







Recreation & Sports Science

Year : 2025
Volume: 9
Issue : 1
Pages :103-113

The Relationship Between Leisure Satisfaction Levels and School Commitment of Physical Education and Sports School Students

Mihraç Köroğlu¹  Burcu Yentürk²  Nuri Muhammet Çelik³  Fikret Soyer⁴ 

¹Batman University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Batman-Türkiye, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6865-413X>, mihrackoroglu@gmail.com

²Batman University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Batman- Türkiye, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1551-447X>, burcu.yenturk@batman.edu.tr

³Batman University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Batman-Türkiye, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6403-6262>, nmcelik@gmail.com

⁴Kırgızistan- Türkiye Manas University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Bishkek-Kyrgyzstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8528-3622>, fikretsoyer@gmail.com

✉ Corresponding Author: burcu.yenturk@batman.edu.tr

Please cite this paper as follows:

Köroğlu K., Yentürk, B., Çelik, N., M. & Soyer, F. (2025). The Relationship Between Leisure Satisfaction Levels and School Commitment of Physical Education and Sports School Students. *International Journal of Recreation and Sport Science*, 9(1), 103-113 <https://doi.org/10.46463/ijrass.1678273>

Article History

Received:
17.04.2025
Accepted:
03.06.2025
Available online:
13.06.2025



ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between leisure satisfaction levels and school commitment of students studying at Batman University, School of Physical Education and Sports. The study includes the students studying at Batman University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching, Department of Coaching Education, Department of Sports Management in regular and evening education. The population and sample of the study consisted of 533 students studying in these departments. In this study, the correlational survey model, one of the quantitative research designs, was used. In the scale used in the study, first of all, questions were asked to learn the demographic information of the students. In the second part, the Organizational Commitment Scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) was applied to measure the commitment of university students to school. In the final section, the Leisure Satisfaction Scale developed by Beard and Ragheb (1980) was used to determine the leisure satisfaction levels of university students. Using the SPSS program to analyze the data obtained from the scales, it was determined that the data followed a normal distribution. The data from the scales were obtained through t-test, periodic analyses, Anavo, and post-hoc tests in cases of significant results. The findings of the study showed that there was a significant difference in the participants' school commitment in terms of gender, age, income level, and type of leisure time activity. No relationship was found between school commitment levels, and the department, and duration of education. ducation, monthly income level and type of leisure. Participants' levels of commitment to school have been shown to have a moderate, positive, and meaningful relationship with their leisure satisfaction. Based on the results of analysis, it can be concluded that as the school commitment levels of the participants increased, their leisure satisfaction level increased.

Keywords: Physical education and sport, leisure time, school commitment

INTRODUCTION

Physical education and sport is an activity consisting of exercises and practices such as games, sports, and gymnastics to improve physical and mental health and physical abilities, based on rules that may vary in accordance with the environmental conditions and the structures of the participants. On

the other hand, sport is the specific customization of physical education activities on the basis of competitions determined by rules that require technical, aesthetic, physiological, and psychological factors when performed at a high level (Aracı, 2001).

Leisure time became a symbol of modernity after the Industrial Revolution, which is regarded as the beginning of modern times, and it has influenced the formation of social and cultural identity and the way

of thinking and living. After the Industrial Revolution, as a result of the decrease in the need for manpower, there has been a positive increase in the time that individuals allocate for themselves, and as a result of the reduction and clarification of working hours, leisure activities have been evaluated in the desired way (Cunningham, 2016).

Studies on defining and making sense of leisure time have continued over the years. Many researchers, writers, sociologists, psychologists, and academics have tried to make leisure time meaningful by analyzing it from different perspectives. In today's modern age, it is clear that awareness of leisure time has developed in industrialized countries and other developing and traditional societies. It can be concluded that what leisure time means or how it is perceived is closely related to the social, cultural, economic, and political structure of society. In addition, the concept of leisure has been correlated with motivation, satisfaction, attitudes, and barriers in social psychology. Leisure time not only refers to the time spent freely, but also to the activities carried out during this period of time (Gürbüz & Henderson, 2013). According to Hung (2012), the advantages of leisure time are categorized under three main headings: physical, mental, and social benefits.

