



RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Effect of Sport Center Employees' Job and Leisure Satisfaction on Quality of Life

Muhammet VAPUR^{1*} 

¹Istanbul Rumeli University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Department of Recreation, İstanbul / Turkey.

*Corresponding author: mvapur37@gmail.com

Abstract

Many studies have been conducted in the literature that affect the quality of life. However, no study has been found that investigates the impact of job and leisure satisfaction on the quality of life of individuals working in sports centres. Therefore, the study aims to measure the impact of job and leisure satisfaction on the quality of life of individuals working in sports centers. For this purpose, data was collected from 395 people working in sports centers in İstanbul. Demographic information form, job satisfaction scale, leisure time satisfaction scale and quality of life scale were used to collect data. The obtained data were processed into the SPSS 27.0 program and frequency average, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, correlation and regression analyzes were performed. As a result of the research, the study shows that job satisfaction and leisure satisfaction of individuals working in sports centers have a positive impact on the quality of life ($p < 0.01$). As job satisfaction and leisure satisfaction increases, participants' quality of life is higher. These findings show that measures that can be taken to increase the job and leisure satisfaction of employees in sports centers can positively affect their quality of life. This study may contribute to the development of various strategies that can be done to improve the quality of life of employees in sports centers.

Keywords

Leisure Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, Quality of Life, Recreation

INTRODUCTION

Sports centres are unique organizations that offer labour-intensive services, bringing together a diverse range of people from managers to frontline staff to produce and deliver sports services to customers (Serarslan, 2005). The employees of sports centres are the backbone of sports service provision. To successfully provide quality sports services, it is crucial to pay more attention to factors influencing the quality of life of the human resources working in this industry.

Most researchers agree that quality of life is multidimensional and lacks a universally accepted definition. The most commonly referenced definition in the literature is the one from the

World Health Organization (1995). According to the WHO, quality of life refers to an individual's perceptions of their position in life within the context of their culture, value systems, goals, expectations, standards, and concerns. Quality of life is a subjective evaluation of one's life based on their goals, expectations, culture, and values. This includes physical health, psychological state, independence level, social relationships, personal beliefs, and environmental factors, representing an overall subjective assessment shaped by cultural, social, and environmental contexts (WHOQOL Group, 1995). Other related concepts identified in studies include well-being, utility, life satisfaction, needs fulfillment, empowerment, capacity building, poverty, human poverty, happiness,

Received: 13 September 2023 ; Accepted: 17. October 2023; Online Published: 25 October 2023

 ORCID: 0000-0002-3417-2156

How to cite this article: Vapur, M. (2023) The Effect of Sport Center Employees' Job and Leisure Satisfaction on Quality of Life. *Int J Disabil Sports Health Sci*;2023;Special Issue 1:398-408. <https://doi.org/10.33438/ijdsHS.1359957>

living standards, and development (McGillivray & Clarke, 2006; McGillivray, 2007)

Numerous factors influence the quality of life, including work dissatisfaction, emotional burnout, marital status, education level, organizational communication issues (Yıldırım & Hacıhasanoğlu, 2011), leisure activities (Silverstein & Parker, 2002; Ngai, 2005; Balkar & Palmer, 2006; Sevil, 2015; Güven, 2018; Çetiner & Yayla, 2021), life satisfaction (Annak, 2005; Demir et al., 2021), emotional well-being, relationships, material well-being, personal growth, physical health, self-determination, social rights, and personal rights (Schalock & Verdugo, 2002; Schalock, 2004). Among the many factors impacting quality of life, this study focuses specifically on job and leisure satisfaction for working individuals.

Working life occupies a substantial and important part of daily life for most people. Job satisfaction or dissatisfaction significantly impacts individuals (Ertürk & Keçecioğlu, 2012). This has led to various definitions of job satisfaction. Davis and Nestrom (1985) define it as the satisfaction or dissatisfaction employees feel about their work, arguing that job satisfaction increases when job characteristics meet worker expectations. Spector (1997:3) defines it as the degree to which people enjoy their job. Barutçugil (2004:389) defines it as the feeling that one's work and what one obtains align with their needs and values. These definitions are generally based on foundational motivation theories like Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Herzberg's two-factor model (Maslow, 1943; Herzberg, 1966).

