

Üniversite Öğrencilerinde, Rekreasyon Faaliyetlerine Katılım ile Yaşam Kalitesi Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi

Investigation of The Correlation Between Quality of Life and Participation in Recreative Activities of University Students

ORIJİNAL ARAŞTIRMA/ ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Gülsüm BAŞTUĞ¹

Ercan ZORBA²

Şahali ÖZKARA³

Uğur ALTINCİT⁴

¹Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7916-2042>

²Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7864-0556>

³Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7835-8294>

⁴Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4383-5417>

Yayın Bilgisi

Gönderi Tarihi: 07.03.2018

Kabul Tarihi: 22.12.2018

Online Yayın Tarihi: 31.12.2018

Öz

Bu araştırmanın amacı, üniversite öğrencilerinde, rekreasyon faaliyetlerine katılım ile yaşam kalitesi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesidir. Çalışmaya, Gazi Üniversitesi ve Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Spor bilimleri Fakültesi'nde öğrenim gören, yaş ortalaması 21,54±2,02 olan, 276 erkek ve 222 kadından oluşan toplam 498 denek gönüllü katılmıştır. Araştırmaya katılan üniversite öğrencilerine kişisel bilgi formu, yaşam kalitesini belirlemek Dünya Sağlık Örgütü Yaşam Kalitesi Ölçeği Kısa Formu (WHOQOL-27) kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde crosstab, Ki-kare, independent t test ve korelasyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Sonuç olarak, yaşam kalitesi alt boyutu olan fiziksel alan ile gelir düzeyi arasında, psikolojik alan ile akademik başarı, gelir düzeyi ve yaşamını geçirdiği yer arasında, sosyal alan ile yaş ve gelir düzeyi arasında, çevresel alan ile gelir düzeyi ve haftalık serbest zaman süresi arasında anlamlı ilişki tespit edilmiştir. Araştırmaya katılan üniversite öğrencilerinde, yaşam kalitesi alt boyutları fiziksel alan ve psikolojik alan toplam puanı ile serbest zamanlarını değerlendirilmede yaşanan güçlüklerle ilişkin verilen cevaplar arasında pozitif yönde anlamlı ilişki bulunmuştur. Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam kalitesini artırmak amacıyla, kampüs içi ve dışında serbest zamanı verimli ve aktif geçirebileceği rekreasyon alanlarının oluşturulması önerilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Rekreasyon, Üniversite öğrencisi, Yaşam kalitesi

Abstract

The aim of this research was to investigate of the correlation between quality of living and participation in recreative activities of university students. A total of 498 subjects, of which 276 male and 222 female, with a mean age of 21.54 ± 2.02, who are students of Faculty of Sports Sciences of both Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University and Gazi University, voluntarily participated to our survey. The World Health Organization Quality of Life Scale-Short Form (WHOQOL-27) and personal information form were used to determine the quality of life for university students participating in the study. Crosstab, Chi-square, independent t-test and correlation analysis were used in the analysis of the data. As a result, it was found that there is a significant correlation between the physical field and the income level, which is the quality of life subscale, between the psychological field and the academic achievement, the income level and the place of life, between the social field and the age and income level. A positive correlation was found in the positive direction for university students participating in the survey between the quality of life subscales total score of the physical and psychological field and the answers about difficulties in assessing your free time. In order to improve the quality of life of university students, it is suggested to create recreation areas where they can spend free time efficiently and actively on and off campus.

Key words: Recreation, University student, Life quality.

INTRODUCTION

Developed countries have used sport as a means to overcome the shortcomings of rapid urbanization as a result of industrialization, which they recognize as important for sports community health. Then, during wars and economic depression, they benefited from the therapeutic and revitalizing effects of sports (Hazar, 2009). Happiness in people's lives will evolve depending on the qualities of life they have achieved. Scientific studies show that the effect of the quality of life on the recreation is positive. Recreation is an interdisciplinary field of study involving voluntary activities to improve the quality of life of a human being, free of charge and free of harm to nature (Tütüncü, 2012). The World Health Organization defines the quality of life as "the way in which people perceive their situation in the context of the culture and value judgments they live in, depending on their goals, expectations, standards, and interest" (WHO, 2003). The quality of life describes the subjective perception of self-health in the sociocultural environment in which one lives. The quality of life is the satisfaction and happiness of being in possession with the desires of the people that they consider important in their life (Başaran, Güzel & Sarpel, 2005). Quality of life displays; gender, age, marital status, social support, housing and characteristics, health, education, income, work life, leisure activities (Aydiner, 2007; Gössweiner, Pfeiffer and Richter, 2002; Özmete, 2010; Torlak and Yavuzçehre, 2008; Tüzün and Eker, 2003). There is a correlation between the quality of life and economic functions. As the economic level increases, the quality of life is increasing which is supported by the studies (Koltarla, 2008; Şeker and Zırhlıoğlu, 2009). Leisure time activities are one of the most important elements that improve the quality of life of the individual and contribute to the individual discovering, renewing and revealing himself/herself (Aslan and Cansever, 2012). Sirgy, Grzeskowiak, and Rahtz (2007) define university quality of life as a measure of positive evaluation of the general quality of university life as a whole. The issues of university life quality, drug and alcohol consumption, social and sexual behavior, time use, consumption and financial issues, physical and mental issues, multiculturalism and gender issues, learning styles, career and employment issues, crime and violence, have been studied in ten dimensions as life topics (Dish, Harlow, Campbell & Dougan, 2000). In the light of this information, the aim of this study is to examine the correlation between the participation of university students in recreational activities and quality of life.

