

The Obstacles Affecting Shopping Center Employees' Participation in Recreational Activities

Huseyin Ozturk

*Gaziantep University Department of Sport Management, P. B 27310, Gaziantep, Turkey
Telephone: +90534521453, E-mail: ozturkavrasya@hotmail.com*

KEYWORDS Entertainment. Leisure Time. Obstruction. Socializing. Staff

ABSTRACT This is a descriptive study prepared for determining the obstacles of shopping center employees' non-participation in recreational activities in their leisure time. Four hundred employees working at the shopping centers in Gaziantep participated in this research. The data obtained in this research was statistically analyzed using SPSS 16.0 package software. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for internal consistency reliability has been found as 0.87. Frequency, percentage, average and standard deviation were used as statistical method during the analysis of the data, t-test was used for two independent groups having variables with normal distribution. ANOVA and Tukey multiple comparison tests were used for comparing more than two independent groups having variables with normal distribution. According to the results of the study, significance level related to the gender and having participated in sport activities before, regarding the leisure obstacles of the employees working at shopping centers, has been found. However, no significance level related to the age has been found.

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to identify the obstacles that cause shopping center employees not to participate in recreational activities. Time is an ongoing process beyond the control of individuals, coming from past to present and following each other towards the future (Akatay 2006; Ekinci et al. 2014). Time is the infinite measure of human beings and it is a transition process from one experience to another and from one place to any other (Arslan 1996).

Leisure time is a time that people can spend as per their own request and desires except for the obligations and duties of life while they are not working (Kilbas 2010). Leisure is a time when one can get rid of all the obligations or connections to others and spent time in activities that are chosen voluntarily (Karakucuk 2005; Hacıoglu et al. 2009). Leisure time is a period of time chosen to enjoy by individuals. Leisure time is a period of time that individuals attend to activities in a social group or individually except for the time spent to exist and live (Clawson and Knetsch 1974). Leisure time is a time that individuals benefit from entertainment, recreation, development and social gains or self-improvement (Dumazedier 1960). Leisure time is accepted by many researchers as a time when individuals can spend except for the working hours. In the day, the leisure time increases in importance regarding the life expectancy of individuals and it will continue to increase (Aytac 2006).

Recreation is a term that refers to the activities people do and participate in their leisure time during after hours (Karakucuk 2008). While leisure time is defined as free time except for necessities, recreation is defined as the activities done during this time (Kelly 1990). Recreation is the field of activities saving happiness, satisfaction, mental balance, character, competitive power, spiritual serenity, freedom, physical and social activity and intellectual point of view and self-expression (Parker 1979).

Recreational activities both make a contribution to individuals by satisfying their psychological needs and make them feel good about themselves by means of physical exercises, plays, artistic and cultural activities and also contribute to the health and development of social behaviors (Tinsley and Eldredge 1995). Recreation done in leisure time is not work and it is non-profit. Individuals participate voluntarily in recreation. Recreational activities provide social benefits and also it gives pleasure and happiness to individuals (Bucher and Bucher 1984).

For the participation in recreational activities, one must have time to spend freely except for the vital needs and working hours (Karakucuk 2005). Recreation will help individuals make a positive contribution to their success and improve the efficiency of their work under the leadership of a good leader who can choose an appropriate activity and provide them with an organized program (Finney 2002).

Improving the playgrounds and courts in recreational areas also increases the participation of individuals (Curry and Ravenscroft 2001; Torkildsen 2005; Yilmaz et al. 2005). To achieve the awareness of recreation and choosing the activities freely is very important for creating a healthy, conscious and happy society no matter which part of society people live in. Therefore, encouraging individuals to participate in recreational activities is the best way to improve working performance, and this will contribute to their personal and social development (Cetinbas 2010).

