for the physiological sub-scale and 0.79 for the aesthetic sub-scale (Profitable et al., 2008). In addition, the internal consistency coefficient for all statements was determined as 0.92 by the researchers (Karli et al., 2008). In this study, the internal consistency coefficient for all statements of the scale is 0.97 while the internal consistency coefficient for the sub-scales of the scale ranges between 0.87 and 0.93.

Job satisfaction scale

The 14-item job satisfaction (IS) scale, which was proposed and whose validity was tested by Hackman and Oldham (1975) and whose Turkish form was prepared by Dilsiz (2006), was used. On the Job Satisfaction Scale, the highest score a person can get is 70, while the lowest score is 14. The high score on the job satisfaction scale is an indication of the positive attitudes of the person towards his job. In this study, the job satisfaction internal consistency coefficient was determined as 0.90.

Data analysis

In the reliability analysis results of leisure and job satisfaction scales, the overall sub-scale and scale Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found to be greater than (job satisfaction(0.90), leisure satisfaction (0.97) the recommended (0.70) value (Buyukozturk, 2011). Moreover, Can (2013) reports that Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which ranges between 0.60 and 0.90, can be considered a fairly reliable value. In this context, it can be stated that the reliability of the measurement tools used in the research has been provided at a sufficient level. As a result of the normality test conducted to determine whether the data were in a normal distribution, Mann Whitney-U Test was used for comparing quantitative continuous data between two independent groups, while the Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for comparing quantitative continuous data between more than two independent groups. In addition, Spearman Rank Differences Correlation analysis was performed to determine the relationship between the sub-scales of the “leisure satisfaction” scale and the “job satisfaction”

scale. Significance was found as $p < 0.05$.

FINDINGS

Table 2 demonstrates that the participants had the highest score with Relaxation “ $X = 4.27$ ” and the lowest score with Aesthetic “ $X = 3.73$ ” among the Leisure Satisfaction Scale sub-scales. In addition, it was determined that the average score for all statements of the Leisure Satisfaction Scale was “ $X = 3.94$ ” and the average score for all statements of the Job Satisfaction Scale was “ $X = 3.57$ ”. These values may mean that the participants have high levels of the Leisure Satisfaction Scale and the Job Satisfaction Scale.

Table 3 highlights that LSS and JSS scores did not show a statistically significant difference according to the gender ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4 highlights that LSS and JSS scores did not show a statistically significant difference according to the marital status ($p < 0.05$).

Table 5 highlights that LSS and JSS scores did not show a statistically significant difference according to the possession of enough leisure ($p < 0.05$).

Table 6 highlights that LSS and JSS scores did not show a statistically significant difference according to the age ($p < 0.05$).

Table 7 highlights that although the LSS and JSS scores did not show a statistically significant difference with respect to the title variable, the mean rank of Prof. Dr. was higher than others in terms of the social sub-scale of the LSS ($p < 0.05$).

Table 8 highlights that LSS and JSS scores did not show a statistically significant difference according to the service life ($p < 0.05$).

Table 9 highlights that LSS and JSS scores did not show a statistically significant difference according to the weekly course hours variable ($p < 0.05$).

Table 10 highlights that there is a positive, low-level, and statistically significant relationship between the participants' Job Satisfaction Scale scores and the Psychological, Educational, Social, Relaxation, Physiological and Aesthetic sub-scales of the LSS.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, it was determined that the participants' leisure and job satisfaction levels were high (Table 2). This is because the academics participating in the study have high levels of satisfaction as a result of their leisure activities and job. The literature review reveals that academics generally have high levels of leisure and job satisfaction. Dogan et al. (2019) found that academics' leisure satisfaction was at a high level. Similarly, there are studies which found that academics have high levels of job satisfaction (Basarangil, 2018; Dogan et al. 2019;

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the leisure satisfaction scale (LSS) and the job satisfaction scale (JSS).

Variables	n	Minimum	Maximum	SS	\bar{x}
LSS Total	201	1.90	5.00	.568	3.94
Psychological	201	1.38	5.00	.648	4.05
Educational	201	1.44	5.00	.662	3.95
Social	201	1.50	5.00	.630	3.86
Relaxation	201	1.50	5.00	.705	4.27
Physiological	201	1.00	5.00	.718	3.77
Aesthetics	201	1.50	5.00	.706	3.73
JSS Total	201	1.79	5.00	.637	3.57

Table 3. Results of Mann Whitney-U test according to the gender variable of LSS and JSS scores.

