Vol. 79 | No. 9/1 | Sep 2023
DOI: 10.21506/j.ponte.2023.9.4
PONTE Florence, Italy
International Journal of Sciences and Research

THE MEANING OF LEISURE AND LIFE SATISFACTION FOR HEALTH MAINTENANCE IN ADULTS

Assoc. Prof. Mehmet DEMİREL
Necmettin Erbakan University, Faculty of Tourism, Department of Recreation Management, Konya, Türkiye
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1454-022X, mehmetdemirel78@gmail.com
Assoc. Prof. Mustafa Can KOÇ
Istanbul Gelisim University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Istanbul, Türkiye
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3007-5367, mckoc@gelisim.edu.tr
Assoc. Prof. Duygu HARMANDAR DEMİREL
Necmettin Erbakan University, Department of Physical Education Teaching, Konya, Türkiye
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4090-7929, duyguharmandar@gmail.com
Assoc. Prof. Emrah SERDAR
Sakarya University of Applied Science, Faculty of Sport Science, Sakarya, Türkiye
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2438-6748, emrah.serdar@outlook.com

Abstract
The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between the meaning of leisure for health maintenance and life satisfaction in adults. The study consists of 361 adult individuals residing in Istanbul province who were determined by convenience sampling method. In addition to "Personal Information Form" (gender, age, marital status), "Meaning of Leisure Scale" and Life Satisfaction Scale were utilized as data collection tools. In the study, parametric analyzes were utilized as a result of skewness and kurtosis values T-test and Anova. The LSD test was employed as a post-hoc analysis to determine the difference between the groups. Pearson Correlation Analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between leisure meaning and life satisfaction. In the light of the findings, significant differences were observed in the life satisfaction scale according to gender variables. However, no significant difference was encountered in the life satisfaction scale according to age and marital status variables. In the leisure meaning scale, significant differences were encountered in the sub-dimensions of leisure utilization, perceived freedom, goal orientation and work relationship according to gender variables, but not in other sub-dimensions. According to the age variable, a significant difference was detected in the perceived competence, goal orientation and work relationship sub-dimensions of the leisure meaning scale, but no significant difference was detected in other sub-dimensions. According to the marital status variable, no significant difference was detected in the meaning of leisure scale. It was determined that there was a positive and weakly significant relationship between the sub-dimensions of the meaning of leisure scale and the life satisfaction scale. As a result, it can be stated that there is a positive relationship between the meaning of leisure and life satisfaction. It can be explained that life satisfaction can be positively affected by the activities that individuals will participate in by adopting the meaning of leisure, taking into account the importance and value of leisure, and that it is also significant for the maintenance of health.

Keywords: Adults, health maintenance, leisure, life satisfaction

Introduction

Human beings desire to maintain a healthy life. Achieving this in a conscious way can only be feasible with a clear comprehension of these concepts. Therefore, health must be well understood first.

