

# The Relationship between Students' Life Satisfaction and Leisure Attitudes (Research on Students of Physical Education and Sports)

Aydın Pekel<sup>1</sup>, Ali Kaya<sup>2</sup>, Sinan Demirci<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Istanbul Gelisim University, School of Physical Education and Sports, İstanbul. E-mail: [apekel@gelisim.edu.tr](mailto:apekel@gelisim.edu.tr), <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0238-1081>

<sup>2</sup>Istanbul Gelisim University, School of Physical Education and Sports, İstanbul. E-mail: [alikaya@gelisim.edu.tr](mailto:alikaya@gelisim.edu.tr), <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0583-8083>

<sup>3</sup>Istanbul Gelisim University, School of Physical Education and Sports, İstanbul. E-mail: [sidemirci@gelisim.edu.tr](mailto:sidemirci@gelisim.edu.tr), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6061-4325>

DOI: 10.47750/pnr.2023.14.03.156

## Abstract

This study aimed to evaluate the relationship between life satisfaction and leisure attitudes of students studying at the School of Physical Education and Sports. Another aim of the study is to examine the leisure attitude and life satisfaction levels of students according to the variables of gender, age, class, physical activity participation status and family monthly income. In the research, quantitative research; relational screening method and causal comparison method were applied. The population of the study consisted of Istanbul Gelisim University School of Physical Education and Sports department's students, and the sample (n=426) consisted of volunteer participants. Easy sampling method was preferred as the sampling method. The data were collected by questionnaire technique. Sociodemographic questions including gender, age, class, level of participation in activities and income level variables, Leisure Time Attitude Scale and Life Satisfaction Scale were applied to the participants. The data obtained were transferred to IBM SPSS24 programme and Mann Whitney U, Kruskal Walls H and Spearman Correlation analysis were applied to determine the relationship levels. Statistical significance level was accepted as  $p < .050$ .

It was determined that there was no difference in life satisfaction level and leisure attitudes according to the gender of the students. No difference in life satisfaction was detected according to the age and class variables of the students, but there was a significant difference in life satisfaction according to activity participation status and family income level. A significant difference was detected in the perception towards leisure attitudes according to the age, class, activity participation status and family income level variables of the students. Moreover, a weak positive relationship was determined between life satisfaction and leisure time attitude.

It was determined that life satisfaction level and leisure time attitudes of male and female students showed similar characteristics. It was determined that the age variable was not a determining variable in the level of life satisfaction, and the attitudes of the participants between the ages of 24-26 were at a better level towards leisure time. It was determined that as the grade level increased, the level of leisure attitude decreased, which was significant, and the grade level was not effective in life satisfaction. It was determined that the life satisfaction and leisure attitudes of the students who regularly participated in recreational and sportive activities were at a better level and statistically significant. It was determined that as the family income level of the students increased, their life satisfaction increased, and the income level variable was a determinant variable in life satisfaction. It was determined that family income level was an important variable in the perception of leisure attitude, and as the income level increased, leisure time attitude was positively affected. It was determined that as the life satisfaction level of the students increased, leisure time attitude also increased and there was a linear relationship between life satisfaction and leisure time attitude.

**Keywords:** Student, Leisure, Life Satisfaction.

## INTRODUCTION

The concept of leisure is one of the popular topics on which much thought, research and definitions are made. Güngörmüş (2007) attributes the main reason for the large number of definitions related to the concept of leisure to the fact that the concept has been analysed by different researchers from different perspectives. In the ideas produced about leisure time, it is generally seen that titles such as "recreation area preferences", "motivation", "constraints" and "attitude" are commonly used (Gürbüz & Henderson, 2013; Tolukan & Yılmaz, 2014). The concept of leisure is the time when an individual does not work, is not necessary to maintain his/her life and spends his/her energy as a result of his/her own will (Kılbaş, 1994). Leisure was defined by Aristotle as the time spent just to participate without any purpose (Kraus, 1985). Veblen (1899) pointed out the

anti-lazy content of leisure time, Broadhurst (2001) stated that leisure is an important part of life, and Yetim (2005) emphasised its importance for skill development. According to Ragheb and Beard (1982), attitude towards leisure time is defined as the positive and negative reflections of the knowledge, beliefs, feelings and behavioural styles that people have acquired towards the concept. The determination of leisure time attitudes, which constantly change and develop in parallel with the change and development of technology, is in close relationship with leisure behaviours, arrangement of programmes, motivation and satisfaction level (Ragreb & Beard, 1982; Kaufman 1984).