Variables	Gender	n	Mean rank	Sum of rank	U	z	p
LSS Total	Male	151	103.14	15573.5	3452.5	-.905	.37
	Female	50	94.55	4727.5			
	Total	201					
Psychological	Male	151	102.69	15506.0	3520.0	-.717	.47
	Female	50	95.90	4795.0			
	Total	201					
Educational	Male	151	103.15	15575.0	3451.0	-.912	.36
	Female	50	94.52	4726.0			
	Total	201					
Social	Male	151	103.54	15634.5	3391.5	-1.079	.28
	Female	50	93.33	4666.5			
	Total	201					
Relaxation	Male	151	98.34	14850.0	3374.0	-1.152	.25
	Female	50	109.02	5451.0			
	Total	201					
Physiological	Male	151	103.36	15607.0	3419.0	-1.003	.32
	Female	50	93.88	4694.0			
	Total	201					
Aesthetics	Male	151	103.61	15645.5	3380.5	-1.118	.26
	Female	50	93.11	4655.5			
	Total	201					
JSS Total	Male	151	102.69	15505.5	3520.5	-.715	.48
	Female	50	95.91	4795.5			
	Total	201					

Kocoglu, 2015; Ozturk and Sahbudak, 2017). In addition, in the research conducted by Basar (2017), Celikkalp et al. (2019), Karagözoglu Asliyukse (2017) and Sangar (2016), the level of job satisfaction of academics was moderate, while it was found to be low in the research

conducted by Ozturk and Şahbudak (2017). It is thought that these differences arise from the fact that their expectations are at a different level as a result of a job performed by academics or are not met at a sufficient level.

Table 4. Results of Mann Whitney-U test according to the marital status variable of LSS and JSS scores.

Variables	Marital Status	n	Mean rank	Sum of rank	U	z	p
LSS Total	Married	133	99.34	13212.0	4301.0	-.567	.57
	Single	68	104.25	7089.0			
	Total	201					
Psychological	Married	133	98.53	13105.0	4194.0	-.843	.40
	Single	68	105.82	7196.0			
	Total	201					
Educational	Married	133	100.12	13315.5	4404.5	-.302	.76
	Single	68	102.73	6985.5			
	Total	201					
Social	Married	133	99.03	13170.5	4259.5	-.675	.50
	Single	68	104.86	7130.5			
	Total	201					
Relaxation	Married	133	100.19	13325.0	4414.0	-.283	.78
	Single	68	102.59	6976.0			
	Total	201					
Physiological	Married	133	103.87	13815.0	4140.0	-.983	.33
	Single	68	95.38	6486.0			
	Total	201					
Aesthetics	Married	133	98.99	13166.0	4255.0	-.692	.49
	Single	68	104.93	7135.0			
	Total	201					
JSS Total	Married	133	97.22	12930.0	4019.0	-1.29	.20
	Single	68	108.40	7371.0			
	Total	201					

Table 5. Results of Mann Whitney-U test according to the possession of enough leisure variable of LSS and JSS scores.

Variables	Possession of enough leisure	n	Mean rank	Sum of rank	U	z	p
LSS Total	Yes	94	101.40	9531.5	4991.5	-.091	.93
	No	107	100.65	10769.5			
	Total	201					
Psychological	Yes	94	105.15	9884.0	4639.0	-.951	.34
	No	107	97.36	10417.0			
	Total	201					
Educational	Yes	94	103.20	9701.0	4822.0	-.505	.61
	No	107	99.07	10600.0			
	Total	201					
Social	Yes	94	104.39	9813.0	4710.0	-.778	.44
	No	107	98.02	10488.0			
	Total	201					
Relaxation	Yes	94	100.32	9430.0	4965.0	-.159	.87
	No	107	101.60	10871.0			
	Total	201					

Table 5. Continues.