Health is a process that extends from the highest level of well-being to the end of life and refers not only to the absence of disease and disability, but also to overall physical, mental and social well-being (Özkarslı, 2023). In order for all individuals in society to maintain and improve their own health, they need to establish their own lifestyles to ensure the sustainability of health. This will be possible only through a process and with the meaning of leisure. The meaning and importance of leisure is subjective and may differ from individual to individual (Dinç et al., 2019). Leisure is the period of time remaining after the time allocated (spent) for job time (working), sleeping, eating and other compulsory tasks (Kemp & Pearson, 1997). It is crucial to understand leisure well and to maintain an appropriate life for the maintenance of health. Leisure has been explained in various ways by many researchers (Daniel et al., 2008; Stebbins, 2011; Yaşartürk, 2016; Primeau, 2003, Bundy,1993; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Coleman & Iso-Ahola, 1993; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Di Bona, 2000; Emerson, 1998; Iso-Ahola, 1979; Neumayer & Wilding, 2005; Passmore & French, 2003; Alexandris et al. 2002; Gürbüz & Handerson, 2013). The value and significance of leisure, which is the subject of numerous scientific studies, is becoming comprehensible. This situation clearly reveals the necessity of adopting the meaning of leisure by everyone. This necessity may also be of importance for increasing life satisfaction. Before addressing life satisfaction, it would be more accurate to explain the word "satisfaction" (Yıldırım & Latifoğlu, 2020). Satisfaction can also be defined as pleasure. People can reach satisfaction if they can meet certain needs, expectations and pleasures in order to enjoy their lives (Toplanır, 2018). Life satisfaction means satisfaction with the whole life, not satisfaction with a specific situation (Çelebi & Çelebi, 2018). In general, it includes the whole life of the person and various aspects of this life (Deniz et al., 2012). There are many factors affecting life satisfaction. These factors include physical, social, emotional, mental health, psychological well-being, effective and functional communication, initiating and maintaining social relationships and having social connections (Kermen et al., 2016). The development of all these factors in individuals refers to the activities that can be carried out in leisure. Individuals can achieve life satisfaction through leisure activities that can develop all these aspects in their free time. This can only be achieved through a proper understanding of leisure. Understanding leisure and achieving life satisfaction. Seeking a relationship between these two concepts emphasizes the purpose of this research and the importance of the research, the results of which will be the guide for the future of adults, even all individuals, who aim for the maintenance of health.

Study Design

This study aims to examine the relationship between the meaning of leisure for health maintenance and life satisfaction in adults. Relational survey model aims to determine the existence and/or degree of change between two or more variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

Study Group

A total of 361 adult individuals residing in Istanbul and determined by convenience sampling method were included in the study with the principle of voluntary participation.

Data Collection Tools

"Personal Information Form" (gender, age, marital status) as well as " Meaning of Leisure Scale" and Life Satisfaction Scale were utilized as data collection tools in the study. Explanations regarding the data collection tools are as follows.

Life Satisfaction Scale:

'Life Satisfaction Scale' which was developed by Diener et al. (1985) and adapted into Turkish by Yetim (1993) was utilized. The scale consisting of 5 items was designed in 7-point Likert type and scoring was performed accordingly. Likert options are listed as "Strongly Disagree (1)", "Disagree (2)", "Partially Disagree (3)", "Undecided (4)", "Partially Agree (5)", "Agree (6)" and "Strongly Agree (7)". This scale is calculated on a total score

Meaning of Leisure Scale:

The "Meaning of Leisure" scale developed by (Esteve et al., 1999) and Turkish validity and reliability study conducted by (Gürbüz et al., 2007) was utilized. The scale is a 6-point Likert-type scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 6=Fully Agree) and consists of a total of 35 items and 8 sub-dimensions (active passive participation, social interaction, perceived competency, leisure utilization, perceived freedom, internal motivation, and goal orientation).

Data Analysis

The data obtained from the personal information form and scales were inputted into the IBM SPSS 24.0 package program and the analyses were conducted through this program. When normal distribution curves, skewness and kurtosis coefficients were taken into consideration, it was determined that all scores were within the range of ±1.5. It is accepted that there is a normal distribution when Kurtosis and Skewness values are between -1.5 and +1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In line with this information, parametric statistical analyzes were conducted in the study. Accordingly, the T test and ANOVA analyzes were implemented. In order to determine the difference between groups, the LSD test was utilized as a post-hoc analysis since it is a technique that finds conservative small differences more than pairwise comparison tests used in pairwise comparisons of groups with homogeneous variances and can be implemented to groups with homogeneous variances whose sample groups are different and can be utilized when the number of individuals in the groups is not equal. The Pearson Correlation Analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the meaning of leisure and life satisfaction. In the statistical analysis and interpretations of the data, the significance level was considered as 0.05.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

	Variable	N	%
Gender	Male	182	50,4
	Female	179	49,6
	Total	**361**	**100,0**
Age	18-24 years	56	15,5
	25-31 years	134	37,1
	32-38 years	82	22,7
	39 years and above	89	24,7
	Total	**361**	**100,0**
Marital Status	Married	198	54,8
	Single	163	45,2
	Total	**361**	**100,0**

When Table 1 is examined, it is observed that 50.4% of the participants are male and 49.6% are female, the highest number of participants is between the ages of 25-31 with 37.1%, followed by 32-28 years with 24.7%, 32-38 years with 22.7% and 18-24 years with 15.5%. It was also observed that 54.8% of the participants were married and 45.2% were single.

