

EXAMINATION OF LEISURE SATISFACTION LEVELS OF INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATING IN YOUTH CENTER ACTIVITIES

Bilal YAMAN²

Beyza Merve AKGÜL¹

Merve KARAMAN¹

Tebessüm AYYILDIZ¹

Suat KARAKÜÇÜK¹

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to examine the levels of free time satisfaction of individuals participating in youth center activities according to some variables. The youth of the youth center in the Central Anatolia region of Turkey constitute the universe of the research. The study group consists of 906 individuals aged between 13 and 27 who are members of 11 youth centers in this region. The internal consistency of 39 questions and six subdimensions (Chronbach et al., 2008), which were developed by Beard and Ragheb (1980) in order to determine free time satisfaction levels in the collection of research data, The Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS) was used. In the analysis of the data, the distributions of the variables according to the groups were examined, the normality of the distributions and the homogeneity of the variances were evaluated and the distributions were not parametric. For this reason, the Mann-Whitney U test and the Kruskal-Wallis-H test were used to determine whether there was any difference between the participants' free time satisfaction levels. In addition, intra-group binary comparisons of meaningful differences were made by Mann-Whitney U test. According to research findings; Participants had the highest free time satisfaction score in relaxation and the lowest score in physiological subscale. No statistically significant difference was found between age variable and free time satisfaction level. As a result, the perceived income level increases as the amount of leisure time increases, and the level of satisfaction of women who have leisure time and those who have personal ability are higher.

Key Words: Recreation, leisure satisfaction, youth center

GENÇLİK MERKEZİ FAALİYETLERİNE KATILAN BİREYLERİN SERBEST ZAMAN TATMİN DÜZEYLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ

ÖZ

Bu araştırmanın amacı, gençlik merkezi faaliyetlerine katılan bireylerin bazı değişkenlere göre serbest zaman tatmin düzeylerinin incelenmesidir. Türkiye İç Anadolu bölgesindeki Gençlik merkezine üye gençler oluşturmaktadır. Araştırma grubunu ise bu bölgede bulunan 11 ildeki Gençlik merkezlerine üye olan yaşları 13-27 arasında değişen 906 birey oluşturmaktadır. Araştırma verileri toplanmasında, serbest zaman tatmin düzeylerini belirlemek amacıyla Beard ve Ragheb' in (1980) geliştirdikleri, Karlı ve arkadaşlarının (2008) yılında geçerlilik güvenilirlik çalışmasını yaparak Türkçe literatüre kazandırdıkları 39 sorudan ve altı alt boyuttan oluşan iç tutarlılık (Chronbach Alfa) katsayısı .92 olarak bulunmuş Serbest Zaman Tatmin Ölçeği (Leisure Satisfaction Scale/LSS) kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde değişkenlerin gruplara göre dağılımları incelenmiş, dağılımların normalliği ve varyansların homojenliği değerlendirilerek dağılımların parametrik özellik sergilemediği sonucuna varılmıştır. Bu nedenle katılımcıların serbest zaman tatmin düzeylerinin değişkenler ile aralarında fark olup olmadığını ortaya koymak için Mann-Whitney U testi ve Kruskal-Wallis-H testi kullanılmıştır. Ayrıca anlamlı farklara ait grup içi ikili karşılaştırmalar yine Mann-Whitney U testi ile yapılmıştır. Araştırma bulgularına göre; katılımcılar en yüksek serbest zaman tatmin puanını rahatlatma, en düşük puanı ise fizyolojik alt boyutunda almışlardır. Yaş değişkeni ile serbest zaman tatmin düzeyi arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunamamıştır. Sonuç olarak algılanan gelir seviyesi, boş zaman miktarı yükseldikçe tatmin düzeyi artmakta ve kadınların, boş zamanını verimli kullandığını belirtenlerin ve kişisel yeteneğe sahip olanların serbest zaman tatmin düzeyleri daha yüksektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Rekreasyon, serbest zaman tatmini, gençlik merkezi

¹ Gazi University Faculty of Physical Education and Sports Sciences Recreation Department

² Ministry of Youth And Sports Directorate General of Projects and Coordination

INTRODUCTION

Due to changes in the socio-economic and cultural levels of people's lives, their leisure time tends to spend their qualities in activities that will positively impact them. For this reason, people are constantly seeking to carry out activities that will contribute to their personal development, such as entering different social circles, strutting away, adapting to changing environmental conditions, protecting and improving body and soul health. On the other hand, people want to maximize their remaining time from intense working hours and to return to their jobs with the fitness they have achieved with renewed and acquired gains (Albayrak, 2012). Furthermore, in the new world order, developed and developing societies have begun to pursue a policy aimed at achieving individuals who appreciate their free time and succeed in increasing their work productivity in this point of pleasure and enjoyment cycle. It is described as "emotional, spiritual, mental, social, occupational and physically healthy state" (Zorba, 2011: 3) with the full meaning of the health definition of the individuals who use their leisure effectively and efficiently and is in a complete readiness level both psychologically, physiologically and socially.