Despite many positive contributions of participation in recreational activities, it was seen that individuals would not participate in or perform in such events because of various reasons (Gurbuz and Karakucuk 2008; Chow and Dong 2013). This is a scientific study, which has been conducted to determine the obstacles preventing the shopping center employees from spending their leisure time efficiently. The aim is to determine the obstacles that prevent them from spending their leisure time and finding solutions for contribution to working and social life of the shopping center employees. Thus, they can be more happy and successful in their social life and their working efficiency increases efficiently. This study will answer the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference in leisure time obstacles of shopping center employees with respect to gender?
2. Is there a significant difference in leisure time obstacles of shopping center employees with respect to their interest in sports?
3. Is there a significant difference in leisure time obstacles of shopping center employees with respect to age?
4. Is there a significant difference in leisure time obstacles of shopping center employees with respect to their income?

METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample

The population consists of shopping center employees of Gaziantep province in 2014. The sample group consists of 208 men and 192 women and total of 400 people. Personal characteristics of the sample group are given in Table 1.

Research Model

Scanning method was used as a research model, which was commonly used in social sciences and conducted on large groups, it receives the opinions of individuals in the group on a case or a fact and try to describe them (Karakaya 2009). In this method, the individual or the subject is defined on his own terms. The opinion of the individual and the subject neither changes nor is affected (Karasar 2007).

Data Collection Tool

The data collection tool in this study consists of two parts. The personal information forms prepared by the researchers were used in the first part, the Leisure Obstacles Scale developed by Alexandris and Carroll (1997) was used in the second part and its Turkish adaptation was made by Gurbuz and Karakucuk (2008) and was overhauled by Gurbuz later on (2012). The scale consists of six dimensions (individual psychology, lack of information, facilities, lack of friends, time, lack of interest) and 18 collected substances of structure. The responses are evaluated according to a four-graduation scale. Each question consists of these options, that is, 1: Absolutely Unimportant, 2: Unimportant, 3: Important and 4: Very Important. Total internal consistency coefficient of the scale was measured as 0.84 (Gurbuz and Karakucuk 2008). However, in this study internal consistency coefficient was measured as 0.87.

Analysis of Data

The data obtained by scales in this study was statistically analyzed using the SPSS 16.0 package software after being computerized. In data evaluation, the frequency, percentage, average and standard deviation were used as statistical methods, the t-test was used for all independent groups and for all scales, and ANOVA analysis was used as one-way analysis of variance. The Tukey test has been used to determine the differences between the groups comparing more than two independent groups having variables with normal distribution. The significance level is considered as $p < 0.05$ in analysis.

RESULTS

The participants in the research are mostly between the 23 and 25 age range (43.5%), 208 of

them (52%) are men, they are mostly underpaid between 830-1000 TL (43.5%) and 278 of them (69.5%) have played sports before. It is seen that mostly men work and they work for low wages and most of them have participated in sport activities and some studies should be done to overcome these problems (Table 1).

Table 1: Personal characteristics about research group

Groups	N	F	%
Age	17-19	54	13.5
	20-22	1116	29
	23-25	174	43.5
	26 and older	56	14
Gender	Man	208	52
	Woman	192	48
Income State	830-1000 TL	174	43.5
	1001-1500 TL	144	36
	1501-2000 TL	62	15.5
	2501 TL and over	20	5
Participation to Sports	Yes	278	69.5
	No	122	30.5
Previously	Total	400	100

The statistical findings, which created the subdimensions of the “Leisure Obstacles Scale” are related to the factors which result from their own obstacles to participation in recreational activities and show that the participants working at shopping center were firstly affected by lack of interest (average=2.23), this was followed by lack of knowledge (average=2.34), individual psychology (average=2.47), lack of friends (average=2.57), time (average=2.61) and facility (average=2.70) (Table 2). According to these results, the lack of activity that attracts their attention has the maximum rate. It is expected that presenting the activities, which attract the shop-

ping center employees’ attention contribute positively to labor productivity.