METHODS

Participants and Procedures

A total of 498 subjects consisting of 276 males and 222 females with a mean age of 21.54 ± 2.02 from the Faculty of Sports Sciences of Gazi University and the Faculty of Sports Sciences of the University of Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University participated to the study of the correlation between participation in recreational activities of university students and quality of life. The World Health Organization Quality of Life Scale-Short Form (WHOQOL-27), which was validated by Eser et al. (1999), and personal information forms were used to determine the quality of life for university students participating in the study.

World Health Organization Quality of Life Scale Short Form (WHOQOL-BREF-27); The World Health Organization Quality of Life Scale-Short Form defines quality life as "how the individual perceives his or her life in relation to its goals, expectations, standards, and concerns within the culture and values system in which the individual lives". WHOQOL-BREF is a short form of WHOQOL-100 developed by the World Health Organization and consisting of 6 sub-dimensions. For each of the 24 episodes of WHOQOL-100, one question was omitted and two questions were added regarding general health and quality of life. This scale, which is composed of 26 items and has a rating type of 5, is prepared as "1 = Never Satisfied, 5 = Very Satisfied". There are four subdimensions: physical health such as the feeling of pain, sleep, energy, positive emotions, self-esteem, psychological health such as body image, social support such as social support, personal correlations and environmental health such as economic situation, transportation, safe environment and health conditions. High score points to the high quality of life. Turkish adaptation was performed by Eser et al. (1999). A question related to the environment in Turkey and has more adaptation covers a total of 27 questions. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients of the scale were found to be .76 in the physical health dimension, .67 in the psychological health dimension, .56 in the social dimension, and .74 in the environmental dimension in the healthy group. Retest reliability ranged from .51 to .81 (Aydemir and Köroğlu, 2007; Eser et al., 1999).

Analysis of Data; One-way analysis of variance (One-Way ANOVA) was used in the analysis of multiple variables. The resulting differences were re-evaluated by the Tukey test and

found to be average that produced significant differences. The correlation between participation and quality of life for recreational activities was analyzed using the Pearson Correlation Test.

FINDINGS

Table 1. Answers distributions of University students to the question "How do you evaluate your free time?"

	How do you evaluate your free time?						Total
	Participating in domestic activities	Participating in physical activities	Participating in social events	Participating in cultural-artistic events	Participating in open space events	Other	
Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University	44 18.3%	92 38.2%	66 27.4%	6 2.5%	13 5.4%	20 8.3%	241 100.0%
Gazi University	48 18.7%	89 34.6%	77 30.0%	11 4.3%	13 5.1%	19 7.4%	257 100.0%
Total	92 18.5%	181 36.3%	143 28.7%	17 3.4%	26 5.2%	39 7.8%	498 100.0%

$\chi^2=2,054$; $p>0,05$

According to Table 1, There was no significant difference between the answers given to the questionnaire of university students when they were asked how they assessed the free time ($p> 0,05$). Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University Social Science Faculty students' responses are as follows: %18,3 of them were domestic activities, 38.2% of them were physical activities, 27.4% of them were social activities, 2.5% of them were cultural and artistic activities, 5.4% of them were outdoor activities and 8,3% of them were other free time events. Gazi University Social Science Faculty students' responses are as follows:18.7% of them were domestic activities, 34.6% of them were physical activities, 30% of them were social activities, 4.3% of them were cultural-artistic activities, 5.1% of them were outdoor activities and 7,4% of them were other free time activities.

Table 2. Distribution of answers given by university students to question "How do you find your quality of life?"

	How do you find your quality of life?					Total
	Terrible	Bad	Mediocre	Good	Very Good	
Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University	7 2.9%	12 5.0%	119 49.4%	88 36.5%	15 6.2%	241 100.0%
Gazi University	7 2.7%	19 7.4%	143 55.6%	80 31.1%	8 3.1%	257 100.0%
Total	14 2.8%	31 6.2%	262 52.6%	168 33.7%	23 4.6%	498 100.0%

According to Table 2, There was no significant difference between the answers given to the questionnaire "how do you find your quality of life? " ($p > 0,05$). Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University Social Science Faculty students' responses are as follows: 2.9% of them were terrible, 5% of them were bad, 49.4% of them were mediocre, 36.5% of them were good and 6.2% were very good. Gazi University Social Science Faculty students' responses are as follows: 2.7% of them was terrible, 7.4% of them were bad, 55.6% of them mediocre, 31.1% of them were good and 3,1% of them were very good.

