Evaluation of Work-Life Balance of Teachers and School Managers

Osman VAİZ
Denetmen, KKTC Milli Eğitim Bakanı

Sarem ÖZDEMİR
Öğretim Üyesi, Uluslararası Kıbrıs Üniversitesi, Temel Eğitim Bölümü

Nedime KARASEL
Okul Müdürü, Değirmenlik İlkokulu

Ali EĞRİBOYUN
Öğrenci, Uluslararası Kıbrıs Üniversitesi, Eğitim Yönetimi

Abstract
The purpose of this study is to reveal the current status of the work-life balance of individuals working as classroom teachers, Turkish teachers and administrators in Turkey and Northern Cyprus and to examine them according to various demographic and professional characteristics. The study was carried out in relational screening model. The research population consists of people who work as primary school teachers, Turkish language teachers and administrators in Turkey and Northern Cyprus in the 2021-2022 academic year. The sample consisted of a total of 1059 people, 836 of whom were teachers and 223 of whom were administrators, selected using random sampling method. The data of the study were collected through an online questionnaire that included the Personal Information Form and the Work-Life Balance Scale. The data collected within the scope of the study were evaluated with quantitative analysis methods using the SPSS-26 software. In this context, frequency analysis, descriptive statistics methods, independent groups t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Tukey HSD test were used. As a result of the study, it was observed that the participants were able to maintain work-life balance at a moderate level. In general, work-life balance does not differ significantly according to gender, marital status, having children and status ($p>0.05$), but the participants aged 51 and above have a significantly higher work-life balance than the participants aged 22-30 ($p<0.05$), and, results according to sub-dimensions are presented in the study.

1. INTRODUCTION
With the entry of women into the workforce in the early 1970s, the idea of work-life balance first became popular (Karaoğlu, 2019). Work-life balance, according to Akbarova (2019), is the reduction of tensions between the responsibilities that people play at work and in their personal lives. Work-life balance is described by Babayiğit (2016) as the harmony between a person's obligations to their family and their place of employment.

Work-life balance has been attempted to be described by a number of theories due to its importance, including spillover, compensation, partition, resource consumption, convenience, work-family conflict, role, instrumentality, and boundary. According to the spillover idea, even the smallest occurrence can have a beneficial or negative impact on both your professional and personal life. According to compensation theory, if there is a bad condition between job and personal life, the person will try to improve in one of the two domains. Spillover theory's opponent is partition theory. A personal or professional event has an impact on the other in the spillover hypothesis, but not the partition theory. According to the notion of resource consumption, the person spends more time working and less time with his or her family. According to convenience theory, each person should strike a healthy balance between their personal and professional lives. The theory of work-family conflict describes circumstances in which a person is unable to perform all of his or her responsibilities or to strike a balance between work and family. position Theory states that each person has a unique position in both work and family life. The problem, according to this theory, is not that there are many positions; rather, it is that people find it difficult to carry out the duties that the roles need. According to the Instrumentality Theory, the person understands that success in the workplace is a prerequisite for success in other areas of life. Work-life balance is expected to establish boundaries between work and home, which are extremely different from one another, according to the Boundary Theory (Girdap, 2019).

As a result of the studies conducted, it has been found out that work-life balance is affected by such factors as gender, education, career planning, marital status, child or elderly care, age, ambiguity of roles, role conflict,

organizational career ladders and career paths, excessive workload and job descriptions, management style, and employee participation in management (Teker, 2015; Yavuz, 2018; İzki, 2019).

When Batur and Saylk (2022) looked at the findings of work-life balance and degrees of commitment or burnout inside the organization, they discovered a negative correlation between the two. However, they discovered a positive correlation at the level of commitment. Ekinci (2021), who performed studies on the organization, found that the impact of work-life balance on organizational commitment is moderate in the context of the link between the two. On the other hand, Araslar (2021) found that those with great work-life balance also have high levels of professional motivation and engagement.

