



## ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCE PARTICIPATION OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Menderes Kabadayı<sup>1</sup>, Tolga Eski<sup>2i</sup>,  
Levent Bayram<sup>3</sup>, Ali Kerim Yılmaz<sup>4</sup>,  
Muhammet Hakan Mayda<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1,3,4,5</sup>Ondokuz Mayıs University Yaşar Doğu,  
Faculty of Sport Sciences, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Kastamonu University,  
School of Physical Education and Sports, Turkey

### Abstract:

The purpose of this study is to find out recreational tendencies of university students, the factors which prevent them from participating in recreational activities and whether these factors differ according to some variables. 200 students, 96 males and 104 females, studying in three different faculties (faculty of theology, faculty of education and faculty of sport sciences) of Samsun Ondokuz Mayıs University during 2016-2017 Academic Year participated in the study voluntarily. Leisure Constraints Scale was used as data collection tool. SPSS 22.0 was used in the statistical analysis of our data. Factor analysis was conducted on the data obtained, followed by Anova Test, Kruskal Wallis Test, Mann-Whitney-U test and T Test according to the data set. When the results of our study were examined, no statistically significant difference was found between age groups in terms of lack of access and friends, lack of information, lack of time and lack of facility, and between genders in terms of lack of facility, lack of time, individual psychology and lack of information ( $p>0.05$ ). Statistically significant difference was found between faculties in terms of lack of knowledge and individual psychology, between genders in terms of access and lack of friends ( $p<0.05$ ). As a conclusion, it can be seen that there are differences between students studying in different faculties in terms of lack of knowledge about recreational activities, problems in finding facilities and individual psychology.

**Keywords:** recreation, constraint, students

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: email [teski@kastamonu.edu.tr](mailto:teski@kastamonu.edu.tr)

## 1. Introduction

Efficient use of leisure time is important for university students in terms of preventing some problems which influence their lives and feeling physically and mentally healthy (Akkaya, 2008). Thus; sport, social and cultural activities should be developed and students should be directed to recreation facilities at university so that they can use their leisure time effectively (Karasar et al., 1999; Bayram et al., 2016). Organizing activities such as cinema, theatre and concerts and supporting students' participation in these activities will both solve some of the problems students have and also will have positive influences on students' spending their leisure time effectively and prevent anxiety (Korkmaz, 2000; Bostancı, 2014).

Recreational activities are an indispensable part of university life (Zorba, 2006), thus, recreational programs in universities have a serious role and significance on university students (Ok et al., 2015). University students' assessing their leisure time and participating in recreational activities takes place in a semi-organized way as part of facilities provided to them during their university education and within this context universities can have a leading role for students to assess their extracurricular activities well (Balci, 2003). Studies have shown that although it is known that recreational activities have significant contributions to individuals, individuals cannot participate in these activities for some reasons or they are faced with some constraints (Karaküçük and Gürbüz, 2007; Chow and Dong, 2013; Ekinci et al., 2014; Çebi et al., 2016; İslamoğlu et al., 2014).

Based on all these information, the purpose of our study is to find out where and how university students spend their leisure time, to find out their preferences and to find out the reasons preventing them from participating in recreational activities.

## 2. Material and Method

### 2.1. Universe and Sample

The universe of the study consists of undergraduate students studying at Samsun Ondokuz Mayıs University during 2016-2017 Academic Year, while the sample of the study consists of 200 (96 males, 104 females) students who were chosen with random sampling method among the day and evening students of faculty of theology, faculty of education and faculty of sport sciences and who participated in the study voluntarily.

## 2.2. Data Collection Tool

The data collection tool used in the study consists of two parts. In the first part, there are questions about demographic information of the participants, while “Leisure Constraints Scale” with developed by Alexandris and Carrol (1997) which consisted of 6 sub-dimensions and 27 items was used. Turkish validity and reliability of the study was conducted by Karaküçük and Gürbüz. The scale has 27 items and 6 sub-dimensions as (1) “lack of time and interest”, (2) “individual psychology”, (3) “lack of knowledge”, (4) “access problem”, (5) “lack of facility” and (6) “lack of friends”. The individuals’ leisure time is assessed on a 4-Likert type scale as “Totally unimportant (1)” and “Unimportant (2)”, “Important (3)”, and “Very important (4)”.