Physiological	Yes	94	99.09	9314.5	4849.5	-.438	.66
	No	107	102.68	10986.5			
	Total	201					
Aesthetics	Yes	94	101.50	9541.0	4982.0	-.115	.91
	No	107	100.56	10760.0			
	Total	201					
JSS Total	Yes	94	101.62	9552.0	4971.0	-.141	.89
	No	107	100.46	10749.0			
	Total	201					

Table 6. Results of Mann Whitney-U test according to the age variable of LSS and JSS scores.

Variables	Age	n	Mean rank	X ²	SD	p
LSS Total	26-33	63	90.90	3.100	2	.21
	34-41	70	102.79			
	42 and above	68	108.51			
	Total	201				
Psychological	26-33	63	98.66	2.024	2	.36
	34-41	70	95.41			
	42 and above	68	108.93			
	Total	201				
Education	26-33	63	89.57	3.698	2	.16
	34-41	70	104.45			
	42 and above	68	108.04			
	Total	201				
Social	26-33	63	93.48	1.565	2	.46
	34-41	70	105.19			
	42 and above	68	103.65			
	Total	201				
Relaxation	26-33	63	97.84	.319	2	.85
	34-41	70	101.55			
	42 and above	68	103.36			
	Total	201				
Physiological	26-33	63	88.94	4.192	2	.12
	34-41	70	104.26			
	42 and above	68	108.82			
	Total	201				
Aesthetics	26-33	63	97.24	1.080	2	.58
	34-41	70	106.72			
	42 and above	68	98.60			
	Total	201				
JSS Total	26-33	63	95.62	.877	2	.65
	34-41	70	104.92			
	42 and above	68	101.95			
	Total	201				

Table 7. Results of Mann Whitney-U test according to the title variable of LSS and JSS scores.

Variables	Title	n	Mean rank	X ²	SD	p
LSS Total	Prof. Dr.	14	122.07	8.67	4	.07
	Assoc. Dr.	41	101.50			
	Asst. Dr.	59	88.70			
	Lecture	49	116.15			
	Res. Asst.	38	92.25			
	Total	201				
Psychological	Prof. Dr.	14	118.11	4.82	4	.31
	Assoc. Dr.	41	101.26			
	Asst. Dr.	59	91.67			
	Lecture	49	111.73			
	Res. Asst.	38	95.07			
	Total	201				
Educational	Prof. Dr.	14	120.71	9.04	4	.06
	Assoc. Dr.	41	100.70			
	Asst. Dr.	59	88.23			
	Lecture	49	117.21			
	Res. Asst.	38	92.99			
	Total	201				
Social	Prof. Dr.	14	126.36	9.30	4	.05
	Assoc. Dr.	41	96.16			
	Asst. Dr.	59	87.10			
	Lecture	49	115.21			
	Res. Asst.	38	100.13			
	Total	201				
Relaxation	Prof. Dr.	14	110.07	2.39	4	.67
	Assoc. Dr.	41	106.89			
	Asst. Dr.	59	92.20			
	Lecture	49	104.37			
	Res. Asst.	38	100.62			
	Total	201				
Physiological	Prof. Dr.	14	128.79	8.91	4	.06
	Assoc. Dr.	41	111.61			
	Asst. Dr.	59	94.06			
	Lecture	49	105.52			
	Res. Asst.	38	84.26			
	Total	201				
Aesthetics	Prof. Dr.	14	109.64	8.92	4	.06
	Assoc. Dr.	41	92.89			
	Asst. Dr.	59	96.38			
	Lecturer	49	120.52			
	Res. Asst.	38	88.57			
	Total	201				
JSS Total	Prof. Dr.	14	112.29	1.08	4	.90
	Assoc. Dr.	41	99.44			
	Asst. Dr.	59	97.56			
	Lecture	49	105.13			
	Res. Asst.	38	98.54			
	Total	201				

Table 8. Results of Kruskal Wallis-H test according to the service life variable of LSS and JSS scores.

