

Article

Investigation of Constraints to be Occured in Participation to the Leisure Activities of High School Students: Sample of Turkey

Cihan Ayhan ¹, Nurullah Emir Ekinçi ², Ilimdar Yalcin^{3,*} and Sihmehmet Yigit⁴

¹ Faculty of Sports Sciences, University of Sakarya, Esentepe Campus, 54100, Sakarya/Turkey; cihanayhan@sakarya.edu.tr

² Department of Physical Education and Sport, University of Dumlupınar, 43800, Kutahya/Turkey; ekinciemir@gmail.com

³ Department of Physical Education and Sport, University of Bingöl, 12000, Bingöl/Turkey; ilimdaryalcin@gmail.com

⁴ Department of Physical Education and Sport, University of Namık Kemal, Tekirdağ/Turkey; smehmetyigit@hotmail.com

* Correspondence: ilimdaryalcin@gmail.com; Tel.: +90 (546) 424 00 23

Abstract: The aim of this research is to determine the factors that may prevent high school students from participating in recreational activities and to investigate whether these factors differ within the scope of various variables. This study consisted of total 1459 (681 women and 778 men) student volunteers who educated in high school level. Sampling method was preferred for easy sampling. The face-to-face survey method was used to collect the data. The "Leisure Constraints Scale" developed by Alexandris and Carroll (1997) and adapted to Turkish by Gürbüz and Karaküçük (2008) was used to determine the factors that might prevent individuals from participating in leisure activities. The data obtained for the research were first transferred to the computer and then analyzed by SPSS packet program. The error margin level in the study was taken as $p < 0.05$. The cronbach alpha of the study was found to be 0.91. As a result, it was found that women participated in the leisure time more than men. It was also observed that the participants met with more leisure constrain in Turkey's eastern regions.

Keywords: high school; student; leisure; leisure constraints

1. Introduction

Today's education system is not only aimed at profession. Schools are obliged not only to provide information but also to socialize the individual. In this respect, leisure education is given importance by the education institutions in terms of evaluation of the non-school hours of the students. Where leisure education is not emphasized, individuals face various obstacles and use time inefficiently.

Time is a process in which events follow each other from the past to the future and continue uninterrupted beyond the control of the individual (1). Karaküçük (2005) emphasized that time is life and that the passage of time is equivalent to the passing of life (2). Leisure time is defined as the period of time spent for sleeping, eating and other compulsory jobs for the individual (3, 4, 5). This time period, which one can freely use for participation in recreational activities, must be out of time for all work and compulsory needs (6). Time availability and time management are critical to the organisation of leisure (7). Sivan (1997) defined this time as "a lifelong learning process that helps

people achieve through socially acceptable leisure activities their fullest leisure potential and desirable quality of life."(8). Time can be manipulated according to our needs (9). The need for recreational activities has an important place among these needs. The leisure time is becoming more and more important nowadays and it is located in the center of the life of people from almost everybody. Increasing levels of social welfare and better living conditions increase the leisure time of individuals in the society (10). According to Demir and Demir (2007), leisure and recreational activities are seen as a serious problem for every segment of the society (11). According to Kenioua and Boumasjed, (2016), students participate in recreational activities, improve their mental health as well as their positive contribution to behavior and personality (12). Leisure activities provide students with positive social behaviors and a quality lifestyle, as well as protecting the young population from harmful habits (13, 14, 15). Despite these positive contributions to recreational activities, it has been observed that individuals do not participate in such activities which are very important for them due to various reasons or they can not attend due to various obstacles (16).

The notion of "barriers" as expressed here refers to the reasons that are prevented or restricted by the individual's participation in leisure activities in the leisure time of the individual and are encountered by the individual (16). It is possible to talk about many social aspects in understanding the factors that prevent individuals from participating in leisure activities. These factors have been interpreted differently by different scientists. For example; Attendance to recreational events Alexandris and Carroll (1997) found age, Gratton (2000) found income level, Ekinici et al., (2014) found gender as a constraint (17, 18, 19).