Table 3. Examination of the correlation between age, gender, department, class, academic achievement status, income level, place of residence, place of life, weekly free time period and sub-dimensions of quality of life for university students.

		Age	Gender	Department	Class	Academic achievement status	Income level	Place of Residence	Place of life	Weekly Free Time Period
Physical field	r	-.001	.033	-.026	.053	.020	.123**	.071	.060	.062
	p	.979	.464	.558	.238	.663	.006	.114	.180	.166
Psychological field	r	.030	-.006	.010	-.078	.122**	.153**	-.005	.099*	.054
	p	.498	.885	.829	.083	.006	.001	.913	.028	.226
Social field	r	.090*	-.004	.046	.045	.057	.118**	-.031	.059	.052
	p	.045	.928	.301	.321	.206	.008	.489	.186	.244
Environmental field	r	-.001	.061	-.006	.036	.013	.149**	-.054	.075	.123**
	p	.982	.174	.894	.428	.780	.001	.233	.095	.006

According to Table 3, no significant correlation was found between the total score of physical field and age ($r = -0.001$), between the total score of physical field and gender ($r = 0.033$), between the total score of physical field and department ($r = -0,026$), between the total score of physical field and class ($r = 0,053$), between the total score of physical field and academic achievement ($r = 0,020$), between the total score of physical field and place of residence ($r = 0,071$), between the total score of physical field and place of life ($r = 0,060$), between the total score of physical field and weekly free time period ($r = 0,062$) ($p > 0.05$). However, there was a significant positive correlation between physical field and income level ($r = 0,123$; $p < 0,05$).

No significant correlation was found between the total score of psychological field and age ($r = 0,030$), between the total score of psychological field and gender ($r = -0.006$), between the total score of psychological field and department ($r = 0.010$), between the total score of psychological field and class ($r = -0,078$), between the total score of psychological field and place of residence ($r = -0,005$), between the total score of psychological field and weekly free time

period ($r=0,054$) ($p > 0.05$). However a significant correlation was found between the psychological field and academic achievement ($r = 0,122$), between the psychological field and income level ($r = 0,153$) and between the psychological field and place of life ($r = 0,099$) ($p < 0.05$). No significant correlation was found between the total score of social field and gender ($r = -0,004$), between the total score of social field and department ($r = 0.046$), between the total score of social field and class ($r=0.045$), between the total score of social field and academic achievement ($r=0,057$), between the total score of social field and place of residence ($r=-0,031$), between the total score of social field and place of life ($r=0,059$), between the total score of social field and weekly free time period ($r=0,052$) ($p > 0.05$). However, there was a significant correlation between social field and age ($r = 0.090$), and between social field and income level ($r = 0.118$) ($p < 0.05$). No significant correlation was found between the total score of environmental field and age ($r = -0,001$), between the total score of environmental field and gender ($r = 0,061$), between the total score of environmental field and department ($r = -0,006$), between the total score of environmental field and class ($r=0.036$), between the total score of environmental field and academic achievement ($r=0,013$), between the total score of environmental field and place of residence ($r=-0,054$), between the total score of environmental field and place of life ($r=0,075$) ($p > 0.05$). However, there was a significant correlation between environmental field and income level ($r = 0.149$) and between environmental field and weekly free time ($r = 0.123$) ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4. Examining the correlation between the questions of "How often do you have difficulty in evaluating your free time?," "How do you generally evaluate your leisure time?" and sub-dimensions of quality of life for university students.

		How often do you have difficulty in evaluating your free time	How do you generally evaluate your leisure time?
Physical field	r	.096*	-.042
	p	.032	.346
Psychological field	r	.194**	.062
	p	.000	.165
Social field	r	.084	-.053
	p	.061	.239
Environmental field	r	.047	.003
	p	.295	.942

According to Table 4, there was a significant positive correlation between the total score of the physical field and the answers given in the question about how often you had difficulty in evaluating your free time ($r=0,096$) ($p < 0,05$). There was no significant correlation between the total score of the physical field and the answers given in the question about how you generally evaluated your free time ($r=0,042$) ($p > 0,05$). There was a significant positive correlation between the total score of the psychological field and the answers to the question about how often you had difficulty in evaluating your free time ($r=0,194$) ($p < 0,05$). There was no significant correlation between the total score of the psychological field and the answers given in the question about how you generally evaluated your free time ($r=0,042$) ($p > 0,05$). There was no significant correlation between the answers given in the question about how often you had difficulty in evaluating your social scoring total score and your free time ($r=0,084$), and the answers given in the question how you generally evaluated your free time ($r=-0,053$) ($p > 0,05$). There was no significant correlation between the answers given in the question about how often you had difficulty in evaluating your total score of the environmental field ($r=0,047$) and your free time, and the answers given in the question about how you generally evaluate your free time ($r=-0,003$) ($p > 0,05$).