According to Turkey's Adrese-Based Population Registration System, the population of Turkey is 78,741,053 as of 2016. Target group approximately 22,302,776 people are in the 13-29 age group. According to this, the young population in Turkey constitutes 28% of the total population (TUIK, 2015). In other words, the young population rate in Turkey is an important proportion within the total population. The high rate of population growth and the surplus of the young population further increase the significance of studies to

evaluate leisure time. Especially, it is seen that the evaluation of the leisure time of the young people living in the cities as being beneficial for them is important for the future of the country (Özşaker, 2012). There is a provision in the 1982 Constitution which is still in force for young people to be able to pass their free time efficiently and to stay away from harmful and bad habits. The most important dynamic highlighting our country in the world and especially in Europe is our young population. Until the 2040s, it is said that this driving force will be an opportunity for Turkey and Europe if it can be evaluated well (Gediz, 2012: 2).

In our country, it is the Youth Services and Sports Provincial Directorates that enable young people to spend their leisure time with productive and high quality activities. According to 2015 data, there are 193 youth centers (GSB, 2015) operating under the provincial directorates within the institution. Individuals can spend their free time with "positive" experiences such as doing sports to be healthy and participating in cultural events or "negative" experiences such as committing various crimes, drug addiction and acts of violence. The role that recreation can be taught and the prevention of violence is important in directing the future habits of young people (Burkeen and Alston, 2001). When we look at the most important mission of youth centers, it appears that there are regulations that will allow young people to spend their free time with scientific, cultural, artistic and sports activities for their interests, needs and expectations. Individuals who have completed social development in the early stages of life and are properly functioning will, of course, be more socially functional and more successful in solving the

problems they face with the help of their problem-solving skills, and the society they create will be a healthier society.

There is a limitation and definition problem in youth when it comes to the change and development of many psychological, social and biological individuals in the field. For this reason, although different age ranges are mentioned in the definition of youth, when the national youth policies are taken into consideration, the individuals aged 14-29 (GSB, 2015) are regarded as young; Is the period of development, spiritual maturation and preparation for life (Yörükoğlu, 2000: 13), which lies between childhood and adulthood. It can be said that the person who develops personally and develops his personality in terms of emotion, thought, behavior and attitude, whose social and moral, emotional, social, moral (Güçlü, 2013: 161). The experiences and experiences of individuals in this period are affecting their lives in advanced age, their quality of life due to their academic and professional achievements. As the families, peers and the community can meet the expectations of young people, and to fulfill their exams and responsibilities that they have to overcome within the education system in order to reach their goals in the adult life, a productive time planning to be satisfied from life is emerging as one of the most important points.

The youth period is a chronological period ending at an unspecified period in which the individual begins to experience changes in the biological and emotional processes and develops towards sexual and psychosocial maturity and gains the individual's independence and social productivity. This transition is accompanied by rapid physical and social changes (Özbay

and Öztürk, 1992: 12), and a transitional period between childhood and adulthood is characterized as youth.

In today's society, the leisure concept, which expresses the time that the individual can spend freely and as he wishes, is also defined as the time remaining from his / her work, the time remaining after his work, or the time required for some social activities to be done (Karaküçük and Gürbüz, 2007).

Positive use of leisure time is beneficial, and negative use is harmful therefore the efficient evaluation of leisure time has positive effects on individuals and especially young people in transitional period. In the developed countries, it is accepted that the best way to give national, spiritual, social, cultural, artistic and human values to young people is to spend leisure time efficiently and more importantly leisure activities is a part of education. The fact that young people can not properly assess their leisure time causes the underlying social, economic and psychological problems to emerge more intensely. Physical, psychological, social and personal development of young people is closely related to participate recreational activities as sports, arts, hobbies or volunteer projects (GSB, 2013: 35).