The literature is replete with analysis extolling the role of schools, colleges, and universities in promoting leisure education and developing the leisure attitudes, values, and skills of young people. Yet the potential of schools systems to constrain the pursuit of leisure experience remains largely an unexplored frontier (20). In light of this information, the aim of this study is to determine the factor that may prevent high school students from participating in leisure activities and examine them in terms of various variables.

2. Materials and Methods

This section includes the model of the researcher, the group of the researchers, the data collection tool, analyzes, methods and techniques related to the solution of the data.

2.1. Research Model

The research was based on quantitative research design. General screening model was applied in order to arrive at a general judgment about the universe, in which the whole universe or a sample taken from it was scanned (21).

2.2. Research Sample

The research sample consisted of total 1459 (681 women and 778 men) student volunteers who educated in high school level in seven different regions of Turkey. There are 3 million 798 thousand students attending formal education in Turkey (22). According to Yazicioglu and Erdoğan (2004), the evaluation of a universe of 1 million people can be evaluated with a sample group of 384 persons. In this respect, the universe in our study is considered to be in relation to the sample (23).

2.3. Data Collection Tools

In this study, The "Leisure Constraints Scale" developed by Alexandris and Carroll (1997) and adapted to Turkish by Gürbüz and Karaküçük (2008) was used to determine the factors that might prevent individuals from participating in leisure activities (17, 24). It is a 27-item and 4-point Likert-type measure evaluating the factors that prevent participation in recreational activities. For each question, options were given: 1: "Absolutely insignificant", 2: "Insignificant", 3: "Important", 4: "Very Important" and were asked to select the most appropriate option from the research group. The Leisure Time Constraints Scale is collected under 6 subscale.

2.4. Analysis of Data

For the data obtained in the study, the SPSS package program was used and frequency (f) and percent (%) distributions of the variables were calculated. The histograms, skewness and kurtosis values were checked to ensure normal distribution of the data. The skewness and kurtosis were considered to be valued -2 to +2 (25). Therefore, the t-test and the ANOVA test were used. In significant different findings, the Scheffe test was used to determine which groups differed.

3. Results

In this section, findings about variables of study are included. Findings showing the distributions of the participant students according to their personal qualities were examined and interpreted.

Table 1. T-test results of students according to gender status variable

Leisure Constraints Scale	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	p
Individual Psychology	Women	681	11.20	2.70	6.05	0.00**
	Men	778	10.30	2.94		
Lack of Information	Women	681	14.05	3.75	4.54	0.00**
	Men	778	13.13	3.92		
Facilities / Service	Women	681	22.53	4.94	4.06	0.00**
	Men	778	21.40	5.50		
Lack of Friends	Women	681	7.84	2.37	3.59	0.00**
	Men	778	7.42	2.34		
Time	Women	681	11.06	2.83	4.84	0.00**
	Men	778	10.34	2.83		
Lack of Interest	Women	681	7.96	2.41	4.88	0.00**
	Men	778	7.34	2.45		

*p<0,05; **p<0,01

When Table 2 was examined, it was observed that there was a statistically significant difference between gender variables and subscales of the leisure constraints scale (individual psychology, lack of information, facilities / service, lack of friends, time, lack of interest) (p<0,05).

Table 2. Difference analysis of the regional variables of the students

		Sum of Squared	df	Mean Squared	F	p	Post-hoc test results
Individual Psychology	Between Groups	327,49	6	54,58	6,79	,000**	D-B, D-G, E-B, E-F, E-G
	Within Group	11669,98	1452	8,04			
	Total	11997,46	1458				
Lack of Information	Between Groups	394,05	6	65,67	4,45	,000**	E-A, E-B, E-C
	Within Group	21428,96	1452	14,76			
	Total	21823,01	1458				
Facilities / Service	Between Groups	814,95	6	135,83	4,94	,000**	E-B, E-C, E-G F-B, F-G
	Within Group	39871,33	1452	27,46			
	Total	40686,28	1458				
Lack of Friends	Between Groups	144,96	6	24,16	4,35	,000**	E-A, E-B, E-C, E-D, E-G
	Within Group	8048,79	1452	5,54			
	Total	8193,74	1458				
Time	Between Groups	195,35	6	32,56	4,04	,001**	E-B, E-C, E-G
	Within Group	11695,81	1452	8,05			
	Total	11891,16	1458				
Lack of Interest	Between Groups	114,12	6	19,02	3,18	,004**	B-F
	Within Group	8671,23	1452	5,97			
	Total	8785,35	1458				