A strong relationship exists between job satisfaction and quality of life, as job satisfaction has been shown to greatly impact overall quality of life (Teles et al., 2014; Ioannou et al., 2015). Various studies on nurses demonstrate a positive correlation between job satisfaction and quality of life (Cimete et al., 2003; İnci, 2008; Çelik & Kılıç, 2019; Joodaki et al., 2019; Kiliç Barmanpek et al., 2022). A study by Şangar (2016) on academics also found that increased job satisfaction improves quality of life. While prior studies have examined this relationship across occupational groups, no studies were found examining sports center employees specifically. Therefore, the following hypothesis was formed to test this relationship in the context of sports center staff:

H₁: Job satisfaction of sports center employees has a significant and positive effect on their quality of life.

Recreation in leisure time is a phenomenon that includes various activities (Dere, 2023: 34). The satisfaction obtained in recreational activities can be expressed as leisure satisfaction. Beard and Ragheb (1980) define leisure satisfaction as “the positive perceptions or feelings an individual gains from participating in leisure activities and choices.” Francken and van Raaij (1981) explained it as a concept judged against standards like individual expectations based on past experiences, personal achievements, or perceived satisfaction levels of others in leisure activities. Meeting expectations brings satisfaction, while unmet expectations cause dissatisfaction. Mannell and Kleiber (1997) suggested leisure satisfaction can be motivation-based (need fulfilment) or appraisal-based (evaluation of satisfaction). To measure different facets of leisure satisfaction, Beard and Ragheb (1980) developed a scale assessing the extent leisure time meets certain needs across six dimensions: psychological, educational, social, relaxation, physiological and aesthetic.

Making effective use of leisure time is important for overall health and well-being. Thus, the satisfaction obtained from leisure activities significantly impacts quality of life (London et al., 1977; Lewis et al., 2001; Ngai, 2005; Spiers & Walker, 2009; Liang et al., 2012; Sevil, 2015; Eruzun, 2017; Tokay Argan & Mersin, 2020). For example, Ngai (2005) found a positive relationship between leisure satisfaction and quality of life among Macau residents, highlighting the importance of recreational activities. In a study on individuals living in Ningbo City, Zhou et al. (2021) found that leisure satisfaction affects all dimensions of quality of life. Kuo (2011), also demonstrated positive links between leisure satisfaction and quality of life dimensions. Tokay Argan and Mersin (2020) conducted a study with 498 healthcare professionals working in the Central Anatolia Region of Turkey. Eruzun (2017), in research on female private sports centre members, determined a positive relationship between leisure satisfaction and quality of life. While prior research has examined this relationship across various samples, no studies have specifically analyzed sports center employees. Therefore, the following hypotheses were developed to test the correlation between

leisure satisfaction and quality of life in this population:

H₂: Leisure satisfaction of sport centre employees has a significant and positive effect on the quality of life.

H_{2.1}: Psychological satisfaction of sport centre employees has a significant and positive effect on quality of life.

H_{2.2}: Educational satisfaction of sports centre employees has a significant and positive effect on quality of life.

H_{2.3}: Social satisfaction of sports centre employees has a significant and positive effect on the quality of life.

H_{2.4}: Relaxation satisfaction of sports centre employees has a significant and positive effect on quality of life.

H_{2.5}: Physical satisfaction of sports centre employees has a significant and positive effect on the quality of life.

H_{2.6}: Aesthetic satisfaction of sports centre employees has a significant and positive effect on the quality of life.

The model of the research was created based on the variables used in the research as a result of the literature review. In the research, a model was created to examine the effect of work and leisure satisfaction of sports center staff on their quality of life. In the model study, the relational survey method and structural equation modeling method, which are among the quantitative research methods, were used.



Figure 1 Research Model

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

The study population comprises individuals working in private sports centres in Istanbul. As of 2023, Istanbul has 1,345 private physical education and sports facilities (Istanbul GSB, 2023). However, no exact data exists on private sports centre employees in the province. Therefore, to provide research flexibility, a significance level of $\alpha=0.05$ was set for sampling errors, and required sample sizes were calculated for different population sizes. Consequently, the sample size was determined as $n=384$ (Çokluk et al., 2010). According to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki, ethical clearance and informed consent were obtained from all participants before the study. Convenience sampling, a random sampling method, was utilized for sampling participants. Data was collected via questionnaires, a quantitative method. An online survey was used to gather data from 395 employees.

Data Collection Tools

The questionnaire comprises four sections: personal information, job satisfaction, leisure satisfaction, and quality of life scale.

