



## Elit Sporcularda Boş Zaman Eğitimi ve Rekreasyon Fayda Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi

### ÖZ

Sporcuların boş zaman içerisinde gerçekleştirdikleri rekreasyon faaliyetleri yaşamlarında önemli bir paya sahiptir. Araştırmanın amacı elit sporcuların yaşamlarındaki boş zaman eğitimi ve rekreasyon fayda düzeylerinin belirlenerek, çeşitli değişkenlerin bu düzeyleri farklılaştırma durumunun ve ölçüm araçları arasındaki ilişki ve etkinin incelenmesidir. Çalışmaya Türkiye Olimpik Hazırlık Merkezlerinde spor yaşantısını devam ettiren 240 erkek ve 151 kadın olmak üzere 391 elit sporcu katılmıştır. Çalışmada elde edilen veriler kişisel bilgi formunun yanı sıra "Boş Zaman Eğitim Ölçeği" ve "Rekreasyon Fayda Ölçeği" ile yüz yüze toplanmıştır. Betimsel istatistikler, bağımsız örneklem T testi, Tek yönlü varyans analizi ANOVA, post hoc testleri, pearson korelasyon testi ve regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular katılımcıların boş zaman eğitimi (3,41±0,50) ve rekreasyon fayda (3,91±0,62) düzeylerinin ortalama değerlerin biraz üzerinde olduğu, özellikle sosyal etkileşim ve sosyal fayda anlamında daha yüksek puanlara sahip oldukları yönündedir. Katılımcıların branş değişkenleri ile ölçüm araçları arasında, cinsiyet, gelir düzeyi, çalışma durumu, boş zamanı değerlendirme biçimi, verimli boş zaman geçirme durumu arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılıklar saptanmıştır. Diğer yandan yaş ve eğitim durumunun "Boş Zaman Eğitim" (BE) ve "Rekreasyon Fayda (RF) düzeylerini farklılaştırmadığı belirlenmiştir. BE ile RF arasında pozitif yönlü orta düzeyde anlamlı ilişki bulunmaktadır ( $r=0,458$ ). Boş Zaman Eğitimi; fiziksel faydayı ( $\beta = 0,099$ ,  $t = 1,213$ ;  $p=0,226$ ), psikolojik faydayı ( $\beta = -0,147$ ,  $t = -1,688$ ;  $p=0,092$ ) ve sosyal faydayı ( $\beta = 0,544$ ,  $t = 7,205$ ,  $p=0,000$ ) anlamlı biçimde etkilemektedir. Elde edilen bulgular boş zaman eğitiminin rekreasyon fayda düzeyini açıklamada 3 alt boyutta toplam varyansın %25'ini açıkladığını göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak sporcuların BE ve RF düzeylerinin belirli değişkenler ile farklılık gösterdiği ve BE ve RF'nin birbirleriyle ilişki ve etki içinde olduğu saptanmıştır. Bulgulardan hareketle sporcuların başarıya giden yolda performans beklentisini boş zaman eğitimlerinin ve rekreasyon fayda düzeylerinin artırılması yönüyle güçlendirilmesi önerilmektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Boş zaman, rekreasyon fayda, eğitim, elit sporcu

## Investigation of Leisure Education and Recreation Benefit Levels in Elite Athletes

### ABSTRACT

Sporcuların boş zaman içerisinde gerçekleştirdikleri rekreasyon faaliyetleri yaşamlarında önemli bir paya sahiptir. Araştırmanın amacı elit sporcuların yaşamlarındaki boş zaman eğitimi ve rekreasyon fayda düzeylerinin belirlenerek, çeşitli değişkenlerin bu düzeyleri farklılaştırma durumunun ve ölçüm araçları arasındaki ilişki ve etkinin incelenmesidir. Çalışmaya Türkiye Olimpik Hazırlık Merkezlerinde spor yaşantısını devam ettiren 240 erkek ve 151 kadın olmak üzere 391 elit sporcu katılmıştır. Çalışmada elde edilen veriler kişisel bilgi formunun yanı sıra "Boş Zaman Eğitim Ölçeği" ve "Rekreasyon Fayda Ölçeği" ile yüz yüze toplanmıştır. Betimsel istatistikler, bağımsız örneklem T testi, Tek yönlü varyans analizi ANOVA, post hoc testleri, pearson korelasyon testi ve regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular katılımcıların boş zaman eğitimi (3,41±0,50) ve rekreasyon fayda (3,91±0,62) düzeylerinin ortalama değerlerin biraz üzerinde olduğu, özellikle sosyal etkileşim ve sosyal fayda anlamında daha yüksek puanlara sahip oldukları yönündedir. Katılımcıların branş değişkenleri ile ölçüm araçları arasında, cinsiyet, gelir düzeyi, çalışma durumu, boş zamanı değerlendirme biçimi, verimli boş zaman geçirme durumu arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılıklar saptanmıştır. Diğer yandan yaş ve eğitim durumunun "Boş Zaman Eğitim" (BE) ve "Rekreasyon Fayda (RF) düzeylerini farklılaştırmadığı belirlenmiştir. BE ile RF arasında pozitif yönlü orta düzeyde anlamlı ilişki bulunmaktadır ( $r=0,458$ ). Boş Zaman Eğitimi; fiziksel faydayı ( $\beta = 0,099$ ,  $t = 1,213$ ;  $p=0,226$ ), psikolojik faydayı ( $\beta = -0,147$ ,  $t = -1,688$ ;  $p=0,092$ ) ve sosyal faydayı ( $\beta = 0,544$ ,  $t = 7,205$ ,  $p=0,000$ ) anlamlı biçimde etkilemektedir. Elde edilen bulgular boş zaman eğitiminin rekreasyon fayda düzeyini açıklamada 3 alt boyutta toplam varyansın %25'ini açıkladığını göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak sporcuların BE ve RF düzeylerinin belirli değişkenler ile farklılık gösterdiği ve BE ve RF'nin birbirleriyle ilişki ve etki içinde olduğu saptanmıştır. Bulgulardan hareketle sporcuların başarıya giden yolda performans beklentisini boş zaman eğitimlerinin ve rekreasyon fayda düzeylerinin artırılması yönüyle güçlendirilmesi önerilmektedir.

