



Investigation of the Teachers' Restraint and Satisfaction Perceptions in their Free Times

Engin Yönet¹

Fehmi Çalık²

Fikret Soyer³

Ezgi Samar⁴

Cuma Ece⁵

Meliha Seviç⁶



(Corresponding Author)

^{1,2,3,4,5,6}Sakarya University of Applied Disciplines, School of Physical Education and Sports, Turkey

*Email: ezgi_samar36@hotmail.com

Abstract

In this study it was intended to investigate the Boredom and satisfaction perceptions of the teachers who participate / do not participate in recreational activities during their leisure time in Konya. The screening model was used in the study. 330 questionnaire forms were distributed to the participants. As the result of the review, 300 of the questionnaires were found to be worth for analyzing after excluding those which were invalid due to the following reasons marking the same options or leaving the questionnaire incomplete. The information of 300 participants (46,7% male n=140, 53,3% female n=160) were taken into consideration. The Leisure Boredom Scale whose Turkish adaptation was made by Kara, Gürbüz and Öncü was used as data collection tool in the research. The boredom and satisfaction perceptions of the participants in their leisure time were evaluated in terms of the age, gender, income level and the frequency of participation. In the study significant difference was observed at the significance level in the leisure boredom perception according to variables age, gender and the frequency of participation. In terms of these variables significant difference was not observed in the satisfaction perceptions. On the contrary, in terms of the income level variable while significant difference wasn't observed in the leisure boredom perception, in the satisfaction perception significant difference was observed. At the participation point of the educational administrators and teachers in leisure time activities contribution can be ensured to the satisfaction perception against the boredom with the necessary planning and implementing possibilities.

Keywords: Teacher, Leisure time, Boredom and satisfaction perceptions.

Citation | Engin Yönet; Fehmi Çalık; Fikret Soyer; Ezgi Samar; Cuma Ece; Meliha Seviç (2019). Investigation of the Teachers' Restraint and Satisfaction Perceptions in their Free Times. Asian Journal of Education and Training, 5(1): 207-212.

History:

Received: 4 December 2018

Revised: 8 January 2019

Accepted: 6 February 2019

Published: 12 March 2019

Licensed: This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Attribution 3.0 License

Publisher: Asian Online Journal Publishing Group

Contribution/Acknowledgement: All authors contributed to the conception and design of the study.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

Transparency: The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study was reported; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

Ethical: This study follows all ethical practices during writing.

Contents

1. Introduction	208
2. Method	209
3. Findings	209
4. Discussion and Results	210
References	211

1. Introduction

All the behaviours in a society are carried out in the institutions which make up that society. People fulfil their roles and relationships through these institutions and learn from them. These are the institutions which have the feature to be the most important to the welfare of the individual and society; family, education, economy, politics, religion and the leisure time evaluation (Fichter, 1996). When considering from this point of view, the institution of the leisure time evaluation which is one of the six basic institutions is universal, compulsory and important (Aydm, 1997).

The concept of time should be addressed in the studies conducted on the issue of leisure time or leisure time evaluation. Time has a great importance since the creation of the mankind and the share of the time understanding is great in the human development. It was the same for the societies also. The societies who arrange their working lives social relations, recreation and entertainment habits on this issue of time in this way are more advanced and shaped compared to the other societies (Mutlu, 2008). So, the planning and using of time is a considerable issue, and we should be aware of planning and consuming this resource in a way that it can be contribute to the individual and social development (Sağlam, 2008). Frank Cheley wrote in the "Investing Leisure Time" that the education of leisure increases the personal happiness therefore the personal effectiveness drastically. Planning and training the leisure time is the way to fight with the greatest threat to the civilization. It should be known that each minute needs to be used in order to serve a good purpose and a good investment (Currell, 2005). Time which has vital importance both for the individual and for the society is the life itself. It is impossible to compensate or replace the time which has been lost already. Wasted time means wasted life (Baltaş and Baltaş, 2000). In summary, in the human life time is sometimes short and sometimes long, it is impossible to repeat it, its beginning and end is certain and it can be measured in hours. There are several types of time. These are the followings; times about being, livelihood related time and leisure time (Tezcan, 1993).

