



Investigation of the Relationship between Recreational Spor Well-Being and Leisure Satisfaction of University Community Members*

Hasan Suat AKSU^{1A}, Alper KAYA^{2B}, Ali BAYRAK^{2C}, Yalçın TÜKEL^{2D},
Mustafa Sabır BOZOĞLU^{2E}

¹Selçuk University, Faculty of Tourism, Department of Recreation Management, Konya, TURKEY.

²Necmettin Erbakan University, Faculty of Tourism, Department of Recreation Management, Konya, TURKEY.

Address Correspondence to Alper Kaya: e-mail: akaya@erbakan.edu.tr

Conflicts of Interest: The author(s) has no conflict of interest to declare.

Copyright & License: Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright to their work licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0.

Ethical Statement: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited.

*This research was presented as a summary paper at the 4th International Recreation and Sports Management Congress.

(Date Of Received): 09.08.2023 (Date of Acceptance): 14.12.2023 (Date of Publication): 31.12.2023

A: Orcid ID: 0000-0001-8196-129X B: Orcid ID: 0000-0002-0364-4122 C: Orcid ID: 0000-0003-2690-1053

D: Orcid ID: 0000-0003-3843-5889 E: Orcid ID: 0000-0001-6814-2142

Abstract

Sports has an important meaning in human life. Acquiring this meaning attached to sports is possible by devoting serious time. Recreational activities are known to improve health, but it is assumed that this health will also make leisure time more enjoyable. Accordingly, the purpose of this relational survey research is to evaluate the link between university community members' pleasure with their leisure time and recreational well-being. The research employed descriptive scanning methodology. In the study, "Recreational Sports Well-Being Scale" and "Leisure Satisfaction Scale" were used to determine the recreational sports well-being and leisure satisfaction levels of the participants. The universe of the research is "Selçuk University Student Communities". A total of 298 people were included in the research. The results show that there is a substantial relationship between leisure time satisfaction and the length of time spent engaging in recreational activities and sports. On the other hand, it has been determined that the income variable is one of the most effective factors in terms of well-being and leisure satisfaction. In conclusion; leisure satisfaction and recreational sport well-being are moderately positively related. It can be stated that the gains of female participants and participants with high perceived income from recreational sports activities contribute more positively to their well-being levels.

Keywords: Recreational Sports Well-Being, Leisure Satisfaction, University Communities.

Özet

Üniversite Topluluk Üyelerinin Rekreatif Spor İyi Oluş ile Serbest Zaman Tatmin İlişkisinin İncelenmesi

İnsan yaşamında sporun önemli bir anlamı vardır. Spora yüklenen bu anlamın kazanılması ise ciddi anlamda zamanın ayrılması ile mümkün olabilir. Rekreatif sporların iyi oluşa katkı sağladığı bilinmekle birlikte bu iyi oluşun serbest zaman tatminini beraberinde getirmesi beklenen bir durumdur. Bu noktadan hareketle oluşturulan bu ilişkisel tarama araştırmasının amacı; üniversite topluluk üyelerinin rekreatif iyi oluş ile serbest zaman tatmini arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesidir. Araştırmada, betimsel tarama deseni kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada katılımcıların rekreatif spor iyi oluş ve serbest zaman tatmin düzeylerini belirlemek için "Rekreatif Spor İyi Oluş Ölçeği" ve "Boş Zaman Doyumu Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini "Selçuk Üniversitesi Öğrenci Toplulukları" oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmaya toplam 298 kişi dahil edilmiştir. Elde edilen bulgulara göre; Rekreatif faaliyetlere katılım süresi ile rekreatif spor iyi oluş ve serbest zaman tatmini arasında anlamlı farklılık bulunmaktadır. Öte yandan gelir değişkeni iyi oluş ve serbest zaman tatmini noktasında en etkili unsurdur. Sonuç olarak; serbest zaman tatmini ve rekreatif spor iyi oluş orta düzeyde pozitif yönde ilişkilidir. Kadın katılımcıların ve gelir algısı yüksek olan katılımcıların rekreatif sportif aktivitelerinden elde ettikleri kazanımların iyi oluş düzeylerine daha olumlu katkı sağladığı söylenebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Rekreatif Spor İyi Oluş, Serbest Zaman Tatmini, Üniversite Toplulukları.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important aims of recreation and leisure services is to contribute to individuals' satisfaction and pursuit of happiness (8). Happiness is the expression of a subjective state of mind characterized by pleasure and satisfaction, which reflects one's general subjective well-being (87). Happiness, one of the most fundamental goals of human life, plays an important role in self-actualization and satisfaction (20). The first studies in this field focused on the importance of work in the lives of adults. Examining the relationships between job satisfaction and life satisfaction attracted the attention of most of the early studies (11). Early advocates of the importance of leisure recognized the potential of leisure to compensate for negative work experiences or to add positive experiences that could not be obtained through work. Wilensky (91) described leisure as having a regenerative effect when people use it to supplement unsatisfying work experiences. Kando & Summers (37) argued that leisure can provide not only positive experiences not sufficiently encountered in work life but also opportunities to recover from negative experiences in work life. A review of the empirical literature provides several perspectives on the relationships between work, leisure, and psychological health. Separately, both leisure satisfaction (40) and job satisfaction (89) have been shown to be positively related to psychological health (68). The positive relationship between leisure satisfaction and psychological health mirrors other studies reporting significant positive relationships between leisure satisfaction and quality of life variables (40).

