

AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATION BETWEEN RECREATIONAL PREFERENCES AND PROFESSION TENDENCIES: A RESEARCH ON UNDERGRADUATE TOURISM AND RECREATION STUDENTS

Oguz TURKAY*
Seyit Ahmet SOLMAZ*
Abdulmenaf
KORKUTATA*
Cagri ERDOGAN*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to reveal how often students of tourism and recreation participate in different recreational activities and how this correlates with their desire to work in the field of recreation. The study was conducted on individuals who studied in different departments of tourism management and recreation at Sakarya University. The data obtained by survey method, was analyzed by statistical methods. A significant difference was reported between the students of the two departments in the frequency of participation in active and passive recreational activities and in the field they desired to work in. The frequency of participation in active recreation indicated the degree of the desire to work in animation units of hotels, organization of nature sports, water sports and the field of recreation and animation. On the other hand, the frequency of participation in passive recreation significantly accounted for the desire to work in entertainment venues.

Keywords: Tourism, Recreation, Recreational Preferences, Desire to Work

REKREATİF TERCİHLER VE ÇALIŞMA EĞİLEMLERİ ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİNİN İNCELENMESİ: TURİZM VE REKREASYON ÖĞRENCİLERİ ÜZERİNDE BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı turizm ve rekreasyon bölümü öğrencilerinin farklı rekreasyon etkinliklerine katılım sıklıklarını belirlemek ve bunun rekreasyon alanında çalışma istekleri ile ilgili kişiyi belirleyebilmektir. Araştırma, Sakarya Üniversitesi'nde İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi çatısı altındaki turizm işletmeciliği bölümü ve Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksek Okulu çatısı altındaki rekreasyon bölümünde lisans öğrenimi gören öğrenciler üzerinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Anket yöntemi ile elde edilen veriler istatistiksel yöntemlerle analiz edilmiştir. Araştırma sonucunda, aktif ve pasif rekreatif faaliyetlere katılım sıklıklarında ve çalışma isteklerinde bölümler arasında anlamlı bir farklılık tespit edilmiştir. Öğrencilerin aktif rekreasyona katılım sıklıkları onların otellerin animasyon bölümlerinde, doğa sporları organizasyonunda ve su sporları vb. alanlarda çalışmak isteklerini belirlemektedir. Diğer yandan pasif rekreasyona katılım sıklığının eğlence mekânlarında çalışma isteğini anlamlı düzeyde açıkladığı görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Turizm, Rekreasyon, Rekreatif Tercihler, Çalışma İsteği

* Sakarya University, Faculty of Business, Tourism Management Department

INTRODUCTION

The notion "leisure time" occupies a prominent place in social life and constitutes one of the most necessary areas in modern society (Mutlu et al., 2011). Therefore, recreational activities have become a basic requirement of working people and students. It was presented that participating in recreational activities has numerous advantages and for individuals, participating in such activities, feeling of happiness is an important element (Baker and Palmer, 2006: 396).

The underlying reason why individuals need recreational activities is their demand for a healthy body, psychological relaxation, active social life, and enhanced productivity and personal abilities. In addition, individual participation in recreational activities plays a pivotal role in achieving such attainments as self-expression, having new experiences and increased success and productivity in working life. It should be noted here that, as mentioned above, the most important thing participation in recreational activities can give individuals is happiness (Yildiz et al., 2012: 321; Aılönü and Mengütay, 2009: 163; Önder, 2003: 3). All things considered, three main advantages of recreational activities are emphasized, namely resting, entertainment and self-development (Zorba, 2008). In this context, university students, burdened with an intensive curriculum, should take part in recreational activities in order to relax both physically and mentally and to refresh themselves. In this way, they will not only have a healthy body but also get involved in self-development.

Recreational activities are useful both for physical and mental development of individuals and for social life. Despite this, they are neither attached enough importance nor discussed in a serious manner in Turkish policies (Yaman, 2011: 36). As stated by Zorba (2008), the vast majority of current recreational activities in Turkey are organized by public institutions, which inevitably limits participation in recreational activities on the part of students and other individuals. For that

reason, availability of organizations/institutions and specialist staff in this field will play an important role in promoting and increasing participation in recreational activities.

Defined as "one's spending his/her free time in an efficient way" in simple terms, recreation is closely intertwined with tourism. It is known that recreation is an important part of tourism, which is described as trips made by individuals to places other than their permanent residences for a variety of purposes including spending one's free time (Batman, 2008). Studies have revealed that satisfaction levels of hotel guests are considerably influenced by the recreational activities provided at the hotel and behaviors of the staff working in the field (Ko and Pastore, 2005; Öziık, 1998). Furthermore, Van Doorn (1982) reported that recreational activities are one of the most important factors in tourists' extending their period of stay at accommodation facilities. In order to turn this into an advantage, it is important that individuals to serve in the field of recreation should be competent in scheduling and managing things (Kökta, 2004: 37).

One can conclude from what has been explained so far above that it is important how qualified individuals to serve in the field of recreation are and how they perceive recreational activities. In this context, it is believed that schools of tourism, whose objective is to provide the tourism industry with qualified and knowledgeable labor force (Hacıo lu et al., 2008), and departments of recreation at schools of physical education and sports will make great contributions to training the type of labor force required by the industry. Therefore, students and graduates of recreation state that they consider tourism establishments and tourist facilities as the main field they desire to work in (Zorba, 2008).

The close relationship between tourism and recreation causes schools that provide education in both disciplines to have a tendency towards recreation. However, it is clear that educational institutions aiming to provide the industry with qualified labor force have different perspectives on recreation (Türkay and Korkutata, 2011). Most of the

training in the field of recreation in Turkey is provided by schools of physical education and sports. On the other hand, departments and schools of tourism are partially distanced from recreation. Furthermore, recreational education in Turkey seems to be double-headed. Thus, there is a lack of consensus among university teachers about what kind of curricula should be implemented for students of these departments (Türkay and Korkututa, 2011). Even so, students that graduate from either department converge, during their professional career, on a common ground, namely tourism. All things considered, enterprises in the industry will benefit greatly from the attempts to determine the field students of these departments desire to work in.

In this study, an attempt was made to reveal the recreational preferences of individuals who studied diverse departments of Tourism Management and Recreation at Sakarya University and the extent to which they desired to work in the field of recreation. The data were collected through a questionnaire. The main attempt was to reveal the recreational preferences of the students and to determine whether there was a significant difference between their desire to work in the field of recreation or tourism. In this context, the authors first defined a general framework for recreational activities, then conducted a review of literature and finally tested whether what was presented in the literature was the case for the students of tourism and recreation at Sakarya University.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept “Recreation” and Recreational Preferences

The industrial revolution and subsequent technological advances have accelerated rural-urban migration, which, in turn, have brought about population growth. As a result of ever-increasing urban population, cities have become places that are difficult for people to live in (Müderriso lu and Uzun,

2004: 109). Leisure activities have become a significant requirement of individuals who are already leading their lives under heavy stress. Especially in the last three decades, marked by rapid modern urbanization and industrial development, the need for recreational activities have increased in accordance with industrial advances and in parallel with the rise in the level of problems and stress in urban life and working life (Müderriso lu et al., 2005: 40; Talay, 2010: 148). From this point of view, Toffler (1981: 13) defined recreation as withdrawal from stress increasing as a result of busy schedule.