Table 2. The distribution of Scale Scores for all participants

Factors	N	Average	Ss.
1. Individual Psychology	400	2.47	0.82
2. Lack of Knowledge	400	2.34	0.77
3. Facility	400	2.70	0.61
4. Lack of Friends	400	2.57	0.61
5. Time	400	2.61	0.55
6. Lack of Interest	400	2.23	0.74

There is a significant difference between the gender variable and the score of shopping center employees obtained from lack of friends (p=0.00), which is one of the subdimensions of the Leisure Obstacles Scale. By this result, the point average of women is higher than men’s score and there is not a significant difference between other sub-dimensions (respectively p=0.78, p=0.80, p=0.30, p=0.12 and p=0.43) (Table 3). According to these results, male employees participate in recreational activities less than female employees because of the lack of friends and males should be ensured to join in friendship activities more.

There is a significant difference between the scores of shopping center employees, which they got from Leisure Obstacles Scale and whether they have done sports before (p=0.05, p=0.00, p=0.02, p=0.04, p=0.03 and p=0.00) (Table 4). The sub-dimension averages of the employees, (individual psychology, lack of knowledge, facility, lack of friends, time, lack of interest) who have not played sports before are higher than

Table 3: Leisure Obstacles Scale’s sub-dimension and the relation with gender

Factor	Gender	N	Avg	Ss	t	P
1. Individual Psychology	Woman	192	2.39	0.81	1.76	0.78
	Man	208	2.54	0.83		
2. Lack of Knowledge	Woman	192	2.33	0.80	0.247	0.80
	Man	208	2.35	0.75		
3. Facility	Woman	192	2.73	0.62	1.03	0.30
	Man	208	2.67	0.59		
4. Lack of Friends	Woman	192	2.69	0.56	3.81	0.00*
	Man	208	2.45	0.64		
5. Time	Woman	192	2.59	0.55	0.49	0.12
	Man	208	2.62	0.55		
6. Lack of Interest	Woman	192	2.29	0.75	1.55	0.43
	Man	208	2.17	0.73		

p<0.05

Table 4: The relation between the sub-dimensions of Leisure Obstacles Scale and doing sport statuses of the participants

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Doing sports</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Avg.</i>	<i>Ss</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
1. Individual Psychology	Yes	278	2.39	0.76	2.83	0.04*
	No	122	2.65	0.92		
2. Lack of Knowledge	Yes	278	2.26	0.74	3.11	0.00*
	No	122	2.52	0.82		
3. Facility	Yes	278	2.65	0.54	2.34	0.02*
	No	122	2.81	0.72		
4. Lack of Friends	Yes	278	2.51	0.57	2.91	0.04*
	No	122	2.70	0.70		
5. Time	Yes	278	2.55	0.50	3.03	0.03*
	No	122	2.73	0.64		
6. Lack of Interest	Yes	278	2.13	0.67	4.05	0.00*
	No	122	2.45	0.85		

p<0.05

the employees who have. According to these results, it is seen that the participation of employees having done sports before in recreational activities is low, and some studies should be done to increase the participation of those in recreational activities.

There is not a significant difference between the scores of shopping center employees, which they got from the Leisure Obstacles Scale and age (respectively, p=0.54, p=13, p=56, p=0.38,

P=33 ve p=0.35) (Table 5). The rate of lack of participating in recreation activities is the same among all age groups of employees. Something should be done to overcome these obstacles.

The scores that shopping center employees got from Leisure Time Obstacles Scale are differed by sub-dimensions of lack of knowledge (p=0.08) and facility shortage (p=0.09) and income status variables, while there is not a significant difference between other sub-dimen-

Table 5: The relation between the sub-dimensions of leisure obstacles scale and age of the participants

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Avg.</i>	<i>Ss</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant difference</i>
1. Individual Psychology	17-19 years	54	2.56	0.72	0.734	0.53	
	20-22 years	116	2.39	0.86			
	23-25 years	174	2.48	0.83			
	26 years and over	56	2.53	0.82			
2. Lack of Knowledge	17-19 years	54	2.33	0.76	1.89	0.13	
	20-22 years	116	2.46	0.82			
	23-25 years	174	2.24	0.72			
	26 years and over	56	2.39	0.81			
3. Facility	17-19 years	54	2.53	0.57	2.53	0.56	
	20-22 years	116	2.79	0.65			
	23-25 years	174	2.71	0.58			
	26 years and over	56	2.65	0.62			
4. Lack of Friends	17-19 years	54	2.54	0.48	1.00	0.38	
	20-22 years	116	2.65	0.58			
	23-25 years	174	2.55	0.63			
	26 years and over	56	2.45	0.74			
5. Time	17-19 years	54	2.51	0.49	1.14	0.33	
	20-22 years	116	2.67	0.58			
	23-25 years	174	2.59	0.51			
	26 years and over	56	2.61	0.65			
6. Lack of Interest	17-19 years	54	2.14	0.53	1.08	0.35	
	20-22 years	116	2.33	0.81			
	23-25 years	174	2.19	0.73			
	26 years and over	56	2.21	0.80			