Table 5. Examining the correlation between the questions of " Where do you evaluate your free time?","How do you find your quality of life?" and sub-dimensions of quality of life for university students.

		Where do you evaluate your free time?	How do you find your quality of life?
Physical field	r	-.038	.275**
	p	.398	.000
Psychological field	r	-.083	.306**
	p	.066	.000
Social field	r	.012	.292**
	p	.784	.000
Environmental field	r	.022	.378**
	p	.626	.000

According to Table 5, there was no significant correlation between the total score of the physical field and the answers given in the question about where you evaluated your free time ($r = -0,038$) ($p > 0,05$). There was a significant positive correlation between the total score of the physical field and the answers given in the question about how you found your quality of life ($r=0,275$) ($p < 0,05$). There was no significant correlation between the total score of the

psychological field and the answers to the question about where you evaluated your free time ($r=-0,083$) ($p >0.05$). There was a significant positive correlation between the total score of the psychological field and the answers to the question about how you found your quality of life ($r=0,306$) ($p<0.05$). There was no significant correlation between the total score of the social field and the answers to the question about where you evaluated your free time ($r=0,012$) ($p >0.05$). There was a significant positive correlation between the total score of the social field and the answers to the question about how you found your quality of life ($r=0,292$) ($p<0.05$). There was no significant correlation between the total score of the environmental field and the answers to the question about where you evaluated your free time ($r=0,022$). There was a significant positive correlation between the total score of the environmental field and the answers to the question about how you found your quality of life ($r=0,378$) ($p<0.05$).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In the study of the correlation between participation and quality of life in recreational activities for university students. There was no significant difference between the answers given to the questionnaire of university students when they were asked how they assessed the free time ($p > 0,05$). Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University Social Science Faculty students' responses are as follows: %18,3 of them were domestic activities, 38.2% of them were physical activities, 27.4% of them were social activities, 2.5% of them were cultural and artistic activities, 5.4% of them were outdoor activities and 8,3% of them were other free time events. Gazi University Social Science Faculty students' responses are as follows:18.7% of them were domestic activities, 34.6% of them were physical activities, 30% of them were social activities, 4.3% of them were cultural-artistic activities, 5.1% were outdoor activities and 7,4% of them were other free time activities (Table 1). In a study of university students' participation in recreational activities by some variables, it was reported that 39% of the students were happier when they spent their free time outside the campus. Moreover, 11.3% of the students who evaluated their leisure time on campus stated that they are happy in the sports hall, 18.9% in the cafeteria and 9.4% in the library (Kılıç and Şener, 2013). In a study of the recreational activities of the students of the Mediterranean University, 43.5% of the students frequently participated in outdoor recreational activities (Mansuroğlu, 2002), while another study found that 70% of the students spend their free time at home (Yeniceri, Coşkun & Özkan, 2011). 32,1% of the population spend their time

at home and 52,1% of them spent their free time outside (Kurar and Baltacı, 2014). In a study on the subject, 89,9% of the men answered no and 91,3% of the girls answered no ("Kılıç ve Şener, 2013") in the question "do you think that the social opportunities of the university are sufficient"? 51,68% of the university students stated that they attend the recreational activities between 1-5 hours per week (Önder, 2003). There was no significant difference between the answers given to the questionnaire "how do you find your quality of life? " ($p > 0,05$). Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University Social Science Faculty students' responses are as follows: 2.9% of them were terrible, 5% of them were bad, 49.4% of them were mediocre, 36.5% of them were good and 6.2% of them were very good. Gazi University Social Science Faculty students' responses are as follows: 2.7% of them were terrible, 7.4% of them were bad, 55.6% of them were mediocre, 31.1% were good and 3,1% were very good (Table 2). In a study about university students, University students' perception of quality of life was stated mediocre with 56% in women and mediocre with 66,3% in men (Zorba, Bayrakdar, Gönülateş, Sever, 2017). For the university students, No significant correlation was found between the total score of physical field and age ($r = -0,001$), between the total score of physical field and gender ($r = 0,033$), between the total score of physical field and department ($r = -0,026$), between the total score of physical field and class ($r = 0,053$), between the total score of physical field and academic achievement ($r = 0,020$), between the total score of physical field and place of residence ($r = 0,071$), between the total score of physical field and place of life ($r = 0,060$), between the total score of physical field and weekly free time period ($r = 0,062$) ($p > 0,05$). However, there was a significant positive correlation between physical field and income level ($r = 0,123$) ($p < 0,05$). No significant correlation was found between the total score of psychological field and age ($r = 0,030$), between the total score of psychological field and gender ($r = -0,006$), between the total score of psychological field and department ($r = 0,010$), between the total score of psychological field and class ($r = -0,078$), between the total score of psychological field and place of residence ($r = -0,005$), between the total score of psychological field and weekly free time period ($r = 0,054$) ($p > 0,05$). However, a significant correlation was found between the psychological field and academic achievement ($r = 0,122$), between the psychological field and income level ($r = 0,153$) and between the psychological field and place of life ($r = 0,099$) ($p < 0,05$). No significant correlation was found between the total score of social field and gender ($r = -0,004$), between the total score of social field and department ($r = 0,046$), between the total score of social field and class ($r = 0,045$), between the total score of social field