Additional factors such as the importance of a well-rounded life, the declining importance of work as a primary source of life satisfaction, and other areas of social life have been identified as important sources of life satisfaction (13, 54). These other areas include family, health, marriage, socioeconomic status, and leisure satisfaction, which is one of the main interests of this study (41, 58, 72, 74, 88).

Leisure satisfaction is defined as the positive perceptions or feelings that an individual creates, elicits or gains as a result of their participation in leisure activities and choices. It is the degree to which the individual is currently satisfied or content with their overall leisure experiences and situations. This positive feeling of satisfaction results from the fulfilment of the individual's felt or unmet needs (8, 78, 79). These needs have been modelled as psychological, educational, social, relaxation, physiological and aesthetic in early research (8, 83) and continue to be supported by current research (14, 63, 73, 94). On the other hand, a significant number of studies frequently emphasize the existence of a positive correlation between leisure time activities and well-being (16, 51, 55, 59, 71).

Well-being or well-being is the responses and interpretations that individuals give to their life experiences (66). Well-being describes a subjective cognitive evaluation and emotional feelings about

life (19). The concept of well-being is derived from two old philosophical concepts. The first one is hedonism proposed by Aristippus and the second one is eudaimonia (psychological well-being), also called self-actualisation, proposed by Aristotle (75). At this point, subjective well-being as proposed by Aristippus emerges as a hedonic-based concept. The purpose of life is manifested as the need to be satisfied and to escape from pain. Its common measurement structure consists of dimensions such as life satisfaction, positive emotions and negative emotions (19). Eudaimonic well-being is based on self-actualisation. As suggested by Aristotle, it is emphasised that the key to well-being lies in self-actualisation. The common measurement structure is self-acceptance, positive relationships with others, autonomy, environmental mastery and personal development (76).

Generally, terms such as well-being, life satisfaction, welfare, happiness or quality of life are used interchangeably (49). According to the United Nations' "2018 World Wellbeing Report", Turkey's wellbeing ranked 69th among 155 countries between 2014 and 2016. Well-being indices include the assessment of gross domestic product (GDP), social support, expected physical health, freedom of choice in life, generosity and government corruption (33). According to the "2022 World Prosperity Report", Turkey's prosperity ranked 112th among 146 countries between 2019 and 2021 (62). As it is known, well-being is largely related to public health. In the field of public health, recreational physical activity, in other words, recreational sport is recognised as an important factor contributing to both physical and mental health (69).

