

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11584041>

Accepted: 30.05.2024

Teachers' Views on Perceptions of Work-Family Enrichment Öğretmenlerin İş-Aile Zenginleşmesi Algılarına İlişkin Görüşleri

Mehmet DEMİRHAN

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı

mhmtdmrhn44@hotmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3053-8875>**Yücel PEKGENÇ**

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı

yucekpekgenc@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1633-4975>

Özet

İş-aile zenginleşmesi, bireyin bir rolde elde ettiği deneyimin diğer roldeki mutluluğunu ve yaşam kalitesini arttırmasıdır. Bireyin iş ortamında elde ettiği deneyim ve birikimin aile ortamında performans ve yaşam kalitesini arttırması, aynı şekilde aile ortamında elde ettiği birikim ve deneyimin de işteki performans ve yaşam kalitesini arttırmasıdır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığına bağlı okullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin iş aile zenginleşmesi algı düzeylerini belirlemek ve iş aile zenginleşmesi algılarını çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelemektir. Araştırmada yöntem olarak nicel araştırma desenlerinden olan betimsel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Çalışma grubunu 2021-2022 eğitim öğretim yılında devlet okullarında görev yapan 320 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Çalışma grubu belirlenirken basit seçkisiz örnekleme tercih edilmiştir. Araştırmada veri toplama aracı olarak “İş-Aile Zenginleşmesi Ölçeği” kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda öğretmenlerin iş-aile zenginleşmesi algılarının “çoğunlukla katılıyorum” düzeyinde olduğu görülmüştür. Öğretmenlerin iş-aile zenginleşmesi algılarının son üç yıl içerisinde ödül alma, unvan, yaş, eğitim durumu, görev yeri, okul türü, maaşla geçinebilme düzeyi ve mezun olunan fakülte türü değişkenlerine göre farklılaşmadığı; cinsiyet, soruşturma geçirme, kıdem, öğretmenliği seçme nedeni değişkenlerine göre ise aralarında anlamlı farklılık olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İş-aile, Zenginleşme, Öğretmen, İş-Aile Zenginleşmesi.

Abstract

Work-family enrichment is when the experience gained by the individual in one role increases the happiness and quality of life in the other role. The experience and knowledge gained by the

individual in the business environment increases the performance and quality of life in the family environment, and the knowledge and experience gained in the family environment increases the performance and quality of life at work. The aim of this study is to determine the perception levels of teachers working in schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education and to examine their perceptions of work-family enrichment in terms of various variables. Descriptive survey model, which is one of the quantitative research designs, was used as a method in the research. The study group consists of 320 teachers working in public schools in the 2021-2022 academic year. While determining the study group, simple random sampling was preferred. In the study, the "Work-Family Enrichment Scale" was used as a data collection tool. As a result of the research, it was seen that teachers' perceptions of work-family enrichment were at the level of "mostly agree". It was found that teachers' perceptions of work-family enrichment did not differ according to the variables of receiving awards, title, age, educational status, place of duty, school type, level of living on salary and type of faculty graduated in the last three years; It was determined that there was a significant difference between them according to the variables of gender, investigation, seniority, and reason for choosing teaching.

Keywords: Work-Family, Enrichment, Teacher, Work-Family Enrichment.

1. INTRODUCTION

When the literature is examined, it is seen that work-family relations are generally conflict-oriented and many studies have been carried out on work-family conflicts. However, due to changes in the workforce such as women taking more part in working life and both spouses working in the family, individuals in the family have to take on more roles related to family and work, and to fulfill and manage the responsibilities of each role they undertake in work and family life correctly (Akçakanat and Uzunbacak, 2019). On the issue of work-family enrichment, it is seen that not enough work has been done in the country and abroad. The concept of work-family enrichment was first expressed by Greenhaus and Powell (2006) in their study "When Work and Family are Allies: Theory of Work-Family Enrichment". In their study, they stated that their aim in the article is to present a work-family enrichment theory that specifies the conditions in which work and family roles are "friend-ally" instead of "enemy". Work-family enrichment is when the experience gained by the individual in one role increases the happiness and quality of life in the other role. The experience and knowledge gained by the individual in the business environment increases the performance and quality of life in the family environment, and the knowledge and experience gained in the family environment increases the performance and quality of life at work (Greenhaus and Powell, 2006).