According to the general consensus, leisure is the time when the people are free from work, obligations and responsibilities and can use this time according to its own free will (Kilbas, 1994). Thus it can be used for responsibility –free activities (such as sport), media activities (such as watching TV, listening to music, playing computer games and reading), performance activities (such as music, dance and drama) and for community services (voluntary work and religious groups) (Byrne *et al.*, 2006). In fact, it can be defined clearer if we say that it is the opposite idea of working. According to De Grazia it is when a person is performing an activity for its own benefit (Tükenmez, 2009). It also involves a process that starts with free will and volunteerism. Volunteering is to undertake leisure activities without being under pressure in a pleasant and satisfying way by using the abilities and opportunities (Stebbins, 2013). Free time is time spent away from business, work, job hunting, domestic chores and education. It also excludes time spent on necessary activities such as eating and sleeping.

The terms of leisure time, free time and spare time are often confused due to the fact that they are interchangeable. Spare time is the time which remains outside the time spent to sustain life. Spare time includes the leisure time to meet the individual needs such as eating, sleeping and child care. The sense of obligation is the least in this need and it depends on the own will of the person. According to it, the spare time is the period of time remained from the working time which can be used freely. In fact there is not a significant difference between free and leisure time. Leisure time or free time is the time spent out of working, searching for job, domestic work and education. While free time refers to direction lessness, leisure time has a potential open for willpower (Köybaşı, 2006). Similarly, leisure time as a complex phenomenon is used by some authors as the synonymous of free time while some others insists on stating that there are qualitative differences between them. The authors, who use leisure time in the sense of free time, say that people are connected to their own judgements and choices as enjoyment or as the remaining time approaches, most of the researchers used leisure time as free time. However, in terms of the features that determine the leisure time it can be seen that they unite at one point; it must be out of obligation or work and can be used according to the wish of the individual. Another thing which should be noted about leisure time is that the evaluating form of the leisure time is added to the factor determining the statue (such as consumer behaviour, education level and profession) (Erkal, 1987).

It can be observed that the speed of the scientific and technological developments in our age causes reduction in the working hours and increase in the leisure time by facilitating the human life. In the daily life the fact that the working and off working activities turned into repetitive activity by becoming boring made the leisure time evaluating applications important (Ozşaker, 2012).

Leisure satisfactions are not observable structures, they are positive emotions and perceptions that occur due to the attractive results of the leisure time activities and preferences (Place and Beggs, 2012). The leisure time satisfaction is known to have positive impact on life satisfaction /quality as much as the age and income variables are known to have. Considering that each act done by the individual has an aim and there is a result revealed by this aim than the activities occurred due to the leisure time activities express the formation of positive or negative leisure satisfaction. The leisure time that emerges along with the working life suggests that the person is engaged in certain activity and as a result of this activity he will feel satisfaction or dissatisfaction. This naturally raises the concept of satisfaction in leisure time (Demir and Demir, 2014). While satisfaction demonstrates the feeling of satisfaction, dissatisfaction expresses the low and unsatisfactory state of arousal and the long exposure to monotonous arousal and boredom. The leisure time boredom perception is a negative mood and reflect a mismatch among the expressions available for the individuals with optimal experience (Yang and Guo, 2011). The leisure time boredom perception emerges along with the leisure time satisfaction as the meaninglessness of an activity or situation. Clearly, the boredom perception does not emerge from not doing anything in the leisure time. On the contrary, it emerges from activities which are not interesting or provocative (Stebbins, 2003).

While the aim of this research was to determine the teachers' perceptions of leisure time boredom and satisfaction according to different variables but it was also intended to find answers to the following sub-problems along with the teachers' participation levels in the leisure time activities.