Leisure is an important part of a balanced lifestyle and is often described as essential for well-being (17). It is suggested that leisure activities support well-being through various psychological and physical mechanisms (90). For example, the DRAMMA model (64) states that leisure activities improve well-being by allowing individuals to relax away from the stress of daily life and participate in activities that meet various psychological needs (autonomy, mastery, meaning, commitment). Furthermore, participation in recreational sports promotes physical health, which is associated with greater life satisfaction. Illness is often associated with lower well-being (75), and improving physical health helps prevent chronic diseases by keeping diseases at bay (26). In addition to influencing well-being through psychological mechanisms, recreational sports also lead to physiological responses that enhance well-being. Viewed through a neurological lens, various forms of physical activity are known to increase levels of norepinephrine, serotonin and dopamine in the brain, all of which are associated with feelings of happiness (61). Studies also show that recreational sports promote positive emotions (38).

Studies on well-being, happiness and quality of life in relation to recreational physical activities have been conducted among the elderly (70), disabled people (60), students (32), adults (34), women (43), adolescents (23), immigrants (86), walkers and dancers (50), but not enough studies have been conducted on university students (53).

University life is called the most important part of a person's life and is also described as a period of transition or adaptation to adulthood in which the ethical values acquired in childhood are compared with the set of values acquired while growing up (67). University students who become young adults experience many changes in every aspect of their lives. These changes include entering into a new social environment, searching for identity, anxiety about the future, searching for a suitable job and in some cases preparing for marriage (77). Given these challenges and pressures, well-being and leisure satisfaction may emerge as a source of concern. Therefore, it is important to examine the issues of well-being and leisure satisfaction within the scope of recreational sports, especially in young individuals. Examining recreational sports well-being and leisure time satisfaction in young individuals will contribute to the recreation and well-being literature.

The aim of this relational survey research, which is based on this point, is to determine the relationship between recreational well-being and leisure time satisfaction of university community members. Within the scope of the research, answers to the following questions were sought.

- Does gender, perceived income level and weekly participation time in sportive recreation activities have a significant effect on the mean recreational sport well-being scores of university community members?
- Is there a significant difference between the gender, perceived income level and weekly participation time in sportive recreation activities and the level of leisure time satisfaction of university community members?
- What is the relationship between recreational sports well-being and leisure satisfaction levels of university community members?

METHOD

Research design

This study aims to determine the relationship between the recreational well-being and leisure satisfaction of university community members, so the study was modeled according to the relational survey model.

Universe and sample

The population of the study consists of "Selçuk University Student Communities". According to the information obtained from the web page of the relevant university, there are 187 student communities in total and 5230 students who are members of these societies. In this study in which simple random sampling method was used, 298 community members were reached. The number of members of the relevant student communities varies from semester to semester. Therefore, no clear inference can be made about the population. The number of members of the relevant student communities varies from semester to semester. Therefore, no clear inference can be made about the population. In this context, in order to reach the entire population, data were collected with the heads of the societies over a period of 3 months and as a result, 298 members were reached (97, 98).

Data collection tools

The research form created by the researchers for the participants, "Recreational Well-Being" and "Leisure Time Satisfaction" scales were used as data collection tools. In the participant form, there are questions about the independent variables of gender, perceived income level and weekly participation time in sportive recreation activities of the relevant group.

The "Recreational Sport Well-Being" scale, developed by Pi et al. (69) and Turkish validity and reliability study by Koç (44), consists of 4 sub-dimensions and 14 items. The sub-dimensions are "Physical and Mental Health" (items 1,2,3 and 4), "Life Satisfaction" (items 5,6,7 and 8), "Family Relationship Development" (items 9,10,11) and "Positive Emotion" (items 12,13,14). The scale has a 5-point scale and the internal consistency coefficient was determined as 0.86 for the whole scale in the study conducted by Koç (44). In the analysis conducted for our study, the internal consistency coefficient was determined as 0.86.