Life satisfaction is the situation arising from the difference between what a person has and what he/she wants in the course of life (Özer & Karabulut, 2003). According to Çivitçi (2009), life satisfaction is the cognitive evaluations made by the individual in the course of life. In general, the concept of life satisfaction includes a person's satisfaction with the past, present and future; the desire to bring his/her life to a better level than before; and the opinions of other individuals on the life of the individual (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). Being aware of oneself, trusting oneself, being open to learning, communicating with other individuals, socialising, getting a job, participating in activities, raising children affect life satisfaction Flanagan, 1978; Yildirim & Belen, 2018). The fact that a person's entire life is in happiness and peace, and that the individual maintains his/her life in the way he/she wants, shows that the life satisfaction of that person is high. Therefore, students' perceptions of life satisfaction and leisure attitudes are of interest.

## METHOD

### Research Model

The research was designed according to the quantitative research model and a descriptive and relational screening method aiming to reveal the current situation was preferred. Descriptive survey was a statistical process that allows the collection, description and presentation of numerical values related to a variable (Büyükoztürk et al. 2008). Relational survey model is a research model that aims to determine whether there is a change between two or more variables and the degree of change (Karasar, 2017). Research 2022 was presented as a summary paper at the 6th International Academic Sports Research Congress.

### Establishment of the Volunteer Group

The population of the study consisted of the employees of sports enterprises that prepare and present profit/benefit-oriented sports activity programmes in Istanbul. The sample of the research consisted of (n=421) participants. Convenience sampling method was preferred as the sampling method.

**Table 1.** Demographic characteristics of the participants

	<b>Variables</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Gender</b>	Female	228	54,2
	Male	193	45,8
	Total	421	100,0
<b>Grade</b>	1. Grade	33	7,8
	2. Grade	188	44,7
	3. Grade	57	13,5
	4. Grade	143	34,0
	Total	421	100,0
<b>Age</b>	18-20	181	43,0
	21-23	101	24,0
	24 and older	139	33,0
	Total	421	100,0
<b>Participation Level in Activities</b>	Never Participate	31	7,4
	Irregularly Paticipation	218	51,8
	Regularly Participation	172	40,9
	Total	421	100,0
<b>Family income level</b>	5500-9500 TL	19	4,5
	9501-13500 TL	128	30,4
	13501-17500 TL	184	43,7
	17501 and more	90	21,4
	Total	421	100,0

### Data Collection Tools

In addition to the personal information form created by the researchers, the Leisure Time Attitude Scale and Life Satisfaction

Scale were used in our study. Information about the data collection tools is available below.

### Personal Information Form

The personal information form created by the researchers, and consisted of gender, grade, age, level of participation in activities, and family income level variables.

### Leisure Time Attitude Scale

The leisure time attitude scale was developed by Ragheb and Beard (1982) and adapted into Turkish by Akgül and Gürbüz (2010). The scale was designed as a 5-point Likert-type scale and the answers were ranked between strongly agree and strongly disagree. The 36-item scale has three sub-dimensions: Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as 0.90.

### Life Satisfaction Scale

Life satisfaction scale was developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffin (1985). The scale, which consisted of a unidimensional structure, was constructed in 5-point Likert type. In the scale adapted into Turkish by Dağlı and Baysal (2016), the answers were ranked between strongly agree and strongly disagree. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as 0.85 in the life satisfaction scale, and had no sub-dimensions and reverse coding.

### Data Analysis

The data obtained from the Personal Information Form, life satisfaction and leisure attitude scale were entered into the SPSS 24.0 package program and analyzes were performed in this program. In the study; distribution analysis, descriptive analysis and non parametric hypothesis tests Mann Whitney U, Kruskal Wallis H analysis and correlation analysis were applied for the relationship.  $P < 0.05$  was considered statistically significant.

