European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science
ISSN: 2501 - 1235
ISSN-L: 2501 - 1235
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

doi: 10.5281/zenodo.852540 Volume 3 | Issue 10 | 2017

LEISURE CONSTRAINTS AND FACILITATORS: PERSPECTIVES FROM TURKEY

Funda Koçak[i]
Ankara University,
Faculty of Sport Sciences
Ankara, Turkey

Abstract:
The aim of this study was to reveal the factors that constraints and facilitators health and fitness club members in Ankara to attend the leisure activities. The population for the research consists of large-scale health and fitness club members in Ankara. Research samples include 389 participants of 190 (M_{age}= 31.26; *SD*= 8.86) women and 199 (M_{age}= 31.31, *SD*= 9.06) men selected with convenience sampling method from four large-scale health and fitness club members in Ankara. Leisure Constraint Questionnaire was used in the study to determine the participants' constraints and Leisure Facilitators Scale to determine the facilitators they face while attending leisure activities. It was determined that though the health and fitness club users have constraints on leisure activity attendance, they use the facilitators to a considerable extent. While the most significant facilitators that enable the participants to attend the leisure activities were the intrapersonal facilitators, the least significant ones were interpersonal facilitators. When the constraints were analysed, the participants were seen to face these, the most on facility level and the least on lack of interest level. It was concluded that there is a statistically significant positive relationship between the participants' leisure constraints and facilitators, and also between the sub-dimensions of the scales. This matter shows that the participants face constraints during leisure attendance but still attend or continue using the facilitators.

Keywords: constraints, facilitators, health and fitness club, leisure

[i] Correspondence: email fkocak@ankara.edu.tr

1. Introduction

Leisure is a concept that comes up often in scientific studies today and is an area of interest for researchers (Silk, Caudwell & Gibson, 2017). While leisure studies were first associated with leisure participant, in later studies (constraints negotiation research) the term was associated with many concepts such as motivation in physical activity participation, desired experiences, negotiation and facilitators to leisure (Jackson, 1993; Scott, 1991; White, 2008). In addition to motivation studies that played an important role in developing the leisure concept, researchers have drawn attention to leisure constraints concept since the 1980s (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Crawford, Jackson & Godbey, 1991).

The role of motivation in leisure activities was first defined by Jackson (1993) as "balance proposition" and the relationship between leisure constraints and the motivation such attendance brings was defined as "*both the initiation and outcome of the negotiation process are dependent on the relative strength of, and interactions between, constraints on participating in activity and motivation for such participation*" (p. 9). According to Jackson (1993), individuals' activity participation can be prevented by some factors but the individual will still attend the leisure activities with the help of "balance". There are studies that show the relationship between motivation and leisure constraints (White, 2008). As a result, motivation dimensions that were agreed upon the most were determined as; self-actualisation, self-respect, daily routine avoidance, involvement, intellectual aesthetics, stimulus avoidance, competency/mastery and relaxion (Beard & Ragheb, 1983; Iso-Ahola & Allen, 1982; Manfredo, Driver & Tarrant, 1996). Although there are many studies like this and similar dimensions in the leisure literature, studies that focus on leisure constraints arose only in the last two decades (Alexandris, Tsorbatzoudis & Grouios, 2002; Chen & Pang, 2012).

The aim of the leisure constraints studies is to analyse and determine the prohibits and inhibits perceived by individuals on leisure activity participation, with factors accepted by researchers (Jackson, 1991). Jackson, Crawford and Godbey (1993) reported that leisure attendance does not depend upon lack of constraints but upon negotiation with them. In other words, people can start or continue leisure participation with facilitators or negotiation (Jackson & Rucks, 1995).

According to Raymore (2002), constraints model remains insufficient in explaining why the individuals attend the activities despite the constraints. Therefore Raymore (2002) suggested a new approach to understand leisure participation which he reported as "*facilitators to leisure are factors that promote or enable the formation of leisure preferences and encourage or enhance participation*" (p. 39). This suggestion includes both the facilitators and the constraints when compared to the base model suggested by

Crawford et al. (1991). A similar idea was formed by Hubbard and Mannell (2001) as leisure constraint negotiation. Unlike the other studies, Hubbard and Mannell (2001) tested and determined coping strategies and their models as well as other researchers' models. In the study, the mode developed by Jackson, Crawford and Godbey (1993) and their own constraint-effects-mitigation model was supported. In other words, they reached to the conclusion that negotiating constraints were about general factors from different sources that would make participation easier. These studies showed that leisure facilitators may have an important role in leisure participation. (Raymore, 2002, Silva & Correia, 2008).