Described as one’s keeping himself/herself fit, his/her physical or mental relief, his/her physical development or renewal, recreation is a combination of two Latin words, namely “re” and “create”, meaning “again” and “produce” respectively. In Turkish, however, it generally refers to “one’s spending his/her free time in an efficient way” (Şahin et al., 2009). According to Akesen (1978), recreation is an activity which suits one’s taste, is based on mental and physical renewal and includes one’s spending his/her free time depending on his/her social, cultural, economic and physiological opportunities (Müderriso lu and Uzun, 2004: 109). On the other hand, Balcı and İhan (2006) described recreation as one’s self-renewal and release of accumulated desires through participation in creative and cultural activities. Recreational activities include voluntary attempts to spend their free time in an useful manner by getting benefits and satisfaction. These activities can be categorized under such general headings as musical occupations, sport activities, games, artistic activities, activities that require ability, nature activities, social and cultural activities (Orel and Yavuz, 2003: 61).

Since free time is what is not included within obligatory working time, recreation is often used interchangeably with spending free time in an efficient way. Hence, it is possible to define recreation as one’s adapting non-working activities to leisure activities (Balcı and İhan, 2006: 11). The content of the recreational activities carried out within free time vary depending on one’s age, gender,

socio-economic and cultural level (Müderiso lu and Uzun, 2004: 109). Therefore, one's physical, mental and psychological condition should be taken into account while recreational activities are scheduled. The reason for this is that recreational activities are teachable, that they have a role in preventing violence and that they are important in guiding future habits of the young (Mansuro lu, 2002: 54). This view is supported by the findings of a study conducted in the U.S.A. It was reported in this study that there was a higher crime rate among students after physical education and music had been excluded from the curriculum, and that the rate decreased after they had been reintroduced (Zorba, 2008). Recreational activities are becoming more and more common and developed. The process is also reflected on the social activities at universities. In most of the universities in such developed nations as England, America and Canada, "campus recreation" is an already adopted and developed concept and regarded as an educational element. From this point of view, it is clear that campuses are necessary not only for providing education or accommodating students but also for meeting recreational requirements of a group that includes students and lecturers (ahin et al., 2009: 63).

The Effects of Recreational Preferences on Profession Tendencies

People want to work in a field in parallel with their special interest. Therefore, it can be assumed that the students studying in tourism and/or recreation departments tend work in a related field. Some specific areas such as hotels, nature sports, water sports, entertainment organizations/venues are main fields in which a tourism or recreation student may get a job. These areas are areas which some kinds of activities organized in, in order to have people's free time spent more meaningful. Therefore, if a student participate a specific kind of recreational activity continually in his/her

private life, he/she expected to prefer working in a field which is consisting similar activities to carried in daily life out. So, it is meaningful to study on the effects of recreational preferences on working tendencies.

On the other hand, the imperishable bound between person and personality is so strong that it is related with every thought and behavior lasting for a life time. In this context, it is understood that personality is a very momentous element for individuals to participate in different types of recreation activities (Lupu, 2011: 272-273) along with demographic and social changes (Williams and Shaw, 2009: 326). Rodgers et. al. (1973) suggested that as a social fact sub-culture and personalities as well as economic factors are crucial elements for the reasons of differences between individuals' recreational preferences. The case of profession tendencies having a place in people is closely related to many factors such as life styles and habits (Çakır, 2004: 2) could not be commented distinct from personality. In previous studies related to profession tendency, personality was discussed as a significant variable (Zang and Fan, 2007: 120; Zhang, 2004; Rogers et. al., 2008, Solmaz et. al., 2012; Türkay et. al., 2011; Erdo an and Zengin, 2012). In this context, it is thought that personality having a critical role on individuals' recreational preferences effects also profession tendency. Thus Türkay et. al. (2012) stated that there is a relation between recreational preferences and profession tendencies.

METHODOLOGY

Aim of the Study

There are many studies in Turkey on recreational preferences and one's spending his/her free time in an efficient way. Some were based on determining recreational preferences of civil servants (Yeniçeri et al., 2002; Özda et al., 2009) whereas others were focused on those of lecturers (Çolako lu, 2005). Most of the remaining studies were based on revealing recreational preferences and leisure habits of university students (Mansuro lu, 2002; Önder, 2003; Müderiso lu and Uzun, 2004; Balcı and Ihan, 2006; Kır,

2007; ahin et al., 2009; Sabba and Aksoy, 2011). Even so, the Turkish literature lacks a study on revealing the fields that students of recreation desire to work in. Therefore, the present study was motivated by the idea that it would be useful to determine the desires of students of tourism and recreation to work in the fields of tourism and recreation. Furthermore, Tütüncü (2009) stated that there are a small number of studies in Turkey on leisure time and recreation and that especially academicians in the field of tourism should focus on this area.

The purpose of this study is to reveal the extent to which students of tourism management and recreation participate in recreational activities and how they regard working in the fields of tourism and recreation. In accordance with the purpose, the data were collected through a questionnaire, a quantitative research method. The reason why questionnaires are preferred is that they make it relatively easier to collect data from many participants and these data can be analyzed in an easy way (Altunıık et al., 2007).

Sample

The population of the study was comprised of students of Tourism Management at Faculty of Business Administration and Recreation Management at School of Physical Education and Sports in Sakarya University. The sample consisted of 323 students in the two departments, chosen through convenience sampling. The data on the sample were collected in the spring term of the education year 2011-2012.

Data Collection

The questionnaire consisted of three sections. The first and second sections included a total of 24 statements, 10 of them concerning active recreational

activities and the remaining 14 of them concerning passive recreational activities, in order to measure how often students participated in recreational activities. The third section, on the other hand, contained the desire to work scale (6 statements) developed by the authors as a result of the review of literature. The statements were rated in a way in which 1 would correspond to “strongly agree” and 5 would refer to “strongly disagree”.

Validity and Reliability

The scale used in the study was tested for reliability purposes. The analysis concluded that 30 statements in the whole scale had a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.854, which suggests that the scale is highly reliable (Kayı , 2005: 405). The statements designed to determine the tendencies of the students towards working had a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0,750.

The data were analyzed through SPSS 15.0 and statistical methods. A frequency analysis was conducted in order to determine the demographics of the students of tourism and recreation. Furthermore, the independent sample t-test was employed so as to decide whether there was a difference between the recreational preferences of the students and their desire to work. Other analyses included a correlation analysis, which was used to reveal the correlation between their desire to work and active/passive recreational activities, and a regression analysis, which was employed to determine the effect of active and passive recreational activities on their desire to work. The findings are presented as follows.

FINDINGS

The study included almost an equal number of male and female participants. The number of male students was slightly higher than that of female students (50,8%) (Table 1). This finding increased the extent to which the sample represented the population in terms of gender.

Table 1: Demographics of the Participants

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
Gender		
Male	164	50,8
Female	159	49,2
Total	323	100
Age		
16-18	9	2,8
19-21	183	56,7
22-24	112	34,7
25 and over	19	5,9
Total	323	100
Grade		
1st Grade	102	31,6
2nd Grade	124	38,4
3rd Grade	23	7,1
4th Grade	74	22,9
Total	323	100
Department		
Tourism	147	45,5
Management	176	54,5
Total	323	100

The participants belonged to similar age groups. Whereas 56,6% of them (183) were 19-21 years old, 34,7% of them (112) were 22-24 years old.