and academic achievement ($r=0,057$), between the total score of social field and place of residence ($r=-0,031$), between the total score of social field and place of life ($r=0,059$), between the total score of social field and weekly free time period ($r=0,052$) ($p > 0.05$). However, there was a significant correlation between social field and age ($r = 0.090$), and between social field and income level ($r=0.118$) ($p < 0.05$). No significant correlation was found between the total score of environmental field and age ($r=-0,001$), between the total score of environmental field and gender ($r=0,061$), between the total score of environmental field and department ($r=-0,006$), between the total score of environmental field and class ($r=0.036$), between the total score of environmental field and academic achievement ($r=0,013$), between the total score of environmental field and place of residence ($r=-0,054$), between the total score of environmental field and place of life ($r=0,075$) ($p > 0.05$). However, there was a significant correlation between environmental field and income level ($r=0.149$) and between environmental field and weekly free time ($r=0.123$) ($p < 0.05$) (Table 3). In the study on university students, (Tekin, Yıldız, Akyüz & Uğur, 2012), participation in sportive activities and recreational activities has affected the social, personal and academic achievement of students

(Cengiz, 1999 and Fisher, Juszczak & Friedman, 1996), and that recreational activities increased academic achievement in both males and females (Sivrikaya, Tekin, Meriç & Tekelioğlu, 2004). Recreational activities have been determined to be influenced by factors such as; age (Broughten and Beggs, 2006; Brown and Frankel, 1993; Seddon, 2011), gender (Amestoy, Rosal & Toscano, 2008; Ayyıldız, 2015; Kaya & Gurbuz, 2015; Temir & Gurbuz, 2012; Vong Tze, 2005), marital status (Liang, Yamashita & Brown, 2013), income level (Akgül, 2011; Ardahan & Lapa, 2010; Bonke, Dedding & Lausten, 2009; Can, 2010; Damianidis, Kouthouris, Alexandris, 2007; Emir, Ayyıldız, 2015; Karaküçük et al., 2008; Tekin, 2009;), education level (Arslan, 2010; Gediz, 2012; Lu and Hu, 2005), social constraints (Fasting and Pfister, 1999; Koca, 2006; Yaprak & Amman, 2009), living conditions (Amestoy, Rosal & Toscano, 2008), fashion (Hall & Page, 2006), facility / service and accessibility (Cerin, Leslie, Sugiyama & Owen, 2010; Masmanidis, 2009, Gürbüz, Yenel, Akgül & Karaküçük, 2010, Palen, Megan, Gleeson, Caldwell & Edward, 2010), the region where he lived (Drakou, Tzetzis and Mamantzi, 2006), traditions (Amin, Suleman, Ali, Gamal & Al Wehedy, 2011), technological developments and related active or passive participation (Yerlisu and Ardahan, 2009). There was a significant positive correlation between the total scores of the physical field and psychological field, which are sub-dimensions

of quality of life, and the answers to the questions about how often you had difficulty in evaluating your free time ($p < 0.05$). There was no significant correlation between the total score of the social and environmental field and the answers to the question about how often you had difficulty in evaluating your free time ($p > 0.05$). There was no significant correlation between the total scores of the physical, psychological, social, and environmental field, which are sub-dimensions of quality of life, and the answers to the question about how they assessed their free time (Table 4). In a study where the leisure times of university students were examined, 64.3% of the respondents said that sometimes and 26.4% never responded when the university students were asked if they had difficulty in evaluating their leisure time (Demirel and Harmandar, 2009). There was a significant positive correlation between physical field ($r=0,275$), psychological field ($r=0,306$), social field ($r=0,292$) and environmental field ($r=0,378$), which are sub-dimensions of quality of life, and the answers to the question about how you find your life quality for the university students ($p < 0.05$). There was no significant correlation between physical field ($r=-0,038$), psychological field ($r=-0,083$), social field ($r=0,012$) and environmental field ($r=0,022$), which are sub-dimensions of quality of life, and the answers to the question about where you evaluate your free time (Table 5). In the study where the quality of life of university students was examined, significant differences were found in the physical field and environmental field sub-factors of the students at $p < 0.05$ (Zorba et al., 2017). In another study in which the quality of life was examined according to some variable, factors such as being a woman, being old, becoming widowed or divorced, low education level, low income level, poor social support, inadequacy of the dwelling and characteristics of the living, having a sickness and/or persistent illness, low job satisfaction and inadequate leisure activities have been found to decrease the quality of life significantly (Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2016). Sirgy, Grzeskowiak and Rahtz (2007) emphasize that the active participation in sports activities at school is highly correlated with the university quality of life perception. In the study of the quality of life of university students according to some variables. It is seen that there is a significant difference between the students' level of university life quality, gender, faculties, and membership of the student community. There was no significant difference according to the class level, the monthly income, and the settlements where the families reside (Eriş & Anıl, 2016). These research findings support our work.

