

1 Article

# 2 Investigation of Constraints to be Occured in 3 Participation to the Leisure Activities of High School 4 Students: Sample of Turkey

5

6 Cihan Ayhan <sup>1</sup>, Nurullah Emir Ekinçi <sup>2</sup>, Ilimdar Yalcin<sup>3,\*</sup> and Sihmehmet Yigit<sup>4</sup>

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

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

11 <sup>3</sup> Department of Physical Education and Sport, University of Bingöl, 12000, Bingöl/Turkey;  
12 ilimdaryalcin@gmail.com

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

15

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

17

18 **Abstract:** The aim of this research is to determine the factors that may prevent high school students  
19 from participating in recreational activities and to investigate whether these factors differ within the  
20 scope of various variables. This study consisted of total 1459 (681 women and 778 men) student  
21 volunteers who educated in high school level. Sampling method was preferred for easy sampling.  
22 The face-to-face survey method was used to collect the data. The "Leisure Constraints Scale"  
23 developed by Alexandris and Carroll (1997) and adapted to Turkish by Gürbüz, Öncü, and Emir  
24 (2012) was used to determine the factors that might prevent individuals from participating in leisure  
25 activities. The data obtained for the research were first transferred to the computer and then  
26 analyzed by SPSS packet program. The error margin level in the study was taken as  $p < 0.05$ . The  
27 cronbach alpha of the study was found to be 0.91. As a result, it was found that women participated  
28 in the leisure time more than men. It was also observed that the participants met with more leisure  
29 constrain in Turkey's eastern regions.

30 **Keywords:** high school; student; leisure; leisure constraints

31

32

33

## 34 1. Introduction

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

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

47 people achieve through socially acceptable leisure activities their fullest leisure potential and  
48 desirable quality of life.”[8]. Time can be manipulated according to our needs (9). The need for  
49 recreational activities has an important place among these needs. The leisure time is becoming more  
50 and more important nowadays and it is located in the center of the life of people from almost  
51 everybody. Increasing levels of social welfare and better living conditions increase the leisure time of  
52 individuals in the society [10]. According to Demir and Demir (2007), leisure and recreational  
53 activities are seen as a serious problem for every segment of the society [11]. According to Kenioua  
54 and Boumasjed, (2016), students participate in recreational activities, improve their mental health as  
55 well as their positive contribution to behavior and personality [12]. Leisure activities provide students  
56 with positive social behaviors and a quality lifestyle, as well as protecting the young population from  
57 harmful habits [13-15]. The process of training of young generation target on proactive behaviors and  
58 attitudes is one of the main goals of promoting leisure activities based on diversification of  
59 motivation, improve of physical fitness and enhancement of motor skills [16-18]. Despite these  
60 positive contributions to recreational activities, it has been observed that individuals do not  
61 participate in such activities which are very important for them due to various reasons or they can  
62 not attend due to various obstacles [19].

63 The notion of "barriers" as expressed here refers to the reasons that are prevented or restricted  
64 by the individual's participation in leisure activities in the leisure time of the individual and are  
65 encountered by the individual [19]. It is possible to talk about many social aspects in understanding  
66 the factors that prevent individuals from participating in leisure activities. These factors have been  
67 interpreted differently by different scientists. For example; Attendance to recreational events  
68 Alexandris and Carroll (1997) found age, Gratton (2000) found income level, Ekinici et al., (2014) found  
69 gender as an constraint [20-22].

70 The literature is replete with analysis extolling the role of schools, colleges, and universities in  
71 promoting leisure education and developing the leisure attitudes, values, and skills of young people  
72 [23, 24]. Yet the potential of schools systems to constrain the pursuit of leisure experience remains  
73 largely an unexplored frontier [25]. In light of this information, the aim of this study is to determine  
74 the factor that may prevent high school students from participating in leisure activities and examine  
75 them in terms of various variables.

