

## **Leisure Time Participation, Subjective Vitality and Life Quality of University Students<sup>1</sup>**

**Sonnur KÜÇÜK KILIÇ**

Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University, Faculty of Education, Department of Physical Education and Sport, Erzincan, TURKEY

**Email:** [sonnur.kucukkilic@erzincan.edu.tr](mailto:sonnur.kucukkilic@erzincan.edu.tr)

*Type: Research Article (Received: 19.08.2019 – Corrected: ---- – Accepted: 23.09.2019)*

### **Abstract**

The aim of this research was to examine the leisure time participation, subjective vitality and life quality levels of university students according to some demographic variables and determine the relation between them. A sample of 317 (121 females and 196 males) students who studying at university provided responses. The mean age of the students was  $21.42 \pm 2.90$ . ‘Subjective Vitality Scale’ and ‘World Health Organization Quality of Life Instrument (WHOQOLBREF)’ were administered on the participants. Descriptive statistical methods, t-test, ANOVA and correlation analyses were used in the data analysis. Subjective vitality and life quality perceptions of the participants were at middle level. While the participants' life quality perceptions did not differ significantly according to gender, subjective vitality perceptions differed significantly. Subjective vitality and life quality perceptions of the participants differed significantly according to actively engage in sports, income, evaluation style of leisure time and participation frequency for recreational activities. In addition, middle and positive correlation was observed between subjective vitality and life quality. The results of the research showed that individuals who engaged in sport actively, had high income and participated in leisure time activities had a high subjective vitality and life quality perception. It had been determined that participation of sports, social and outdoor activities in leisure time had a positive effect on subjective vitality and life quality perceptions. In addition, as the subjective vitality of the participants increases, the level of life quality also increases.

**Keywords:** Subjective vitality, leisure time participation, life quality, university student

---

<sup>1</sup>The abstract of this study was presented as an oral presentation at the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Congress on Recreation and Sport Management (11-14 April 2019, Bodrum).

## Introduction

Developments of science and technology not only reduce the need for people in production, but also lead to a decrease in the working time of individuals (Karaküçük, 2001). So, these developments in living conditions enable to people spending time for leisure activities increasingly (Kim et al. 2015; Ramazanoğlu et al. 2004). Similarly, besides the increase in leisure time, factors such as increase in education and income level and prolongation of life have led to the increase in demand for leisure activities (Mansuroğlu, 2002). The concept of leisure time is defined as the time in which an individual gets rid of all difficulties or connections for both himself/herself and others, can use them freely as he/she wishes (Bakır, 1990) and will engage in an activity of his/her own choice (Tezcan, 1994). In this context, it is stated that active participation in leisure activities, which constitute an important aspect of daily life (Heo and Lee, 2010), creates positive emotions on individuals (Caldwell et al. 1992; Murphy, 2003) and this situation contributes to the development of self-fulfilling and spiritually healthy young people (Passmore ve French, 2001). In addition, participation in leisure time activities reduces the level of depression and loneliness (Morgan and Bath, 1998; Warr et al. 2004), helps to cope with the challenges of aging (Steinkamp and Kelly, 1987), contributes to physical, social, psychological and cognitive health (Cheung et al. 2009; Shin and You, 2013), improves health and provides socialization (Drakou et al. 2008). On the other hand, studies have shown that participation in leisure activities is the most important determinant of life satisfaction (Riddick and Stewart, 1994) and is associated with increased happiness and life satisfaction (Menec, 2003; Ragheb and Tate, 1993).

On the other hand, it is stated that participation in leisure time activities has a positive effect on individuals' life quality as well as life satisfaction (Lloyd and Auld, 2002; Mannel, 2007). When these activities are well planned, they play an important role in improving of life quality socially and psychologically (Ashby et al. 1999) and it is one of the most important factors that contributes to the self-discovery, renewal and revelation of the individual (Aslan and Cansever, 2012). Research shows that participation in leisure time activities has effects that are characterized by direct improvements in a person's quality of life, often defined as increased mood (Hull, 1990), happiness, and pleasure (Csikszentmihalyi ve Le Fever, 1989). Similarly, the studies in the literature emphasize the role of leisure time contributing to the quality of life (Michalos, 2005; Wendel-Vos et al. 2004). The concept of quality of life, which was first used in the article 'On the Quantity and Quality of Life' published by Long in 1960 (Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2016), expresses how individuals perceive the positive and negative aspects of their lives subjectively (WHO, 1998) and includes both psychological and physical factors that affect the general perception of satisfaction in an individual's life (Diener, 1984; Diener et al. 1999). The quality of life defined as "individuals' perception of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns" (WHO, 1993) is becoming a growing interest in finding and sustaining satisfaction, happiness and faith prospectively for individuals and communities in a rapidly changing world (Mercer, 1994). According to Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000), positive individual traits, virtues such as subjective happiness, hope, optimism and courage, are very important to improve one's quality of life and avoid psychological problems.