Time is needed to plan and use the time economically and effectively and increase the quality of life because it is a valuable resource that can not be replaced again (Jones, 2000), that is to say, an unstoppable value (Sabuncuoğlu, Paşa and Kaymaz, 2010: 5)

By virtue of the time when one can divide a day into 24 equal parts, Sleeping, working and / or training, eating and drinking, personal care and

so on. After all, he may have a separate time frame, which we can call "leisure" that he can only use for his activities in his own way. Individuals have free time and activities that they perform in their free time are directly or indirectly influencing the other dimensions and values of their lives (Karaküçük, 2008: 14-52). The second survey of the Time Usage Survey conducted by the Turkish Statistical Institute (TURKSTAT) in 2006 was carried out for 13 months from 1 August 2014 to 31 July 2015, covering the years 2014-2015. According to the survey, individuals between 15 and 24 years of age spend an average of 9 hours and 9 minutes on sleep, 9 hours and 41 minutes on average to spend 5 hours and 10 minutes to meet their obligatory work and needs, volunteer work and social activities, sports and recreation, And leisure activities such as games, watching TV, radio and listening to music.

Every individual wants to devote himself or herself away from his / her duties and responsibilities, and at this free time, he / she is directed towards the activities he / she wants in accordance with his / her needs. As a result, the individual needs recreation. These needs may depend on many things (Çelik, 2011). As a result of all these reasons, within the context of recreational needs, the individual tries to meet the need of pleasure from these activities through the activities he participates in. The individual feels that the pleasure is satisfied, and this feeling is called throughout life. The concept of pleasure comes to the forefront with satisfaction (Ayyildiz, 2015). Satisfaction is defined; impulse, motivation, meeting needs and expectations. According to another definition, satisfaction is related to the difference between expectations and expectations of individuals, the less the

difference, the higher the satisfaction (Kovacs, 2007). The individual who participates in recreation activities for leisure aims to satisfy himself or herself by satisfying the expectations of these activities as he wishes in every other task. As a result of this expectation, it is desired to obtain leisure satisfaction from the activities it participates (Çelik, 2011). Leisure is about the quality that satisfied individuals perceive from the way they fill their free time; In general, how satisfied they are with their leisure time (Kovacs, 2007). Beard and Ragheb (1980) have expressed that leisure satisfaction will lead to positive perceptions, emotional individual forms, or that the individual will gain as a result of leisure activities and choices. The leisure experience is ultimately an important determinant in the happiness of the individual. Satisfaction with free time can vary according to the perception of happiness (Amestoy, Rosal and Toscano, 2008). Measuring whether individuals are able to benefit from the leisure activities they attended, whether they meet expectations and are happy with participation in these activities, can provide important information about the further development of leisure time activities and even the expansion of the activity spectrum in taking precautions to make them happy and satisfied when evaluating their free time. (Karli et al., 2008). In this context, the level of leisure satisfaction of the individuals participating in Youth Center activities and the level of leisure satisfaction of participants in terms of sex, age, perceived income level, place of residence, daily leisure, efficient use of leisure, Does it change according to the situation? The answers were searched. It is thought that it is more useful to determine the expectations of youth about youth centers and plan

their activities and activities in this direction. It is thought that the education and activities carried out in youth centers can guide young people

in their time as their most precious capital and to be able to evaluate their youth with useful and good works on behalf of today and tomorrow.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

While the study population consists of young people from the Youth Center in the Central Anatolia region of Turkey, the research group constitutes 906 individuals who are randomly selected from 13-27 ages who are members of 11 youth centers in this region. In this study, a personal information form consisting of eight questions was used to collect data about personal variables.

According to this, other independent variables are perceived income level ($N_{low} = 132$, $N_{medium} = 655$, $N_{high} = 119$), daily leisure time ($N_{1-2 \text{ hours}} = 313$, $N_{3-4 \text{ hours}} = 409$, $N_{5 \text{ hours and more}} = 184$), efficient use of leisure time ($N_{yes} = 336$, $N_{hayır} = 154$, $N_{partially} = 416$), having personal ability ($N_{var} = 691$, $N_{yok} = 215$).

In order to determine the level of leisure satisfaction of participants, 39 questions that were developed by Beard and Ragheb (1980), Karlı and his colleagues (2008) and the Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS), which was the internal consistency (Chronbach Alfa) coefficient .92 consisting of six sub dimensions (Beard, Ragheb, 1980). Scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale and the highest score that can be taken from the scale is 195 and the lowest score is 39. The Leisure Satisfaction Scale consists of six sub-dimensions. These; Educational, Physiological, Aesthetic,

Relaxing, Social and Psychological sub dimensions. The internal consistency coefficient for the scale was .96 for this study, the internal consistency coefficients for the subdimensions of the scale; Education .89, Physiological .91, Aesthetic .91, Relaxation .90, Social .89, Psychological .90.