Most of the participants were first (31,6%) or second (38,4%) grade students while there were relatively fewer number of third (7,1%) and fourth (22%) grade students. The discrepancy might have resulted from the fact that especially fourth grade students of tourism do not attend school as often as others owing their on-the-job training in the spring term. The participants were distributed similarly between the departments, suggesting that the sample represented the recreational preferences of the students of the two departments and their tendencies towards working at an equal level.

The t-test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference between the students of tourism and recreation in the frequency of participation in active recreational activities. In this context, Table

2 presents arithmetic mean values concerning the frequency.

There was a statistically significant difference between the students of the two departments in the frequency of participation in all of the active recreational activities ($p < 0,05$) (Table 2). In addition, it can be concluded from the arithmetic mean values of their responses to the statements that they were unwilling to participate in active recreational activities. Another finding is that the students of tourism were much more unwilling to participate in active recreational activities when compared to the students of recreation (Table 2).

The students of recreation were more actively involved in such activities as football, volleyball, natural sports, folklore dance and gymnastic/aerobic (step). This involvement might have resulted from the fact that students of recreation are chosen on the basis of a special ability test and that they are subject to intensive practical courses in different branches of sports.

Table 2: The Differentiation in the Frequency of Participation in Active Recreational Activities

Statements	Departments	Mean.	SD.	Mean Difference	t Value	Significance																																																																																																																														
Indoor or outdoor walking/running	Tourism	2,972	1,220	0,745	5,712	0,000*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	2,227	1,118				Football	Tourism	3,698	1,590	0,931	5,296	0,000*	Recreation	2,767	1,555	Basketball	Tourism	4,260	1,044	1,186	8,660	0,000*	Recreation	3,073	1,410	Volleyball	Tourism	3,876	1,179	1,115	7,848	0,000*	Recreation	2,761	1,339	Swimming	Tourism	3,500	1,303	0,363	2,512	0,013*	Recreation	3,136	1,284	Gym/Aerobic (step)	Tourism	4,260	1,083	0,800	5,937	0,000*	Recreation	3,460	1,334	Cycling	Tourism	3,767	1,120	0,392	2,945	0,003*	Recreation	3,375	1,267	Far Eastern sports	Tourism	4,741	0,776	0,661	5,312	0,000*	Recreation	4,079	1,416	Nature sports (mountaineering, rafting, paragliding etc.)	Tourism	4,633	0,777	0,934	7,642	0,000*	Recreation	3,698	1,379	Water Sports	Tourism	4,503	0,983	0,432	3,342	0,001*	Recreation	4,070	1,333	Body Building	Tourism	4,266	1,210	0,738	4,981	0,000*	Recreation	3,528	1,449	Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*	Recreation	3,420	1,358	Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637
Football	Tourism	3,698	1,590	0,931	5,296	0,000*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	2,767	1,555				Basketball	Tourism	4,260	1,044	1,186	8,660	0,000*	Recreation	3,073	1,410	Volleyball	Tourism	3,876	1,179	1,115	7,848	0,000*	Recreation	2,761	1,339	Swimming	Tourism	3,500	1,303	0,363	2,512	0,013*	Recreation	3,136	1,284	Gym/Aerobic (step)	Tourism	4,260	1,083	0,800	5,937	0,000*	Recreation	3,460	1,334	Cycling	Tourism	3,767	1,120	0,392	2,945	0,003*	Recreation	3,375	1,267	Far Eastern sports	Tourism	4,741	0,776	0,661	5,312	0,000*	Recreation	4,079	1,416	Nature sports (mountaineering, rafting, paragliding etc.)	Tourism	4,633	0,777	0,934	7,642	0,000*	Recreation	3,698	1,379	Water Sports	Tourism	4,503	0,983	0,432	3,342	0,001*	Recreation	4,070	1,333	Body Building	Tourism	4,266	1,210	0,738	4,981	0,000*	Recreation	3,528	1,449	Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*	Recreation	3,420	1,358	Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431						
Basketball	Tourism	4,260	1,044	1,186	8,660	0,000*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	3,073	1,410				Volleyball	Tourism	3,876	1,179	1,115	7,848	0,000*	Recreation	2,761	1,339	Swimming	Tourism	3,500	1,303	0,363	2,512	0,013*	Recreation	3,136	1,284	Gym/Aerobic (step)	Tourism	4,260	1,083	0,800	5,937	0,000*	Recreation	3,460	1,334	Cycling	Tourism	3,767	1,120	0,392	2,945	0,003*	Recreation	3,375	1,267	Far Eastern sports	Tourism	4,741	0,776	0,661	5,312	0,000*	Recreation	4,079	1,416	Nature sports (mountaineering, rafting, paragliding etc.)	Tourism	4,633	0,777	0,934	7,642	0,000*	Recreation	3,698	1,379	Water Sports	Tourism	4,503	0,983	0,432	3,342	0,001*	Recreation	4,070	1,333	Body Building	Tourism	4,266	1,210	0,738	4,981	0,000*	Recreation	3,528	1,449	Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*	Recreation	3,420	1,358	Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431																
Volleyball	Tourism	3,876	1,179	1,115	7,848	0,000*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	2,761	1,339				Swimming	Tourism	3,500	1,303	0,363	2,512	0,013*	Recreation	3,136	1,284	Gym/Aerobic (step)	Tourism	4,260	1,083	0,800	5,937	0,000*	Recreation	3,460	1,334	Cycling	Tourism	3,767	1,120	0,392	2,945	0,003*	Recreation	3,375	1,267	Far Eastern sports	Tourism	4,741	0,776	0,661	5,312	0,000*	Recreation	4,079	1,416	Nature sports (mountaineering, rafting, paragliding etc.)	Tourism	4,633	0,777	0,934	7,642	0,000*	Recreation	3,698	1,379	Water Sports	Tourism	4,503	0,983	0,432	3,342	0,001*	Recreation	4,070	1,333	Body Building	Tourism	4,266	1,210	0,738	4,981	0,000*	Recreation	3,528	1,449	Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*	Recreation	3,420	1,358	Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431																										
Swimming	Tourism	3,500	1,303	0,363	2,512	0,013*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	3,136	1,284				Gym/Aerobic (step)	Tourism	4,260	1,083	0,800	5,937	0,000*	Recreation	3,460	1,334	Cycling	Tourism	3,767	1,120	0,392	2,945	0,003*	Recreation	3,375	1,267	Far Eastern sports	Tourism	4,741	0,776	0,661	5,312	0,000*	Recreation	4,079	1,416	Nature sports (mountaineering, rafting, paragliding etc.)	Tourism	4,633	0,777	0,934	7,642	0,000*	Recreation	3,698	1,379	Water Sports	Tourism	4,503	0,983	0,432	3,342	0,001*	Recreation	4,070	1,333	Body Building	Tourism	4,266	1,210	0,738	4,981	0,000*	Recreation	3,528	1,449	Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*	Recreation	3,420	1,358	Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431																																				
Gym/Aerobic (step)	Tourism	4,260	1,083	0,800	5,937	0,000*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	3,460	1,334				Cycling	Tourism	3,767	1,120	0,392	2,945	0,003*	Recreation	3,375	1,267	Far Eastern sports	Tourism	4,741	0,776	0,661	5,312	0,000*	Recreation	4,079	1,416	Nature sports (mountaineering, rafting, paragliding etc.)	Tourism	4,633	0,777	0,934	7,642	0,000*	Recreation	3,698	1,379	Water Sports	Tourism	4,503	0,983	0,432	3,342	0,001*	Recreation	4,070	1,333	Body Building	Tourism	4,266	1,210	0,738	4,981	0,000*	Recreation	3,528	1,449	Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*	Recreation	3,420	1,358	Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431																																														
Cycling	Tourism	3,767	1,120	0,392	2,945	0,003*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	3,375	1,267				Far Eastern sports	Tourism	4,741	0,776	0,661	5,312	0,000*	Recreation	4,079	1,416	Nature sports (mountaineering, rafting, paragliding etc.)	Tourism	4,633	0,777	0,934	7,642	0,000*	Recreation	3,698	1,379	Water Sports	Tourism	4,503	0,983	0,432	3,342	0,001*	Recreation	4,070	1,333	Body Building	Tourism	4,266	1,210	0,738	4,981	0,000*	Recreation	3,528	1,449	Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*	Recreation	3,420	1,358	Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431																																																								
Far Eastern sports	Tourism	4,741	0,776	0,661	5,312	0,000*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	4,079	1,416				Nature sports (mountaineering, rafting, paragliding etc.)	Tourism	4,633	0,777	0,934	7,642	0,000*	Recreation	3,698	1,379	Water Sports	Tourism	4,503	0,983	0,432	3,342	0,001*	Recreation	4,070	1,333	Body Building	Tourism	4,266	1,210	0,738	4,981	0,000*	Recreation	3,528	1,449	Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*	Recreation	3,420	1,358	Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431																																																																		
Nature sports (mountaineering, rafting, paragliding etc.)	Tourism	4,633	0,777	0,934	7,642	0,000*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	3,698	1,379				Water Sports	Tourism	4,503	0,983	0,432	3,342	0,001*	Recreation	4,070	1,333	Body Building	Tourism	4,266	1,210	0,738	4,981	0,000*	Recreation	3,528	1,449	Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*	Recreation	3,420	1,358	Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431																																																																												
Water Sports	Tourism	4,503	0,983	0,432	3,342	0,001*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	4,070	1,333				Body Building	Tourism	4,266	1,210	0,738	4,981	0,000*	Recreation	3,528	1,449	Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*	Recreation	3,420	1,358	Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431																																																																																						
Body Building	Tourism	4,266	1,210	0,738	4,981	0,000*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	3,528	1,449				Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*	Recreation	3,420	1,358	Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431																																																																																																
Bowling	Tourism	3,751	1,189	0,331	2,331	0,020*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	3,420	1,358				Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*	Recreation	4,244	1,152	Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431																																																																																																										
Skiing	Tourism	4,541	0,856	0,296	2,647	0,009*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	4,244	1,152				Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*	Recreation	3,795	1,431																																																																																																																				
Folk Dances	Tourism	4,315	1,131	0,519	3,637	0,000*																																																																																																																														
	Recreation	3,795	1,431																																																																																																																																	