## 76 **2. Materials and Methods**

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

### 79 *2.1. Research Model*

80 The research was based on quantitative research design and descriptive cross-sectional study.  
81 General screening model was applied in order to arrive at a general judgment about the universe, in  
82 which the whole universe or a sample taken from it was scanned [26].

### 83 *2.2. Research Sample*

84 The research sample consisted of total 1459 (681 women and 778 men) student volunteers who  
85 educated in high school level in seven different regions of Turkey. Age averages of participants was  
86  $16.48 \pm 1.16$  years. The participants consisted of Aegean Region (13,2%), Southeastern Anatolia Region  
87 (12,4%), Mediterranean region (12,7%), Blacksea Region (14,8%), Marmara Region (15,5%), Central  
88 Anatolia Region (16,1%), and Eastern Anatolia Region (15,3%) in the regions of Turkey. All  
89 participants were informed of the research procedures, purposes of the investigation and gave their  
90 written consent prior to participation. There are 3 million 798 thousand students attending formal  
91 education in Turkey [27]. According to Yazicioglu and Erdoğan (2004), the evaluation of a universe  
92 of 1 million people can be evaluated with a sample group of 384 persons. In this respect, the universe  
93 in our study is considered to be in relation to the sample [28]. Research sample of current study was  
94 chosen according to Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics [29].

95

## 96 2.3. Data Collection Tools

97 In this study, The "Leisure Constraints Scale" developed by Alexandris and Carroll (1997) and  
 98 adapted to Turkish by Gürbüz, Öncü, and Emir (2012) was used to determine the factors that might  
 99 prevent individuals from participating in leisure activities [20, 30]. It is a 18-item and 4-point Likert-  
 100 type measure evaluating the factors that prevent participation in recreational activities. For each  
 101 question, options were given: 1: "Absolutely insignificant", 2: "Insignificant", 3: "Important", 4: "Very  
 102 Important" and were asked to select the most appropriate option from the research group. The  
 103 Leisure Time Constraints Scale is collected under 6 subscale. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients  
 104 for the total scale was found as 0.85. The cronbach alpha reliability was found as 0.91 in the current  
 105 study.

## 106 2.4. Analysis of Data

107 For the data obtained in the study, the SPSS package program was used and frequency (f) and  
 108 percent (%) distributions of the variables were calculated. The histograms, Skewness and Kurtosis  
 109 values were checked to ensure normal distribution of the data. The Skewness and Kurtosis were  
 110 considered to be valued -2 to +2 [31]. Therefore, the t-test and the ANOVA test were used. In  
 111 significant different findings, the Scheffe test was used to determine which groups differed.  
 112 Significance was set at  $p < 0.05$  and results were considered significant with 95% confidence interval.

## 113 3. Results

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

117 **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	2.80	.68	6.05	0.00**
	Men	778	2.58	.74		
Lack of Information	Women	681	2.81	.75	4.54	0.00**
	Men	778	2.63	.78		
Facilities / Service	Women	681	2.82	.62	4.06	0.00**
	Men	778	2.68	.69		
Lack of Friends	Women	681	2.62	.79	3.59	0.00**
	Men	778	2.48	.78		
Time	Women	681	2.77	.71	4.84	0.00**
	Men	778	2.59	.71		
Lack of Interest	Women	681	2.65	.81	4.88	0.00**
	Men	778	2.45	.82		

118 \* $p < 0,05$ ; \*\* $p < 0,01$

119

120

121 According to Table 1, it was observed that there was a statistically significant difference between  
 122 gender variables and subscales of the leisure constraints scale (individual psychology, lack of  
 123 information, facilities / service, lack of friends, time, lack of interest) ( $p < 0,05$ ). It was concluded that  
 124 the average scores in all sub-dimensions are against female participants.

125

126

127 **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&lt;0,05; \*\*p&lt;0,01

128

129

130

131 Table 2 shows the results of the ANOVA test according to the region variable of participants.

132 According to region, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference subscales of the

133 leisure constraints scale (individual psychology, lack of information, facilities / service, lack of

134 friends, time, lack of interest) (p&lt;0,05).