As a result, no significant correlation was found between total score of the physical field, which is sub-dimension of life quality, and age, gender, department, class, academic achievement, place of residence, place of life and weekly free time. However, there was a significant positive correlation between physical field and income level ($p < 0,05$). There was no significant correlation between total score of psychological field and age, gender, department, class, place of residence and weekly free time. However, there was a significant correlation between the psychological field and academic achievement, income level, and place of life ($p < 0,05$). There was no significant correlation between social field total score and gender, department, class, academic achievement, place of residence, place of life, and weekly free time. However, there was a significant correlation between social field and age and income level ($p < 0,05$). There was no significant correlation between total environmental field and age, gender, department, class, academic achievement, place of residence and place of life. However, there was a significant correlation between environmental field, income level and weekly free time ($p < 0,05$). In the university students who participated in the study, there was a significant positive correlation between the total scores of the physical field and psychological field, which are sub-dimensions of quality of life, and the answers to the questions about how often you had difficulty in evaluating your free time ($p < 0,05$). There was a significant positive correlation between the total scores of the physical field, psychological field, social field and environmental field, which are sub-dimensions of quality of life, and the answer to the question about how you found your quality of life ($p < 0,05$). In order to improve the quality of life of university students, it is suggested to create recreation areas where they can spend free time efficiently and actively on and off campus. As a result, it was found that there is a significant correlation between the physical field and the income level, which is the quality of life subscale, between the psychological field and the academic achievement, the income level and the place of life, between the social field and the age and income level.