Stating that work-family enrichment is different from other structures in the literature that represent the positive side of the work-family face, Carlson (2006) stated that individuals who can transfer resource gains in one area to another area in a way that leads to an improvement in the quality of

life in the other role can develop a self-enrichment criterion. When employees use the conflict resolution skills they will learn in the workplace in the family, they will be able to resolve their conflicts with their children, spouses or other family members more effectively. Similarly, parents have stated that the patience they develop with their children helps them to establish better relationships with others in the work environment (Carlson, 2006). Korkmaz (2021) expressed the concept of work-family enrichment as the positive emotions and achievements of individuals in business life improve family life, provide satisfaction in family life, and use the psychological competencies acquired in business life to fulfill their duties and responsibilities in family life, or in the same way, experiences, feelings and competencies in family life can produce positive results in business life.

The passion they feel for their work will also be reflected in the family environment of the employees and will make it possible for them to cope better with the emotional load at work and to experience less negative emotional labor by using the competencies they have developed in the family, the positive emotion they experience, and the capacities they have acquired. Likewise, an employee who is passionate about his job will evaluate the negativities he experiences with a more optimistic and constructive perspective, and his positive feelings towards his job will serve as a protective factor for him from the effects of negativities. When exposed to negative situations, there will be significant differences in both the emotion and the way an employee who does his job with passion and reflects these feelings to his interlocutors compared to an employee who does not have passion for his job (Bektaş and Çetin, 2020). Work-family enrichment makes significant contributions to organizations as it increases the performance of employees and the quality of the working environment (Çalışkan, Oben, Atan and Yozgat, 2013). However, this contribution is not one-way and also makes significant contributions to the employees (Arslan, 2018). For example, an individual who is in a positive mood when leaving work responds more positively, patiently, and happily to family members, eventually increasing their influence and performance as a parent or spouse (Carlson, 2006).

As can be seen, there is a two-way transition in work-family enrichment. There is both the transfer of positive work lives to the home and the transfer of positive home lives to the work environment. It can be said that these transitions increase the happiness and joy of individuals, reflect positively on their bilateral relations, help them gain new skills and abilities, and allow them to spend more quality and more peaceful time.

In this context, the aim of this study is to determine the perception levels of work-family enrichment of teachers working in schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education and to examine their perceptions of work-family enrichment in terms of various variables. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought.

1. What is the level of teachers' perceptions of work-family enrichment?
2. Do teachers' perceptions of work-family enrichment differ significantly according to gender, age, professional seniority, type of school, educational status, whether or not to be investigated,

title, whether or not to receive an award, the reason for choosing the profession, the type of faculty graduated, the way the school works, the ability to live on a salary and the place of duty?

2. METHOD

In this study, descriptive survey model was used. Descriptive screening is a research conducted on large/large groups in which individuals' opinions, attitudes and perceptions about a phenomenon and/or event are tried to be described (Karakaya, 2009). In the survey model, the objects, events or individuals that are the subject of the research are tried to be explained and defined as they are in their own conditions (Kuzu, 2013). The descriptive survey model was used to examine the level of work-family enrichment perceptions and work-family enrichment levels of teachers working in schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education in terms of various variables.

2.1. Universe and Sample

The population of the study consists of teachers working in schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education in the 2021-2022 academic year. Simple random sampling method was used while forming the study group. In this context, 328 teachers who were randomly contacted constituted the study group of the research. As a result of the 328 questionnaires applied to the teachers in the sample group, 8 questionnaires that were found to be not filled in properly were removed and the remaining 320 questionnaires were evaluated. The findings regarding the personal characteristics of the teachers participating in the study are shown in Table 1.

1272

Table 1. Findings on the Demographic Characteristics of the Teachers Participating in the Research

Demographic Nature	Groups	n	%
Gender	A. Woman	172	53,8
	B. Male	148	46,2
	Sum	320	100,0
Age	A. 20-29 years old	78	24,4
	B. 30-39 years old	174	54,4
	C. 40-49 years old	62	19,4
	D. 50 and above	6	1,9
	Sum	320	100,0
Seniority	A. 1-5 years	83	25,9
	B. 6-10 years	95	29,7
	C. 11-15 years	77	24,1
	D. 16-20 years	44	13,8
	E. 20 years and above	21	6,6
	Sum	320	100,0