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148 **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

149

150

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

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170 **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

171 \*p&lt;0,05; \*\*p&lt;0,01

172

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

176

177 **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	2.66	.72	-1.46	0.14
	No	567	2.71	.71		
Lack of Information	Yes	892	2.72	.77	0.70	0.47
	No	567	2.69	.78		
Facilities / Service	Yes	892	2.74	.65	-0.06	0.94
	No	567	2.74	.68		
Lack of Friends	Yes	892	2.55	.79	0.10	0.91
	No	567	2.54	.79		
Time	Yes	892	2.68	.71	0.84	0.39
	No	567	2.65	.72		
Lack of Interest	Yes	892	2.52	.83	-1.65	0.09
	No	567	2.59	.80		

178

\*p&lt;0,05; \*\*p&lt;0,01

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

#### 182 4. Discussion

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

188 There are many factors that affect participants' participation in recreational activities. Gender,  
189 one of these factors, is an important part of social activity that restricts participation of individuals in  
190 recreational activities [32] and plays an important role in participation in leisure activities [33].

191 When the results of the t-test were analyzed according to the gender variable of the  
192 participants, it was found that there were significant differences between all the subscales of leisure  
193 constraints scale and female participants had the the highest constraints score in all subscales. Some  
194 work done on the relevant area, similar results were obtained as a result of this study, gender showed  
195 a significant difference on leisure constraints and it has been found that women are more likely to  
196 have constraints than men (34-40). When the related studies are examined, it is seen that women face  
197 more constraints than men in the current situation in the direction of the results of this study. It is  
198 thought that this may be due to the fact that families do not give enough support for their  
199 participation in recreational activities for girls, because society is over-pressing on girls and girls can  
200 not participate in activities freely [41-43].

201 When the analysis results were analyzed according to the region variable of the participants,  
202 significant differences were found between all the subscales of the leisure constraints scales and  
203 region. This result has different causes. In Western regions, recreation education is given more  
204 importance than eastern regions. Western regions have more facilities for leisure activities than the  
205 eastern regions [44]. As there are cultural differences between regions, the point of view towards  
206 recreation is changing. Individuals living in the eastern regions face more barriers to recreational  
207 facilities than those living in western regions. This is thought to be due to the fact that the land in  
208 rural areas is less suitable than the urban area in terms of facilities and that the number of people  
209 living in rural areas is lower than those living in urban areas. This is because the rural areas are less  
210 favorable in terms of facilities [45-47]. According to Arbel et al. (2009), Participation in recreational  
211 activities in areas with low income levels was less due to facility costs [48]. When the analysis results  
212 were analyzed according to the weekly leisure time of the participants, significant differences were  
213 found in the individual psychology, lack of information and facility which is subscale of the leisure  
214 constraints scale. In the individual psychology and lack of information subscales, the highest  
215 constraint score is reached in individuals who do not have enough free time per week (6-10 hours).  
216 Since leisure time activities have positive effects on the mental health of the individual [49-51],  
217 participants with sufficient leisure time are thought to have lower scores of individual psychological  
218 barrier than other participants. It was thought that the constraints score for lack of information sub-  
219 dimension was high in participants with limited free time, which might have been due to the fact that  
220 attendees did not go to recreation education due to lack of time.

