

Received: 11.03.2019
Published: 15.12.2019

Accepted: 30.10.2019
December 2019 • 9(3) • 522-536

Examining The Factors That May Restrict Teacher Candidates To Access Recreational Activities

Recep ÖZ*

Mehmet YAZICI**

Murat Tolga KAYALAR*** Yasemin ÇAKMAK YILDIZHAN****

Abstract. The purpose of the present study is to investigate the recreation obstacles of teacher candidates in terms of different variables. A total of 178 teacher candidates (male: 108, female:70) from Faculty of Education at Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University voluntarily took part in the present study to meet this purpose in 2018. 94 of the participants were from the department of computer education and instructional technology, and the rest of them was from the department of psychological counseling and guidance. The instrument named "Leisure Time Obstacle Scale" was used during the study, which was developed by Alexandris and Carroll (1997), adopted to Turkish context by Gürbüz and Karaküçük (2007), and revised by Gürbüz et al., (2007). Independent sample t-test and One-way ANOVA tests were used to answer the research questions. Tukey test was employed as a posthoc analysis to figure out the differences among the categories. Consequently, a nonsignificant result was observed for the subfactors of LTOS depending on the variables including gender, class level, and the sports branch being interested. However, a significant difference was found at the friend and time subfactors of the LTOS in terms of department category ($p < .05$). Furthermore, a significant difference was also observed at friend subfactor of LTOS for achievement level. Finally, a significant difference was also detected from the analysis results for the information subfactor of LTOS in terms of sports branch being interested.

Keywords: Teacher Training, Recreation, Recreation Barriers

* Orcid id: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9974-0022>, Assist. Prof. Dr., Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University, Faculty of Education, Computer Education & Instructional Technologies, recepoz@erzincan.edu.tr

** Orcid id: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3210-714X>, Assist. Prof. Dr., Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Department of Sports Management, myazici@erzincan.edu.tr

*** Orcid id: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2442-9330>, Assist. Prof. Dr., Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University, Faculty of Education, Computer Education & Instructional Technologies, mtkayalar@erzincan.edu.tr

**** Orcid id: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7131-4259>, Assist. Prof. Dr., Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Department of Sports Management, ycakmak@erzincan.edu.tr

1. INTRODUCTION

Time and time management is nowadays an important issue that is of particular concern to everyone. Arslan (1996) states that time is a measurement of infinity for humans and it is the period that humans develop to determine how long it takes to travel from one place to another or from one experience to another. In other words, time is a process which follows one another from past to present and from present to future and continues permanently without any involvement of human beings (Üstün, et al., 2013; Akatay, 2003).

It is possible to claim that humans cannot appreciate the value of their time and cannot manage time properly (Gürbüz, & Aydın, 2012). Due to lots of internal and external reasons, humankind does not have the will to show adequate attention and management regarding the most precious wealth that they own. Time management is an application process of individuals' management functions to personal activities in order to reach their goals in an effective and beneficial way in their private and working lives (Erdem, 1999). Erdem, et al. (2005) describe time as a source that is not possible to augment by working a lot and hence time management does not aim to scale up the limited time but to increase the quality of the activities that are done in that limited time.

Leisure is shortly defined as the time that remains from working, sleeping and other self-maintenance activities by Roberts (2006) and Tezcan (1994) and activities done in the described time are called leisure activities. If we consider time as a frame, leisure covers a specific area within this general area. It is a timeframe that remains after tasks an individual is required to perform regarding themselves or their environment, where they are free of any obligations and which they can use of their own will. Parker explains leisure as being "a time span where an individual is freed from all obligations both for themselves and for others or from all connections and where they do an activity that they choose themselves" (Hacıoğlu, et al., 2009). Although leisure is generally mistaken for free time, the two concepts do not mean the same thing since leisure consists of a specific area within free time. Therefore, free time has a quality to cover leisure.

Recreation, from Latin recreation, implies restructuring, renewal or being recreated. Its correspondence in our language is commonly given as making free time valuable. This situation means relaxing and entertaining activities that individuals or social groups do willingly in their free time (Ozankaya, 1995). Recreation is classically called to be activities that are done by an individual after obligatory work and activities and that are relaxing and completely voluntary (Kraus, 1985). According to another definition, recreation is identified as being different than idleness and as activity oriented free time that people independently spare for their own comfort and development except for the necessities of their work and needs of their family and society (Adewusi, 1988).