Physical Benefits: With today's technological developments, increasing mechanization is widely used in almost every field. Providing ease of work for human beings, this situation brings along many diseases due to inactivity. For protection against these diseases, one of the methods is for people to tend to physical activities in leisure time (Tel, 2008).

Spiritual Benefits: People having an efficient leisure organization will be more successful besides feeling happy in their inner world and social life by getting away from their tired and stressful work life (Aydoğan & Gündoğdu, 2006).

Social benefits, Socialization is one of the basic needs that human beings have had ever since the beginning of their existence. Although this need was felt even in hunter-gatherer times, today it can be met through leisure activities (Aydoğan & Gündoğdu, 2006).

Commitment means the ability to bring out strong energy. Commitment is not a passive but an active process. The student's ability to concentrate on the subject, to pay attention, and to find it worthwhile to do what the teacher wants him/her to do is evidence that commitment is an active process. Students do not consider what they are asked to do as an obligation, they perceive the task as a means of achieving their goals, and they spend all their energy to complete the task with enthusiasm and care

(Schlechty, 2011).

School commitment, as well as its multi-dimensional definitions, is defined in the literature in three dimensions: behavioral commitment, affective commitment and cognitive commitment. Behavioral commitment includes attending academic and extracurricular activities and social activities at school, being successful in these activities, and behaviors that will prevent leaving school. Research on behavioral commitment is concerned with student behavior. Emotional commitment includes positive or negative reactions to the teacher, friendships in the classroom, and feeling emotionally committed to the school. An additional component of emotional commitment is a person's willingness to complete their schoolwork. Emotional commitment research examines the attitudes, interests, and values of students. Likewise, school commitment is a multidimensional structure that includes these three elements (Fredricks et al., 2004). Students with high cognitive commitment tend to display more effective coping skills in the face of failure. Research in the field of cognitive commitment is concerned with issues such as how to organize self-directed learning. School commitment is a multidimensional structure that contains these three elements (Fredricks et al., 2004).

METHOD

Research Model

In our study, the correlational survey design was used in accordance with the aim of investigating the presence of a statistically significant relationship between leisure time activity satisfaction and school commitment sub-dimensions of the regular and evening education students of the Department of Physical Education Teaching, Department of Coaching Education, and Department of Sports Management of our university. The correlational survey design is a survey model used to determine the presence of change and differentiation between two or more variables. This model is a way to determine whether there is a differentiation in variables and if so, how this differentiation takes place and whether the variables change together or not (Karasar, 2011).

Research Group

This study was applied to students studying in the Department of Physical Education Teaching, Department of Coaching Education, and Department of Sports Management at Batman University School of Physical Education and Sports in the 2023-2024 academic year.

The population of our study includes 810 students studying in the Department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching, Department of Coaching Education and Department of Sports Management at Batman University School of Physical Education and Sports. The sample includes 533 students studying in these departments. In the study, the results revealed that 68.5% of the students were male and 31.5% were female. The age distribution of the students was analyzed, and it was found that 35,1% of them were between the ages of 17-20, 35,1% were between the ages of 21-24, 7,9% were between the ages of 25-29 and 6,4% were 30 years and older. Considering the departments in which the students studied, it was determined that 42.2% of them were coaching education, 19.9% were physical education and sports teaching, 11.6% were sports management evening education, and 26.3% were sports management regular education students.

Table 1. Demographic Information of the Students

		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	328	68,5
	Female	205	31,5
Age	Age 17 to 20	187	35,1
	Age 21 to 24	270	50,7
	Age 25 to 29	42	7,9
	30 years and older	34	6,4
Department	Coaching	225	42,2
	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	106	19,9
	Sports Management (evening education)	62	11,6
	Sports Management (mainstream education)	140	26,3
The Duration of Your Education at the University	Less than 1 year	72	13,5
	1 to 4 years	448	84,1
	5 to 7 years	13	2,4
Monthly Income	less than 500 TL	196	36,8
	501-1000 TL	215	40,3
	1001-1750 TL	46	8,6
	1751-3000 TL	15	2,8
	over 3000 TL	61	11,4
Leisure Activities	Musical activities	37	6,9
	Sports activities	408	76,5
	Artistic activities	4	0,8
	Outdoor Activities	26	4,9
	Other activities	58	10,9

