Sport Sciences
ISSN: 1308 7266 (NWSASPS)
ID: 2019.14.4.2B0121

Status : Research Article
Received: 17.06.2019
Accepted: 10.10.2019

Huseyin Öztürk
Gaziantep University, ozturkavraya@hotmail.com, Gaziantep-Turkey

DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.12739/NWSA.2019.14.4.2B0121
ORCID ID	0000-0002-4968-586X
CORRESPONDING AUTHOR	Hüseyin Öztürk

THE FACTORS AFFECTING SELECTION OF PARKS AND RECREATION AREAS FOR PHYSICAL ACTIVITY PURPOSES

ABSTRACT

This study was prepared with the aim of determining the factors affecting the choice of places for users who come to parks and recreation areas for physical activity. It consists of people coming to the parks in Gaziantep to do sports. SPSS 22 statistical package program was used to analyze the data obtained in the research. For normally distributed variables, t-test was used for two independent group's comparison, ANOVA and Tukey multiple comparison tests were used for more than two independent group's comparison, and frequency, percentage and mean values were used as descriptive statistics for this research. It the end of the research, results showed that according to the gender variable, scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale do not differ significantly; according to the marital status and smoking variable venue selection subscale scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale differ significantly and according to the education status and age variable, inability to participate in activities subscale scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale differ significantly. This research will contribute positively to the physical area selection and recreation areas for the parked users. We believe that this kind of study programs and useful results can be obtained for those who come to recreation activities in parks.

Keywords: Park, Recreation, Recreation Area, Physical Activity, Goal

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout history it has been observed with health-related studies that people living in motion are exposed to more diseases than active individuals [2]. Although beneficial to the health of physical activity is well known, threatens health of disturbances used by inactivity, excess weight such as obesity are increasing day by day in our country and developed countries [3 and 4]. It is also known that physical activity is also effective in relieving many mental health problems such as stress and depression [5 and 6]. Along with industrialization, along with fast-growing cities, people have moved away from nature and the developing technology has made life easier and also makes it more immobile, leading people to areas of physical activity or leisure. One of them is the park where they can do physical activity [7]. In the terms of planning parks and recreation areas which have recently increased significantly by the reasons such as promoting people to physical activity through healthy living and sport, the city getting a good appearance; and at the point of knowing the expectations of target population, the satisfaction of users and also the increase in participation in physical activity parks and recreation areas are very important issues for local administrators to

How to Cite:
Öztürk, H., (2019). The Factors Affecting Selection of Parks and Recreation Areas for Physical Activity Purposes, Sport Sciences (NWSASPS), 14(4):40-48, DOI: 10.12739/NWSA.2019.14.4.2B0121.

provide a better service [8 and 9]. Increasing the quality of urban people's lives is the main responsibility of local governments. Local governments are obliged to manage and develop the city entrusted to them in the best possible way. In this context, the importance of urban people to the parks and recreation areas has increased recently due to the improvement of the physical and psycho-social situation and the good appearance of the city [10]. Due to the principle of public health protection, which is one of the primary tasks of the state, local governments have increased the number of parks and recreation areas with the encouragement of the governments [1]. It is also seen that recreational sports facilities have been built in the campuses of many universities [11 and 12].

For these reasons, the preparation of environments that will allow the individual to live a happier and more peaceful life has become the main target of various institutions, organizations and the municipalities in the first place. With the realization of this target, it is necessary to create environments where the society can be intertwined with nature and environment, can be enjoyed and at the same time relaxed. In this sense, it can be considered as a remarkable subject to make areas where individuals can spend their free time in physical movement. In recent years, the number of parks and recreation areas, recreation which have been increased rapidly in Turkey are phenomenon that increases in importance and expands in the lives of the societies [13 and 14]. A number of studies' results show that people who exercise in their free time in parks have the opportunity to relax psychologically, to regenerate, to move away from the strut and to change social relationships positively [15 and 16].

2. RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE

The parks are free and there is no difficulty for anyone to reach. The parks seem to provide physical and social benefits to people who go for physical activity purposes. These benefits will be further enhanced by the increased awareness of physical activity by individuals using parks. If physical activity is done consciously, efficiency can be obtained. At the same time measures must be taken to ensure that people who come to the parks are also able to perform physical activity safely. This study was prepared with the aim to identify the needs and expectations of the people who go to parks and recreation areas for physical activity purposes. This study was carried out with the study of 621 people who came to the parks for physical activity in Gaziantep province in order to determine the factors affecting the selection of the users of the park and recreation areas for physical activity purposes.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this section; the research model, target population of the research, the data collection tools to be used in the research and the statistical methods used in the analysis of the obtained data will be mentioned. Research Model Screening model was used to determine the factors affecting selection of venues by people who go to parks and recreation areas for physical activity purposes. Rather than focusing on the causes of events, the survey method is a method that attempts to find the conditions, characteristics, and the relation between them [17].

