

Beyza M. AKGÜL¹

Tebessüm AYYILDIZ¹

Merve KARAMAN¹

EXAMINATION OF LEISURE SATISFACTION LEVELS OF INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATING IN RECREATIVE ACTIVITIES THROUGH SPORTS CENTERS WITH REGARD TO SOME VARIABLES ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the level of leisure satisfaction of individuals participating in sports at sports centers with regard to gender, age and perceived income. 109 male and 85 female, in total 194 individuals who were the members of amajor sports centers participated to this study in Ankara. The participants' leisure satisfaction levels are examined by the "LeisureSatisfaction Scale" (Leisure Satisfaction Scale; Beard & Ragheb, 1980). The scale was translated into Turkish and was studied about validity and reliability by Karlı,Polat,Yılmaz, Koçak (2008). The participants' personal informations is included in the study with "Personal Information Form". One Way Multivariate Variance Analysis ANOVA (MANOVA) is used while testing the participants' leisure satisfaction sub-scale scores in relation with difference between gender, age, and income levels. As results of Manova, no significance difference revealed in gender and age variables. The One Way ANOVA is used to determinate the perceived income level efficiency in which level. According to perceived income; significant difference has been revealed between Leisure Satisfaction Scale's sub-scale of education and aesthetic ($F(4,194)=3.719$; $F(4,194)=3.664$, $p<0.01$). As conclusion; leisure satisfaction levels change depending on income variable. Leisure satisfaction levels in education sub-scale were found higher for individuals whose perceived income levels are high ($=3.85$) than individuals with medium ($=3.52$) perceived income. Leisure satisfaction levels were found higher in LSS's aesthetic sub-scale ($p<0.05$) on individuals with perceived income level is high($=4.03$) than perceived income is medium ($=3.68$) and low ($=3.52$).

Key words: Leisure Satisfaction, Recreation, Sports Center

SPOR MERKEZLERİNDE REKREATİF FAALİYETLERE KATILAN BİREYLERİN SERBEST ZAMAN TATMİN DÜZEYLERİNİN FARKLI DEĞİŞKENLERE GÖRE İNCELENMESİ

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı, spor merkezlerine üye olan bireylerin serbest zaman tatmin düzeylerinin cinsiyet, yaş ve algılanan gelire göre değerlendirilmesidir. Çalışmaya Ankara ilindeki büyük ölçekli spor merkezlerine üye olan 109 erkek ve 85 kadın toplam 194 kişi katılmıştır. Katılımcıların serbest zaman tatmin düzeyleri Karlı ve ark.(2008) geçerlilik güvenilirlik çalışmasını yaparak Türkçe'ye çevirdikleri "Serbest Zaman Tatmin Ölçeği" (Leisure Satisfaction Scale; Beard&Ragheb, 1980) ile incelenirken, katılımcıların kişisel bilgileri "Kişisel Bilgi Formu" ile araştırmaya dahil edilmiştir. Katılımcıların serbest zaman tatmin ölçeği alt boyut puanlarına cinsiyet, yaş ve gelir düzeyi değişkenlerine göre farkı test etmek için Tek Yönlü Çok Değişkenli ANOVA (MANOVA) kullanılmıştır. MANOVA sonuçlarına göre, cinsiyet ve yaş değişkenleri bakımından anlamlı bir fark ortaya çıkmazken, algılanan gelir değişkenine göre ise SZTÖ' nün alt boyutlarından eğitim ve estetik alt boyutlarında anlamlı fark olduğunu göstermiştir ($F(4,194)=3.719$; $F(4,194)=3.664$, $p<0.01$). Bu sonuçlara göre; algılanan gelir seviyesinin hangi düzeyde etkili olduğunu belirlemek amacıyla Tek Yönlü Varyans Analizi(One Way ANOVA) kullanılmıştır. Buna göre; SZTÖ'nün algılanan gelir düzeyine göre sadece eğitim ve estetik alt boyutlarında anlamlı farklılık bulunmuştur [$F(3,193)=3.917$; $F(3,193)=4,162$, $p<0.01$].Sonuç olarak serbest zaman tatmin düzeyi algılanan gelir değişkenine göre değişmektedir ve eğitim alt boyutunda algılanan geliri yüksek olanların ($\bar{x}=3.85$) orta ($\bar{x}=3.52$) olanlara göre serbest zaman tatmin düzeyleri daha yüksekken, SZTÖ' nün estetik alt boyutunda algılanan geliri yüksek olanların ($\bar{x}=4.03$) orta ($\bar{x}=3.68$) ve düşük ($\bar{x}=3.52$) olanlara göre serbest zaman tatmin düzeylerinin daha yüksek olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır ($p<0.05$).