In the analysis of the data, the distributions according to the groups were examined in the first stage, the skewness and kurtosis values in the second stage were examined and in the third and last stage the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to the data. As a result of the tests performed, it was observed that the non-parametric tests had to be applied since the data were observed to not fit the normal distribution. The Mann-Whitney U test, the perceived income, the amount of daily leisure the Kruskal-Wallis-H test for the efficient use of leisure, the independent variables to have gender and personal ability to test whether the leisure satisfaction levels of the participants varied according to the variables used. In-group bilateral comparisons of Kruskal-Wallis-H test-end mean differences were also performed by the Mann-Whitney U test. In addition, descriptive statistics of participants' subdimensions of leisure satisfaction scale and subdimensions were presented. Statistical significance level was accepted as 0.05.

RESULTS

Table 1. Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values of the Participants' Leisure Satisfaction and Sub-dimensions

N= (906)	Min.	Max.	\bar{x}	Sd
Educational	1,0	5,00	3,71	,86
Physiological	1,0	5,00	3,44	,92
Aesthetic	1,0	5,00	3,64	,99
Relaxation	1,0	5,00	3,82	,97
Social	1,0	5,00	3,68	,90
Psychological	1,0	5,00	3,63	,88
Leisure Satisfaction	1,0	5,00	3,65	,77

In Table 1 it is seen that the highest arithmetic mean of the participants is in the relaxation subdimension (3.82 ± 0.97), and the lowest arithmetic mean is the physiological subdimension (3.44

± 0.92). It is also seen that the level of free time satisfaction (3.65 ± 0.77) of the individuals participating in youth center activities is high.

Table 2. Comparison of Leisure Satisfaction Scores According to Sex Variables of Participants

	Gender	N	Rank Average	Rank Sum	z	p
Educational	Male	466	435,89	203127,00	2,086	,037*
	Female	440	472,15	207744,00		
Physiological	Male	466	467,06	217652,00	1,608	,108
	Female	440	439,13	193219,00		
Aesthetic	Male	466	449,62	209523,50	,461	,645
	Female	440	457,61	201347,50		
Relaxation	Male	466	434,23	202350,00	2,296	,022*
	Female	440	473,91	208521,00		
Social	Male	466	444,18	206989,50	1,104	,270
	Female	440	463,37	203881,50		
Psychological	Male	466	456,96	212942,00	,410	,682
	Female	440	449,84	197929,00		
Leisure Satisfaction	Male	466	447,33	208457,00	,730	,465
	Female	440	460,03	202414,00		

*p<0,05 statistically significant.

Table 2 shows the participants' leisure satisfaction scores and their sub-dimensions compared to the gender variable. Mann-Whitney U test was findings were examined, according to the gender variable, the participants'

used to determine the difference between leisure satisfaction scores according to gender variable. When the leisure satisfaction scores differ only in education and relaxation sub-

dimensions ($p < 0,05$). Accordingly, female participants, participating in youth center activities in the education

subscale and relaxation subscale have a higher level of leisure satisfaction than male participants.

Table 3. Comparison of Participants' Leisure Satisfaction Scores According to Perceived Income Variable

Perceived Income Level		N	Rank Sum	χ^2	p
Educational	Low	132	426,06	4,438	,109
	Medium	655	451,55		
	High	119	494,64		
Physiological	Low	132	464,94	1,479	,477
	Medium	655	447,20		
	High	119	475,51		
Aesthetic	Low	132	433,40	5,700	,058
	Medium	655	448,20		
	High	119	504,95		
Relaxation	Low	132	426,43	2,482	,289
	Medium	655	454,54		
	High	119	477,82		
Social	Low	132	445,63	3,646	,162
	Medium	655	447,34		
	High	119	496,11		
Psychological	Low	132	423,49	11,542	,003*
	Medium	655	446,27		
	High	119	526,58		
Leisure Satisfaction	Low	132	433,10	5,097	,078
	Medium	655	448,80		
	High	119	501,97		

* $p < 0,05$ statistically significant.

Table 3 compares the leisure satisfaction scores and subdimensions of the respondents according to the perceived income variable. Kruskal-Wallis-H test was applied to determine the difference between leisure satisfaction scores and subdimensions according to perceived income level. When the findings were examined, according to perceived income level, participants' leisure satisfaction scores

showed only a change in the psychological sub-dimension ($p < 0,05$). Individuals participating in youth center activities with a high level of income perceived in the psychological sub-dimension according to the binary comparison made to determine which groups this change is among are higher in the level of perceived income than those with medium and low levels of leisure satisfaction.