Work-life balance, motivation, and engagement studies have been conducted not only on employees but also on managers' work-life balances and the implications for organizations. Kerim (2021) asserts that the manager's team leadership style has a direct impact on employees' judgments of job satisfaction, commitment to work, and work-life balance. In a distinct manager-based study, Ergin (2022) tried to investigate the role of manager support in the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction and concluded that work-life balance favorably impacts managers' job satisfaction. Alkan (2019), examined the relationship between work-life balance and work engagement of school administrators and found that there is a relationship between work-life balance and work engagement. It also was concluded that there was a significant difference in favor of the study, and there were significant differences in the scores of the scale of work engagement according to the variables of marital status, spouse's employment, gender, having children, graduation, staff status, graduation.

Kiral (2020) investigated the relationship between high school administrators' empowerment of teachers and teachers' school engagement. The analyses conducted regarding teachers' levels of commitment revealed that there was no significant difference according to the subject variable, but it was found that male teachers possessed lower emotional commitment than female teachers. The researcher found that there was no significant difference in terms of work-life balance according to teachers' seniority, subject, and gender variables.

The work-life balance and job stress of employees who were required to work from home in their studies, on the other hand, were found to have a substantial impact on job satisfaction, according to Irawanto, Novianti, and Roz (2021). According to Akcebe (2022), there is a low correlation between attitudes toward teleworking and work-life balance. However, Ünal (2021) compared the work-life balance with the distance learning process during the pandemic process and discovered that teachers found it challenging to distinguish between work and non-work life when they had to work from home; they were unable to find time for professional development; they were unable to find time for their families or themselves; and the pandemic process had a negative psychological and physical impact on them.

According to research on work-life balance, psychological safety, and occupational health conducted by Gragnano, Simbula and Miglioretti (2020), job satisfaction is more strongly influenced by occupational health than by work-life balance. On the other hand, Demirbağ, Demir and Yozgat (2021) explored the connection between psychological safety and work-life balance and discovered that both psychological safety and the efficiency of remote working were regulated by work-life balance. It is also seen in the literature review that; Work-life balance, that is, establishing a balance between working life and private life, which are two separate sub-dimensions of individual life, is very important for both the individual and the society (Yalçınkaya, 2019). If this balance is not achieved, serious problems may arise in personal, organizational and familial areas such as the emergence of diseases, dissatisfaction with life, increase in family problems and divorce, increasing problems with parents, increase in juvenile delinquency and violence, and inefficiency of employees (Karaoğlu, 2019; Akın, 2019; Alkan, 2019).

When comparing the teaching profession to other occupations, it is clear that it has quite different qualities. Some parts consider it as an easy job due to the flexibility of working hours and summer vacations, while the experiences of instructors in the background go mostly unreported. Several issues are faced in the background. All social events and the production of working papers during the semester, which are chores unrelated to education, as well as class preparation, are various elements that enhance instructors' workload (Nakip, 2015). According to studies undertaken by educational groups, teachers are overworked and one-third of them suffer from stress and burnout. To overcome these challenges, a teacher must always be committed to self-improvement, a constant learner, and the most hardworking. He or she should stay current on innovations in his or her profession, be able to use those developments, update course tools and materials as appropriate, and seek methods to improve his or her teaching. A teacher or administrator, on the other hand, must make time for his or her family, friends, and self. As a result, when duties in life outside of school are added to responsibilities at school, teachers and administrators may struggle to fulfill these various responsibilities. A person's work-life balance might be thrown off after a stressful

procedure due to variables such as forgotten obligations, exhaustion, and stress. In both family and corporate life, problems and tension might arise (Akbarova, 2019). In this respect, it is believed that the concept of work-life balance of teachers and administrators should be examined in depth. For these reasons, it was seen necessary to conduct this study.