In conclusion, people may negotiate with constraints and individuals can manage to start or maintain leisure participation. Though leisure facilitators are encouraging and effective on leisure participation, studies are usually about leisure facilitators and leisure motivation. There are few studies in the literature that analyse the relationship between leisure constraints and leisure facilitators. It is thought to add up to leisure constraints literature that such a study is conducted in Turkey, a culture that can qualify as a no-estern culture. The aim of this study is to analyse the relationship between the factors that facilitate and constrain leisure activity participation of current fitness center members in Ankara. More specific research questions included the following:

- What is the relationship between leisure facilitators and perceived leisure constraints?
- What are the perceived leisure constraints of private fitness center users and how are these constraints related to gender, marital status and age?
- What are the leisure facilitators of private fitness center users and how are these facilitators related to gender, marital status and age?

2. The Relationships between Leisure Constraints and Facilitators to Leisure

The concept of leisure constraints that has been focused on in the last thirty years enable a better understanding on individuals' leisure schedules and preferences (Godbey, Crawford & Shen, 2010). Leisure constraints affect individuals' approaches to recreative activities (Hinch, Jackson, Hudson &Walker, 2005) and play an important role in their participation or lack of attendance (Jackson, 2005). When studies on this topic were analysed, the relationships between the participation frequency, preferences regarding specialised activities, commitment and constraints, and behaviours were examined (Alexandris et al., 2002; Carroll & Alexandris, 1997; Frederick & Shaw, 1995; Henderson, Bedini, Hecht & Schuler, 1995; Hubbard & Mannell, 2001). Godbey et al. (2010) take the three level basic compounds in the constraints model; intrinsic, interpersonal and

structural constraints as the main structure in expressing leisure constraints. In most of the studies it was concluded that individuals are limited the most by interpersonal constraints (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Crawford, Jackson & Godbey, 1991). Despite all these constraint or prevention factors, individuals were observed to participate in leisure activities even in a particular amount with motivational factors, negotiation strategies and facilitators. This shows that obstacles can be overcome by facilitators (Kim et al., 2011).

According to Raymore (2002), constraints model has shaped leisure researches, making it harder to explain why the individuals participate in the activities. For him, the biggest issue in constraints approach was that the absence of constraints did not lead to individuals' activity participation. Thus, Raymore (2002) has suggested facilitates leisure participation that includes both facilitators and constraints in response to the basic model suggested by Crawford et al. (1991). Because using the term facilitators creates conceptual consistency with the constraints literature. What lies behind individuals' leisure constraint negotiation preferences is the facilitating factors that "make it easier" for them to participate in the leisure activities (Hubbard & Mannell, 2001). This model emphasises that the roles of the individual and social roles must be interpreted in connection with broader environmental powers. Facilitators to leisure contain structural, interpersonal and personal facilitators that encourage individuals to attend the activities or help create their perceived or experienced leisure (Raymore, 2002). Structural factors are about the socio-cultural beliefs that determine the appropriate behaviours for the members of a society. Interpersonal facilitators contain the encouragement from people close to the individual such as family members, colleagues, friends or peers. Personal factors include personality, past experiences and the individual's belief of self-efficacy (Roster, 2007). Personal facilitators are not only factors related to personal history that attract individuals or personalities to a certain activity but also the physical and mental skills needed for the particular activity participation.

3. Methods

3.1 Participants and Procedures

The research population consists of users of large-scale fitness centres in Ankara. Research samples were 389 members chosen from four health and fitness clubs (Base Life Club, Macfit Podium, Macfit Gordion and X Fit Dikmen) with more than 1000 members by convenience sampling. Data were collected from members that visit these centres at least two times a week, between February 2017 and May 2017. 190 of the participants were females (Mage= 31.26; SD=8.86) and 199 were males (Mage= 31.31,

SD=9.06). In terms of demographics, the majority in the sample was male (51%), belonging to the age group of 26-35 (38.3%) and single (65.3%). All the demographics are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Socio-demographic Information of the sample

Gender	Marital Status	Age groups in year
Males: 199 (51%)	Married: 135 (%34.7)	18-25: 113 (29.0%)
Females: 190 (49%)	Single: 254 (%65.3)	26-35: 149 (38.3%)
		36-45: 83 (21.3%)
		>46: 44 (11.3%)

n=389.