Variable	Service life	n	Mean rank	X ²	SD	p
LSS Total	1-5 years	68	97.57	1.656	3	.65
	6-10 years	49	95.56			
	11-15 years	28	109.96			
	16 and above	56	105.44			
	Total	201				
Psychological	1-5 years	68	102.90	2.285	3	.52
	6-10 years	49	90.57			
	11-15 years	28	108.54			
	16 and above	56	104.04			
	Total	201				
Educational	1-5 years	68	98.85	1.065	3	.79
	6-10 years	49	98.36			
	11-15 years	28	111.21			
	16 and above	56	100.82			
	Total	201				
Social	1-5 years	68	99.07	.377	3	.95
	6-10 years	49	99.22			
	11-15 years	28	106.25			
	16 and above	56	102.27			
	Total	201				
Relaxation	1-5 years	68	95.07	1.417	3	.70
	6-10 years	49	103.68			
	11-15 years	28	99.50			
	16 and above	56	106.61			
	Total	201				
Physiological	1-5 years	68	90.31	5.692	3	.70
	6-10 years	49	97.43			
	11-15 years	28	116.66			
	16 and above	56	109.28			
	Total	201				
Aesthetics	1-5 years	68	103.22	2.443	3	.49
	6-10 years	49	96.24			
	11-15 years	28	114.48			
	16 and above	56	95.72			
	Total	201				
JSS Total	1-5 years	68	101.84	.494	3	.92
	6-10 years	49	96.05			
	11-15 years	28	102.75			
	16 and above	56	103.44			
	Total	201				

In this study, it was found that the participants' Leisure Satisfaction Scale and Job Satisfaction Scale scores did not show a statistically significant difference in terms of

gender, marital status, possession of enough leisure, age, title, weekly course hours, and service life variables (Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9). This can be explained by

Table 9. Results of Kruskal Wallis-H test according to the weekly course hours variable of LSS and JSS scores.

Variables	Weekly course hours	n	Mean rank	X ²	SD	p
LSS Total	0-10	43	97.69	1.529	3	.68
	11-20	21	94.67			
	21-30	67	97.99			
	31 and above	70	107.81			
	Total	201				
Psychological	0-10	43	101.10	.881	3	.83
	11-20	21	91.93			
	21-30	67	99.62			
	31 and above	70	104.98			
	Total	201				
Educational	0-10	43	97.66	.269	3	.97
	11-20	21	99.12			
	21-30	67	101.43			
	31 and above	70	103.20			
	Total	201				
Social	0-10	43	98.99	.796	3	.85
	11-20	21	93.79			
	21-30	67	99.98			
	31 and above	70	105.38			
	Total	201				
Relaxation	0-10	43	100.84	4.216	3	.24
	11-20	21	89.26			
	21-30	67	94.01			
	31 and above	70	111.31			
	Total	201				
Physiological	0-10	43	92.65	3.872	3	.28
	11-20	21	91.33			
	21-30	67	98.49			
	31 and above	70	111.43			
	Total	201				
Aesthetics	0-10	43	94.84	2.493	3	.48
	11-20	21	102.07			
	21-30	67	95.91			
	31 and above	70	109.34			
	Total	201				
JSS Total	0-10	43	110.97	2.605	3	.46
	11-20	21	110.07			
	21-30	67	96.61			
	31 and above	70	96.36			
	Total	201				

Table 10. The relationship between LSS and JSS scores.

Variables	LSS Total	Psychological	Educational	Social	Relaxation	Physiological	Aesthetics
JSS Total	.382**	.387**	.299**	.342**	.300**	.288**	.275**

n = 201, significant at the level of **p < 0.01.

the fact that the demographic characteristics of the academics participating in the research did not have an impact on the level of satisfaction they had as a result of their leisure activities and job. There are studies supporting the result of this research. (Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa 2010; Broughton and Beggs, 2007; Basar, 2017; Celik, 2011; Dogan et al., 2019; Saritas, 2010; Sangar, 2016; Sat et al., 2015; Karadag et al., 2018; Karagozoglu Asliyukse, 2017; Ozturk and Sahbudak, 2017; Tuzlugöl Dost and Cenkseven, 2008; Yavuzer et al., 2007) found that academicians' job satisfaction levels did not differ statistically according to the gender. However, in studies conducted by Bas et al. (2019), Celikkalp et al. (2019) and Dogan et al. (2019), it was found that academics' job satisfaction levels showed a statistically significant difference in favor of men according to the gender. Kocoglu (2015), on the other hand, determined that there was a difference in favor of women. It is thought that these differences arise from the fact that women generally think in more detail than men and that men have structures that can ascribe less meaning to the results of the events than women.