p<0.05

sions (respectively $p=0.12$, $p=0.72$, $p=0.67$, $p=0.21$) (Table 6). According to results of multiple comparisons Tukey test, which was done in order to find the stated difference between the sub-dimensions and units in groups, the income status of employees who are salaried between 830-1000 TL (average=2.43) is higher than the ones salaried between 1001-1500 TL (average=2.17) in sub-dimension of lack of knowledge. Another difference is in the facility sub-dimension, the income status of employees who are salaried between 830-1000 TL (average=2.75) is higher than the ones salaried between 1001-1500 TL (average=2.57) and the income status of employees who are salaried between 1501-2000 TL (average=2.57) is lower than the ones salaried between 1501-2000 TL (average=2.81). As a result of the study, it is thought that the employees who have lower income should be informed about recreational activities and those who have medium income should be informed about the facilities.

DISCUSSION

These findings were derived from the research to show similarities and differences be-

tween the findings derived from the studies related to the subject on different sample groups. Similar results were obtained in the study done by Demirel and Harmandar (2009) and it showed that lack of interest is the lowest result. When the other results were examined, it was concluded that the obstacles are lack of facility and time according to the studies by Emir (2012), Amin et al. (2011), Kandaz and Herguner (2007), Gungormus et al. (2006), Gurbuz et al. (2010), Ozdilek et al. (2007), Colakoglu (2005), Shah and Aminuddin (2007), Cerin et al. (2010) and Masmanidis et al. (2009).

The study is similar to many other studies in the literature. The study which, was done by Emir (2012) on university students released that there is a significant difference among individual psychology, time and lack of interest, which are sub-dimensions of obstacles for participation in recreational activities, according to gender variable. As a result of Ekinci's (2012) examination of the factors that may affect the university students' participation in sportive and non-sportive recreational activities, it was concluded that there is a significant difference in leisure time obstacles such as lack of knowledge, lack of friends and time according to gender. The

Table 6: The relation between the sub-dimensions of leisure obstacles scale and Income status of the participants

Factor	Age	N	Avg.	Ss	F	p	Significant difference
1. Individual Psychology	1001-1500 TL	144	2.43	0.84	1.91	0.12	
	1501-2000 TL	62	2.35	0.87			
	2001 TL and over.	20	2.83	0.75			
	830-1000 TL	174	2.43	0.84			
2. Lack of Knowledge	1001-1500 TL	144	2.17	0.69	3.96	0.08*	1-2*
	1501-2000 TL	62	2.40	0.67			
	2001 TL and over.	20	2.56	0.83			
	830-1000 TL	174	2.75	0.62			
3. Facility	1001-1500 TL	144	2.57	0.60	3.88	0.09	1-2*, 2-3*
	1501-2000 TL	62	2.81	0.58			
	2001 TL and over.	20	2.86	0.53			
	830-1000 TL	174	2.60	0.63			
4. Lack of Friends	1001-1500 TL	144	2.54	0.51	0.44	0.72	
	1501-2000 TL	62	2.58	0.68			
	2001 TL and over.	20	2.46	0.92			
	830-1000 TL	174	2.62	0.58			
5. Time	1001-1500 TL	144	2.62	0.45	0.51	0.67	
	1501-2000 TL	62	2.53	0.65			
	2001 TL and over.	20	2.56	0.57			
	830-1000 TL	174	2.26	0.78			
6. Lack of Interest	1001-1500 TL	144	2.27	0.66	1.50	0.21	
	1501-2000 TL	62	2.05	0.80			
	2001 TL and over.	20	2.20	0.75			

