



Feyza Meryem Kara

Kırıkkale University, fmkara@kku.edu.tr, Kırıkkale-Turkey

Behlül Özdedeoğlu

Başkent University, bozdedeoğlu@baskent.edu.tr, Ankara-Turkey

<http://dx.doi.org/10.12739/NWSA.2017.12.3.2B0109>

EXAMINATION OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEISURE BOREDOM AND LEISURE CONSTRAINTS

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to analyze the relation between leisure boredom and leisure constraints in individuals, who are participants/non-participants of recreational activities and living in Ankara, and the relation between leisure boredom and leisure constraints in terms of demographic variables. 238 people who living in Turkey, Ankara city (Altındağ, Çankaya, Etimegut and Mamak)-participant/non-participant of recreational activities- 152 women and 86 male participated in this study. As a data collection tool, "Leisure Boredom Scale" and "Leisure Constraints Questionnaire-18", were used. Data were analyzed by using descriptive statistical methods, ANOVA and Pearson Correlation test. In addition, research results showed that participants' scores obtained from "Leisure Boredom Scale" and "Leisure Constraints Questionnaire-18", there was a statistically significant difference in gender, marital status and age variables, and there was a significant relationship between these variables ($p < 0.05$). As a result, it was determined that there was a statistically significant and positive relationship between leisure boredom and leisure constraints ($p < 0.05$).

Keywords: Leisure, Leisure Boredom, Leisure Constraints, Physical Activity, Recreation

SERBEST ZAMANDA SIKILMA ALGISI VE ALGILANAN ENGELLER ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİNİN İNCELENMESİ

ÖZ

Bu araştırmanın amacı Ankara'da rekreasyonel aktivitelere katılan/katılmayan bireylerde serbest zamanda sıkılma algısı ile algılanan engeller arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırma ve serbest zamanda sıkılma algısı ve algılanan engellerin farklı demografik değişkenler arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesidir. Çalışmaya Türkiye'nin Ankara ilinde yaşayan ve Ankara'nın çeşitli semtlerinde (Altındağ, Çankaya, Etimegut ve Mamak) ikamet eden rekreasyonel etkinliklere katılan/katılmayan 152 kadın ve 86 erkek toplam 238 kişi katılmıştır. Araştırmada veri toplama aracı olarak, Serbest Zamanda Sıkılma Algısı Ölçeği ve "Boş Zaman Engelleri Ölçeği-18" kullanılmıştır. Veriler; betimsel istatistik yöntemler, ANOVA ve Pearson Correlation testi kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Ayrıca araştırma sonucunda, katılımcıların "Serbest Zamanda Sıkılma Algısı Ölçeği" ve "Boş Zaman Engelleri Ölçeği-18"nden aldıkları puanların cinsiyet, medeni durum ve yaş değişkenlerine göre anlamlı bir şekilde farklılaştığı ve aralarında anlamlı ilişkilerin olduğu görülmüştür ($p < 0.05$). Sonuç olarak, katılımcıların serbest zamanda sıkılma algıları ile algılanan engeller arasında anlamlı ve pozitif bir ilişki saptanmıştır ($p < 0.05$).

Anahtar Kelimeler: Serbest Zaman, Sıkılma Algısı, Algılanan Engeller, Fiziksel Aktivite, Rekreasyon

How to Cite:

Kara, F.M. ve Özdedeoğlu, B., (2017). Examination of Relationship Between Leisure Boredom and Leisure Constraints, *Sport Sciences (NWSASPS)*, 12(3): 24-36, DOI: 10.12739/NWSA.2017.12.3.2B0109.



1. INTRODUCTION

Leisure activities, which are based on voluntary participation for people to spend their leisure time with more quality individually or collectively (Kraus and Bates, 1975; Jensen, 1977; Houlihan, 1997; Mull, Bayless and Jamieson, 2005; Torkildsen, 2005), may have different meanings for individuals; the same activity could develop different thoughts and emotions in each individual (Godbey, 1999; Howard and Young, 2002). Research shows that the quality of time people spend during the leisure activity and positive experiences are one of the key variables in the continuity of these activities (Searle, MacTavish, Brayley, 1993; Beggs and Elkins, 2010; Aran, 2014). The main reasons that lead individuals to leisure participation can be expressed as; escaping from the routine of everyday life, reducing stress, physical and mental well-being, and the desire to feel good and socialize (Banda, Bradley and Bryant, 1991). In this context, identification of individuals' motivation to participate in leisure activities and providing satisfaction are crucial for individuals to achieve personal satisfaction and making these activities sustainable. Time slots individuals reserve for leisure activities constitute the period of time they can express themselves in the best way (McLean, Hurd, Rogers and Kraus, 2008). However, individuals encounter some problems participating in leisure activities. According to the studies, the question why individuals can't continue these activities or which factors are behind this issue has been asked very commonly in recent years. At this juncture the concept of boredom is examined via in-depth analysis in the related literature.