"Leisure Time Satisfaction" scale, which was developed by Beard & Ragheb (8) and Turkish validity and reliability study was conducted by Karlı et al. (39), consists of 51 items and 6 sub-dimensions. The sub-dimensions are respectively "Education" (17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25th item), "Physiological" (41,21,43,44,45,46th item), "Aesthetic" (48,49,50,51st item), "Relaxation" (37,38,39,40. Item), "Social" (26,27,28,29,30,31,32,35. Item) and "Psychological" (1,2,3,5,6,7,9,9,12.Item) The scale has a 5-point scale and the internal consistency coefficient was calculated by Karlı et al. (39), the internal consistency coefficient was determined as 0.92 for the whole scale. In the analysis conducted for our research, the internal consistency coefficient was determined as 0.87.

Analysing the data

After the participant form, "Recreational Well-Being" and "Leisure Time Satisfaction" scale used in this article were entered into a single form, they were virtualised with the help of "Google Forms" and sent to the community members via e-mail and "Whatsapp". A total of 298 members were returned.

Since 7 participants marked more than one independent variable and 14 participants left most of the questions blank or made more than one marking, the data obtained from a total of 21 participants were excluded from the analysis. The analyses with the remaining 277 data were included in the analysis in the "Jamovi" package programme. In order to test the homogeneity of the data and to decide which analyses to be performed, the results of the "Skewness-Proportionality" test were examined. According to the test results, since all values were between ± 2 values (95), Anova test was performed for "Leisure Time Interest" and independent variables with more than two options. After the assumptions were met as explained in detail in the findings section, MANOVA test was performed for "Recreational Sport Well-Being" and independent variables.

Ethical approval and institutional permission

Ethics committee permission for this research was received from the Social and Human Scientific Research Ethics Committee with the decision numbered 2023/265 on 09/06/2023.

FINDINGS

MANOVA test was performed to examine whether the independent variables of gender, perceived income level and duration of weekly participation in sportive recreation activities have a significant effect on the composite mean scores of physical and mental health, life satisfaction, family relationship development and positive emotional states, which are sub-dimensions of recreational sport well-being. Information on gender, perceived income level and weekly participation time in sportive recreation activities are given in Table 1.

When Table 1 was analysed, it was seen that women's averages of physical and mental health ($x=3.05$), life satisfaction ($x=3.06$), family relationship development ($x=3.01$) and positive emotion ($x=3.04$) were higher than men ($x(\text{physical and mental health})= 2.99$; $x(\text{life satisfaction})= 2.96$, $x(\text{family relationship development})= 2.92$ and $x(\text{positive emotion})= 2.99$). When analysed in terms of perceived income variable, it was seen that the group with good income ($x=4.04$) was higher than the group with normal ($x=3.93$) and low income ($x=2.55$), the group with normal income ($x=4.03$) was higher than the group with good income ($x=4.01$) and low income ($x=2.51$), in the dimension of family relationship development, the normal group ($x=4.01$) was higher than the good group ($x=3.98$) and the low group ($x=2.45$), and finally, in the dimension of positive emotion, the group with good income ($x=3.98$) was higher than the normal group ($x=3.93$) and the low group ($x=2.56$).

In terms of the weekly sportive recreation participation time variable, the physical and mental health averages of the group participating for 120-179 minutes ($x=3.22$) were higher than the other groups ($x(240 \text{ and over})=3.05$; $x(180-249 \text{ minutes})=2.98$; $x(10-119 \text{ minutes})=2.70$); at the point of life satisfaction, the average of the group participating 120-179 minutes ($x=3.23$) is higher than the other groups ($x(240 \text{ and over})=3.18$; $x(180-249 \text{ minutes})=2.91$; $x(10-119 \text{ minutes})=2.53$); at the point of developing family relationship, the average of the group participating with 120-179 minutes weekly ($x=3.22$) is higher than the other groups ($x(240 \text{ and over})=3.14$; $x(180-249 \text{ minutes})=2.92$; $x(10-119 \text{ minutes})=2.28$) and finally, at the point of developing positive emotions, it was determined that the average of the group ($x=3.21$) participating with a weekly duration of 120-179 minutes was higher than the other groups ($x(240 \text{ and over})=3.13$; $x(180-249 \text{ minutes})=3.00$; $x(10-119 \text{ minutes})=2.52$).