Table 4. Comparison of Leisure Satisfaction Scores According to Participant's Daily Leisure Time Variable

Amount of Daily Leisure		N	Rank Average	χ^2	p
Educational	1-2 hour	313	424,70	6,532	,038*
	3-4 hour	409	462,57		
	5 hour and more	184	482,34		
Physiological	1-2 hour	313	426,32	5,500	,064
	3-4 hour	409	471,95		
	5 hour and more	184	458,73		
Aesthetic	1-2 hour	313	420,81	7,642	,022*
	3-4 hour	409	468,41		
	5 hour and more	184	475,97		
Relaxation	1-2 hour	313	428,08	5,429	,066
	3-4 hour	409	460,27		
	5 hour and more	184	481,69		
Social	1-2 hour	313	430,51	3,746	,154
	3-4 hour	409	464,08		
	5 hour and more	184	469,10		
Psychological	1-2 hour	313	422,38	6,853	,032*
	3-4 hour	409	467,96		
	5 hour and more	184	474,31		
Leisure Satisfaction	1-2 hour	313	418,29	8,788	,012*
	3-4 hour	409	469,49		
	5 hour and more	184	477,86		

*p<0,05 statistically significant.

Table 4 also shows the participants' leisure satisfaction scores and their sub-dimensions compared to the daily leisure variable. The Kruskal-Wallis-H test was used to determine the difference between leisure satisfaction scores and subdimensions according to the amount of daily leisure. When the findings were examined, leisure satisfaction scores and educational, aesthetic and psychological subscale scores of the participants varied according to the amount of daily leisure time (p <0,05). In order to show which

groups this change is made, the results show that the leisure satisfaction scores according to the binary comparison and the 1-2 hours of the youth center activities indicating that the daily leisure time is 3-4 hours in all the different sub-dimensions and also the leisure satisfaction scores, educational, aesthetics subscale, the amount of leisure time is 5 hours and more, indicating that the youth center members are 1-2 hours of leisure satisfaction scores are higher.

Table 5. Comparison of Leisure Satisfaction Scores According to Participants' Use of Leisure Efficiently

Efficient leisure time		N	Rank Average	X ²	p
Educational	Yes	336	492,21	13,618	,001*
	No	154	397,11		
	Partly	416	443,11		
Physiological	Yes	336	482,14	14,377	,000*
	No	154	382,56		
	Partly	416	456,63		
Aesthetic	Yes	336	487,39	15,035	,001*
	No	154	392,62		
	Partly	416	448,66		
Relaxation	Yes	336	464,26	2,837	,160
	No	154	417,44		
	Partly	416	458,16		
Social	Yes	336	489,16	14,504	,001*
	No	154	388,85		
	Partly	416	448,63		
Psychological	Yes	336	496,08	24,845	,000*
	No	154	365,07		
	Partly	416	451,85		
Leisure Satisfaction	Yes	336	495,18	19,821	,000*
	No	154	372,12		
	Partly	416	449,96		

*p<0,05 statistically significant.

Table 5 compares the leisure satisfaction scores and subdimensions of leisure time users according to their leisure time utilization. The Kruskal-Wallis-H test was used to determine the difference between leisure satisfaction scores and subdimensions according to the use of leisure time efficiently. When the findings were examined, the leisure satisfaction scores and educational, physiological, aesthetic, social, psychological subscale scores of the participants varied according to the use of leisure time efficiently ($p < 0,05$). According to bilateral comparisons made to show which groups this change is made, the

results indicate that the individuals participating in youth center activities, which indicate that they use leisure time efficiently in aesthetic, social and psychological subdimensions, are partly productive and inefficient, while at the same time indicating that they are inefficient. The level of satisfaction with free time is higher. However, the levels of leisure satisfaction are lower than those who said that the individuals who participated in the youth center activities used the leisure time efficiently in the education sub-dimension and those who said that they used the leisure time inefficiently in the physiological sub-dimension.