*Significance level: $p < 0,05$

Ranking: 1- Always; 2- Often; 3- Sometimes; 4- Rarely; 5- Never.

The activity that the participants most frequently carried out was “indoor or outdoor walking and running”. The reason for this might be that the activity does not require a personal ability and that it can be undertaken in a number of places without difficulty. Among the activities that the participants least frequently carried out were Far Eastern sports, gymnastic, water sports, skiing, mountaineering and rafting. In addition, another attempt was made to test the frequency at which the students of

tourism and recreation participated in passive recreational activities. The t-test concluded that there was a difference between the students of the two departments only in two types of passive recreational activities, namely “I go on a picnic” and “I go to coffee houses” ($p < 0,05$). There was a statistically significant difference between the students in their responses to these two statements ($p < 0,05$) (Table 3). An analysis of the arithmetic mean values concerning the two statements suggests that the students were not willing to carry out these

passive recreational activities. It is possible to consider these recreational activities as social activities rather than individual ones. A look at the arithmetic mean values concerning the statements on passive recreational activities included in Table 3 suggests that the students of both departments were frequently involved in such individual passive recreational activities as reading a book, watching TV,

listening to music and shopping. The arithmetic mean values of all the statements were below the median (3). This figure suggests that the participants were frequently involved in these activities. Even so, it is an interesting finding that the students of both departments were unwilling to get involved in going on a picnic, going to coffee houses and playing a musical instrument.

Table 3. The Differentiation in the Frequency of Participation in Passive Recreational Activities

Statements	Departments	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	T Value	Significance
I read books, magazines and newspapers.	Tourism	2,146	0,961	-0,126	-1,137	0,256
	Recreation	2,272	1,022			
I watch TV, video or listen to music.	Tourism	1,650	0,729	-0,150	-1,676	0,095
	Recreation	1,801	0,881			
I take part in social-cultural activities such as cinema, theatre etc.	Tourism	2,630	0,982	0,027	0,247	0,805
	Recreation	2,602	1,025			
I go on a picnic.	Tourism	3,650	0,951	0,389	3,493	0,001*
	Recreation	3,261	1,030			
I go shopping.	Tourism	2,274	0,972	-0,169	-1,437	0,152
	Recreation	2,443	1,140			
I piddle around in downtown.	Tourism	3,684	1,112	0,008	0,067	0,947
	Recreation	3,676	1,247			
I go to coffee houses.	Tourism	4,411	1,087	0,450	3,355	0,001*
	Recreation	3,960	1,323			
I go to cafes.	Tourism	2,904	1,065	0,034	0,285	0,776
	Recreation	2,869	1,110			
I play a musical instrument.	Tourism	4,342	1,147	0,262	1,905	0,058
	Recreation	4,079	1,328			
I chat with my friends	Tourism	1,541	0,847	-0,066	-0,695	0,487
	Recreation	1,608	0,868			

*Significance level: $p < 0,05$

Ranking: 1- Always; 2-Often; 3-Sometimes; 4-Rarely; 5-Never.

The passive recreational activity that the participants most frequently carried out was chatting with friends (Table 3). This frequency was reflected by the arithmetic mean values of their responses to the statement "I chat with my friends" (Tourism,

1,541; Recreation, 1,608). This finding is quite reasonable seeing that students spend long hours together either at home or dormitory and that the activity requires neither physical action nor money.

Table 4. The Results of the T-Test on the Differentiation between the Departments in the Frequency of Participation in Active and Passive Recreational Activities

Statements	Departments	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	T Value	Significance
Passive Recreational Activities	Tourism	2,923	0,515	0,066	1,120	0,264
	Recreation	2,857	0,537			
Passive Recreational Activities	Tourism	4,077	0,600	0,674	9,077	0,000*
	Recreation	3,402	0,733			

*Significance level: $p < 0,05$

Table 4 presents the distribution of active and passive recreational activities between the departments. Regardless of their department, the participants participated in passive recreational activities at similar levels of frequency (Tourism: 2,923; Recreation: 2,857). On the other hand, the students of recreation (3,402) were more frequently involved in active recreational activities than those of tourism (4,077). Seeing that students of tourism are mainly subject to theoretical courses, they are

more likely to get involved in these branches as just hobbies.