Personal Information Form

Demographic information such as age, marital status, educational status, income status, working period and working position were collected relevant to the study purpose.

Job Satisfaction Scale

It was developed by Brayfield & Rothe (1951) and shortened by Judge et al. (1998). The validity and reliability study of the Turkish version of the scale was conducted by Başol & Çömlekçi (2020). The scale has a structure consisting of 5 items and a single sub-dimension. The internal consistency of the scale was calculated as 0.929. The items are organized as a 5-point Likert type (1= Strongly Agree, 5= Strongly Disagree). The total internal reliability coefficient of the data obtained for this study was calculated as 0.89. The reference range of Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale is quite reliable (Altunışık et al., 2010).

Leisure Satisfaction Scale

The 24-item Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS) was originally developed in long form by Beard & Ragheb (1980) and later reorganized into a short form in 1992. It was adapted into Turkish by Gökçe & Orhan (2011). The scale comprises six subdimensions across 24 statements:

psychological satisfaction (items 1-4), educational physical satisfaction (13-16), relaxation satisfaction (17, 20), and aesthetic satisfaction (21-24). Items are 5-point Likert-type (1= Strongly Agree, 5= Strongly Disagree). For current research, the total internal reliability coefficient was 0.96, within the quite reliable reference range for Cronbach's alpha per Altunışık et al. (2010).

Individual Quality of Life Scale

Developed by the International Wellbeing Group (2006) based on Gullone & Cummins' (1999) Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale, this 8-item scale focuses on different life areas with a 0-10 scale. The validity and reliability of the Turkish version were established by Şimşek (2011) with a 0.87 reliability coefficient. For the current study, the total internal reliability coefficient was 0.88, within the quite reliable Cronbach's alpha range per Altunışık et al. (2010).

Table 1: Participants' Demographics

Variables		f	%
Gender	Male	218	55.2
	Female	177	44.8
Age	18-23	48	12.2
	24-29	295	74.7
	30-35	17	4.3
	36 years and older	35	8.9
Marital Status	Married	110	27.8
	Single	285	72.2
Education Level	High School	32	8.1
	Associate degree	48	12.2
	Undergraduate	281	71.1
	Postgraduate	34	8.6
Income Status	0-11.500 TL	214	54.2
	11.501-23.000 TL	130	32.9
	23.001-34.500 TL	34	8.6
	34.501 TL and above	17	4.3
Duration of employment	1-2	57	14.4
	3-4	203	51.4
	5-6	52	13.2
	7-8	54	13.7
	9 years and above	29	7.3
Working position	Sales-marketing	128	32.4
	Consultant	118	29.9
	Coach	104	26.3
	Administrator	36	9.1
	Other personnel	9	2.3

satisfaction (5-8), social satisfaction (9-12),

Statistical Analysis

The collected data were analyzed in the SPSS 27.0 statistical program. Descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated for the demographic factors and scale scores. Skewness and kurtosis values were examined to determine normality of the scale score distributions. Pearson correlation analysis and multiple linear regression analysis were conducted to test the study hypotheses.

RESULTS

Demographic Information

The data presented herein provides insights into the demographic distribution of the employees who participated in the study.

Out of the participant employees, 55.2% were male and 44.8% were female. Considering the age distribution, 12.2% are between the ages of 18-23, 74.7% are between the ages of 24-29, 4.3% are between the ages of 30-35 and 8.9% are 36 years and above. Regarding the marital status of the employees, 27.8% are married and 72.2% are single. In terms of education level, 8.1% are high school graduates, 12.2% are associate degree graduates, 71.1% are undergraduate and 8.6% are postgraduate graduates. In terms of the income distribution, 52.2% of the employees earn 0-11,500 TL, 32.9% earn 11,500-23,000 TL, 8.6%

earn 23,001-34,500 TL and 4.3% earn 34,501 TL and above. Considering the seniority of the employees, 14.4% of them have 1-2 years of experience, 51.4% of them 3-4 years, 13.2% of them 5-6 years, 13.7% of them 7-8 years and 7.3% of them 9 or more than 9 years of experience. Regarding their working positions, 32.4% are sales-marketing, 29.9% are consultants, 26.3% are coaches, 9.1% are managers and 2.3% are other personnel.