**Table 2.** Skewness, Kurtosis and Kolmogorov Smirnov test significance level results of the participants' scores obtained from the scales

Scale	N	Skewness	Kurtosis	p
Life Satisfaction Scale	421	-1,729	,507	,000
Cognitive	421	-1,543	,919	,000
Affective	421	-,518	1,164	,000
Behavioral	421	-1,433	1,018	,000
Leisure Attitude Scale Total	421	-1,426	2,674	,000

It was seen that there were deviations from normality in the data obtained from the life satisfaction scale, the leisure time attitude scale and the cognitive, affective and behavioral sub-dimensions of the leisure time attitude scale. The application of Kolmogorov-Smirnov analysis was only one of the methods used to determine the normal distribution status of the data. When the normal distribution curves were examined, it was determined that there were deviations from normality (Büyüköztürk, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). It was determined that there were deviations from normality in the scale scores, the coefficients were not in the range of  $\pm 1$  to  $\pm 1.5$  and the data did not show a normal distribution.

**Table 3.** Descriptive statistics of the participants' scores from the scales

Scales	N	Min	Max	X±Sd
<b>Life Satisfaction</b>	421	1,20	5,00	3,32±0,70
Cognitive	421	2,00	5,00	3,80±0,55
Affective	421	1,92	5,00	3,95±0,54
Behavioral	421	1,83	5,00	3,88±0,55
<b>Leisure Attitude Scale Total</b>	421	1,97	5,00	3,88±0,49

The participants' life satisfaction mean was  $3.32 \pm 0.70$ , leisure time attitude; cognitive dimension mean was  $3.80 \pm 0.55$ , affective dimension mean was  $3.95 \pm 0.54$ , behavioral dimension mean was  $3.88 \pm 0.55$  and leisure time attitude mean was  $3.88 \pm 0.49$ .

## RESULTS

**Table 4.** Comparison of participants' scores on the scales according to gender

Scales	Gender	N	Rank mean	Total Rank	u	p
Life Satisfaction	Male	228	204,21	46967,50	20402,50	,089
	Female	193	224,41	43983,50		
Cognitive	Male	228	208,99	48068,00	21503,00	,411
	Female	193	218,79	42883,00		
Affective	Male	228	216,72	49845,00	21800,00	,558
	Female	193	209,72	41106,00		
Behavioral	Male	228	206,17	47420,00	20855,00	,181
	Female	193	222,10	43531,00		
Leisure Attitude Scale Total	Male	228	210,54	48424,00	21859,00	,591
	Female	193	216,97	42527,00		

\* $p < ,050$ ; \*\* $p < ,001$

In Table 4, no statistically significant difference detected in the level of life satisfaction according to the gender of the participants ( $p > 0.05$ ). Moreover, no statistically significant difference was found in the total score and sub-dimensions of leisure time attitude according to gender variable ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 5.** Comparison of the participants' answers to the scales according to age variable

	Age	N	Rank mean	sd	X <sup>2</sup>	p	Difference
Life Satisfaction	18-20 aged <sup>a</sup>	181	210,79	3	1,927	,382	-
	21-23 aged <sup>b</sup>	101	203,35				
	24-26 aged <sup>c</sup>	139	224,55				
Cognitive	18-20 aged <sup>a</sup>	181	184,25		20,125	,000**	c>a
	21-23 aged <sup>b</sup>	101	224,49				
	24-26 aged <sup>c</sup>	139	244,37				
Affective	18-20 aged <sup>a</sup>	181	178,74		29,851	,000**	c>a
	21-23 aged <sup>b</sup>	101	222,58				
	24-26 aged <sup>c</sup>	139	253,10				
Behavioral	18-20 aged <sup>a</sup>	181	184,98		18,594	,000**	c>a
	21-23 aged <sup>b</sup>	101	226,78				
	24-26 aged <sup>c</sup>	139	241,72				
Leisure Attitude Scale Total	18-20 aged <sup>a</sup>	181	178,72		28,741	,000**	c>a
	21-23 aged <sup>b</sup>	101	225,20				
	24-26 aged <sup>c</sup>	139	251,20				

\* $p < ,050$ ; \*\* $p < ,001$

When Table 5 was examined, no statistically significant difference found in the level of leisure satisfaction according to the age of the participants ( $p > 0.05$ ). A statistically significant difference was found in the total score and sub-dimensions of leisure time attitude according to the age variable ( $p < 0.05$ ). It was determined that this was due to the difference between 18-20 years old and 24-26 years old. When the rank means were considered, it was seen that the students in the 24-26 age range had better attitudes towards leisure time.