The purpose of this study is to display the work-life balance of individuals who work as classroom teachers, Turkish language teachers and administrators in Turkey and Northern Cyprus and its examination according to various demographic and professional characteristics. In line with purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. Are teachers and administrators able to maintain work-life balance?
2. Are the levels of work-life balance of teachers and administrators affected by their gender, marital status, having children, their status and age?
3. Are the levels of work-life harmony, neglecting life, making time for oneself and life is work, which are the sub-dimensions of work-life balance of teachers and administrators, affected by their gender, marital status, having children, status, and age?

2. METHOD
2.1. Research Design
The study was conducted with relational screening model. Screening model ensures that the study conducted on the sample selected from identified population describes that sample quantitatively (Cresswell, 2012). In this approach, it is essential that the researcher does not affect the process except for the application of the tools necessary to collect the desired data (Büyüköztürk et al., 2018). In studies using relational screening model, it is aimed to determine the relationship between two or more variables (Kaya, Balay ve Göçen, 2012).

2.2. Population of the Study
The universe of the research consisted of people who worked as Classroom Teachers, Turkish Language Teachers and administrators in Turkey and Northern Cyprus in the 2021-2022 academic year. The sample included a total of 1059 people, 836 of whom were teachers and 223 of whom were administrators, who were selected using the random sampling method. The distribution of the participants by demographic and professional characteristics is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic and Professional Characteristics of Participants

		N	%
Gender	Female	651	61,5
	Male	408	38,5
Age	22-30	203	19,2
	31-40	443	41,8
	41-50	294	27,8
	51 and above	119	11,2
Marital status	Single	281	26,5
	Married	778	73,5
Have children?	Yes	715	67,5
	No	344	32,5
With whom one lives	Family	902	85,2
	Alone	157	14,8
Status	Teacher	836	78,9
	Administrator	223	21,1
Which region do you work in?	Marmara	215	20,3
	Mediterranean	171	16,1
	Central Anatolia	163	15,4
	Aegean	139	13,1
	Southeast Anatolia	99	9,3
	TRNC	98	9,3

	Black Sea	89	8,4
	Eastern Anatolia	85	8,0

As seen in Table 1, 61.5% of the teachers and administrators participating in the study are female and 38.5% are male. In terms of age, 19.2% of the participants are 22-30 years old, 41.8% are 31-40 years old, 27.8% are 41-50 years old, and 11.2% are 51 years old and older. In terms of marital status, 73.5% of the participants are married and 67.5% have children. In addition, it was determined that 85.2% of the participants lived with their families and 78.9% were teachers. As for the region of duty, it was found out that 20.3% of the participants worked in Marmara, 16.1% in the Mediterranean, 15.4% in Central Anatolia, 9.3% in Southeast Anatolia, 8.0% in Eastern Anatolia, 13.1% in Aegean, 8.4% in Black Sea and 9.3% in TRNC.

2.3. Collection of Data and Data Collection Tools
The data of the research were collected through an online questionnaire including Personal Information Form and Work-Life Balance Scale. The Work-Life Balance Scale was developed by Apaydın (2011). The scale, which consists of a total of 20 5-point Likert-type items, includes four sub-dimensions called Work-Life Harmony, Neglecting Life, Making Time for Oneself, and Life is Work. An increase in the total score obtained from the scale and its sub-dimensions indicates an increase in the relevant level. The reliability of the scale was found as α=0.791.

2.4. Analysis of Data
The data collected within the scope of the study were evaluated with quantitative analysis methods using the SPSS-26 program. In this context, frequency analysis, descriptive statistics methods, independent groups t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Tukey HSD test were used. The reason for using parametric tests is that the data meet the normality condition. This was decided by examining the skewness and kurtosis values. Since these values were between +-1.50, it was decided that the data were normally distributed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