Education Status	A. Associate Degree	4	1,3
	B. License	276	86,3
	C. Graduate	40	12,4
	Sum	320	100,0
Appellation	A. Teacher	288	90,0
	B. Administrator	32	10,0
	Sum	320	100,0
Place of Duty	A. Village	69	21,6
	B. District Center	98	30,6
	C. Provincial Center	153	47,8
	Sum	320	100,0
School Type	A. Kindergarten	18	5,6
	B. Primary School	145	45,3
	C. Secobdary School	111	34,7
	D. High School	46	14,4
	Sum	320	100,0
Teaching Profession Sel.	A. My ideal profession	148	46,3
	B. Family request	18	5,6
	C. Vocational guidance	17	5,3
	D. Eligibility of my score	122	38,1
	E. Other	15	4,7
	Sum	320	100,0
Have You Been Investigated?	A. Yes	75	23,4
	B. No	245	76,6
	Sum	320	100,0
Have You Received an Award in the Last 3 Years?	A. Yes	53	16,6
	B. No	267	83,4
	Sum	320	100,0
Faculty You Graduated From	A. Education Faculty	265	82,8
	B. Arts and Sciences Fac.	24	7,5
	C. Other	31	9,7
	Sum	320	100,0
Living on My Current Salary	A. Totally agree	23	7,2
	B. Agree	82	25,6
	C. I'm undecided	51	15,9
	D. I disagree	118	36,9
	E. I don't agree at all.	46	14,4
	Sum	320	100,0
How Your School Works	A. Normal Education	211	65,9
	B. Dual Teaching	109	34,1
	Sum	320	100,0

As can be seen in Table 1, 172 (53.8%) of the 320 participants were female and 148 (46.2%) were male. There are 78 (24.4%) participants in the 20-29 age range, 174 (54.4%) in the 30-39 age range, 62 (19.4%) in the 40-49 age range, and 6 (1.9%) in the 50-plus age range. While 4 (1.3%) of the participants have an associate degree, 276 (86.3%) have a bachelor's degree, 40 (12.4%) have a graduate level. Of the participants, 83 (25.9%) had 1-5 years of professional seniority, 95 (29.7%) had 6-10 years, 77 (24.1%) had 11-15 years, 44 (13.8%) had 16-20 years and 21 (6.6%) had more than 20 years of professional seniority. Of the participants, 288 (90.0%) were teachers and 32 (10.0%) were administrators. While 69 (21.6%) of the participants work in the village, 98 (30.6%) work in the district center and 153 (47.8%) work in the city center. Of the respondents, 18 (5.6%) work in kindergarten, 145 (45.3%) in primary school, 111 (34.7%) in secondary school and 46 (14.4%) in high school. While 211 (65.9%) of the participants work in schools with regular education, 109 (34.1%) of them work in schools with dual education. While 75 (23.4%) of the participants had undergone an investigation, 245 (76.6%) had not undergone any investigation; In addition, 53 (16.6%) received an award in the last three years, while 267 (83.4%) did not receive any award in the last three years. 265 (82.8%) of the participants graduated from the Faculty of Education, 24 (7.5%) from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and 31 (9.7%) from other faculties. 23 (7.2%) of the participants completely agreed, 82 (25.6%) agreed, 51 (15.9%) were undecided, 118 (36.9%) disagreed and 46 (14.4%) did not agree at all. When the participants were asked about their reasons for choosing the teaching profession, 148 (46.3%) of them stated that they were their ideal profession, 18 (5.6%) were family desire, 17 (5.3%) were to benefit from vocational guidance, 122 (38.1%) were sufficient and 15 (4.7%) were due to other reasons.

2.2. Data Collection Tools

In the study, the two-dimensional "Work-Family Enrichment Scale" developed by Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne and Grzywacz (2006) and adapted to Turkish by Çalışkan, Ürü Sani, Atan Tarlacı and Yozgat (2013) was used. Cronbach's alpha value was recalculated before the scale was used. The work-family enrichment sub-dimension of the work-family enrichment scale was 0.971, the family-family enrichment sub-dimension was 0.964 and the overall reliability of the scale was 0.975. The fact that the calculated reliability coefficient of the scale is above 0.70 in the analyzes shows that the reliability of the test scores is high (Büyüköztürk et al. 2014).

2.3. Analysis of Data

The data obtained in the study were analyzed using IBM SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences for Windows) statistical package program. In order to classify the data, analyzes such as standard deviation, frequency, percentage values, arithmetic mean were used. In addition, the data

did not show a normal distribution. The Mann Whitney U Test and Kruskal Wallis Tests were used to determine whether there was a difference between the variables.

The "Work-Family Enrichment Scale", which consists of 18 items, consists of two sub-dimensions. The two dimensions of work-family enrichment are "Work-family enrichment" and "Family-business enrichment". Items 1-10 aim to measure the dimensions of "Work-family enrichment" and items 11-18 "Family-business enrichment" in the scale used.