Table 2. Skewness and Kurtosis Values of the Participants' Scale Scores

Scales		**N**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**
Life Satisfaction Scale		361	-,097	-,765
	Active-Passive Participation	361	-,675	,829
	Social Interaction	361	-,582	,230
	Perceived Competency	361	-,567	,398
Meaning of Leisure Scale	Leisure Utilization	361	-,579	,400
	Perceived Freedom	361	-,775	,680
	Internal Motivation	361	-,435	-,069
	Goal Orientation	361	-,1,020	1,375
	Job Relation	361	-,683	,416

Considering the Skewness and Kurtosis coefficients in Table 2, it was determined that all scores were within the range of ±1.5. In line with this information, parametric statistical analyzes were performed in the study.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of the Participants' Scores From the Scales

Scales		N	Min	Max	X±SS
Life Satisfaction Scale		361	5,00	35,00	19,67±6,46
Meaning of Leisure Scale	Active-Passive Participation	361	1,00	,6,00	4,10±0,98
	Social Interaction	361	1,00	,6,00	4,21±1,10
	Perceived Competency	361	1,00	,6,00	4,24±1,05
	Leisure Utilization	361	1,00	,6,00	4,20±1,06
	Perceived Freedom	361	1,00	,6,00	4,30±1,08
	Internal Motivation	361	1,00	,6,00	4,10±1,17
	Goal Orientation	361	1,00	,6,00	4,50±1,07
	Job Relation	361	1,00	,6,00	4,39±1.11

When Table 3 is examined, it is observed that the life satisfaction scale score of the participants is 19.67±6.46. When the leisure meaning scale scores of the participants are examined, it was determined as follows: Active-Passive Participation 4,10±0,98, Social Interaction 4,21±1,10, Perceived Competency 4,24±1,05, Leisure Utilization 4,20±1,06, Perceived Freedom 4,30±1,08, Internal Motivation 4,10±1,17, Goal Orientation 4,50±1,07 and Job Relation 4,39±1.11.

Table 4. Comparison of Participants' Scores on the Scales According to Gender

Scales		Gender	N	X	Ss	t	p
Life Satisfaction Scale		Male	182	18,95	6,39	-2,12	**,034**
		Female	179	20,39	6,47		
Meaning of Leisure Scale	Active-Passive Participation	Male	182	4,07	0,94	-,732	,464
		Female	179	4,14	1,02		
	Social Interaction	Male	182	4,17	1,15	-,800	,424
		Female	179	4,26	1,05		
	Perceived Competency	Male	182	4,15	1,08	-1,76	,078

		Female	179	4,34	1,01		
Leisure Utilization	Male	182	4,08	1,08	-2,14	**,032**	
	Female	179	4,32	1,03			
Perceived Freedom	Male	182	4,16	1,11	-2,38	**,018**	
	Female	179	4,43	1,03			
Internal Motivation	Male	182	4,02	1,14	-1,34	,179	
	Female	179	4,18	1,19			
Goal Orientation	Male	182	4,37	1,09	-2,34	**,020**	
	Female	179	4,63	1,05			
Job Relation	Male	182	4,24	1,15	-2,72	**,007**	
	Female	179	4,55	1,05			

**p<,050; **p<,001*

When Table 4 is examined, a statistically significant difference was determined in the life satisfaction scale according to gender variable (p<,034). Although statistically significant differences were observed in the sub-dimensions of leisure utilization (p<,032), perceived freedom (p<,018), goal orientation (p<,020) and job relation (p<,007) of the leisure meaning scale according to gender, no significant difference was detected in the sub-dimensions of active-passive participation, social interaction, perceived competency and internal motivation (p>0.05).