Anahtar Kelimeler: Serbest Zaman Tatmini, Rekreasyon, Spor Merkezi

¹Gazi University School of Physical Education and Sports

INTRODUCTION

Technological acceleration rapidly having momentum in the last century has brought change. This change has led into our daily lives and by affecting the time usage of the individuals; it causes the new concepts to enter into our lives. Industrialization has taken a back seat the manpower in many points and so we come across the concept of leisure remaining from workload. The concept of leisure time has taken its place with the word "leisure" in English. The word "leisure" in English is derived from the word "licere" in Latin that means being allowed or free. The word "loisir" in French means "free time" (Torkildsen, 2005;46).

The word leisure refers as the simplest sense to the period of time that can be spent by the individuals as they wish freely. Leisure can be described as getting rid of obstacles/difficulties, having the right to choose and the remaining time from the work or from some social behaviors that are compulsory to be performed (Karaküçük, 2007;19). In this context, the activities away from all kinds of difficulties and that we can use freely and we can participate in voluntarily have become important, because spending the leisure with efficient activities has an important role in the development of the individual. When it comes to spend the leisure, it is required to recognize the concept of recreation.

The term of recreation comes from the word recreation that means regeneration or recovery in Latin. This term means restructuring of the energy or restoration of function ability (Kelly, 1990;25). Recreation has generally been evaluated as the activities regaining the energy after hard work and as light and relaxing and chosen as

voluntarily and that gives opportunity to return to work as renewed (McLean,Hurd,Rogers,2008).

Lots of recreation theorists prefer to explain recreation comprehensive as much as possible. For this reason, a path for describing recreation is all the activities that are the acquisitions of the participant and except for working (Kelly, 1990;25). By containing needs and interests of the people from each section, recreation programs are required to include the fields in which the people can easily apply them and show their abilities. With this sense, recreation activity areas are musical activities (instrumented, orchestral, solo, chorus, etc.), sport activities (team, individual, nature, struggle and mind sports), games (educative games for all ages), dance (folk dances, modern and rhythmic dances, etc.), the activities requiring art and crafts (plastic, leather, ceramics, metal, photography, art, wood, etc.) outdoor activities (camping, having a picnic, environmentalism, etc.), scientific discussion meetings, etc.) (Karaküçük, 2005;86).

Recreative activities provide individuals to enjoy the activities they choose freely and to gain definite physical or spiritual acquisition (Kelly,1990;25), and it is seen as an activity maintained under some conditions through certain motivations. More than external motivations or rewarding, it is incited with intrinsic motivations such as personal satisfaction (Tekin, 2009;55). This incitement increases satisfaction levels of the individuals in their lives. Looking at the satisfaction descriptions made in literature, satisfaction is described as meeting the impulse, instinct, needs and expectations. According to another description, satisfaction is related to the difference between the things owned by the individuals and their expectations; the

lesser this difference is, the higher the satisfaction will (Kovacs,2007). The Word satisfaction is a concept we frequently encounter especially in social dimension of our lives. A person wants to be satisfied with his work. Satisfying is a benefit we want to acquire from everything we do (Çelik, 2011). The individuals participating in leisure activities, ie. Recreation activities aim to satisfy with these activities by meeting their expectations as in all activities. As a result of this expectation, they desire to obtain leisure satisfaction from these activities. Being handled of these recreative activities subjected to this study on the basis of sport activities and the satisfaction levels in compensate for this time period are the basic elements of the research.

In this context, leisure satisfaction is related to the quality that the individuals comprehend by the leisure type; generally it points out how much they are satisfied with their leisure (Kovacs, 2007). Beard and Ragheb (1980) express that leisure satisfaction arises positive senses, emotions and individual forms or as a result of leisure activities and choices, the individuals gain acquisition. Leisure satisfaction is expressed by the levels of which leisure activities or status the individuals are satisfied or pleased with. The positive emotion of this satisfaction is the conclusion of the satisfaction of individual's needs felt or not felt.