The concept of leisure time boredom is defined as individuals' being devoid of leisure activities that help them spend meaningful/quality time or not participating in these activities/not being able to creating alternatives although having excessive leisure time (Iso-Ahola and Wessinger 1987; Russel, 1996; Shaw, 1996). Mikulas and Vodanovich (1993), on the other hand, describe the concept of boredom as "the state of low or insufficient stimulation or dissatisfaction." From this viewpoint, the concept of boredom is defined as a situation and an emotional state and often specified a personality feature (Vodanovich, 2003). Vodanovich and Watt (1999) express that boredom in leisure time is associated generally with the amount of time and individuals' poor time management skills. "Therefore, previous research characterize boredom as an incoherent concept with low comparability, a term that lacks a common definition, and as an ambiguous concept of which generalization efforts often cause loss of meaning" (Kara, Gürbüz and Öncü, 2014).

From this viewpoint, it is considered that dissatisfaction in leisure time activities, obliviousness to different leisure time activities -or in other words, having low stimulation levels cause individuals to perceive constraints in leisure time (Oh, Caldwell and Oh, 2011). In the end, investigating the connection between the concept of boredom and "reasons encountered by individuals and reasons that prevent or restrict them from participating in leisure activities during leisure time" (Gürbüz and Karaküçük, 2007) becomes crucial. In fact, it is emphasized that individuals can't participate in these activities due to leisure time constraints or various reasons (Alexandris and Carroll, 1997). These constraints are factors that prevent people from participating in leisure time activities, reduce the number (recurrence) of these activities, decrease motivation, eliminate advantages of leisure time services, and keep people from doing what is good for them (Jackson, 1988; Jackson and Henderson, 1995; Mannel and Loucks-Aktison, 2005, Scott 2005). Factors keeping



people from participating in leisure time activities are listed by Crawford and Godbey (1987) in three groups hierarchized as personal, interpersonal, and structural. The person who wants to participate in an activity firstly encounters personal constraints. Personal constraints include a person's mental state and behavior such as stress, anxiety, fatigue or depression. Interpersonal constraints include lack of family and friends in the activity. Structural factors that influence leisure time behavior are money, time, access, geographical conditions, etc. (Crawford and Godbey, 1987; Crawford, Jackson and Godbey, 1991). While structural constraints have less influence on leisure time behavior, personal and interpersonal factors have significant influence on leisure time (Jackson, 2005). Researchers found out that personal and interpersonal factors influence the process of determining leisure time activities, while structural factors play a significant role in the process of participating in the those activities (Crawford, Jackson and Godbey, 1991). The focus of many studies describing the perceived constraints are shaped as individual/psychological, social knowledge, access/services, lack of partners, shortage of time and interest (Crawford and Godbey, 1987; Crawford, Jackson and Godbey, 1991; Jackson, 1988; Jackson and Henderson, 1995; Mannel and Loucks-Aktison, 2005; Scott, 2005).

In this context, leisure time constraints come up in the literature as a popular research topic in the recent history and the factors that influence these constraints become highly important. In light of this information, this study aims to investigate the relation between the concept of boredom in leisure time and perceived constraints among people living in Ankara, who does and does not participate in leisure activities individually or as a group.

2. RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE

While the concept of leisure time is seen as a huge step in improving quality of life for people, inadequate efforts regarding where and how these activities will be realized constitutes one of the biggest problems of 20th century (Torkildsen, 2005). When leisure time, which is an integral part of human life, is used effectively; positive results such as protection of individuals' physical and mental health, enhancing the joy of living, socializing, improving personal skill levels, raising productivity, developing creativity, and establishment of unity in the community can be achieved (Karaküçük, 2005). At that point, identifying the problems individuals face in participating in leisure activities is essential to increase participation and making the activities sustainable.

3. METHOD

3.1. Participants

The participants of this study were selected amongst individuals residing in various districts of Ankara (Altındağ, Çankaya, Etimegut and Mamak), who does and does not participate in leisure activities. The sample group consisted of 238 volunteers, of which of which 152 are female ($\bar{X}_{age}=24.52\pm 8.31$) and 86 are male ($\bar{X}_{age}=23.27\pm 6.47$) (Table 1).