Research shows that quality of life is associated with subjective vitality (Salama-Younes, 2011). The concept of subjective vitality, which is based on the theory of self-determination (Deci and Ryan, 2000), is defined as the energy felt by one's self (Ryan and Frederick, 1997). Subjective vitality is a complex and dynamic structure that is influenced by both physical and psychological factors (Ryan and Deci, 2001), which means that the person is full of energy,

enthusiastic, lively, cheerful, high-aroused and dynamic without fatigue, exhaustion or burnout (Fini et al. 2010; Ryan and Frederick, 1997). In this context, can be said that individuals with high levels of subjective vitality are more alert, more energetic and more committed to life (Bostic et al. 2000). Studies in the literature show that subjective vitality is positively related to well-being (Ryan and Frederick, 1997), life satisfaction (Salama-Younes, 2011) and subjective happiness (Akin, 2012), and negatively related to depressive symptoms and anxiety (Niemic et al. 2006). So, can be said that subjective vitality refers to the assessment of people's quality of life (Diener et al. 2008; Pavot and Diener, 2004) and individuals who have a high level of subjective vitality perceive their lives as rewarding and satisfying, and experience their lives positively (Leontopoulou and Trilivia, 2012).

As a result of the literature review, studies were found in the literature that contextualised university students' subjective vitality and life satisfaction (Salama-Younes, 2011), subjective vitality and psychological well-being (Ryan and Frederick, 1997), leisure participation and life quality (Baştuğ et al. 2018; Peleias et al. 2017), leisure participation and psychological well-being (Karaca and Yerlisu Lapa, 2016; Liu and Yu, 2014; Molina-Garcia et al. 2011), leisure participation and life satisfaction (Huang and Carleton, 2003; Yaşartürk et al. 2017). However, in the literature review, there were no studies about university students' leisure time participation, subjective vitality and life quality perceptions. In this context, can be said that university students are exposed to many stresses due to many reasons such as change of residence, increased responsibility, adaptation to the university environment and heavy curricula. So these factors may affect their subjective vitality and life quality perceptions negatively. On the other hand, it is thought that participation in leisure time activities has a positive effect on these factors and plays an important role in increasing individuals' subjective vitality and life quality perceptions. Therefore, the aim of this research is to examine the leisure time participation, subjective vitality and life quality levels of university students according to some demographic variables and determine the relation between them.

## **Materials and Methods**

The study was based on the 'survey' method which widely used in the descriptive research model (Ekiz, 2009). In this model, the individual or object is tried to be defined as it exists within its own conditions (Karasar, 2012). And 'questionnaire' was used as the data collection technique (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996).

### **Participants**

The study sample consists of 317 (121 females, 196 males) university students ( $M_{age}=21.42\pm 2.90$ ) who were studying at Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University in Erzincan, Turkey. Also convenience sampling method was used to determine the research group.

### **Instruments**

#### **Subjective Vitality Scale (SVS)**

The Subjective Vitality Scale (SVS) was administered on the participants as data collection tool. The SVS was originally developed by Ryan and Frederick (1997) in order to measure level of subjective vitality was translated into Turkish by Uysal et al. (2014). The scale was consisted of 7 items and all items were measured by using a seven-point Likert scale (Strongly disagree, strongly agree). High scores obtained from the scale indicate that the individual's subjective vitality level is high. In this study, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was measured as 0.84 for the scale.

### World Health Organization Quality of Life Instrument (WHOQOL-BREF-TR)

Turkish version of the World Health Organization Quality of Life Instrument (WHOQOL-BREF-TR) was used to measure life quality perceptions of the students. It was translated into Turkish by Eser et al. (1999). The scale was consisted of 5 sub-factor and 26 items, and all items were measured by using a five-point Likert scale. In this study, physical health, psychological health, social relations and environment sub-factor of the scale were used. High score points to the high quality of life. In this study, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was measured as 0.69 for ‘*Physical Health*’, 0.77 for ‘*Psychological Health*’, 0.54 for ‘*Social Relations*’ and 0.72 for ‘*Environment*’.

### Procedure

Data collection tool was administered to the participants following the getting necessary permissions in 2018-2019 Spring Semester. Required explanations were made about the purpose of the study and the detailed informations were given about the filling data collection tool in the guidelines. Application was based on voluntary basis. Questionnaire forms which were gathered by the researcher were controlled and filled out missing or wrong ones excluded from the study.

### Data Analysis

The statistical analyses were carried out with SPSS 21 program. Descriptive statistics, t-test, one way ANOVA and Pearson Correlation were used in the data analysis. Skewness and Kurtosis values and results of Levene tests were examined and decided whether the data satisfied the prerequisites of parametric test or not (Büyüköztürk, 2012). And also Cronbach’s alphas were calculated for the scales in order to evaluate their internal consistencies. In the study, the level of significance was determined as 0.05.

### Findings

The mean and SD of the SVS scores of the university students who participated in this study was 4.67 and 1.27 respectively. WHOQOL-BREF-TR scores when analysed based on factors, findings indicated that the ‘*Physical Health*’ (3.70) had highest average, while the ‘*Environment*’ had lowest average (3.38). The Skewness and Kurtosis values showed that the data was distributed within the area of normalcy (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Descriptive Statistics for the SVS and WHOQOL-BREF-TR

	Items Number	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min	Max
<i>SVS</i>	7	4.67	1.27	-0.17	-0.37	1.00	7.00
<i>Physical Health</i>	7	3.70	0.56	-0.11	-0.38	2.14	5.00
<i>Psychological Health</i>	6	3.54	0.66	-0.67	0.61	1.17	5.00
<i>Social Relations</i>	3	3.61	0.82	-0.26	-0.37	1.00	5.00
<i>Environment</i>	8	3.38	0.59	-0.09	-0.06	1.75	5.00