Table 5 presents the arithmetic mean values concerning the responses provided by the students of tourism and recreation to the statements on their desire to work in the fields of tourism and recreation. Except for getting assigned in entertainment venues and working in the field of tourism, the students of tourism were more reluctant to work in all of the fields than the students of recreation ($p < 0,05$).

Table 5: Choice of the Field to Work in

Statements	Departments	Mean.	SD	Mean Difference	t Value	Significance
I desire to be assigned in animation departments of hotels.	Tourism	3,075	1,434	0,683	4,329	0,000*
	Recreation	2,392	1,389			
I desire to work in the organization of nature sports.	Tourism	2,774	1,290	0,751	5,359	0,000*
	Recreation	2,022	1,204			
I desire to be assigned in entertainment venues.	Tourism	2,534	1,339	-0,204	-1,280	0,201
	Recreation	2,738	1,523			
I desire to work in the field of water sports, beaches, entertainment and recreation.	Tourism	2,431	1,191	0,488	3,758	0,000*
	Recreation	1,943	1,134			
I desire to work in the field of tourism.	Tourism	1,697	0,889	-0,206	-1,858	0,064
	Recreation	1,903	1,104			
I desire to work in the field of recreation and animation.	Tourism	2,938	1,390	0,642	4,116	0,000*
	Recreation	2,295	1,399			

*Significance level: $p < 0,05$

Ranking: 1- Always; 2- Often; 3- Sometimes; 4- Rarely; 5- Never.

A significant difference was observed between the students of tourism and recreation in their responses to the statement "I desire to be assigned in animation departments of hotels" ($p < 0,05$). A look at the arithmetic mean values of the responses suggests that the students of recreation (2,392) were more willing to work

in animation units of hotels than the students of tourism (3,075). In addition, the latter group of students was least willing to work in the field of animation. These findings suggest that students of tourism have more negative attitude towards animation.

Another significant difference was observed in the responses to the statement "I desire to

work in the organization of nature sports". A look at the arithmetic mean values of the responses indicates that the students of recreation were more willing to work in this field. Similarly, there were differences between the students of tourism and recreation in their statements on working in the fields of water sports, entertainment, resting, recreation and animation ($p < 0,05$). The students of recreation were more willing to work in all these fields.

An interesting finding is that there was no significant difference between the students of both departments in their responses to the statement "I desire to work in the field of tourism". Similarly, no significant difference was observed in their responses to the statement "I desire to work in entertainment venues" ($p > 0,05$). These findings suggest that the students of recreation were just as willing as students of tourism to work in the fields of tourism. However, this was not the case for the students of tourism, who were not as willing as the students of recreation to work in the field of recreation. Previous studies have also revealed that students of tourism do not want to work in the field of recreation (Batman and Kutay, 2008; Benli

and Karaosmano lu, 2005) and that only 2% of graduates of tourism are employed in the field of animation (Akta and Tarcan, 2002). The findings displays that the students of tourism were not get involved in recreational activities as much as the students of recreation did, which might be the reason why the former group of students was unwilling to work in the field of recreation.

Table 6 presents the results of the correlation analysis that was conducted to reveal the direction and degree of the correlation between active/passive recreational preferences and the statements on the field that the students desired to work in. The analysis did not yield a significant correlation between active/passive recreational preferences and the desire to work in the field of tourism ($p > 0,05$). This finding suggests that although the students of tourism and recreation had a desire to work in the field of tourism (1,816) their recreational preferences were not directly correlated with their desire. Furthermore, no significant correlation could be found between their passive recreational preferences and their desire to work in the field of recreation and animation (2,582) ($p > 0,05$).

Table 6: The Correlation between the Desire to Work and Active/Passive Recreational Activities

Statements	Ort.	S.S.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
(1) I desire to be assigned in animation departments of hotels.	2,702	1,446							
(2) I desire to work in the organization of nature sports.	2,371	1,303	0,436**						
(3) I desire to be assigned in entertainment venues.	2,650	1,444	0,323**	0,244**					
(4) I desire to work in the field of water sports, beaches, entertainment and recreation.	2,164	1,182	0,350**	0,450**	0,372**				
(5) I desire to work in the field of tourism.	1,816	1,021	0,276**	0,152**	0,292**	0,206**			
(6) I desire to work in the field of recreation and animation.	2,582	1,430	0,593**	0,300**	0,300**	0,340**	0,334**		
(7) Passive Recreational Activities	2,886	0,527	0,128*	0,112*	0,283**	0,160**	0,089	0,079	
(8) Active Recreational Activities	3,705	0,755	0,225**	0,282**	0,208**	0,284**	-0,050	0,206**	0,430**

* Significant Correlation at the level of 0,05 ** Significant Correlation at the level of 0,01
 Ranking: 1-Strongly Agree 5- Strongly Disagree

This was not the case for active recreational preferences of the students ($p < 0,01$). Thus, it can be argued that students who have a high tendency towards active recreational preferences are more willing to work in the field of recreation and animation than students who have a high tendency towards passive recreational preferences. There was a significant and considerable correlation (0,593; $p < 0,01$)

between the desire of the students to work in the field of recreation and animation (2,582) and their desire to be assigned in animation units of hotels (2,702) (Table 6). An overview of Table 6 suggests that the extent to which the students participated in active recreational activities had a larger influence on the field they chose to work in.

Table 7: The Influence of Active and Passive Recreational Preferences on the Field Desired

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Beta Coefficient	Beta Significance	F Value	R ²	Model Significance
Passive Activity	Recreational I desire to be assigned in animation departments of hotels.	0,039	0,521	8,743	0,046	0,000
Active Activity	Recreational	0,208	0,001			
Passive Activity	Recreational I desire to work in the organization of nature sports.	-0,012	0,840	13,839	0,074	0,000
Active Activity	Recreational	0,287	0,000			
Passive Activity	Recreational I desire to be assigned in entertainment venues.	0,238	0,000	15,696	0,084	0,000
Active Activity	Recreational	0,105	0,076			
Passive Activity	Recreational I desire to work in the field of water sports, beaches, entertainment and recreation.	0,047	0,429	14,344	0,077	0,000
Active Activity	Recreational	0,263	0,000			
Passive Activity	Recreational I desire to work in the field of tourism.	0,135	0,029	2,823	0,011	0,061
Active Activity	Recreational	-0,108	0,080			
Passive Activity	Recreational I desire to work in the field of recreation and animation.	-0,012	0,845	7,095	0,036	0,001
Active Activity	Recreational	0,211	0,001			

According to the results of the regression analysis presented in Table 7, only the desire to work in the field of tourism, one of the statements that constituted the dependent variables, could not be accounted for by the model in a significant way ($p > 0,05$). Even though the students of tourism and recreation were willing to work in the field of tourism (1,816), the extent to which they participated in recreational activities did not support their willingness. Their desire to work in the field of recreation and animation (2,582) and to be assigned in animation units of hotels (2,702) could be accounted for by the extent to which they

participated in active recreational activities only by 3,6% and 4,6% respectively. Those students who frequently participated in active recreational activities were somewhat willing to work in the organization of nature sports (R^2 : 0,074) and in the field of water sports, beaches, etc. (R^2 : 0,077). In addition, those students who frequently took part in passive recreational activities had a desire to work in entertainment venues (R^2 : 0,084). In this context, active and passive recreational activities preferred by the students of tourism and recreation had a partial influence on their desire to work in indoor entertainment venues (8,4%) and outdoor entertainment venues

(7,7%). The findings suggest that the fields that the students were willing to work in were in accordance with their recreational preferences.