Table 5. Comparison of Participants' Scores on the Scales According to Age

Scales		Age	N	X	Ss	f	p	Difference (LSD)
Life Satisfaction Scale		18-24 years[a]	56	19,57	6,39	,521	,668	-
		25-31 years[b]	134	19,18	6,13			
		32-38 years[c]	82	20,25	6,67			
		39 years and above[d]	89	19,92	6,85			
Meaning of Leisure Scale	Active-Passive Participation	18-24 years[a]	56	3,96	0,89	1,693	,168	-
		25-31 years[b]	134	4,10	0,91			
		32-38 years[c]	82	4,01	1,15			

	39 years and above[d]	89	4,29	0,97			
Social Interaction	18-24 years[a]	56	4,18	1,15	1,186	,315	-
	25-31 years[b]	134	4,12	1,11			
	32-38 years[c]	82	4,17	1,16			
	39 years and above[d]	89	4,40	1,01			
Perceived Competency	18-24 years[a]	56	4,02	1,12	3,268	**,021**	a-b a-d b-c c-d
	25-31 years[b]	134	4,37	0,98			
	32-38 years[c]	82	4,03	1,09			
	39 years and above	89	4,39	1,02			
Leisure Utilization	18-24 years[a]	56	4,23	1,02	1,362	,254	-
	25-31 years[b]	134	4,25	1,01			
	32-38 years[c]	82	4,00	1,20			
	39 years and above[d]	89	4,29	1,02			
Perceived Freedom	18-24 years[a]	56	4,27	0,96	1,916	,127	-
	25-31 years[b]	134	4,42	1,02			
	32-38 years[c]	82	4,06	1,24			
	39 years and above[d]	89	4,35	1,07			
Internal Motivation	18-24 years[a]	56	3,96	1,16	,648	,585	-
	25-31 years[b]	134	4,10	1,13			
	32-38 years[c]	82	4,06	1,34			
	39 years and above[d]	89	4,23	1,06			
Goal Orientation	18-24 years[a]	56	4,57	1,14	2,990	**,031**	b-c c-d
	25-31 years[b]	134	4,53	1,03			
	32-38 years[c]	82	4,20	1,17			

	39 years and above[d]	89	4,67	0,98			
	18-24 years[a]	56	4,37	1,04			
	25-31 years[b]	134	4,43	1,11			b-c
Job Relation	32-38 years[c]	82	4,10	1,23	3,133	**,026**	c-d
	39 years and above[d]	89	4,62	1,00			

**p<,050; **p<,001*

When Table 5 is examined, there was no significant difference in the life satisfaction scale according to age. In the leisure meaning scale, no significant difference was observed in the sub-dimensions of active-passive participation, social interaction, leisure utilization, perceived freedom and internal motivation (p>,050), while statistically significant differences were observed in the sub-dimensions of perceived competency, goal orientation and job relation. This difference was determined to be originated from the ages in the sub-dimensions of perceived competency (a-b, a-d, b-c, c-d), goal orientation (b-c, c-d) and job relation (b-c, c-d).

Table 6. Comparison of Participants' Scores on the Scales According to Marital Status

Scales		**Marital Status**	**N**	**X**	**Ss**	**t**	**p**
Life Satisfaction Scale		Married	198	20,18	6,59	1,66	,098
		Single	163	19,04	6,27		
Meaning of Leisure Scale	Active-Passive Participation	Married	198	4,12	1,06	,256	,798
		Single	163	4,09	0,87		
	Social Interaction	Married	198	4,22	1,14	,201	,841
		Single	163	4,20	1,06		
	Perceived Competency	Married	198	4,23	1,08	-,262	,793
		Single	163	4,26	1,02		
	Leisure Utilization	Married	198	4,18	1,06	-,407	,685
		Single	163	4,23	1,06		
	Perceived Freedom	Married	198	4,26	1,12	-,747	,456
		Single	163	4,34	1,03		
	Internal Motivation	Married	198	4,13	1,16	,568	,570
		Single	163	4,06	1,18		

Goal Orientation	Married	198	4,43	1,08	-1,33	,183
	Single	163	4,58	1,06		
Job Relation	Married	198	4,42	1,16	,426	,670
	Single	163	4,37	1,06		

**p<,050; **p<,001*

When Table 6 is analyzed, there was no statistically significant difference in the sub-dimensions of life satisfaction and leisure meaning scale according to marital status variable (p<,050).