$p<0.05$

study done by Demir and Demir (2006) indicated that, even a little, the gender affected the individuals about participation in leisure time activities. There is a significant difference in the study, *The Diversity Between Participation in Recreational Activities According to Demographic Characteristics of the Students*, which was conducted by Karaçar and Pasli (2014). In a study conducted by Ozsaker (2012), the factor for non-participation to leisure time activities was examined among the students of Adnan Menderes University and determined that there is a significant difference between the sub-dimensions of participation obstacles and gender. It was found that there is a significant difference in favor of women in individual psychology, lack of knowledge and time sub-dimensions. In a study done by Gurbuz et al. (2010) the obstacles of individuals' non-participation in recreational activities were examined, and a significant difference was found between facilities and services and transport, social environment and lack of knowledge, individual psychology and time in terms of gender. In another study done by Alexandris and Carroll (1997) on university students, significant differences were determined in favor of women according to sub-dimensions of individual psychology, lack of facilities and in sufficient financial resources in terms of gender. The relation between the reasons for not participating in recreational activities and gender was examined in several studies and has also reached similar conclusions (Shah and Aminuddin 2007; Damianidis et al. 2007; Amin et al. 2011).

When examining the relationship between perceived obstacles to participation in recreational activities and doing sport and interest variable, it was seen that there are many similar studies in the literature. In the study done by Emir (2012), significant difference was found between individual psychology and lack of friends. In the study done by Damianidis et al. (2007) on middle school and high school students to determine the perceived obstacles to participation in extracurricular sport activities, it was determined that the activity participation scores of the students interested in sports are higher.

When examining the relationship between perceived obstacles to participation in recreational activities and age variable, it was seen that the study differs from other studies in the literature. In the study done by Amin et al. (2011),

the relation between the perceived obstacles to participation in physical activities in leisure time and age was examined and it was seen that the participants, age of 18-25, have high scores in sub-dimensions of time and facility shortage. In another study done by Alexandris and Carroll, significant differences were found between participation of university students in recreational activities and age factor in sub-dimensions of individual psychology and lack of knowledge. The scores of people between 45-65 years old are higher than participants aged 26-35 (Alexandris and Carroll 1997). According to the analysis records of Ekinici et al. (2014) the significant difference was found between leisure obstacles and age in time sub-dimension.

When examining the relationship between perceived obstacles to participation in recreational activities and income status variable, it was seen that the study is similar to other studies in the literature. As a result of the study done by Ekinici et al. (2014) the leisure time obstacles of the participants indicated significant difference according to monthly income in sub-dimensions of individual psychology and facilities or services.

In the study done by Ozsaker on university students, the reasons for not participating in leisure activities were examined and significant differences were found among the sub-dimensions of individual psychology, lack of friends, and time, preventing participation and income status (Ozsaker 2012). As a result of the study named *The Diversity Between Participation in Recreational Activities According to Demographic Characteristics of the Students*, significant differences were found according to income status (Karaçar ve Pasli 2014). It was observed that there are many studies that examined the relationship between income status and reasons for not participating in recreational activities and obtained findings also support the results of the study (Can 2010; Okumus 2002; Bodur 1988; Drakou et al. 2006; Kandaz and Herguner 2007).

CONCLUSION

The shopping center employees participating in the study were mostly in the age group of 23-25 years, mostly men participated in the study (208 men), they are mostly paid minimum wage between 830-1500 TL and 278 of them have done

sports in their life. According to statistical findings related to the factors, which are preventing employees from participation in recreational activities and forming the sub-dimensions of Leisure Obstacles Scale, lack of interest and lack of knowledge are ranked as the first place. One of the sub-dimensions of Leisure Obstacles Scale, the lack of friends indicated significant difference with gender variable. All sub-dimensions of Leisure Obstacles Scale indicated significant difference with doing sports status.