A:Aegean Region; B:Southeast Anatolia Region; C:Mediterranean Region; D:Black Sea Region;
E:Marmara Region; F:Central Anatolia Region; G:Eastern Anatolia Region

*p<0,05; **p<0,01

Table 2 shows the results of the ANOVA test according to the region variable of the students who participated in the survey. According to region, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference subscales of the leisure constraints scale (individual psychology, lack of information, facilities / service, lack of friends, time, lack of interest) (p<0,05).

Table 3. Difference analysis of the leisure time variable of students per week

		Sum of Squared	df	Mean Squared	F	p	Post-hoc test results
Individual Psychology	Between Groups	144,12	4	36,03			
	Within Group	11853,34	1454	8,15	4,42	,001**	E-A, E-B
	Total	11997,46	1458				
Lack of Information	Between Groups	240,65	4	60,16			
	Within Group	21582,36	1454	14,84	4,05	,003**	B-E
	Total	21823,01	1458				
Facilities / Service	Between Groups	388,86	4	97,22			
	Within Group	40297,42	1454	27,71	3,50	,007**	C-E
	Total	40686,28	1458				
Lack of Friends	Between Groups	27,41	4	6,85			
	Within Group	8166,33	1454	5,62	1,22	,300	-
	Total	8193,74	1458				
Time	Between Groups	31,85	4	7,96			
	Within Group	11859,31	1454	8,16	,97	,419	-
	Total	11891,16	1458				
Lack of Interest	Between Groups	46,80	4	11,70			
	Within Group	8738,55	1454	6,01	1,94	,100	-
	Total	8785,35	1458				

A:1-5 hours; B:6-10 hours; C:11-15 hours; D:16-20 hours; E:21 hours and over

*p<0,05; **p<0,01

Table 3 shows the results of the ANOVA test according to the weekly leisure time variance of the students participating in the survey. According to this, there was a statistically significant difference between students have weekly leisure time and individual psychology, lack of information and facilities / service subscales (p<0.05).

Table 4. Difference analysis of variance of welfare level felt by students

		Sum of Squared	df	Mean Squared	F	P	Post-hoc test results
Individual Psychology	Between Groups	46,93	4	11,73			
	Within Group	11950,54	1454	8,22	1,42	,223	-
	Total	11997,46	1458				
Lack of Information	Between Groups	110,13	4	27,53			
	Within Group	21712,88	1454	14,93	1,84	,118	-
	Total	21823,01	1458				
Facilities / Service	Between Groups	198,32	4	49,58			
	Within Group	40487,96	1454	27,85	1,78	,130	-
	Total	40686,28	1458				
Lack of Friends	Between Groups	57,78	4	14,44			
	Within Group	8135,97	1454	5,60	2,58	,036	C-E
	Total	8193,74	1458				
Time	Between Groups	43,10	4	10,78			
	Within Group	11848,06	1454	8,15	1,32	,259	-
	Total	11891,16	1458				
Lack of Interest	Between Groups	16,08	4	4,02			
	Within Group	8769,27	1454	6,03	,66	,615	-
	Total	8785,35	1458				

A:Very bad; B:Bad; C:Normal; D:Good; E:Very good

*p<0,05; **p<0,01

Table 4 shows the ANOVA test results according to the level of welfare level felt by the students who participated in the research. According to this, there is a statistically significant difference between the level of prosperity felt by the students and the lack of friendship sub-dimension.