**Table 6.** Comparison of the participants' answers to the scales according to the grade variable

	Grade	N	Rank mean	sd	X <sup>2</sup>	p	Difference
<b>Life Satisfaction</b>	1. Grade <sup>a</sup>	33	164,66	3	7,833	,052	-
	2. Grade <sup>b</sup>	188	209,53				
	3. Grade <sup>c</sup>	57	223,96				
	4. Grade <sup>d</sup>	143	226,58				
<b>Cognitive</b>	1. Grade <sup>a</sup>	33	311,06		63,379	,000**	a>d
	2. Grade <sup>b</sup>	188	268,48				
	3. Grade <sup>c</sup>	57	204,04				
	4. Grade <sup>d</sup>	143	193,52				
<b>Affective</b>	1. Grade <sup>a</sup>	33	269,87		58,188	,000**	a>d
	2. Grade <sup>b</sup>	188	168,22				
	3. Grade <sup>c</sup>	57	203,28				
	4. Grade <sup>d</sup>	143	164,26				
<b>Behavioral</b>	1. Grade <sup>a</sup>	33	263,73		41,562	,000**	a>d
	2. Grade <sup>b</sup>	188	173,72				
	3. Grade <sup>c</sup>	57	214,59				
	4. Grade <sup>d</sup>	143	183,91				
<b>Leisure Attitude Scale Total</b>	1. Grade <sup>a</sup>	33	291,19	69,901	,000**	a>d	
	2. Grade <sup>b</sup>	188	264,51				
	3. Grade <sup>c</sup>	57	206,19				
	4. Grade <sup>d</sup>	143	163,17				

\* $p < ,050$ ; \*\* $p < ,001$

When Table 6 was examined, there was no statistically significant difference in the level of life satisfaction according to the grade level of the participants ( $p > 0,05$ ). A statistically significant difference was found in the total score and sub-dimensions of leisure time attitude according to the grade variable ( $p < 0,05$ ). It was determined that this was due to the difference between the 1st and 4th grades. When the rank means were considered, it was seen that the 1st grade students' attitudes towards leisure time were at a better level.

**Table 7.** Comparison of the participants' scores from the scales according to the family income status variable

	Income Status	N	Rank mean	sd	X <sup>2</sup>	p	Difference
<b>Life satisfaction</b>	5500-9500 TL <sup>a</sup>	19	100,16	3	38,281	,000**	a<d b<d
	9501-13500 TL <sup>b</sup>	128	178,49				
	13501-17500 TL <sup>c</sup>	184	234,18				
	17501 and more <sup>d</sup>	90	245,03				
<b>Cognitive</b>	5500-9500 TL <sup>a</sup>	19	130,37		51,393	,000**	a<d b<d
	9501-13500 TL <sup>b</sup>	128	165,64				
	13501-17500 TL <sup>c</sup>	184	226,92				
	17501 and more <sup>d</sup>	90	272,29				
<b>Affective</b>	5500-9500 TL <sup>a</sup>	19	146,29		72,030	,000**	a<d b<d
	9501-13500 TL <sup>b</sup>	128	154,68				
	13501-17500 TL <sup>c</sup>	184	224,35				
	17501 and more <sup>d</sup>	90	290,11				
<b>Behavioral</b>	5500-9500 TL <sup>a</sup>	19	163,50		60,334	,000**	a<d b<d
	9501-13500 TL <sup>b</sup>	128	159,47				
	13501-17500 TL <sup>c</sup>	184	221,47				
	17501 and more <sup>d</sup>	90	285,54				
<b>Leisure Attitude Scale Total</b>	5500-9500 TL <sup>a</sup>	19	132,82	80,978	,000**	a<d b<d	
	9501-13500 TL <sup>b</sup>	128	152,18				
	13501-17500 TL <sup>c</sup>	184	225,45				
	17501 and more <sup>d</sup>	90	294,28				

\* $p < ,050$ ; \*\* $p < ,001$

When Table 7 was examined, a statistically significant difference was detected in life satisfaction, leisure time attitude and sub-dimensions according to the family income status variable ( $p < 0,05$ ). It was determined that this was due to the difference

between 5500-9500 TL and 17501 TL and above group, 9501-13500 TL and 17501 TL and above group. When the rank means were considered, it was seen that the life satisfaction and attitudes towards leisure time of the students whose family income level was 17501 TL and above were at a better level.