In the literature review related to the marital status variable, there are studies supporting the result of this research. In the studies conducted by Celikkalp et al. (2019), Karadag et al. (2018), Kocoglu (2015), Ozturk and Sahbudak (2017) and Yavuzer et al. (2007), the job satisfaction levels of academics did not show statistically significant differences according to the marital status variable. However, in the studies carried out by Bas et al. (2019), Orhan and Komsu (2016), Sat et al. (2015) and Tuzlugol Dost and Cenkseven (2008), the job satisfaction levels of academics showed statistically significant differences in favor of married people. It is believed that these differences arise from the fact that married academics have achieved more success in their work because they are in a more orderly life style than the single ones, and that the return resulting from this success is at a satisfactory level.

Based on the age variable, there are studies supporting the result of this research. Basar (2017), Bas et al. (2019), Celikkalp et al. (2019), Kocoglu (2015), Karadag et al. (2018), Orhan and Komşu (2016), Saritas (2010), Tuzlugol Dost and Cenkseven (2008) and Yavuzer et al. (2007) found that academics' job satisfaction levels did not show statistically significant differences according to the age variable. In this context, it can be said that age does not have an impact on job satisfaction.

Based on the literature review related to the title variable, there are studies supporting the result of this research. Studies by Bas et al. (2019), Karadag et al. (2018), Karagozoglu and Asliyukse (2017), Saritas (2010), Serinkan and Bardakci (2009) and Tuzlugol Dost and Cenkseven (2008) found that job satisfaction levels did not show a statistically significant difference according to the title variable. However, in the studies conducted by Celikkalp et al. (2019), Kocoglu (2015) and Ozturk and Şahbudak (2017), it was found that the job

satisfaction levels of academics show statistically significant differences according to the title variable. It is thought that these differences arise from the fact that the job satisfaction levels of academics differ as they progress in terms of title. As a matter of fact, in the research conducted by Kocoglu (2015), it was found that this statistically significant difference occurred in favor of professors and associate professors.

The literature review related to the service life variable, there are studies supporting the result of this research. In the studies conducted by Basar (2017), Celikkalp et al. (2019), Karagozoglu Asliyukse (2017), Kocoglu (2015), Sangar (2016) and Yavuzer et al. (2007), the job satisfaction levels of academics did not show statistically significant differences according to the service life variable. However, Bas et al. (2019), Karadag et al. (2018), Guler and Veysikarani (2019), Ozturk and Sahbudak (2017), Saritas (2010) and Sat et al. (2015) found that job satisfaction levels showed a statistically significant difference according to the service life variable. This difference may arise from situations such as the repetition of the gains brought by the experiences that occur with the service life, or may occur because the level of job satisfaction differs due to the advances in the academic career with the increasing service life.

There are studies supporting the result of this research regarding the weekly course hours variable. In the studies conducted by Bas et al. (2019) and Karagozoglu Asliyukse (2017), it was found that academics' job satisfaction levels did not show a statistically significant difference according to the weekly course hours variable. In this context, it can be said that the weekly course hours have no effect on job satisfaction.

In this study it was determined that there was a positive, low-level, and statistically significant relationship between the participants' scores of the Leisure Satisfaction Scale and Job Satisfaction Scale's Psychological, Educational, Social, Relaxation, Physiological and Aesthetic sub-scales. In the study conducted by Dogan et al. (2019), it was determined that there was a positive and medium-level relationship between the participants' leisure satisfaction and job satisfaction levels.

As a result, it can be concluded that the participants' Leisure Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction scores did not show a statistically significant difference in terms of gender, marital status, possession of enough leisure, age, title, weekly course hours, and service life, and there was a positive and low-level relationship between Leisure Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Akinci, Z. (2002).** Factors affecting job satisfaction in the tourism sector: an application in five star accommodation establishments. *Akdeniz University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 2(4): 1-25.
- Aksu, A. (1995).** Assessment of the Relationship between the Efficient