When investigating the length of school attendance, the highest number was 84.1% for students who had attended for one to four years, followed by 13.5% who had not finished their first year and 2.4% who had attended for five to seven years. In terms of the income distribution of the students, it was found that 36.8% of the participants had a monthly income of less than 500 TL, 40.3% had an income between 501 and 1000 TL, 8.6% had an income between 1001 and 1750 TL, 2.8% had a monthly income between 1751 and 3000 TL and 11.4% had an income over 3000 TL. Examining the Leisure activities, it was found that 6.9% of the students were interested in music, 76.5% in sports,

0.8% in artistic activities, 4.9% in extracurricular activities, and 10.9% in other activities. Demographic information of the students is presented in Table 1.

Data Collection Tools

The questionnaire used within the scope of the research consists of three parts. There are seven questions in the first part of the questionnaire regarding the demographic information of the participants (gender, age, department of study, type of study, duration of study, monthly income, and leisure activities participated in). The second part of the questionnaire includes the Organizational Commitment Scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) and it was adapted into Turkish by Wasti (2000) to measure university students' commitment to school. The third part of the questionnaire

includes the Leisure Time Satisfaction Scale developed by Beard and Ragheb (1980) and it was adapted into Turkish by Gökçe and Orhan (2011) to measure the leisure satisfaction levels of university students. In the scales included in the measurement tool, a five-item Likert-type scale was used (1. Strongly Disagree, 2. Disagree, 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4. Agree and 5. Strongly Agree).

Data Analysis

The normality test conducted to determine the appropriate analysis methods for the different hypotheses suggested in the research is shown in Table 2. Based on George and Mallery's (2003)

statement that skewness and kurtosis values should vary between -2 and +2 in order for the data to be normally distributed; therefore, it was determined that school commitment and leisure satisfaction variables were normally distributed. T-test and ANOVA were performed because the data obtained

from the scales showed mainstream distribution, and post-hoc analysis was performed in cases of a significant difference. Additionally, a correlation analysis was performed in order to determine the relationship between leisure satisfaction and school commitment.

Table 2. Normality Test

	Average	Skewness	Kurtosis
School Commitment	2,8984	0,271	-0,110
Leisure Satisfaction	-0,745	-0,745	0,302

RESULTS

The t-test of the mean scores of the participants' school commitment and leisure satisfaction levels scale for gender variable is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. T-Test Results of School Commitment and Leisure Time Activity Satisfaction Levels by Gender Variable

	Gender	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
School Commitment	Female	205	2,69	0,78	531	-4,38	0,00*
	Male	328	3,03	0,88			
Leisure Satisfaction	Female	205	3,67	0,91	531	0,17	0,87
	Male	328	3,65	0,91			

* $p < 0.05$

The mean scores of the participants in the school commitment scale were significantly different according to gender, $T(531) = -4.38$, $p < 0.05$. It was observed that the mean school commitment level of male students ($X = 3.03$) was significantly higher than that of female students ($X = 2.69$). The mean scores of the participants' leisure activity satisfaction scale

do not show a significant difference by gender $T(531) = 0.17$, $p > 0.05$.

The descriptive statistics of the participants' school commitment and leisure satisfaction levels by the age variable are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistic of School Commitment and Leisure Activities by Age Variable

	Age	N	\bar{X}	SS
School Commitment	Age 17 to 20	187	2,96	0,87
	Age 21 to 24	270	2,80	0,82
	Age 25 to 29	42	2,93	0,92
	30 years and older (D)	34	3,30	0,97
Leisure Satisfaction	Age 17 to 20	187	3,60	0,94
	Age 21 to 24	270	3,63	0,88
	Age 25 to 29	42	3,83	0,96
	30 years and older (D)	34	4,01	0,78

The highest mean scores on the school commitment scale were observed in participants aged 30 years and above ($X = 3.30$) and the lowest in participants aged 21 to 24 years ($X = 2.80$). The highest mean score on the leisure satisfaction levels scale was observed in participants aged 30 years and over ($X = 4.01$), and the lowest mean score was

observed in participants aged 17 to 20 years ($X = 3.60$).