Table 1. Descriptive findings of independent variables

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	n	x	s
Gender				
Physical and Mental Health	Woman	127	3.05	0.86
	Male	150	2.99	0.85
Life Satisfaction	Woman	127	3.06	0.87
	Male	150	2.96	0.86
Family Relationship Development	Woman	127	3.01	0.91
	Male	150	2.92	0.97
Positive Emotion	Woman	127	3.04	0.92
	Male	150	2.99	0.83
Perceived Income				
Physical and Mental Health	Low	186	2.55	0.56
	Normal	50	3.93	0.44
	Good	41	4.04	0.46
Life Satisfaction	Low	186	2.51	0.52
	Normal	50	4.03	0.40
	Good	41	4.01	0.42
Family Relationship Development	Low	186	2.45	0.65
	Normal	50	4.01	0.50
	Good	41	3.98	0.43
Positive Emotion	Low	186	2.56	0.63
	Normal	50	3.93	0.45
	Good	41	3.98	0.43
Weekly Participation in Sportive Recreation				
Physical and Mental Health	60-119	45	2.70	0.55
	120-179	74	3.22	0.79
	180-239	84	2.98	0.90
	240 and above	74	3.05	0.96
Life Satisfaction	60-119	45	2.53	0.43
	120-179	74	3.23	0.91
	180-239	84	2.91	0.92
	240 and above	74	3.18	0.82
Family Relationship Development	60-119	45	2.28	0.70
	120-179	74	3.22	0.85
	180-239	84	2.92	0.94
	240 and above	74	3.14	0.96
Positive Emotion	60-119	45	2.52	0.62
	120-179	74	3.21	0.90
	180-239	84	3.00	0.86
	240 and above	74	3.13	0.87

Some assumptions were tested before the MANOVA test conducted to test the significance of this difference over the composite scores. First of all, the normality assumption of the scores of the independent variables belonging to the dependent variables was checked with the Skewness-Normality test. As a result of the test, it was determined that all values were between ± 2 values. The assumption of normality of the multivariability of the dependent variables was checked with the "Q-Q plot" graph and it was found that the conditions were met. In order to test the equality of covariance matrices, it was tested with "Box's M test" and since there was no significant difference between the covariance matrices ($X^2 = 9.98$; $p > .05$), the condition was met. After the assumptions were met, MANOVA test results for the independent variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. MANOVA test results for independent variables

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Squares	F	p
Gender	Physical and Mental Health	0.20	1	0.20	0.59	0.44
	Life Satisfaction	0.78	1	0.78	2.43	0.12
	Family Relationship Development	0.55	1	0.55	1.25	0.26
	Positive Emotion	0.14	1	0.14	0.37	0.54
Perceived Income	Physical and Mental Health	110.22	1	110.22	329.14	<.001
	Life Satisfaction	117.78	1	117.78	366.84	<.001
	Family Relationship Development	122.89	1	122.89	279.17	<.001
	Positive Emotion	102.37	1	102.37	260.65	<.001
Rec. Duration of Participation	Physical and Mental Health	0.94	1	0.94	2.81	0.09
	Life Satisfaction	0.14	1	0.14	0.46	0.49
	Family Relationship Development	1.63	1	1.63	3.72	0.05
	Positive Emotion	0.20	1	0.20	0.51	0.47
Error	Physical and Mental Health	91.42	273	0.33		
	Life Satisfaction	87.65	273	0.32		
	Family Relationship Development	120.17	273	0.44		
	Positive Emotion	107.22	273	0.39		

*p<.017 (Bonferroni Correction) (96)

As a result of the MANOVA test, it was determined that there was no significant difference in the combined mean scores of female and male participants' physical and mental health, life satisfaction, family relationship development and positive emotion levels ($F(4-270)=0.85$; $p>0.05$; Pillai's Trace= 0.01).