Table 6. Comparison of Leisure Satisfaction Scores According to Participants' Personal Ability

	Personal Ability	N	Rank Average	Rank Sum	z	p
Educational	Yes	691	480,33	331909,00	5,539	,000*
	No	215	367,27	78962,00		
Physiological	Yes	691	481,64	332815,50	5,813	,000*
	No	215	363,05	78055,50		
Aesthetic	Yes	691	481,31	332585,50	5,762	,000*
	No	215	364,12	78285,50		
Relaxation	Yes	691	478,11	330376,50	5,108	,000*
	No	215	374,39	80494,50		
Social	Yes	691	483,11	333829,00	6,113	,000*
	No	215	358,33	77042,00		
Psychological	Yes	691	489,28	338092,50	7,386	,000*
	No	215	338,50	72778,50		
Leisure Satisfaction	Yes	691	488,60	337621,00	7,238	,000*
	No	215	340,70	73250,00		

*p<0,05 statistically significant.

Table 6 shows the participants' leisure satisfaction scores and their sub-dimensions compared to having personal abilities. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine the difference in leisure satisfaction scores according to having personal ability. When the findings are examined, the level of leisure satisfaction of participants according to having personal ability varies according to

leisure satisfaction scores and all sub-dimensions (p<0,05). According to this, participants who indicate that they have the personal ability to enjoy their leisure time in the center of youth, in terms of education, physiological, aesthetic, relaxation, social and psychological sub-dimensions, have higher levels of leisure satisfaction than those who have no personal ability.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of the findings obtained in this part of the research will be given to the results of the research and discussion will be given in the direction of the studies. Within the scope of the research results, it is seen that the highest arithmetic average value of the participants is in the relaxation sub-dimension (3.82 ± 0.97) and the lowest arithmetic mean is the

physiological sub-dimension (3.44 ± 0.92). It is also

seen that the level of leisure satisfaction (3.65 ± 0.77) of the individuals participating in youth center activities is high. When we look at other studies that were made when the literature was examined; According to the findings of this research which was done in order to determine the leisure satisfaction levels according to some demographic variables of youth

centers, it was determined that the participants had the highest level of relaxation in the relaxation sub-dimension and lowest in the physiological dimension. When the results are evaluated on the three eastern youth centers serving to assess the youth's free time, Düzce and Bolu's members show that the levels of leisure satisfaction are higher in all the sub-dimensions except the physiological dimension than the Ankara one (Sönmezoğlu et al., 2014).

According to research findings that Ayyildiz and Gökyürek (2016) made in parallel with our research findings; The highest arithmetic mean of the participants was found to be the relaxation sub-dimension (3.99 ± 0.87), and the lowest arithmetic average was the physiological sub-dimension (3.59 ± 0.78). Again parallel to our research results; In the survey conducted with 173 male and 223 female participants in the province of Yerlisu Lapa (2013) in Antalya, the relaxation sub-dimension of the leisure time satisfaction level subdimensions of the male and female participants was higher in arithmetic mean of 4,37 and 4,26, respectively, Satisfaction level.

When the findings obtained from the research were examined, the leisure satisfaction scores of the participants according to the gender variable only change in education and relaxation sub-dimensions ($p < 0,05$). According to this, in the education subscale and the relaxation subscale, the level of leisure time satisfaction of women in the youth center is higher than that of men. When the findings of

Sönmezoğlu and others (2014) are finally taken into consideration, According to the gender variable, the participants' leisure satisfaction scores differ only in the education and relaxation sub-dimensions ($p < 0,05$). According to another research; the leisure satisfaction levels of university students were found to be in accordance with sex and gender, and there was no difference according to sex in terms of leisure satisfaction levels of male and female participants (Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa, 2010). There are many studies in the literature that suggest that the gender variable does not show significant difference in the level of leisure satisfaction, supporting the outcome of the research (Broughten and Beegs, 2006; Berg et al., 2001; Lu and Hu, 2005; Orphan, 2014: 88; Spiers And Walker, 2009).

No statistically significant difference was found between age groups and leisure satisfaction scores and all subdimensions among our research findings. In this respect, we can say that as the age increases or decreases, the levels of leisure satisfaction of the youth center members do not differ. According to research findings of orphans, there was no significant difference between the age groups of the research participants and the levels of leisure satisfaction (Orphan, 2014: 88). According to another research, as the age increases, the level of leisure satisfaction decreases (Amestoy et al., 2008).