Results from the t-test indicated that there was a significant difference between gender and SVS scores ( $t=2.84, p<0.05$ ). According to this result, male university students’ average scores (4.83) were higher than the female university students’ average scores (4.42). By contrast, there was no significant difference between gender and ‘*Physical Health*’ ( $t=1.71, p>0.05$ ), ‘*Psychological Health*’ ( $t=0.20, p>=0.05$ ), ‘*Social Relations*’ ( $t=1.11, p>0.05$ ) and ‘*Environment*’ ( $t=0.79, p>0.05$ ) (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Results of t-test according to gender

	Female (n=121)		Male (n=196)		t	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
<i>SVS</i>	4.42	1.16	4.83	1.31	2.84	0.01
<i>Physical Health</i>	3.63	0.52	3.74	0.58	1.71	0.09
<i>Psychological Health</i>	3.53	0.58	3.55	0.71	0.20	0.85
<i>Social Relations</i>	3.67	0.78	3.57	0.85	1.11	0.27
<i>Environment</i>	3.41	0.56	3.36	0.60	0.79	0.43

Analyses showed that there was a significant difference between active involvement in sport and subjective vitality ( $t=3.16$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). According to this, participants who were involvement in sport actively had higher average scores (4.91) than the non-involvement participants (4.47). And also there was a significant difference between active involvement in sport and 'Physical Health' ( $t=3.37$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and 'Psychological Health' ( $t=2.67$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) subscale scores. Students who active involvement in sport had higher 'Physical Health' and 'Psychological Health' subscale average scores.

**Table 3.** Results of t-test according to active involvement in sport

	Yes (n=146)		No (n=171)		t	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
<i>SVS</i>	4.91	1.28	4.47	1.22	3.16	0.00
<i>Physical Health</i>	3.81	0.56	3.60	0.54	3.37	0.00
<i>Psychological Health</i>	3.65	0.67	3.45	0.65	2.67	0.01
<i>Social Relations</i>	3.68	0.84	3.55	0.80	1.48	0.14
<i>Environment</i>	3.55	0.55	3.23	0.58	5.04	0.00

A significant difference was found between university students' SVS ( $F_{(2,314)}=5.85$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), 'Psychological Health' ( $F_{(2,314)}=6.14$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), 'Social Relations' ( $F_{(2,314)}=3.64$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and 'Environment' ( $F_{(2,314)}=15.15$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) scores depending on income level. In SVS, 'Psychological Health', 'Social Relations' and 'Environment', the scores of the participants who had 1001 TL and more income level were higher than the others (Table 4).

**Table 4.** Results of ANOVA according to income level

	500 TL and less (n=165)		501-1000 TL (n=89)		1001 TL and more (n=63)		F	p	Significant Difference
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
<i>SVS</i>	4.58	1.22	4.50	1.29	5.15	1.25	5.85	0.00	3>1, 3>2
<i>Physical Health</i>	3.67	0.59	3.66	0.58	3.82	0.42	1.88	0.16	-
<i>Psychological</i>	3.43	0.71	3.58	0.64	3.77	0.52	6.14	0.00	3>1
<i>Social Relations</i>	3.50	0.83	3.65	0.77	3.82	0.82	3.64	0.03	3>1
<i>Environment</i>	3.24	0.59	3.42	0.52	3.69	0.54	15.15	0.00	3>1, 3>2, 2>1

1: 500 TL and less, 2: 501-1000 TL, 3: 1001 TL and more

It was determined that the SVS ( $t=3.13$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), 'Physical Health' ( $t=2.17$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and 'Environment' ( $t=2.76$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) scores of the students differed significantly according to the status of participation in sport activities in leisure time. On the other hand, SVS ( $t=2.44$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and 'Psychological Health' ( $t=2.75$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) scores of the students differed significantly according to the status of participation in social activities in leisure time.



According to these findings, it can be said that students who participate in sport activities in their leisure time had higher subjective vitality and perception of life quality related to physical health and environment. On the other hand, subjective vitality and life quality perceptions related to psychological health of students participating in social activities in their leisure time were found high (Table 5).

**Table 5.** Results of t-test according to evaluation style of leisure time (evaluation with sport and social activities)

	Sport Activities				Social Activities				t	p		
	Yes (n=174)		No (n=143)		Yes (n=145)		No (n=172)					
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD				
<i>SVS</i>	4.87	1.25	4.43	1.24	3.13	0.00	4.86	1.33	4.51	1.20	2.44	0.02
<i>Physical Health</i>	3.76	0.56	3.62	0.55	2.17	0.03	3.74	0.52	3.65	0.59	1.44	0.15
<i>Psychological</i>	3.61	0.62	3.46	0.70	1.99	0.05	3.65	0.61	3.45	0.70	2.75	0.01
<i>Social Relations</i>	3.61	0.77	3.60	0.88	0.12	0.91	3.66	0.84	3.56	0.80	1.14	0.26
<i>Environment</i>	3.46	0.54	3.28	0.62	2.76	0.01	3.41	0.58	3.35	0.59	0.94	0.35

Analyses showed that the SVS ( $t=2.15$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and ‘*Social Relations*’ ( $t=2.39$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) scores of the students differed significantly according to the status of participation in outdoor activities in leisure time. On the other hand, there were no significant different between SVS ( $t=1.28$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), ‘*Physical Health*’ ( $t=0.26$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), ‘*Psychological Health*’ ( $t=1.62$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), ‘*Social Relations*’ ( $t=0.44$ ,  $p>0.05$ ) and ‘*Environment*’ ( $t=1.05$ ,  $p>0.05$ ) scores of the students and the status of participation in touristic activities in leisure time. Students who participate in outdoor activities in their leisure time had higher subjective vitality and perception of life quality related to social relations (Table 6).