- Turnover Rate and Efficiency in Hotel Enterprises and an Application in Antalya University. Master's Thesis, Akdeniz University Institute of Social Sciences, Antalya.
- Ardahan, F., and Yerlisu Lapa, T. (2010).** Study of the free satisfaction levels of university students by gender and income. Hacettepe Journal of Sports Sciences, 21(4): 129-136.
- Bas, M., Aksu, M., Unubol, H., and Sayar, G. H. (2019).** Investigation of the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Perceived Social Support in Academics. Uskudar University Journal of Social Sciences, 9: 345-375.
- Basar, P. (2017).** The effect of participating management on job satisfaction: a research on academic staff. Journal of Economics and Business Politics and International Relations, 3(1): 1-34.
- Basarangil, I. (2018).** Participation of academicians in leisure activities, job satisfaction and job efficiency: A research at Kırklareli University. Tourism Academic Journal, 5(2): 155-170.
- Broughton, K., and Beggs, B. A. (2007).** Leisure satisfaction of older adults. Activities, Adaptation and Aging, 31(1): 1-18.
- Budak, A. (2006).** Job Satisfaction Level of Public Employees: An Application in the Ministry of National Defense, Fuel Supply and Nato Pol Facilities. Master's Thesis, Eskisehir Anadolu University, Institute of Social Sciences, Eskisehir.
- Buyukozturk, S. (2011).** Data analysis handbook for the social sciences (22nd edition). Ankara: Pegem Academi.
- Can, A. (2013).** Quantitative Data Analysis in Scientific Research Process with SPSS. Ankara: Pegem Academi.
- Celik, G. (2011).** Examination of leisure time barriers and satisfaction levels of disabled people working in public institutions (Antalya center example), Akdeniz University Institute of Social Sciences. Master's Thesis, Antalya.
- Celikalp, U., Temel, M., and Bilgic, S. (2019).** Academicians' job satisfaction and affecting factors. Journal of Yuksekogretim, 9(1): 59-66.
- Chen, L. H. (2008).** Job satisfaction among information system personnel. Computers in Human Behaviour, 24: 105-118.
- Dilsiz, B. (2006).** Multivariate Statistical Analysis of the Burnout and Job Satisfaction Levels of Teachers Working in Secondary Education Schools in Konya by Region. Master's Thesis, Selcuk University, Konya.
- Dogan, M., Elci, G., and Gurbuz, B. (2019).** Free time satisfaction freezing perception and relationship between job satisfaction: Q study on academics. Spormeter Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, 17(1), 154-164.
- Du Cap, M. C. (2002).** The Perceived Impact of the Acadia Advantage Program on the Leisure Lifestyle and Leisure Satisfaction of the Students at Acadia University. Master Thesis. Acadia University, Ottawa, pp. 139.
- Eren, E. (1993).** Management and organization. İstanbul: İstanbul University publish.
- Gegez, A. E. (2007).** Marketing Research, İstanbul: Beta publishing.
- Gokce, H. (2015).** The effect of Recreational Activities on self-efficacy, exam anxiety and free time satisfaction levels of individuals who are preparing for the university entrance exam. Ph.D. Thesis, Ankara University Institute of Health Sciences, Ankara.
- Guler, E. Ö., and Veysikarani, D. (2019).** Statistical analysis of the impact of burnout and job satisfaction on academicians. Ataturk University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 33(3): 829-848.
- Gurbuz, S., and Sahin, F. (2016).** Research methods in social sciences. Ankara: Seckin Publishing.
- Gurbuz, S., and Yuksel, M. (2008).** Emotional intelligence in working environment: job performance, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and its relation with some demographic features. Dogus University Journal, 9(2): 174-190.
- Iscan, Ö. F., and Timuroglu, M. K. (2007).** The effect of organizational culture on job satisfaction and an application. Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 21(1): 119-135.
- Jensen, C. R. (1995).** Outdoor Recreation in America, 5th Ed. USA: Human Kinetics.
- Karadag, T. F., Karatas, Ö., and Yücel, A. S. (2018).** The effect of demographic features of teaching staff on job satisfaction levels (example of Ardahan University). Electronic Turkish Studies, 13(26).
- Karagozoglu Asliyukse, M. (2017).** In information and records management in turkey Department Research Assistant of job satisfaction levels of employees. Information and Document Research, 7: 2-29.