Table 1. Demographic profile of participants

Question	Group	n	%
Gender	Male	152	63.9
	Female	86	36.1
Marital Status	Single	145	60.9
	Married	93	39.1
Education Status	Associate Degree	19	8.0
	Bachelor's Degree	113	47.5
	Post Graduate Degree	106	44.5
Economic Status	0-1000TL	51	21.4
	10001-2000TL	34	14.3
	2001-3000TL	70	29.4
	3001-upper	83	34.9
Age	20 <	66	27.7
	21-30	139	58.4
	31-40	20	8.4
	41-50	7	2.9
	50 >	6	2.5
Physical Activity Participation	Yes	156	65.5
	No	82	34.5

4. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

4.1. Leisure Constraints Questionnaire (LCQ)

In the study, "Leisure Constraint Questionnaire-18" was used as data collection tool. The questionnaire was developed by Alexandris and Carroll (1997) who examined factors that can constraint university students from participating in leisure activities; translated into Turkish by Karaküçük and Gürbüz (2007); and re-tested via confirmatory factor analysis by Gürbüz, Öncü and Emir (2012). The questionnaire consists of 18 items assessing factors that constraint participation in leisure activities. 4-point Likert-type grading questionnaire was used. Participants were given 4 options for each question: 1. "Absolutely unimportant", 2. "Unimportant", 3. "Important", and 4. "Very important". They were asked to choose the one that is most relevant to their views. According to the results of analysis performed in this study, it was determined that the internal consistency coefficient was .84 for the total questionnaire.

4.2. The Leisure Boredom Scale

Leisure Boredom Scale was developed by Iso-Ahola and Weissinger (1990) to examine "the personal differences in leisure boredom perceptions. The original scale has one dimensional structure, self-report style, and consists of 16 items with 5-point Likert-type grading. Validity and reliability assessment of the adult adaptation of the Turkish version was performed with original form by Kara, Gürbüz and Öncü (2014). It was applied on adult individuals from various professional backgrounds. The Leisure Boredom Scale consists of two subscales. "Boredom" subscale reflects the negative perspective against leisure time activities (I usually don't like what I do in my free time, but I don't know what else to do). "Satisfaction" subscale reflects the individual's positive perspective on the perception of leisure time (The idea of leisure time excites me). Only boredom sub scale used in this study. According to the results of analysis in this study, internal consistency coefficient was .62 for boredom subscale.



4.3. Personal Information Form

The personal information form developed by the researchers consists of questions about participants' age, gender, education, and participation in leisure time activities.

4.4. Data Collection

Scales were applied on participants via interviews by appointment. After getting necessary approvals, implementation of the data collection tools used in the study was applied on the participants of the exercise before exercise hours. Before scales were applied, researchers made necessary explanations for participants and it took approximately 10 minutes for each participant to fill out the scales.

4.5. Data Analysis

Statistical analysis within the scope of the research was carried out with SPSS 20 statistical software pack. Statistical methods used in evaluating the data were frequency, mean, standard deviation; Multivariate Analysis of Variance, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), Tukey's multiple comparison test, Pearson Correlation test. Skewness and Kurtosis (normal distribution of data) values and Levene (equality of variances) test results were examined in order to determine if the data satisfies the preconditions of parametric tests (Büyüköztürk, 2008). In cases where the assumptions regarding Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) were covered, One-Way MANOVA was used. In opposite cases, One-Way Univariate Variance Analysis (ANOVA) was used. When one-way MANOVA resulted in a significant difference, follow-up tests with ANOVA were performed in order to determine which dependent variables in the dependent variables set cause the significant difference. In cases where a significant difference was identified as a result of one-way ANOVA, pairwise comparisons were performed via the Scheffe test. The premise that suggests population variances and covariances among dependent variables are the same in all levels of independent variables was tested via Box's M statistics. It was seen that this premise was violated (Box's M:210.95; $F(13.95)=15.20$, $p>0.05$); it was assumed that this violation could have stemmed from not fulfilling the normality premise; during analyses the Pillai's Trace coefficient, which is not based on this premise, was used.

5. FINDINGS

The findings of the study are presented below in accordance with the hypothesis of the research. According to the results of analysis aimed to examine the relation between leisure time boredom and perceived constraints, it can be seen in Table 1 that 'boredom' factor has the highest average (4.40) and 'individual/psychological' factor has the lowest average (2.38) in Leisure Constraints Questionnaire (LCQ) and the Leisure Boredom Scale (LBS) (Table 2).