1. Do the teachers' leisure time boredom-satisfaction perceptions show significant difference according to the age?

2. Do the teachers' leisure time boredom-satisfaction perceptions show significant difference according to the gender?
3. Do the teachers' leisure time boredom-satisfaction perceptions show significant difference according to the level of income?
4. Do the teachers' leisure time boredom-satisfaction perceptions show significant difference according to the frequency of participation?

2. Method

2.1. The Research Model

The general screening model which is one of the descriptive research methods was used in this study. It is defined by Arseven (1993) as a research form which is based on the data obtained from a sample selected from the society universe in order to determine the actual state of the event and case within a certain time and under dependant conditions.

2.2. Working Group

The sample group of the study consisted of teachers working in the province of Konya.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

The Personal Information Form prepared by the researchers and the Leisure Boredom Perception Scale were applied to the participants of the study.

Personal Information Form: This form was prepared to collect the teachers' demographic information. It consisted of four questions in order to learn about the participants' age, gender.

Leisure Time Boredom Perception: The original of this scale was developed by Iso-Ahola and Weissinger (1990). The original scale was one-dimensional and consisted of 16 items. The validity and reliability test of its Turkish version was made by Kara et al. (2014). The 10 questions in the scale are applied by using the five point Likert type scale whose scoring varies from (1) I definitely disagree to (5) I totally agree. The 1st, 2nd, 6th, 7th and 10th questions in the scale express the boredom perception while the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 8th and 9th questions represent the satisfaction perception. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .72 for the boredom perception and .77 for the satisfaction perception.

Data Analysis: the scales were applied to the volunteer teachers after information was provided by the researchers. The statistical analysis was carried out by transferring the raw data to the SPSS 20.00 statistical software package.

3. Findings

The demographic features related to the analyses conducted according to the aim of the research were given in Table 1 while the findings were given in Table 2, Table 3, Table 4 and Table 5.

Table-1. The Demographic Features of the Participants.

Gender	N	%	Average Monthly Income	N	%
Male	140	46,7	Below 2800	76	25,3
Female	160	53,3	Between 2801-3100	115	38,3
			More than 3101	109	36,3
Age	N	%	Participation in Activities	N	%
Under 29	95	31,7	Sometimes	165	55,0
Between 30 and 39	115	38,3	Once per week	72	24,0
Gender	N	%	Average Monthly Income	N	%

Source: Monthly income and participation frequency.

When examining Table 1, it can be seen that 46,7% of the participants were men while 53.3% of them were women, 38.3% of the participants were between the age of 30 and 39, 38.3 % of them had an average income between of 2801 and 3100 TL, the average income of the participants' 36.3% was more than 3101 TL and in terms of the participation the rare participation appeared to be 55%.

Table-2. The T –Test results related to the Leisure Time Boredom and Satisfaction Levels according to the Gender Variable.

Feeling	Gender	N	Average	SS.	t	p
Boredom	Male	140	11,821	3,70158	2,103	,036
	Female	160	10,906	3,80962		
Satisfaction	Male	140	18,714	3,74221	,056	,956
	Female	160	18,687	4,57940		

*p≤0,05; ** p≤0,01.

When examining Table 2, a significant difference was observed in the 0,05 significant level of the participants' leisure time boredom perception in terms of the gender variable. In other words the boredom perceptions of the participants differed on the basis of the leisure time assessments. It was observed that the male participants appeared to have more boredom perceptions than the female participants. Significant difference was not detected in the participants' leisure time satisfaction perceptions in terms of the gender variable.

Table-3. The Result of the One –way ANOVA test related to the Leisure Time Boredom and Satisfaction Levels according to the age variable.