As a result of the test for perceived income status, a significant difference was found in the mean combined scores of physical and mental health, life satisfaction, family relationship development and positive emotion levels ($F(4-270)=203.02$; $p<0.05$; Pillai's Trace= 0.75). As a result of the test performed for the variable of weekly participation time in recreational activities, it was determined that there was no significant difference in the mean combined scores of physical and mental health, life satisfaction, developing family relationships and positive emotion levels ($F(4-270)=2.13$; $p>0.05$; Pillai's Trace= 0.07).

Table 3. ANOVA test results for perceived income variable

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	n	x	ss	F	p	Difference (Tukey)
	Perceived Income						
Education	1-) Low	186	3.26	0.47	144.55	<.001	3>1
	2-) Normal	50	4.04	0.25			
	3-) Good	41	4.02	0.28			
Physiological	1-) Low	186	3.23	0.58	84.2	<.001	3>1
	2-) Normal	50	3.95	0.32			
	3-) Good	41	3.96	0.35			
Aesthetics	1-) Low	186	3.30	0.62	64.3	<.001	3>1
	2-) Normal	50	4.02	0.38			
	3-) Good	41	3.97	0.40			
Relaxation	1-) Low	186	3.24	0.64	83.6	<.001	3>2>1
	2-) Normal	50	3.96	0.37			
	3-) Good	41	4.07	0.34			
Social	1-) Low	186	3.25	0.45	142.8	<.001	3>1
	2-) Normal	50	4.01	0.31			
	3-) Good	41	3.95	0.21			
Psychological	1-) Low	186	3.14	0.47	181.4	<.001	3>1
	2-) Normal	50	4.02	0.27			
	3-) Good	41	3.95	0.27			

As a result of the ANOVA test between perceived income status and leisure time satisfaction; a significant difference was found between all sub-dimensions of the scale and perceived income ($p<0.05$). As a result of the "Post-Hoc Tukey" test performed to measure between which groups the significant difference occurred; in the educational sub-dimension, the group with good perceived income status ($x=4.02$) and the group with low perceived income status ($x=3.26$); in the physiological sub-dimension, between the group with good perceived income ($x=3.96$) and the group with low perceived income ($x=3.23$); in the aesthetic sub-dimension, between the group with good perceived income ($x=3.97$) and the group with low perceived income ($x=3.30$); in the relaxation sub-dimension, between the group with good perceived income ($x=4.07$) and the group with normal ($x=3.96$) and low perceived income ($x=3.24$); in the social sub-dimension, between the group with good perceived income ($x=3.95$) and the group with low perceived income ($x=3.25$) and finally, in the psychological sub-dimension, a significant difference was found between the group with good perceived income ($x=3.95$) and the group with low perceived income ($x=3.14$).

Table 4. ANOVA test results for the variable of weekly sportive recreation participation time

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	n	\bar{x}	ss	F	p	Difference Tukey
	Weekly Participation in Sportive Recreation						
Education	1-) 60-119	45	3.26	0.48	5.06	<.001	2>3>1
	2-) 120-179	74	3.62	0.52			
	3-) 180-239	84	3.54	0.56			
	4-) 240 and above	74	3.53	0.56			
Physiological	1-) 60-119	45	3.09	0.59	7.68	<.001	2>3>4>1
	2-) 120-179	74	3.59	0.56			
	3-) 180-239	84	3.55	0.62			
	4-) 240 and above	74	3.48	0.60			
Aesthetics	1-) 60-119	45	3.27	0.56	4.22	<.001	2>1
	2-) 120-179	74	3.65	0.63			

	3-) 180-239	84	3.53	0.71			
	4-) 240 and above	74	3.56	0.59			
Relaxation	1-) 60-119	45	3.14	0.71	4.39	<.001	2>4>3>1
	2-) 120-179	74	3.59	0.68			
	3-) 180-239	84	3.53	0.61			
	4-) 240 and above	74	3.56	0.65			
Social	1-) 60-119	45	3.12	0.41	14.44	<.001	2>4>3>1
	2-) 120-179	74	3.67	0.51			
	3-) 180-239	84	3.48	0.52			
	4-) 240 and above	74	3.55	0.52			
Psychological	1-) 60-119	45	3.13	0.45	8.00	<.001	2>1
	2-) 120-179	74	3.56	0.51			
	3-) 180-239	84	3.40	0.60			
	4-) 240 and above	74	3.47	0.62			