Findings obtained when income variable is taken into consideration;

Participants' leisure satisfaction scores according to the level of perceived income vary only in the psychological sub-dimension. According to the binary comparison made between these groups, the perceived level of the youth centered youth with high level of perceived income in the psychological sub-dimension is higher than middle and low level of leisure satisfaction scores. The findings of the researches of Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa (2010) on the leisure satisfaction levels of university students according to sex and gender were found to be significantly different according to the level of leisure. As income levels of participants increase, leisure satisfaction levels also increase. Especially the revenue is 350 TL. Have a very low satisfaction in all sub-dimensions, indicating that one's income is influential on their leisure time activities. According to the results of the survey conducted by Orphan (2014: 91), participants who have a monthly average monthly income of TL 4001 or higher are more likely to be satisfied than those who have a monthly average of TL 1,000 or less. In another study, it was aimed to examine the levels of leisure satisfaction on the side of basketball and football and the economic levels of the leisure satisfaction subscale scores and the total scale scores of the individuals who indicated their economic level as "bad" (= 3,701) = 4,473), respectively. This finding can be interpreted as a significant relationship between economic level and leisure satisfaction (Silver and Karakullukçu, 2015). In parallel with this interpretation, Agyar (2013) and Russell (1987) conclude

that free time activities and income, one of the demographic characteristics, are significantly related.

Participants' leisure satisfaction scores and educational, physiological, aesthetic, social, psychological subscale scores vary according to the use of leisure time efficiently when the findings obtained about whether or not individuals use their leisure time efficiently. According to the bilateral comparisons made to show which groups this change is made, the youth center members who use the leisure time efficiently in the aesthetic, social and psychological subdimensions and the ones who stated that they used partly efficiently and inefficiently at the same time, Leisure satisfaction is higher. On the other hand, the levels of leisure satisfaction are lower than those who say that youth center members use fruitful and inefficient use of leisure time in the education sub-dimension, while those who say that they use fruitful and inefficient use leisure time in the physiological sub-dimension.

When the findings are examined, the level of leisure satisfaction of participants according to having personal ability varies according to leisure satisfaction scores and all subdimensions. According to this, participants who indicate that they have the personal ability to enjoy their leisure time in the center of youth, in terms of education, physiological, aesthetic, relaxation, social and psychological subdimensions, have higher levels of leisure satisfaction

than those who have no personal ability. In all the findings, the level of income perceived according to our research results increases as the amount of leisure time increases, while the satisfaction level of women who have leisure time and those who have personal abilities are higher.

We can list suggestions for studies that can be done in line with our research results as follows. Youth centers should be provided with information on the identification of the youth centers of the individual and their activities. Young people who are members of youth centers can be given free / leisure time evaluation habits and cultures, free/ leisure time training to create this awareness and awareness among them. Youth centers can be investigated for the prevention of bad habits and for reducing bad habits. Surveys should be conducted for young people and their families, to improve the quality of service of youth

center services and to provide better services, and to share the results with relevant authorities and authorities. In order to find solutions to the problems of young people who are members of youth centers and psychological problems they are experiencing, specialists in different fields such as social worker, psychological counseling and guidance specialist should be employed in youth centers and in-service trainings should be evaluated. Continuous information exchange and co-ordinated work should be carried out with all public institutions and organizations, non-governmental organizations, youth clubs and communities working with young people. The best practices and practices applied in youth centers in other countries should be explored and the activities and activities applicable in youth centers in our country should be evaluated.

REFERENCES

- 1.Agyar, E. "Contribution of perceived freedom and leisure satisfaction to life satisfaction in a sample of turkish women." *Social Indicators Research*,116, pp.1-15,2013.
- 2.Albayrak, A. "Evaluation of Accommodation Companies Recreation Activities in İstanbul". *Online Academic Journal of Information Technology*, 3 (8), 43-58, 2012. [In Turkish with English Abstract].
- 3.Ardahan, F. Yerlisu Lapa, T. "An Examination of Leisure Satisfaction Level of University Students with regard to Gender and Income. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi Hacettepe J. of Sport Sciences*,"21 (4), pp.129–136, 2010. [In Turkish with In English Abstract].
- 4.Ayyıldız, T. " Examination of Leisure Satisfaction Levels of Individuals Participating in Recreative Dance Activities." *Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü*, Ankara, pp. 16-43, 2015. [In Turkish with In English Abstract].
5. Ayyıldız, T., Gökyürek, B. "Examination of Leisure Satisfaction Levels Of Individuals Participating In Recreative Dance Activities". *Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport / Science, Movement And Health*. 16(2),pp.147-155, 2016.
- 6.Beard, J.,G. Ragheb, M.,G., "Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*," 12 (1), pp. 20–33,1980.
- 7.Berg, E., C.,Trost, M., Schneider,I.E.,Allison, M.T., "Dyadic Exploration of the Relationship of Leisure Satisfaction,Leisure Time,and Gender to Relationship Satisfaction." *Leisure Sciences*,23: pp.25-46,2001.
- 8.Broughten, K., Beggs, A., "Leisure satisfaction of older adults. *Activities, Adaptation & Aging*," 31(1), 2006.