**Table 6.** Results of t-test according to evaluation style of leisure time (evaluation with outdoor and touristic activities)

	Outdoor Activities				Touristic Activities				t	p		
	Yes (n=83)		No (n=234)		Yes (n=46)		No (n=271)					
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD				
<i>SVS</i>	4.93	1.30	4.58	1.25	2.15	0.03	4.89	1.31	4.63	1.26	1.28	0.20
<i>Physical Health</i>	3.75	0.57	3.67	0.55	1.08	0.28	3.72	0.60	3.69	0.55	0.26	0.79
<i>Psychological</i>	3.64	0.61	3.51	0.68	1.65	0.10	3.69	0.64	3.52	0.67	1.62	0.11
<i>Social Relations</i>	3.79	0.79	3.54	0.82	2.39	0.02	3.66	0.78	3.60	0.83	0.44	0.66
<i>Environment</i>	3.42	0.58	3.37	0.59	0.70	0.48	3.46	0.60	3.37	0.58	1.05	0.29

Results of the analyses showed that both SVS ( $F_{(2,394)}=15.20$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and ‘*Physical Health*’ ( $F_{(2,314)}=7.19$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), ‘*Psychological Health*’ ( $F_{(2,314)}=3.86$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), ‘*Social Relations*’ ( $F_{(2,314)}=7.24$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and ‘*Environment*’ ( $F_{(2,314)}=14.50$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) scores of students differed significantly according to the frequency of participation in recreational activities (PFRA). Students who often participate in recreational activities had higher subjective vitality and life quality perceptions related to physical health, psychological health, social relations and environment (Table 7).

**Table 7.** Results of ANOVA according to participation frequency for recreational activities (PFRA)

	Rarely (n=68)		Sometimes (n=169)		Often (n=80)		F	p	Significant Difference
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
<i>SVS</i>	4.03	1.22	4.72	1.16	5.12	1.32	15.20	0.00	2>1, 3>1, 3>2
<i>Physical Health</i>	3.57	0.56	3.65	0.53	3.89	0.58	7.19	0.00	3>1, 3>2
<i>Psychological</i>	3.42	0.66	3.51	0.63	3.71	0.72	3.86	0.02	3>1
<i>Social Relations</i>	3.41	0.86	3.55	0.76	3.89	0.84	7.24	0.00	3>1, 3>2
<i>Environment</i>	3.13	0.60	3.37	0.56	3.63	0.54	14.50	0.00	2>1, 3>1, 3>2

1: Rarely, 2: Sometimes, 3: Often

There were significant positive and middle correlations between SVS and ‘Physical Health’ ( $r=0.48$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), ‘Psychological Health’ ( $r=0.59$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), ‘Social Relations’ ( $r=0.40$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and ‘Environment’ ( $r=0.47$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) subscale scores of the university students (Table 8).

**Table 8.** Correlations between SVS and WHOQOL-BREF-TR scores

	SVS		
	n	r	p
<i>Physical Health</i>	317	0.48**	0.00
<i>Psychological Health</i>	317	0.59**	0.00
<i>Social Relations</i>	317	0.40**	0.00
<i>Environment</i>	317	0.47**	0.00

\*\* $p<0.01$

## Discussions

The results of the study revealed that subjective vitality perception of the university students was at middle level. The results support the findings of some studies in the literature (Deniz and Satici, 2017; Salama-Younes, 2011). In contrast to with these results, while the subjective vitality of the participants was above the middle level in some studies (Akin and Akin, 2014; Sariçam, 2015; Taylor and Lonsdale, 2010; Yazıcı, 2015), was high level in the others (Vlachopoulos, 2012). On the other hand, similar to the results of some studies (Koçak, 2019; Sarıgöz, 2019; Yılmaz, 2016), the participants' perception of quality of life was found at middle level. On the contrast, in the study conducted by Brajsa-Zganec et al. (2011), the participants' perception of life quality was found at high level. The reason for this difference may be related to the university environment in which students study. Considering the stress situation that university students are exposed to both academically and socially and spending most of the day on campus, it can be thought that designing university campuses in such a way that students can participate in more social activities will contribute to the elimination of these negativities.

In regards to the influence of gender on perceptions of subjective vitality levels, in this study found that there was a significant difference between females and males. According to this result, male university students had higher subjective vitality level than the females. In some studies in the literature (Ryan et al, 2010; Yazıcı, 2015), it was determined that subjective vitality perception did not differ according to gender. And also, according to the results of the study, participants' perception of life quality did not differ according to gender. Similarly, in

some studies, conducted by Akyüz et al. (2017), Baştuğ et al. (2018), Koçak (2019), Yılmaz (2016), there were no significant difference between gender and life quality perceptions. On the other hand, while it was determined that female participants had higher quality of life perceptions in some studies in the literature (Eriş and Anıl, 2015; Karaca and Yerlisu Lapa, 2016), and male participants had higher quality of life perceptions in some studies (Bozdağ, 2019; Cieslak et al. 2007; Emamvırdı, 2013; Gillison et al. 2006; Guallar-Castillon et al. 2005; Hamad Amin, 2018; Pekmezovic et al. 2011; Tekkanat, 2008; Ulutaş, 2019). This finding can be related that females who have more emotional nature as a personality and living more intense in their relationship on social life.