3. FINDINGS OF STUDY

In this part of the study, the findings obtained as a result of the analysis made with statistical techniques in line with the data collected from the teachers who make up the sample are included.

Table:2 Teachers' Work-Family Enrichment Scale Scores

	Substance	N	X	Ss	Level
Work-Family Enrichment Sub-Dimension	1-My duties and responsibilities related to my job help me develop different perspectives, which in turn helps me to be a better family member.	320	4,40	1,18	Mostly Agree
	2- My duties and responsibilities related to my job allow me to gain new knowledge, which helps me to become a better family member.	320	4,40	1,27	Mostly Agree
	3- My job-related duties and responsibilities help me develop new skills, which in turn helps me become a better family member.	320	4,41	1,24	Mostly Agree
	4- Juggling my work puts me in a good mood, which helps me become a better family member.	320	4,38	1,30	Mostly Agree
	5- My dedication to my work makes me a happy and peaceful individual, which allows me to be a better family member.	320	4,41	1,32	Mostly Agree
	6- My dedication to my work makes me a cheerful person, which helps me become a better family member.	320	4,27	1,36	Mostly Agree
	7- My duties and responsibilities related to my job increase my sense of personal fulfillment, which contributes to being a better family member.	320	4,33	1,31	Mostly Agree
	8- My duties and responsibilities related to my job make me feel like I can get things done, which helps me to be a better family member.	320	4,47	1,23	Mostly Agree

	9- The sense of accomplishment that my job gives me contributes to becoming a better family member.	320	4,52	1,20	Mostly Agree
Family- Business Enrichment Sub-Dimension	10- Dealing with family businesses allows me to gain new knowledge, which makes me a better employee.	320	4,30	1,23	Quite agree
	11- The experience and skills I have gained through my family life contribute to me becoming a better employee.	320	4,47	1,19	Mostly Agree
	12- The different perspectives I have gained through my family life contribute to me being a better employee.	320	4,48	1,22	Mostly Agree
	13- Dealing with family affairs puts me in a good mood, which contributes to me becoming a better employee.	320	4,35	1,23	Quite agree
	14- My devotion to my family makes me a cheerful person, which contributes to me becoming a better employee.	320	4,52	1,27	Mostly Agree
	15- Dealing with family business makes me a happy and peaceful individual, which allows me to be a better employee.	320	4,45	1,27	Mostly Agree
	16- Having a family life prevents me from wasting my time at work, which helps me to be a more effective and efficient employee.	320	4,32	1,34	Quite agree
	17- Having duties and responsibilities related to my family encourages me to focus more on my work at work, which contributes to being a more effective and efficient employee.	320	4,35	1,31	Quite agree
	18- Having duties and responsibilities related to my family paves the way for me to use my time much more effectively at work, which makes me a more productive employee.	320	4,33	1,31	Quite agree
	Sum	320	4,40	1,06	Mostly Agree

When an evaluation was made by taking into account the scores given by the teachers on the work-family enrichment scale, it was seen that they expressed their opinion as "mostly agree". This situation can be interpreted as teachers' perceptions of both the work-family enrichment sub-dimension and the family-work enrichment sub-dimension are high.

Table:3 Teachers' Scores from the Work-Family Enrichment Scale and Mann Whitney-U Test Results on Gender

Sub-Dimensions		Gender	N	\bar{X}	SO	U	z	p
Work Family Enrichment		Woman	172	174.92	30085.50	10248.50	-3.012	.003
		Male	148	143.75	21274.50			
Family Work Enrichment		Woman	172	164.73	28334.00	12000.00	-.884	.377
		Male	148	155.58	23026.00			

*p<.05

According to the Mann Whitney - U test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differed according to the gender variable, the work-family enrichment sub-dimension [$z = -3.012$, $p < 0$], aile-iş zenginleşmesi alt boyutu [$z = -.884$, $p = > 0$] was calculated. It is seen that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of female teachers and the mean scores of male teachers in favor of female teachers in the sub-dimension of work-family enrichment. According to this finding, it can be said that female teachers' job-related duties and responsibilities, the new skills they acquire in the work environment, and their commitment to their jobs contribute to their being happier, more cheerful and better family members. Another striking point is that the mean scores of female teachers are higher than male teachers in both sub-dimensions. This result can be explained as female teachers' perceptions of both work-family enrichment and family-work enrichment are higher than male teachers.