9. Burkeen, E. W., M. A. Alston, "Using recreation to prevent violence and drug abuse. Parks and Recreation, 36 (3), 2011.
10. Çelik, G. "Analyse leisure constraints and satisfaction of disabled people working in public sector: Antalya city center", Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya, pp. 2-18, 2011. [In Turkish with In English Abstract].
11. Gediz, S. "Within recreational activities as a public service the Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sport West Mediterranean Region Youth Centres analyse", (MT), Akdeniz University Social Sciences Institute, 2012 Antalya. [In Turkish with In English Abstract].
12. Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı. "Üniversite Gençlerinin Serbest Zaman Kullanım Alışkanlıkları Araştırması." Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı Yayını, No:72, Ankara, 2013. [In Turkish].
13. Gümüş, H., Karakullukçu Ö.F. "Leisure Satisfaction In Football And Basketball Fans: A Sample of Afyonkarahisar". International Journal of Science Culture and Sport (IntJSCS) (3), pp.401-409, 2015.
14. Karaküçük, S., Gürbüz, B. "Rekreasyon ve Kent(li)leşme". Gazi Kitabevi, pp.19, Ankara, 2007. [In Turkish].
15. Karlı, Ü., Polat, E., Yılmaz, B., Koçak, S. "Reliability and Validity Study Of Leisure Satisfaction Scale (Lss-Long Version). Hacettepe Spor Bilimleri Dergisi.19 (2), pp. 80-91, 2008. [In Turkish with English Abstract].
16. Kovacs, A., "The leisure personality: relationships between personality, leisure satisfaction, and life satisfaction," (DT), Indiana University School of Health, Indiana, pp. 29-42, 2007.
17. Lu, L., Hu, C., H., "Personality, leisure experiences and happiness. Journal of Happiness Studies," 6, pp. 325-342, 2005.
18. Lüküslü, D. Yücel, H., "Gençlik Halleri: 2000'li Yıllar Türkiye'sinde Genç Olmak." Efil Yayınevi, pp.13, Ankara, 2013. [In Turkish].
19. Özbay, H. Öztürk, E, "Gençlik." İletişim Yayınları, pp.12, İstanbul,1992. [In Turkish].
20. Özşaker, M. " An Evaluation on Non Participation of the Youth in Leisure Time Activities", Selçuk University Journal Of Physical Education And Sport Science. 14(1) pp. 126-131, 2012.
21. Russell, R.,V. "The importance of recreation satisfaction and activity participation to the life satisfaction of age-segregated retirees". Journal of Leisure Research, 19 (4), 273-283,1987.
22. Sönmezoğlu, U., Polat, E., Aycan, A. "Youth Center Members and According to Some Variables Levels of Leisure Satisfaction" International Journal of Science Culture and Sport, (1). pp. 219-229, 2014.
23. Spiers, A., Walker, G.J. "The Effects of Ethnicity and Leisure Satisfaction on Happiness. Peacefulness, and Quality of Life". Leisure Sciences, 31. pp.84-99, 2009.
24. T.C. Başbakanlık Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu. Haber Bülteni. 2015. Erişim: <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=18627> (12.11.2015). [In Turkish].
25. T.C. Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı Gençlik Merkezleri. Erişim: <http://genclikmerkezi.gsb.gov.tr> (23.11.2015). [In Turkish].
26. Yerlisu Lapa, T., Ardahan, F., "The Reasons Students at Akdeniz University Participate in Leisure Activities and the Ways They Spend Their Time" Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences. 20 (4). pp.132-144, 2009. [In English Abstract].
27. Yerlisu, Lapa, T., "Life satisfaction, leisure satisfaction and perceived freedom of park recreation participants. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences," 93, pp.1985-1993, 2013.
28. Yetim, G., "The effect of leisure involvement on leisure satisfaction and loyalty: A study on fitness centers in Eskişehir" Anadolu University Health Sciences Institute, pp.88-91, 2014. [In English Abstract].
29. Yörükoğlu, A. "Gençlik Çağı: Ruhsal Sağlığı ve Ruhsal Sorunları". On Birinci Basım. Özgür Yayınları, Ankara, pp.13, 2000. [In Turkish].
30. Zorba, E. "Yaşam Boyu Spor". İstanbul: Bedray Basın Yayıncılık, pp.3, 2011. [In Turkish].