Mean, Standard Deviation and Normality Analyses

Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation and Normality Analyses of Job Satisfaction, Leisure Time Satisfaction, and Quality of Life

Variables	N	\bar{x}	Ss	Skewness	Kurtosis
Job Satisfaction	395	3.581	1.815	-0.342	-0.489
Leisure Satisfaction	395	3.728	0.970	-.463	.323
Psychological Satisfaction	395	3.461	0.940	-.430	-.025
Educational Satisfaction	395	3.583	0.928	-.416	-.258
Social Satisfaction	395	3.570	0.925	-.378	-.325
Physical Satisfaction	395	3.874	0.913	-.634	.047
Relaxation Satisfaction	395	3.309	0.956	-.338	-.289
Aesthetic Satisfaction	395	3.576	0.925	-.471	.098
Quality of Life	395	6.324	2.644	-0.271	-0.579

As Table 2 indicates, the mean job satisfaction, leisure satisfaction, psychological satisfaction, educational satisfaction, social satisfaction, social satisfaction, social satisfaction, physical satisfaction, relaxation satisfaction, aesthetic satisfaction, relaxation satisfaction, aesthetic satisfaction and quality of life of sports

centre employees were calculated as 3.581, 3.728, 3.461, 3.583, 3.583, 3.570, 3.874, 3.309, 3.576 and 6.324, respectively. Skewness and kurtosis values are between ± 1.5 . According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), skewness and kurtosis values between -1.5 and +1.5 indicate a largely normal distribution.

Table 3: Results of Pearson Correlation Analyses

Variables	N	R	P
Job Satisfaction	395	0.346	.000
Quality of Life			
Leisure Satisfaction	395	0.575	.000
Quality of Life			
Psychological Satisfaction	395	0.572	.000
Quality of Life			
Educational Satisfaction	395	0.512	.000
Quality of Life			
Social Satisfaction	395	0.514	.000
Quality of Life			
Physical Satisfaction	395	0.481	.000
Quality of Life			
Relaxation Satisfaction	395	0.485	.000
Quality of Life			
Aesthetic Satisfaction	395	0.538	.000
Quality of Life			

According to the result of the Pearson correlation test conducted to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and quality of life level, there is a moderate, positive linear relationship between job satisfaction and quality of life ($r=.346$, $p=.000$). The Pearson correlation test conducted to determine the relationship between the level of leisure time satisfaction and quality of life of sports centre employees shows that there is a moderate, positive linear relationship between leisure time satisfaction and quality of life ($r=.575$, $p=.000$). The Pearson correlation test conducted to determine the relationship between psychological satisfaction, which is among the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction, and quality of life, displays there is a moderate, positive linear relationship between psychological satisfaction and quality of life ($r=.572$, $p=.000$). The Pearson correlation test conducted to determine the relationship between educational satisfaction, which is among the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction, and quality of life, reveals that there is a moderate, positive linear relationship between educational satisfaction and quality of life ($r=.512$, $p=.000$).

The Pearson correlation test conducted to determine the relationship between social satisfaction, which is among the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction, and quality of life, indicate that

there is a moderate, positive linear relationship between social satisfaction and quality of life ($r=.514$, $p=.000$). The Pearson correlation test conducted to determine the relationship between physical satisfaction, which is among the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction, and quality of life, shows that there is a moderate, positive linear relationship between physical satisfaction and quality of life ($r=.481$, $p=.000$). The Pearson correlation test conducted to determine the relationship between relaxation satisfaction, which is among the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction, and quality of life, displays that there is a moderate, positive linear relationship between relaxation satisfaction and quality of life ($r=.485$, $p=.000$).

The Pearson correlation test conducted to determine the relationship between aesthetic satisfaction, which is among the sub-dimensions of leisure satisfaction, and quality of life, reveals that there is a moderate, positive linear relationship between aesthetic satisfaction and quality of life ($r=.538$, $p=.000$). According to the Pearson correlation analysis, a relationship between 0-0.29 is considered weak, 0.30-0.64 is considered moderate, 0.65-0.84 is considered strong, and 0.85-1 is considered very strong (Ural & Kılıç, 2018).