The sub-dimensions of Leisure Obstacles Scale, which are lack of knowledge and lack of facility, indicated significant difference with income status, while not indicating significant difference with other sub-dimensions.

It is thought that the shopping center employees' doing sports before but receiving minimum wage can cause a decrease in their interest to participation in recreational activities and this lack of interest can cause a decrease in their interest to enlightenment.

Consequently, the studies, which are intended for treating leisure time of shopping center employees, must be taken into consideration and suitable environment must be created because most of the employees remarked that there are not enough facilities for removing the leisure obstacles and even if there are, they do not have enough knowledge. The deficiencies must be made up with regard to these topics. Thus, they can make use of mentioned positive impacts and these impacts contribute them to succeed both in their sociocultural life and professional life.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the lights of these results, it is considered that giving more opportunities to the workers of service industry can make a big contribution to both their business and social life. It is also assumed that the employers giving chances of leisure to their employees can raise labor productivity.

REFERENCES

- Akatay A 2006. Time management in the organization. *S.U. Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 10: 281-299.
- Alexandris K, Carroll B 1997. Demographic differences in the perception of constraints on recreational sport participation: Results from a study in Greece. *Leisure Studies*, 16: 107-125.
- Amin TT, Suleman W, Ali A, Gamal A, Al Wehedy A 2011. Pattern, prevalence, and perceived personal barriers toward physical activity among adult Saudis in Al-Hassa, KSA. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 80: 775-784.
- Arslan S 1996. *A Study on the Female Student's Remaining in Higher Education Credit and Hostels Institution, Recreation Problems (Leisure Time Evaluation)*. Master's Thesis. Institute of Social Sciences. Turkey: Gazi University.
- Aytac O 2006. Consumerism and commodification in the clamp of leisure time. *Kocaeli University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 11(1): 27-53.
- Bodur F 1998. *When the Anadolu University of Economics and Bose Rating Tendencies of Administrative Sciences Faculty Students*. Master Thesis, Unpublished. Institute of Social Sciences. Turkey: Anadolu University.
- Bucher CH, Bucher CA 1984. *Recreation for Today's Society*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Englewood Cliffs.
- Can S 2010. Mugla University: Determination of the faculties of elementary education students are part of the family of the killer leisure time activities ceremonies. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 18(3): 861-870.
- Cerin E, Leslie E, Sugiyama T, Owen N 2010. Perceived barriers to leisure-time physical activity in adults: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 7: 451-459.
- Cetinbas RN 2010. *Identification and Investigation of Leisure Time Evaluation Under the Ministry of National Education in Schools Serving Teachers of Physical Education and Sports*. MA Thesis of Leisure Habits of Evaluation, Unpublished. Health Sciences Institute. Sivas, Turkey: Cumhuriyet University.
- Chow H, Dong YH 2013. Relationship between participation in leisure activities and constraints on Taiwanese breastfeeding mothers during leisure activities. *BMC- Public Health*, 13(410): 860-871.
- Clawson M, Knetsch JL 1974. Leisure in modern America. In: JF Murphy (Ed.): *Concepts of Leisure*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, pp. 21-36.
- Colakoglu T 2005. A study on the evaluations of university teaching staff over leisure time habits. *Journal of Gazi Faculty of Education*, 25(1): 247-258.
- Curry NR, Ravenscroft N 2001. Countryside recreation provision in England: Exploring a demand-led approach. *Land Use Policy*, 18: 281-291.
- Damianidis C, Kouthouris C, Alexandris K 2007. Perceived constraints on extracurricular sports recreation activities among student: The case study of schools of Livadia city in Greece. *Journal Inquiries in Sport and Physical Education*, 5(3): 379-385.
- Demir C, Demir D 2006. Individuals leisure activities factors affecting the participation relationship between sex: License an application for students. *Ege University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Ege Academic Journal*, 6(1): 36-48.
- Demirel M, Harmandar D 2009. Determination of the constraints on recreational participation of university students. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 6(1): 838-846.