Feeling		Sum of Square	SD	Mean Square	F	p	Significant Difference
Boredom	Between the Groups	174,630	2	87,315	6,325	,002**	1-2
	Within the Groups	4100,036	297	13,805			
	Total	4274,667	299				
Satisfaction	Between the groups	42,541	2	21,271	1,206	,301	
	Within the Groups	5238,459	297	17,638			
	Total	5281,000	299				

Age: 1= under 29; 2= between 30-39; 3= above 40.

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

When examining [Table 3](#), significant difference ($F(2-297)=6.325$, $p<0.01$) was observed in the 0,01 significance level of the participants' leisure time boredom perceptions in terms of the gender variable. In other words, the boredom perception of the participants differed under the age of 40 in terms of the age variable. Significant difference was not detected in the participants' leisure time satisfaction perceptions in terms of the age variable.

Table-4. The Result of the One –way ANOVA test related to the Leisure Time Boredom and Satisfaction Levels according to the income level variable.

Feeling		Square of the sums	SD	Mean Square	F	p	Significant Difference
Boredom	Between the Groups	78,402	2	39,201	2,775	,064	
	Within the Groups	4196,265	297	14,129			
	Total	4274,667	299				
Satisfaction	Between the groups	167,160	2	83,580	4,854	,008**	1-2
	Within the Groups	5113,840	297	17,218			
	Total	5281,000	299				

Average Monthly Income: 1= under 2800 TL 2= between 2801-3100 TL ; 3=more than 3101 TL *p<0,05; ** p<0,01.

When examining [Table 4](#), significant difference ($F(2-297)=2.775$, $p>0.05$) was not detected in the participants' leisure time boredom perceptions in terms of the income level variable. Significant difference ($F(2-297)=4.854$, $p<0.01$) was observed in the participants' leisure time satisfaction perceptions in terms of the income level variable. In other words, the leisure time satisfaction levels of the participants whose average monthly income were less than 3100 TL differed in terms of the income level.

Table-5. The Result of the One –way ANOVA test related to the Leisure Time Boredom and Satisfaction Levels according to the Frequency of Participation in the Activities.

Feeling		Square of the Sums	SD	Square of the means	F	p	Significant difference
Boredom	Between the groups	161,895	2	80,947	5,996	,003**	1-3
	Within the groups	3969,223	294	13,501			
	Total	4131,118	296				
Satisfaction	Between the Groups	93,011	2	46,505	2,667	,071	
	Within the Groups	5127,319	294	17,440			
	Total	5220,330	296				

The state of the participation in the activities: 1=sometimes; 2=once in a week; 3=More than two in a week.

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

When examining [Table 5](#), significant difference ($F(2-294)=5.996$, $p<0.01$) was observed at the 0,01 significance level of the participants' leisure time boredom perceptions in terms of the frequency of the participation in the activities. In other words, the leisure time boredom perception of the participants differed in terms of the participation variable. Beside this, significant differences were not detected in relation with the teachers' leisure time satisfaction levels in terms of the participation variable.

4. Discussion and Results

The aim of the study was to evaluate the leisure boredom and satisfaction perceptions of the teachers working in the city of Konya in terms of age, gender, income and the frequency of the participation in recreational activities.

When looking at the gender status of the participants it was observed that 53,3% of the participants were women while 46,7% of them were men [Table1](#). The fact that in the study of Tunçel which was conducted on the teachers in Izmir, 57.9% of the participants were women while 38,3% of them were men and in the research made by Karaküçük on the issue of teachers 51% of the participants were women and 49% of them were men supported the results of our research ([Karaküçük, 1995](#); [Tunçel, 1999](#)). In this context, it was understood that the profession of teaching was preferred generally by women. In this research while the leisure time boredom scores of the male participants were higher than the same scores of the female participant, difference was not observed between the satisfaction perceptions in terms of gender. In the studies of [Riddick \(1986\)](#); [DiBona \(2000\)](#) differences were not observed in relation with the gender ([Sönmezoğlu et al., 2014](#)). In the majority of the studies conducted on the free time satisfaction levels differences were not observed in terms of the gender ([Ardahan and Yerlisu, 2010](#)). In this regard our study is in line with the literature. In contrast to this, in the studies made by [Emir et al. \(2012\)](#) the boredom points of the female participants were observed to be higher than the points of the male participants ([Kara and Özdedeolu, 2015](#)). The findings of these studies do not comply with the findings of our research.