Table 4: Results of Simple Linear Regression Analysis

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable	R	R ²	F	p	β	t	p
Job Satisfaction	Quality of Life	0.346	.120	53.353	.000	.346	7.304	.000
Leisure Satisfaction		0.575	.331	194.025	.000	.575	26.196	.000
Psychological Satisfaction		0.572	.293	163.082	.000	.542	12.770	.000
Educational Satisfaction		0.512	.262	139.510	.000	.512	11.811	.000
Social Satisfaction		0.514	.264	140.919	.000	.514	11.871	.000
Relaxation Satisfaction		0.481	.232	118.592	.000	.481	10.890	.000
Physical Satisfaction		0.485	.189	91.527	.000	.435	9.567	.000
Aesthetic Satisfaction		0.538	.290	160.369	.000	.538	12.664	.000

Simple linear regression analysis was performed to predict quality of life according to job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a predictor of quality of life ($F(1, 393) = 53.353$, $p < .001$). Job satisfaction predicts 12 per cent of the variance in quality of life. When the aesthetic satisfaction of sports centre employees increases by one unit,

quality of life will increase by .346 units. According to this result, hypothesis H_1 is accepted. Simple linear regression analysis was performed to predict quality of life according to leisure satisfaction. Leisure satisfaction is a predictor of quality of life ($F(1, 393) = 194.025$, $p < .001$). Leisure satisfaction predicts 33 per cent of the

variance in quality of life. When leisure satisfaction of sports centre employees increases by one unit, quality of life will increase by .575 units. According to this result, hypothesis H₂ is accepted. Simple linear regression analysis was performed to predict quality of life according to psychological satisfaction, a sub-dimension of leisure satisfaction. Psychological satisfaction is a predictor of quality of life ($F(1, 393) = 163.082, p < .001$). Psychological satisfaction predicts 29 per cent of the variance in quality of life. When the psychological satisfaction of sports centre employees increases by one unit, quality of life will increase by .542 units. According to this result, hypothesis H_{2.1} is accepted.

Simple linear regression analysis was performed to predict quality of life according to educational satisfaction, which is a sub-dimension of leisure satisfaction. Educational satisfaction is a predictor of quality of life ($F(1, 393) = 139.510, p < .001$). Educational satisfaction predicts 26 per cent of the variance in quality of life. When the educational satisfaction of sports centre employees increases by one unit, their quality of life will increase by .512 units. According to this result, hypothesis H_{2.2} is accepted. Simple linear regression analysis was performed to predict quality of life according to social satisfaction, a sub-dimension of leisure satisfaction. Social satisfaction is a predictor of quality of life ($F(1, 393) = 140.919, p < .001$).

Social satisfaction predicts 26 per cent of the variance in quality of life. When the social satisfaction of sports centre employees increases by one unit, quality of life will increase by .514 units. According to this result, hypothesis H_{2.3} is accepted. Simple linear regression analysis was performed to predict quality of life according to relaxation satisfaction, which is a sub-dimension of leisure satisfaction. Physical satisfaction is a predictor of quality of life ($F(1, 393) = 118.592, p < .001$). Physical satisfaction predicts 23 per cent of the variance in quality of life. When the physical satisfaction of sports centre employees increases by one unit, quality of life will increase by .481 units. According to this result, hypothesis H_{2.4} is accepted.

Simple linear regression analysis was performed to predict quality of life according to physical satisfaction, a sub-dimension of leisure satisfaction. Relaxation satisfaction is a predictor of quality of life ($F(1, 393) = 91.527, p < .001$).

Relaxation satisfaction predicts 19 per cent of the variance in quality of life. When the relaxation satisfaction of sports centre employees increases by one unit, quality of life will increase by .435 units. According to this result, hypothesis H_{2.5} is accepted.

Simple linear regression analysis was performed to predict quality of life according to aesthetic satisfaction, which is a sub-dimension of leisure satisfaction. Aesthetic satisfaction is a predictor of quality of life ($F(1, 393) = 160.369, p < .001$). Aesthetic satisfaction predicts 29 per cent of the variance in quality of life. When the aesthetic satisfaction of sports centre employees increases by one unit, quality of life will increase by .538 units. According to this result, hypothesis H_{2.6} is accepted.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

This study aims to investigate the effect of job and leisure satisfactions of sports center employees on their quality of life. The sample group of the study consists of individuals working in sports businesses operating in the province of Istanbul. Data were collected from 395 employees using a survey form consisting of a demographic information form, job satisfaction scale, leisure satisfaction scale, and quality of life scale. The collected data were analyzed in the SPSS 27.0 statistical program. Frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation values were used to perform descriptive statistics of demographic factors and scale scores. Skewness and kurtosis values were examined to determine the normal distribution of the scales. Pearson correlation analysis and multiple linear regression analysis were conducted to test the hypotheses.