1277

Table:4 Mann Whitney-U Test Results on Whether Teachers Have Been Investigated with Their Scores from the Work-Family Enrichment Scale

Sub-Dimensions		Investigation	N	\bar{X}	SO	U	z	p
Work Family Enrichment		Yes	75	126.15	9461.50	6611.50	-3.683	.000
		No	245	171.01	41898.50			
Family Work Enrichment		Yes	75	127.77	9583.00	6733.00	-3.509	.000
		No	245	170.52	41777.00			

*p<.05

According to the Mann Whitney-U test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differed according to the variable of whether teachers were investigated or not, the work-family enrichment sub-dimension [$z = -3.683$, $p < 0$] and the family-family enrichment sub-dimension [$z = -3.509$, $p < 0$] were calculated. It is seen that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers who did not undergo an investigation and the mean scores of the teachers who were investigated in both sub-dimensions. This significant difference seems to be in favor of teachers who have not been investigated. According to this finding, it can be said that the positive experiences of the teachers who did not undergo

investigations in the work environment contributed to the family environment, and in the same way, the positive experiences they had in the family environment contributed to the work environment.

Table:5 Mann Whitney-U Test Results on Teachers' Scores and Awards from the Work-Family Enrichment Scale

Sub-Dimensions		Prize	N	\bar{X}	SO	U	z	p
Work Enrichment	Family	Yes	53	151.02	8004.00	6573.00	-.819	.413
		No	267	162.38	43356.00			
Family Enrichment	Work	Yes	53	153.98	8161.00	6730.00	-.563	.574
		No	267	161.79	43199.00			

According to the Mann Whitney-U test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differed according to the variable of teachers' rewarding in the last three years, the work-family enrichment sub-dimension [$z = -.819$, $p > 0$] and the family-family enrichment sub-dimension [$z = -.563$, $p > 0$] were calculated and there was no significant difference between them.

Table:6 Mann Whitney-U Test Results Regarding Teachers' Scores from the Work Family Enrichment Scale and Their Titles

Sub-Dimensions		Appellation	N	\bar{X}	SO	U	z	p
Work Enrichment	Family	Teacher	288	159.19	45846.50	4230.50	-.762	.446
		Administrator	32	172.30	5513.50			
Family Enrichment	Work	Teacher	288	158.46	45636.50	4020.50	-1.186	.236
		Administrator	32	178.86	5723.50			

According to the Mann Whitney-U test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differed according to the title variable of the participants, the work-family enrichment sub-dimension [$z = -.762$, $p > 0$] and the family-family enrichment sub-dimension [$z = -1.186$, $p > 0$] were calculated. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of teachers and administrators in both sub-dimensions.

Table:7 Teachers' Scores from the Work-Family Enrichment Scale and Mann Whitney-U Test Results on School Work Type

Sub-Dimensions		Kind	N	\bar{X}	SO	U	z	p
Work Enrichment	Family	Normal	211	158.21	33382.50	11016.50	-.617	.537
		Dual	109	164.93	17977.50			
Family Enrichment	Work	Normal	211	158.33	33407.00	11041.00	-.586	.558
		Dual	109	164.71	17953.00			

According to the Mann Whitney - U test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differed according to the variable of the school's working style, the work-family enrichment sub-dimension [$z = -.617, p > 0$] and the family-family enrichment sub-dimension [$z = -.586, p > 0$] were calculated. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of teachers working in schools with regular education and teachers working in schools with dual education in both sub-dimensions.

Table: 8 Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Teachers' Workplace Mentality Scores According to Age Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Age Group	N	Rank Average	sd	χ^2	P	Significant Difference
Work Family Enrichment	20-29	78	182.04	3	7.342	.062	
	30-39	174	149.34				
	40 and above	68	162.07				
Family Work Enrichment	20-29	78	158.71	3	.758	.859	
	30-39	174	160.07				
	40 and above	68	160.84				

According to the Kruskal Wallis test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differed according to the age variable, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers in both sub-dimensions.

1279

Table: 9 Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Teachers' Work-Family Enrichment Scores According to the Educational Status Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Education Status	N	Rank Average	Sd	χ^2	P
Work Family Enrichment	Associate Degree	4	166.13	2	.059	.971
	License	276	160.01			
	Graduate	40	163.30			
Family Work Enrichment	Associate Degree	4	175.13	2	.197	.906
	License	276	159.70			
	Graduate	40	164.54			

According to the Kruskal Wallis test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differed according to the variable of educational status, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers in both sub-dimensions.