Table 7. The relationship Between Participants' Life Satisfaction and the Meaning of Leisure

		Meaning of Leisure Scale								
		Life Satisfaction Scale	Active-Passive Participation	Social Interaction	Perceived Competency	Leisure Utilization	Perceived Freedom	Internal Motivation	Goal Orientation	Job Relation
Life Satisfaction Scale	r	1	,295**	,251**	,221**	,300**	,285**	,146**	,234**	,208**
	p		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,005	,000	,000
	n	361	361	361	361	361	361	361	361	361

**p<,050; **p<,001; r= Correlation coefficient; p= Level of Significance*

When Table 7 is analyzed, it is observed that there is a positive, weakly significant relationship between the sub-dimensions of the meaning of leisure scale and the life satisfaction scale.

Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, which aimed to examine the relationship between the meaning of leisure and life satisfaction for the maintenance of health in adult individuals, a significant difference was determined between the gender variable and the meaning of leisure and life satisfaction (Table 4). It was determined that the leisure meaning and life satisfaction levels of female participants were higher than male participants. It is believed that this situation emerged in the study may be due to the fact that female participants have higher awareness of predicting leisure and implementing it into personal life than male participants. In a study conducted by Yıldız (2016) to examine the life satisfaction and emotional intelligence levels of university students in terms of gender and class variables, a significant difference was determined between the gender variable and life satisfaction and it was determined that female participants had a higher life satisfaction level than male participants. According to a study conducted by Yılmaz and Aslan (2013) to reveal the relationship between the life satisfaction of teachers and workplace loneliness, a significant difference was determined between the gender variable and life satisfaction and it was determined that female teachers had a higher life satisfaction level than

male teachers. In a study conducted by Küçük Kılıç et al. (2016) to determine the relationship between life satisfaction and recreational satisfaction, it was determined that female participants had higher life satisfaction levels than male participants. While these results coincide with the research findings, in a study conducted by Yelpaze and Yakar (2019) in the opposite direction of the research finding, no significant difference was detected between gender variable and life satisfaction. In a study conducted by Dinç et al. (2019) to examine the life levels of university students in terms of various variables, a significant difference was observed between gender variable and meaning of leisure, and it was determined that female participants had a higher level of meaning of leisure than male participants. According to another study conducted by Şahin (2023), a significant difference was determined between gender variable and meaning of leisure and it was revealed that female participants had a higher level of meaning of leisure. While these results are in parallel with the research finding, in the opposite direction of the research finding, in a study conducted by Yalçın et al. (2017) to examine the levels of smartphone addiction and leisure meaning of university students in terms of various variables, no significant difference was encountered between gender variable and meaning of leisure.

While there was no significant difference between age and life satisfaction, there was a significant difference between the meaning of leisure (Table 5). Participants aged 39 and over were determined to have higher levels of leisure meaning than participants in other age groups. It can be stated that this situation that emerged in the research may be due to the fact that the individual perceived competencies of the participants in the relevant age group are more experienced in elements such as job competence and goal orientation than younger individuals. In the study conducted by Recepoğlu (2013) to examine the relationship between pre-service teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession and satisfaction with life, no significant difference was detected between age variables of pre-service teachers and life satisfaction. In a study conducted by Avşaroğlu et al. (2005) to examine the professional burnout and life satisfaction of technical teachers, there was no significant difference between age variables and life satisfaction. According to a study conducted by Özgür et al. (2010), there was no significant difference between the age variable and life satisfaction, and it was determined that the group between the ages of 18-21 had a higher level of life satisfaction compared to individuals in other age groups. These results are relatively in line with the research finding. In a study conducted by Gülcan and Nedim Bal (2014) to determine the effect of young adults' optimism on life satisfaction and happiness, a significant difference was detected between the age variable and life satisfaction. In a study conducted by Lakot Atasoy et al. (2015) to examine the leisure perceptions and barriers of prospective physical education teachers, a significant difference was detected between the age variable and the meaning of leisure. According to a study conducted by Batur (2019) to determine the relationship between leisure perceptions and leisure barriers of athletes interested in shooting, a significant difference was determined between the age variable and the meaning of leisure, and it was revealed that individuals aged 40 and over had the lowest level of leisure meaning. In the study conducted by Nakış (2019), a significant difference was determined between the age variable and the meaning of leisure. In another study conducted by Soyer et al. (2017), a significant difference was found between the age variable