The results showed that individuals working in sports centers have job and leisure satisfaction scores above the scale average and their quality of life is at a good level. It can be said that the employees enjoy their jobs, have high motivation levels, and are generally happy at work. Additionally, they make good use of their time outside of work, enjoy recreational activities, and are psychologically and socially satisfied. Furthermore, it has been identified that the employees have high levels of physical, mental, emotional, and social well-being and lead happy and healthy lives. The research findings indicate that job satisfaction positively affects quality of

life. Employees enjoying and taking pleasure in their work, being happy and satisfied at the workplace, have a positive effect on the quality of life. According to the findings of the study, it can be averred that job satisfaction positively affects quality of life. The fact that employees love and enjoy their jobs and are happy and satisfied at work positively affects their quality of life (β :.346). There are studies in the literature supporting this result, which is supported by the studies in the relevant literature (Cimete et al., 2003; İnci, 2008; Çelik & Kılıç, 2019; Joodaki et al., 2019; Kiliç Barmanpek et al., 2022).

Leisure satisfaction positively affects the quality of life (β : .575). Psychological, educational, social, physical, relaxation and aesthetic satisfaction obtained from recreational activities positively increase the quality of life. Studies in the literature support this result (London et al., 1977; Lewis et al., 2001; Ngai, 2004; Spiers & Walker, 2009; Liang et al., 2012; Sevil, 2015; Eruzun, 2017; Tokay Argan & Mersin, 2020; Vapur & Yavuz, 2022). Psychological satisfaction, which is the sub-dimension of leisure participation, positively affects the quality of life (β : .542). The fact that the recreational activities that employees participate in their leisure time are interesting, increase self-confidence and give a sense of achievement positively supports quality of life.

Educational satisfaction, which is the sub-dimension of leisure participation, positively affects the quality of life (β : .512). It can be claimed that employees' quality of life is enhanced by learning new things, increasing their personal development, and gaining knowledge about new people through the recreational activities they participate in. Social satisfaction, which is the sub-dimension of leisure participation, positively affects quality of life (β : .514). The satisfaction derived from employees making new friendships and meeting other people participating in the same recreational activities enhances the quality of life in a positive direction. Physical satisfaction, which is the sub-dimension of leisure time participation, positively affects the quality of life (β : .481). Recreational activities that employees participate in during their leisure time may improve quality of life as they help to improve physical fitness, renew themselves physically, and stay healthy. Relaxation satisfaction, a leisure participation subdimension, positively impacts the quality of life (β : .435). Stress reduction, emotional well-being,

and physical fitness from leisure activities support quality of life. Aesthetic satisfaction, another leisure subdimension, also positively affects the quality of life (β : .538). Aesthetically pleasing, well-designed recreational settings increase quality of life.

Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest is declared by the authors. In addition, no financial support was received.

Ethics Committee

The Istanbul Rumeli University Ethics Commission approved the study procedures and ethics in their 23/08/2023 meeting, decision number 2023/08.

Author Contributions

Study Design, Data Collection, Statistical Analysis, Data Interpretation, Manuscript Preparation, Final review and editing, performed by the author.

REFERENCES

- Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S. and Yıldırım, E. (2010). *Research Methods in Social Sciences SPSS Applied*, Sakarya Publishing.
- Annak, B.B. (2005). Social Support, Social Network, Life Satisfaction And Quality Of Life: Comparing On Patients Diagnosed Anxiety Disorder, Mood Disorder, Hemodialysis Patients. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Mersin University Social Sciences Institute, Psychology Department, Mersin.
- Balker, D. A. and Palmer, R. J. (2006). "Examining the Effects of Perceptions of Community and Recreation Participation on Quality of Life. *Social Indicators Research*; 75(3); 395-418.
- Barutçugil, İ. (2004). *Strategic Human Resources Management*. Kariyer Publishing, p.145-148.
- Başol, O. and Çömlekçi, M. F. (2020). Adaptation of The Job Satisfaction Scale: Validity And Reliability Study. *Journal of Kırklareli University Vocational School of Social Sciences*; 1(2); 17-31.