## 2.3. Data Analysis

SPSS 22.0 program was used for the analysis of data. Kolmogorov-smirnov test was used to find out whether the data were normally distributed and Anova and T-test were used for normally distributed data, while Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U test were used for data sets which were not normally distributed.

## 3. Results

**Table 1:** Demographic information of the participants

Demographic Information	n	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	104	52.0
Male	96	48.0
<b>Age</b>		
18 - 20	78	39.0
21 - 23	106	53.0
24 - 26	10	5.0
27 and older	6	3.0
<b>Faculty</b>		
Faculty of Sport Sciences	82	41.0
Faculty of Theology	60	30.0
Faculty of Education	58	29.0

**Table 2:** Comparison of students from different faculties in terms of lack of friends

Faculty	Average	SD	F	p
Faculty of Sport Sciences	15.00	3.90		
Faculty of Theology	14.90	3.83	1.587	0.210
Faculty of Education	16.55	4.50		

No statistically significant difference was found between the faculties in terms of access and lack of friends ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 3:** Comparison of students from different faculties in terms of lack of knowledge

Faculty	Average	SD	F	p
Faculty of Sport Sciences	15.19	2.92	13.616	0.000
Faculty of Theology	12.03	3.38		
Faculty of Education	11.72	3.13		

Statistically significant difference was found between the faculties in terms of access and lack of friends ( $p<0.05$ ).

**Table 4:** Anova Test analysis of lack of interest sub-dimension in terms of faculties

Faculty	Average	SD	F	p
Faculty of Sport Sciences	13.70	3.24	2.030	0.137
Faculty of Theology	12.56	2.56		
Faculty of Education	14.00	2.80		

No statistically significant difference was found between the faculties in terms of lack of interest ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 5:** Comparison of students from different faculties in terms of lack of facility

Faculty	Average	SD	F	p
Faculty of Sport Sciences	12.46	1.87	4.621	0.012
Faculty of Theology	10.70	3.09		
Faculty of Education	12.00	2.42		

Statistically significant difference was found between the faculties in terms of lack of facility ( $p<0.05$ ).

**Table 6:** Comparison of students from different faculties in terms of lack of time

Faculty	N	Median	p
Faculty of Sport Sciences	82	14	0.770
Faculty of Theology	60	14	
Faculty of Education	58	15	

No statistically significant difference was found between the faculties in terms of lack of time ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 7:** Comparison of students from different faculties in terms of lack of individual psychology

Faculty	N	Median	p
Faculty of Sport Sciences	82	7.00	0.024
Faculty of Theology	60	6.00	
Faculty of Education	58	5.00	

Statistically significant difference was found between the faculties in terms of individual psychology ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 8:** Comparison of Access and Lack of friend sub-dimensions in terms of gender

Gender	Average	SD	t	p
Male	16.53	4.09	2.955	0.004
Female	14.20	3.76		

Statistically significant difference was found between genders in terms of access and lack of friends ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 9:** Comparison of Lack of knowledge sub-dimension in terms of gender

Gender	Average	SD	t	p
Male	13,01	3,34	-0,653	0,515
Female	13,47	3,69		

No statistically significant difference was found between genders in terms of lack of knowledge ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 10:** Comparison of Lack of interest sub-dimension in terms of gender

Gender	N	Mean Rank
Male	104	52.31
Female	96	48.54
	<b>Sig.</b>	0.514

No statistically significant difference was found between genders in terms of lack of interest ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 11:** Comparison of Lack of facility sub-dimension in terms of gender

Gender	N	Mean Rank
Male	104	54.67
Female	96	45.98
	<b>Sig.</b>	0.130

No statistically significant difference was found between genders in terms of lack of facility ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 12:** Comparison of Lack of time sub-dimension in terms of gender

Gender	Average	SD	t	p
Male	14.75	2.33	2.487	0.015
Female	13.39	3.08		

Statistically significant difference was found between genders in terms of lack of time ( $p<0.05$ ).

**Table 13:** Comparison of individual psychology sub-dimension in terms of gender

Gender	N	Mean Rank
Male	104	53.43
Female	96	47.32
<b>Sig.</b>		0.285

No statistically significant difference was found between genders in terms of individual psychology ( $p>0.05$ ).

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusion

When the results of our study were examined, it was found that 15% of our sample group had weekly 1-5 hours of leisure time, and 33% had 6-10 hours, while 19% were found to have weekly 11-15 hours of leisure time and 33% were found to have weekly 16 hours and more of leisure time.