CONCLUSION

Although there are many studies on how students of tourism perceive the sector (Airey and Frontistis, 1997; Kusluvan and Kusluvan, 2002; Aksu and Koksall, 2005; Roney ve Oztin, 2007), the number of studies on the departments of recreation and animation is relatively limited (Erdem, 2010). Similarly, there are a number of studies on the recreational preferences of university students in Turkey while the literature seemingly includes no comparative studies on the recreational preferences of students of tourism and recreation.

Students of tourism and recreation, two departments marked by activity and sociability, are expected to have active and social recreational preferences and to get frequently involved in such recreational activities. However, according to the findings of this study, students of tourism and recreation are frequently involved in none of the active recreational activities included in the statements. Besides, all of the passive recreational activities in which students of both departments are involved in are individual. A significant difference was observed between the students of tourism and recreation in the frequency of participation in active recreational activities ($p < 0,05$). The students of recreation had a higher tendency towards active recreational activities than the students of tourism. This is not a surprising finding, for students of tourism more often focus on theoretical courses at university whereas students of recreation take sports-based and practical courses.

It was found that students of tourism are unwilling to work in the field of recreation and animation as well as animation units of hotels. There is not a considerable difference between students of tourism and recreation in their desire to work in the field

of tourism or entertainment venues. However, students of recreation are much more willing to work in the fields of water sports, nature sports and recreation when compared to students of tourism. The main reason for this might be that students of tourism are not often involved in recreational activities and provided with a kind of education based on theories.

When it was tested how recreational preferences influence desires to work in given fields, a clear attitude have been displayed. To be continually participating in active recreational activities do someone more willing to work in areas of animation departments of hotels; organizations of nature sports; water sports, beaches, entertainment and recreation; and recreation and animation in general. Being continually participated in passive recreational activities are more likely to prefer work in entertainment venues. There is no effect of recreational preferences on willingness to work in tourism.

According to the findings of this research it is arguable that recreation students are more likely to be a part of sub-areas of recreation. Tourism students are not as willing as recreation students are. On the other hand, two groups are more willing to work in tourism in similar manner. Therefore, it can be expressed that recreation field is not so attractive for students of tourism, although tourism attract students of recreation just about as strongly as students of tourism. This is because; tourism provides good career opportunities for people from diverse educational backgrounds. But, to prefer work in tourism is not an output of recreational preference. It means that students who is participating all kind of recreational activities in daily life may tend to be a part of tourism. In direct contradiction, to prefer an occupation in the area of outdoor recreation was determined by participation to active recreation. In parallel with this identification, to tend getting a job in the area of entertainment venues was determined by participation to passive recreation. In the lights of these findings, some recommendations may count for schools and

professionals. Firstly, recreation departments genuinely support hotels to find workforce for animation departments. Secondly, tourism departments are a bit far from supplying workforce for recreation fields. Recreation schools must focus on the working areas of recreation and tourism to develop some relations with enterprises in order to find opportunities for their students. But, tourism students will see a more strong competition to capture an opportunities in tourism. Therefore, tourism schools must empower their educational system, to gain advantages for their students to take a job in tourism sector. Professionals of enterprises may call into question whether a candidate is being participated to active recreation or passive recreation when they take someone up to work. If the job is in an area of animation, natural sports, water sports or recreation and animation in general, someone must be preferred who have participated to active

recreation. If the job is in entertainment venues, a passive recreation-participated one must be retained.

The present study provides information on the tendencies of students of tourism and recreation to work in the field of tourism. In this sense, it will hopefully make a great contribution to the literature. Despite its significance, this study has its own limitations, as is the case for all scientific research. The first one is that the study was confined to Sakarya University. Therefore, the study could be extended to cover a larger sample in order to get more reliable results. It is also worth studying the potential influences of the frequency of participation in recreational activities on their tendencies to work. Finally, although the high percentage at which students of tourism and recreation participate in individual recreational activities is regarded as a reflection of their personal characteristics, it is still subject to research.