3.1. Population and Sample

Target population of the research is the people who come to the parks and recreation areas for physical activity in the province of

Gaziantep. Personal data belonging to the individuals included in this research are presented in Table 1. When sampling is chosen, random sampling method is used. The random sampling method is a sampling method in which each individual in the study universe has an equal chance of being selected [18]. By random sampling, 621 (344 females, 277 male) people were included in the sampling. It was made with those who agreed to participate in the work by going to 14 parks located in the central districts of Gaziantep.

3.2. Preparation of the Data Collection Tool

The scale used in this study consists of two parts. In the first section, personal data of people who come to the parks and recreation areas for physical activity and in the second section [9]. Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale (PAVES) consists of two sub-dimensions. The first sub-dimension, physical activity place selection dimension that shows the reasons why people who go to parks and recreation areas for physical activity select parks and recreation areas as physical activity areas. The scale consists of 15 items, in type of five point Likert scale (1:Very Important, 2:Important, 3:Does not matter, 4:Trivial, 5:Very Trivial). In the second sub-dimension, the dimension of the elements that prevent participation in physical activity that measures the obstacles to physical activity of people in park and recreation areas. The scale consists of 18 items, in type of five point Likert scale (1:Absolutely Disagree, 2:Disagree, 3:Partially agree, 4:Agree, 5:Absolutely Agree).

3.3. Analysis of Data

SPSS for Windows 22 package program was used for analyzing the data. To test the reliability of the scale used in the research calculated Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was analyzed and results are as follows: Physical Activity Location Selection sub-dimension 0.78, Substance Impairing Factors in Physical Activity, 0.94 and the total scale value is 0.90. For the analysis of the data, Kolmogorov Smirnov test was used to check the normal distribution of continuous variables. For normally distributed variables, t-test was used for two independent groups comparison, ANOVA and Tukey multiple comparison tests for more than two independent group's comparison, and frequency, percentage and mean values were used as descriptive statistics for this research. Statistical analysis in this research was accepted as $p<0.05$ significant.

Table 1. Personal data belonging to the individuals who come parks and recreation areas for physical activity purposes

Groups	N	F	%
Gender	Woman	344	55.4
	Man	277	44.6
Marital Status	Married	387	62.3
	Single	234	37.7
Smoking	Yes	181	29.1
	No	440	70.9
Education Status	Primary and Secondary School	112	18.1
	High school	325	52.3
	University and Higher	184	29.6
Age	18-24 Years	161	25.9
	25-31 Years	200	32.2
	32 Years and Over	261	41.9

Table 1 shows the distribution of the answers given to questions about personal characteristics of the research group. According to this; Participants majority 55.4% of the research were women (344), 62.3% (387) married, 70.9% (440) non-smokers, 52.3% (325) high school graduates and 32 years and over 41.9% (261 persons) of the population are seen.

4. RESULTS

There was no significant difference in scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to gender variable.

Table 2. T-test results of scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to marital status variable

Factor	Marital Status	N	M	SD	t	p
Selection Venue	Married	387	1.08	0.29	2.22	0.02*
	Single	234	1.03	0.20		
Reasons not to Participate	Married	387	1.25	0.82	0.26	0.77
	Single	234	1.24	0.69		
Total score	Married	387	1.03	0.18	0.26	0.79
	Single	234	1.03	0.19		

p<0.05

When Table 2 is examined, there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to marital status variable with subscale of selection venue (t=2.22, p<0.05). There is no statistically significant difference between the scores according to marital status variable with subscale of reasons not to participate and total Reasons not to participate (t=0.26, p>0.05), Total score (t=0.26, p>0.05). According to these results, it can be said that those who are married in the Selection Venue subscale get more points than those who are single.