The one-way variance test (Anova) conducted to determine whether the participants' school commitment and leisure satisfaction levels differed according to their ages is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Anova Test Results of School Commitment and Leisure Satisfaction Levels by Age Variable

	Source of Variance	Total Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	Significant Difference		
					F	p	D-B
School Commitment	Intergroup	8,75	3	2,92	4,00	0,01*	D-B
	Intra-group	388,28	529	0,73			
	Total	397,03	532				
Leisure Satisfaction	Intergroup	6,40	3	2,14	2,62	0,06	
	Intra-group	431,11	529	0,82			
	Total	437,52	532				

In Table 5, a significant difference was observed when the mean school commitment scores of the participants were analyzed by age variable, $F(3,529) = 4.00$, $p < 0.05$. The participants over 30 (D) ($X = 3.30$) had higher levels of school dedication than the participants between 21 and 24 (B) ($X = 2.80$), according to the post-hoc (tukey hsd) results, which were used to determine which age ranges this

difference was between. There is no significant difference between the participants' leisure satisfaction levels and the age variable, $F(3,529) = 2.62$, $p > 0.05$.

The descriptive statistics of the participants' levels of school commitment and leisure satisfaction activities for the age variable are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of School Commitment and Leisure Activities by Department of Study Variable

	The Department Studied in	N	\bar{X}	SS
School Commitment	Coaching (A)	225	2,84	0,87
	Physical Education and Sports Teaching (B)	106	3,00	0,82
	Sports Management (Evening Education)(C)	62	2,90	0,92
	Sports Management (Mainstream Education) (D)	140	2,90	0,97
Leisure Satisfaction	Coaching (A)	225	3,56	0,94
	Physical Education and Sports Teaching (B)	106	3,84	0,88
	Sports Management (Evening Education) (C)	62	3,70	0,96
	Sports Management (Mainstream Education) (D)	140	3,67	0,78

The mean scores of the school commitment scale were highest in physical education and sports teaching ($X = 3.00$) and lowest in coaching education ($X = 2.84$) according to the department variable. The highest mean score of the leisure satisfaction levels scale was seen in physical education and sports

teaching ($X = 3.84$) and the lowest mean score was seen in coaching education ($X = 3.56$).

The one-way variance test (Anova) conducted to understand whether the participants' school commitment and leisure satisfaction levels differ according to the department they study is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Anova Results of School Commitment and Leisure Satisfaction Levels by Department of Study Variable

	Source of Variance	Total Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p
School Commitment	Intergroup	1,94	3	0,65	0,87	0,46
	Intra-group	395,10	529	0,75		
	Total	397,03	532			
The highest mean Satisfaction	Intergroup	5,98	3	2,00	2,44	0,63
	Intra-group	431,54	529	0,82		
	Total	437,51	532			

In Table 7, when the mean scores of the participants' school commitment are examined in terms of the department they study, no significant difference is found, $F(3,529) = 0.87$, $p > 0.05$. Again,

there is no significant difference between the participants' leisure satisfaction levels and the department where they study at, $F(3,529) = 2.44$, $p > 0.05$. The descriptive statistics of the participants'

school commitment and leisure satisfaction levels for the variables of the study period are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of School Commitment and Leisure Activities by Duration of Education Variable

	Study Period	N	\bar{X}	SS
School Commitment	less than 1 year (A)	72	3,20	1,09
	1 to 4 years (B)	448	2,85	0,81
	5 to 7 years (C)	13	2,83	0,94
Leisure Satisfaction	less than 1 year (A)	72	3,67	1,15
	1 to 4 years (B)	448	3,66	0,86
	5 to 7 years (C)	13	3,62	0,89

The highest mean scores of the school commitment scale were observed in the participants who studied less than 1 year ($X=2,84$) and the lowest in the participants who studied for 5 to 7 years ($X=2,83$). The highest mean score of the leisure satisfaction levels scale was observed in participants who studied less than 1 year ($X=43,67$)

and the lowest mean score was seen in participants who studied for 5 to 7 years ($X=3,62$).