- Karakucuk, S. (1997).** Recreation, Evaluation of Leisure Times. Second Edition Ankara: Bagirgan Publishing.
- Karli, U., Polat, E., Yilmaz, B., and Kocak, S. (2008).** Validity and reliability study of free time satisfaction scale (Sztö-Long version). Journal of Sports Sciences, 19(2): 80-91.
- Kaya, N. (2013).** The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: An Application. Master's Thesis, Marmara University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Kocoglu, C. M. (2015).** Measurement of job satisfaction levels of academic staff. ODU Journal of Social Sciences Researches, 5(13): 16-35.
- Mackenzie, R. A. (1985).** Time Trap - How Do You Control Time? Cev., Yakut GUNER. İstanbul: Interest Publishing.
- McLean, D., Hurd, A. R., and Rogers, N. B. (2008).** Kraus' Recreation and Leisure in Modern Society. Mississauga, Canada: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Meb (2006).** Physical Education and Sports History, Ministry of National Education, Middle Education General Directorate, 9th Grade Curriculum Booklet.
- Odum, R. Y., Box, W. R., and Dunn, M. G. (1990).** Organizational Cultures, Commitment, Satisfaction and Cohesion. Public Productivity and Management Review, 14: 157-169.
- Orhan, U., and Komsu, U. C. (2016).** The effect of perceptions of abuse and burnout levels on learning attitude and job satisfaction in academicians. Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences, 16(3): 1-18.
- Oshagbemi, T. (1997).** The influence of rank on the job satisfaction of organizational members. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 12(7): 511-521.
- Ozturk, M., and Sahbudak, E. (2017).** Psychological harassment (mobbing) and job satisfaction: A study on researchers at Cumhuriyet University. Journal of Sociology Studies, 20(2): 200-228.
- Saglam, B., and Berberoğlu, M. (2010).** A research on burnout and job satisfaction of academic staff of vocational school. Gümüşhane University Institute of Social Sciences Electronic Journal, 1(2).
- Sangar, Z. (2016).** Job Satisfaction and Quality of Life: A Study on Academic Staff. Master's Thesis. Eskisehir Osmangazi University Educational Sciences Institute, Eskisehir.
- Saritas, M. (2010).** Determination of job satisfaction and job stress levels of teaching staff. Education Sciences, 5(2): 81-92.
- Sat, A., Dogan, H., and Amil, O. (2015).** Investigation of psychological needs and job satisfaction of academicians in terms of some variables: Example of Kayseri. OPUS International Journal of Community Research, 5(8): 112-132.
- Seigenthaler, K. (1997).** Health benefits of leisure. Research Update, Parks and Recreation, 32(1): 24-31.
- Serinkan, C., and Bardakci, A. (2009).** A research on job satisfaction and levels of burnout of academic staff at Pamukkale University. Journal of Social Sciences of Manas University, 11(21): 115-132.
- Tas, Y. (2011).** The effect of job satisfaction and information sharing level on emotional commitment: A research at Kocaeli University research and application hospital. Journal of Kocaeli University Institute of Social Sciences, 1(21): 117-131.
- Tella, A., Ayeni, C. O., and Popoola, S. O. (2007).** Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment of Library Personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in Oyo State. Library Philosophy and Practice, pp.1-16.
- Telman, N., and Unsal, P. (2004).** Employee Satisfaction. Epsilon Publishing, İstanbul, 262pp.
- Tuzlugol Dost, M., and Cenkseven, F. (2008).** Socio-demographic variables of teachers and job satisfaction according to their assessment. Education and Science, 33(148): 28-39.
- Ungoren, E., Cengiz, F., and Algur, S. (2009).** "Determining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational conflict management: A research on hospitality business. Journal of Electronic Social Sciences, 8(27), pp.36-56.
- Wuest, D., and Bucher, C. (2006)** Foundations of physical education, exercise science and sport. McGraw Hill, New York.

Yavuzer, Y., Karatas, Z., and Gundogdu, R. (2007). Investigation of continuous anxiety and satisfaction levels of auxiliary docents working in education faculties. *Journal of Abant Izzet Baysal University Education Faculty*, 85-100.

Yetim, A. (2005). *Sociology and Sports*. Istanbul: Yaylacik Printing.

Citation: Koç, M. C., and Er, Y. (2020). Leisure satisfaction and job satisfaction: A research on academics. *African Educational Research Journal*, 8(2): 329-341.