Table 2. Means and standart deviation of sub-scales

Variables	Number of items	N	Mean (M)	Ss
Individual/Psychological	3	238	2.40	2.40
social knowledge	3	238	3.33	2.45
Access	3	238	4.00	2.78
Lack of Partners	3	238	3.33	2.51
Time	3	238	3.67	2.71
Lack of Interest	3	238	3.00	2.54
Boredom	5	238	4.40	2.38
Total Scale	23	238	4.42	0.50

Table 3. Correlation analysis of all dimensions and participant's income of the study

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
F1	1							
F2	0.509**	1						
F3	0.562**	0.580**	1					
F4	0.464**	0.348**	0.348**	1				
F5	0.293**	0.312**	0.217**	0.297**	1			
F6	0.323**	0.467**	0.501**	0.252**	0.290**	1		
F7	0.123	0.152**	0.087	0.182**	0.019	0.028	1	
F8	-0.204**	--0.062	-0.150*	-0.096	0.071	-0.025	--0.040	1

F1: Individual/Psychological, F2: Social knowledge, F3: Access, F4: Lack of Partners, F5: Time, F6: Lack of Interest, F7: Boredom, F8: Income

According to the correlation between LCQ sub-scales (Individual/Psychological, Social knowledge, Access, Lack of Partners, Time, Lack of Interest) and LBS sub-scale (Boredom), a positive significant correlation was detected between lack of partners and social knowledge sub-scales and boredom sub-scale. However, negative significant correlation between the same scales and income variable was detected in 'individual/psychological' and 'access' sub-scales (Table 3).

Table 4. ANOVA results by age

Factors	Age	M	Ss	F	p	Significant Difference
Boredom	20>	2.41	.696	1.801	.129	-
	20-29	2.41	.861			
	30-39	2.21	.921			
	40-49	2.25	.805			
	50≤	1.60	.606			
Individual/ Psychological	20>	2.31	.700	1.163	.328	-
	20-29	2.47	.709			
	30-39	2.21	.642			
	40-49	2.52	.539			
	50≤	2.16	.781			
Social Knowledge	20>	2.40	.726	1.182	.032	20>/20-29 20-29/30-39
	20-29	2.47	.601			
	30-39	2.40	.705			
	40-49	2.90	.251			
	50≤	2.22	.958			
Access	20>	2.76	.694	1.376	243	-
	20-29	2.82	.577			
	30-39	2.65	.577			
	40-49	3.00	.000			
	50≤	2.33	1.03			
Lack of Partners	20>	2.54	.547	1.643	.164	-
	20-29	2.53	.517			
	30-39	2.28	.686			
	40-49	2.76	.317			
	50≤	2.27	.742			
Time	20>	2.68	.499	.344	.848	-
	20-29	2.70	.484			
	30-39	2.78	.329			
	40-49	2.85	.377			
	50≤	2.77	.910			
Lack of Interest	20>	3.98	.494	3.359	.011	20>/30-39
	20-29	3.96	.478			
	30-39	3.52	.967			
	40-49	3.88	.651			
	50≤	4.13	.500			



Besides, it shows that the main effect of age variable is significant only on LCQ sub-scales (Pillai's Trace $F(1.296)=1.324$, $p<0.05$). ANOVA results showed that LCQ sub-scales 'lack of interest' ($F(4.997)=2.837$, $p<0.059$) and 'social knowledge' ($F(4.997)=2.684$, $p<0.05$) differ significantly with regard to age main effect. In the sub-scales 'social knowledge and 'lack of interest' where a significant difference was detected, it was seen that the scores of participants under 20 were higher than those aged 30-39. Besides, it was seen that participants aged 20-29 scored higher on 'social knowledge' sub-scale than participants aged 30-39 (Table 4).

Table 5. Leisure boredom and leisure constraints subscales compared to gender, marital status, and physical activity participation

Factors	Female (N=152)		Male (N=86)		Single (N=145)		Married (N=93)		Participant (N=156)		Not Participant (N=82)	
	M	Ss	M	Ss	M	Ss	M	Ss	M	Ss	M	Ss
F1	2.45	.74	2.31	.61	2.53	.73	2.19	.59	2.37	.66	2.41	.76
F2	2.47	.65	2.41	.65	2.47	.65	2.41	.64	2.36	.66	2.49	.621
F3	2.84	.63	2.67	.57	2.62	.56	2.71	.56	2.74	.60	2.80	.64
F4	2.59	.51	2.36	.56	2.46	.56	2.58	.51	2.40	.53	2.55	.56
F5	2.72	.49	2.68	.47	2.69	.48	2.73	.49	2.69	.49	2.72	.47
F6	3.99	.47	3.83	.66	3.90	.52	3.98	.59	3.91	.54	3.94	.58
F7	2.41	.82	2.32	.81	2.46	.85	2.25	.75	2.35	.81	2.43	.84

F1: Individual/Psychological, F2: Social Knowledge, F3: Access, F4: Lack of Partners, F5: Time, F6: Lack of Interest, F7: Boredom