Table 5. Results of t-test according to the students' sport participation

Leisure Constraints Scale	Sport Participation	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	p
Individual Psychology	Yes	892	10.63	2.88	-1.46	0.14
	No	567	10.85	2.83		
Lack of Information	Yes	892	13.62	3.84	0.70	0.47
	No	567	13.47	3.90		
Facilities / Service	Yes	892	21.92	5.20	-0.06	0.94
	No	567	21.94	5.41		
Lack of Friends	Yes	892	7.64	2.37	0.10	0.91
	No	567	7.62	2.37		
Time	Yes	892	10.73	2.84	0.84	0.39
	No	567	10.60	2.86		
Lack of Interest	Yes	892	7.54	2.48	-1.65	0.09
	No	567	7.76	2.39		

*p<0,05; **p<0,01

When Table 5 was examined, there was not statistically significant difference between the *sport participation* of the students and subscales of the leisure constraints scale (individual psychology, lack of information, facilities / service, lack of friends, time, lack of interest) ($p>0,05$).

4. Discussion

In this study; determining the factors that may prevent students from participating in recreational activities, this constraints has been investigated under various variables. In this context, high school students who study in 7 different regions of Turkey, it has been examined whether there is a significant difference between leisure constraints scale and gender, living area, welfare level and doing sport status.

There are many factors that affect participants' participation in recreational activities. Gender, one of these factors, is an important part of social activity that restricts participation of individuals in recreational activities (26) and plays an important role in participation in leisure activities (27).

When the results of the t-test were analyzed according to the gender variable of the participants, it was found that there were significant differences between all the subscales of leisure constraints scale and female participants had the the highest constraints score in all subscales. Some work done on the relevant area, similar results were obtained as a result of this study, gender showed a significant difference on leisure constraints and it has been found that women are more likely to have constraints than men (28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34). When the related studies are examined, it is seen that women face more constraints than men in the current situation in the direction of the results of this study. It is thought that this may be due to the fact that families do not give enough support for their participation in recreational activities for girls, because society is over-pressing on girls and girls can not participate in activities freely (35, 36, 37).

When the analysis results were analyzed according to the region variable of the participants, significant differences were found between all the subscales of the leisure constraints scales and region. This result has different causes. In Western regions, recreation education is given more importance than eastern regions. Western regions have more facilities for leisure activities than the eastern regions (38). As there are cultural differences between regions, the perspective of recreation varies. In Western regions, recreation education is given more importance than eastern regions. Western regions have more facilities for leisure activities than the eastern regions (38). As there are cultural differences between regions, the point of view towards recreation is changing. Individuals living in the eastern regions face more barriers to recreational facilities than those living in western regions. This is thought to be due to the fact that the land in rural areas is less suitable than the urban area in terms of facilities and that the number of people living in rural areas is lower than those living in urban areas. This is because the rural areas are less favorable in terms of facilities (39, 40, 41). According to Arbel et al. (2009), Participation in recreational activities in areas with low income levels was less due to facility costs (42). When the analysis results were analyzed according to the weekly leisure time of the participants, significant differences were found in the individual psychology, lack of information and facility which is subscale of the leisure constraints scale. In the individual psychology and lack of information subscales, the highest constraint score is reached in individuals who do not have enough free time per week (6-10 hours). Since leisure time activities have positive effects on the mental health of the individual (43, 44, 45), participants with sufficient leisure time are thought to have lower scores of individual psychological barrier than other participants. It was thought that the constraints score for lack of information sub-dimension was high in participants with

limited free time, which might have been due to the fact that attendees did not go to recreation education due to lack of time.