3. FINDINGS
3.1. Work-Life Balance Total Score
Whether total scores of work-life balance differed significantly according to gender, marital status, having children and status was examined by using independent groups t-test, and the findings are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Examination of Work-Life Balance Total Scores by Gender, Marital Status, Having Children and Status

		n	Mean	S	t	Sd	p
Gender	Female	651	66,65	11,82	-0,830	944,426	0,407
	Male	408	67,22	10,41			
Marital Status	Married	778	67,32	11,19	-2,136	403,848	0,330
	Single	281	65,62	11,50			
Having children	Yes	715	67,24	10,74	1,479	599,477	0,140
	No	344	66,09	12,36			
Status	Teacher	836	66,73	11,32	-0,748	351,633	0,455
	Manager	223	67,37	11,23			

According to Table-2, work-life balance total scores did not differ significantly according to gender, marital status, having children and status (p>0.05).

In addition, when the scores obtained are evaluated according to the lowest and highest scores that can be obtained from the scale, it has been determined that the scores are generally at a moderate level (about 58%). This showed that the participants were able to maintain a medium level of work-life balance.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine whether the work-life balance total scores showed significant difference by age, and the findings are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Analysis of Work-Life Balance Total Scores by Age

		Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	p
Age	Inter-groups	1393,516	3	424,505	3,668	**0,012**
	Intra-groups	133600,7	1055	126,636		

	Total	134994,2

* p<0,05.

Accordingly, work-life balance total scores differed significantly according to age (p>0.05). As a result of multiple comparisons (post-hoc), the work-life balance scores of those aged 51 and over were found to be significantly higher than the participants aged between 22 and 30.

3.2. Work-Life Harmony Sub-Dimension Score
Whether the scores of the work-life harmony sub-dimension differed significantly according to gender, marital status, having children, status and with whom one lived were examined by using independent groups t-test, and the findings are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Examination of Work-Life Harmony Sub-Dimension Scores by Gender, Marital Status, Having Children, Status, and Living with Whom

		n	Mean	s	T	Sd	p
Gender	Female	651	19,62	5,84	0,803	827,067	0,422
	Male	408	19,31	6,18			
Marital Status	Married	281	19,44	5,89	-0,202	504,509	0,840
	Single	778	19,52	6,01			
Having children	Yes	715	19,4	6,02	-0,789	693,194	0,430
	No	344	19,71	5,87			
Status	Teacher	836	19,31	5,97	-2,051	350,369	**0,041**
	Administrator	223	20,23	5,95			
Living with Whom	Family	902	19,58	5,98	0,957	214,541	0,340
	Alone	157	19,08	5,95			

* p<0,05.

According to Table-4, the work-life harmony sub-dimension scores did not differ significantly according to gender, marital status, having children and with whom one lived (p>0.05). However, significant difference was found according to status (p<0.05). The work-life harmony scores of the administrators are significantly higher than the teachers. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine whether the work-life harmony sub-dimension scores differed significantly according to age and region of duty, and the findings are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Analysis of Work-Life Harmony Sub-Dimension Scores by Age and Region of Duty

		Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	P
Age	Inter-groups	2,255	3	0,752	0,021	0,996
	Intra-groups	37732,49	1055	35,765		
	Total	37,734,74	1058			
Region of Duty	Inter-groups	806,409	7	115,21	3,279	**0,002**
	Intra-groups	36928,28	1051	35,136		
	Total	37734,74	1058			

* p<0,05.

As seen in the table, the scores of the work-life harmony sub-dimension did not differ significantly according to age (p>0.05), but differed significantly according to the region of duty (p<0.05). Work-life harmony scores of the participants working in the TRNC were found to be significantly higher than those working in the Mediterranean, Central Anatolia, Eastern Anatolia, and Aegean regions.