3.2 Research Instruments

The survey consisted of three sections: Leisure Facilitator Scale, the Leisure Constraints Questionnaire (LCQ) and demographic questions.

LCQ, used in the survey for determining the constraints that the participants face on leisure activity participation, was developed by Alexandris and Carroll (1997). The Turkish adaptation of the scale was made by Gürbüz et al., (2012). LCQ consists of 18 items and 6 sub-dimensions (individual psychology, lack of social environment and knowledge, facility/service and access, lack of partners and attention). The scale is a 4-point Likert scale and its evaluation varies from strongly insignificant to significant between 1 and 4 points.

Leisure Facilitator Scale (LFS), developed by Kim et al. (2011) was used for determining the participants' leisure facilitators. The Turkish adaptation of the scale was made by Gürbüz et al., (2015). It consists of 16 items and 3 sub-dimensions (personal facilitators, interpersonal facilitators and structural facilitators) and is a 5-point Likert type. The scale is evaluated from strongly insignificant to strongly significant between 1 and 5 points.

3.3. Statistical Analysis

In this research, whether the data showed normal distribution or not was analysed with Shapiro Wilk test. Shapiro Wilk results shown p=0.000 value in all sub-dimensions. However, the Skewness and Kurtosis values being between -2.00 and +2.00 shows that the data was distributed normally (George and Mallery, 2010). Therefore, the data was accepted to show normal distribution with Pearson Coefficient of Correlation, independent sample t test and ANOVA, in addition to statistics techniques. Error of margin in the research was taken as α=0.05 and α=0.01.

4. Results

4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Analysis

In Reliability Analysis results, Cronbach's Alpha value was observed to be acceptable in all leisure facilitator sub-dimensions (intrapersonal facilitators, interpersonal facilitators, structural facilitators) and leisure constraints sub-dimensions (individual/psychological, lack of knowledge, facilities/services, lack of partners, time, lack of interest) (Table 2). According to leisure facilitators descriptive statistics, the intrapersonal facilitators had the highest mean score (3.62), followed by the structural facilitators (3.61). In terms of constraints, the facilities/services had the highest mean score (2.96), followed by the Time (2.88) and lack of knowledge (2.84) (Table 2).

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Analysis

	Mean (SD)	Alpha Scores
Leisure Facilitators Scale (LFS)	**3.51(.60)**	**.854**
Intrapersonal	3.62(.74)	.829
Interpersonal	3.22(.89)	.721
Structural	3.61(.68)	.762
The Leisure Constraints Questionnaire (LCQ)	**2.79(.48)**	**.853**
Individual/psychological	2.83(.66)	.710
Lack of knowledge	2.84(.76)	.765
Facilities/services	2.96(.66)	.732
Lack of partners	2.52(.78)	.755
Time	2.88(.68)	.712
Lack of ınterest	2.69(.73)	.737

The first research question explored was the relationship between leisure facilitators and perceived leisure constraints sub-dimensions (Table 3, Table 4).

Table 3: Bivariate correlations between constraint dimensions and facilitators

Scales	1	2
The Leisure Constraints Questionnaire	-	.39**
Leisure Facilitators Scale		-

**p>0.01.

A positive significant relationship was detected between the participants' leisure constraints and leisure facilitators ($r = 0.39$; $p < 0.01$).

Table 4: Bivariate correlations between constraints dimensions and facilitator's dimensions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Intrapersonal		.34**	.49**	.31**	.18**	.27**	.15**	.28**	.11*
2. Interpersonal			.52**	.07	.06	.11*	.47**	.01	.18**
3. Structural				.29**	.20**	.15**	.40**	.18**	.19**
4. Individual/psychological					.45**	.39**	.19**	.46**	.43**
5. Lack of knowledge						.35**	.20**	.46**	.43**
6. Facilities/services							.20**	.43**	.20**
7. Lack of partners								.23**	.32**
8. Time									.30**
9. Lack of interest									

**p>0.01, *p>0.05.

Bivariate correlations were used to test the relationship between leisure constraints and facilitators sub-dimensions (Table 4). As it can be seen on the table, interpersonal facilitators and structural facilitators dimensions were found between lack of partners and highest correlations (r=0.47; p>0.01) for interpersonal, (r=0.40; p>0.01) for structural). Intrapersonal facilitators and highest positive correlations were found in individual/psychological (r=0.31; p>0.01).