The satisfaction of leisure is a topic on which developing societies today must carefully stress, but the studies performed in our country about this matter is limited. However, to what extend it is important to be met the compulsory necessities in order that a person is satisfied with the life, it has closely relationship with satisfaction sense they will obtain in their leisure. For this reason, the aim of this study is to examine the leisure satisfaction

levels of the individuals participating in recreative activities in multi-purpose sport centers in the province of Ankara due to the different variables. In our country, the number of the research on leisure satisfaction levels of the individuals participating in recreative activities in sport centers is very few. For this reason, it is thought that the study will contribute to the literature in both aspects. Besides, in conclusion of recreative activities that the individuals participate in sport centers, revealing leisure time activities will help the organizations to rearrange their policies and with the identification of the variables affecting leisure time satisfaction level, it will help configuration of the qualities of activities.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

Study Group

The population of the study is composed of the individuals participating in recreative activities in multi-purpose sport centers (there are more than one sport branches or activities such as swimming, squashing, fitness, etc.) in the province of Ankara (Ammon and Stotlar, 2003) The study group is composed of 194 people whose age mean is $x=27,89\pm 9,2$ ad who are the members of Most Life Club, Vamos Sports Complex, Base Life Club and Sport International. The descriptive statistics related to the study group is given below.

Table 1. The distribution of the Individuals participating in the study due to gender

		f	%
Gender	Female	85	56,2
	Male	109	43,8
	Total	194	100

Table 2. The distribution of the individuals participating in the study

		f	%
Age Groups	15-25	96	49,5
	26-36	62	32,0
	37+	36	18,6
	Total	194	100

due to age groups

Table 3. The distribution of the individuals participating in the study due to perceived income level

		f	%
Perceived income	Very low	11	5,7
	Low	17	8,8
	Middle	97	50,0
	High	69	35,6
	Total	194	100

Data Collection Tool

In this study, personal information form developed by the researchers in order to be detected of demographic data was used. In order to identify leisure time satisfaction levels of the individuals participating in the research, Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS) developed by Beard and Ragheb (1980) and added to Turkish literature after being conducted of validity and reliability studies by Karlı et al. in 2008 that includes 39 questions and six sub-dimensions and whose KMO sample efficiency measure is .92 and in conclusion of Barlett Globalism test is $p < .05$ and internal consistency is .92 was used. For this study, internal consistency coefficient was found as .94 and significance level as $p < .01$. Leisure Satisfaction Scale is a five point Likert type scale and the highest point to be got from the scale is 195 and the lowest point is .39.

In line with this, the highest mean value to be got is 5 while the lowest value is 1. When the sub-dimensions of the scale is examined, psychological sub-dimension is evaluated the

psychological contributions of leisure activities to the individuals such as the feeling of freedom, amusement, attendance and intellectual development, its education sub-dimension is as the benefits provided by leisure activities to the individuals' personal development, and to recognize themselves and their environment; its social sub-dimension is as the benefits of leisure activities in making new relationships of the individuals with other people and the perceptions about these relationships; its relaxation dimension is as the effect of free time in getting rid of stress and the difficulties of life, its physiological dimension is as the physiological benefits such as being fit, healthy, weight control and well-being state as a result of leisure activities and its aesthetic dimension is as the design, beauty, novelty and amenity of the spaces that the individuals go or use in order to perform leisure activities (Karlı et al.,2008).

Analysis of the Data

In analysis of the data, SPSS 19.0 package program was used. For demographic features of research group, frequency and percentage calculations were made. The distributions of the variables due to the groups were examined and the normality of the distributions and homogeneity of the variances were evaluated and it was concluded that their distribution point out parametric features. LSS total point means were calculated and Pearson Correlation Analysis was made in order to look whether there is a relationship between leisure satisfaction levels and sub-dimension of LSS. When the relationship between all sub-dimensions are identified, one way multivariate variant analysis (MANOVA) was used to determine whether there is a difference in the sub-dimensions of

the scale due to gender, age and income variables. According to the results, one way ANOVA was used in order to identify at which level the

affecting variable will be effective. Statistical significance level was accepted as $p < 0.01$.

FINDINGS

In this research, the tables of obtained results and the analysis conducted are given in the table.