According to another result obtained from the research, the participants who stated that they actively engaged in sports had higher subjective vitality levels. In the study conducted by Yazıcı (2015), it was determined that subjective vitality perception did not differ according to actively engaged in sports. On the other hand, in some studies in the literature (Ju, 2017; Kinnafick et al. 2014; Moustaka et al. 2012; Ommundsen et al. 2010; Stathi et al. 2002), it has been concluded that participation in physical activity increases the perception of subjective vitality. Ryan et al. (2010) found that even imagining physical activity had a positive effect on subjective vitality. And also, similar to subjective vitality perceptions, the results obtained from the study indicate that the participants who stated that they actively engaged in sports had a higher life quality perception. The results support the findings of some studies in the literature (Emamvırdı, 2013; Yaran, 2014). On the other hand, in some studies in the literature (Dupuis and Smale, 1995; Gill et al. 2013; Kılınç et al. 2016; Moraes et al. 2009; Shibata et al. 2007; Sodergren et al. 2008; Ware and Sherbourne, 1992) have concluded that participation in physical activity increases the perception of life quality. In the studies conducted by Hamad Amin (2018) and Park and Kim (2013), it was determined that life quality perception did not differ according to participation in physical activities. The reason for this difference may be related to the nature of sport. As a matter of fact, it is a known fact that participation in regular physical activity has many contributions to psychological and physical health.

As a result of the study, it was determined that the participants with high income status had higher perceptions of subjective vitality. The results support the findings of some studies in the literature (Yazıcı, 2015). On the other hand, it was found that the participants with high income status had higher life quality perceptions. The results support the findings of some studies in the literature (Emamvırdı, 2013; Pekmezovic et al. 2011). In contrast, some studies have concluded that there is no relationship between income status and life quality perception [Akyüz et al. 2017; Ulutaş, 2019]. People who has higher income may has different social status can be effective in showing up these findings.

According to another result obtained from the study, it was found that the participants who evaluated their leisure time by participating in sportive, social and outdoor activities had higher subjective vitality perceptions. In the study conducted by Molina-Garcia et al. (2011) was determined that the participants who evaluated their leisure time by participating in physical activity had higher subjective vitality perceptions. On the other hand, similar to the subjective vitality perception, participants who evaluated their leisure time by participating in sportive, social and outdoor activities had higher life quality perceptions. In the studies in the literature, it is stated that the participants who evaluate their leisure time by participating in physical activities (Han, 2015; Jurakic et al. 2010; Lee et al. 2014; Lo et al. 2015; Rose et al. 2007; Vuillemin et al. 2005), social activities (Cheung et al. 2009; Lloyd and Auld, 2002] and outdoor activities (Lee et al. 2014) have higher life quality perception.



As a result of the study, it was determined that the participants who frequently participated in leisure time activities had higher perceptions of subjective vitality and life quality. Similar to this finding, it was concluded that quality of life increased as the frequency of participation in leisure activities increased (Gönülateş, 2016; Huang and Carleton, 2003). Individuals who can perform more activities in their leisure time move away from negativities such as work intensity or psychological pressure and thus have more subjective vitality and life quality level.

Finally, the results of the study show that there is a positive relationship between subjective vitality and life quality perception. On the other hand, studies show that there is a positive relationship between subjective vitality and psychological well-being (Fini et al. 2010). Similarly, in different studies in the literature, subjective vitality was found to be positively related to self-realization, positive affectivity, self-esteem, extraversion, intrinsic motivation and life satisfaction (Çakar, 2012; Ryan and Frederick, 1997). In this context, it can be said that subjective vitality perception has a positive effect on life quality and increasing individuals' subjective vitality perception plays an important role in improving life quality.

### **Conclusions**

According to the results of the study, students who actively participate in sport and leisure activities and evaluate leisure times with sportive, social and outdoor activities have high subjective fitness and life quality perceptions. In this context, it is thought that directing students to leisure time activities will contribute positively in psychological sense. Therefore, university campuses need to be organized to increase participation in leisure time activities. This research that examines the role of participation leisure time on subjective vitality and life quality perception of university students can conduct in different groups which live in different socio-economic cities.