In order to understand whether the participants' school commitment and leisure satisfaction levels differ according to the duration of education, a one-way variance test (Anova) is presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Anova Test Results of School Commitment and Leisure Satisfaction Levels by Duration of Education

	Source of Variance	Total Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F	p
School Commitment	Inter-group	7,06	2	3,54	0,82	0,08
	Intra-group	389,95	530	0,74		
	Total	397,03	532			
The highest mean Satisfaction	Inter-group	0,24	2	0,12	0,15	0,95
	Intra-group	437,50	530	0,82		
	Total	437,52	532			

In Table 9, no significant difference was found when the mean scores of the participants' school commitment were analyzed by the duration of their education, $F(2,530) = 0.82$, $p > 0.05$. Similarly, no significant difference was found between the participants' leisure satisfaction levels and the

duration of their education in their department, $F(2,530) = 0.15$, $p > 0.05$.

The descriptive statistics of the participants' school commitment and leisure satisfaction levels for the monthly income variable are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics of School Commitment and Leisure Activities by Monthly Income Variable

	Monthly Income	N	\bar{X}	SS
School Commitment	less than 1000 TL (A)	196	3,02	0,88
	1001-2500 TL (B)	215	2,76	0,79
	2501- 4000 TL (C)	46	2,71	0,64
	4001-6000 TL (D)	15	2,67	0,53
	over 6000 TL (E)	61	3,19	1,11
Leisure Satisfaction	less than 1000 TL (A)	196	3,58	1,04
	1001-2500 TL (B)	215	3,72	1,21
	2501- 4000 TL (C)	46	3,45	1,25
	4001-6000 TL (D)	15	3,42	2,13
	over 6000 TL (E)	61	3,95	1,08

The highest mean scores of the school commitment scale were seen in the participants over 6000 TL ($X=3,19$) and the lowest in the participants between 4001 and 6000 TL ($X=2,67$) according to

the monthly income levels of the students. The highest mean score of the leisure satisfaction levels scale was above 6000 TL ($X=3,95$) and the lowest

mean score was seen in participants with 4001 to 600 TL ($X=3,42$).

The one-way variance test (Anova) conducted to understand whether the participants' school

commitment and leisure satisfaction levels differ according to their monthly income levels is shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Anova Test Results of School Commitment and Leisure Satisfaction Levels by Income Level

	Source of Variance	Total Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p	Significant Difference
School Commitment	Intergroup	14,22	4	3,56	4,90	0,01	D-E
	Intra-group	382,81	528	0,73			
	Total	397,03	532				
The highest mean Satisfaction	Intergroup	10,05	4	2,51	3,10	0,15	-
	Intra-group	427,48	528	0,81			
	Total	437,52	532				

In Table 11, a significant difference was observed when the mean school commitment scores of the participants were analyzed by income levels, $F(4,528) = 4.90$, $p < 0.05$. The participants in the range of 4001–6000 TL (D) ($X=2,67$) had lower school commitment levels than the participants in the range of over 6000 TL (E) ($X=3,19$), according to the results of the post-hoc (tukey hsd) conducted

to determine which income groups this difference was between. There was no significant difference between the participants' leisure satisfaction levels and the monthly income variable $F(4,528) = 3.10$, $p > 0.05$.

The descriptive statistics of the participants' school commitment and leisure satisfaction levels for the leisure activity type variable are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Descriptive Statistics of School Commitment and Leisure Activities by Leisure Time Activity Type Variable

	Leisure Activities	N	\bar{X}	SS
School Commitment	Musical activities	37	2,89	0,83
	Sports activities (B)	408	3,00	0,86
	Artistic activities (C)	4	2,53	0,42
	Outdoor Activities (D)	26	2,37	0,68
	Other activities (E)	58	3,46	0,79
Leisure Satisfaction	Musical activities	37	3,41	0,98
	Sports activities (B)	408	3,72	0,87
	Artistic activities (C)	4	3,94	0,65
	Outdoor Activities (D)	26	3,70	0,89
	Other activities (E)	58	3,31	1,03

The highest mean score of the school commitment scale was other activities ($X=3,46$) and the lowest mean score was outdoor activities ($X=2,37$) when analyzed according to the type of leisure activities performed by the students. The highest mean score of the leisure satisfaction levels scale was artistic activities ($X=3,94$), and the lowest mean score was other activities ($X=3,31$).