- Beard, J. and Ragheb, M. (1980). Measuring Leisure Satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*; 12(1); 20-33.
- Brayfield, A. and Rothe, H. F. (1951). An Index of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*; 35(5); 307-311.
- Cimete, G., Gencalp, N. S. and Keskin, G. (2003). Quality of Life and Job Satisfaction of Nurses. *Journal of Nursesing Care Quality*; 18(2);151-158.
- Çelik, Y. and Kılıç, İ. (2019). The Relationships Between Job Satisfaction, Professional Burnout and Quality of Life in Nurses. *Journal of Kocatepe Medicine*; 20(4); 230-238.
- Çetiner, H. and Yayla, Ö. (2021). The Effect of Activity Commitment on Life Satisfaction And Quality Of Life: A Research About Cyclists. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*; 42 (1); 209-222.
- Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G. and Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Multivariate Statistics SPSS and LISREL Applications for Social Sciences*. Pegem.
- Davis, K. and Nestrom, J.W. (1985). *Human Behavior at work: Organizational Behavior*, 7 edition, McGraw Hill, p.109
- Demir, R., Tanhan, A., Çiçek, İ., Yerlikaya, İ., Kurt, S. Ç. and Ünverdi, B. (2021). Psychological Well-being and Life Satisfaction as Predictors of Quality of Life. *Journal of Education for Life*; 35(1); 192-206.
- Dere, G. (2023). *Rekreasyon ve Spor. Rekreasyonda Güncel Konular ve Yeni Trendler*, Efe Akademi Publisher. p. 33-52.
- Ertürk, E. and Keçecioglu, T. (2012). Relations Between the Levels of Employees Job Satisfaction and Burnout: A Sample Application on the Teachers. *Ege Academic Review*; 12(1), 39-52.
- Eruzun, C. (2017). Investigating the Effect of Women's Participation in Sports Activities on Their Leisure Satisfaction and Quality of Life: B-Fit Sport Centers Members Sample. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Bartın University Institute of Educational Sciences, Bartın.
- Francken, D. A. and Van Raaij, W. F. (1981). Satisfaction with Leisure Time Activities. *Journal of Leisure Research*; 13(41); 337-352.
- Gökçe, H. and Orhan, K. (2011). Validity and Reliability Study of the Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS) into Turkish. *Hacettepe J. of Sport Sciences*; 22 (4); 139-145.
- Gullone, E. and Cummins, R. A. (1999). The Comprehensive Quality Of Life Scale: A Psychometric Evaluation With An Adolescent Sample. *Behaviour Change*; 16(2); 127-139.
- Güven, Y. (2018). Effects of Frequency of Recreational Activities on Happiness and Quality of Life in Employee. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Gazi University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland, Ohio: World Publishing Company.
- International Wellbeing Group. (2006). Personal wellbeing index-adult (PWI-A): 4th Edition. Melbourne: Australian Centre on Quality of Life, Deakin University. Retrieved 10 September 2009 from: http://www.deakin.edu.au/research/acqol/instruments/wellbeing_index.htm.
- Ioannou, P., Katsikavali, V., Galanis, P., Velonakis, E., Papadatou, D. and Sourtzi, P. (2015) Impact Of Job Satisfaction On Greek Nurses' Health-Related Quality Of Life, *Safety and Health at Work*; 6(4); 324–328.
- İnci, K. (2008). Job Satisfaction, Burnout and Their Effects on Quality of Life Among Emergency Departments' Nurses. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Marmara University, Institute of Health Sciences, İstanbul.
- İstanbul.GSB,(2023). <http://istanbul.gsb.gov.tr/Sayfalar/3482/347/%C3%96zel%20Beden%20E%C4%9Fitimi%20ve%20Spor%20Tesisleri.aspx>. Date of Access: 02/08/2023.
- Joodaki, Z., Mohammadzadeh, S. and Salehi, S. (2019). The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Quality of Life in Nurses At Khorramabad Educational Hospitals, 2019. *JN*; 8(5); 25-32.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C. and Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional Effects On Job And Life Satisfaction: The Role Of Core Evaluations. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*; 83(1); 17-34.
- Kiliç Barmanpek, N., Şahin, A., Demirel, C. and Parlar Kiliç, S. (2022). The Relationship