Individuals do sports for recreation and in order to keep healthy, become powerful, defend themselves, etc. (Tel, et al., 2001). The life quality of individuals increases with leisure activities that they allocate for themselves. Recreation activities are a concept

that is required for a more beneficial and meaningful life (Tekin, et al., 2004). Among these activities, the type that is based on the application of various branches of sport and physical exercise and that make up a large part of recreation activities is called sportive recreation.

Recreational sports activities or sport recreation, different than performance sports related to competition, aim to develop skills that require less competition, compliance with rules and equal treatment. Physical activities for leisure time enable them with problem-solving skills, learning new skills and with opportunities to find new methods for success and failure (Yaman, & Arslan, 2009). The basis of sport recreation is physical exercise (Zorba, et al., 2004).

The majority of time of young people includes leisure activities. Young people who rest and have fun grasp life tightly and such activities contribute to the development of personality in terms of health and psychological aspects (Akkaya, 2008). Primarily, the need for recreation in universities becomes more meaningful for young university students (Kaba, 2009).

It is an obligation that these positive benefits are understood well in order to measure leisure time with physical activities and to achieve relaxation and relief (Tinsley and Tinsley, 1986). Making leisure time valuable through physical and sportive activities is important to eliminate the tension that technology and urbanization will create on individuals and people or to reduce their stress that is already present (Tekin, et al., 2004). Sport is one of the largest, most diverse and most remarkable areas of recreation. Sports and recreation constantly affect each other. While recreation plays an important role in spreading sports among people and achieving success in sports activities, sports provides an important field of action in meeting the recreational needs of people. Sports do this task for the most part by doing activities such as sports for everyone or sports for health (Şahin, 1997).

All sports have recreation characteristics (Roberts, 1992). Sports are games, and nowadays all kinds of games are leisure time activities for both players and spectators. Players and spectators consider games they play as extremely serious (Gratton and Tice, 1989; Robert, et al., 1988). The concept of sport is about creating or developing and gaining knowledge. In this way, sports appear as “only games”. Results are rarely important issues for a larger society. Especially sports are separate from politics, trade, military issues and even family life cases (Lengkeek, 1993). As long as the sport is amateurish, it will be a leisure activity. Living conditions that change, environmental, social factors, technology and eating habits adversely affect the physical activity levels of school-age children. Research in this area has shown that physical activity levels of school-age children have decreased significantly over the last two decades (Janssen, Katzmarzyk, Boyce ve Pickett, 2004). Regular exercise and physical activity habit should be gained in pre-school period since it is easier to teach pre-school children exercise habits than adolescents (Gallahue, & Donnelly, 2003).

Recreation activities are also a part of school life. Every student who spends most of their time in classrooms or laboratories needs to participate in recreational activities (Zorba, et al., 2006). Participation of university students in recreation activities and making their free time valuable are realized in a semi-organized manner within the framework of the opportunities provided by universities during their education, and in this context, universities can also assume a guiding task for their students to make good use of their time out of formal education (Özşaker, 2012).

Despite the advantages of participation in recreational activities, it has been observed that people are not involved in such activities which are very beneficial for themselves for various reasons or they are not involved for various reasons (Karaküçük, & Gürbüz, 2007; Chow, & Dong, 2013).

Studies in this area show that the number of people who participate in recreational activities is more than that of those involved in other activities. In some of the European countries, the highest increase among recreation activities has been observed in sports since the 1950s. 1960s-1970s were the years when sports were the most preferred. Governments have encouraged their people to engage in recreation activities, particularly in doing sports. With the increase of leisure time, there has been an increase in participation in sports activities and self-made sports activities (Roberts, 1992). In the extant cultural heritage of Turkey, recreation and recreation-related topics occupy quite a large place (Aribal, 2013). Before the Turks settled in Anatolia, it was seen that the preparations for war turned into games in their spare time, especially the games played on horses were widespread. During the Anatolian Seljuk period, main leisure activities were going to the plateaus, swimming in the hot springs, and recreation activities were diversified with the influence of religious elements, as well. In the Ottoman period, it was observed that women preferred playing reeds, singing-folk songs and doing needlework-embroidery in their spare time, and men went to the baths, coffeehouses or recreation areas, hunting, dealing with activities such as shooting and falconry (Yüncü, et al., 2013).