REFERENCES

- Akgül, B.M. (2011). *Farklı Kültürlerdeki Bireylerin Boş Zaman Aktivitelerine Yönelik Tutumlarının Değerlendirilmesi: Ankara Londra Örneği*. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Amestoy, V. C., Rosal, R. S. & Toscano, E.V. (2008). The leisure experience. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37, 64-78.
- Amin, T.T., Suleman, W., Ali, A., Gamal, A. & Al Wehedy, A. (2011). Pattern, Prevalence, and Perceived Personal Barriers Toward Physical Activity Among Adult Saudis in Al-Hassa, KSA. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 8, 775-784.
- Ardahan, F. ve Yerlisu Lapa, T. (2010). Üniversite öğrencilerinin serbest zaman tatmin düzeylerinin cinsiyete ve gelire göre incelenmesi. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences*, 21(4), 129-136.
- Arslan, S. (2010). *Yetişkin kent halkının belediyelerin serbest zaman eğitimi ile rekreasyon etkinliklerinin sunumuna ve yaşam kalitesine etkisine ilişkin görüşleri (Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi Örneği)*. Doktora Tezi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, 160.
- Aslan, N. ve Cansever, B.A. (2012). Ergenlerin Boş Zaman Değerlendirme Algısı. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42, 23-35.
- Aydemir, Ö. ve Köroğlu, E. (2007). *Psikiyatride kullanılan klinik ölççekler*. Ankara: Hekimler Yayın Birliği.
- Aydımer Boylu, A. (2007). *Ailelerin Yaşam Kalitelerini Etkileyen Bazı Objektif ve Sübjektif Göstergelerin İncelenmesi*, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Aile ve Tüketici Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı Doktora Tezi, Ankara.
- Ayyıldız, T. (2015). *Rekreatif dans faaliyetlerine katılan bireylerin serbest zaman tatmin düzeylerinin incelenmesi*, Gazi Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, *Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Ankara.
- Başaran, S., Güzel, R. ve Sarpel, T. (2005). Yaşam Kalitesi ve Sağlık Sonuçlarını Değerlendirme Ölçütleri. *Romatizma Dergisi*. 20(1), 55-63.
- Bonke, J., Dedding, M. & Lausten, M. (2009). Time and money: A simultaneous analysis of men's and women's domain satisfactions. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10, 113-131.
- Boylu, A.A. & Paçacıoğlu, B. (2016). Quality of Life and Indicators. *Journal of Academic Researches and Studies*, 8, 15,137-150.
- Broughten, K. & Beggs, A. (2006). Leisure satisfaction of older adults. *Activities, Adaptation Aging*, 31(1), 1-18.
- Brown, A. B. & Frankel, B. G. (1993). Activity through years: leisure, leisure satisfaction, and life satisfaction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10, 1-17.
- Can, S. (2010). Muğla Üniversitesi eğitim fakültesi ilköğretim bölümü öğrencileri ailelerinin boş zaman faaliyetlerine katılım biçimlerinin belirlenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 18(3), 861-870.
- Cengiz, E. (1999). *The Examination of Physiological Needs and Social and Personal Adjustment Level of Students of Anatolian High School, Science High School and Super High Schools*, Unpublished Master Thesis, University of İnönü, Malatya.
- Cerin, E., Leslie, E., Sugiyama, T. & Owen, N. (2010). Perceived Barriers to Leisure-Time Physical Activity in Adults: An Ecological Perspective. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 7, 451-459.
- Daminianidis, C., Kouthouris, C., Alexandris, K. (2007). Activities among students. The Case study of schools of livadiacity in Greece. *Inquiries in Sport and Physical Education*, 5(3), 379-385.
- Demirel, M. & Harmandar, D. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreasyonel etkinliklere katılımlarında engel oluşturabilecek faktörlerin belirlenmesi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1), 839-846.
- Disch, W. B., Harlow, L. L., Campbell, J. F. and Dougan, T. R. (2000). Student functioning, concerns, and sociopersonal well being. *Social Indicators Research*, 51(1), 41-74.
- Drakou, A., Tzetzis, G. & Mamantzi, K. (2006). Leisure constraints experienced by university students in Greece, United States Sports Academy. *The Sport Journal*, 1543-1518.
- Emir, E. (2012). *Rekreatif etkinliklere katılımın önündeki engellerin belirlenmesi: üniversite öğrencileri örneği*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Trabzon.
- Eriş, M.H., Anıl, D. (2016). An Examination of the levels of university student's quality of life in terms of some variables. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 31(3), 491-504.
- Eser, E., Fidaner, H., Fidaner, C., Eser, S.Y., Elbi, H., Göker, E. (1999). WHOQOL-100 and WHOQOL-BREEF's psychometric features. *3P Magazine*, 23-40.
- Fasting, K. & Pfister, G. (1999). *Opportunities and Barriers for Women in Sports (Turkey)*. Las Vegas: Women of Diversity.
- Fisher, M., Juszczak, L. & Friedman, S. (1996). Sports participation in an urban high school: Academic and psychological correlates. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 18(5), 329-334.
- Gediz, S. (2012). *Kamu hizmeti olarak rekreasyon etkinlikleri kapsamında "Gençlik hizmetleri ve spor il müdürlükleri Batı Akdeniz bölgesi gençlik merkezleri analizi"*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya, 5-78.
- Gössweiner, V., Pfeiffer, C. & Richter, R. (2002). Quality of Life and Social Quality. *Working Paper 12, Austrian Institute for Family Studies*.
- Gürbüz, B., Yenel, F., Akgül, M.B. & Karaküçük, S. (2010). Measuring Constraints to Leisure Activities: Demographic Differences. *Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport / Science, Movement and Health*, 10(2), 362-354.
- Hall, C.M. & Page, S. (2006). *The geography of tourism and recreation*. New York: Routledge.
- Hazar, A. (2009). *Rekreasyon ve animasyon*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Baştuğ, G., Zorba, E., Özkar, Ş., ve Altıncı, U. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinde, rekreasyon faaliyetlerine katılım ile yaşam kalitesi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *CBÜ Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 13(2), 342-355.