Table: 10 Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Teachers' Work-Family Enrichment Scores by Job Location

Sub-Dimensions	Place of Duty	N	Rank			
			Average	Sd	χ^2	p
Work Family Enrichment	Village	69	156.15			
	District center	98	166.85	2	.697	.706
	Provincial Center	153	158.39			
Family Work Enrichment	Village	69	151.10			
	District center	988	162.42			
	Provincial Center	153	163.51	2	.920	.631

According to the Kruskal Wallis test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differed according to the variable of educational status, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers in both sub-dimensions.

1280

Table: 10 Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Teachers' Work-Family Enrichment Scores by Job Location

Sub-Dimensions	Place of Duty	N	Rank			
			Average	Sd	χ^2	p
Work Family Enrichment	Village	69	156.15			
	District center	98	166.85	2	.697	.706
	Provincial Center	153	158.39			
Family Work Enrichment	Village	69	151.10			
	District center	988	162.42			
	Provincial Center	153	163.51	2	.920	.631

According to the Kruskal Wallis test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differed according to the variable of place of duty, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers in both sub-dimensions.

Table:11 Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Teachers' Work-Family Enrichment Scores by Professional Seniority

Sub-Dimensions	Professional Seniority	N	Rank		χ^2	p	Significant Difference
			Average	Sd			
Work Family Enrichment	A. 1-5 years	83	186.58				A-B
	B.6-10 years	95	148.91				
	C.11-15 years	77	155.25				
	D.16-20 years	44	143.98	4	9.810	.044	
	E.21years and above	21	163.71				
Family Work Enrichment	A.1-5 years	83	172.61				
	B.6-10 years	95	149.43				
	C.11-15 years	77	161.51				
	D.16-20 years	44	150.48	4	4.261	.372	
	E.21years and above	21	180.02				

*p<.05

The Kruskal Wallis test was performed to see whether there was a significant difference between the teachers grouped according to five different professional seniority in the sub-dimensions of the work-family enrichment scale according to their seniority (length of service in teaching). In the Kruskal Wallis test, the work-family enrichment sub-dimension was found to be [$(\chi^2_{84})= 9,810$, $p<.05$], and the family-family enrichment sub-dimension was [$\chi^2 (4)= 4,261$, $p>.05$]. According to the variable of length of service in teaching, there were significant differences in the sub-dimension of work-family enrichment. In order to determine which groups this significant difference was, the analysis was continued with the Tamhane test, one of the Post Hoc tests. According to the analysis of the tamhane test, it was seen that the significant difference was between teachers with 1-5 years of service and teachers with 6-10 years of service time. According to the analysis of the full hane test, it can be said that teachers with 1-5 years of service (seniority) reflect their positive experiences in the work environment and their new skills to the family environment more than teachers with 6-10 years of service (seniority).

Table:12 Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Teachers' Work-Family Enrichment Scores by School Type

Sub-Dimensions	School Type	N	Rank Average	Sd	χ^2	p	Significant difference
Work Family Enrichment	Kindergarten	18	202.64	3	5.934	.115	
	Primary school	145	165.32				
	Secondary school	111	153.32				
	High school	46	146.12				
Family Work Enrichment	Kindergarten	18	193.31	3	8.114	.059	
	Primary school	145	171.74				
	Secondary school	111	145.91				
	High school	46	147.46				

According to the Kruskal Wallis test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differs according to the school type variable, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers in both sub-dimensions.

Table:13 Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Teachers' Job Family Enrichment Scores According to the Reason for Choosing a Profession

Sub-Dimensions	Reason for Choosing a Profession	N	Rank Average	sd	χ^2	p	Significant difference
Work Family Enrichment	A. To be his ideal profession	148	190.23	4	33.349	.000	A-B
	B. Family request	18	103.08				A-D
	C. Benefiting from vocational guidance	17	160.79				A-E
	D. Because the score is appropriate	122	139.03				
	E. Other	15	110.33				
Family Work Enrichment	A. To be his ideal profession	148	181.49	4	21.089	.000	A-B
	B. Family request	18	103.03				A-D
	C. Benefiting from vocational guidance	17	162.56				
	D. Because the score is appropriate	122	149.62				
	E. Other	15	108.50				