Although participation in recreational activities has an important place in individuals' lives, it is a known fact that most of the time, there is not enough participation in recreational activities due to some reasons. In a study, Çoruh (2013) found results similar to the results of our study. Tolukan (2010) reported that a great majority of students stated that the period of leisure time was insufficient and they had difficulties in making use of leisure time. Parallel to the results of our study, studies have proven that the factor which constraints recreational activities the most is lack of time (Jackson, 1988).

Leisure time is directly associated with not only time factor, but also with a great number of variables such as age, place of residence and financial possibilities. When the results of our study are examined, while no statistically significant difference was found in all sub dimensions in terms of age, studies clearly show that age-dependent

participation in recreational activities have changed (Torkildsen, 2005). In addition, it can be seen that among 18-25 year-old university students, participation in recreational activities changed according to lack of financial possibilities (Alexandris and Carroll, 1997). When studies conducted on university students are considered, studies have shown that students do not know how to spend their leisure times or in general they spend their time inertly (Demir, 2003). On the contrary, there are also studies which show that time is enough for leisure time activities and this time is used efficiently (Güngörmüş, 2017).

When the results of our study are examined, it is found that when compared with the students of faculty of education and faculty of sport sciences, students of the faculty of theology experienced problems in participating in leisure time activities in terms of lack of facility. In a study by Çoruh (2013), it was found that a great majority of university students complained about lack of facilities and they spent about 1-5 hours a week in the existing facilities. This difference can be interpreted as the fact that especially students of sport faculty have a control on the areas they can spend their leisure time activities in the city they live. In addition, as stated by Yılmaz et al. (2003), these differences in the use of facilities can be sufficient or insufficient in terms of individuals' economic and social structure.

When the sub-dimensions of all factors which constraint the participation of leisure time activities are analyzed in terms of the variable of gender, significant differences were found between faculties in terms of lack of access and friends, it can be seen that lack of access and friends influenced the participation of male students when compared with female students. When the studies in literature are examined, studies have shown that when the area in which leisure time activity will be conducted is easy to reach, that area will increase its potential with a rate of approximately 20% (Karatoprak, 2011; Çoruh, 2013). When the sub-dimension of lack of time was compared in terms of loss of time, it was found that female students participated less in reactive facilities when compared with male students. In parallel with the results of our study, when literature was reviewed, it was clearly stated that lack of time influenced leisure time participation, and similar to our study, female students experienced problems in participating in leisure time activities due to lack of time when compared with male students (Henderson, 1991; Henderson, 1995; Hudson, 2000; Çoruh, 2013). When the other sub-dimensions are examined, no statistically significant differences were found in terms of the variables of faculty and gender. When studies in literature are examined, it can be seen that a great number of studies are in line with our study. However, unlike our study, there are also studies which show differences in leisure time activities in sub-

dimensions of individual psychology between genders (Sharp, 1996; Tolukan, 2010; Çoruh, 2013).

As a conclusion, it is thought that the differences between university students in terms of the differences in participating in leisure time activities in terms of the variables of faculty and gender differ in terms of the residential area, lack of time and lack of information about recreational areas, and if the required efforts are made to increase students' participation in recreational activities and to provide them a more social life, more positive results will be obtained and students' participation in such activities will increase.

## References

1. Akkaya, S. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin popüler kültür etkinlikleri ve boş zaman alışkanlıkları. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*.
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., 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.
4. Balcı, V., Demirtaş, M., Gürbüz, P., İlhan, A., & Ersöz, V. (2003). Ankara'daki üniversite öğrencilerinin boş zaman etkinliklerine katılımlarının araştırılması. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 158*, 161-173.
5. Bayram, L., Keskin, D. Ö. Y., Kabadayı, M., & Bostancı, Ö. (2016). Üniversitede Eğitim Gören Milli Sporcuların Sorunlarının İncelenmesi. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 1*(2), 75-84.
6. Chow, H., Dong, Y.H. (2013). Relationship between Participation in Leisure Activities And Constraints On Taiwanese Breastfeeding Mothers During Leisure Activities, *BMC Public Health, 13*(410).
7. Çebi, M., Çavuşoğlu, G., Ünver, Ş., İslamoğlu, İ., & ACAR, K. (2016). Determination of the Factors Preventing Students of the Faculty of Sports Sciences from Participating in Recreational Activities Ondokuz Mayıs University Sample. *Journal Of Social Sciences Research, 10*(4), 2236–2240.
8. Çoruh, Y. (2013). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Rekreatyoneel Eğilimleri Ve Rekreatyoneel Etkinliklere Katılımına Engel Olan Faktörler: Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen

Üniversitesi Örneği. *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.*

9. Demir, C. (2003). Demografik özellikler ile sağlanan imkânların sportif faaliyet tercihleri üzerine etkileri: üniversite gençliğine yönelik bir uygulama. 1. *Gençlik, Boş Zaman ve Doğa Sporları Sempozyumu. Türk Hava Kurumu Basım Evi İşletmeciliği. Ankara, 1-24.*
10. Ekinci, N. E., Kalkavan, A., Üstün, Ü. D., & Gündüz, B. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin sportif ve sportif olmayan rekreatif etkinliklere katılmalarına engel olabilecek unsurların incelenmesi. *Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 1(1), 1-13.*
11. Ergül, O. K., Hulusi, A. L. P., & Çamlıyer, H. (2015). Üniversite gençliğinin sportif rekreasyon etkinliklerine yönelik ilgileri ve katılma düzeylerinin belirlenmesi.
12. Güngörmüş, H. A. (2007). Özel sağlık-spor merkezlerinden hizmet alan bireyleri rekreasyonel egzersize güdüleyen faktörler. *Doktora Tezi: Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 98-105.*
13. Gürbüz, B., Karaküçük, S. (2007). Boş Zaman Engelleri Ölçeği-28: Ölçek Geliştirme, Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması, Gazi Üniversitesi, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi,(12)1, 3-10.
14. Henderson, K. A. (1995). Women's leisure: More truth than facts?. *World Leisure & Recreation, 37(1),*
15. Henderson, K. A., & Dialeschki, M. D. (1991). A sense of entitlement to leisure as constraint and empowerment for women. *Leisure Sciences, 13(1), 51-65.*
16. Hudson, S. (2000). The segmentation of potential tourists: Constraint differences between men and women. *Journal of Travel Research, 38(4), 363-368.*
17. İslamoğlu, İ., İmamoğlu, A., & Çavuşoğlu, G. (2014). Verçenik Plateau Alternative Tourism and Recreational Activities. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport (IntJSCS), 2(6), 271-282.*
18. Jackson, E. L. (1988). Leisure constraints\*: A survey of past research. *Leisure sciences, 10(3), 203-215.*
19. Karasar, N., Hakan, A., Can, G., Özdeş, K., Sözer, E., Gültekin, M., ... & Şenel, A. (1999). Anadolu Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Sosyo-Kültürel ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Özellikleri ile Beklenti ve Sorunları. *Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayını.*
20. Karatoprak C, İlgar Y, Mülazımoğlu-Ballı Ö. (2011). Kent İçi Rekreasyon Parklarının Rekreasyon Potansiyelinin Belirlenmesi. I. Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Kongresi. Antalya.

21. Korkmaz, A. (2000). Yüksek Öğretim Gençliğinin Problemleri. *Milli Eğitim*, 145, 41-45.
22. Sharp, A., & Mannell, R. C. (1996, May). Participation in leisure as a coping strategy among bereaved women. In *Eighth Canadian Congress on Leisure Research* (pp. 241-244). Ontario: University of Ottawa.9-13.
23. Tolukan, E. (2010). Özel Yetenekle İlgili Bölümlerde Okuyan Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Rekreatif Aktivitelere Katılımlarına Engel Olabilecek Unsurların Belirlenmesi. *Niğde Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim dalı, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Niğde*.
24. Torkildsen, G. (2005). *Leisure and recreation management*. Psychology Press.
25. Yılmaz, H., Yılmaz, S., & Yıldız, N. D. (2003). Kars kent halkının rekreatif talep ve eğilimlerinin belirlenmesi. *Journal of the Faculty of Agriculture*, 34(4).
26. Zorba, E., Zorba, E., Kesim, Ü., Ağılönü, A., Cerit, E. (2006). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılım Düzeylerinin Belirlenmesi (Muğla Üniversitesi Örneği), 9. Uluslar Arası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı, 43-44.
27. Bostancı, Ö. (2014). Trait anxiety levels of university students studying at sports departments. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 9(20), 1021.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).