and the meaning of leisure, and it was determined that young participants (17-20 years old) had a higher level of meaning of leisure.

There was no significant difference between marital status and life satisfaction and meaning of leisure (Table 6). When the means were analyzed, it was found that married participants had a higher level of life satisfaction than single participants. It can be stated that this situation that emerged in the research findings may be due to the fact that married individuals live more regular, systematic and programmed lives compared to single participants and this programmed life positively affects life satisfaction. In a study conducted by Güner et al. (2014) to determine the relationship between burnout and occupational stress levels of bank employees, life satisfaction and job satisfaction, no significant difference was detected between marital status and life satisfaction. In a study conducted by Bilge et al. (2009) on family court experts, no significant difference was identified between the marital status variables of the participants and life satisfaction, while it was determined that married participants had a higher satisfaction level. In a study conducted by Tekir et al. (2016) on healthcare professionals, it was revealed that there was no significant difference between marital status variables and life satisfaction levels of healthcare professionals, while single healthcare professionals had higher life satisfaction levels. While these results relatively coincide with the research findings, in a study conducted by Güler and Usluca (2021) to determine the relationship between life satisfaction levels and mindfulness levels of adult individuals, a significant difference was observed between the marital status variables of the participants and their life satisfaction levels. In a study conducted by Kara et al. (2018) to examine the leisure perceptions of adult individuals in terms of various variables, a significant difference was detected between the marital status variable and the meaning of leisure. As a result of the correlation analysis conducted to determine the relationship between the meaning of leisure and life satisfaction, it was determined that there was a weakly significant positive relationship between the two measurement tools (Table 7). In the study conducted by Şahin (2023), a significant positive relationship was determined between life satisfaction and leisure meaning. In a study conducted by Er et al. (2019) to determine the relationship between leisure meaning and life satisfaction, it was reported that there was a significant positive relationship between leisure meaning and life satisfaction. These results are similar to the findings of the study.

As a result, life satisfaction differed significantly in terms of gender variables, but not in terms of age and marital status variables. Meaning of leisure has a significant difference in terms of gender and age variables, while it does not display a significant difference in terms of marital status variable. In addition, it can be stated that there is a positive relationship between life satisfaction and leisure meaning. At the same time, it can be stated that female participants, individuals in the 32-38 age range and married individuals have a higher level of life satisfaction, and female participants and individuals aged 39 and over have a higher level of meaning of leisure.

Suggestions

The research is designed according to the principles of quantitative method and further studies planned to be conducted may prefer qualitative or mixed method. The research sample can be

increased or individuals engaged in various sportive or recreational activities can be included in the sample. In addition to the measurement parameters utilized in the study, new measurement parameters (happiness, subjective well-being, health beliefs, etc.) can be included and the mediating effect of the added parameters can be the subject of future studies.

References

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):233-52

Avşaroğlu, S. , Deniz, M. & Kahraman, A. (2005). Teknik Öğretmenlerde Yaşam Doyumu İş Doyumu Ve Mesleki Tükenmişlik Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* , (14) , 115-129

Batur, A. (2019). Türkiye'de Atıcılık Branşı ile İlgilenen Sporcuların Serbest Zaman Algısı ve Engelleri. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). *T.C. Batman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Rekreasyon Yönetimi Anabilim* Dalı Batman.