When the ANOVA analysis results were analyzed according to the welfare level of the participants, it was determined that scale of leisure constraints had a significant difference in the 'lack of friends' subscale. As the level of welfare declines, it is seen that the barrier scores for lack of friends subscale increase. There were significant differences in individual psychology, lack of information, time, lack of interest, and facility subscales in some studies conducted in the related literature (35, 46). In some studies, it has been found that the level of income for participation in recreational activities is significant. It can be said that the living standards of the individuals with high income level increase directly or indirectly (16, 18, 47). It is seen that the results in the related literature do not show similar results with this study. It is considered that this is the reason why studies are applied to different age groups from the age groups applied in this study. When analysis results were analyzed according to participants' sporting situations, it was determined that there was no significant difference in individual psychology, lack of information, lack of time, and lack of interest which is subscales of leisure constraints scales. The study conducted by Alexandris and Carroll (1997) on university students is the result of the high level of lack of knowledge of participants in sporting events (17). In the study conducted by Soyer et al. (2017), there was a significant difference in the lack of interest subscale of leisure constraints scale (48). In the study carried out by Emir (2012), there was a significant difference between the individual psychology and lack of interest subscales of the leisure time scale (49). The results in the relevant studies do not seem to match the results of this study in terms of the relevant variables. According to the results of the research, female participants seem to be much more constraints than men. Therefore, in order to remove these obstacles, it is thought that it is possible to provide enough information about leisure activities with female participants, to provide the necessary facilities by various institutions in order to get their participation regularly, and to give the opportunity for families to participate in these activities.

5. Conclusion

The barrier that participants see in their leisure time is increasing towards the eastern regions. In the regions located in the east; increasing the number of necessary facilities, raising awareness of the mental and physical benefits of leisure activities of the people in the community, and raising awareness in this regard can significantly reduce the factors that prevent individuals from participating in leisure activities. This study applied on a large audience in Turkey, on the reduction or elimination of constraints to participation in recreational activities has an important place. In particular, the literature will contribute to increasing recreational facilities, making them more accessible, and enabling all segments of society to benefit from these activities.

Acknowledgments: This study presented in International Congress of Recreation and Sports Management in Mugla/TURKEY, 10-13 May 2018.

Author Contributions: All these authors contributed equally on study design, data analyses, and manuscript drafting.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Akatay, A. Örgütlerde zaman yönetimi. [Time management in organizations. In Turkish]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, **2003**, (10), 281-300.
2. Karaküçük, S. *Rekreasyon Boş Zamanları Değerlendirme*. [Recreation Leisure Evaluation. In Turkish]. Bağırgan Yayınevi, Ankara, 2005.
3. Kemp, K. & Pearson, S. *Leisure and Tourism*. Longman Press, 2. Great Britain, 1997.
4. Howe, C. Z. & Carpenter, G. M. (1985). *Programming leisure experiences: A cyclical approach*. Prentice-Hall Inc.
5. Parker R. & Downie G.R. Recreational therapy: A model for consideration. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, **1981**, 54(3) 22-27.
6. Demirel, M. & Harmandar, D. Üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreasyonel etkinliklere katılımlarında engel oluşturabilecek faktörlerin belirlenmesi. [Determination of the constraints on recreational participation of university students. In Turkish]. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, **2009**, 6(1), 839-846.