Descriptive statistics for the LCQ sub-dimensions for all participations were the foundation for addressing the third research question about leisure constraints. Descriptive statistics for the LCQ sub-dimensions for all participations were the foundation for addressing the second research question about leisure constraints. Overall findings indicated that the Facilities/services sub-dimension was the biggest constraint to leisure for the participants (M=2.96, SD =.66) based on a 4-point Likert-type scale with 1=not important and 4=very important reason. This constraint mean did not differ descriptively compared to lack of time (M = 2.88, SD = .68), lack of knowledge (M = 2.84, SD = .76) and individual/ psychological (M = 2.64, SD = .71) constraints. Of lesser importance as a constraint was lack of interest (M = 2.69, SD = .73) and lack of partners (M = 2.52, SD = .78). These mean scores were somewhat clustered together, and the standard deviations were small.

However, all of the perceived constraints variables except for gender were considered important. Descriptive statistics and mean scores for gender, marital status and age shown in Table 5. Independent Sample t test result for gender showed no statistically significant differences when compared to any of the LCQ sub-dimensions. However, both married (M=2.80, SD=.56) and single (M=2.87, SD=.70) participants had similar facilities/services sub-dimension scores, which were high. Besides, single participants had the higher mean constraint scores in all LCQ sub-dimensions except the facilities/services sub-dimension. However, only statistical differences were found

related to lack of partners $t_{(387)}$=-3.03, p=0.03 sub-dimension. Married participants in the study indicated that lack of partners was less of a constraint to leisure than it was for single participants.

ANOVA was conducted for the LCQ sub-dimensions related to age. ANOVA analysis indicated significant differences in lack of partners, $F(3, 388)=4.12$, $p<.05$ sub-dimension among participants with different age groups. Post hoc Scheffe multiple comparisons indicated that significant difference was the greatest with 18-25 and 26-35 age groups participants being less constrained than 36-45 age groups lack of partner sub-dimension.

Table 5: The Leisure Constraints Questionnaire sub-dimensions compared to gender, marital status, age

	Gender		**Marital Status**		**Age groups in year**			
	Male	**Female**	**Married**	**Single**	**19-25**	**26-35**	**36-45**	**>46**
	N = 199	**N = 190**	**N = 135**	**N = 254**	**N =113**	**N =149**	**N =83**	**N =44**
Sub-dimensions	**M(SD)**	**M(SD)**	**M(SD)**	**M(SD)**	**M(SD)**	**M(SD)**	**M(SD)**	**M(SD)**
Individual/psychological	2.81(.68)	2.85(.64)	2,78(,71)	2,85(,63)	2.82(.63)	2.87(.60)	2.87(.71)	2.62(.75)
Lack of knowledge	2.80(.80)	2.89(.72)	2,78(,73)	2,87(,78)	2.87(.75)	2.83(.74)	2.93(.77)	2.65(.83)
Facilities/services	2.90(.67)	3.02(.63)	3,05(,68)	2,91(,64)	2.82(.67)	3.01(.61)	3.04(.63)	2.99(.77)
Lack of partners	2.47(.77)	2.57(.79)	2,35(,77)**	2,60(,77)**	2.60(.75)*	2.60(.76)*	2.33(.85)*	2.37(.76)
Time	2.84(.68)	2.92(.68)	2,84(,73)	2,90(,66)	2.87(.67)	2.91(.68)	2.87(.64)	2.83(.82)
Lack of interest	2.63(.73)	2.76(.73)	2,64(,71)	2,72(,74)	2.71(.75)	2.72(.74)	2.74(.65)	2.47(.77)

**p>0.01, *p>0.05

Table 6: Leisure Facilitators Scale sub-dimensions compared to gender, marital status, age