**Key Words:** Leisure, education, benefit, elite athletes

## INTRODUCTION

Apart from the time assigned for work and mandatory necessities, people participate in various recreational activities with physically and mentally fulfilling effects to break away from the tedious, demanding, and tiring daily routines and business life. Leisure time can be defined as a period of time that contains all aspects remaining after necessities such as work and sleep, which the individual considers deliberately, likes, receives satisfaction from and allows for some exploration and creativity<sup>9 12 22 23 25 35 38 39 41</sup>. Leisure can alternatively be defined as experiences that are selected with relative freedom, are personally satisfying and honestly worthwhile, and lead to self-actualization and ultimately self-actualization through the application of specific abilities and resources<sup>17</sup>. Leisure time is strongly tied to doing what we want<sup>5</sup>, as well as being free of duty and burdensome commitment<sup>38 40</sup>.

Leisure time is a term that will emerge as people become more conscious of how to make optimal use of their time. It can be said that modern people, who want to use their time by planning and caring, experience this awareness. In fact, simply having free time is insufficient for its healthy and functional utilization. Therefore, individuals should be aware that time belongs to them and they can use it as they wish<sup>28</sup>. People must be given fundamental training on how to spend their free time in a way that is both appropriate and healthy for them and the environment. The earlier this education process starts for individuals, the more likely they will become people who have adopted a recreational lifestyle when they turn into adults in the forthcoming years. Recreation is defined as a multidimensional activity that includes physical, cognitive, emotional, and social components that people choose to engage in their spare time<sup>5</sup>. Recreation is defined as the activity that people choose to engage in in their leisure time and it involves a variety of activities with physical, cognitive, emotional, and social elements. Activities are considered more significant than the cause<sup>5</sup>. The gains emphasized here refer to a rise in the individual's level of pleasure and delight, as well as the benefit they receive to some extent. The advantages of recreation are the beneficial outcomes acquired through recreational activities. Leisure benefits assist people in determining what they hope to achieve by participating in recreational activities, as well as the outcomes of these activities, and they play an important role in recreation research. Kao considers the benefits of recreation as individual experiences obtained as a result of participation in recreational activities that enable individuals to meet their physical and mental development or personal needs<sup>26</sup>.

### **The Importance of Leisure Education in Elite Athletes**

Leisure education, as a concept, refers to a flexible and effective development process aimed at adjusting to the flow of life, renewing, and building an ethic of affirmation and enjoyment that is appropriate for spending leisure time in the most advantageous way. Leisure education aims to improve self-awareness, obtain a deeper understanding of leisure and leisure interests, and stimulate skill development that increases free will. Individual development, including features such as autonomy, competence, and social relations, can be influenced by family members, neighbors, educators, leisure and recreation specialists, the environment, and other variables. Leisure education refers to programs that are specifically designed to help people enjoy leisure and happiness while also improving, growing, and progressing. This includes instilling information through enjoyable recreational activities<sup>13</sup>. Leisure education is defined as a learning process through which people learn to manage crucial areas of their leisure time. With growing recognition of the value of leisure time for individual and societal development,

the most general objective of leisure education has been regarded as improving individual quality of life. Socialization includes leisure education, which is a developmental process. The concept of leisure education evolves across fields to represent multiple interpretations of leisure time<sup>37</sup>. The most valuable natural technique for individuals to defend themselves from such threats is to engage in recreational activities to cope with stress, anxiety, boredom, and feelings of emptiness. Individuals must get great leisure education from an early age in order to ensure orientation to recreational behaviors. The key objective of leisure and recreation education is to provide people with the knowledge and skills they need to make the most of their free time<sup>42</sup>. Then, leisure education can be defined as educational and training activities carried out through recreational experiences in addition to the traditional theoretical and experimental education methods required to achieve the desired sensations, satisfaction, and behaviors in cognitive, emotional, and physical terms through effective time management and the most appropriate use of leisure time.