**Table 8.** The relationship between life satisfaction and leisure time attitudes of the participants

		<b>Cognitive</b>	<b>Affective</b>	<b>Behavioral</b>	<b>Leisure attitude</b>
Life satisfaction	r	,250	,332	,385	,350
	p	,000**	,000**	,000**	,000**

\* $p < ,050$ ; \*\* $p < ,001$

Table 8 showed that there was a weak positive relationship between life satisfaction and cognitive sub-dimension ( $r = ,250$ ;  $p = ,000$ ), affective sub-dimension ( $r = ,332$ ;  $p = ,000$ ), behavioral sub-dimension ( $r = ,385$ ;  $p = ,000$ ), and leisure attitude ( $r = ,350$ ;  $p = ,000$ ).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

It was seen that the life satisfaction levels of the university students participating in the research were at a medium level. Although the life satisfaction of the students in the sample group was at a medium level, it was understood that their expectations were not fully met or they were not satisfied. This situation can be explained by the fact that their university life continues and they were financially dependent on their families or external sources. When the literature was examined, Akyol, Başaran, and Yeşilbaş (2018) stated that the trainees attending the public education centre had a high level of life satisfaction perception, and Özkul and Cömert (2018) stated that the life satisfaction of teachers was at a medium level. It was seen that there were studies that support our research results as well as studies that were not in the same direction. This may be due to the differences in people's expectations and needs, rapid change and demographic differences.

Moreover, it was seen that the perceptions of the university students participating in the study towards leisure time attitudes were at a good level. Following the results obtained, it was understood that students perceive leisure time in a good way in terms of cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects. Therefore, it can be said that university students show awareness of using their leisure time, enjoy their leisure time and use their leisure time efficiently. When the literature was examined, Yıldırım (2019) stated that students' leisure time attitudes were at a good level in his master's thesis study in which he examined university students' leisure time attitudes, and Denkel, Sağiroğlu, Taşkın, and Ayar (2020) stated that students' attitudes towards leisure time activities were at a high level. In the literature, there were studies that support our results as well as studies that were not similar to our results.

Besides, it was determined that the life satisfaction level and leisure time attitudes of male and female students in the sample group were similar. This may be due to the fact that male and female students were in a similar sociodemographic structure, the opportunities they have access to were similar, and they tend to spend their leisure time together in general. When the literature was examined, Akyol, Başaran, and Yeşilbaş (2018) stated that life satisfaction differed according to the gender variable in the study conducted on the trainees attending the public education centre and that the life satisfaction of female participants was higher, while Denkel, Sağiroğlu, Taşkın, and Ayar (2020) also found that there was a significant difference in women's leisure time perception compared to men. In another study, Gökçe (2019) stated that there was a significant difference in the affective and cognitive sub-dimension and the total score of the leisure time scale, while there was no statistically significant difference in the behavioral sub-dimension. The results obtained from the studies may vary due to the region of residence, educational status, and sociocultural differences.

Moreover, it was determined that there was a similarity in the life satisfaction of the students in the sample group according to the age variable. There were significant differences in the total score and sub-dimensions of leisure time attitude according to the age variable. It was determined that students between the ages of 24-26 had better attitudes towards leisure. As a result, it can be stated that increasing the age of a person was considered more beneficial with the experience gained. When the literature was examined, Yüksel, Şahin, and Sarıdemir (2017) found that the life satisfaction levels of teachers under the age of 30 were higher than older teachers, while Acar and Yılmaz (2021) and Aslan (2020) determined that the age variable did not differ on life satisfaction. In another study, Yaşartürk, Akyüz, and Karataş (2018) and Küçükeşmen, Şimşek, and Türkoğlu (2020) stated that there was no significant relationship between students' leisure time management and age variable. Research results differ from our results. The difference in the results may have emerged with the effect of the region of residence, personal differences and other variables. In general, as an individual gets older, his/her responsibilities in the flow of life may increase. Following the increase in responsibilities, the individual's time may be limited.