3.3. Neglecting Life Sub-Dimension Score
Whether the scores of neglecting life sub-dimension differed significantly according to gender, marital status, having children, status and with whom one lived was examined by using independent groups t-test, and the findings are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Examination of Neglecting Life Sub-Dimension Scores by Gender, Marital Status, Having Children, Status and Living with Whom

		n	Mean	s	T	Sd	P
Gender	Female	651	19,76	4,40	-3,959	925,216	**0,000**
	Male	408	20,80	4,00			
Marital Status	Married	281	19,44	5,89	-0,202	504,509	0,840
	Single	778	19,52	6,01			
Having children	Yes	715	20,25	4,19	0,936	643,881	0,350
	No	344	19,98	4,44			
Status	Teacher	836	20,17	4,23	0,151	336,651	0,880
	Administrator	223	20,12	4,45			
Living with Whom	Family	902	20,11	4,28	-0,866	214,501	0,386
	Alone	157	20,43	4,26			

* p<0,05.

When Table-6 is examined, the scores of the neglecting life sub-dimension did not differ significantly according to marital status, having children, status and with whom one lived (p>0.05), but significant difference was found according to gender (p<0, 05). Neglecting life scores of males are significantly higher than the scores of females.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine whether the scores of neglecting life sub-dimension differed significantly according to age and region of duty, and the findings are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Examination of Neglecting Life Sub-Dimension Scores by Age and Region of Duty

		Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	P
Age	Inter-groups	419,38	3	139,793	7,796	**0,000**
	Intra-groups	18917,33	1055	17,931		
	Total	19336,71	1058			
Region of Duty	Inter-groups	126,697	7	18	0,99	0,437
	Intra-groups	19210,01	1051	18,278		
	Total	19336,71	1058			

* p<0,05.

According to Table-7, the scores of the neglecting life sub-dimension did not differ significantly according to the region of duty (p>0.05), but showed a significant difference according to age (p<0.05). Work-life harmony scores of participants aged 51 and over were found to be significantly higher than all other participants.

3.4. Making Time for Oneself Sub-Dimension Score
Whether the scores of the sub-dimension of making time for oneself differed significantly according to gender, marital status, having children, status and with whom one lived was examined by using the independent groups t-test, and the findings are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Examination of making Time for Oneself Sub-Dimension Scores According to Gender, Marital Status, Having Children, Status and Living with Whom

		n	Mean	s	t	Sd	P
Gender	Female	651	13,59	3,70	-0,017	868,123	0,987
	Male	408	13,59	3,68			
Marital Status	Married	281	13,07	3,76	-2,710	483,396	**0,007**
	Single	778	13,71	3,66			
Having children	Yes	715	13,74	3,62	1,906	643,127	0,570
	No	344	13,27	3,83			
Status	Teacher	836	13,55	3,66	-0,572	337,97	0,567

	Administrator	223	13,72	3,83			
Living with Whom	Family	902	13,69	3,66	2,110	207,821	**0,036**
	Alone	157	12,99	3,86			

* p<0,05.

According to the table, the scores of making time for oneself sub-dimension did not differ significantly by gender, having children and status (p>0.05). However, significant difference was found according to marital status and with whom one lived (p<0.05). Singles and those living with their families obtained significantly higher scores for making time for themselves than the married and those living alone.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine whether the scores of the sub-dimension of taking time for oneself differed significantly according to age and region of duty. The obtained findings are given in Table 9.

Table 9. Examining the Scores of Making Time for Oneself Sub-Dimension by Age and Region of Duty

		Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	P
Age	Inter-groups	228,213	3	76,071	5,648	**0,001**
	Intra-groups	14210,28	1055	13,469		
	Total	144338,49	1058			
Region of Duty	Inter-groups	136,646	7	19,521	1,435	0,188
	Intra-groups	14301,85	1051	13,608		
	Total	14438,49	1058			

* p<0,05.

Accordingly, the scores of the sub-dimension of making time for oneself did not differ significantly according to the region of duty (p>0.05), but showed a significant difference according to age (p<0.05). The scores of the participants aged between 22-30 years of making time for themselves were found to be significantly lower than those between the ages of 31-40 and those aged 51 and over.