As a result of the ANOVA test performed between weekly participation time in sportive recreation activities and leisure time satisfaction; a significant difference was found between all sub-dimensions of the scale and perceived income ($p<0.05$). When the relationship of the significant difference between the groups was examined; between the group with 120-179 minutes of participation in the educational sub-dimension ($x=3.62$) with the group with 180-239 minutes of participation ($x=3.54$) and the group with 60-119 minutes of participation ($x=3.26$); between the group with 120-179 minutes of participation in the physiological sub-dimension and all other groups ($x(180-239 \text{ minutes})=3.55$; $x(240 \text{ and over})=3.48$; $x(60-119 \text{ minutes})=3.09$); in the aesthetic sub-dimension, between 120-179 minutes of participation ($x=3.65$) and 60-119 minutes of participation ($x=3.27$); in the relaxation sub-dimension, between the group with 120-179 minutes of participation ($x=3.59$) and all other groups ($x(240 \text{ and over})=3.56$; $x(180-239 \text{ minutes})=3.53$; $x(60-119 \text{ minutes})=3.14$); in the social sub-dimension, between the group participating 120-179 minutes ($x=3.67$) and all other groups ($x(240 \text{ and over})=3.55$; $x(180-239 \text{ minutes})=3.55$; $x(60-119 \text{ minutes})=3.12$); finally, in the psychological sub-dimension, there was a difference between the group participating 120-179 minutes ($x=3.56$) and the group participating 60-119 minutes ($x=3.13$).

Table 5. Relationship test between recreational sports well-being and leisure time satisfaction

	n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. R.S.İ.O. Physical and MentalHealth		Spearman p value	-								
2. R.S.İ.O. Life Satisfaction		Spearman p value	0.62 <.001	-							
3. R.S.İ.O. Family Relationship Development		Spearman p value	0.60 <.001	0.60 <.001	-						
4. R.S.I.O. Positive Emotion	277	Spearman p value	0.60 <.001	0.63 <.001	0.58 <.001	-					
5. SZTÖ Education		Spearman p value	0.50 <.001	0.52 <.001	0.58 <.001	0.51 <.001	-				
6. SZTÖ Physiological		Spearman p value	0.41 <.001	0.42 0,06	0.43 <.001	0.40 <.001	0.53 <.001	-			
7. SZTÖ Aesthetics		Spearman p value	0.40 <.001	0.43 0,46	0.40 <.001	0.40 0,03	0.46 <.001	0.42 <.001	-		
8. SZTÖ Relaxation		Spearman p value	0.41 <.001	0.42 <.001	0.45 <.001	0.44 0,38	0.44 <.001	0.41 <.001	0.40 <.001	-	
9. SZTÖ Social		Spearman p value	0.44 <.001	0.54 <.001	0.52 <.001	0.47 0,09	0.54 <.001	0.46 <.001	0.45 <.001	0.36 <.001	-
10. SZTÖ Psychological		Spearman p value	0.54 <.001	0.58 0,62	0.51 <.001	0.57 0,23	0.58 <.001	0.52 <.001	0.47 <.001	0.44 <.001	0.51 <.001