Given that athletes are a significant part of the culture in which they reside, it is not surprising that they are followed in a variety of sectors other than sports. As a result, athlete training is critical since they serve as role models for society. This education encompasses not only academics but also social and cultural aspects. Recreational activities in leisure time have healing, developing, and soothing influence on persons on a physical, psychological, and social level, therefore leisure time is just as vital for athletes' growth as it is for society. Athletes' leisure time and recreational activities, which they engage in their spare time, play an essential role in their training. Sports, as they evolved over time, became to incorporate a variety of economic, social, cultural, and geographical factors, and this scenario compelled all societies to train excellent athletes at all times and in all conditions. Because sports has become the best promotional face of countries, with billions of people watching sports organizations. While training for a competition, the athletes continue their studies with the help of many others. During these times, athletes who spend their days in extended camps and intense training are socially, physically, and intellectually exhausted. During this phase, leisure and recreational activities become increasingly important in free time. Because leisure education enriches people's lives, their health, and all areas of modern life<sup>31</sup>. Athletes' leisure education can also be a way for them to make the most of their free time, express themselves artistically, and grow as individuals.

The focus of this research is to look into the relationships between leisure education and recreational benefit levels of elite athletes who have been promoted to the national team in their age category, as well as several other variables. As a result, it is expected that the study will serve as a resource for scientists who want to undertake similar research and add to the sports literature.

## **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

### **Sample**

The study's sample was determined using the convenient sampling method, one of the non-probability sampling methods. In this context, 391 elite athletes, 240 men (age:18,56,  $\pm 2,50$ ) and 151 women (age:17,45,  $\pm 2,07$ ), A voluntary consent form was filled out for all participants participating in the study. who continued their sports life in Turkey Olympic Preparation Centers in 2022, voluntarily participated in the research. Athletes in shooting, athletics, boxing, gymnastics, fencing, wrestling, weightlifting,

judo, modern pentathlon, Taekwon-Do, swimming and other branches constitute the study group. Information on the demographic characteristics of the participants is given in Table 1.

### **Personal Information Form**

The researcher used the Personal Information Form to determine the characteristics of the athletes who participated in the study, such as age, gender, income, branch, and daily free time.

### **Leisure Education Scale**

Munusturlar, (2017)<sup>33</sup> developed and validity reliability study a Leisure Education Scale with 36 items and seven sub-dimensions. Awareness, social interaction skills, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic incentive, boredom, problem solving, and time management are the dimensions. The overall internal dependability coefficient for LE was found to be .89.

### **Leisure Benefit Scale**

“Leisure Benefit Scale: LBS”, “Recreation Benefit Scale: RBS” developed by Ho was used. Akgül et al. (2018)<sup>1</sup>. developed a Turkish adaption of the scale, with internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) of .81 for Physical, .80 for Psychological, .86 for Social, and .83 in total The Recreation Benefit Scale has a total of 24 items and is divided into three sub-dimensions: 1) physical (between questions 1 and 7), 2) psychological (between questions 8 and 15), and 3) social (between questions 16 and 24). Strongly Disagree-Disagree-Undecided-Agree-Strongly Agree are the responses on the 5-point Likert-type scale. The scale can provide a minimum of 24 points and a maximum of 120 points. The internal reliability coefficient in Total LB was reported to be .96 for the current study.

### **Data Collection**

For the usage of the scales, necessary permits were secured from the scale owners. After providing the relevant information to the athletes and their families and obtaining their agreement, the scales were applied face-to-face during the athletes' resting hours and on the training fields. The study covered successful elite athletes residing in Turkish Olympic Preparation Centers in 2022.

### **Data Analysis**

The study was conducted using a quantitative method and a scanning model. Normality and reliability analyses, descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test, one-way analysis of variance ANOVA, post hoc testing, Pearson correlation test, and regression analysis were used to examine the data.

## RESULTS

**Table 1.** Percentage and Frequency Distributions of the Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

N=(391)			
	Variable	f	%
Gender	Male	240	61,4
	Female	151	38,6
Age	16 and below	95	24,3
	17	80	20,5
	18	61	15,6
	19	45	11,5
	20	42	10,7
	21	26	6,6
Education	22 and above	42	10,7
	Secondary school graduate	155	39,6
	High school graduate	202	51,7
Working Status	Bachelor's degree	34	8,7
	Worker	24	6,1
	Student	343	87,7
Income	Other	24	6,1
	Low	133	34,0
	Middle	241	61,6
Sport Branches	High	17	4,3
	Shooting	10	2,6
	Athletics	48	12,3
	Boxing	13	3,3
	Gymnastics	15	3,8
	Other	12	3,1
	Fencing	17	4,3
	Wrestle	103	26,3
	Barbell	34	8,7
	Judo	51	13,0
	Modern Pentathlon	10	2,6
	Taekwondo	37	9,5
	Swimming	41	10,5
Daily Leisure Time	1 hour and less	23	5,9
	2 hours	64	16,4
	3 hours	51	13,0
	4 hours	66	16,9
	5 hours	48	12,3
	6 hours	50	12,8
	7 hours	13	3,3
	8 hours	35	9,0
	9 hours or more	41	10,5
Daily Study (work or study) Time	2 hours and less	33	8,4
	3 hours	26	6,6
	4 hours	50	12,8
	5 hours	54	13,8
	6 hours	63	16,1
	7 hours	19	4,9
	8 hours	60	15,3
	9 hours	12	3,1
	10 hours	30	7,7
	11 hours	44	11,3
	Productive Leisure Time	Yes	159
Partially		197	50,4
No		35	9,0

Types of Leisure Time	Sporty	209	53,5
	Cultural	53	13,6
	Art	59	15,1
	Other	70	17,9

**Table 2.** Leisure Education and Leisure Benefit Scales Arithmetic Means, Standard Deviation and Kurtosis Skewness Values