The one-way variance test (Anova) conducted to understand whether the participants' school commitment and leisure time satisfaction levels differ according to the type of leisure activity is presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Anova Results of School Commitment and Leisure Satisfaction Levels by Leisure Activity Type

	Source Of Variance	Total Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p	Significant Difference
School Commitment	Intergroup	22,78	4	5,70	8,04	0,01	B-D, D-E
	Intra-group	374,25	528	0,71			
	Total	397,03	532				
Leisure Satisfaction	Intergroup	11,23	4	2,81	3,48	0,08	-
	Intra-group	426,29	528	0,81			
	Total	437,52	532				

In Table 13, when the mean school commitment scores of the participants were analyzed in terms of the type of their leisure activities, a significant difference was observed $F(4,528) = 8.04$, $p < 0.05$. The study employed post-hoc (tukey hsd) analysis to ascertain which leisure activities caused the difference.

There was a relationship between non-space activities (D) ($X=2,37$), sports activities (B) ($X=3,00$), and other activities (E) ($X=3,46$),

Table 14. Corelation Analysis Between School Commitment Leisure Satisfaction

Leisure Satisfaction		
School Commitment	Pearson Corr.	0,40
	p	0,00
	N	533,00

Table 14 indicates that there is a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between school commitment levels and leisure satisfaction, $r=0.40$, $p < 0.05$. It can be said that as school commitment levels increase, leisure satisfaction also increases. Looking at the coefficient of determination ($r^2=0.16$), it can be said that 16% of the entire variance in school commitment levels is due to leisure satisfaction.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this study was to determine whether different demographic factors had an impact on the level of school commitment and leisure satisfaction among students studying at Batman University School of Physical Education and Sports. Conceptual information about physical education and sports, leisure time and school commitment is provided in the first part of the study. The method section of the study provides an explanation of the way the research was conducted in the second section. In the results section, the analysis findings are presented.

A significant difference was observed between the school commitment levels of the participants who participated in the study and gender variables. It was concluded that the average level of school commitment of male participants was higher than

according to the findings of the post-hoc (tukey hsd) analysis conducted to determine which leisure time activities this difference is between.

For the question "Is there a significant relationship between the participants' school commitment levels and leisure satisfaction?", the correlation analysis for the relationship between school commitment levels and leisure time satisfaction is presented in Table 14.

that of female participants. Güle (2013) found a significant difference between the commitment of physical education teachers and gender variables in his study. In the study, the commitment of male teachers was found to be higher than that of female teachers. Sarı (2013) examined the school commitment levels of high school students and concluded that the school commitment levels of male students were significantly higher. Ceylan (2022) observed a significant difference in the school commitment levels of female students in his study. In Savi's (2011) study, when the relationship between school commitment and gender variables was examined, it was found that the school commitment levels of female students were significantly higher than those of male students. In our study, no significant difference was found between the participants' leisure satisfaction and gender variables. Ardahan and Lapa (2010) did not detect a significant difference between leisure satisfaction and gender in their study conducted with university students. Hadi et al., (2021) concluded that there was no significant difference in the leisure satisfaction levels of male and female participants in their study with individuals participating in sportive recreational activities. In their study on youth center members, Sönmezoğlu et al., (2014) found that women had higher levels of leisure time satisfaction

compared to men. In this case, it is thought that women are more satisfied in terms of education and relaxation in leisure activities.

In our study, we analyzed the mean school commitment scores of the participants in terms of the age variable and found a significant difference. According to the results of the analysis carried out to ascertain the age groups wherein this difference existed, the participants aged 30 years and above exhibited higher levels of school dedication than the participants aged 21 to 24 years. In his study, Savi (2011) determined that the mean total scores of the participants on the school commitment scale differed significantly by age. Bellici (2015) concluded that there was a significant difference in students' commitment to school according to age. In our study, there was no significant difference between the leisure satisfaction levels of the participants and the age variable. Likewise, Erdemli and Yaşartürk (2020) did not find a significant difference between leisure satisfaction and age variables in their study in physical education and sports teaching department students. In the study conducted by Yaşartürk (2019) on university students, in parallel with our study, no significant relationship was found between leisure satisfaction and age variables.