Table 4. Arithmetic and Standard Deviation Values of the Sub-Dimensions of LSS

Leisure Satisfaction Level	N= (194)	
	\bar{x}	Ss
Psychological	3,60	0,75
Education	3,62	0,72
Social	3,70	0,65
Relaxation	3,63	0,73
Physiological	3,74	0,72
Aesthetics	3,80	0,74
Total	3,66	0,60

The mean of the total points got by the participants from LSS and the means related to sub-dimensions are seen in Table 4. Accordingly, since the highest mean point to be got from the scale is 5, leisure satisfaction levels of the

participants are high. When the sub-scales were examined, it was observed that the points got by the participants from the sub-dimension of aesthetics were higher than the other sub-dimensions.

Table 5. Pearson Correlation Analysis Results related to the Sub-Dimensions of LSS

	Psychological	Education	Social	Relaxation	Physiological	Aesthetics
Psychological	1	,701**	,680**	,530**	,597**	,574**
	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	194	194	194	194	194	194
Education	,701**	1	,695**	,496**	,616**	,627**
	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	194	194	194	194	194	194
Social	,680**	,695**	1	,588**	,672**	,691**
	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	194	194	194	194	194	194
Relaxation	,530**	,496**	,588**	1	,661**	,595**
	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	194	194	194	194	194	194
Physiological	,597**	,616**	,672**	,661**	1	,729**
	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	194	194	194	194	194	194
Aesthetics	,574**	,627**	,691**	,595**	,729**	1
	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	194	194	194	194	194	194

** $p < 0.01$

As it is seen in Table 5, according to Pearson Correlation Analysis Results, it is seen that the dependent variable that

are the sub-dimensions of LSS (psychological, education, social, relaxation, physiological) are in a

significant and positive relationship with each other. It was found a positive and meaningful relationship between psychological sub-dimension and

respectively education, social, relaxation, physiological and aesthetics ($r=0.701$; $r=0.680$; $r=0,530$; $r=0,597$; $r=0.574$, $p<0.01$).

Table 6. MANOVA Results of Sub-Dimension Points of LSS According to Gender, Age and Perceived Income Variables

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Gender	Psychological	3,638	1	3,638	,114	,736
	Education	20,470	1	20,470	,459	,499
	Social	30,606	1	30,606	1,116	,292
	Relaxation	15,032	1	15,032	1,777	,184
	Physiological	3,148	1	3,148	,168	,682
	Aesthetics	3,340	1	3,340	,401	,527
Age	Psychological	155,858	2	77,929	2,447	,089
	Education	5,746	2	2,873	,064	,938
	Social	44,700	2	22,350	,815	,444
	Relaxation	36,830	2	18,415	2,177	,116
	Physiological	29,107	2	14,533	,779	,461
	Aesthetics	35,896	2	17,948	2,157	,119
Percieved Income	Psychological	333,075	4	83,269	2,615	,037
	Education	663,246	4	165,812	3,719	,006
	Social	220,857	4	55,214	2,014	,094
	Relaxation	30,767	4	7,692	,909	,460
	Physiological	183,716	4	45,929	2,457	,047
	Aesthetics	121,962	4	30,490	3,664	,007

According to MANOVA results regardless of the effects of gender, age and income levels on the sub-dimensions of LSS, no significant difference was found in terms of gender and age variables, while there was a significant difference according to income variable. This finding indicates that the points of age groups (15-25,

26-36, 37+) and gender variables do not vary between the sub-dimensions of LSS ($p>0.01$), and the points due to the variable of income varies in the sub-dimensions of education and aesthetics of LSS sub-dimensions ($F(4,194)=3.719$; $F(4,194)=3.664$, $p<0.01$) (Table 6).