Recreation phenomenon in the contemporary sense started in Turkey in the republican era. The idea of the dissemination of sports activities to the society has developed with the "Physical Training Law" with the number 3530 (Ardahan, Turgut, & Kalkan, 2016). In the following years, recreation activities were carried out within the scope of Youth Services and Sports Directorates, Youth Camps, Volunteer organizations, Sports centers, game clubs that are usually opened in big cities and Physical Education and Sports Colleges (Zorba, 2002). Since the 1980s, recreation programs have been included in development plans and recreation activities have started to be planned by universities, local administrations and private sports clubs (Zorba, 2008; Ekici, Bayrakdar, & Odabaş, 2010).

Investigation of leisure and sporting challenges is important for recreation and exercise literature from various perspectives (Alexandris, & Carroll, 1999). In the leisure literature, the term "Barrier" refers to the reasons that restrict or prevent the

participation of people in recreational activities in their leisure time (Karaküçük and Gürbüz, 2007). Crawford, et al. (1991) examined leisure constraints in three dimensions: internal, structural and interpersonal, and stated that the internal dimension was the most effective of these dimensions and that it was created at people's decision-making step. According to the model, the most important factor that restricts or prevents from participating in recreational activities is "internal constraints" whereas "structural constraints" factor is at the bottom (Gürbüz, et al. 2010). It is possible to talk about many social factors in understanding the factors that restrict the participation of people in leisure activities. According to Alexandris and Carrol (1997), education level, gender and age are examples of these factors.

In the related literature, it is observed that some studies have been done related to the participation of young people in recreational activities. In a study related to the factors that might create obstacles for the participation of university students in recreational activities (Demirel, & Harmandar, 2009), no significant difference was found in terms of leisure constraints by gender; however, it was found that the difference in the terms of facility-service, lack of knowledge and individual psychology was significant according to the university variable.

On the other hand, this result is different from the result of the study conducted to determine the obstacles of participation of university students in recreational activities (Emir, Öncü, & Gürbüz, 2013), where it was found that there is a significant difference in favor of male students according to gender variable in the individual psychology and lack of interest sub-dimensions.

In another study, it was revealed that the average score of male students was lower in individual psychology, lack of knowledge and time dimensions (Özşaker, 2012).

In a study regarding active athletes (Ayhan, Eskiler, & Soyer, 2017), it was found that leisure constraints of active athletes according to gender show significant difference in terms of physical health, lack of friends and time.

The aim of the current study is to determine whether the leisure constraints of teacher candidates show significant differences according to some selected variables. For this purpose, answers to the questions below were sought:

1. Do leisure constraints of teacher candidates show a significant difference according to gender?
2. Do leisure constraints of teacher candidates show a significant difference according to the department that they are enrolled?
3. Do leisure constraints of teacher candidates show a significant difference according to their grade levels?
4. Do leisure constraints of teacher candidates show a significant difference according to their academic success?

5. Do leisure constraints of teacher candidates show a significant difference according to the sports branches of interest?

2. METHOD

The research is a study planned in the general screening model. General screening models are “screening arrangements made on the whole population or a group of an example or a sample taken from it in order to reach a general judgment about the population in a population consisting of many elements” (Karasar, 2009).

Sample

The research data were obtained from 178 teacher candidates enrolled in two different teacher training programs of Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University Faculty of Education in 2018-2019 academic year. 108 (60.67%) of the participants are male and 70 (39.33%) are female. In the scope of the study, there are 94 students (52.81%) enrolled in Computer Education and Instructional Technology Education Program (CEIT) and 84 students (47.19%) enrolled in Guidance and Psychological Counseling Program (GPC).

Data Collection Tool

In the study, Leisure Time Obstacle Scale (LTOS) developed by Alexandris and Carroll (1997), adapted to Turkish by Gürbüz and Karaküçük (2007) and later revised by Gürbüz et al. (2012) was used as a data collection tool. This scale has 18 items consisting of individual psychology, lack of information, lack of facilities, lack of friends, time and lack of interest. A 4-point Likert-type scale was used in answering. In the scale, 1 is used for “Absolutely Trivial”, 2 for “Trivial”, 3 for “Important” and 4 for “Very Important”. Total internal consistency coefficient of the scale was calculated as .84 (Gürbüz, Karaküçük, 2007).