While in terms of the age variable significant differences were detected in the leisure time boredom sub-dimension, difference was not observed in the sub-dimension of satisfaction. Especially the leisure boredom perception scores of the participants under the age of 39 were detected to be higher than the same scores of the participants who were older than 40. In the literature, in the study conducted by Kara and Gücal on the same issue, in the sub-dimension of boredom the scores of the participants at the age group of 20-29 were higher than the scores of the participants who were between 40 and 49 (Kara and Gücal, 2015). In this context, although the findings of this study were parallel with the literature it could be understood that the younger individuals adopted the passive life. In addition, in a research conducted by Öcalan on the issue of the leisure time activities and sport places of the newly appointed young teachers working in the eastern city centres it was identified that the teacher who have relatively the most free time in our society sought for passive activities with less recreational features and participated very less in sporting activities (Ocalan, 1996). In the study of the in various sub-dimensions of the leisure time satisfaction score on those who participated in individual recreational sports was found to be higher in the age group under 40. Therefore, studies which do not comply with our research are also available in the literature.

In this research significant differences were not observed among the leisure time boredom perceptions of the participants in terms of the income level variable, but a certain level of income increase led to differences in the leisure time satisfaction perceptions (except for those with the highest income level). In the literature, in the research conducted by Gümüş and Karakullukçu (2015) it was suggested that along with the increase in the income level of the individuals the amount of the satisfaction received from the leisure time activities also increased. In a study which supported the findings of our study up to a certain degree obtained a moderate correlation between the income and the leisure satisfaction in his study conducted on the relationship between the life satisfaction and social competence acquired in the leisure time participation for the middle aged or older adults (Gökçe, 2008). It can be stated that this relationship was the nearest study to our research findings. Indeed, differences were detected in the leisure time satisfaction perceptions of the participants who were in the lower –income and middle-income category. Researches which do not support the results of our study are also available in the literature. For example, significant difference was not detected between the income and leisure satisfaction in a study conducted by Brown and Frankel (1993) on the relationship between the leisure time satisfaction and the demographic variables.

The participation in activities did not have important impact on the sub-dimension of satisfaction however significant difference was detected in the sub-dimension of boredom. In terms of the frequency of the participation in activities, it was observed that the boredom perception was increased by the rare participation and the frequent participation while the weekly one participation did not cause any difference. In Brown and Frankel's study called 'Activity Through The Years; Leisure, Leisure Satisfaction And Life Satisfaction' a small but significant correlations was detected between the participation in physical activities and the leisure satisfaction (Brown and Frankel, 1993). In the study of Kara and Özdedeoğlu (2015) which intended to investigate the relationship between leisure boredom perception and the obstacles of leisure time it was stated that the participation in the leisure activities did not have fundamental impact on the sub-factors of the leisure boredom perception scale. In the study of Ağduman (2014) it was determined that the leisure satisfaction of those who participated in more leisure time activities was higher than of those who participated in fewer activities. These studies are not intended to support the findings of our research. According to the study conducted by Andrew and Withey the vast majority of the people were satisfied in the leisure activities (47%) while a very small part of them were not (8,3%), whereas the different leisure activities provide satisfaction at different levels. According to Lu and Argyle (1994) the serious, stable and constructive activities provide more satisfaction and happiness (Lu and Hu, 2005). The researchers revealed that the participation in leisure activities and the satisfaction obtained as the result of this participation improved the character and personality of the individuals. However the different leisure activities provide benefits and satisfaction in different sizes. For example the serious leisure activities provide more satisfaction due to the fact that they are more stressful, gripping and require more struggle and control. But it should be also known that non-serious leisure activities provided less benefit even they led to boredom by achieving less satisfaction (Akyildiz, 2013). According to the universal judgement the satisfaction effect of the active participation is weakening through the passive participation.