	Gender		**Marital Status**		**Age groups in year**			
	Male	**Female**	**Married**	**Single**	**19-25**	**26-35**	**36-45**	**>46**
	N = 199	**N = 190**	**N = 135**	**N = 254**	**N =113**	**N =149**	**N =83**	**N =44**
Sub-dimensions	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
Intrapersonal	3,69(,74)*	3,53(,74)*	3,43(,75)	3,71(,72)	3,67(,70)	3,73(,73)	3,47(,71)	3,32(,85)
İnterpersonal	3,06(,87)*	3,40(,87)*	2,84(,76)	3,43(,88)	3,34(,89)	3,35(,89)	3,06(,84)	2,80(,80)
Structural	3,57(,69)	3,66(,67)	3,39(,64)	3,73(,67)	3,70(,69)	3,66(,68)	3,50(,62)	3,41(,72)

**p>0.01, *p>0.05

Descriptive statistics for the LFS sub-dimensions for all participations were the foundation for addressing the third research question about leisure facilitators. Overall findings indicated that the intrapersonal sub-dimension was the highest facilitator to

leisure for the participants (M=3.62, SD =.74). This facilitator is followed by respectively stractural (M=3.61, SD =.68) and interpersonal (M=3.22, SD=.89). These mean scores were somewhat clustered together, and the standard deviations were small. This approximation draws attention to the fact that the points are very close.

Leisure facilitator variables examined except for structural were considered important. Descriptive statistics and mean scores for gender, marital status and age for leisure facilitators shown in Table 6. In t test results, conducted for gender variable, a significant difference between personal $t_{(387)}$=-2.18, p=.01 and interpersonal $t_{(387)}$=3.82, p=.01 sub-dimensions. In leisure activity participation, males use personal facilitators more and females use interpersonal facilitators more. When the participants were compared according to their marital status, a significant difference was found between personal $t_{(387)}$=-3.65, p=.01, interpersonal $t_{(387)}$=-6.53, p=.01 and structural $t_{(387)}$=-4.71, p=.01 sub-dimensions. In all sub-dimensions, single individuals use facilitators more than married ones.

ANOVA was conducted for the LFS sub-dimensions related to age. In age group comparison results, a significant difference was found between personal F(3, 385)=4.95, p<.01, interpersonal F(3, 385)=6.03, p<.01 and structural F(3, 385)=2.97, p<.01 sub-dimensions. It is seen in the Post hoc Scheffe multiple comparisons results, participants that are younger than 46 aged were using facilitators less than 18-25 and 26-35 aged participants.

5. Discussion

In this survey, the participants used personal facilitator more and preferred structural and interpersonal facilitators respectively. Kang et al., (2017) has reported that leisure participation is affected the most by interpersonal facilitators. On the other hand, the participants were observed to face constraints of Facilities/services, followed by lack of knowledge. In the study conducted in Turkey by Gürbüz and Hendersen (2014) the participants' most popular constraints were structural aspects of access that include inadequate facilities, inability to get to opportunities and insufficient funds. But in most of the studies in other countries that examine the recreational participation constraints, time was the top dimension followed by psychological, lack of partners and accessibility/financial dimensions (Alexandris & Carroll, 1997; Jackson, 1995; Mannell & Zuzanek, 1991). This matter can occur from individuals not having an established sense of recreation habits in a developing country like Turkey although the number of these facilities increased greatly in the past 15 years.

A positively significant relationship between the leisure constraints and facilitators of the participants in the study was detected. This shows that facilitators

come into play more when constraints increase. Highest positive correlations in the study were found among lack of partners with interpersonal facilitators and structural facilitators dimensions. Many studies claim that leisure facilitators can play an important role in leisure participation (Mannell, 2001; Raymore, 2002). But although there are factors that can encourage or affect leisure participation, there are few quantitative proofs regarding leisure facilitators' direct connection to individuals' leisure participation. For example, thanks to McLean and Hamilton (2011), it has been concluded that individuals have access to leisure activities and have opportunities to participate and be satisfied via leisure facilitators. Results in this manner qualify to add up to leisure facilitator's literature.