Table 1

Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficients for leisure-constraints subscale scores

DIMENSIONS	NO of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	
		(Karaküçük, & Gurbuz, 2012)	Current application
Individual Psychology	3	,72	,608
Lack of information	3	,79	,864
Lack of Facility	3	,63	,780
Friend	3	,82	,838

Time	3	,64	,684
Interest	3	,75	,753

Table 1 shows the reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the Leisure Time Obstacle Scale (LTOS). While the reliability coefficients found in the current practice of the Individual Psychology (.608) and Time (.684) subscales are relatively low, they are still usable for answering research questions.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected by an internet-based questionnaire created with Google forms with permission from related departments. The students filled in the questionnaire completely voluntarily and outside of class hours on their mobile phones, but most of them completed it on the computer.

Independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA test were used to answer the research questions. In cases where there is a significant difference according to the one-way ANOVA test Tukey's test was used to determine the source of the difference.

3. FINDINGS

In this section, findings related to the analysis results of the collected data are presented.

Table 2

Leisure-constraints subscale scores according to gender

Sub dimens.	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Ss	df	t	p
IP	Female	108	9,0648	2,71814	176	,392	,69
	Male	70	8,9000	2,76704			
Information	Female	108	8,8148	3,42107	176	,216	,82
	Male	70	8,7000	3,54004			
Facility	Female	108	10,4352	3,05487	176	-,202	,84
	Male	70	10,5286	2,93762			
Friend	Female	108	8,2685	3,39215	176	-,540	,59
	Male	70	8,5429	3,17456			
Time	Female	108	9,0556	2,72693	176	1,436	,15
	Male	70	8,4143	3,17368			
Interest	Female	108	7,9630	3,27244	176	-,359	,72
	Male	70	8,1429	3,24946			

Table 2 reveals independent sample t-test results regarding whether there is a significant difference between the participants' LTOS subscale scores according to

gender. It has been found that there is no significant difference between the averages of LTOS sub-dimensions according to gender.

Table 3

Leisure-constraints subscale scores according to department variable

Sub dimens.	Dept.	N	\bar{X}	Ss	df	t	p
IP	CEIT	94	8,9681	2,87911	176	-,164	,870
	GPC	84	9,0357	2,57161			
Information	CEIT	94	8,5532	3,55182	176	-,883	,379
	GPC	84	9,0119	3,35632			
Facility	CEIT	94	10,5638	3,03584	176	,431	,667
	GPC	84	10,3690	2,97694			
Friend	CEIT	94	8,9362	3,03318	176	2,425	,016*
	GPC	84	7,7500	3,49138			
Time	CEIT	94	9,2766	3,00682	176	2,316	,022*
	GPC	84	8,2738	2,73906			
Interest	CEIT	94	8,3617	3,52518	176	1,426	,156
	GPC	84	7,6667	2,90132			

*p < 0,05

Independent sample t-test results related to the LTOS subscale scores of the participants according to the department variable are shown in Table 3. According to the department where the student is registered, the difference between the mean scores of the LTOS's friend and time dimensions have been found to be significant. In both dimensions, it is observable that the average scores of CEIT students are significantly higher than that of GPC students.

Table 4

ANOVA results related to the sub-dimension scores of the LTOS according to grade level variable

Sub Dim.	Grade	N	\bar{X}	Ss	F	p
IP	1,00	43	9,0000	2,87849	1,936	,126
	2,00	31	9,7419	2,50290		
	3,00	54	8,3519	2,45839		
	4,00	50	9,2400	2,93160		
	Total	178	9,0000	2,73087		
Informa- tion	1,00	43	9,2093	3,24080	,965	,411
	2,00	31	8,4839	4,15428		
	3,00	54	8,2222	3,06943		
	4,00	50	9,1600	3,57063		
	Total	178	8,7697	3,45884		

Facility	1,00	43	10,3953	3,14824	1,357	,258
	2,00	31	10,2581	3,10878		
	3,00	54	10,0185	2,49142		
	4,00	50	11,1600	3,26615		
	Total	178	10,4719	3,00128		
Friend	1,00	43	7,9070	3,61092	,846	,470
	2,00	31	8,1935	3,58161		
	3,00	54	8,3148	2,97679		
	4,00	50	8,9600	3,19413		
	Total	178	8,3764	3,30193		
Time	1,00	43	8,3953	2,95312	1,261	,289
	2,00	31	8,4194	2,80207		
	3,00	54	8,7593	2,62740		
	4,00	50	9,4400	3,22085		
	Total	178	8,8034	2,91898		
Interest	1,00	43	7,5814	3,06464	2,384	,071
	2,00	31	7,7742	3,28339		
	3,00	54	7,5926	2,60998		
	4,00	50	9,0600	3,84076		
	Total	178	8,0337	3,25542		

Table 4 displays the results of the LTOS sub-dimension scores of the participants according to the grade level variable. It is observed that the difference among the LTOS mean scores according to the students' grade level is not significant.