Table 3. T-test results of scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to smoking variable

Factor	Smoking	n	M	SD	t	p
Selection Venue	Yes	181	1.12	0.36	3.48	0.01*
	No	440	1.04	0.21		
Reasons not to Participate	Married	181	1.30	0.85	1.29	0.19
	Single	440	1.22	0.74		
Total score	Married	181	1.04	0.26	1.87	0.61
	Single	440	1.02	0.15		

p<0.05

When Table 3 is examined, there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to smoking variable with subscale of selection venue (t=3.48, p<0.05). There is no statistically significant difference between the scores according to smoking variable with subscale of reasons not to participate and total score Reasons not to participate (t=1.29, p>0.05), Total score (t=1.87, p>0.05). According to these results, it can be said that smokers in the Selection Venue subscale get more points than non-smokers.

Table 4. ANOVA and Tukey tests' results of scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to education status variable

Factor	Education Status	n	M	SD	F	p	Significant Difference
Selection Venue	Primary and Secondary Education	112	1.08	0.29	1.10	0.33	
	High School	325	1.06	0.27			
	University and Higher	184	1.04	0.20			
Reasons Not to Participate	Primary and Secondary Education	112	1.03	0.18	11.3	0.00*	a<b, b>c
	High School	325	1.38	0.99			
	University and Higher	184	1.13	0.45			
Total Score	Primary and Secondary Education	112	1.02	0.13	0.86	0.46	
	High School	325	1.04	0.23			
	University and Higher	184	1.02	0.19			

p<0.05

When Table 4 is examined, there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to education status variable with subscale of reasons not to participate (f=11.3, p<0.05). There is no statistically significant difference between the scores according to education status variable with subscale of selection venue and total score (Selection Venue f=1.10, p>0.05, Total score=0.86, p>0.05). According to these results, it can be said that high school graduates cannot participate in more physical activities than primary and secondary school graduates, university graduates and postgraduates.

Table 5. Anova and Tukey tests' results of scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to age variable

Factor	Age	n	M	SD	F	p	Significant Difference
Selection Venue	18-24 Years	161	1.07	0.26	1.08	0.33	
	25-31 years	200	1.08	0.31			
	32 Years and Over	260	1.04	0.23			
Reasons Not to Participate	18-24 Years	161	1.51	1.18	14.8	0.00*	a>b, a>c
	25-31 Years	200	1.09	0.40			
	32 Years and Over	260	1.20	0.62			
Total Score	18-24 Years	161	1.02	0.15	0.69	0.50	
	25-31 Years	200	1.04	0.24			
	32 Years and Over	260	1.01	0.16			

When Table 5 is examined, there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to age variable with subscale of reasons not to participate (f=14.8, p<0.05). There is no statistically significant difference between the scores according to age variable with subscale of selection venue and total score (Selection Venue f=1.08, p>0.05, Total score f=0.69, p>0.05). According to these results, it can be said that those who are between the ages of 18-24 cannot participate in more physical activities than those who are between the ages of 25-31 and 32 years and over.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the gender variable, scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale do not differ significantly. There are some studies with different results from results of this research. As a result of Johnson et al. study "Outdoor recreation constraints: A examination of race, gender, and rural dwelling", gender-based

perceptions of female and male participants' participation in physical activity were found [19]. Thapa et al. concluded that more men were involved in the activity which they conducted in a recreation area with intensive water activities [20]. Henderson and Bialeschki point out that female participants face more obstacles in leisure time activities than male participants [21]. Gungormus reported that by evaluating individuals' motivation levels for recreational exhaustion according to gender variable, women give more importance to health than men [17]. Alexandris and Carrol indicated in their study that women are more affected than men by restraint factors [3]. According to findings of Bulgu et al. by the creation of new opportunities for women to participate in physical activities in recent years' women's using parks as physical activity area has increased compared to men's [13].James in his study called "Its Impact on Recreational Participation of Young Women. Perth, Western Australia" found that women participated in physical activities at public facilities [22]. Shores et al. Jackson and colleagues and Hudson found that affecting restraint factors of activity participation differed by gender [19, 23, and 24]. Different results are thought to be due to the difference in the sample group.

According to the marital status variable, scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale, it can be said that those who are married in the Selection Venue subscale get more points than those who are single. Ozturk's study called "Opinions and expectations of people who come to parks for purpose of physical activity in their leisure times (Gaziantep local research)" has similar results with this research and it shows that those who participate in the research mostly consist of married people [7]. As a result of Agilonu's study called "Recreation services and model determination in local administrations (Example of Fethiye)" married people constituted a majority in participants [25].

Gumus's study has different results from this research and according to his study's results there is no significant relationship between scale scores of marital status and reasons of not to participate in physical activity in parks and recreation areas [1]. Different results are thought to be due to the difference in the sample group.