A gender significant relationship was not found between gender and perceived leisure. This is an unexpected result according to the current literature. Today, the relationship between women's disadvantaged roles in society and their access to leisure is focused on intensively in gender and leisure researches (Aitchison, 2001). According to these studies, women face more constraints than man in leisure activities due to their culturally based gender roles (Alexandris & Carroll, 1997; Jackson & Henderson, 1995). The reason why such difference did not show up in the current study might be that the study was conducted in the health and fitness clubs in one of the most developed cities in Turkey, the capital city Ankara. Because the social roles of women, especially educated women in Turkey are changing and they start to spend more time outside their homes.

However when a comparison was made on marital status, single participants have higher values compared to married ones except for LCQ sub-dimensions mean scores facilities/services sub-dimension. But the values are very close. Only statistical differences were found related to lack of partners sub-dimension. Single participants face more constraints on lack of partners dimension than married participants. It is indeed possible to observe insignificant results regarding constraints between singles and married participants (Alexandris & Carroll, 1997). The reason of this difference occurring in lack of partners dimension might be because of the exercise environments available for couple's participation becoming more common these days.

When age variant was analysed, 18-25 and 26-35 age groups participants face less constraints than 36-45 age group participants. Jackson (1993) reported that personal constraints increase with age. In many studies, an inverse relationship is seen between age and constraints. This means that as age increases constraints increase as well (Alexandris & Carrol, 1997). Torkildsen (2012) reported that age is an important factor in recreational activity participation but this effect differs depending upon the individual and the considered activity. Kunz and Graham (1996) expressed that young people intend to participate in physical and sports activities more than elders.

However, in the current study, age shows difference in only one sub-dimension. Other than that, the values are very close to each other. This can be caused by participants under 35 years of age have broader social environments than 36-45 year old participants due to reasons like school and work.

When the participants were analysed in terms of gender, leisure facilitator variables examined except for structural were considered important. Male participants use personal facilitators more and female participants use interpersonal facilitators more in leisure activities. Treiber et al. (1991) indicates that social support has positive effects on continuous sports activity participation. This result shows that women need more support in participating in sportive recreational activities. However, in the study conducted on Korean female participants by Kang et al. (2017) it was observed that the participants preferred intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural facilitators respectively. This is thought to be caused by cultural differences.

When the participants were analysed in terms of marital status, a significant difference between personal, interpersonal and structural subscales. In all sub-dimenisons, single individuals use facilitators more than married ones. Studies cannot present a relationship between marital status and leisure constraints (Alexandris & Carroll, 1997). Current study has only found a significant difference in lack of partner. This matter shows that all individuals, whether married or single, face constraints to a certain degree. But singles use facilitators in all dimensions more than married ones. The number of single people in the study is higher than married people. This proves that singles participate in leisure activities more than married ones by using facilitators.

In the age group comparison results, a significant difference between personal, interpersonal and structural sub-dimensions. In all sub-dimensions, participants that are 46 or older use facilitators less than participants in the 18-25 and 26-35 age groups. Lobo (1999) reported that young people are more willing to attend leisure activities. This might be the reason why the young participants use motivation and facilitators more in participation.

As a result, it has been concluded that structural constraints are more powerful than personal and interpersonal constraints. The participants are limited by lack of partners and lack of interest the least. While the participants use personal facilitators the most when annihilating these constrains, they prefer interpersonal constraints the least. A positively significant relationship between participants' leisure time constraints and leisure facilitators was detected. This shows that the individuals face more constraints in leisure participation but as constraints increase, they use facilitators more.

6. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The demand for health and fitness clubs in Turkey has increased in the last 15 years and this sector has grown especially due to many health and fitness club chains' opening one after another. This popularity continues in both national and international levels. Because of Ankara's location as the capital city of Turkey, it has been affected by this matter more in a positive sense. But the limited academic surveys show that the sportive leisure participation in Turkey is still not at the desired level. Turkish people are shown to prefer more home-base leisure activities (especially watching TV) in these studies (Erkip, 2009; Gürbüz et al., 2010). In this study, leisure participants' perception regarding constraints was researched with theoretical models suggested in the literature (constraints and facilitators) and information on whether these constraints would be overcome by facilitators was searched for. As constraints increase in health and fitness club users, facilitators increase as well. This is why the ways that facilitators can be used more by individuals can be discussed in preceding surveys. Another point is the health and fitness clubs in which the study was conducted. The data was gathered only from health and fitness club members in Ankara. Also, cultural and socio-economic variants were not included in the analyses of the study. Future surveys may analyse constraint perception in participants from different areas and conclude the role of socio-economic status and culture in constraint perception and facilitators this way. In addition, larger and highly represented samples used in future studies will be more effective in generalising the results.