Table 5

ANOVA results related to LTOS subscale scores according to academic success variable

Sub Dim.	Mark	N	\bar{X}	Ss	F	p
IP	Low	14	8,7857	3,37818	,427	,653
	Average	136	9,1029	2,74679		
	High	28	8,6071	2,33078		
	Total	178	9,0000	2,73087		
Info.	Low	14	8,9286	3,75119	2,689	,071
	Average	136	9,0368	3,43276		
	High	28	7,3929	3,22421		
	Total	178	8,7697	3,45884		
Facility	Low	14	8,8571	3,61316	2,435	,091
	Average	136	10,6765	2,76990		
	High	28	10,2857	3,57830		

	Total	178	10,4719	3,00128		
Friend	Low	14	6,8571	2,53763	5,755	,004
	Average	136	8,8309	3,33901	Tukey = High < Average	
	High	28	6,9286	2,86652		
	Total	178	8,3764	3,30193		
Time	Low	14	7,5714	2,97979	2,244	,109
	Average	136	9,0441	2,95364		
	High	28	8,2500	2,56219		
	Total	178	8,8034	2,91898		
Interest	Low	14	7,0714	3,31580	,754	,472
	Med.	136	8,0662	3,16275		
	Average	28	8,3571	3,68394		
	Total	178	8,0337	3,25542		

Table 5 shows the results of the LTOS sub-dimension scores of the participants according to the academic success variable. According to the academic achievement of the student, it is seen that there is a significant difference between the mean scores related to the friend dimension of the LTOS. Average grade mean is significantly higher than High grade mean in this dimension.

Table 6

ANOVA results related to LTOS subscale scores according to the sports of interest variable

	Sub Dimension	N	\bar{X}	Ss	F	p
IP	None	33	9,5758	2,26426	,951	,388
	Individual	111	8,8288	2,88845		
	Team sports	34	9,0000	2,60536		
	Total	178	9,0000	2,73087		
Information	None	33	9,8485	3,12371	5,200	,006*
	Individual	111	8,1351	3,43904	Tukey = None > ind. and team	
	Team sports	34	9,7941	3,41813		
	Total	178	8,7697	3,45884		
Facility	None	33	10,3939	2,94681	,014	,986
	Individual	111	10,4865	3,04471		
	Team sports	34	10,5000	2,99747		
	Total	178	10,4719	3,00128		
Friend	None	33	8,1818	3,05629	,093	,911
	Individual	111	8,3874	3,40900		
	Team sports	34	8,5294	3,25888		
	Total	178	8,3764	3,30193		

Time	None	33	9,3636	2,71360	,765	,467
	Individual	111	8,6486	2,89089		
	Team sports	34	8,7647	3,21039		
	Total	178	8,8034	2,91898		
Interest	None	33	8,4242	3,37297	,601	,549
	Individual	111	8,0631	3,17169		
	Team sports	34	7,5588	3,44824		
	Total	178	8,0337	3,25542		

Table 6 shows the results of the LTOS sub-dimension scores of the participants according to the sport of interest variable. It is noted that the difference among the mean scores of the knowledge dimension of the LTOS according to the sports branch of interest is significant. In this dimension, the average None score is significantly higher than the individual and team average scores.

4. CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The aim of this study is to investigate the factors that may prevent the preservice teachers' participation in recreational activities in terms of various variables.

According to the analyses, while, according to the reliability coefficients of the LTOS sub-dimensions, the reliability coefficients found in the Individual Psychology and Time sub-dimensions are relatively low in the current practice; nevertheless, it has been found that they still have the quality to be usable for answering research questions.

It is specified that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the participants in terms of LTOS sub-dimensions according to gender. Jackson (2000) stated that their potential to restrict participation in recreational activity changed for different individuals and/or groups. According to Demir and Demir (2006), gender has little effect on participation in leisure activities.