7. Burston, M.A. (2017). I work and don't have time for that theory stuff: Time poverty and higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, **2017**, 41(4), 516-529.
8. Sivan, A. Recent developments in leisure education research and implementation. *World Leisure & Recreation*, **1997**, 39(2), 41-44.
9. Barker, T.S. *Time and the Digital: Connecting Technology, Aesthetics, and A Process Philosophy of Time*. Dartmouth College Press, Hanover/Germany, 2012.
10. Kurar, İ. & Baltacı, F. People's leisure habits review: case of Alanya. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, **2014**, 2(6), 39-52.
11. Demir, C. & Demir, N. Bireylerin boş zaman faaliyetlerine katılmalarını etkileyen faktörler ile cinsiyet arasındaki ilişki: Lisans öğrencilerine yönelik bir uygulama. [The relationship between gender and factors affecting individual participation in leisure activities: an application for undergraduate students. In Turkish]. *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, **2007**, 6(1), 36-48.
12. Kenioua, M., & Boumasjed, A.E. Sport and mental health level among university students. *Physical Education Of Students*, **2016**, 20(3), 39-42. DOI: [10.15561/20755279.2016.0305](https://doi.org/10.15561/20755279.2016.0305)
13. Tuncay, S. Türkiye'de gençlik sorunlarının psikolojik boyutu. [Psychological Dimensions of Youth Issues. In Turkish]. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, **2000**, 1(1), 244-251.
14. Leifa, A.V. & Zheleznyak, Y.D. Influence of physical activity on students' life quality. *Physical Education Of Students*, **2017**, 21(5), 244-248. DOI: [10.15561/20755279.2017.0507](https://doi.org/10.15561/20755279.2017.0507)
15. Richmond, D., Sibthorp, J., Gookin, J., Annarella, S. & Ferri, S. Complementing classroom learning through outdoor adventure education: Out-of-school-time experiences that make a difference. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, **2018**, 18(1), 36-52, DOI: 10.1080/14729679.2017.1324313
16. Karaküçük, S. & Gürbüz, B. *Rekreasyon ve kent(l)leşme*. [Recreation and urbanization. In Turkish]. Gazi Kitabevi, Ankara, 2007.
17. Alexandris, K. & Carroll, B. Demographic differences in the perception of constraints on recreational sport participation: Results from a study in Greece. *Leisure Studies*, **1997**, (16), 107-125.
18. Gratton, C. *Economics of Sport And Recreation*, Sport Pres, London/U.K, 2000.
19. Ekinci, N.E., Kalkavan A., Üstün Ü.D. & Gündüz B. Üniversite öğrencilerinin sportif ve sportif olmayan rekreatif etkinliklere katılmalarına engel olabilecek unsurların incelenmesi. *Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, **2014**, 1(1),1-13.
20. Yankholmes, A.K.B. & Lin, S. Leisure and education in Ghana: An exploratory study of university students' leisure lifestyles. *World Leisure Journal*, **2012**, 54(1), 58-68.
21. Karasar, N. *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. [Scientific Research Method. In Turkish]. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 21.Baskı, Ankara, 2012.
22. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Öğrenci Sayısı. [Ministry of National Education, Number of Students. In Turkish]. Available online: <http://www.meb.gov.tr/ogrenci-sayisi-17-milyon-588-bine-yukseldi/haber/10675/tr> (accessed on 30 January 2018).
23. Yazıcıoğlu, Y. & Erdoğan, S. *Spss Uygulamalı Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. [Spss Applied Scientific Research Methods. In Turkish]. Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara, 2004.
24. Gürbüz, B. & Karaküçük, S. Boş zaman engelleri ölçeği-28: ölçek geliştirme, geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. [Leisure constraints scale-28: scale development, validity and reliability study. In Turkish]. *Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, **2008**, 7 (1) 3-10.
25. George, D. & Mallery, M.P. *Using SPSS for Windows Step By Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 2001.
26. Culp, R.H. Adolescent girls and outdoor recreation: a case study examining constraints and effective programming. *Journal of Leisure Research*, **1998**, 30(3), 356-379.