MANOVA results showed that the main effect of gender variable is significant only on LCQ sub-scales (Pillai's Trace $F(1.236)=2.152$, $p<0.05$). ANOVA was used to understand which dependent variable contributes to multivariate significance. It was concluded that 'access' ($F(1.236)=4.601$, $p<0.05$) and 'lack of partners' ($F(1.236)=10.010$, $p<0.05$) sub-scales differ significantly with regard to gender main effect; and in all sub-scales, female participants' scores were higher than male participants' scores (Table 5). Besides, the analyses show that marital status variable has significant effect on LCQ and LBS sub-scales [Pillai's Trace $F(8.229)=5.065$, $p<0.05$]. ANOVA results showed that 'boredom' ($F(1.236)=3.568$, $p<0.05$) and 'individual/psychological' ($F(1.236)=3.105$, $p<0.05$) sub-scales differ significantly with regard to marital status main effect; and single participants' scores were higher than those of married participants (Table 5). MANOVA results show that physical activity participation variable doesn't have main effect (Pillai's Trace $F(1.296)=1.761$, $p>0.05$) on LCQ and LBS sub-scale (Table 5).

6. DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to examine the correlation between leisure boredom and perceived constraints in individuals residing in various districts of Ankara, who does and does not participate in leisure activities. According to the results of analyses aimed to examine the correlation between leisure boredom and perceived constraints, considering the correlation results between LCQ sub-scales (Individual/Psychological, Social knowledge, Access, Lack of Partners, Time, Lack of Interest) and LBS sub-scale of "boredom," a positive significant correlation ($p<0.05$) was detected between lack of partners and social knowledge sub-scales and boredom sub-scale. According to these results, it can be discussed that lack of partners and social knowledge on available activities increase the perception of boredom. In this context, it is seen that there is a significant



correlation between the concept of socialization (which plays an important role in activity participation) and low stimulation from available activities. In fact, it was seen in the research that "the feeling of togetherness" increases commitment to the activity (Kara, 2015); and a significant correlation between social knowledge and individual motivation levels and constraint perception levels was detected in the research conducted by Alexandris and Carroll (1997) on university students' participation frequency in sports activities and sub-scales that constraint the participation. Thus, it can be argued that individuals' emotional state of motivation influence the perception of boredom.

On the other hand, the findings show that there is a negative correlation between income variable and 'individual/psychological' and 'access' sub-scales. Similar results were found in research conducted by Ekinçi, Kalkavan, Üstün and Gündüz (2014); and Emir, Öncü and Gürbüz (2013). Similarly; it is possible to relate the concept of 'access' to income among constraints. It is an important focal point for individuals to know how to benefit from a leisure activity. Individuals' ability to describe the satisfaction from the activity enables them to choose a direction of movement regarding preferences and satisfaction. In this context, it is foreseen that individuals may act according to their financial status when setting personal preferences for leisure constraints. Moreover, according to Gratton (2000) economy is the key factor in determining individuals' participation or demand in leisure activities. It is basically an individual's financial status to cover gym fees, transportation fares, costs of food and drinks consumed during activity, membership or participation fees, and money spent for equipment (clothing, footwear, etc.) (Kara, 2015).

Research findings showed that the main effect of gender variable is significant only in LCQ sub-scales. It was concluded that access, lack of partners, and lack of interest sub-scales are significantly differ with regard to gender main effect; and in all sub-scales female participants scored higher than males. These findings show parallelism with the findings of the research on university students conducted by Emir, Öncü and Gürbüz (2013). According to Moccia (2000) gender plays an important role in choosing leisure activities. According to Demir and Demir (2006), gender has minimal influence on participating in leisure activities. Alexandris and Carroll (1997) on the other hand, stated that leisure constraints -individual/psychological in particular, has more effect on women than on men. When Çoruh and Karaküçük's research (2014) is examined, it can be confirmed that there is a significant difference between students' gender and individual/psychological, time, and social knowledge sub-scales. In their study, Tolukan and Yılmaz (2014) found a significant difference between individual/psychological and gender; and between individual/psychological and lack of partners.

Similar results were obtained in several studies (Emir, 2012; Damianidis, Kouthouris and Alexandris, 2007; Amin, Suleman, Ali, Gamal, Wehedy, 2011; Özşaker, 2012; Koca, Henderson, Asci and Bulgu, 2009; Sönmez, Argan, Sabirli and Sevil, 2010) examining the correlation between the reasons of non participation in leisure activities and gender variable. In this context, it is obvious that female participants perceive "gendered space" (Kara, 2014) while perceiving leisure constraints. In fact, it is speculated that scales like lack of partners, which detract an individual from socialization trigger this condition. On the other hand, it can be argued that women's lack of interest in leisure activities stems from gender roles. In Turkish culture, women have to put off responsibilities such



as family and children in order to adapt to social life. In this context, it is considered that women's lack of interest is caused by the gender roles society imposes on them. In addition, various studies state that reasons such as being busy with work, being single and family responsibilities led to this situation (Kay and Jackson, 1991; Lee and Zhang, 2010; Mowen, Payne and Scott, 2005; Nyaupane and Andereck, 2008).