According to the department variable of the participants, it is seen that the difference between the mean scores of the friends and time dimensions of the LTOS is significant. In both dimensions, the mean score of CEIT students is significantly higher than the mean scores of GPC students. Temir and Gürbüz (2014) found that the time factor in the participants' participation in recreational activities took the first place in the analysis results, whereas lack of interest factor was the lowest. In the study of Gürbüz and Karaküçük (2007), it was found that the factors such as time factor and facilities and transportation were the main constraints for participation. The results obtained are similar to the results of the studies. Regarding the elements that prevent participation in leisure activities on the basis of the department, it can be concluded that because of their continuous work with computers, CEIT students do not see it as a time barrier, and that GPC students regard such activities as a leisure barrier. According to this, the level of participation of students in different activities may also vary. Bahar (2008) stated that

the time allocated for students of Physical Education and Sports Teaching to participate in sporting activities and to follow these activities was higher than that of other branch students.

It is observed that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the LTOS according to the grade level variable of the participants. Demirel (2009)'s study on university students did not find a significant difference between the participants' leisure time constraints and their ages.

According to the academic success variable of the participants, it is seen that the difference between the mean scores of the friend dimension of LTOS is significant. Also, in this dimension, it has been found that Average-grade mean is significantly higher than the High-grade mean. It can be stated that students with a high level of academic achievement are more successful in dealing with leisure time constraints than students with moderate academic achievement. Tekin et al. (2008) reported in their study that participating in activities increased academic achievement.

According to the sports branch of interest variable of the participants, it is seen that the difference between the mean scores of the Information dimension of LTOS is significant. As for this dimension, None average score is significantly higher than the average of Individual and Team scores. A significant difference has been identified regarding leisure constraints since students are not interested in any kind of sport in their pre-university lives and have no knowledge about this issue. In a study conducted by Alexandris and Carrroll (1997) on the frequency of participation in recreational sports activities by university students and the factors that prevent this participation, a significant relationship was found between the lack of knowledge and the level of motivation of the individual and the level of perception of the constraints.

As a result; nowadays, the necessity and reality of leisure time is a situation (Can, 2010). In societies consisting of individuals who are not fully aware of leisure time activities, leisure activities are mostly composed of passive activities (Karaküçük, 2014). Activities with a passive quality lead to problems that cause hypokinetic disorders in societies. As a consequence of this, problems such as cholesterol, obesity, muscle and bone problems, cardiovascular fat, psycho-social disorder and diabetes occur (Zorba, 2015). Sportive recreational activities that individuals participate voluntarily and fondly lead individuals to a vibrant life while satisfying them psychologically at the same time (Ertüzün, 2016). In the remaining time from the time they devote to the courses and their compulsory needs that they are obliged to do, university students should benefit from the concept of recreation and the activities included in this concept in order to socialize, to discard their mental problems, to be healthy sportively, to increase their culture and knowledge. As such, they will be able to benefit from the mentioned useful activities and it will be easier for them to achieve success both in their socio-cultural lives and in their professional lives (Kaba, 2009). Individuals' acquiring positive understanding and habits related to the use of leisure time is of great importance not only in increasing academic success but also in eliminating the barriers of leisure time. The popularization of

recreation education is thought to contribute to the conscious elimination of psychological and physiological disorders in individuals and therefore in society. It is considered to be important that universities organize recreational opportunities such as cultural-artistic-sportive etc. activities realized in line with the needs of students and increase the recreational activities. Since the study is limited to Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University students, it is thought that similar studies will also be more useful in different sample groups and our study will contribute to similar studies in the future.