3.5. "Life is Work" Sub-dimension Scores
Whether the scores of the "life is work" sub-dimension differed significantly according to gender, marital status, having children, status and with whom they lived was examined by using independent groups t-test, and the findings are given in Table 10.

Table 10. Examination of "Life is Work" Sub-Dimension Scores by Gender, Marital Status, Having Children, Status and Living with Whom

		n	Mean	s	T	Sd	p
Gender	Female	651	13,68	2,73	0,984	925,064	0,326
	Male	408	13,52	2,48			
Marital Status	Married	281	13,02	2,78	-4,229	461,277	**0,000**
	Single	778	13,83	2,55			
Having children	Yes	715	13,85	2,51	4,011	610,018	**0,000**
	No	344	13,13	2,83			
Status	Teacher	836	13,70	2,65	2,044	357,090	**0,042**
	Administrator	223	13,30	2,58			
Living with Whom	Family	902	13,69	2,64	2,285	216,234	0,230
	Alone	157	13,18	2,59			

* p<0,05.

As seen in the table, the scores of the "life is work" sub-dimension did not differ significantly according to gender and with whom one lived (p>0.05). However, significant difference was found according to marital status, having children and status (p<0.05). Singles, those with children, and teachers obtained higher scores on "life is work" than the married, the childless, and the administrators.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine whether the scores of the "life is work" sub-dimension differed significantly according to age and region of duty, and the findings are given in Table 11.

Table 11. Examination of the Scores of the "Life is Work" Sub-dimension According to Age and Region of Duty

		Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	p
Age	Inter-groups	56,616	3	18,872	2,727	**0,043**
	Intra-groups	7301,964	1055	6,921		
	Total	7358,58	1058			
Region of Duty	Inter-groups	51,741	7	7,392	1,063	0,385
	Intra-groups	7306,839	1051	6,952		
	Total	7358,58	1058			

* p<0,05.

According to the table, the scores of "life is work" sub-dimension did not differ significantly according to the task region (p>0.05), but showed a significant difference according to age (p<0.05). The "life is work" scores of the participants aged between 22-30 years old were found to be significantly higher than those between the ages of 31-40 and those aged 51 and over.

4. DISCUSSION

1059 people participated in the study on the work-life balance of teachers and administrators. In this study, which included teachers and administrators, sub-dimensions of the work-life balance scale were interpreted in accordance with independent considerations. There was no significant difference between "life is work," "making time for oneself," "work-life harmony," and gender when the sub-dimensions of the work-life balance scale and the independent variable of gender were analyzed. However, there was a significant difference between gender and "neglecting life." In a related study, Paçal (2019) found that the "life is work" sub-dimension and gender showed a substantial difference, with the other sub-dimensions showing no difference at all.

When the link between the status variable and the sub-dimensions of the work-life balance scale was explored, the sub-dimension "life is work" did reveal a significant difference, but making time for oneself, neglecting life, and work-life harmony did not. The administrators' somewhat increased workload and their greater focus on work in order to succeed in their jobs are two factors contributing to this. Apaydn (2011) evaluated professors based more on their titles than on their rank. Their differences in the sub-dimension "life is work" were quite significant, according to the study. Both studies found the same results for making time for oneself, and no significant differences were found in this sub-dimension. They did not achieve the same outcomes with the disregarding life sub-dimension, though. It was found in Apaydn's study that professors and assistant professors neglected their personal lives. In Apaydn's study, the work-life harmony sub-dimension and status/title were significantly different for professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, but not for teachers and administrators (Apaydn, 2011).

The independent variable of married status and the sub-dimensions did not differ significantly. Similarly, the sub-dimension "life is work" showed a substantial difference, despite there being no statistically significant difference between the other sub-dimensions of "making time for oneself," "neglecting life," or "work-life harmony." Married people view life as more work than singles do. We can explain this by assuming that married people prioritize their careers in order to ensure that their families enjoy greater standards of living. There was not a significant difference between any of the sub-dimensions and marital status in Usta's (2020) study.