REFERENCES

1. Agilonu, A. and Mengutay, S. (2009). Model Determination and Recreation Services in Public Managements, *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 6 (2): 160-176. [Ağılönü, A. ve Mengütay, S. (2009). Yerel Yönetimlerde Rekreasyon Hizmetleri ve Model Belirleme, *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6 (2): 160-176.]
2. Airey, D. and Frontistis, A. (1997). Attitudes to Careers in Tourism: An Anglo Greek Comparison, *Tourism Management*, 18 (3): 149-158.
3. Aksu, A.A. and Köksal, C.D. (2005). Perceptions and Attitudes of Tourism Students in Turkey, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 17 (5): 436-477.
4. Aktas, A. and Tarcan, E. (2002). Importance of University Source Used for Personnel Recruitment in Hospitality Enterprises: A Research in Antalya, *Tourism Education Conference-Workshop*, 11-13 December 2002, Ankara, pp.523-532. [Aktas, A. ve Tarcan, E. (2002). Konaklama işletmelerinin personel temininde kullandıkları üniversite kaynağının yeri ve önemi: Antalya yöresinde bir araştırma, *Turizm Eğitimi Konferans-Workshop*, 11-13 Aralık 2002, Ankara, ss.523-532.]
5. Altunışık, R., Coskun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S. and Yıldırım, E. (2007). Research Methods in Social Sciences: with SPSS Applications, Istanbul, Sakarya Publishing. [Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S. ve Yıldırım, E. (2007). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri: SPSS Uygulamalı*, İstanbul: Sakarya Yayıncılık.]
6. Balci, V. and Aydın, I. (2006). Determining of the Tendencies Recreational Activity Participation of University Students in Turkey, *Journal of Sportmeter Physical Training and Sports Sciences*, 4 (1): 11-18. [Balci, V. ve Aydın, I. (2006). Türkiye'deki Üniversite öğrencilerinin Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılım Eğilimlerinin Belirlenmesi, *Sportmetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4 (1): 11-18.]
7. Batman, O. (2008). Hotel Management, Istanbul: Degisim Publishing. [Batman, O. (2008). *Otel İşletmelerinin Yönetimi*, İstanbul: Değişim Yayınları.]
8. Batman, O. and Kutay, O. (2008). A Research on profession perceptions of undergraduate tourism students in Kyrgyzstan: Current Status, Problems of Tourism Education in Kyrgyzstan and Solution Proposals, *National Tourism Congress*, Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University, 20 May 2008, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, pp. 105-112. [Batman, O. ve Kutay, O. (2008). Kırgızistan'da Turizm Eğitimi Alan Öğrencilerin Meslek ile İlgili Algılamalarına Yönelik Bir Araştırma, Kırgızistan'da Turizm Eğitiminin Mevcut Durumu, Sorunları ve Çözüm Önerileri, *Ulusal Turizm Kongresi, Kırgızistan-Türkiye Manas Üniversitesi*, 20 Mayıs 2008, Bishkek, Kırgızistan, ss. 105-112.]
9. Baker, D. W., and Palmer, R. J. (2006). Examining the Effects of Perceptions of Community and Recreation Participation on Quality of Life, *Social Indicators Research*, 75 (3): 395-418.
10. Benli, T. and Karaosmanoğlu, K. (2005). An Empirical Research related problems of Associated Degree and Bachelors Degree Students Completed Training in Tourism Enterprises, *Journal of Regulation*, Year 8, No 88. [Benli, T. ve Karaosmanoğlu, K. (2005). Turizm Sektöründeki İşletmelerde Meslek Stajını Yapan Ön Lisans Ve Lisans Öğrencilerinin Sorunlarına İlişkin Bir Alan Çalışması, *Mevzuat Dergisi*, Yıl 8, Sayı 88.]
11. Cakir, M. A. (2004). Developing of Career Decision-Inventory, *Journal of Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 37 (2): 1-14. [Çakır, M. A., (2004). Mesleki Karar Envanterinin Geliştirilmesi, *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 37 (2): 1-14.]
12. Colakoglu, T. (2005). A Study on the Leisure Time Habits of Academic Staff, *Journal of Gazi Faculty of Education*, 25 (1): 247-258. [Çolakolu, T. (2005). Üniversite Öğretim Elemanlarının Bo Zaman Alı Kanlıklarını Değerlendirmeleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma, *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25 (1): 247-258.]
13. Erdem, B. (2010). Attitudes of Undergraduate Level Tourism Students Towards Animation Sections of Hotel Enterprises: An Empirical Research, *Ege Academic View*, 10 (3): 1085-1113. [Erdem, B. (2010). Lisans Düzeyinde Turizm Eğitimi Alan Öğrencilerin Otel İşletmelerinin Animasyon Bölümüne Yönelik Tutumları: Ampirik Bir Araştırma, *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 10 (3): 1085-1113.]
14. Erdogan, C. and Zengin B. (2012). Determining of professional Tendencies of the undergraduate tourism students according to A and B type personality traits: Sample of Sakarya University, *11th Traditional Tourism Symposium*, 16.04.2012, Sakarya. [Erdogan, C. ve Zengin B. (2012). Turizm Lisans Öğrencilerinin A ve B Tipi Kişilik Özelliklerine Göre Mesleki Yönelimlerinin Belirlenmesi: Sakarya Üniversitesi Örneği, *11. Geleneksel Turizm Sempozyumu*, 16.04.2012, Sakarya.]
15. Hacıoğlu, N., Kaslı, M., Şahin, S. and Tetik, N. (2008). Tourism Education in Turkey, Ankara: Detay Publishing. [Hacıoğlu, N., Kaslı, M., Şahin, S. ve Tetik, N. (2008). *Türkiye'de Turizm Eğitimi*, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.]
16. Kayis, A. (2005). "Reliability Analysis", Multiple Variables Statistical Techniques with SPSS Practices, Edt. Seref Kalaycı, Ankara: Asil Publishing. [Kayis, A. (2005). "Güvenilirlik Analizi", *SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri*, Edt. Şeref Kalaycı, Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.]
17. Kir, I. (2007). University Students' Leisure Time Activities: A Sample of KSU, *Firat University Journal of Social Sciences*, 17 (2): 307-328. [Kır, I. (2007). Yüksek Öğretim Gençliğinin Bo Zaman Etkinlikleri: KSÜ Örneği, *Firat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 17 (2): 307-328.]
18. Ko, Y.J. and Pastore D.L. (2005). A Hierarchical Model of Service Quality for the Recreational Sport Industry, *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 14 (2): 84-97.
19. Korktas, K. S. (2004). Recreation and Leisure Time Assessment, Ankara: Nobel Press. [Korktas, K. S. (2004). *Rekreasyon Bo Zaman Değerlendirme*, Nobel Basımevi, Ankara.]
20. Kuslivan, S. and Kuslivan, Z. (2000). Perception and Attitudes of Undergraduate Tourism Students Toward Working in the Tourism Industry in Turkey, *Tourism Management*, 21: 251-269.
21. Lupu, E. (2011). Personality Traits, the Tendency Towards Irrational Attitudes and Their Connection with Physical Education Activities, *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29: 272 – 279.
22. Mansuroğlu, S. (2002). Determination of Leisure Characteristics and Outdoor Recreation Tendencies for Students of Akdeniz University, *Akdeniz University Journal of Faculty of Agriculture*, 15 (2): 53-62. [Mansuroğlu, S. (2002). Akdeniz Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Serbest Zaman Özellikleri ve Dinlenme