According to the smoking variable, scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale, it can be said that smokers in the Selection Venue subscale get more points than non-smokers. Gumus's study has similar results with this research and according to results, the subscale of reasons of not to participate in physical activity showed that smokers participate more than non-smokers because of smoking [1]. Aydanagir's study about approaches on physical activities and exercises has different results and was found that non-smokers participated regularly in physical activities compared to smokers [26]. Also, Milligan et al.'s study about effects of smoking participation in physical activity, they found that non-smokers participated regularly in physical activities compared to smokers [27]. It is consistent with our study that smoking has the same results in the whole sample.

It's seen that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to education status variable with subscale of reasons not to participate and those who graduated from high school get more points than those who have primary/secondary education and university/higher education. Asikkutlu's study called "Motivations and restraints; Ankara Göksu Parkı ve Harikalar Diyari" has similar results with this

research and that study showed that it changed according to education status [28]. As a result of Gumus's study it depended on whether it is primary school or secondary school or high school or university [9]. In study of Searla and Jackson about restraints of participation in recreation, it is stated that the effects of restraints decrease as the level of education increases [29]. It is consistent with our study that smoking has the same results in the whole sample. It's seen that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to age variable with subscale of reasons not to participate and those who are between the ages of 18-24 get more points than those who are between the ages of 25-31 and 32 years and over. Similar to this research Kunz and Graham's study called "Life Coure Changes in Alcohol Consumption in Leisure Activities of Men and Women" showed that young people tended to participate in physical activity more than older people [30].Different from this this research Tatli and Gundogdu's study called "Problem and suggestions about sport parks made by local administrations (Example of Mersin)" showed that people who go to parks for purposes of sport are mostly over 50 years old [31]. According to Simsek et al.'s study about open field parks and users, it's seen that majority of individuals involved in the research are people aged 36 years and over [32]. It is consistent with our study that smoking has the same results in the whole sample.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

According to gender variable there is no significant difference about selection parks and recreation areas for purposes of physical activity. In other words, at the point of preferring parks and recreation areas as physical activity areas users whether they are male, or female does not have influence. According to the marital status variable, scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale there is a statistically significant difference between the total scores of the married and the unmarried ones. As a reason for this difference, it seems that singles do not choose parks and recreation areas physical activity spaces as well as married ones. According to this result, it's necessary to work on selection parks and recreation areas for physical activity areas by single ones. There is a statistically significant difference between the scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to smoking variable with subscale of selection venue. As a reason for this difference, it seems that non-smokers do not choose parks and recreation areas as physical activity spaces as well as smokers. According to this result it's necessary to work on selection parks and recreation areas for physical activity areas by non-smokers.

There is a statistically significant difference between the scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to education status variable with subscale of reasons of not to participate. It's seen that high school graduates have more reasons not to participate than primary/secondary school and university/higher graduates. According to this result it's necessary to work on selection parks and recreation areas for physical activity areas by the ones who have low and high education levels. There is a statistically significant difference between the scores of Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale according to age variable with subscale of reasons of not to participate. It's seen that the ages of 18-24 have more reasons not to participate than the ages of 25-32 and 32 years and over. Therefore, it's necessary to work on selection parks and recreation areas for physical activity by younger ones.