Also, in accordance with the literature, in this study the intent to continue participation that was used commonly in earlier studies can be used as dependent variable (Alexandris, Kouthouris & Girgolas, 2009; Alexandris & Stodolska, 2004; Alexandris, Funk & Pritchard, 2011; Armitage & Conner, 1999). Thus, the relationship between constraints and facilitators can be further interpreted.

Finally, relationship and difference tests were used in this study. Because determining the relationship between constraints and facilitators were made a top priority in this study. These determined relations in the current survey can be improved in future studies and the structural models can be tested. This way, factors affecting leisure participation and decision making process can be further understood.

References

1. Aitchison C, 2001. Gender and leisure research: The "codification of knowledge". Leisure Sciences, 23(1), 1-19.

2. 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(2), 107-125.
3. Alexandris K, Kouthouris C, Girgolas, G, 2007. Investigating the relationships among motivation, negotiation, and alpine skiing participation. Journal of Leisure Research, 39(4), 648-667.
4. Alexandris K, Stodolska M, 2004. The influence of perceived constraints on the attitudes toward recreational sport participation. Loisir et Société/Society and Leisure, 27(1), 197-217.
5. Alexandris K, Tsorbatzoudis C, Grouios G, 2002. Perceived constraints on recreational sport participation: Investigating their relationship with intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and amotivation. Journal of Leisure Research, 34(3), 233-252.
6. Alexandris K, Funk DC, Pritchard M, 2011. The impact of constraints on motivation, activity attachment, and skier intentions to continue. Journal of Leisure Research, 43(1), 56-79.
7. Armitage CJ, Conner M, 1999. Distinguishing Perceptions of Control From Self-Efficacy: Predicting Consumption of a Low-Fat Diet Using the Theory of Planned Behavior1. Journal of applied social psychology, 29(1), 72-90.
8. Beard JG, Ragheb MG, 1983. Measuring leisure motivation. Journal of leisure research, 15(3), 219-228.
9. Carroll B, Alexandris K, 1997. Perception of constraints in strength of motivation: Their relationship to recreational sport participation in Greece. Journal of Leisure Research, 29(3), 279-299.
10. Chen M., & Pang X. (2012). Leisure motivation: An integrative review. Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal, 40(7), 1075-1081.
11. Crawford DW, Godbey G, 1987. Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure. Leisure sciences, 9(2), 119-127.
12. Crawford DW, Jackson EL, Godbey G, 1991. A hierarchical model of leisure constraints. Leisure sciences, 13(4), 309-320.
13. Erkip F, 2009. Leisure in the Turkish context: A preliminary account. World Leisure Journal, 51 (4), 275-281.
14. Frederick CJ, Shaw SM, 1995. Body image as a leisure constraint: Examining the experience of aerobic exercise classes for young women. Leisure Sciences, 17(2), 57-73.
15. George D, Mallery M, 2010.SPSS for Windows step by step: a simple guide and reference, 17.0 update. 11th Edition, USA: Pearson Higher Education.