Table 7. Mean, Standard Deviation and ANOVA Results of LSS Sub-Dimension Points Due to Perceived Income Level

		n	x	S	sd	F	p
Psychological	Bad	11	3,6136	0,6554	3-193	1,519	.211
	Little	17	3,3015	0,81617			
	Middle	97	3,5757	0,7812			
	Good	69	3,7192	0,69412			
Education	Bad	11	3,4141	0,64424	3-193	3,917	.01
	Little	17	3,3987	0,77585			
	Middle	97	3,5269	0,73094			
	Good	69	3,8519	0,6578			
Social	Bad	11	3,5227	0,5472	3-193	2,484	.062
	Little	17	3,5662	0,79195			
	Middle	97	3,6289	0,68619			
	Good	69	3,8714	0,57481			
Relaxation	Bad	11	3,5909	1,16336	3-193	0,762	.517
	Little	17	3,4706	0,69531			
	Middle	97	3,5954	0,78432			
	Good	69	3,7283	0,56837			
Physiological	Bad	11	3,9394	0,64236	3-193	2,993	.032
	Little	17	3,5784	0,6773			
	Middle	97	3,6186	0,77578			
	Good	69	3,9227	0,6465			
Aesthetics	Bad	11	3,7727	0,78625	3-193	4,162	.007
	Little	17	3,5294	0,67825			
	Middle	97	3,683	0,8397			
	Good	69	4,0399	0,52093			

One way ANOVA results based on sub-dimension according to mean, standard deviation and perceived income level related to six sub-dimension of the scale are shown in Table 7. Accordingly, a significant difference in only the sub-dimensions of education and aesthetics according to perceived income level of LSS was found [F(3, 193)=3.917; F(3, 193)=4,162, p<0.01]. According to

Tukey HSD test results conducted to find in which groups the differences between perceived income levels, the ones having good perceived level of education sub-dimension of LSS (x =3.85) have higher leisure satisfaction levels than the ones having middle (x =3.52), while the ones having perceived level of aesthetics sub-dimension of LSS (x=4.03) have higher leisure satisfaction levels than the ones having middle (x=3.68) and little (x=3.52)(p<0.05).

DISCUSSION AND RESULT

According to the findings of this research conducted to find out the leisure satisfaction levels of the individuals participating in recreative activities in sport centers due to different variables, a positive correlation was found between psychological, education, social, relaxation, physiological and aesthetics that are the sub-dimensions of

Leisure Satisfaction Scale. In line with this, when any sub-dimension point is high, the other sub-dimension points are also high. Since the correlation between sub-dimensions is significant, triple and double interaction between the independent variables of gender, age and income was examined and no interaction was found between the variables.

According to MANOVA results that we search the effect of independent variables on the sub-dimensions of LSS, no difference was found in terms of gender and age variables, while a significant difference was found in terms of income variable. In the research, it was found that gender did not reveal statistically significant difference on leisure satisfaction levels. In parallel with this result, in the researches conducted by Broughten and Beegs (2006), Amestoy et al. (2008), Berg et al. (2001), Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa (2010), Lu and Hu (2005), Vong Tze (2005), Kabanoff (1982) and Spiers and Walker (2009), it was expressed that leisure satisfaction level did not reveal statistically significant difference in terms of gender variable. In literature, there are some studies obtained different results except for this result. As an example to these studies, Brown and Frankel (1993) obtained higher results on behalf of men in leisure satisfaction studies. Similarly, Misra and McKean (2000) obtained the result that men participants had higher leisure satisfaction than women

Demir and Demir (2006) reached the conclusion that gender has an affect even little in participating leisure activities. Sönmezoğlu et al. (2014) found in their research that women participants have higher leisure satisfaction levels than men participants in the sub-dimension of psychological, education and relaxation looking from the aspect of gender variable.

According to age variable that is another variable of the research, any significant difference was not found on leisure satisfaction level. In contrast to the research results, in conclusion of the study conducted by Amestoy et al. (2008), there is an inverse proportion between age and leisure satisfaction levels that is described in the shape of u i.e, they express that the age is getting older, leisure satisfaction level is getting decreased, similarly, in the research

conducted by Yerlisu Lapa (2013) on the individuals participating in recreative activities in the parks, in the sub-dimensions of LSS age variable only in psychological, social and physiological sub-dimensions, it was found to create significance. In the research conducted by Brown and Frankel (1993) on the individuals over 65 years old, it was revealed that when the age is getting older, leisure satisfaction level is getting decreased. According to another result; Broughten and Beggs (2006) stated in their research that the gender variable had statistically significant effect on leisure satisfaction level.