- Rekreasyon E ilimlerinin Belirlenmesi, *Akdeniz Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15 (2): 53-62.]
23. Mutlu, I., Yılmaz, B., Gungormus, H. A., Sevindi, T., Gurbuz, B. (2011). Comparisons of Motivational Factors That Effect Individuals to Participate Recreational Exercise with regard to Demographic Variables, *Selçuk University Journal of Physical Training and Sports Sciences*, 13 (1): 54-61. [Mutlu, ., Yılmaz B., Güngörmü H. A., Sevindi T., Gürbüz B. (2011). Bireyleri Rekreasyonel Amaçlı Egzersize Motive Eden Faktörlerin Çe itli De i kenlere Göre Kar ıla tırılması, *Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden E itimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 13 (1): 54-61.]
24. Muderrisoğlu, H. and Uzun, S. (2004). Recreational Tendencies of Students at Faculty of Forestry, Abant İzzet Baysal University, *Journal of Suleyman Demirel University Faculty of Forestry, Series A, No 2*, pp.108-121. [Muderrisoğlu, H. ve Uzun S. (2004). Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Orman Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Rekreasyonel E ilimleri, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Orman Fakültesi Dergisi, Seri A, Sayı 2*, s.108-121.]
25. Muderrisoğlu, H., Kutay, E. L. and Esen, Sevil O. (2005). Barriers in Rural Recreational Activities, *Journal of Agriculture Sciences*, 11 (1): 40-44. [Muderrisoğlu, H., Kutay, E.L. ve Esen, Sevil Ö. (2005). Kırsal Rekreasyonel Faaliyetlerde Kısıtlayıcılar, *Tarım Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11 (1): 40-44.]
26. Orel, F. and Yavuz, M. C. (2003). A Pilot Research on Determining Customer Profiles in Recreational Tourism, Cukurova University, *Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 11 (11): 61-76. [Orel, F. ve Yavuz, M. C. (2003). Rekreasyonel Turizmde Mü teri Profilinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Pilot Çalış ma, *Cukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11 (11): 61-76.]
27. Onder, S. (2003). A Research on Determination of Recreational Tendency and Demands of Students of Selçuk University, *Journal of Selçuk University Faculty of Agriculture*, 17 (32): 31-38. [Önder, S. (2003). Selçuk Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Rekreasyon ve Taleplerinin Belirlenmesi Üzerinde Bir Ara tırma, *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17 (32): 31-38.]
28. Ozdag, S., Yeniceri, M., Fisekcioglu, I. B., Akcakoyun F., Kurkcu, R. (2009). Recreational Time Evaluation Tendencies, Antropometric and Physical Fitness Level of Civil Servants, *Journal of Selçuk University Social Sciences Institute, Vol 22*, pp. 307-323. [Özda , S., Yeniçeri M., Fisekçioğlu .B., Akçakoyun F., Kürkçü R. (2009). Devlet Memurlarının Bo Zaman De erlendirme E ilimleri, Antropometrik ve Fiziksel Uygunluk Seviyeleri, *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Cilt 22*, s. 307-323.]
29. Ozisik, Y. (1998). A Research on Recreation Problems of Military Academy Instructors, Gazi University Health Sciences Institute, *Unpublished Master Thesis*, Ankara. [Özıkık, Y. (1998). Kara Harp Okulu Öğretim Elemanlarının Rekreasyon Sorunları Üzerine Bir Ara tırma, *Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamı Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara*.]
30. Rodgers, H. B., Patmore J. A., Gittins J. W. and Tanner M. F. (1973). Recreation and Resources, *The Geographical Journal*, 139 (3): 467-473.
31. Rogers, E., Creed P. A. and Glendon A. I. (2008). The Role of Personality in Adolescent Career Planning and Exploration: A Social Cognitive Perspective, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 73: 132-142.
32. Roney, S. A. and Öztin, P. (2007). Career Perceptions of Undergraduate Tourism Students: A Case Study in Turkey, *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 6 (1): 4-17.
33. Sabbag, C. and Aksoy, E. (2011). The Leisure Time Activities of University Students and Governmental Staff: Adiyaman Case, *Journal of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Social Sciences Institute, Year 3, No 4*, pp. 10-23. [Sabba , Ç., Aksoy, E. (2011). Üniversite Öğrencileri ve Çalışanların Bo Zaman Etkinlikleri: Adiyaman Örne i, *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Yıl 3, Sayı 4*, s. 10-23.]
34. Sahin, C., Akten, S., Erol, U. E. (2009). A Research on Determining of Vocational School Students' Participation to Recreation Activities, *Journal of Artvin Çoruh University Faculty of Forestry*, 10 (1): 62-71. [Sahin, C., Akten S., Erol U. E. (2009). E rdirir Meslek Yüksekokul Öğrencilerinin Rekreasyon Faaliyetlerine Katılımlarının Belirlenmesi Üzerine Bir Çalış ma, *Artvin Çoruh Üniversitesi Orman Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10 (1): 62-71.]
35. Solmaz, S. A., Turkay, O., Erdogan, C. and Korkutata, A. (2012). The Effects of Sociotropy and Autonomy Personality Traits on Willingness to Make a Career in Tourism, *3th. Symposium of Human Resources Improvement in Tourism*, 10-11.05.2012, Antalya. [Solmaz, S. A., Türkay O., Erdoğan Ç. ve Korkutata A. (2012). Sosyotropi ve Otonomi Ki ilik Özelli inin Turizmde Kariyer Yapma ste ine Etkisi: Turizm Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Ara tırma, *3. Turizmde İnsan Kaynakları Geli imi Sempozyumu*, 10-11.05.2012, Antalya.]
36. Talay, I., Kaya, F. and Belkayali, N. (2010). Effects of Socio-Economic Pattern on Recreational Demand: Sample of Bartın, *Journal of Geographical Sciences*, 8 (2): 147-156. [Talay, ., Kaya F. ve Belkayalı N., (2010), Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapının Rekreasyonel ve Talepler Üzerine Etkisi: Bartın Kenti Örne i, *Co rafik Bilimler Dergisi*, 8 (2): 147-156.]
37. Toffler, A. (1981). Fear for Future, (Translation: Sorgut S.), Altın Publishing, Istanbul. [Toffler, A., (1981), Gelecek Korkusu, (Çeviri: Sorgut S.), Altın Yayınevi, İstanbul.]
38. Turkay, O. and Korkutata A. (2011). Structuring of Recreation Education in Turkey: A Field Study on Perspectives of BESYO and Tourism Management Comparison, *10th. Traditional Tourism Panel, Sakarya University*, 15 April 2010, Sakarya, pp. 105-115. [Türkay, O. ve Korkutata A. (2011). Türkiye'deki Rekreasyon Eğitiminin Yapılanması: BESYO ve Turizm İletmecili i Bakı Açılarının Kar ıla tırılması Üzerine Bir Alan Çalış ması, *10. Geleneksel Turizm Paneli, Sakarya Üniversitesi 15 Nisan 2010, Sakarya*, ss. 105-115.]
39. Turkay, O., Solmaz, S. A. and Erkol, G. (2011). The Effect of Goal Orientation on Willingness to Make Career in Tourism: A Research on Potential Tourism, *2th. Symposium of Human Resources Improvement in Tourism*, 11-13.03.2011, Akdeniz University, Antalya, 228-247. [Türkay, O ve Solmaz S. A. ve Erkol G. (2011). Hedef Yönelimlili in Turizmde Kariyer Yapma ste ine Etkisi: Potansiyel Turizm Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Ara tırma, *II. Turizmde İnsan Kaynakları Geli imi Sempozyumu*, 11-13.03.2011, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Antalya, 228-247.]
40. Turkay, O., Solmaz S. A., Korkutata, A. and Erdogan, C. (2012). Recreational Preferences and Working Tendencies of Tourism and Recreation Students, *I. Recreation Research Congress*, 12-15 April 2012, Antalya. [Türkay, O., Solmaz S. A., Korkutata, A. ve Erdoğan Ç. (2012). Turizm ve Rekreasyon

- Örencilerinin Rekreatif Tercihleri ve Çalışma Eilimleri, *I. Rekreatyon Ara tırma Kongresi*, 12-15 Nisan 2012, Antalya.]
41. Tutuncu, O. (2009). Tourism, Recreation and Leisure Time Management, *Anatolia: Journal of Tourism Research*, 20 (2): 240-241. [Tütüncü, Ö. (2009). Turizm, Rekreatyon ve Serbest Zaman Yönetimi, *Anatolia: Turizm Ara tırmaları Dergisi*, 20 (2): 240-241.]
42. Van Doorn, J. (1982). Can Futures Research Contribute to Tourism Policy?, *Tourism Management*, 2 (3): 116-119.
43. Williams, A. M. and Shaw, G. (2009). Future Play: Tourism, Recreation and Land Use, *Land Use Policy*, 326-335.
44. Yaman, E. (2011). Functionality of Social Clubs According to Students In the Context of Recreation, *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences*, 2 (3): 35-48. [Yaman, E., (2011), Rekreatyon Ba lamında Ö renci Algılarına Göre Sosyal Kulüplerin İlevselli i, *Uluslararası Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2 (3): 35-48.]
45. Yeniceri, M., Coskun, B., Ozkan, H., (2002). A Research on Determining Leisure Time Assessment Tendency of Government Officers in Mugla City Centre, *Journal of Mugla University Social Sciences*, 2 (3): 35-48. [Yeniçeri, M., Co kun, B., Özkan H. (2002). Mu la İ Merkezindeki Memurların Bo Zaman De erlendirme E ilimlerinin Belirlenmesi Üzerine Bir Ara tırma, *Mu la Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Sayı 7.]
46. Yıldız, M., Sahan H., Tekin M., Devcioglu S., Yazar D. N. (2012). Examination of Recreation Levels of University Students with Regard to Various Variables, *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46: 320-325
47. Zang, L. (2004). Learning Approaches and Career Personality Types: Biggs and Holland United, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37: 65-81.
48. Zang, L. and Fan W. (2007). Do Modes of Thinking Predict Career Interest Types Among Chinese University Students?, *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 2: 118-127.
49. Zorba, E. (2008). Perspective and Development of Recreation in Turkey, *Journal of Gazi News*, September 2008, pp. 52-55. [Zorba, E. (2008). Türkiye'de Rekreatyona Bakı Açısı ve Geli imi, *Gazi Haber Dergisi*, Eylül 2008, ss. 52-55.]