Bilge, F., Sayan, A., & Kabakçı, Ö. F. (2009). Aile mahkemesi uzmanlarının meslek doyumları, yaşam doyumları ve ilişkilere yönelik inançlarının incelenmesi. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 4(32), 20-31.

Bundy, A.C. (1993). Assessment of play and leisure: Delineation of the problem. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 47, 217–221.

Coleman, D., ve Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1993). Leisure and health: The role of social support and self-determination. Journal of leisure research, 25(2), 111-128.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). Flow: The psychology of optimal experience. New York, New York: Harper & Row.

Çelebi, G. Y. ve Çelebi, B. (2018). Lise öğrencilerinin yaşam doyumu düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. Erciyes Journal of Education, 2(2), 1-15.

Daniel, D. M., Army, R. H., & Nancy, B. R. (2008). Kraus' recreation and leisure in modern society. (8th Edition). Boston: Jones and Barlett Publishers.

Deniz, M., Arslan, C., Özyeşil, Z. ve İzmirli, M. (2012). Öz-anlayış, yaşam doyumu, negatif ve pozitif duygu: Türk ve diğer ülke üniversite öğrencileri arasında bir karşılaştırma. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 12(23), 428-446.

Di Bona, L. (2000). What are the benefits of leisure? An exploration using the Leisure Satisfaction Scale. British Journal of Occupational Therapy, 63(2), 50-58.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J. and Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. Journal of Personality Assessment, 49(1).

Dinç, H., Koca, H.B., Poyraz, A. ve Aydemir, K. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin boş zaman anlamlarının incelenmesi. Türkiye Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 3(1), 1-9

Emerson, H. (1998). Flow and occupation: A review of the literature. Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy, 65, 37– 44.

Er, Y., Koç, M. C., Demirel, M., & Çuhadar, A. (2019). The meaning of leisure and life satisfaction: The sample of university students. *International Journal of Culture and History*, 6(2), 1-16.

Esteve, R., San Martin, J., ve Lopez, A.E. (1999). Grasping The Meaning of Leisure: Developing A Self Report Measurement Tool. Leisure Studies, 18(2), 79-91.

Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E., (2009). How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.

Gülcan, A., & Nedim Bal, P. (2014). Genç yetişkinlerde iyimserliğin mutluluk ve yaşam doyumu üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi. *Asya Öğretim Dergisi*, 2(1 (ÖZEL)), 41-52.

Güler, K., & Usluca, M. (2021). Yetişkin Bireylerde Bilinçli Farkındalık ile Yaşam Doyumu Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Uluslararası Anadolu Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(1), 372-383.

Güner, F., Çiçek, H., & Can, A. (2014). Banka çalışanlarının mesleki stres ve tükenmişlik düzeylerinin iş doyumu ve yaşam doyumu düzeyleri ile ilişkisi. *Uluslararası Alanya İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(3), 59-76.

Gürbüz B., Özdemir A.S., Karaküçük S. (2007). Meaning of leisure scale: Evaluation of psychometric characteristics on Turkish university students. 4th International Mediterranean Sport Science Congress. Antalya, Turkey.

Gürbüz, B., ve Henderson, K. (2013). Exploring the Meanings of Leisure among Turkish University Students, Croatian Journal of Education, 15(4), 927-957.

Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1979). Basic dimensions of definitions of leisure. Journal of Leisure Research, 11, 28–39.

Kara, F. M., Emir, E., Gürbüz, B., & Öncü, E. (2018). Serbest Zamanın Anlamı: Yetişkin Bireyler Örneği. *Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 16(3), 187-195.

Kemp, K., ve Pearson, S. (1997). Leisure and Tourism. Great Britain: Longman Press.

Kermen, U., Tosun, N. G. ve Doğan, U. (2016). Yaşam doyumu ve psikolojik iyi oluşun yordayıcısı olarak sosyal kaygı. Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2(1), 20-29.