In our study, no significant difference was found when the mean scores of the participants' school commitment were analyzed in terms of the department they studied. It was seen that the mean scores of the school commitment scale were the highest in physical education and sports teaching and the lowest in coaching departments, according to the department variable. In his study, conducted with 240 participants studying at Akdeniz University, Direk (2020) could not detect a significant difference between the department variable and school commitment levels. In our study, no significant difference was found between the leisure satisfaction levels of the participants and the department they studied. The highest mean score of the leisure satisfaction levels scale was seen in physical education and sports teaching, and the lowest mean score was seen in coaching education departments. Aktop and Göksel (2023) concluded in their study that there was no significant difference between the leisure time interests of the sports sciences faculty students and the department they studied.

In our study, there was no significant difference when the mean scores of school commitment were analyzed by the duration of the study. The mean scores of the school commitment scale were highest in participants who studied less than 1 year and lowest in participants who studied for 5 to 7 years, according to the variable of the duration of study at school. In our study, there is no significant difference

between the participants' leisure satisfaction levels and the duration of their education in the department they study. The highest mean score of the leisure satisfaction levels scale was seen in those who studied for less than 1 year, and the lowest mean score was seen in those who studied for 5 to 7 years.

In our study, there was a significant difference when the mean school commitment scores of the participants were analyzed in terms of income levels. The post-hoc results, which were used to determine which income groups this difference was between, showed that participants in the 4001-6000 TL range had lower school involvement levels than those in the 6000 TL and above. Fulya (2019) found a significant relationship between income level and school commitment in a study conducted with 1278 university students. In the study by Arastaman (2009), the school commitment scores of students with low and medium income levels were statistically significantly higher than the school commitment scores of students with high income levels. In our study, when the participants' levels of leisure satisfaction activities and monthly income variables were analyzed, it was determined that there was no significant difference between them. The highest mean score of the leisure time activity satisfaction levels scale was above 6000 TL and the lowest mean score was seen in those with 4001-6000 TL. Erdemli and Yaşartürk (2020) concluded that there is no significant difference between students' leisure satisfaction and income levels. Yiğit (2018) worked with 485 students in his research and concluded that leisure satisfaction activities did not differ significantly according to income level.

In our study, a significant difference was observed when the mean school commitment scores of the participants were analyzed in terms of their leisure activity types. According to the post-hoc results to find out which type of leisure activity this difference is between, there is a relationship between sports activities, extracurricular activities, and other activities. The mean scores of the school commitment scale were highest in sports activities and lowest in extracurricular activities according to the type of leisure activities. In our study, there is no significant difference between the levels of leisure satisfaction activities of the participants and the type of their leisure activities. The highest mean score on the leisure satisfaction levels scale was for artistic activities, and the lowest mean score was for other activities. Kara (2000) concluded in his study that the participants generally attach more importance to sportive activities such as aerobics, step, fitness, and tennis. Balci (2003) concluded that university students tend to deal with popular sports such as football, basketball, volleyball, table tennis,

swimming, chess, backgammon, and table tennis as leisure time activities.

In conclusion that, In the literature review, commitment studies conducted in educational institutions have generally focused on the commitment of academic staff and teachers to the school. Considering that the university has its own unique structure and students are the basic building blocks, studies on students' commitment to the university will be as interesting as the aforementioned studies and will be useful for completing university education in the most effective way.

In conclusion that, in our study, it was observed that there was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the participants' level of school commitment and their leisure satisfaction.