Besides, according to the results of the analysis, it was seen that marital status variable differ significantly in 'boredom' and 'individual/psychological' sub-scales; single participants scored higher than married ones. According to Shuta (1993) "leisure time boredom is the state of dissatisfaction the individual experiences when he/she cannot find anything to do alone or that would attract his/her interest." Vodanovich and Watt (1999) attempted to explain leisure boredom by difficulties that individuals experience in time management. At this point, they emphasized that leisure boredom is an approach associated generally with time, such as having too much free time, having too few activities to fill the free time, or lack of meaningful leisure activity. In the research conducted by Kara, Gürbüz, and Öncü in 2014, it was stated that perceived boredom in leisure time does not differ according to the marital status variable. When findings are evaluated in light of these statements, it is considered that single participants' having excess free time or having difficulty finding an activity to do alone result in this. It is possible to claim that participants' marital status doesn't affect their excitement for leisure activities, the need for trying new activities, or being active in the events they attend.

According to the findings, it was concluded that age variable differs significantly only in LCQ sub-scales 'social knowledge' and 'lack of interest. In the 'social knowledge' and 'lack of interest' sub-scales where significant differences were detected, participants under 20 scored higher than participants aged 30-39. In addition, participants aged 20-29 scored higher than those aged 30-39 in 'social knowledge' sub-factor. In Emir's research (2012), it was stated that leisure constraints vary by age; and students aged 24 and over scored higher than those under 20. In the research conducted by Alexandris and Carroll (1997), however, significant differences were observed between factors preventing the university students from participating in leisure activities and age factor, in sub-scales 'individual/psychological' and 'social knowledge. Also, participants aged 45-65 scored higher on the scale than those aged 26-35. Similarly, Pala and Dinç (2013) stated that seniors see 'time' sub-factor as a more significant constraint. However, in their study on university students, Demirel, Dumlu, Gürbüz and Balcı (2013) could not find a significant difference between participants' leisure constraints and their ages. In this context, it is seen that findings do not show parallelism with related studies. Yet, it is considered that this result, which is based on a small difference between mean values, stems from the fact that participants under 20 experience social knowledge and interest due to university preparation, and can't make time for leisure activities. In addition, it can be argued that 20s, which is very important in education and getting prepared for life, is also an important period of time in perceiving leisure constraints.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a cross-sectional research, this study was limited to the city of Ankara with the aim of determining the prevalence of a phenomenon or phenomena in a community; and examining the correlation

between those phenomena. Consequently, a positive and significant correlation ($p < 0.05$) was detected between participants' perceived leisure time constraints and perceived constraints. Besides, a relation between ages, gender, and marital status was also detected. As a result, when the findings about perceived leisure boredom and perceived leisure constraints are considered, it is seen that participating in leisure activities or ensuring continuity is a significant problem in Turkey. This study suggests working with similar sample groups in future studies in order to better understand the causes of these problems; to increase leisure boredom research; and understand the correlation between leisure time constraints.

NOTE

This study was presented at the 4th Leisure Research Congress 5-7 November 2015, Eskişehir.