**REFERENCES**

- Akın U, Akın A (2014). Investigating the predictive role of authenticity on subjective vitality with structural equation modelling. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14(6): 2043-2048.
- Akyüz H, Yaşartürk F, Aydın İ, Zorba E, Türkmen M (2017). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam kalitesi ve mutluluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *International Journal of Cultural and Social Studies (IntJCSS)*, 3(Special Issue 2): 253-262.
- Ashby JS, Kottman T, De Graaf D (1999). Leisure satisfaction and attitudes of perfectionists: Implications for therapeutic recreation professionals. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 33: 142-151.
- Aslan N, Cansever BA (2012). Ergenlerin boş zaman değerlendirme algısı. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42: 23-35.
- Bakır M (1990). Rekreasyon ve turizm ilişkisinin turizm politikalarının oluşturulmasındaki önemi. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi. İstanbul Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Baştuğ G, Zorba E, Özkara Ş, Altıncit U (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinde, rekreasyon faaliyetlerine katılım ile yaşam kalitesi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *CBÜ Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 13(2): 342-355.
- Bostic TJ, Rubio DM, Hood MA (2000). Validation of the subjective vitality scale using structural equation modeling. *Social Indicators Research*, 52(3): 313-319.
- Boylu AA, Paçacıoğlu B (2016). Yaşam kalitesi ve göstergeleri. *Akademik Araştırmalar ve Çalışmalar Dergisi*, 8(15): 137-150.
- Bozdağ B (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin fiziksel aktivite düzeyleri ile yaşam kaliteleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Brajsa-Zganec A, Merkas M, Sverko I (2011). Quality of life and leisure activities: How do leisure activities contribute to subjective well-being?. *Soc Indic Res*, 102: 81-91.
- Büyüköztürk S (2012). Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı (16. Basım). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Caldwell L, Smith E, Weissenger E (1992). The relationship of leisure activities and perceived health of college students. *Society and Leisure*, 15(2): 545-556.
- Cheung MC, Ting W, Chan LY, Ho KS, Chan WM (2009). Leisure participation and health related quality of life of community dwelling elders in Hong Kong. *Asian Journal of Gerontology & Geriatrics*, 4(1): 15-23.
- Cieslak F, Levandoski G, Goes SM, Santos TK, Vilela Junior GB, Leite N (2007). The relationship between quality of life and physical activity in college students attending a physical education course. *Fit Perf J.*, 6(6): 357-361.
- Csikszentmihalyi M, Le Fever J (1989). Optimal experience in work and leisure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56: 815-22.
- Çakar FS (2012). The relationship between the self-efficacy and life satisfaction of young adults. *International Education Studies*, 5(6): 123-130.

- Deci EL, Ryan RM (2000). The ‘what’ and ‘why’ of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268.
- Deniz ME, Satıcı SA (2017). The relationship between big five personality traits and subjective vitality. *Anales de Psicologia*, 33(2): 218-224.
- Diener E (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3): 542–575.
- Diener E, Kesebir P, Lucas R (2008). Benefits of accounts of well-being - for societies and for psychological science. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 57: 37-53.
- Diener E, Suh EM, Lucas RE, Smith HL (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 123(2): 276–303.
- Drakou A, Tzetzis G, Mamantzi K (2008). Leisure constraints experienced by university students in Greece. *The Sport Journal*, 11(1).
- Dupuis SL, Smale BJA (1995). An examination of relationship between psychological well-being and depression and leisure activity participation among older adults. *Society and Leisure*, 18(1): 67-92.
- Ekiz D (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri (2. Basım)*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Emamvırdı R (2013). *Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksek okulunda öğrenim gören öğrencilerinin sağlıkla ilgili yaşam kalitesinin incelenmesi (Gazi Üniversitesi örneği)*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Eriş HM, Anıl D (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam kalitesi düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1-14.
- Eser E, Fidaner H, Fidaner C, Eser S, Elbi H, Göker E (1999). Psychometric properties of the WHOQOL-100 and WHOQOL-BREF. *J Psychiatry Psychol Psychopharmacol*, 7(2): 23-40.
- Fini AAS, Kavousian J, Beigy A, Emami M (2010). Subjective vitality and its anticipating variables on students. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5: 150-156.
- Gill DL, Hammond CC, Reifsteck EJ et al. (2013). Physical activity and quality of life. *J Prev Med Public Health*, 46(1): 28-34.
- Gillison FB, Standage M, Skevington M (2006). Relationships among adolescents’ weight perceptions, exercise goals, exercise motivation, quality of life and leisure-time exercise behaviour: a self-determination theory approach. *Health Education Research*, 21(6): 836-847.
- Gönülateş S (2016). *Farklı ülkelerde rekreatif katılımın yaşam kalitesi üzerine etkisi*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Guallar-Castillon P, Sendio AR, Banegas JR, Lopez-Garcia E, Rodriguez-Artalejo F (2005). Differences in quality of life women and men in the older population of Spain. *Social Science & Medicine*, 60: 1229-1240.
- Hamad Amin BM (2018). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin akademik öz-yeterlik ve yaşam kalitelerinin fiziksel aktivite yapma durumlarına göre incelenmesi (Van İli örneği)*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Van.
- Han GS (2015). The relationship between self-efficacy and college life satisfaction: Moderating effect of leisure sport participation level. *Journal of the Korea Academia Industrial Cooperation Society*, 16(4): 2478-2485.