Author Contributions: N.M.Ç, B.Y.: data collection. M.K. F.S: data analysis and original draft preparation. M.K., B.Y., N.M.Ç: review and editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Aktop, M., & Göksel, A. G. (2023). Examining the relationship between leisure interests and life satisfaction among sports science education students. *Journal of Sport and Recreation for All*, 5(2), 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.56639/jsar.1386975>
- Aracı, H. (2001). *Physical education in schools for teachers and students*. Nobel Publishing.
- Arastaman, G. (2009). Perspectives of students, teachers, and administrators on first-year high school students' school engagement. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education*, 26, 102–112.
- Ardahan, F., & Lapa, T. Y. (2010). Investigating university students' leisure satisfaction levels according to gender and income. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 21(4), 129–136.
- Aydoğan, İ., & Gündoğdu, F. B. (2006). Leisure activities of female faculty members. *Journal of the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences*, 2, 217–232.
- Balci, V. (2003). Investigating university students' participation in leisure activities in Ankara. *National Education Journal*, (158).
- Beard, J. G., & Ragheb, M. G. (1980). Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 12(1), 20–33.
- Bellici, N. (2015). The examination of school engagement in middle school students across various variables. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Education*, 15(1), 48–65. <https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2015.15.1-5000128594>
- Ceylan, H. (2022). *School culture as a key factor in middle school students' school engagement* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Graduate School of Education.
- Cunningham, H. (2016). *Leisure in the industrial revolution: C. 1780–c. 1880* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Direk, O. (2020). *Examining organizational commitment and leadership orientations among faculty of sports sciences students* (Unpublished master's thesis). Akdeniz University Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Erdemli, E., & Yaşartürk, F. (2020). Examining the relationship between leisure satisfaction and problem-solving skills among physical education and sports teacher trainees. *MANAS Journal of Social Studies*, 9(3), 1871–1882. <https://doi.org/10.33206/mjss.605808>
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept; state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109.
- Fulya, A. (2019). *Analysis of the relationship between psychological capital, classroom engagement, and school alienation perceptions among university students*

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The research was approved by Batman University Ethics Committee on 14.05.2024 (Approval No.2024/03.54).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in this study.

Data Availability Statement: Datasets are available through the corresponding author upon reason-able request.

Acknowledgments: No

Conflicts of Interest: The authors unequivocally assert that this research was undertaken while devoid of any commercial or financial affiliations that might be perceived as potential conflicts of interest.

- (Doctoral dissertation). İnönü University, Institute of Educational Sciences.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference (11.0 update, 4th ed.)*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Gökçe, H., & Orhan, K. (2011). Turkish validity and reliability study of the leisure satisfaction scale. *Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences*, 22, 139–145.
- Gülle, M. (2013). *An investigation of physical education and sports teachers' perceptions of workplace bullying and their levels of organizational commitment* (Master's thesis). Sakarya University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Sakarya.
- Gürbüz, B., & Henderson, K. (2013). Exploring the meanings of leisure among Turkish university students. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 15(4), 927–957.
- Hadi, G., Erdem, B., & Duman, E. (2021). Investigating the relationship between leisure satisfaction levels and optimal performance mood states of participants in sportive entertainment activities. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 32(1), 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.17644/sbd.702867>
- Hung, H. J. (2012). A study on leisure benefits breaking through leisure activities. *Journal of National Taiwan Normal University*, 3(4), 77–92.
- Kara, S. (2000). *Recreation and animation activities in 4- and 5-star hotels (The case of Muğla)* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). Muğla University, School of Physical Education and Sports.
- Karasar, N. (2011). *Scientific research methods*. Nobel Publishing.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage Publications.
- Sarı, M. (2013). Sense of belonging to school among high school students. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(1), 147–160.
- Savi, F. (2011). School attachment scale for children and adolescents: The study of validity and reliability. *Elementary Education Online*, 10(1), 80–90.
- Schlechty, P. C. (2011). *Reforming the school* (Trans. Y. Özden). Nobel Academic Publishing.
- Sönmezoğlu, U., Polat, E., & Aycan, A. (2014). Leisure satisfaction levels of youth center members by selected variables. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, 2(1), 219–229.
- Tel, M., & Köksalan, B. (2008). A sociological investigation of faculty members' participation in sports activities (The case of Eastern Anatolia). *Firat University Journal of Social Sciences*, 18, 261–278.
- Wasti, S. A. (2000). Validity and reliability analysis of Meyer and Allen's three-dimensional organizational commitment scale. In *Proceedings of the 8th National Congress of Management and Organization* (pp. 401–410).
- Yaşartürk, F. (2019). Analysis of the relationship between the academic self-efficacy and leisure satisfaction levels of university students. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 7(3), 106–115.
- Yiğit, İ. (2018). *An investigation of leisure satisfaction levels of individuals participating in recreational activities in university communities* (Master's thesis). İnönü University, Institute of Health Sciences, Malatya.