According to Kara and Gücal (2015) the participation in leisure activities affect the leisure satisfaction while it can be stated that the leisure satisfaction will affect the intention to participate in the future leisure activities (Sevil, 2015). Therefore it is possible to say that there is a reflexive relationship between the participation in the leisure applications and the leisure satisfaction.

Undoubtedly, using the leisure time actively will enhance the personal life of the individual and along with the leisure satisfaction also the life satisfaction will be ensured. It will help to socialize and to adopt the social rules during the socialization process by making the person feel dynamic, healthy and relaxed. In this way it has become the matter of curiosity in what degree the recreation used widely by the teacher educating the children and the young people can be applied. It was observed the generally the teachers chose passive activities such as reading books and newspapers, watching TV and listening to music as leisure time assessing activities (Erken, 2008). When considering the teachers' educational identities and roles, they can both take precautions against the occupational exhaustion as well as they can contribute to the function of being a social example by participating actively in the leisure time. The followings can be suggested within the scope of this study;

1. Establishing and disseminating a recreation team within the school
2. The teachers should include into the education the evaluation of the leisure time activities
3. Facilitating the participation of the teachers in the leisure time activities held in the province where they are working.

References

- Ağduman, F., 2014. The analysis of leisure motivation and satisfaction of university students. Master Thesis, Erzurum: Atatürk University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Akyildiz, M., 2013. The relation between personality traits of serious and unregistered participants and the time satisfaction. PhD Thesis, Eskişehir: Anadolu University, Institute of Health Sciences.