- Heo J, Lee Y (2010). Serious leisure, health perception, dispositional optimism, and life satisfaction among senior games participants. *Educational Gerontology*, 36(2): 112-126.
- Huang C, Carleton B (2003). The relationships among leisure participation, leisure satisfaction, and life satisfaction of college students in Taiwan. *Journal of Exercise Science and Fitness (JESF)*.
- Hull RB (1990). Mood as a product of leisure: causes and consequences. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 22: 99-111.
- Ju H (2017). The relationship between physical activity, meaning in life, and subjective vitality in community-dwelling older adults. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 73: 120-124.
- Jurakic D, Pedisic Z, Greblo Z (2010). Physical activity in different domains and health-related quality of life: a population-based study. *Qual Life Res*, 19: 1303-1309.
- Karaca AA, Yerlisu Lapa T (2016). Serbest zaman katılımı, psikolojik iyi olma ve serbest zaman engelleri ile baş etme stratejilerinin üniversite öğrencileri üzerinde incelenmesi. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(2): 3293-3304.
- Karaküçük S (2001). Boş zamanları değerlendirme. Ankara: Seren Matbaacılık.
- Karasar N (2012). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi. Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Kılınc H, Bayrakdar A, Çelik B, Mollaoğulları H, Gencer YG (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinde fiziksel aktivite düzeyi ve yaşam kalitesi. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(3): 3794-3806.
- Kim S, Sung J, Park J, Ditmore SW (2015). The relationship among leisure attitude, satisfaction, and psychological well-being for college students. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport (JPES)*, 15(1): 70-76.
- Kinnafick FE, Thogersen-Ntoumani C, Duda JL, Taylor, I (2014). Sources of autonomy support, subjective vitality and physical activity behaviour associated with participation in a lunchtime walking intervention for physically inactive adults. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 15: 190-197.
- Koçak M (2019). Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin yaşam kaliteleri ile stres düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Yozgat Bozok Üniversitesi, Yozgat.
- Lee JH, Lee JH, Park SH (2014). Leisure activity participation as predictor of quality of life in Korean urban-dwelling elderly. *Occup. Ther. Int.* 21: 124-132.
- Leontopoulou S, Triliva S (2012). Explorations of subjective wellbeing and character strengths among a Greek University student sample. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 2(3): 251-270.
- Liu H, Yu B. (2015). Serious leisure, leisure satisfaction and subjective well-being of Chinese university students. *Soc Indic Res*, 122: 159-174.
- Lloyd KM, Auld CJ (2002). The role of leisure in determining quality of life: Issues of content and measurement. *Social Indicators Research*, 57(1): 43-71.

- Lo FE, Tsai FC, Lee MB, Tsai LT, Lyu SY, Yang CC (2015). Contextual factors influencing leisure physical activity of urbanized indigenous adolescents. *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association*, 114: 1082-1087.
- Mannell R (2007). Leisure, health and well-being. *World Leisure Journal*, 49(3): 114-128.
- Mansuroğlu S (2002). Akdeniz üniversitesi öğrencilerinin serbest zaman özellikleri ve dış mekan rekreasyon eğilimlerinin belirlenmesi. *Akdeniz Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(2): 53-62.
- Menec V (2003). The relationship between everyday activities and successful aging: A 6-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences, Series B*, 58(2): 74-82.
- Mercer C (1994). Assessing liveability: From statistical indicators to policy benchmarks in C. Mercer (ed.), *Urban and Regional Quality of Life Indicators*. Griffith University, Brisbane, pp. 3-12.
- Michalos AC (2005). Arts and the quality of life: An exploratory study. *Social Indicators Research*, 71: 11-59.
- Molina-Garcia J, Castillo I, Queralt A (2011). Leisure time physical activity and psychological well-being in university students. *Psychological Reports*, 109: 2, 453-460.
- Moraes M, Corte-Real N, Dias C, Fonseca AM (2009). Satisfaction with life, physical activity and smoking in adolescents from different geographic areas of Portugal. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências del Deporte*, 30(2): 137-149.
- Morgan K, Bath PA (1998). Customary physical activity and psychological well being: A longitudinal study. *Age and Ageing*, 27: 35-40.
- Moustaka FC, Vlachopoulos SP, Kabitsis C, Theodorakis Y (2012). Effects of an autonomy-supportive exercise instructing style on exercise motivation, psychological well-being, and exercise attendance in middle-age women. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 9: 138 - 150.
- Murphy H (2003). Exploring leisure and psychological health and wellbeing: Some problematic issues in the case of Northern Ireland. *Leisure Studies*, 22(1): 37-50.
- Nachmias CF, Nachmias D (1996). *Research methods in the social sciences*. (5th Ed.) New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Niemiec CP, Lynch MF, Vansteenkiste M, Bernstein J, Deci EL, Ryan RM (2006). The antecedents and consequences of autonomous self-regulation for college: A self-determination theory perspective on socialization. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29: 761-775.
- Ommundsen Y, Lemyre PN, Abrahamsen F, Roberts GC (2010). Motivational climate, need satisfaction, regulation of motivation and subjective vitality: A study of young soccer players. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 41: 216-242.
- Park JY, Kim, NH (2013). Relationship between physical activity, health status, and quality of life of university students. *Journal of Korean Public Health Nursing*, 27(1): 153-165.
- Passmore A, French D (2001). Development and administration of a measure to assess adolescents' participation. *Adolescence*, 36(141): 67-75.
- Pavot W, Diener E (2004). The subjective evaluation of well-being in adulthood: Findings and implications. *Ageing International*, 29(2): 113-135.