27. Moccia, F.D. Plannig time: An emergent european practice. *European Plannig Studies*, **2000**, 8(3), 367-376.
28. Shaw, S. Gender, leisure and constraints: Towards a framework for the analysis of women's leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, **1994**, 26(1), 8-22.
29. Jackson, E.L. & Henderson, K. Gender-based analysis of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, **1995**, 17: 31-51.
30. Misra, R. & McKean, M. College students' academic stress and its relation to their anxiety, time management and leisure satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Studies*, **2000**, 16(1), 41-52.
31. Han, W. J. *Leisure participation and Constraints: The Case of Korean Americans*. Doctoral dissertation. The Pennsylvania State University, USA, 2005.
32. Jackson, E.L. *Constraints to Leisure*. State College, PA: Venture Pub., Inc., 2005.
33. Santos, M.S., Hino, A.A., Reis, R.S. & Rodriguez-Anez, C.R. Prevalence of barriers for physical activity in adolescents. *Rev Bras Epidemiol*, **2010**, 13(1), 94-104.
34. Dias, D.F., Loch, M.R., & Ronque, E. V. Perceived barriers to leisure-time physical activity and associated factors in adolescents. *Ciencia & Saude Coletiva*, **2015**, (11), 3339. DOI:10.1590/1413-812320152011.00592014
35. Ayhan, C., Eskiler, E. & Soyer, F. Aktif sporcuların rekreatif etkinliklere katılımlarına engel oluşturabilecek faktörlerin yaşam tatmini ve yaşam kalitesi üzerine etkisi. [Investigation of the effects of constraints to be occurred in active athletes participation to the recreative activities on life satisfaction and quality. In Turkish]. *ERPA International Congresses on Education*, Hungary, **2017**, 164-175, Budapest/Hungary.
36. Raymore, L. Godbey, G. & Crawford, D. Self-esteem, gender, and socioeconomic status: Their relation to perception of constraint on leisure among adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, **1994**, 2(26), 99-118.
37. Harrington, M. & Dawson, D. Who has it best? Women's labour force participation, perceptions of leisure and constraints to enjoyment of leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, **1995**, 27(1): 4-24.
38. Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu. [Turkish Statistical Institute. In Turkish]. http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1013 (accessed on 5 February 2018).
39. Demirdöğen, A., Ören, M. N., & Alemdar, T. Türkiye'de Tarım Politikaları Kapsamında Sağlanan Destekler Ve Kırsal Yoksulluk. [Rural Poverty and Agricultural Supports within the Context of Agricultural Policies in Turkey. In Turkish]. *Ulusal Tarım Ekonomisi Kongresi*, **2012**, 10, 85-94.
40. Kartal, N., & Demirhan, Y. Türkiye'de Kentsel Yoksulluğun Kırsal Nedenleri ve Çözüm Önerileri Üzerine. [On The Rural Reasons of The Urban Poverty in Turkey and Solution. In Turkey]. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, **2014**, 15(2), 135-154.
41. Edwards, M.B., Theriault, D.S., Shores, K.A. & Melton, K.M. Promoting youth physical activity in rural southern communities: Practitioner perceptions of environmental opportunities and barriers. *Journal of Rural Health*, **2014**, (30), 379-387.
42. Arbel, J., Wood, L.J., Howat, P. & Giles-Corti, B. The class is always cheaper on the other side: Socioeconomic discrepancies in the cost of using recreational facilities. *Annals of Leisure Research*, **2009**, (12), 83-88.
43. Kara, A., İzci, E. & Murathan, F. Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin serbest zamanlarını değerlendirme alışkanlıkları ve öğrenmeye ilişkin tutumları. [The habit of the evaluation of the free time and the attitudes toward learning of the physical education teachers. In Turkish]. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, **2011**, 6, (1), 958-987.
44. Gümüş, H. & Özgül, S.A. Development of scales for barriers to participation and preference factors in the use of recreation area. *Journal of Human Sciences*, **2017**, 14(1), 865-882.
45. Karakaş, G., Kolayış, İ. E., & Eskiler, E. Yüzme Egzersizine Katılan Kadınların Egzersiz Motivasyonlarının İncelenmesi. [Investgation of exercise motivations' women participating in swimming exercise. In Turkish]. III. Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Kongresi, Eskişehir, 5-7 November 2015.
46. Tolukan, E. & Yılmaz, B. Özel yetenekle ilgili bölümlerde okuyan öğrencilerin rekreasyonel aktivitelere katılımlarına engel olabilecek unsurların belirlenmesi. [Determining the factors which can prevent recreational participation of university students who attend to the departments according to special skill exams. In Turkish]. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, **2014**, Special Issue(1), 525-539.
47. Dong, E. & Chick, G. Leisure constraints in six chinese cities. *Leisure Sciences*, **2012**, (34), 417-435.
48. Soyer, F., Yıldız, N. O., Harmandar Demirel, D., Serdar, E., Demirel, M., Ayhan, C. & Demirhan, Ö. Üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreatif etkinliklere katılımlarına engel teşkil eden faktörler ile katılımcıların yaşam doyumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. [The investigation of the relationship between the factors that prevent university students from attending to the recreational activities and the life satisfaction of the participants. In Turkish]. *Journal of Human Sciences*, **2017**, 14(2), 2035-2046. DOI:10.14687/jhs.v14i2.4647
49. Emir, E. *Rekreatif etkinliklere katılımın önündeki engellerin belirlenmesi: üniversite öğrencileri örneği*. [Determination of constraints against participate in recreational activities: Perspectives of university students. In Turkish]. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Trabzon, December 2012.