N=(391)	Min.	Max.	$\bar{x}$	Sd	Skewness	Kurtosis
Leisure Education	1,53	5,00	3,41	0,50	0,034	0,860
Awareness	1,00	6,00	3,87	0,78	-0,840	1,265
Intrinsic Motivation	2,00	5,00	3,94	0,67	-0,337	-0,202
Extrinsic Motivation	1,00	5,00	2,61	1,01	0,225	-0,875
Social Interaction Skills	1,17	5,00	3,74	0,73	-0,466	0,251
Time Management	1,00	5,00	3,56	0,84	-0,530	0,154
Problem Solving	1,00	5,00	3,25	0,87	-0,340	-0,217
Boredom	1,00	5,00	3,15	0,88	-0,288	-0,160
Leisure Benefit	1,75	5,00	3,91	0,62	-0,379	0,318
Physical Benefits	1,00	5,00	3,91	0,68	-0,528	0,702
Psychological Benefits	2,00	5,00	3,94	0,65	-0,308	0,027
Social Benefits	1,11	5,00	3,89	0,68	-0,649	1,084

When Table 2, in which the arithmetic means and standard deviation values of the participants' leisure education and leisure benefit levels are determined; it was seen that the participants exhibited a level of leisure education above the average values ( $3,41 \pm 0,50$ ), the highest sub-dimension score was obtained in social interaction skills ( $3,74 \pm 0,73$ ), and the lowest sub-dimension score was obtained in the extrinsic motivation sub-dimension ( $2,61 \pm 1,01$ ). Similarly, the recreational benefit level was higher than the average values ( $3,910,62$ ), with the highest sub-dimension score in the social benefit sub-dimension ( $3,89 \pm 0,68$ ) and the lowest sub-dimension score in the psychological benefit sub-dimension ( $3,94 \pm 0,65$ ). As a result, the participants' leisure education and leisure benefit levels are slightly higher than usual, and they have higher scores, particularly in terms of social contact and social benefit. The kurtosis skewness values were analyzed in the context of the normality analysis, and it was concluded that the data had a normal distribution, therefore parametric tests were used. It is said that the kurtosis and skewness coefficients should ideally be between +1 and -1, however, values between +2 and -2 are acceptable as well.<sup>21</sup>

**Table 3.** Independent Sample T-Test Results Between LE and LB And Gender Variable

N=(391)	Gender	n	$\bar{x}$	Sd	t	p
Leisure Education	Male	240	3,41	0,54	-0,247	0,805
	Female	151	3,42	0,43		
Awareness	Male	240	3,82	0,82	-1,563	0,119
	Female	151	3,95	0,71		
Intrinsic Motivation	Male	240	3,89	0,68	-1,743	0,082
	Female	151	4,02	0,66		
Extrinsic Motivation	Male	240	2,71	1,02	2,387	0,017*
	Female	151	2,46	0,98		
Social Interaction Skills	Male	240	3,73	0,69	-0,437	0,662
	Female	151	3,76	0,78		
Time Management	Male	240	3,49	0,86	-2,029	0,043*
	Female	151	3,67	0,79		
Problem Solving	Male	240	3,28	0,89	0,832	0,406
	Female	151	3,20	0,84		

Boredom	Male	240	3,18	0,89	0,979	0,328
	Female	151	3,09	0,88		
Leisure Benefit	Male	240	3,86	0,63	-1,936	0,054
	Female	151	3,99	0,60		
Physical Benefits	Male	240	3,85	0,70	-2,142	0,033*
	Female	151	4,00	0,63		
Psychological Benefits	Male	240	3,88	0,66	-2,272	0,022*
	Female	151	4,04	0,62		
Social Benefits	Male	240	3,86	0,68	-1,127	0,260
	Female	151	3,94	0,68		

p<0,05\*

When the results of an independent sample T-test were compared to the gender variable on the leisure education scale, it was discovered that the sub-dimensions of extrinsic motivation ( $t=2,387$ ;  $p=0,017$ ) and time management ( $t=-2,029$ ;  $p=0,043$ ) differed by gender. Men had higher levels of extrinsic motivation and time management than women, according to the data. The physical ( $t=-2,142$ ;  $p=0,033$ ) and psychological ( $t=-2,272$ ;  $p=0,022$ ) sub-dimensions of recreational benefit differed according to gender when the gender variable's variations in the amount of recreational benefit were evaluated. As a result, it was discovered that female participants received greater physical and psychological benefits than male participants.

On the other hand, the analyses of the participants' age ( $F=1,139$ ;  $p=0,339$ ;  $F=0,953$ ;  $p=0,457$ ), education level ( $F=0,673$ ;  $p=0,551$ ;  $F=2,116$ ;  $p=0,122$ ), and assessment tools, revealed that neither variable substantially differentiated the LE and LB values.

On the other hand, the ANOVA results between income status and leisure education show that the income level of the participants significantly differentiates the awareness ( $F=3.612$ ;  $p=0.028$ ) sub-dimension from the LE scale sub-dimensions. The results of the post hoc tests show that there is a significant difference in the awareness sub-dimension between all income categories. When all income categories are evaluated, it is discovered that as income levels rise, so does awareness.