- Pekmezovic T, Popovic A, Tepavcevic DK, Gazibara T, Paunic M (2011). Factors associated with health-related quality of life among Belgrade University students. *Qual Life Res*, 20: 391-397.
- Peleias M, Tempski P, Paro HBMS et al. (2017). Leisure time physical activity and quality of life in medical students: Results from a multicentre study. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med*, 3: 1-10.
- Ragheb MG, Tate RL (1993). A behavioural model of leisure participation, based on leisure attitude, motivation and satisfaction. *Leisure Studies*, 12(1): 61-70.
- Ramazanoğlu F, Altungül O, Özer A (2004). Sportif açıdan rekreasyon etkinliklerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 176.
- Riddick CC, Stewart DG (1994). An examination of the life satisfaction and importance of leisure in the lives of older female retirees: A comparison of blacks and whites. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(1): 75-87.
- Rose TE, McDonnell J, Ellis G (2007). The impact of teacher beliefs on the provision of leisure and physical activity education curriculum decisions. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 30(3): 183-198.
- Ryan RM, Bernstein JH, Brown KW (2010). Weekends, work, and well-being: psychological need satisfactions and day of the week effects on mood, vitality, and physical symptoms. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 29(1): 95-122.
- Ryan RM, Deci EL (2001). To be happy or to be self-fulfilled: A review of research on hedonic and eudemonic well-being. In S. Fiske (ed.), *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141-166, Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, Inc.
- Ryan RM, Frederick C (1997). On energy, personality and health: Subjective vitality as a dynamic reflection of well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 65: 529-565.
- Salama-Younes M (2011). Positive mental health, subjective vitality and satisfaction with life for French physical education students. *World Journal of Sport Sciences*, 4(2): 90-97.
- Sarıçam H (2015). Mediating role of self-efficacy on the relationship between subjective vitality and school burnout in Turkish adolescents. *The International Journal of Educational Researchers*, 6(1): 1-12.
- Sarıgöz AO (2019). Spor eğitimi alan ampute bireylerin sağlıklı yaşam biçimi, yaşam kalitesi ve boş zaman engel düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi*. Bartın Üniversitesi, Bartın.
- Seligman M, Csikszentmihalyi M (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55: 5-14.
- Shibata A, Oka K, Nakamura Y, Muraoka I (2007). Recommended level of physical activity and health-related quality of life among Japanese adults. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*.
- Shin K, You S (2013). Leisure type, leisure satisfaction and adolescents' psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 7(2): 53-62.
- Sodergren M, Sundquist J, Johansson SE, Sundquist K (2008). Physical activity, exercise and self-rated health: A population-based study from Sweden. *BMC Public Health*.

- Stathi A, Fox KR, McKenna J (2002). Physical activity and dimensions of subjective well-being in older adults. *Journal of Aging & Physical Activity*, 10(1): 76-92.
- Steinkamp MW, Kelly JR (1987). Social integration, leisure activity, and life satisfaction in older adults: activity theory revisited. *Int J Aging Hum Dev.*, 25(4): 293-307.
- Taylor IM, Lonsdale C (2010). Cultural differences in the relationships among autonomy support, psychological need satisfaction, subjective vitality, and effort in British and Chinese physical education. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 32: 655-673.
- Tekkanat Ç (2008). Öğretmenlik bölümünde okuyan öğrencilerde yaşam kalitesi ve fiziksel aktivite düzeyleri. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Denizli.
- Tezcan M (1994). Boş zamanların değerlendirilmesi sosyolojisi. Ankara: Atilla Kitabevi.
- Ulutaş E (2019). Sakarya Üniversitesi öğrencilerinin akıllı telefon kullanma düzeyleri ve yaşam kalitesi düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış uzmanlık tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya.
- Uysal R, Sarıçam H, Akın A (2014b). Öznel zindelik ölçeği Türkçe formunun psikometrik özellikleri. *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 33: 136-146.
- Vlachopoulos SP (2012). The role of self-determination theory variables in predicting middle school students' subjective vitality in physical education. *Hellenic Journal of Psychology*, 9: 179-204.
- Vuillemin A, Boini S, Bertrais S, Tessier S, Oppert JM, Herberg S et al. (2005). Leisure time physical activity and health-related quality of life. *Preventive Medicine*, 41(2): 562-569.
- Ware JE Jr, Sherbourne CD (1992). The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical Care*, 30(6): 473-483.
- Warr P, Butcher V, Robertson I. (2004). Activity and psychological wellbeing in older people. *Aging & Mental Health*, 8(2): 172-183.
- Wendel-Vos GCW, Schuit AJ, Tijhuis MAR, Kromhout D (2004). Leisure time physical activity and health-related quality of life: Cross-sectional and longitudinal associations. *Quality of Life Research*, 13: 667-677.
- World Health Organization (1993). WHOQoL Study Protocol. WHO (MNH7PSF/93.9).
- World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment Group (1998). The World Health Organization quality of life assessment (WHOQOL): Development and general psychometric properties. *Social Science and Medicine*, 46(12): 1569-1585.
- Yaran M (2014). Spor yapan ve yapmayan üniversite öğrencilerinde uyku ve yaşam kalitesinin incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Samsun.
- Yaşartürk F, Akyüz H, Karataş İ (2017). Rekreatif etkinliklere katılan üniversite öğrencilerinin serbest zamanda sıkılma algısı ile yaşam doyum düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *International Journal of Cultural and Social Studies (IntJCSS)*, 3(Special Issue 2): 239-252.
- Yazıcı ÖF (2015). Beden eğitimi öğretmeni adaylarının mutluluk ve zindelik düzeylerinin incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Trabzon.

---

Yılmaz Ç (2016). Engelli üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam kalitesinin incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.