According to research results, leisure satisfaction level creates difference in education and aesthetics sub-dimensions of LSS sub-dimensions according to perceived income levels. Of LSS sub-dimensions, in education sub-dimension, the ones with high perceived income level in have higher leisure satisfaction levels than the ones having middle level, in aesthetics sub-dimension, the ones having perceived income level has higher leisure satisfaction levels than the ones with middle and low levels.. According to the results of the research, when the income level is getting increased, leisure satisfaction level is increased. In LSS, when education sub-dimension questions are compared, the individuals evaluate the benefits for their personal development, identification of themselves and the environment. When aesthetic sub-dimension questions are compared, the individuals evaluate the location they go or use to perform leisure activities in terms of design, beauty, and novelty. Therefore, looking at which criteria of the sub-dimensions are evaluated, these criteria are more reachable for the ones with high income levels. In parallel with this result, Ardahan and Lapa (2010) state that leisure satisfaction level varies due to income, and when the income level is getting high, leisure satisfaction

level increases. Agyar (2013), Russell (1987), Bonke et al. (2007) suggest that the income variable creates a statistically significant difference on leisure satisfaction level. Besides, Amestoy et al.(2008) state in their study that the individuals expressing themselves as having low income have leisure satisfaction levels and, Brown et al.(1993), Mancini (1978) and Vong Tze (2005) reached to the conclusion in their study that the income level had no effect of income level on leisure activity.

By looking at the mean of total points that the participants in the research from LSS, it was observed that leisure satisfaction levels were high. When the mean points of the participants related to sub-dimensions were examined, it was observed that aesthetic sub-dimension of LSS sub-dimensions was higher than the other sub-dimensions and the psychological sub-dimension was the lowest. In the scale, aesthetics sub-dimension questions give opportunity to the individuals evaluating the spaces that the individuals go or use in order to perform leisure activities of the individuals in terms of design, beauty, novelty and amenity. Looking from this aspect, the sport centers of which the participants of our study group are members are multi-purpose centers having different elements, in this scope, being higher of the aesthetic sub-dimension is an expected result. However, according to Pearson Correlation Analysis results, the point differences between sub-dimensions are not high since a correlation was detected among sub-dimensions.

According to the result of their study conducted with 3331 participants in youth centers in the provinces of Bolu, Düzce and Ankara, Sönmezoğlu et al. (2014) concluded the result that the relaxation sub-dimension of LSS sub-dimensions had the highest arithmetic mean and physiological sub-dimension had the lowest one. In parallel with this

result, Misra and McKean (2000), Yerlisu Lapa (2013) stated in their studies that relaxation sub-dimension of LSS sub-dimensions is higher than the other sub-dimensions. In leisure satisfaction level examination conducted by Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa (2010) on university students, education sub-dimension is seen as sub-dimension having the highest point. In the research conducted by Agyar (2013) on 1437 participants, it was obtained that the points in the Psychological and Physiological sub-dimensions of LSS sub-dimensions had the highest arithmetic mean at high level.

As a result, in our study that aimed to examine the leisure satisfaction levels of the individuals participating in recreative activities in sport centers, due to different variables, it was found that the participants generally had high level of leisure levels of the participants and besides this, they got the highest level in aesthetic sub-dimension. It is seen that gender and age variable of independent variables do not create any difference in psychological, education, social, relaxation that are the sub-dimensions of LSS ie. Leisure satisfaction levels do not vary due to the gender and age of the individual. On the contrary, that education sub-dimension of LSS was affected by perceived income level was observed. When the perceived income level is getting increased, leisure satisfaction levels vary positively.