The leisure education ( $F=0,868$ ;  $p=0,421$ ) and recreational benefit ( $F=0,179$ ;  $p=,836$ ) scores of elite athletes did not differ statistically substantially depending on their working status

When the difference between daily leisure time and LE, LB scales was examined, a significant difference was found only in LE awareness ( $F=2,404$ ;  $p=0,015$ ) and social interaction ( $F=2,014$ ;  $p=0,044$ ) and LB psychological ( $F=2,336$ ;  $p=0,019$ ) and social ( $F=2,517$ ;  $p=0,011$ ) benefit sub-dimensions. In the awareness sub-dimension of the LE scale, post hoc tests show that practically all time zones have a substantial relationship with each other, but those who work for 10 hours have the highest awareness score. In the social contact sub-dimension, individuals with 4 to 9 hours of leisure time differ from the rest of the group, while those who work for 4 hours have more social interaction. In the psychological benefit sub-dimension of the LB sub-dimensions, there are also in-group disparities in favor of those who work 11 hours. The social benefit sub-dimension shows that when leisure time grows, the social benefit increases.

Only the awareness sub-dimension of LE ( $F=2,669$ ;  $p=0,047$ ) showed a significant difference in the analysis between the variable of how leisure time is valued and the

measurement techniques and was discovered that those who chose the other option scored higher on LE awareness.

The LE scale revealed a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of intrinsic motivation ( $F=1,691$ ;  $p=0,073$ ) and extrinsic motivation ( $F=2,580$ ;  $p=0,004$ ) in the branch variable, and modern pentathlon athletes had stronger intrinsic motivation in internal motivation and problem solving. When it came to extrinsic motivation and boredom, it was discovered that wrestling athletes had greater extrinsic motivation and boredom scores than other athletes. When looking at total scores ( $F=3,042$ ;  $p=0,001$ ) and all sub-dimensions ( $F=2,019$ ;  $p=0,026$ ;  $F=3,927$ ;  $p=0,000$ ;  $F=2,358$ ;  $p=0,008$ ), significant differences are found. In all significant differences, it was determined that the athletes who made modern pentathlons exhibited higher LB levels than all other sports branches.

**Table 4.** Independent-Sample T-Test Results Between LE and LB and The State of Productive Leisure Time

N=(391)	Productive leisure time	n	$\bar{x}$	Sd	F	p
Leisure Education	Yes	159	3,44	0,46	0,475	0,623
	Partially	197	3,40	0,48		
	No	35	3,36	0,75		
	Total	391	3,41	0,50		
Awareness	Yes <sup>1</sup>	159	3,98	0,81	4,132	0,017*
	Partially	197	3,83	0,68		
	No <sup>2</sup>	35	3,58	1,02		
	Total	391	3,87	0,78		
Intrinsic Motivation	Yes <sup>1</sup>	159	4,05	0,65	4,022	0,019*
	Partially	197	3,89	0,64		
	No <sup>2</sup>	35	3,74	0,87		
	Total	391	3,94	0,67		
Extrinsic Motivation	Yes <sup>3</sup>	159	2,47	1,08	3,305	0,038*
	Partially <sup>2</sup>	197	2,68	0,97		
	No <sup>1</sup>	35	2,88	0,90		
	Total	391	2,61	1,01		
Social Interaction Skills	Yes <sup>1</sup>	159	3,83	0,69	3,302	0,038*
	Partially	197	3,72	0,71		
	No <sup>3</sup>	35	3,50	0,91		
	Total	391	3,74	0,73		
Time Management	Yes <sup>1</sup>	159	3,68	0,80	3,375	0,035*
	Partially <sup>2</sup>	197	3,49	0,81		
	No <sup>3</sup>	35	3,36	1,06		
	Total	391	3,56	0,84		
Problem Solving	Yes	159	3,28	0,82	0,318	0,728
	Partially	197	3,21	0,85		
	No	35	3,28	1,13		
	Total	391	3,25	0,87		
Boredom	Yes	159	3,13	0,92	0,559	0,572
	Partially	197	3,13	0,81		
	No	35	3,30	1,13		
	Total	391	3,15	0,88		
Leisure Benefit	Yes <sup>1</sup>	159	4,01	0,59	4,786	0,009*
	Partially <sup>2</sup>	197	3,87	0,58		
	No <sup>3</sup>	35	3,69	0,87		
	Total	391	3,91	0,62		

Physical Benefits	Yes <sup>1</sup>	159	4,01	0,65	4,802	0,009*
	Partially	197	3,87	0,60		
	No <sup>3</sup>	35	3,64	1,04		
	Total	391	3,91	0,68		
Psychological Benefits	Yes <sup>1</sup>	159	4,04	0,64	4,311	0,014*
	Partially <sup>2</sup>	197	3,90	0,61		
	No <sup>3</sup>	35	3,73	0,86		
	Total	391	3,94	0,65		
Social Benefits	Yes <sup>1</sup>	159	3,99	0,63	3,539	0,030*
	Partially <sup>2</sup>	197	3,84	0,66		
	No <sup>3</sup>	35	3,70	0,91		
	Total	391	3,89	0,68		

p<0,05\*; 1>2>3

In addition to the LE and LB in Table 4, the independent sample T-Test results between the state of using leisure time efficiently show that the sub-dimensions of awareness (F=4,132, p=0,017), intrinsic motivation (F=4,022, p=0,019), extrinsic motivation (F=3,305, p=0,038), social interaction skills (F=3,302, p=0,038) and time management (F=3,375, p=0,035) differ significantly from the variable of productive use of leisure time. With the exception of extrinsic incentives, all significant differences were found to be in favor of those who claimed that they utilized their spare time constructively. The variable of efficient use of leisure time has a statistically significant difference in recreational benefit total scores (F=4,786, p=0,009) and all sub-dimensions (F= 4,802, p=0,009), (F=4,311, p=0,014), (F=3,539, p=0,030). As a result, all significant differences in LB were found to be high in favor of those who reported that they utilized their leisure time productively, similar to the leisure education scale.