- Between Nurses' Job Satisfaction Levels And Quality Of Life. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*; 58(4); 2310-2320.
- Kuo, C. (2011). A Study On Leisure Satisfaction And Quality Of Life–Based On Badminton Participants. *Journal of Global Business Management*; 7(2); 1–9. <http://www.jgbm.org/page/17%20Chin-Tsai%20Kuo-2.pdf>.
- Lewis, J. B., Barcelona, R. and Jones, T. (2001). “Leisure Satisfaction and Quality of Life: Issues for the Justification of Campus Recreation”. *Recreational Sports Journal*; 25(2); 57–63. doi:10.1123/nirsa.25.2.57
- Liang, J., Yamashita, T. and Brown, J. S. (2012). Leisure Satisfaction and Quality of Life in China, Japan, and South Korea: A Comparative Study Using Asia Barometer 2006. *Journal of Happiness Studies*; 14(3); 753–769.
- London, M., Crandall, R. and Seals, G. W. (1977). “The Contribution of Job and Leisure Satisfaction to Quality of Life”. *Journal of Applied Psychology*; 62(3); 328-334. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.62.3.328>
- Mannell R. C. and Kleiber. D. A. (1997). *A Social Psychology of Leisure*. State college. PA Venture Publishing.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). Preface to Motivation Theory. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 5: 85–92.
- McGillivray, M. (2007). *Human Well-Being, Concept and Measurement*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- McGillivray, M. and Clarke, M. (2006). *Human Well-Being: Concepts and Measures*. McGillivray, M. and Clarke, M. (eds.). *Understanding Human Well-Being*. United Nations University Press, 3-15.
- Ngai, V. T. (2005). “Leisure Satisfaction and Quality of Life in Macao, China”. *Leisure Studies*; 24(2); 195–207. doi:10.1080/02614360412331313502
- Schalock, R. L. (2004). The Concept of Quality of Life: What We Know and Do Not Know. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*; 48(3), 203–216. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2788.2003.00558.x
- Schalock, R. L. and Verdugo, M.A. (2002). *Handbook on Quality of Life for Human Service Practitioners*. Washington DC: American Association on Mental Retardation.
- Serarslan, M. Z. (2005). *Sports Management and Case Study Analysis*. Morpa Culture Publications.
- Sevil, T. (2015). The Effect of Therapeutic Recreational Activity Participation on Elders’ to Perceived Leisure Satisfaction, Life Satisfaction and Quality of Life. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Anadolu University Institute of Health Sciences, Eskişehir.
- Silverstein, M. and Parker, M., G. (2002). Leisure Activities And Quality Of Life Among The Oldest Old In Sweden. *Research On Aging*; 24(5); 528-547.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause, and Consequences*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Spiers, A. and Walker, G. J. (2009). “The Effects of Ethnicity and Leisure Satisfaction on Happiness, Peacefulness, and Quality of Life”. *Leisure Sciences*; 31(1); 84-99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400802558277>
- Şangar, Z. (2016). Job Satisfaction and Quality of Life: Academic Study on Academic Staff. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir.
- Şimşek, E. (2011). The Effects of Organizational Communication and Personality Traits on Life Satisfaction. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Anadolu University, Institute of Social Sciences, Eskişehir.
- Tabachnick, G. B. and Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Teles, M. A., Barbosa, M. R., Vargas, A. M., Gomes, V. E., e Ferreira, E. F., de Barros Lima, A. M. and Ferreira, R. C. (2014). Psychosocial Work Conditions and Quality of Life Among Primary Health Care Employees: A Cross Sectional Study, *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*; 12(1);1–13.
- Tokay Argan, M. and Mersin, S. (2020). Life Satisfaction, Life Quality, and Leisure Satisfaction in Health Professionals. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*; 57(2); 660-666.
- WHOQOL Group (1995). The World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment (Whoqol): Position Paper From The World Health Organization. *Social Science and Medicine*; 41(10); 1403-1409.

- Vapur, M. and Yavuz, E. (2022). The Effect Of Leisure Participation on The Life Quality: The Mediating Role of Leisure Satisfaction and Perceived Stress. *Journal of Gastronomy, Hospitality and Travel*; 5(3); 1252-1268.
- Yıldırım, A. and Hacıhasanoğlu, R. (2011). Quality of Life and Effective Variables Among Health Care Professionals. *Journal of Psychiatric Nursing*; 2(2); 61-68
- Zhou, B., Zhang, Y., Dong, E., Ryan, C. and Li, P. (2021). Leisure Satisfaction And Quality Of Life Of Residents In Ningbo, China. *Journal of Leisure Research*; 52(4); 469-486.



This work is distributed under <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>