KAYNAKÇA

1. Ammon, R., Stotlar, D.K., Contemporary Sport Management. (Editors : Parks , J.B., Quarterman, J.) Champaign : Human Kinetics ,2003.
2. Ardahan, F., Yerlisu Lapa, T., "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Serbest Zaman Tatmin Düzeylerinin Cinsiyete ve Gelire Göre İncelenmesi." Spor Bilimleri Dergisi Hacettepe J. of Sport Sciences . 21 (4)pp.129-136,2010. [In Turkish]
3. Agyar, E., "Contribution of Perceived Freedom and Leisure Satisfaction to Life Satisfaction in a Sample of Turkish Women". Social Indicators Research.116pp.1-15,2014.
4. Amestoy, V.C., Rosal, R., S., Toscano, E.V., "The Leisure Experience" The Journal of Socio-Economics.37.pp.64-78,2008.
5. Beard, J.G., Ragheb, M.G., "Measuring leisure satisfaction." Journal of Leisure Research ,12 (1),pp. 20-33.1980.
6. 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.
7. Borke J, Dedding M, Lausten M., "Time and Money: A simultaneous analysis of men's and women's domain satisfactions." J Happiness Stud, 10.pp.113-131,2009.
8. Brown, A.B., Frankel, B.G., "Activity Through Years: Leisure, Leisure Satisfaction, and Life Satisfaction". Sociology of Sport Journal.10.pp.1-17,1993.
9. Çelik, G., Kamu Kuruluşlarında Çalışan Engelli Bireylerin Serbest Zaman Engellerinin ve Tatmin Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi (Antalya Merkez Örneği). Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Antalya. Spor Yöneticiliği Anabilim Dalı. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, s.8,2011. [In Turkish with English Abstract]
10. Demir, C. ve Demir, N. "Bireylerin Boş Zaman Faaliyetlerine Katılmalarını Etkileyen Faktörler ile Cinsiyet Arasındaki İlişki : Lisans Öğrencilerine Yönelik Bir Uygulama." Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi.1.pp.36-48,2006.
11. Kabanoff, B., "Occupational and Sex Differences in Leisure Needs and Leisure Satisfaction." Journal of Occupational Behavior.3.pp.233-245,1982.
12. Karaküçük, S., Rekreasyon Boş Zamanları Değerlendirme.(Beşinci Baskı), Gazi Kitabevi, s.6, Ankara, 2005.
13. Karaküçük, S., Gürbüz ,B., Rekreasyon ve Kent(li)leşme. Gazi Kitabevi, s.19, Ankara, ,2007.
14. Karlı, Ü., Polat, E., Yılmaz, B., Koçak, S., Serbest Zaman Tatmin Ölçeği'nin (SZTÖ-Uzun Versiyon) Geçerlilik ve Güvenilirlik Çalışması, Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 19(2), pp.80-91,2008.
15. Kelly, J.R., Leisure, Prentice-Hall Inc.,s.25, New Jersey,1990.
16. Kovacs, A., "The Leisure Personality: Relationships Between Personality, Leisure Satisfaction, and Life Satisfaction, School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation," Indiana University, Doktora Tezi, s.29-42, 2007.
17. Lu L, Hu C.H. "Personality, Leisure Experiences and Happiness." Journal of Happiness Studies, 6.pp.325-342,2005.
18. Mancini J.A. "Leisure Satisfaction and Psychologic Well-being in Old Age: Effects of Health and Income." Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 26 (12).pp.550-552,1978.
19. McLean D.D., Hurd A.R., Rogers ,N.B., Kraus' Recreation and Leisure In Modern Society.(Sekizinci Baskı), Sudbury. Jones And Barlett Publishers.s.40.Sudbury,2008.
20. Misra, R., Kean, M., "College Students' Academic Stress and Its Relation to Theirs Anxiety, Time Management, and Leisure Satisfaction. American Journal of Health Studies.16(1).pp.41-51,2000.
21. Management, And Leisure Satisfaction." American Journal of Health Studies.16(1).pp.41-51,2000.
22. Russell RV. "The importance of recreation satisfaction and activity participation to the life satisfaction of age- segregated retirees." Journal of Leisure Research, 19 (4).pp. 273-283,1987.
23. Siegenthaler, K., L., O'dell, I., "Leisure Attitude, Leisure Satisfaction, and Perceived Freedom in Leisure within Family Dyads." Leisure Sciences.22.pp.281-296, 2000.
24. Sönmezoğlu, U., Polat E., Aycan A., Gençlik Merkezi Üyeleri ve Bazı Değişkenlere Göre Serbest Zaman Tatmin Düzeyleri. International Journal of Science Culture and Sport. Special Issue.1.pp.219-229,2014.
25. Tekin. A., Rekreasyon, Ata Ofset Matbaacılık, s.55, Ankara, 2009.
26. Torkildsen, G., Leisure and Recreation Management (beşinci baskı), Chapman & Hall, s.46, London, 2005.
27. Vong Tze, N., " Leisure satisfaction and quality of life in Macao, China." Leisure Studies, 24(2).pp.195-207,2005.
28. Yerlisu Lapa, T., "Life satisfaction, leisure satisfaction and perceived freedom of park recreation participants." Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences.93.pp.1985-1993,2013.