**Table 5.** Multiple Regression Analysis Results Between LE and LB

	B	Std. Error	$\beta$	t	p	Zero- order r	Partial r
Constant	2,005	,141		14,199	,000		
Physical Benefits	,074	,061	,099	1,213	,226	,391	,062
Psychological Benefits	-,114	,067	-,147	-1,688	,092	,366	-,085
Social Benefits	,404	,056	,544	7,205	,000	,503	-,344
R=0,508	R <sup>2</sup> = 0,258						
F <sub>(44,922)</sub> =0,000	p<0,000						

The dependent variable: Leisure education

Leisure education, according to regression analysis findings, has a considerable impact on social benefit ( $\beta = 0,544$ ,  $t = 7,205$ ,  $p=0,000$ ) while having no effect on physical ( $\beta = 0,099$ ,  $t = 1,213$ ;  $p=0,226$ ) or psychological benefit ( $\beta = -0,147$ ,  $t = -1,688$ ;  $p=0,092$ ). Leisure education explains 25% of the total variance in the sum of three sub-dimensions in explaining the leisure benefit, according to the findings.

**Table 6.** Pearson Correlation Test Findings Between LE and LB

		N	Total Leisure Education Zam. Fāitimi	Awareness	Intrinsic Motivation	Extrinsic Motivation	Social Interaction	Time Management	Problem Solving	Boredom	Total Benefit	Physically Benefit	Psychological Benefit	Social Benefit
Total Leisure Education	p.	391	1	.557**	.342**	.566**	.637**	.623**	.688**	.641**	.458**	.391**	.366**	.503**
Awareness	p.	391	.557**	1	.543**	-.122*	.508**	.354**	.213**	.056	.647**	.598**	.569**	.629**
Intrinsic Motivation	p.	391	.342**	.543**	1	-.160**	.390**	.303**	.135**	.020	.895**	.867**	.906**	.738**
Extrinsic Motivation Skill	p.	391	.566**	-.122*	-.160**	1	-.003	.110*	.421**	.584**	-.134**	-.161**	-.164**	-.062
Social Interaction	p.	391	.637**	.508**	.390**	-.003	1	.516**	.288**	.129*	.511**	.454**	.431**	.528**
Time Management	p.	391	.623**	.354**	.303**	.110*	.516**	1	.432**	.222**	.364**	.336**	.302**	.370**
Problem Solving	p.	391	.688**	.213**	.135**	.421**	.288**	.432**	1	.450**	.208**	.139**	.157**	.266**
Boredom	p.	391	.641**	.056	.020	.584**	.129*	.222**	.450**	1	.068	.050	.006	.123*
Total Benefit	p.	391	.458**	.647**	.895**	-.134**	.511**	.364**	.208**	.068	1	.918**	.937**	.929**
Physically Benefit	p.	391	.391**	.598**	.867**	-.161**	.454**	.336**	.139**	.050	.918**	1	.827**	.760**
Psychological Benefit	p.	391	.366**	.569**	.906**	-.164**	.431**	.302**	.157**	.006	.937**	.827**	1	.794**
Social Benefit	p.	391	.503**	.629**	.738**	-.062	.528**	.370**	.266**	.123*	.929**	.760**	.794**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The results of a Pearson correlation analysis that examined the association between leisure education and leisure benefit scales show that LE and LB have a reasonably significant positive relationship ( $r=0,458$ ). In addition to the total scores, the sub-dimensions were shown to have a typically favorable and fairly significant association with one another.

## DISCUSSION

The current research findings aim to determine the leisure education and leisure benefit levels in elite athletes, as well as to examine the relationship and effect between the various variables of these levels and the measurement tools; it is observed that the participants' leisure education ( $3,41 \pm 0,50$ ) and recreation benefit ( $3,91 \pm 0,62$ ) levels are slightly above the average values, with higher scores, especially in terms of social interaction and social benefit. The players' high social values can be explained by the fact that they live in a communal environment during their professional sports careers, and so their socialization traits are strong as a result. In a separate study, the leisure education levels of coach candidates were determined, and it was discovered that, contrary to the current research findings, the participants' leisure education level ( $119,93 \pm 15,05$ ) was below average, with the awareness ( $21,22 \pm 3,59$ ) sub-dimension having the highest average among the sub-dimensions and the problem-solving ( $13,83 \pm 5,02$ ) sub-dimension having the lowest average. In another study, the leisure benefit levels were shown to be high<sup>30</sup>. As a result, one of the primary objectives for participants should be to engage in leisure activities as a result of the leisure education they receive and to improve their leisure benefit in this manner.