221 When the ANOVA analysis results were analyzed according to the welfare level of the  
222 participants, it was determined that scale of leisure constraints had a significant difference in the 'lack  
223 of friends' subscale. As the level of welfare declines, it is seen that the barrier scores for lack of friends  
224 subscale increase. There were significant differences in individual psychology, lack of information,  
225 time, lack of interest, and facility subscales in some studies conducted in the related literature [41,  
226 52]. In some studies, it has been found that the level of income for participation in recreational  
227 activities is significant. It can be said that the living standards of the individuals with high income  
228 level increase directly or indirectly [19, 21, 53]. It is seen that the results in the related literature do  
229 not show similar results with this study. it is considered that this is the reason why studies are applied  
230 to different age groups from the age groups applied in this study. When analysis results were  
231 analyzed according to participants' sporting situations, it was determined that there was no  
232 significant difference in individual psychology, lack of information, lack of time, and lack of interest  
233 which is subscales of leisure constraints scales. The study conducted by Alexandris and Carroll  
234 (1997) on university students is the result of the high level of lack of knowledge of participants in  
235 sporting events [20]. In the study conducted by Soyer et al. (2017), there was a significant difference  
236 in the lack of interest subscale of leisure constraints scale [54]. In the study carried out by Emir (2012),  
237 there was a significant difference between the individual psychology and lack of interest subscales of  
238 the leisure time scale [55]. The results in the relevant studies do not seem to match the results of this  
239 study in terms of the relevant variables. According to the results of the research, female participants  
240 seem to be much more constraints than men. Therefore, in order to remove these obstacles, it is  
241 thought that it is possible to provide enough information about leisure activities with female  
242 participants, to provide the necessary facilities by various institutions in order to get their  
243 participation regularly, and to give the opportunity for families to participate in these activities.