A similarity detected in the life satisfaction levels of the participants according to the grade variable. It was seen that there was a difference in the total score and sub-dimensions of leisure time attitude according to the grade variable. It was seen that first-year students have more leisure time. This situation can be explained by the fact that first-year students have more leisure as a

result of having fewer responsibilities. In parallel with the increase in the grade level of the students, it can be expected that their course intensity will also increase. Besides, it can be thought that the expectations of the members of the society and their families will increase. A similarity detected in the life satisfaction levels of the participants according to the grade variable. It was seen that there was a difference in the total score and sub-dimensions of leisure time attitude according to the grade variable. It was seen that first-year students have more leisure time. This situation can be explained by the fact that first-year students have more leisure as a result of having fewer responsibilities. In parallel with the increase in the grade level of the students, it can be expected that their course intensity will also increase. Besides, it can be thought that the expectations of the members of the society and the expectation of their families will increase.

It was seen that there was a difference in life satisfaction and leisure time attitude and its sub-dimensions according to the family income status variable of the participants. With the increase in the income level variable, the individual may have the opportunity to do more activities. This situation will allow them to enjoy life more with the activities that take place and to evaluate their leisure time correctly. When the literature was examined, Aslan (2020) observed an increase in the life satisfaction of individuals with increasing financial power, while in another study, Denkel, Sagiroglu, Taskin, and Ayar (2020) reported a significant difference in the family income level variable. This difference was significant between those with a family income level of less than 2000 TL and those with a family income level of 2000 - 4000 TL. In other words, with the increase in income level, leisure time management increases in parallel. The results of the research are consistent with our results.

When the direction and level of the relationship between life satisfaction and leisure time attitude were examined, it was found that there was a weak positive relationship. When the literature was examined, Turan, Gülşen and Bilaloğlu (2019), Acar and Yılmaz (2021) and Su (2021) stated that there was a positive relationship between leisure time and life satisfaction in their master's thesis study.

As a result, it was determined that students' life satisfaction was at a moderate level and their leisure time attitudes were at a good level. It was seen that life satisfaction and leisure time attitudes of male and female students were similar. Age, class and family income level were found to be a determining variable in leisure time attitudes, and students with higher income levels had better life satisfaction. It was determined that there was a weak positive relationship between life satisfaction and leisure time attitude. It was determined that with the increase in the leisure time attitudes of the students, the level of pleasure, enjoyment and happiness they will get from life also increases.