*p<.05

The Kruskal Wallis test was performed to see whether there was a significant difference between the teachers in the work-family enrichment scale sub-dimensions according to the reasons for choosing the profession. In the Kruskal Wallis test, the work-family enrichment sub-dimension was [$\chi^2(4) = 33.349, p < .05$], and the family-family enrichment sub-dimension was [$\chi^2(4) = 21.089, p < .05$]. According to the reasons for choosing the profession of the teachers, it was observed that there were significant differences in both sub-dimensions. In order to determine which groups this significant difference was, the analysis was continued with the Tamhane test, one of the Post Hoc tests. According to the Tamhane test analysis, it was seen that the significant difference was between those who said "it was my ideal profession" and those who said "my family wanted it and I wrote it because my score was appropriate" in the sub-dimension of job family enrichment. In the sub-dimension of family job enrichment, it was seen that the significant difference was between those who said "it was my ideal profession" and those who said "my family wanted it, I wrote it because my score was appropriate, and for other reasons". According to the analysis of the Tamhane test, it can be said that those who teach because it is their ideal profession have a higher level of carrying their positive lives, new skills and happiness in the business environment to the home environment and their positive experiences, new skills and happiness in the family environment compared to those who teach because their family wants it or because their score is enough to teach.

Table:14 Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Teachers' Work-Family Enrichment Scores by Type of Faculty Graduated

Sub-Dimensions	Faculty Type	N	Rank Average	sd	χ^2	p
Work Family Enrichment	Education Faculty	265	157.07	2	2.195	.334
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	24	180.60			
	Other	31	174.27			
Family Work Enrichment	Education Faculty	265	156.88	2	2.463	.292
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	24	182.31			
	Other	31	174.53			

According to the Kruskal Wallis test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differs according to the variable of the type of faculty graduated, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers in both sub-dimensions.

Table: 15 Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Teachers' Job Family Enrichment Scores According to the Variable of Living on Salary

Sub-Dimensions	Living on a Salary	N	Rank Average	sd	χ^2	p	Significant Difference
Work Family Enrichment	Totally agree	23	198.39	4	11.157	.052	
	Agree	82	172.58				
	I'm undecided	51	174.34				
	I disagree	118	144.35				
	I disagree at all	46	146.11				
Family Work Enrichment	Totally agree	23	181.63	4	6.884	.142	
	Agree	82	179.31				
	I'm undecided	51	152.43				
	I disagree	118	150.11				
	I disagree at all	46	152.01				

1284

According to the Kruskal Wallis test, which was conducted to determine whether the Work-Family Enrichment scale differs according to the variable "I can live on my salary", there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the teachers in both sub-dimensions.

4. CONCLUSION DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

It was determined that the perceptions of work-family enrichment of the teachers participating in the research were generally at the level of "mostly agree". This result shows that teachers believe that their behaviors and emotions affect each other both in the transfer from work to family and from family to work. In his study, Korkmaz (2021) found that both sub-dimensions of work-family enrichment had a high level of positive significance. Hanson, Hammer and Colton (2003) determined that positive experiences in the work environment contribute to the family environment, and Halbesleben, Harvey and Bolino (2009) determined that the joy, morale and positive emotions experienced in the family are reflected in the work environment.

It is seen that there is a significant difference between the gender of teachers and their perceptions of work-family enrichment in favor of female teachers only in the sub-dimension of work-family enrichment. Similarly, Arslan (2018) concluded that there is a significant difference in favor of

women in the sub-dimension of work-family enrichment according to gender. In their study, Baral and Bhargava (2011) determined that work-family enrichment is higher in women than in men. This situation coincides with the findings obtained in the research.

A significant difference was found between the mean scores of the teachers who did not undergo an investigation and the mean scores of the teachers who underwent investigations in both sub-dimensions of work-family enrichment. This significant difference seems to be in favor of teachers who have not been investigated. According to this finding, it can be said that the positive experiences of teachers who do not have problems with their administrators and do not undergo investigations contribute to the family environment, and the positive experiences they have in the family environment also contribute to the work environment. In their study, Nicklin and McNall (2013) determined that supporting the contributions of employees and feeling good in the work environment positively affect work-family enrichment. In addition, Hanson et al. (2003) found that there is a positive spread from work to family, and that the skills developed in the workplace help family life. Similarly, they found that there was a positive spread from family to work, and that behaviors within the family led to positive behaviors in the workplace.

Considering the mean scores of work-family enrichment, there was no significant difference between teachers in both sub-dimensions according to the variables of receiving awards, title, age, educational status, place of duty, type of school, level of living on salary and type of faculty graduated in the last three years. In their study, Konaklı and Arslan (2017) found that teachers who were appreciated and supported by parents were motivated to their jobs. In this context, it can be said that teachers who are rewarded in schools can be happier and more successful both in the school environment and in the family environment.