## 244 5. Conclusion

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

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

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

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

258

259

260



261 **References**

- 262 1. Akatay, A. Örgütlerde zaman yönetimi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* **2003**, (10), 281-  
263 300 [In Turkish].
- 264 2. Karaküçük, S. *Rekreasyon Boş Zamanları Değerlendirme, 6th ed.*; Bağırğan Publication, Ankara, Turkey, 2008;  
265 ISBN: 9755810485.
- 266 3. Kemp, K.; Pearson, S. *Leisure and Tourism*. Longman Press: Harlow, United Kingdom, 1997; ISBN:  
267 0582292174.
- 268 4. Howe, C. Z.; Carpenter, G. M. *Programming leisure experiences: A cyclical approach*, Prentice-Hall Inc: USA,  
269 1985; ISBN: 0137292864.
- 270 5. Parker R.; Downie G.R. Recreational therapy: A model for consideration. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, **1981**,  
271 54(3), 22-27.
- 272 6. Demirel, M.; Harmandar, D. Üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreasyonel etkinliklere katılımlarında engel  
273 oluşturabilecek faktörlerin belirlenmesi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi* **2009**, 6(1), 839–846 [In Turkish].
- 274 7. Burston, M.A. I work and don't have time for that theory stuff: Time poverty and higher education. *Journal*  
275 *of Further and Higher Education* **2017**, 41(4), 516-529, DOI: 10.1080/0309877X.2015.1135885.
- 276 8. Sivan, A. Recent developments in leisure education research and implementation. *World Leisure &*  
277 *Recreation* **1997**, 39(2), 41-44, DOI: 10.1080/10261133.1997.9674066.
- 278 9. Barker, T.S. *Time and the Digital: Connecting Technology, Aesthetics, and A Process Philosophy of Time*,  
279 Dartmouth College Press: Hanover, Germany, 2012; ISBN: 1611683009.
- 280 10. Kurar, I.; Baltacı, F. People's leisure habits review: Case of Alanya. *International Journal of Science Culture*  
281 *and Sport*, **2014**, 2(6), 39-52, DOI: 10.14486/IJSCS177.
- 282 11. Demir, C.; Demir, N. Bireylerin boş zaman faaliyetlerine katılmalarını etkileyen faktörler ile cinsiyet  
283 arasındaki ilişki: Lisans öğrencilerine yönelik bir uygulama. *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, **2007**, 6(1), 36-48 [In  
284 Turkish].
- 285 12. Kenioua, M.; Boumasjed, A.E. Sport and mental health level among university students. *Physical Education*  
286 *of Students* **2016**, 20(3), 39-42, DOI: 10.15561/20755279.2016.0305.
- 287 13. Tuncay, S. Türkiye'de gençlik sorunlarının psikolojik boyutu. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü*  
288 *Dergisi* **2000**, 1(1), 244 -251 [In Turkish].
- 289 14. Leifa, A.V.; Zheleznyak, Y.D. Influence of physical activity on students' life quality. *Physical Education of*  
290 *Students* **2017**, 21(5), 244-248. DOI: 10.15561/20755279.2017.0507.
- 291 15. Richmond, D.; Sibthorp, J.; Gookin, J.; Annarella, S.; Ferri, S. Complementing classroom learning through  
292 outdoor adventure education: Out-of-school-time experiences that make a difference. *Journal of Adventure*  
293 *Education and Outdoor Learning* **2018**, 18(1), 36-52, DOI: 10.1080/14729679.2017.1324313.
- 294 16. Badau, A.; Badau, D.; Serban, C.; Tarcea, M.; Rus, V. Wellness integrative profile 10 (WIP10) - an integrative  
295 educational tool of nutrition, fitness and health, *Journal of Pakistan Medical Association* **2018**, 68(6), 882-887.
- 296 17. Badau, D. The educational impact of implementation the education through adventure discipline in  
297 physical education and sports academic curriculum. *Physical education of students* **2017**, 21(3), 108–115. DOI:  
298 10.15561/20755279.2017.0302.
- 299 18. Gorucu, A.; Tokay, B.; Badau, A. The effects of three different type of exercises on aerobic and anaerobic  
300 power. *Physical education of students*. **2017**, 21(4), 152–157. DOI: 10.15561/20755279.2017.0401.
- 301 19. Karaküçük, S.; Gürbüz, B. *Rekreasyon ve kent(li)leşme*. Gazi Bookstore: Ankara, Turkey, 2007; ISBN:  
302 9944165525.
- 303 20. Alexandris, K.; Carroll, B. Demographic differences in the perception of constrains on recreational sport  
304 participation: Results from a study in Greece. *Leisure Studies* **1997**, 16(2), 107-125, DOI:  
305 10.1080/026143697375449.
- 306 21. Gratton, C.; Taylor, P. *Economics of Sport And Recreation*, 2nd ed.; Sport Pres, London, United Kingdom,  
307 2000; ISBN: 0419189602.
- 308 22. Ekinci, N.E.; Kalkavan, A.; Üstün, Ü.D.; Gündüz, B. Üniversite öğrencilerinin sportif ve sportif olmayan  
309 rekreatif etkinliklere katılmalarına engel olabilecek unsurların incelenmesi. *Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim*  
310 *Bilimleri Dergisi* **2014**, 1(1), 1-13.
- 311 23. Jordan, K.A.; Gagnon, R.J.; Anderson, D.M.; Pilcher, J.J. Enhancing the college student experience:  
312 outcomes of a leisure education program. *Journal of Experiential Education* **2018**, 41(1), 90–106, DOI:  
313 10.1117/1053825917751508.
- 314 24. Kawabata, M.; Chua, K.L.; Chatzisarantis, N.L. A school-based intervention program in promoting leisure-  
315 time physical activity: trial protocol. *BMC Public Health* **2018**, 18(1), 433, DOI: 10.1186/s12889-018-5320-1.
- 316 25. Yankholmes, A.K.B.; Lin, S. Leisure and education in Ghana: An exploratory study of university students'  
317 leisure lifestyles. *World Leisure Journal* **2012**, 54(1), 58-68, DOI: 10.1080/04419057.2012.668044.