## REFERENCES

1. Acar, K. and Yılmaz, A.K. (2021). Üniversite öğrencilerinin serbest zaman doyumları ile yaşam doyumları arasındaki ilişki. *Journal of Physical Education & Sports Science/Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15(1).
2. Akgül, B.M. and Gürbüz, B. (2010). Leisure attitude scale: the study of reliability and validity. *Gazi Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 16 (1), 37-43.
3. Akyol, B., Başaran, R. and Yeşilbaş, Y. (2018). Halk eğitim merkezlerine devam eden kursiyerlerin yaşam doyum düzeyleri ve yaşam boyu öğrenme eğilimleri. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (48), 301-324.
4. Aslan, G. (2020). İlkokul yöneticilerinin iş doyum düzeyleri ile yaşam doyum düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Denizli*.
5. Broadhurst, R. (2001). *Managing Environments for Leisure and Recreation*, New York: Routledge.
6. Büyükoztürk, Ş. (2007). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. 7.Baskı, Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık. Ankara.
7. Büyükoztürk, Ş. et al. (2008). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. 1. Baskı, Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
8. Çivitçi, A. (2009). İlköğretim öğrencilerinde yaşam doyumu: Bazı kişisel ve ailesel özelliklerin rolü. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*,22(1), 29-52. Bursa.
9. Dağlı, A. and Baysal, N. (2016). Yaşam doyumu ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15 (59) , 0-0. DOI: 10.17755/esosder.263229
10. Denkel, M., Sağıroğlu, İ., Taşkın, C. and Ayar, H. (2020). Öğrencilerin boş zaman aktivitelerine yönelik tutum düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 15(5).
11. Diener, E.D. Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J. and Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
12. Diener, E., Suh, E.M., Lucas, R.E. and Smith, H.L. (1999). Subjective well being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*,125(2), 276-302.
13. Eranıl, A. K. and Özcan, M. (2018). Lise öğrencilerinin boş zaman yönetimi becerisinin incelenmesi. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(6), 779-785.
14. Flanagan, J.C. (1978). A research approach to improving our quality of life. *Am Psychologist*, 33(2), 138-147.
15. Gökçe, S.C. (2019). Spor Genel Müdürlüğü merkez teşkilatında çalışan personelin boş zaman aktivitelerine yönelik tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi. *Master's thesis, Kırıkkale Üniversitesi. Kırıkkale*.
16. Güngörmüş, H.A. (2007). Özel sağlıkspor merkezlerinden hizmet alan bireyleri rekreasyonel eğzersize güdüleyen faktörler. (Doktora Tezi). *Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü*. Ankara.
17. Gürbüz, B. and Henderson, K. (2013): Exploring the meanings of leisure among Turkish university students. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 15(4), 927-957.
18. Karasar, N. (2017). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi kavramlar ilkeler teknikler*. Nobel Yayınları. Ankara.
19. Kaufman, J.E. (1984). A Study of leisure satisfaction, leisure participation, and patterns of leisure activity in relationship to anxiety levels in retirees. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 45(9), 3782-A.
20. Kılbaş, Ş. (1994). *Gençlik ve boş zamanı değerlendirme*. Çukurova Üniversitesi.
21. Kraus, R.G. (1985). *Recreation program planning today*. Scott Foresman ve Company.
22. Küçükesmen, E. Şimşek, A. and Türkoğlu, M.E. (2020). Önlisans öğrencilerinin sosyo-demografik özelliklerine göre boş zaman yönetimi. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (38), 202-231.

23. Özer, M. and Karabulut Ö.Ö. (2003). Yaşlılarda yaşam doyumu. *Geriatry*, 6(2), 72-74.
24. Özkul, R. and Cömert, M. (2018). Ortaokul öğretmenlerinde yaşam doyum düzeyi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(3), 707-724.
25. Ragheb, M.G. and Beard, J.G. (1982). Leisure attitude measurement. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 14, 155-167.
26. Su, İ.H. (2021). Emeklilerde boş zaman yönetimi, rekreatif etkinlik katılımı ve yaşam doyumunun incelenmesi. Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Anabilim Dalı. Mersin.
27. Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L.S. (2013). *B.G. Tabachnick, L.S. Fidell using multivariate statistics*. Pearson. Boston.
28. Tolukan, E. and Yılmaz, B. (2014). Özel yetenekle ilgili bölümlerde okuyan öğrencilerin rekreasyonel aktivitelere katılımlarına engel olabilecek unsurların belirlenmesi. *International Journal of Sport Culture and Science*, 2(Special Issue 1), 525-539.
29. Turan, E.B., Gülşen, D.B.A. and Bilaloğlu, M. (2019). Kadın çalışanların yaşam doyumu ile boş zaman engelleri arasındaki ilişki: Akdeniz Üniversitesi örneği. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(1), 104-114.
30. Veblen, T. (1899). *The theory of the leisure class*. (reprinted, 1934). Modern Library. New York.
31. Yaşartürk, F., Akyüz, H. and Karataş, İ. (2018). Rekreasyon bölümü öğrencilerinin boş zaman yönetimi ile akademik başarılarını etkileyen örgütsel faktörler arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(2), 233-243.
32. Yetim, A.A. (2005). *Sosyoloji ve spor*. Yaylacık Matbaası. İstanbul.
33. Yıldırım, M.K. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin boş zaman tutum düzeylerinin boş zamanda sıkılma algısını belirlemedeki rolünün incelenmesi Master's thesis, Kırıkkale Üniversitesi. Kırıkkale.
34. Yıldırım, M. and Belen, H. (2018). Fear of happiness predicts subjective and psychological well-being above the Behavioral Inhibition System (BIS) and Behavioral Activation System (BAS) model of personality. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 2(1), 92-111.