REFERENCES

1. Alexandris, K. and Carroll, B., (1997). Demographic Differences in the Perception of Constraints on Recreational Sport Participation: Results from a Study in Greece. *Leisure Studies*, 107-125.
2. Amin, T.T., Suleman, W., Ali, A., Gamal, A., and Wehedy, A.A., (2011). Pattern, Prevalence and Perceived Personal Barriers Toward Physical Activity Among Adult Saudis In Al-Hassa, KSA, *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 8(6), 775-784.
3. Aran, S., (2014). A Case Study on Defining Leisure Time Motivation of Recreation Students. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 734-739.
4. Banta, T.W., Bradley, J., and Bryant, J., (1991). Quality and Importance of Recreational Services: Technical Manual and Survey. Corvallis, OR: NIRSA.
5. Beggs, B.A. and Elkins, D.J., (2010). The Influence of Leisure Motivation on Leisure Satisfaction, *LARNet; The Cyber Journal of Applied Leisure and Recreation Research*.
6. Büyüköztürk Ş., (2008). Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı (9. Basım). Ankara, Pegem Akademi.
7. Crawford, D.W. and Godbey, G., (1987). Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, 9(2), 119-127.
8. Crawford, D.W., Jackson, E.L., and Godbey, G., (1991). A Hierarchical Model of Leisure Constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 13, 309-320.
9. Çoruh, Y. and Karaküçük, S., (2014). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Rekreatif Eđilimleri ve Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılımına Engel Olan Faktörler. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, SI(1) 854-862.
10. Damianidis, C., Kouthouris, C., and Alexandris, K., (2007). Perceived Constraints on Extracurricular Sports Recreation Activities among Students. The Case Study of Schools of Livadia City in Greece., *Inquiries in Sports and Physical Education*, 5(3), 379-385.
11. Demir, N. and Demir, C., (2006). Bireylerin Boş Zaman Faaliyetlerine Katılmalarını Etkileyen Faktörler İle Cinsiyet Arasındaki İlişki: Lisans Öğrencilerine Yönelik Bir Uygulama *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 6(1), 26-48.
12. Demirel, M., Dumlu, Y., Gürbüz, B. and Balcı, V., (2013). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılımını Engelleyen Faktörlerin Belirlenmesi, 2. Rekreatif Araştırmaları Kongresi, Aydın, Turkey, *Bildiriler Kitabı*, pp:600-607.

13. Ekinçi, E.E., Kalkavan A., Üstün, Ü.D. and Gündüz, B., (2014). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Sportif ve Sportif Olmayan Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılmalarına Engel Olabilecek Unsurların İncelenmesi, Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 1(1):1-13.
14. Emir, E., (2012). Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılımın Önündeki Engellerin Belirlenmesi: Üniversite Öğrencileri Örneđi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Trabzon: Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı.
15. Emir, E., Öncü, E. and Gürbüz, B., (2013). Determination of Constraints Against Participation Recreational Activities: Perspectives of University Students, 55th ICHPER.SD Anniversary World Congress and Exposition, İstanbul, Turkey, 532, December 19-21.
16. Godbey, G., (1999). Leisure and Sexuality. In Leisure in Your Life: An Exploration. State College, PA: Venture.
17. Gratton, C., (2000). Economics of Sport and Recreation, London, U.K., Sport Press.
18. Gürbüz, B. and Karaküçük, S., (2007). Boş Zaman Engelleri Ölçeđi-28: Ölçek Geliştirme, Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması, Gazi Üniversitesi, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, XII, 1, pp:3-10.
19. Gürbüz, B., Öncü, E. and Emir, E., (2012). Leisure Constraints Questionnaire: Testing the Construct Validity. 12th International Sports Sciences Congress, Denizli, Turkey, 339-343.
20. Houlihan, B., (1997). Sport, Policy, and Politics: A Comparative Analysis. London: Routledge.
21. Howard, D.K. and Young, M.E., (2002). Leisure: A Pathway to Love and Intimacy. Disability Studies Quarterly. 22(4), 101-120.
22. Iso-Ahola, S.E. and Weissinger, E., (1987). Leisure and Boredom. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 5(3), 356-364.
23. Iso-Ahola, S.E. and Weissinger, E., (1990). Perceptions of Boredom in Leisure: Conceptualization, Reliability and Validity of the Leisure Boredom Scale. Journal of Leisure Research, 22(1), 1-17.
24. Jackson, E.L., (1988). Leisure Constraints: A Survey of Past Research. Leisure Sciences, 10, 203-215.
25. Jackson, E.L., (2005). Leisure Constraints Research: Overview of a Developing Theme in Leisure Studies. In E. L. Jackson (Ed.), Constraints to Leisure (pp:3-19). State College, PA: VenturePub., Inc
26. Jackson, E. and Henderson, K., (1995). Gender-based Analysis of Leisure Constraints. Leisure Sciences, 15, 1-11.
27. Jensen, C.R., (1977). Leisure and Recreation: Introduction and Overview. Philadelphia: Lea&Febiger.
28. Kara, F.M., (2014). Gendered Space; Recreation and Women. 13th International Sport Science Congress: Konya/Turkey.
29. Kara, F.M., (2015). Serbest Zamanda Sıkılma Algısının Yaşam Kalitesi ve Evlilik Doyumu Üzerine Etkisinin Belirlenmesi. Doktora Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara.
30. Kara, F.M., Gürbüz, B., and Öncü, E., (2014). Leisure Boredom Scale: The Factor Structure and the Demographic Differences. The Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise (TJSE) 16(2), 28-35.
31. Karaküçük, S., (2005). Rekreasyon Boş Zamanları Deđerlendirme, (5. Baskı), Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
32. Karaküçük, S. and Gürbüz, B., (2007). Boş Zaman Engelleri Ölçeđi-28: Ölçek Geliştirme, Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması, Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 1(3-10).