Participants in the applied leisure education program were found to have greater levels of self-efficacy, leisure autonomy, and leisure efficacy<sup>11 27</sup>. There are numerous approaches for presenting leisure education at the current time<sup>33</sup>. Simultaneously, leisure education looks to be a one-of-a-kind tool for enhancing a sense of community/socialization, a sense of self, and involvement with students' institutions through active learning<sup>20</sup>. Various leisure activities have been proven to have beneficial interactions and benefits with a variety of factors in studies<sup>3,6,7,14,15,32,34,36</sup>.

Gender, income, employment position, the way people evaluate their free time and spend productive free time, as well as branch factors and measuring instruments, all showed statistically significant variations in the current study. Men, contrary to current research findings, had higher levels of leisure benefits, according to another study<sup>8</sup>. Studies that show that gender has a substantial impact on the leisure benefit are once again included in the literature.<sup>18</sup> Parallel to the study, Üstün et al. (2021)<sup>16</sup> discovered that female participants received a considerable and high level of leisure benefit. Gender is seen to make a difference in several studies, although it is not a significant determinant in others. This finding suggests that leisure activities are democratic participation practices that are not gender-based. Applications with equal participation should be preferred when designing programs.

In the current investigation, it was discovered that age and education level did not discriminate between LE and LB levels. In 2020, Güldür and Yaşartürk presented their research's parallel finding<sup>24</sup>. Munusturlar, (2017)<sup>33</sup>, in contrast to the current finding, found that the independent variables of education level and age had an effect on leisure education in his study, which looked at the effect of municipalities programmed and planned recreation services provided under the roof of townhouses on the leisure education levels of participants Akyüz, (2020)<sup>2</sup> and Ertekin, (2021)<sup>18</sup> also discovered that the leisure benefit is greatly differentiated by age. When looking through the literature, researchers have come up with a variety of conclusions, and it is projected that providing leisure time education to specific age groups will improve the degree of leisure benefit.

While there is a moderately significant positive association between LE and LB ( $r=0,458$ ); leisure education had a significant impact on social benefit ( $\beta = 0,544$ ,  $t = 7, 205$ ,  $p=0,000$ ) but not on physical ( $\beta = 0,099$ ,  $t = 1,213$ ;  $p=0,226$ ) or psychological ( $\beta = -0,147$ ,  $t = -1,688$ ;  $p=0,092$ ) benefit. Leisure education explains 25% of the total variance in the sum of three sub-dimensions in explaining the leisure benefit, according to the findings. Munusturlar, (2017)<sup>33</sup> carried out a similar study on university students and discovered that leisure education improved self-esteem and subjective well-being. Similar to the findings of the current study, Ayyıldız, et al, (2021)<sup>4</sup> discovered that leisure education has a relatively significant favorable link with personal improvement initiatives. Leisure education accounted for 25% of the variance in personal growth initiatives. More leisure time involvement, on the other hand, improves the degree of leisure benefit, according to.<sup>10</sup> According to the findings of Eskiler (2019)<sup>19</sup>, there is a positive and significant association between leisure time utility and leisure satisfaction. Furthermore, leisure satisfaction was found to predict roughly 84% of the sub-dimensions of leisure benefit. The findings revealed that offering leisure time benefits in extreme sports has a substantial impact on extreme sports leisure pleasure. Another study, Karaküçük, et al. (2019)<sup>29</sup> discovered a marginally positive connection between environmental attitude and leisure benefits. As a result, the research backs up the positive association and effect levels found.

As a result, it was discovered that the athletes' LE and LB levels fluctuate depending on certain conditions and that LE and LB are linked and influence each other. According to the findings, it is critical to value leisure time activities in addition to performance expectations and training programs in order for athletes to achieve success. It is suggested that research be conducted to enhance the level of leisure training and advantages, as well as to strengthen them.

## REFERENCES

1. Akgül BM., Ertüzün E., Karaküçük S. (2018). Rekreasyon fayda ölçeği: Geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*. 23(1), 25-34.
2. Akyüz H. (2020). Rekreasyon Bölümü öğrencilerinin rekreasyon fayda ve yaşam doyum düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Turkish Studies Social Sciences*. 15(5), 2323-2336.
3. Arslan S. (2010). Yetişkin Kent halkının belediyelerin serbest zaman eğitimi ile rekreasyon etkinliklerinin sunumuna ve yaşam kalitesine etkisine ilişkin görüşleri (Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi örneği). Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara.
4. Ayyıldız Durhan, T., Kurtipek S., Gungor NB. (2021). Leisure education as a predictor of personal growth initiative. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*. 13(5), 1430-1444.
5. Broadhurst R. (2001). *Managing environments for recreation and leisure*. London: Routledge.
6. Carbonneau H., Caron CD., Desrosiers J. (2011). Effects of an adapted leisure education program as a means of support for caregivers of people with dementia. *Archives of Gerontology And Geriatrics*. 53(1), 31-39.
7. Chang LC., Yu P., Jeng MY. (2015). Effects of leisure education on self-rated health among older adults. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*. 20(1), 34-40.