- Karaküçük, S., Yenel, F., Gürbüz, B., Özdemir, S., Demirel, M., Sarol, H., Karaküçük, B.M. (2008). Türk toplumunun boş zaman davranış profilleri ve rekreasyonel etkinliklere katılımdaki engeller: Ankara ili örneği. *Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 16(4), 41-51.
- Kaya, S., Gürbüz, B. (2015). An Examination of university students' attitudes towards leisure activities. *Pamukkale Journal of Sport Sciences*, 6(3),46-59.
- Kılıç, M. & Şener, G. (2013). Üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreasyon etkinliklerine katılımlarındaki sosyolojik etkenler ve yapısal kısıtlamalar. *Journal of Higher Education & Science/Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 3(3), 220-227.
- Koca, C. (2006). Beden eğitimi ve spor alanının da toplumsal cinsiyet ilişkileri. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 17(2), 84.
- Koltarla, S. (2008). *Taksim eğitim ve araştırma hastanesi sağlık personelinin yaşam kalitesinin araştırılması*. Sağlık Bakanlığı Taksim Eğitim ve Araştırma Hastanesi Aile Hekimliği Kliniği. Uzmanlık Tezi. İstanbul.
- Kurar, İ. ve Baltacı, F. (2014). Halkın boş zaman değerlendirme alışkanlıkları: Alanya örneği. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, 2, 39-52.
- Liang, J., Yamashita, T., & Brown, J.S. (2013). Leisure satisfaction and quality of life in China, Japan and South Korea: A Comparative Study using Asia Barometer 2006. *J Happiness Stud.*, 14, 753 – 769.
- Lu, L., Hu, C.H. (2005). Personality, leisure experiences and happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 6, 325–342.
- Masmanidis, T. (2009). Perceived Constraints of Greek University Students' Participation In Campus Recreational Sport Programs. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 33, 150-156.
- Mansuroğlu, S. (2002). Akdeniz Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Serbest Zaman Özellikleri ve Dış Mekân Rekreasyon Eğilimlerinin Belirlenmesi. *Akdeniz Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(2), 53-62.
- Önder, S. (2003). Selçuk üniversitesi öğrencilerinin rekreasyonel eğilim ve taleplerinin belirlenmesi üzerinde bir Araştırma. *Selçuk Tarım ve Gıda Bilimleri Dergisi*, 17(32), 31-38.
- Özmete, E. (2010). Aile yaşam kalitesi dinamikleri: Aile iletişimi, ebeveyn sorumlulukları, duygusal, duygusal refah, fiziksel/materyal refahın algılanması. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(11), 455-465.
- Palen, L.A., Megan, E.P., Gleeson, S.L., Caldwell, L.L., Edward, A. (2010). Leisure constraints for adolescents in Cape Town, South Africa: A Qualitative Study. *Leisure Sciences*, 32, 434-452.
- Seddon, C. (2011). *Life styles and social participation*. London, England.
- Sirgy, M.J., Grzeskowiak, S., Rahtz, D. (2007). Quality of college life (QCL) of students: developing and validating a measure of well being. *Social Indicators Research*, 80(2), 343-360.
- Sivrikaya, K., Tekin A., Meriç, B. & Tekelioğlu, F.U. (2004). Erkek ve bayan yıldız milli buz patencilerin kaygı düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(1), 3-7.
- Şeker, B, D. Zırhlıoğlu, G. (2009). An Evaluation of the relationship between burn out, job satisfaction and life satisfaction among police officers in Van Police Department. *Turkish Journal of Police Studies*, 11(4), 1-26.
- Tekin, A. (2009). *Rekreasyon*. Ankara: Ata Ofset Matbaacılık.
- Tekin, M., Yıldız, M., Akyüz, M., Uğur, O. A. (2012). Karaman yükseköğrenim kredi ve yurtlar kurumunda kalan üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreatif etkinliklere katılım ve beklentilerinin incelenmesi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9, 121-135.
- Temir, Ö. ve Gürbüz, B. (2012). *Rekreasyonel Aktivitelere Katılımın Önündeki Engellerin İncelenmesi*. 1. Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Kongresi, Antalya.
- Torlak, S. E. ve Yavuzçehre, P. S. (2008). Denizli Kent Yoksullarının Yaşam Kalitesi Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler*, 17(2), 23-44.
- Tütüncü, Ö. (2012). Rekreasyon ve Rekreasyon Terapisinin Yaşam Kalitesindeki Rolü. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 23(2), 248 – 252.
- Tüzün, E. H. ve Eker, L. (2003). Sağlık değerlendirme ölçütleri ve yaşam kalitesi. *Sağlık ve Toplum Dergisi*, 13(2), 3-8.
- Vong Tze, N. (2005). Leisure satisfaction and quality of life in Macao, China. *Leisure Studies*, 24(2), 195-207.
- WHO. (2003). Health and Development Through Physical Activity and Sport, Erişim tarihi: 09.02.2018, http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2003/WHO_NMH_NPH_PAH_03.2.pdf.
- Yaprak, P. ve Amman, M. T. (2009). Sporda kadınlar ve sorunları. *Türkiye Kick Boks Federasyonu Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(2), 39-49.
- Yerlisu, L. T. ve Ardahan, F. (2009). Akdeniz üniversitesi öğrencilerinin serbest zaman etkinliklerine katılım nedenleri ve değerlendirme biçimleri. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 20(4), 132-144.
- Yeniçeri, M., Coşkun, B. & Özkan, H. (2011). Muğla il merkezindeki memurların boş zaman değerlendirme eğilimlerinin belirlenmesi üzerine bir araştırma. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(7), 46-60.
- Zorba, E., Bayraktar, A., Gönülateş, S. & Sever, O. (2017). Analysis of the level of life quality of university students. *TOJRAS*, 14(1), 1-16.