References

- Akatay, A. (2003). Örgütlerde Zaman Yönetimi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 10, 281-299.
- Akkaya, S. (2008). *Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Popüler Kültür Etkinlikleri Ve Boş Zaman Alışkanlıkları*. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Anadolu Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Alexandris, K., & Carroll, B. (1997). Demographic Differences in the Perception of Constrains on Recreational Sport Participation: Results From a Study in Greece, *Leisure Studies*, 16, 107-125.
- Alexandris, K., & Carroll, B. (1999). Constrains on Recreational Sport Participation in Adults in Greece: Implications for Providing and Managing Sport Services, *Journal of Sport Management*, 13(4), 317-332.
- Ardahan, F., Turgut, T., & Kalkan, A. K. (2016). *Her Yönüyle Rekreasyon*. Detay Yayıncılık. Ankara.
- Arıbal, G. (2013). *Türkiye’de Rekreasyonun Kurumsallaşması ve İlk Rekreasyon Derneği*. II. Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı. X-XI. Aydın.
- Arslan, S. (1996). *Yüksek Öğretim Kredi ve Yurtlar Kurumu’na Bağlı Yurtlarda Kalan Bayan Öğrencilerin Rekreasyon (Boş Zaman Değerlendirme) Sorunları Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Gazi Üniversitesi/ Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Ayhan, C., Eskiler, E., & Soyer, F. (2017). *Aktif Sporcuların Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılımlarına Engel Oluşturabilecek Faktörlerin Yaşam Tatmini ve Yaşam Kalitesi Üzerine Etkisi*, Erpa Int. Congresses on Education, Hungary, 164-175.
- Bahar, H. H. (2008). Cinsiyet ve Branşa Göre Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Serbest Zaman Etkinlikleri (Erzincan Eğitim Fakültesi Örneği). *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(2), 117-140.
- Can, S. (2010). Muğla Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İlköğretim Bölümü Öğrenci Ailelerinin Boş Zaman Faaliyetlerine Katılım Biçimlerinin Belirlenmesi, *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 18(3), 861-870
- Crawford, D., Jackson, E., & Godbey, G. (1991). A Hierarchical Model of Leisure Constrains, *Leisure Studies*, 9, 119-127.
- Demir, C., & Demir, D. (2006). Bireylerin Boş Zaman Faaliyetlerine Katılmalarını Etkileyen Faktörler ile Cinsiyet Arasındaki İlişki: Lisans Öğrencilerine Yönelik Bir Uygulama, Ege Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 6(1), 36-48.
- Demirel, M., & Harmandar, D. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreasyonel etkinliklere katılımlarında engel oluşturabilecek faktörlerin belirlenmesi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1), 838-846.
- Ekici, S., Bayrakdar, A., & Odabaş, K. (2010). Emniyet Müdürlüğü Personelinin Boş Zamanları Değerlendirme Alışkanlıklarının Araştırılması. *Atabesd*, 12(1), 30-40.

- Emir, E., Öncü, E., & Gürbüz, B. (2012). Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılımın Önündeki Engellerin Belirlenmesi: Üniversite Öğrencileri Örneği Examination of Constraints to Leisure Activities in Turkish University Students. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 14(4), 3895-3904.
- Erdem, R. (1999). Yöneticiler İçin Zaman Yönetimi. *Modern Hastane Yönetimi*, 3(7), 26-31.
- Erdem, R., Pirinççi, E., & Dikmetaş, E., (2005), Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Zaman Yönetimi Davranışları ve Bu Davranışların Akademik Başarı ile İlişkisi, *Manas Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14, 67-177.
- Ertüzün, E. (2016). Sağlık Perspektifinden Rekreasyon ve Esenlik (Wellness). S. Karaküçük (Ed.), *Rekreasyon Bilimi* (s. 545-590) içinde, Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Gallahue, D. L., & Donnely, F. (2003). Developmental physical education for all children. *Human Kinetics*.
- Gürbüz, B., & Karaküçük, S. (2007).Boş Zaman Engelleri Ölçeği: Ölçek geliştirme geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(1), 3-10.
- Gürbüz, B., Karaküçük, S., & Sarol, H. (2010). *Examination of Perception of Constraints on Recreational Activities Participation: Results From A Study in Ankara*, 11. International Sport Sciences Congress, Antalya, 340-343.
- Gürbüz, B., Öncü, E., & Emir, E. (2012). *Boş Zaman Engelleri Ölçeği: Yapı Geçerliliğinin Test Edilmesi*. 12. Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi, Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Denizli.
- Gratton C., & Tice A. (1989). Sport Participation and Health. *Leisure Studies*, 8, 77-92.
- Hacıoğlu, N., Gökdeniz A. ve Dinç Y. (2009) *Boş Zaman Ve Rekreasyon Yönetimi Kitabı*, 17, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Jackson E. L. (2000). Will research on leisure constraints stil be relevant in the twenty-first century? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32 (1), 62-68.
- Janssen, I., Katzmarzyk, P. T., Boyce, W. F., & Pickett, W. (2004) The independent influence of physical inactivity and obesity on health complaints of 6th to 10th grade Canadian youth. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 1, 331-343.
- Kaba, C. İ. (2009). *Türkiye’ deki Üniversitelerde Kampüs Rekreasyonunun Mevcut Durumu ve Kampus Rekreasyon Modellemesi*. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Marmara Üniversitesi/Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Karaküçük, S. (2014). *Rekreasyon: boş zamanları değerlendirme*. (Geliştirilmiş 7. Baskı) Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Karaküçük, S., & Gürbüz, B. (2007). *Rekreasyon ve Kent(li)leşme*, Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
- Lengkeek J. (1993). Collective and Private Interest in Recreation-the Dutch Case. *Leisure Studies*, 12, 7-32.
- Ozankaya, Ö. (1995). *Toplumbilim Terimleri Sözlüğü*.(4.Basım), Ankara: Cem Yayınevi.
- Özşaker, M. (2012). Gençlerin Serbest Zaman Aktivitelerine Katılmama Nedenleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme, *Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 14 (1), 126-131.
- Roberts K. (2006). *Leisure in contemporary society* (2. baskı) Wallingford, UK: Cabi.
- Roberts K., York C. S., & Brodie D. A. (1988). Participant Sport in the Commercial Sector. *Leisure Studies*, 7, 145-157.
- Roberts K. (1992). Disintegration of Sport. In Williams T., Almond L. ve Sparkes A., (Ed.): *Sport and Physical Activity*, London, Spon.
- Şahin, H. (1997). *Sporcuların Performans Sporunu bıraktıktan Sonraki Yaşamlarında Boş Zaman Değerlendirme İlgilerinin Araştırılması*. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Çukurova Üniversitesi/Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Adana.