8. Chao C. (2013). The Relationship among leisure involvement, leisure benefits, and happiness of elementary schoolteachers in tainan county. *International Research in Education*. 1(1), 29-51.
9. Cheek NH., Burch WR. (1976). The social organization of leisure in human society. New York: Harper & Row. 6(6), 731-732.
10. Chin-Tsai K. (2013). Leisure involvement, leisure benefits, quality of life, and job satisfaction. a case study on 2011 creating sports island plan in chiayi city, taiwan held by sports affairs council, executive yuan. *International Review of Management And Business Research*. 2(2), 421.
11. Chino H., Takeuchi Y., Wakano T., Koike K., Nagata S. (2019). Leisure education in Japan. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*. 53(3), 274-279.
12. Cooper W. (1999). Some philosophical aspects of leisure theory: leisure studies state college. İçinde: Jackson EL., Burton TL. (Editors). *Leisure studies prospects for the twenty-first century*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
13. Dattilo J. (2015). Positive psychology and leisure education: A balanced and systematic service delivery model. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*. 49(2), 148-165.
14. Dattilo J., Lorek A., Sliwinski M., Chen ST., Hill N. (2021). An examination of video assisted leisure education in middle-aged and older adults. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 52(2), 227-246.
15. Desrosiers J., Noreau L., Rochette A., Carbonneau H., Fontaine L., Viscogliosi C., Bravo G. (2007). Effect Of a home leisure education program after stroke: a randomized controlled trial. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 88(9), 1095-1100.
16. Dogan Üstün U., Topal A., Yılmaz O., Özer B. (2021). Analyzing The differences in the leisure benefit perceptions of male and female high school students with different leisure choices. *Journal for Educators Teachers and Trainers*. 12(4), 119-125.
17. Elkington S., Stebbins R. (2014). *The serious leisure perspective: An introduction*. Routledge.
18. Ertekin AB. (2021). The effect of leisure benefits on loneliness of university students. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*. 7(3), 189-194.
19. Eskiler E., Yıldız Y., Ayhan C. (2019). The effect of leisure benefits on leisure satisfaction: Extreme sports. *Turkish Journal of Sport And Exercise*. 21(1), 16-20.
20. Evans KE., Hartman CL., Anderson DM. (2013). "It's more than a class": Leisure education's influence on college student engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*. 38(1), 45-58.
21. George D., Mallery P. (2019). *Ibm Spss statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference*: Routledge.
22. Godbey G. (2008). *Leisure in your life: New perspectives*: Venture Publishing.
23. Green E., Woodward D., Hebron S. (1990). *Women's leisure, what leisure?: A feminist analysis*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
24. Güldür B., Yaşartürk F. (2020). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin rekreasyon faaliyetlerine katılımındaki fayda ve yaşam doyum düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Güncel Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 6(2), 495-506.
25. Henderson KA. (2014). *Introduction to recreation services: Sustainability for a changing world*: Venture Publishing State College. Usa.

26. Huang CM. (2012). Establishment of effect model of participation experience in enterprise sports games on leisure benefits and organizational commitment. *Pakistan Journal of Statistics*. 28(5), 1-12.
27. Kao IC., Chang LC. (2017). Long-term effects of leisure education on leisure needs and stress in older adults. *Educational Gerontology*. 43(7), 356-364.
28. Karaküçük S., Akgül B. (2016). *Ekorekreasyon-rekreasyon ve çevre*. Gazi Kitap Evi, Ankara.
29. Karaküçük S., Ayyıldız Durhan T., Akgül BM., Aksin K., Özdemir AS. (2019). Oryantiring sporcularında ekosentrik, antroposentrik, antipatik yaklaşımların rekreasyon fayda ile ilişkisi. *Gazi University Journal of Gazi Educational Faculty*. 39(3), 1263-1288.
30. Korkutata A., Özavci R. Turistlerin rekreasyon fayda düzeylerinin demografik değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Turar Turizm ve Araştırma Dergisi*. 10(1), 63-79.
31. Levy J. (2000). *Leisure education, quality of life and community development: toward. leisure education, community development, and populations with special needs*. CABI Publishing. New York.
32. Litwiller F., White C., Gallant KA., Gilbert R., Hutchinson S., Hamilton-Hinch B., Lauckner H. (2017). The benefits of recreation for the recovery and social inclusion of individuals with mental illness: An integrative review. *Leisure Sciences*. 39(1), 1-19.
33. Munusturlar S. (2017). *Boş zaman eğitiminin benlik saygısı ve öznel iyi oluş üzerine etkisi*. Doktora Tezi. Anadolu Üniversitesi. Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı. Eskişehir.
34. Oncescu J., Neufeld C. (2020). Bridging low-income families to community leisure provisions: The role of leisure education. *Leisure/Loisir*. 44(3), 375-396.
35. Roberts K. (2006). *Leisure In Contemporary Society*. CABI Publishing. New York.
36. Searle MS., Mahon MJ., Iso-Ahola SE., Sdrolia HA., Van Dyck J. (1998). Examining The long term effects of leisure education on a sense of independence and psychological well-being among the elderly. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 30(3), 331-340.
37. Sivan A. (2000). Community development through leisure education: Conceptual approaches. *Leisure Education, Community Development And Populations With Special Needs*. 31-42.
38. Spracklen K. (2013). *Leisure, sports & society*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
39. Terekli M., Erkan M., Heper E., Katırcı H. (2000). Serbest Zaman endüstrisi içerisinde rekreasyon sporu. 1. *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Kongresi Bildirileri*.
40. Torkildsen G. (1999). *Leisure and recreation management*. Chapman&Hall.
41. Torkildsen G. (2005). *Recreation and leisure management*. London and New York. Routledge.
42. Torkildsen G. (2012). *Leisure and recreation management*: Routledge.