While there was no significant difference between the teachers and administrators having children and the sub-dimensions of making time for oneself, work-life harmony and neglecting life, a significant difference was found in terms of the sub-dimension of "life is work". Those who do not have children tend to see life as work. In a similar study conducted by Usta (2020), the number of children was examined. According to the results of that analysis, no significant difference was found in terms of all sub-dimensions (Usta, 2020). There was no significant difference between the age independent variable and all sub-dimensions of work-life balance. According to Yalçın (2019), who conducted a comparable study, significant difference was found only in terms of work-life harmony sub-dimension. Work-life harmony scores of participants aged 50 and over were found significantly higher than those aged 40 and younger (Yalçın, 2019).

While there is no significant difference between who the teachers and administrators live with and the sub-dimensions of work-life harmony and neglecting life, there is a significant difference in terms of the sub-dimensions of making time for oneself and "life is work". Compared to those living alone, those who live with their families can devote time to themselves and do not see life as just work. In Babacan's (2020) study, however, no significant difference was found between who the participants lived with and all sub-dimensions.

5. CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the study, firstly, it was seen that participants ensure work-life balance at a moderate level. In addition, it was found out that the work-life balance of participants did not show difference according to gender, marital status, having children and status. When the work-life harmony levels of participants are examined, it has been concluded that there is no difference according to gender, marital status, having children and with whom one lived, whereas work-life harmony showed difference according to their status. In this respect, it has been determined that teachers have higher level of work-life harmony compared to administrators.

When the levels of disregarding life of the teachers and administrators participating in the study were evaluated, it was discovered that there was a substantial variation based on the participants' gender and age. Female participants were shown to be more neglectful of life than male participants. When the age variable was studied, it was discovered that those in the 51-60 age group neglected life less than those in the other age groups. It was established that the level of life neglect did not alter according on the participants' marital status, whether or not they had children, their status, or who they lived with. When the time allocation levels of the participants were studied within the scope of the research, it was discovered that there was no variation based on gender, marital status, whether or not they had children, status, age, or the region where they worked. Furthermore, it has been discovered that there is a difference based on who the participants live with, and that this difference is produced by the participants living with their family. It was discovered that persons who live with their family devote more time to themselves than those who live alone.

It was discovered that there is no difference in participants' "life is work" levels, which is another component of the study, based on their gender, age, and region of duty characteristics. The study found that the "life is work" sub-dimension differs by marital status, with married people seeing life as more labor than other participants. Furthermore, it was discovered that individuals who do not have children regard life as work more than participants who do.

When the "life is work" level of participants was examined according to their status, it emerged that teachers do not see life as simply work, whereas administrators do. It was also found that the "life is work" level fluctuated depending on who one lived with, with participants who live alone receiving higher scores than individuals who live with their family.

The results of the study can be reconstructed by considering different teaching fields. It can be done in 7 different regions of Turkey to compare work-life balances between regions. This study can be handled with a sociological approach and it can be investigated why people put their work at the center of life. With a similar approach, the problems of individuals who have problems in work-life adjustment can be investigated. It can increase the awareness of individuals on different issues with in-service trainings for teachers and administrators. By improving the working conditions of teachers and administrators, it can be helped to achieve a more comfortable work-life balance. By reducing the workload of managers who see life as work, improvements can be made in their work-life balance.

References

Akbarova, L. (2019). *İş-yaşam dengesi ve iş performansi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi ve bir araştırma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Akın, E. (2019). *Meslek liserinde çalışan öğretmenlerin iş yaşam dengesi sorunu : İzmit örneği*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.

Alkan, U. (2019). *Okul yöneticilerinin çalışmaya tutkunluk ve iş-yaşam dengesi arasındaki ilişkisi (İstanbul ili Sancaktepe ilçesi örneği)*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Çanakkale.