- Drakou A, Tzetzis G, Mamantzi K 2006. Leisure constraints experienced by university students in Greece. *United States Sports Academy The Sport Journal*, 1543-9518.
- Dumazedier J 1960. Current problems of the sociology of leisure. *International Social Science Journal*, 4(4): 522-531.
- Ekinci NE, Kalkavan A, Ustun UD, Gunduz B 2014. Üniversite öğrencilerinin sportif ve sportif olmayan rekreatif etkinliklere katılmalarına engel olabilecek unsurların incelenmesi. *Sportif Bakis: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(1): 1-13.
- Emir E 2012. *Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılımın Önündeki Engellerin Belirlenmesi: Üniversite Öğrencileri Örneği*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Trabzon, Turkey: Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi.
- Finney C 2002. Recreation Its Effect on Productivity. *Recreation Management*, December /January.
- Gungormus HA, Yetim AA, Çalik C 2006, Ankara'daki beden eğitimi ve spor yüksek okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin boş zamanlarını değerlendirme biçimlerinin araştırılması. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 14(1): 285-294.
- Gurbuz B, Karakucuk S, Soral H 2010. Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılımın Önündeki Algılanan Engel Farklılıklarının İncelenmesi: Ankara Örneği. *11 Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi*, Antalya, Turkey.
- Gurbuz B, Karakucuk S 2008. Boş zaman engelleri olceği, olcek geliştirme, geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(1): 3-10.
- Hacıoğlu N, Gökdeniz A, Dinc Y 2009. *Boş Zaman ve Rekreatif Yönetimi Kitabı*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Kandaz GN, Herguner G 2007. Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenlerinin serbest zamanlarını değerlendirme biçimlerinin incelenmesi (Sakarya İli Örneği). *The International Journal of the Humanities*, 4: 1-9.
- Karacur E, Paşlı MM 2014. Turizm ve otel işletmeciliği programı öğrencilerinin rekreatif eğilimleri ve rekreatif etkinliklere katılımına engel olan faktörler. *Turizm Akademik Dergisi*, 1(1): 29-38.
- Karakaya I 2009. *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Ani Yayıncılık.
- Karakucuk S 2005. *Rekreatif Boş Zamanları Değerlendirme*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Karakucuk S 2008. *Rekreatif (Boş Zamanları Değerlendirme)*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Karasar N 2007. *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. 14th Edition. Ankara: Nobel Publication and Distribution.
- Kelly JR 1990. *Leisure*. 2nd Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Kilbas SK 2010. *Rekreatif Boş Zamanı Değerlendirme*. Ankara: Nobel Publication.
- Masmanidis T 2009. Perceived constraints of Greek university students' participation in campus recreational sport programs. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 33: 150-156.
- Okumus Y 2002. *Kocaeli İlinde Bulunan, Farklı Sanayi Kuruluşlarında Çalışan Bireylerin Boş Zamanlarını Değerlendirme Tercihleri, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Kocaeli, Turkey: Kocaeli Üniversitesi.
- Ozdilek C, Demirel M, Harmandar D 2007. Dumlupınar ve sakarya üniversitelerinde öğrenim gören beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin boş zaman etkinliklerine katılım nedenleri ve düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması. *The International Journal of the Humanities*, 4(2): 1-13.
- Ozsaker M 2012. Gençlerin serbest zaman aktivitelerine katılmama nedenleri üzerine bir inceleme. *Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise*, 14(1): 126-131.
- Parker S 1979. *The Sociology of Leisure*. London: George Allen And Unwin Ltd.Public Health.
- Shah PM, Aminuddin Y 2007. Sport participation constraints of Malaysian University. *The International Journal of the Humanities*, 5(3): 1-8.
- Tinsley HEA, Eldredge BD 1995. Psychological benefits of leisure participation: A taxonomy of leisure activities based on their need-gratifying properties. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42(2): 123-132.
- Torkildsen G 2005. *Leisure and Recreation Management*. London, UK: Spon Press.
- Yılmaz S, Zengin M, Yıldız ND 2005. Determination of user profile at city parks: A sample from Turkey. *Building and Environment*, 42: 2325-2332.

Paper received for publication on October 2015
Paper accepted for publication on March 2016