According to the seniority variable, it was determined that there was a significant difference in the sub-dimension of work-family enrichment. It was determined that this significant difference was between teachers with 1-5 years of service and teachers with 6-10 years of service time. According to this result, it can be said that teachers with 1-5 years of service (seniority) reflect their positive experiences in the business environment and their new skills to the family environment more than teachers with 6-10 years of service (seniority). Grzywacz and Marks (2000) stated that there is a positive spread from work to family, that what is done in the workplace affects the occupations at home, and that the occupation and environment in the work environment contribute to the well-being of the person in the family environment.

According to the variable of the reason for choosing the teaching profession of the participants, it was observed that there was a significant difference between both sub-dimensions. It has been determined that this significant difference is between those who say "it was my ideal profession"

and those who say "my family wanted it and I wrote it because my score was appropriate" in the sub-dimension of job family enrichment. In the sub-dimension of family job enrichment, it was determined that the significant difference was between those who said "it was my ideal profession" and those who said "my family wanted it, I wrote it because my score was appropriate, and for other reasons". According to these results, it can be said that those who teach because it is their ideal profession have a higher level of carrying their positive experiences in the business environment, new skills and happiness to the home environment and their positive experiences in the family environment, new skills and happiness to the business environment compared to those who teach because their family wants them or because their score is sufficient for teaching.

This study was conducted to reveal the level of teachers' perceptions of work-family enrichment and whether it differs according to various variables. The research was limited to teachers working in the Ministry of National Education in the 2021-2022 academic year. It may be suggested to expand the sample and compare the results to be obtained by working with teachers working in private schools. In addition, researchers may be advised to conduct extensive qualitative research in order to reveal detailed reasons for teachers' perceptions of work-family enrichment. In addition, it can be said that this important phenomenon, which covers the whole lives of individuals, will be tested with other occupational groups and the results to be obtained will contribute to future studies. In this study, the concept of work-family enrichment has been tried to be described by considering it with many variables. In the studies to be carried out, it can be said that working with other variables that can explain work-family enrichment, looking at the relationship between them and examining whether they predict different variables will contribute to the literature.

KAYNAKÇA

Akçakanat, T., & Uzunbacak, H. H. (2019). Kısaltılmış iş-aile zenginleşmesi ölçeği Türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Akademik Araştırmalar ve Çalışmalar Dergisi (AKAD)*, 11(20), 172-179.

Arslan, S. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin pozitif psikolojik sermaye algıları ile iş-aile zenginleşmesi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.

Baral, R., & Bhargava, S. (2011). Examining the moderating influence of gender on the relationships between work-family antecedents and work-family enrichment. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 26(2), 122-147.

Bektaş, U., & Çetin, M. (2020). Pandemi sürecince sağlık çalışanlarında iş tutkusu, duygusal emek ve iş aile zenginleşmesi ilişkisinin incelenmesi. *Turkish Studies*, 15(6), 189-204.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz,Ş., Demirel, F. (2014). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H. (2006). “Measuring the positiveside of the work–family interface: development and validation of a work–family enrichment scale”. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(1), 131-164.

Çalışkan, S. C., Oben, Ü. S., Atan, Ö. ve Yozgat, U. (2013). *Hizmetkar liderliğin iş-aile zenginleşmesi üzerindeki etkisinde kapsamlı bir model geliştirme arayışları: örgütle özdeşleşme ve pozitif psikolojik kaynakların bu etkileşimde aracılık rolü üzerine bir araştırma*. 21. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi. 298-304.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A Theory of Work-Family Enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 72–92.

Grzywacz, J. G., Marks, N. F. (2000). “Family, work, work-familyspillover, and problem drinking during midlife”. *Journal of Marriageand Family*, 62(2), 336-348.

Halbesleben, J. R., Harvey, J., ve Bolino, M. C. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources view of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(6), 1452.

Hanson, G. C., Hammer, L. B., Colton, C. L. (2006). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work-family positive spillover. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 11(3), 249-265.

Karakaya, İ. (2009). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Anı Yayınları.

Konaklı, T., & Arslan, S. (2017). Pozitif örgütsel davranış bağlamında öğretmenlerde iş aile zenginleşmesinin incelenmesi. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi - Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 5(3), 223-244. www.enadonline.com DOI: 10.14689/issn.2148-2624.1.5c3s10m

Korkmaz, F. (2021). Mesleki canlılık kazanımında iş-aile zenginleşmesinin rolü: Yapısal eşitlik model analizi. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13(1), 942-955.

Kuzu, A. (2013). Araştırmanın Planlanması (Editör: Adile Aşkım KURT). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Eskişehir, Anadolu Üniversitesi, 19-45.

Nicklin, J. M., & McNall, L. A. (2013). Work–family enrichment, support, and satisfaction: A test of mediation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22(1).