33. Kay, T. and Jackson, G., (1991). Leisure Despite Constraint: The Impact of Leisure Constraints on Leisure Participation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23, 301-313.
34. Kraus, R. and Bates, B., (1975). *Recreation Leadership and Supervision*, W.B. Saunders, Philadelphia, PA.
35. Koca, C., Henderson, K.A, Asci, F.H., and Bulgu, N., (2009). Constraints to Leisure-Time Physical Activity and Negotiation Strategies in Turkish Women, *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41.2, 225-251.
36. Lee, B. and Zhang, A., (2010). Women's Leisure and Leisure Satisfaction in Contemporary Urban China. *World Leisure Journal*, 52, 211-221.
37. Mannell, R. and Loucks-Atkinson, A., (2005). Why Don't People Do What's "Good" For Them? Cross Fertilization among the Psychologies of Non-participation in Leisure, Health and Exercise Behaviours. In E., Jackson (Ed.), *Constraints to Leisure* pp:221-232. Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.
38. McLean, D.D., Hurd, A., and Rogers, N., (2008). *Kraus' Recreation and Leisure in Modern Society*, Jones&Barlett Publishers, Sudbury, MA.
39. Mikulas, W.L. and Vodanovich, S.J., (1993). The Essence of Boredom. *Psychological Record*, 43:3-12.
40. Moccia, F.D., (2000). Planning Time: An Emergent European Practice. *European Planning Studies*, 8(3), 367-376.
41. Mowen, A.J., Payne, L.L. and Scott, D., (2005). Change and Stability in Park Visit at Once on Straints Revisited. *Leisure Sciences*, 27, 191-204.
42. Mull, R.F., Bayless, K.G., and Jamieson, L.M., (2005). *Recreational Sport Management*, Human Kinetics, Champaign.
43. Nyaupane, G.P. and Andereck, K.L., (2008). Understanding Travel Constraints: Application and Extension of a Leisure Constraints Model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46, 433-439.
44. Oh, S.S., Caldwell, L.L., and Oh, S.Y., (2001). An Examination of Leisure Constraints, Participation in Creative Activities and Hobbies, and Leisure Boredom in a Sample of Korean Adults, *World Leisure Journal*, 43(2), 30-38.
45. Özşaker, M., (2012). Gençlerin Serbest Zaman Aktivitelerine Katılmama Nedenleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma, *Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 14(1), 126-131.
46. Pala, F. and Dinç, S.C., (2013). Kamu Kurumlarında Görev Yapan Personelin Serbest Zaman Etkinliklerine Katılımını Engelleyen Faktörlerin Belirlenmesi, 2. Rekreatyon Araştırmaları Kongresi, Aydın, Turkey, 632-637.
47. Russell, R.V., (1996). *Pastimes: The Context of Contemporary Leisure*. Madison, WI: Brown and Benchmark.
48. Searle, M.S., Mactavish, J.B., and Brayley, R.E., (1993). Integrating Ceasing Participation with Other Aspects of Leisure Behavior: A Replication and Extension. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25(4), 389-404.
49. Scott, D., (2005). The Relevance of Constraints Research to Leisure Service Delivery. In E.L. Jackson (ed.) *Constraints to Leisure*, pp. 279-93. State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
50. Shaw, S.M., (1996). Boredom, Stres and Social Control in the Daily Activities of Adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28(4), 274-293.
51. Shuta, V.J., (1993). The Definition of Boredom, as well as Boredom vs. Being Doomed. Retrieved From: <http://www.pdv-systeme.de/users/martinv/pgg/02R/02R048.html>. Inactive link. Last access: January 15, 2013.



-
52. Sönmez, G.A., Argan, M., Sabirli, T.N., and Sevil, T., (2010). A Different Leisure Activity for Turkish Women: Invitation Day. *World Leisure Journal*, 52(2), 94-103.
doi:10.1080/04419057.2010.9674634
 53. Tolukan, E. and Yılmaz, B., (2014). Özel Yetenekle İlgili Bölümlerde Okuyan Öğrencilerin Rekreasyonel Aktivitelere Katılımlarına Engel Olabilecek Unsurların Belirlenmesi. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*. (SI)1, 529-535.
 54. Torkildsen, G., (2005). *Leisure and Recreation Management*. New York: Routledge.
 55. Vodanovich, S.J. and Watt J.D., (1999). The Relationship between Time Structure and Boredom Proneness: An Investigation Between Two Cultures. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 139(2), 143-152.
 56. Vodanovich, S.J., (2003). Psychometric Measures of Boredom: A review of The Literature. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 137(6), 569-595.