- Tekin A., Ramazanoğlu F., & Tekin G. (2004). Fiziksel Egzersiz İçeren Serbest Zaman Aktiviteleri ve Stres İlişkisi. *Sporla Sosyal Alanlar Seçme Konular. 1.* Ramazanoğlu F. (Ed.), 86-87, Ankara: Bıçaklar Kitabevi.
- Tekin M., Yıldız M., Akyüz M., & Uğur OA. (2008). Karaman Yüksek Öğrenim Kredi Ve Yurtlar Kurumunda Kalan Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılım ve Beklentilerinin İncelenmesi. *Erzincan Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(1), 121-135.
- Temir Ö., & Gürbüz, B., (2012). *Rekreasyonel Aktivitelere Katılımın Önündeki Engellerin İncelenmesi*. I. Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Kongresi. Kemer, Antalya.
- Tel M., Öcalan M., & Yaman M. (2001). Taekwondocuların Bu Spor Tercih Etme Nedenleri ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Durumları, *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(1), 3-5.
- Tezcan M. (1994). *Boş Zamanları Değerlendirme Sosyolojisi*. Ankara: Atilla Kitabevi.
- Tinsley, H.E.A., & Tinsley, D.J. (1986). A theory of the attributes, benefits, and causes of leisure experience. *Leisure Sciences*, 8, 1-45.
- Ustun, U.D., Kalkavan, A., & Demirel, M. (2013). Investigating Free Time Motivation Scores of Physical Education and Faculty of Education Students According to Different Variables, *The Online Journal of Recreation and Sport*, 2(1), 18-26.
- Yaman, M., & Arslan, S. (2009). Çocuk ve Gençlik Suçlarının Önlenmesinde Rekreatif Sporlar, *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1), 445-459.
- Yüncü, D., Coşkun, İ. O., Sevil, T., Özel, Ç. H., Yüncü, H. R., & Şimşek, K. Y. (2013). *Rekreasyon Yönetimi*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Zorba, E. (2015). *Herkes İçin Yaşam Boyu Spor*, 23-24, Ankara: Fırat Yayıncılık.
- Zorba, E. (2008). Türkiye de Rekreasyona Bakış Açısı ve Gelişimi. *Gazi Haber Dergisi*. 52-55.
- Zorba E., & Bakır M. (2004). Serbest Zaman Kavramı. *Sporla Sosyal Alanlar Seçme Konular 1.* Ramazanoğlu F. (Ed.), 106, Ankara: Bıçaklar Kitabevi.
- Zorba, E. (2002). *Türkiye’de Rekreasyona Bakış, Gelişimi ve Beklentiler*. 7. Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi Panel Kitabı, 185-194. Antalya.