- Ardahan, F. and L.T. Yerlisu, 2010. Investigation of university students' time of satisfaction with gender and income. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 21(4): 129-134.
- Arseven, A.D., 1993. *Field research method*. Ankara: Gül Publishing House.
- Aydın, M., 1997. *Sociology of institutions*. Ankara: The Valley Publications.
- Baltaş, A. and Z. Baltaş, 2000. *Stress and coping ways*. Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore.
- Brown, B. and B.G. Frankel, 1993. Activity through the years: Leisure, leisure satisfaction, and life satisfaction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10(1): 1-17. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.10.1.1>.
- Byrne, T., E. Nixon, P. Mayock and J. Whyte, 2006. *Free-time and leisure needs of young people living in disadvantaged communities*. Dublin: Combat Poverty Agency.
- Currell, S., 2005. *The march of spare time*. America: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Demir, M. and S.S. Demir, 2014. Free time requirement of employees and factors affecting the time of free time. *Journal of Business and Economics Studies*, 2(3): 74-78.
- DiBona, G., 2000. Neural control of the kidney: Functionally specific renal sympathetic nerve fibers. *American Journal of Physiology-Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology*, 279(5): R1517-R1524. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpregu.2000.279.5.r1517>.
- Emir, U., P. Tuite and G. Öz, 2012. Elevated pontine and putamenal gaba levels in mild-moderate parkinson disease detected by 7 tesla proton mrs. *PloS One*, 7(1): 1-8. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0030918>.
- Erkal, M.E., 1987. *Sociology*. Istanbul: Filiz Bookstore.
- Erken, K., 2008. *Teachers' participation in sport activities in leisure time*. Master Thesis, Sakarya: Sakarya University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Fichter, J., 1996. *What is sociology? N.Çelebi (Trans.)*. Ankara: Atilla Bookstore.
- Gökçe, H., 2008. *Investigation of the relation of free time satisfaction with life satisfaction and socio-demographic variables*. Thesis, Denizli: Pamukkale University, Institute of Health Sciences.
- Gümüş, H. and Ö.F. Karakullukçu, 2015. Leisure satisfaction in football and basketball fans: A sample of Afyonkarahisar. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, 3(3): 401-409.
- Iso-Ahola, S. and E. Weissinger, 1990. Perceptions of boredom in leisure: Conceptualization, reliability and validity of the leisure boredom scale. *Journal of Leisure research*, 22(1): 1-17. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1990.11969811>.
- Kara, F.M. and A.Ç. Gücal, 2015. *Investigation of the relationship between business perception and the perception of constriction at free time*. III. Congress of Recreational Research. pp: 188-195.
- Kara, F.M., B. Gürbüz and E. Oncü, 2014. Leisure boredom scale: The factor structure and the demographic differences. *Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise*, 16(2): 28-35. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.15314/tjse.201428102>.
- Kara, F.M. and B. Özdedeoğlu, 2015. *Investigation of the relationship between sickness perception and leisure barriers in free time*. III. Recreation Research Congress. pp: 494-499.
- Karaküçük, S., 1995. *Recreation leisure time regulation*. 2nd Edn., Ankara: Seren Ofset.
- Kılbas, S., 1994. *Youth and leisure evaluation*. Ankara: Ministry of Youth and Sports Publication No: 30.
- Köybaşı, N., 2006. *Comparative sociological analysis of indigenous tourists participating in tourism and leisure tourism as a tool for evaluating leisure sociology and leisure*. Master Thesis, Eskişehir: Anadolu University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Lu, L. and M. Argyle, 1994. Leisure satisfaction and happiness as a function of leisure activity. *The Kaohsiung Journal of Medical Sciences*, 10(2): 89-96.
- Lu, L. and C.H. Hu, 2005. Personality, leisure experiences and happiness. *Journal of Happiness studies*, 6(3): 325-342. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-005-8628-3>.
- Mutlu, İ., 2008. *A study on the attitudes of the exercising persons towards their leisure (Kayseri Province Case)*. Thesis, Niğde: Niğde University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Ocalan, M., 1996. *The activities of teachers who work in East Province centers in their leisure time and the place of sports*. Master Thesis, Elazığ: Fırat University, Institute of Health Sciences.
- Ozşaker, M., 2012. *An evaluation on non participation of the youth in leisure time activities*. Selçuk University Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science, 14(1): 126-131.
- Place, G. and B. Beggs, 2012. Leisure satisfaction in GLBT sports leagues. *LARNet-The Cyber Journal of Applied Leisure and Recreation Research*, 15(3): 1-12.
- Riddick, C., 1986. Leisure satisfaction precursors. *Journal of Leisure research*, 18(4): 259-265. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1986.11969664>.
- Sağlam, S.P., 2008. *The effects of the group license guidance program prepared for the evaluation of leisure time on students' aggressive behaviors*. Master Thesis, Mersin: Mersin University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Sevil, T., 2015. *The effect of participation in therapeutic recreational activities on the emotions of life of the elderly, life satisfaction and quality of life*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Eskişehir: Anadolu University SBE.
- Sönmezoğlu, U., E. Polat and A. Aycan, 2014. Youth center members, and some free time satisfaction levels. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, 2(5): 219-229. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.14486/ijscs91>.
- Stebbins, R.A., 2003. Leisure reflections. *LSA Newsletter*, 64(65): 29-31.
- Stebbins, R.A., 2013. *Planning your time in retirement*. USA: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Tezcan, M., 1993. *Leisure sociology*. Ankara: Ankara University Press.
- Tükenmez, M., 2009. *Sociology and sports*. Istanbul: Source Publications.
- Tunçel, E.F., 1999. *The role of sports in the evaluation habits of teachers in leisure time*. Master Thesis, Izmir: Ege University, Institute of Health Sciences.
- Yang, H. and L. Guo, 2011. Relationship between self-esteem and leisure boredom among college students. *The Cyber Journal of Applied Leisure and Recreation Research*, 14(1): 2-12.