Küçük Kılıç, S., Atasoy, K. L., Gürbüz, B., & Öncü, E. (2016). Rekreasyonel tatmin ve yaşam doyumu arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(3), 56-70.

Lakot Atasoy, K., Öncü, E., & Kılıç, K. S. (2015). Beden Eğitimi Öğretmeni Adaylarında Serbest Zaman Algısı ve Engelleri. 3. Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Kongresi, Eskişehir Anadolu Üniversitesi. Eskişehir.18-23

Nakış, İ. A. (2019). Spor Eğitimi Veren Kurumlarda Öğrenim Gören Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Boş Zamanın Anlamına İlişkin Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). T.C. Kütahya Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı*, Kütahya.

Neumayer, B., ve Wilding, C. (2005). Leisure as commodity. Occupation and practice in context. Marrickville: Elsevier Australia

Özgür, G., Babacan Gümüş, A., & Durdu, B. (2010). Evde ve yurtta kalan üniversite öğrencilerinde yaşam doyumu. *Psikiyatri Hemşireliği Dergisi*, 1(1), 25-32.

Özkarslı, F. (2023). Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Spora Yönelik Tutum ve Sağlıklı Yaşam Becerilerinin İncelenmesi. *Hitit Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çorum.*

Passmore, A., ve French, D. (2003). The nature of leisure in adolescence: A focus group study. British Journal of Occupational Therapy, 66, 419–426.

Primeau, L.A. (2003). Play and leisure. Willard and Spackman's occupational therapy. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Recepoğlu, E. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının yaşam doyumları ile öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Özel, (1), 311-326.

Soyer, F., Demirel, M., Kacay, Z., Ayhan, C., & Demirel, D. H. (2017). Examination of the Opinions of University Students on the Meaning of Leisure and the Lesson Study Approaches. Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 18-31.

Stebbins, R. A. (2011). The Idea of leisure. (1st Edition). New York: Transaction Publishers.

Şahin, N. (2023). Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Rekreatif Faaliyetlerin Yaşam Doyumu ve Boş Zamanın Anlamına Etkisinin Farklı Değişkenler Işığında İncelenmesi (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). *T.C. Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Rekreasyon Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı* Rekreasyon Yönetimi Bilim Dalı, Konya.

Tabachnick, B. G. And Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using multivariate statistics. Boston, Pearson.

Tekir, Ö., Çevik, C., , Arık, S., & Çetin, G. (2016). Sağlik çalişanlarinin tükenmişlik, iş doyumu düzeyleri ve yaşam doyumunun incelenmesi. *Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(2), 51-63.

Toplanır, E. (2018). Yaşam Doyumu Kendini Gerçekleştirme ve Ölüm Korkusu Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Haliç Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Yalçın, C., Demirel, M., Demirel, D. H., & Çolakoğlu, T. (2017). Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin boş zamanın anlamı ile akıllı telefon bağımlılıklarına ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(1), 1-11.

Yaşartürk, F. (2016). Elit düzeydeki sporcuların rekreatif etkinlik tercihlerinde tutum, sıkılma algısı ile yaşam doyumlarının incelenmesi. *Doktora Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya.*

Yelpaze, İ., & Yakar, L. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam doyumu ve bilişsel esnekliklerinin incelenmesi. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 9(54), 913-935.

Yetim, U. (1993). Life satisfaction: A study based on the organization of personal projects. *Social Indicators Research*, 29, 277-289.

Yıldırım, B. ve Latifoğlu, G. (2020). Serbest zaman tatmini ile yaşam doyumu ve duygusal zekâ arasındaki ilişki. In Conference Proceeding Book (p. 68). Near East University.

Yıldız, M. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinde duygusal zekâ yaşam doyumu ve depresyonun cinsiyet ve sınıf seviyelerine göre etkileri. *Opus Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(11), 451-474.

Yılmaz, E., & Aslan, H. (2013). Öğretmenlerin İş Yerindeki Yalnızlıkları ve Yaşam Doyumları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi, *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 3(3), 59-69.