- 318 26. Karasar, N. *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. 28th ed.; Nobel Academic Publication: Ankara, 2015; ISBN:  
319 6055426583.
- 320 27. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Öğrenci Sayısı. Available online: [http://www.meb.gov.tr/ogrenci-sayisi-17-milyon-](http://www.meb.gov.tr/ogrenci-sayisi-17-milyon-588-bine-yukseldi/haber/10675/tr)  
321 [588-bine-yukseldi/haber/10675/tr](http://www.meb.gov.tr/ogrenci-sayisi-17-milyon-588-bine-yukseldi/haber/10675/tr) (accessed on 30 January 2018).
- 322 28. Yazıcıoğlu, Y.; Erdoğan, S. *Spss Uygulamalı Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*, 4th ed.; Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara,  
323 Turkey, 2014; ISBN: 9758326988.
- 324 29. Sengül, Ü.; Shiraz, S.E.; Eren, M. Economic activities of regions of level 2 according to statistical regional  
325 units classification (NUTS) in turkey determining by using dea and tobit model application. *Çanakkale*  
326 *Onsekiz Mart University Journal of Administrative Sciences* **2013**, *11*(21), 75.
- 327 30. Gürbüz, B.; Öncü, E.; Emir, E. Leisure constraints questionnaire: Testing the construct validity, 12.  
328 International Sport Sciences Congress, 12-14 December 2012, Denizli, Turkey; Ömer Levent Tuncay Ed.,  
329 2012; 339-343.
- 330 31. George, D.; Mallery, M.P. *Using SPSS for Windows Step By Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*, 4th ed.; Boston,  
331 MA: Allyn & Bacon, 2002; ISBN: 0205375529.
- 332 32. Culp, R.H. Adolescent girls and outdoor recreation: a case study examing constraints and effective  
333 programming. *Journal of Leisure Research* **1998**, *30*(3), 356-379.
- 334 33. Moccia, F.D. Plannig time: An emergent european practice. *European Plannig Studies* **2000**, *8*(3), 367-376.
- 335 34. Shaw, S. Gender, leisure and constraints: Towards a framework for the analysis of women's leisure. *Journal*  
336 *of Leisure Research* **1994**, *26*(1), 8-22.
- 337 35. Jackson, E.L.; Henderson, K. Gender-based analysis of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, **1995**, *17*(1), 31-  
338 51, DOI: 10.1080/01490409509513241.
- 339 36. Misra, R.; McKean, M. College students' academic stress and its relation to their anxiety, time management  
340 and leisure satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Studies* **2000**, *16*(1), 41-52.
- 341 37. Han, W. J. *Leisure participation and Constraints: The Case of Korean Americans*. Doctoral dissertation, The  
342 Pennsylvania State University, USA, 2005.
- 343 38. Jackson, E.L. *Constraints to Leisure*. State College, PA: Venture Publication, Inc., 2005; ISBN: 1892132540.
- 344 39. Santos, M.S.; Hino, A.A.; Reis, R.S.; Rodriguez-Anez, C.R. Prevalence of barriers for physical activity in  
345 adolescents. *Rev Bras Epidemiol* **2010**, *13*(1), 94-104, DOI: 10.1590/S1415-790X2010000100009.
- 346 40. Dias, D.F.; Loch, M.R.; Ronque, E. V. Perceived barriers to leisure-time physical activity and associated  
347 factors in adolescents. *Ciencia & Saude Coletiva* **2015**, *20*(11), 3339. DOI: 10.1590/1413-812320152011.00592014.
- 348 41. Ayhan, C.; Eskiler, E.; Soyer, F. Aktif sporcuların rekreatif etkinliklere katılımlarına engel oluşturabilecek  
349 faktörlerin yaşam tatmini ve yaşam kalitesi üzerine etkisi. ERPA International Congresses on Education,  
350 Budapest, Hungary, 18-21 May 2017; Hüseyin Çalışkan, İsmail Önder, Şenol Beşoluk Eds.: Edugarden,  
351 Sakarya, Turkey, 2017, 164-175.
- 352 42. Raymore, L.; Godbey, G.; Crawford, D. Self-esteem, gender, and socioeconomic status: Their relation to  
353 perception of constraint on leisure among adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research* **1994**, *2*(26), 99-118, DOI:  
354 10.1080/00222216.1994.11969948.
- 355 43. Harrington, M.; Dawson, D. Who has it best? Women's labour force participation, perceptions of leisure  
356 and constraints to enjoyment of leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research* **1995**, *27*(1): 4-24, DOI:  
357 10.1080/00222216.1995.11969974.
- 358 44. Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu. [http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt\\_id=1013](http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1013) (accessed on 5 February 2018).
- 359 45. Demirdöğen, A.; Ören, M. N.; Alemdar, T. Türkiye'de Tarım Politikaları Kapsamında Sağlanan Destekler  
360 Ve Kırsal Yoksulluk. Ulusal Tarım Ekonomisi Kongresi, Konya, Turkey, 5-7 Semptember 2012; Cennet  
361 Oğuz, Zeki Bayramoğlu, Zuhul Karakayacı Eds.: Tarımsal Yayım ve Haberleşme, Konya, Turkey, 2012, 85-  
362 94.
- 363 46. Kartal, N.; Demirhan, Y. Türkiye'de Kentsel Yoksulluğun Kırsal Nedenleri ve Çözüm Önerileri Üzerine.  
364 *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi* **2014**, *15*(2), 135-154 [In Turkish].
- 365 47. Edwards, M.B.; Theriault, D.S.; Shores, K.A.; Melton, K.M. Promoting youth physical activity in rural  
366 southern communities: Practitioner perceptions of environmental opportunities and barriers. *Journal of*  
367 *Rural Health* **2014**, *30*(4), 379-387, DOI: 10.1111/jrh.12072.
- 368 48. Arbel, J.; Wood, L.J.; Howat, P.; Giles-Corti, B. The class is always cheaper on the other side: Socioeconomic  
369 discrepancies in the cost of using recreational facilities. *Annals of Leisure Research* **2009**, *12*(1), 83-88, DOI:  
370 10.1080/11745398.2009.9686810.
- 371 49. Kara, A.; İzci, E.; Murathan, F. Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin serbest zamanlarını değerlendirme  
372 alışkanlıkları ve öğrenmeye ilişkin tutumları. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy* **2011**, *6*(1), 958-987  
373 [In Turkish].
- 374 50. Gümüş, H.; Özgül, S.A. Development of scales for barriers to participation and preference factors in the  
375 use of recreation area. *Journal of Human Sciences*, **2017**, *14*(1), 865-882, DOI: 10.14687/jhs.v14i1.4448.