REFERENCES

[1] Gumus, H., Ozgul, S.A., and Karakılıc, M., (2015). Physical Activity Venue Evaluation Scale (PAVES). A Validityand Reliability Study, Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences, 26(1):1-8.
[2] Ozer, K., (1997). Physical Fitness. 3. Printing, Ankara, Nobel Publication Distribution.
[3] Alexandris, K. and Carroll, B., (1997). Demographic Differences in the Perception of Constraints on Recreational Sport Participation: Result from a in Greece. Leisure Studies, 16(2):107-125.
[4] Daley, A.J., (2002). School Based Physical Activity in the United Kingdom: Can It Create Physically Active Adults? Quest, 5(4):21-33.
[5] Edwards, P. and Agis, T., (2006). Promoting Physical Activity and Active Living in Urban Environments, The role of local Governments. World Health Organization, Europe.
[6] Nielsen, T.S. and Hansen, K.B., (2007). Do Green Areas Affect Health? Result from a Danish Survey on The Use of Green Areas and Health Indicators, Health and Place, 13(4):839-850.
[7] Ozturk, H., (2015). Opinion and Expectation of the Community Who Come to the Parks for Doing Sports (Applications in Gaziantep). Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise, 17(3):21-26.
[8] Basaran, I., (2007). Local Government, Istanbul, Okutan Publication Distribution.
[9] Gumus, H., (2012). The Factors That Has an Effect on the Attendance and Location Choice of the Visitors to the Parksand Recreations Centers for Physical Activities, Doktoral Thesis.
[10] Kilbas, S., (2010). Recreation Bosphorus Evaluation. 4. Printing, Ankara: Gazi Bookstore.
[11] Hacicaferoglu, S., (2014). Determining the Levels of Cooperation Between the Employees of Directorate of School of PhysicalEducationand Sports (BESYO) and the Department of Health, Culture and Sports (SKSD) Head Office. The Online Journal of Recreation and Sport, 3(3):8-26.
[12] Hacicaferoglu, S., Gundogdu, C., Hacicaferoglu, H., and Yucel, A.S., (2004). A Study on the Participation of Students of School Of Physical Education and Sports in Spare Time (Recreation) Activities (İnönü University As A Sample). Journal of Sports and Performance Researches, 5(1):5-17.
[13] Bulgu, N., Artan, C.K., and Asci, F.H., (2007. Daily Life, Women and Physical Activity. Hacettepe, Journal of Sport Sciences, 18(4):167-18.
[14] Ozturk, H., (2016). Habits of the Students Staying at Residence. The Online Journal of Recreation and Sport, 5(1):25-33.
[15] Dishman, R.K., Washburn, R.A., and Heath, G.W., (2004. Physical Activity Epidemiology. Champaign IL Human K1inetics.
[16] Gungormus, H.A., (2007). Comparisons of Motivational Factors That Effect Individuals to Participate Recreational Exercise with regard to Demographic Variables, Doctoral Thesis, Ankara.
[17] Creswell, J.W., (2012). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
[18] Arli, M. and Nazik, H., (2001). Introduction to Scientific Research, Ankara, Gazi Bookstore.
[19] Johnson, C.Y., Bowker, J.M., and Cordell, K., (2001). Outdoor Recreation Constraints: Au Examination of Race, Gender, and Rurald Welling. Southern rural sociology, 12:111-113.

[20] Thapa, B., Confer, J.J., and Mendel sohn, J., (2004). Trip Motivation Samong Water-Basedrec Reationists. Retrieved October.
[21] Henderson, K.A. and Bialeschki, M.D., (1993). Negotiating Negotiating Constraints to Women's Physical Recreation. Society and Leisure, 16:389-412.
[22] James, K., (1995). Ownership of Space: Its Impact on Recreational Participation of Young Women. Perth, Western Australia: Edith Cowan University, Department of Leisure Sciences.
[23] Shores, K.A., Scott, D., and Floyd, M.F., (2007). Constraints to Outdoor Recreation: A Multiple Hierarchy Stratification Perspective. Leisure sciences, 29:227-246.
[24] Hudson, S., (2000). The Segmentation of Potential Tourists: Constraint Differences between Men and Women. Journal of Travel Research, 38(4):363-368.
[25] Agilonu, A., (2007). A Model of Recreation Services in Local Government, International Journal of Human Sciences, 6(2):160-176.
[26] Aydangir A.S., (2008). Determination of Physical Activity and Exercise Approaches of Individuals Over 18 Years of Living in Ankara, Master thesis.
[27] Milligan, R.A.K., Burke, V., Dunbar, D.L., Spencer, M., Balde, E., Beilin, L.J., and Gracey, M.P., (1997). Associations between Lifestyle and Cardiovasculerrisc Factors in 18-year-old Australians, 21(3):186-195.
[28] Asikkutlu, H.S., (2008). Recreational Motivation and Conflicts; Example of Ankara Goksu Park and Harikalar Diyari Park, Duzce, Master thesis.
[29] Searle, M. and Jackson, E., (1985). Socio-economic Variation in Perceived Barriers to Recreation Participation among would be Participants. Leisure Sciences, 7:227-249.
[30] Kunz, J.L. and Graham, K., (1996). Life Cource Changes in Alcohol Consumption in Leisure Activities of Men and Women. Journal of Drug Issues, 26:805-827.
[31] Tatli, T.K. and Gundogdu, M., (2014). The Problems and Resolution Advisory Related The Sports Parks Built By The Local Goverment (Mersin Example), Journal of International Multidisciplinary Academic Researches, 1(1):41-52.
[32] Simsek, D., Katirci, H., Akyildiz, M., and Sevil, G., (2011). A Research on Outdoor Fıtness Parks and Their Users, Spormetre The Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 9(2):41-48.