Apaydın, Ç. (2011) *Öğretim üyelerinin işe bağımlılık düzeyi ile iş-yaşam dengesi ve iş-aile yaşam dengesi arasındaki ilişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Araslar, A. (2021). *İş yükü ile iş-yaşam dengesinin işten ayrılma niyeti üzerine etkisi*. Doktora Tezi, Bursa Uludag Üniversitesi

Babacan, B. (2020). *Yoğun Bakım Hemşirelerinin İş Yaşam Dengesinin İncelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ege Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.

Babayiğit, A. (2016). *İş yaşam dengesinin örgütsel bağlilik ve işten ayrılma niyeti*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya.

Batur, M. S., & Saylık, A. (2022). İş yaşam dengesinin yordayıcısı olarak tükenmişlik: Türkiye'de halk eğitimi merkezi müdürleri üzerine bir çalışma. *Trakya Eğitim Dergisi*, 12(1), 381-395.

Demirbağ, O., Demir, H. C., & Yozgat, U. (2021). Uzaktan çalışmanın iş güvencesizliğine etkisinde iş-yaşam dengesi ve psikolojik güvenliğin düzenleyici-aracılık rolü. *Hitit Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14(1), 1-25.

Ekinci, H. (2021). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin görüşlerine göre iş yaşam dengesi ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya.

Ergin, R. (2022). *Öğretmenlerin iş yaşam dengesi ve iş doyumu arasındaki ilişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Pamukkale Üniversitesi

Girdap, E. (2019). *Kariyerizm ile iş-yaşam dengesi arasındaki ilişki üzerine bir araştırma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi İşletme Estitüsü, Sakarya.

Gragnano, A., Simbula, S., & Miglioretti, M. (2020). Work–life balance: Weighing the importance of work–family and work–health balance. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(3), 907.

Irawanto, D. W., Novianti, K. R., & Roz, K. (2021). Work from home: Measuring satisfaction between work–life balance and work stress during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Economies*, 9(3), 96.

İzki, Ö. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin iş aile yaşam dengesinin performanslarına etkisi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Karaoğlu, B.O. (2020). *İş-yaşam dengesinin çalışanların işe olan tutumuna etkisi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Kerim, Z. (2021). *Okul yöneticilerinin sergiledikleri takım liderliği davranışları ile öğretmenlerin iş doyumu ve iş yaşam dengesi arasındaki ilişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Pamukkale Üniversitesi

Kiral, B. (2020). The relationship between the empowerment of teachers by school administrators and organizational commitments of teachers. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 7(1), 248-265.

Nakip, C. (2015). *Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik öz-yeterlik inançları ile öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları arasındaki ilişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bolu.

Paçalı, S. (2019). *Spor Kuruluşları Çalışanlarının İş-Yaşam Dengesi İş Tatmini Ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi: Muğla İli Örneği*. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Muğla.

Tabachnick, B.G., Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed).Boston: Allyn ve Bacon.

Teker, S. (2015). *Okullarda iş-yaşam dengesiyle örgütsel adalet ilişkisi*. İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Tuğsal, T. (2017*). İş-yaşam dengesi, sosyal destek ve sosyo-demografik faktörlerin tükenmişlik üzerindeki etkisi*. İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Usta, M. (2020). *Dönüşümcü Liderlik İle İş Doyumu İlişkisinde İş-Yaşam Dengesinin Rolü: Muhasebe Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Ünal, I. (2021). Teachers' work-life balance in emergency remote teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 17(2).

Yalçın, B. (2019). *İş Yaşamında Var Olmama Durumu Ve İşyaşam Dengesi Arasındaki İlişkinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma*. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.

Yalçınkaya, E. (2019*). Öğrenilmiş güçlülük ile iş-yaşam dengesi arasındaki ilişki: Otomotiv sektöründe bir araştırma*. Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bursa.

Yavuz, N. (2018). *İş-yaşam dengesi ile iş stresinin esnek çalışma uygulamaları bağlamında incelenmesi*. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.