16. Godbey G, Crawford DW, Shen XS, 2010. Assessing hierarchical leisure constraints theory after two decades. Journal of Leisure Research, 42(1), 111-134.
17. Gürbüz B, Özdemir AS, Sarol H, Karaküçük S, 2010. Comparison of recreation behaviours of individuals with regard to demographic variables. Series Physical Education and Sport/Science, Movement and Health, 10, 362 – 365.
18. Gürbüz B, Öncü E, Emir E, 2012. Leisure Constraints Questionnaire: Testing the Construct Validity. 12th International Sports Sciences Congress, 339-343, December 12-14, Denizli, Turkey.
19. Gürbüz B, Henderson KA, 2014. Leisure activity preferences and constraints: perspectives from Turkey, World Leisure Journal, 56(4), 300-316.
20. Gürbüz B, Öncü E, Emir E, 2015. Serbest Zaman Kolaylaştırıcıları Ölçeğinin Türk Kültürüne Uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması, III. Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Kongresi, 182-187, 5-7 Kasım, Eskişehir, Türkiye.
21. Henderson KA, Bedini LA, Hecht L, Schuler R, 1995. Women with physical disabilities and the negotiation of leisure constraints. Leisure studies, 14(1), 17-31.
22. Hinch, T., Jackson, E. L., Hudson, S., & Walker, G. (2005). Leisure constraint theory and sport tourism. Sport in society, 8(2), 142-163.
23. Hubbard J, Mannell RC, 2001. Testing competing models of the leisure constraint negotiation process in a corporate employee recreation setting. Leisure Sciences, 23(3), 145–163.
24. Iso-Ahola SE, Allen J R, 1982. The dynamics of leisure motivation: The effects of outcome on leisure needs. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 53(2), 141-149.
25. Jackson EL, 2005. Leisure constraints research: Overview of a developing theme in leisure studies. In Jackson E.L. (ed.), Constraints to leisure (p. 3-22). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
26. Jackson EL, 1991. Leisure constraints/constrained leisure: Special issue introduction. Journal of Leisure Research, 23(4), 279-285.
27. Jackson EL, 1993. Recognizing patterns of leisure constraints: Results from alternative analyses. Journal of leisure research, 25(2), 129-149.
28. Jackson EL, Crawford DW, Godbey G, (1993). Negotiation of leisure constraints. Leisure sciences, 15(1), 1-11.
29. Jackson EL, Henderson KA. 1995. Gender-based analysis of leisure constraints. Leisure sciences, 17(1), 31-51.
30. Jackson EL, Rucks VC, 1995. Negotiation of leisure constraints by junior-high and high-school students: An exploratory study. Journal of leisure research, 27(1), 85-105.

31. Kim B, Heo J, Chun S, Lee Y, 2011. Construction and initial validation of the leisure facilitator scale. Leisure/Loisir, 35(4), 391-405.
32. Kang HY, Kim HH, Choi HW, Lee WI, Lee CW, 2017. Relationship between Leisure Facilitators and Serious Leisure among Female Korean College Soccer Participants. Asian Social Science, 13(4), 117-124.
33. Korotkov D, McLean H, Hamilton L, 2011. Predicting leisure satisfaction: A comparative analysis of the agency and communion model with the five-factor model of personality. The American Association of Behavioral and Social Sciences Journal, 15, 1-20.
34. Kunz JL, Graham K, 1996. Life course changes in alcohol consumption in leisure activities of men and women. Journal of Drug Issues, 26(4), 805-829.
35. Lobo F, 1999. The leisure and work occupations of young people: A review. Journal of occupational science, 6(1), 27-33.
36. Manfredo MJ, Driver BL, Tarrant MA, 1996. Measuring leisure motivation: A meta-analysis of the recreation experience preference scales. Journal of leisure Research, 28(3), 188-213.
37. Mannell RC, Zuzanek J, 1991. The nature and variability of leisure constraints in daily life: The case of the physically active leisure of older adults. Leisure Sciences, 13(4), 337-351.
38. Roster CA, 2007. "Girl power" and participation in macho recreation: the case of female Harley riders. Leisure Sciences 29(5), 443-461.
39. Raymore LA, 2002. Facilitators to leisure. Journal of Leisure Research, 34(1), 37-51.
40. Scott D, 1991. The problematic nature of participation in contract bridge: A qualitative study of group-related constraints. Leisure Sciences, 13(4), 321-336.
41. Silk M, Caudwell J, Gibson H, 2017. Views on leisure studies: pasts, presents & future possibilities? Leisure Studies, 36(2), 153-162,
42. Silva O, Correia A, 2008. Facilitators and constraints in leisure travel participation: the case of the southeast of Portugal. International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research, 2(1), 25-43.
43. Torkildsen G, 2012. Torkildsen's sport and leisure management. In: Taylor P, editor, 6th edition, Routledge: Oxon.
44. Treibe FA, Baranowski T, Braden DS, Strong WB, Levy M, Knox W, 1991. Social support for exercise: Relationships to physical activity in young adults. Preventive Medicine, 20(6), 737–750.
45. White DD, 2008. A structural model of leisure constraints negotiation in outdoor recreation. Leisure Sciences, 30(4), 342-359.