- 376 51. Karakaş, G.; Kolayış, İ. E.; Eskiler, E. Yüzme Egzersizine Katılan Kadınların Egzersiz Motivasyonlarının  
377 İncelenmesi. III. Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Kongresi, Eskişehir, Turkey, 5-7 November 2015; Kerem  
378 Yıldırım Şimşek, Özkan Tütüncü Eds.: Karaca Turizm, Eskişehir, Turkey, 2015, 534-543.
- 379 52. Tolukan, E.; Yılmaz, B. Özel yetenekle ilgili bölümlerde okuyan öğrencilerin rekreasyonel aktivitelere  
380 katılımlarına engel olabilecek unsurların belirlenmesi. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport* **2014**,  
381 Special Issue (1), 525-539, DOI: 10.14486/IJSCS124, [In Turkish].
- 382 53. Dong, E.; Chick, G. Leisure constraints in six chinese cities. *Leisure Sciences* **2012**, *34*(5), 417-435, DOI:  
383 10.1080/01490400.2012.714702.
- 384 54. Soyer, F.; Yıldız, N. O.; Harmandar Demirel, D.; Serdar, E.; Demirel, M.; Ayhan, C.; Demirhan, Ö.  
385 Üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreatif etkinliklere katılımlarına engel teşkil eden faktörler ile katılımcıların  
386 yaşam doyumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Journal of Human Sciences* **2017**, *14*(2), 2035-2046. DOI:  
387 10.14687/jhs.v14i2.4647, [In Turkish].
- 388 55. Emir, E. *Rekreatif etkinliklere katılımın önündeki engellerin belirlenmesi: üniversite öğrencileri örneği*. Master  
389 Thesis, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Trabzon, Turkey, December 2012 [In  
390 Turkish].  
391