As a result of the correlation analysis carried out to determine the relationship between "Recreational Sports Well-Being" and "Leisure Time Satisfaction"; the correlation between RSIQ "Life Satisfaction" and SZTÖ "Aesthetic" ($r=0.46$, $p>0,05$) (96) and SZTÖ "Psychological" ($r=0.62$, $p>0,05$) sub-dimensions; no significant relationship was found between RHI "Positive" and SZTÖ "Social" ($r=0.38$, $p>0,05$) and SZTÖ "Psychological" ($r=0.23$, $p>0,05$) (96) sub-dimensions. On the other hand, it was determined that there was a moderate positive relationship between the related measurement tools.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, which aimed to examine the relationship between recreational sport well-being and leisure time satisfaction perceptions of university community members, no significant difference was found between gender variable and recreational sport well-being and leisure time satisfaction (Table 2), and it was determined that the recreational sport well-being levels of female participants were higher than male participants (Table 1). It is thought that this situation may be due to the fact that female participants are more aware of the psychological, physical and social benefits obtained as a result of participation in recreational sporting activities. According to a study conducted by Gümüşay et al. (30), no significant difference was found between gender variable and recreational sport well-being and it was determined that female participants had a higher level of recreational sport well-being than male participants. In a study conducted by Kermen et al. (42) to determine whether the concepts of psychological well-being and life satisfaction are affected by the concept of social anxiety, no significant difference was found between the gender variable and the level of psychological well-being, and it was revealed that male participants had a higher level of well-being than female participants. In a study conducted by Ertürk et al. (25), a significant difference was found between gender variable and psychological well-being level and it was determined that female participants had a higher level of psychological well-being than male participants. There are studies (1, 5, 6, 9, 18, 22, 31, 35, 46, 81).

A significant difference was found between the perceived income status variable and the participants' leisure time satisfaction and recreational sport well-being (Table 2, Table 3). When

descriptive findings are analysed, it is seen that the group with low level of recreational sport well-being is the group with low perceived income (Table 1). Looking at the mean leisure time satisfaction of the participants, it was determined that the group with the lowest mean was the participants with low perceived income level (Table 3). It can be said that these findings in the study may be due to the fact that participants with low perceived income level cannot benefit more from recreational-oriented sportive activities than participants with normal or good perceived income level due to economic constraints and this situation affects their leisure time satisfaction in general. According to a study conducted by Tunç (84), a significant difference was found between the income levels of the participants and psychological well-being, and it was revealed that the psychological well-being levels of the participants with low income levels were higher than the participants with other income groups. In a study conducted by Dost (21) on university students in Turkey and South Africa, it was determined that the subjective well-being of the participants differed according to the perceived income status variable. According to another study conducted by Geçgin & Sahraç (27), a significant difference was determined between the perceived income status of the participants and psychological well-being, and it was determined that the psychological well-being levels of the participants with low perceived income status were lower than the participants with other income status perceptions. In the study conducted by Gökbulut & Bal (29) to determine the relationship between mental well-being and healthy awareness, a significant difference was determined between the income levels of the participants and their mental well-being, and it was determined that the participants with poor income levels were lower than the participants with medium and good income levels. According to a study conducted by Elmas et al. (24) to determine the relationship between university students' physical activity level and psychological well-being levels, no significant difference was found between the income level variable of the participants and the level of psychological well-being. In a study conducted by Ardahan & Yerlisu Lapa (3) to examine the leisure time satisfaction levels of university students according to income and gender variables, a significant difference was found between the income level and leisure time satisfaction levels of the participants, and it was determined that as the income level increased, the level of leisure time satisfaction increased. In a study conducted by Yaman et al. (92) to examine the leisure time satisfaction levels of youth centre employees in terms of various variables, a significant difference was found between the participants' perceived income level variable and the level of leisure time satisfaction, and it was determined that as the perceived income level increases, the level of leisure time satisfaction increases. According to a study conducted by Sevil & Şimşek (80), no significant difference was found between the income status of the participants and their level of leisure satisfaction. There are studies in the literature that confirm the findings of the research and contrary to the research (2, 7, 10, 15, 28, 45, 47, 48, 56, 57, 65, 82, 85, 93).

While a significant difference was found between the variable of weekly participation time in sportive recreational activities and leisure time satisfaction (Table 4), no significant difference was found between recreational sport well-being (Table 2). Considering the descriptive findings, it was determined that individuals who participated in weekly sportive recreational activities between 120-179 minutes had higher recreational sport well-being and leisure time satisfaction levels compared to other participants (Table 1, Table 4). It is thought that this situation that emerged in the research findings may be due to the fact that individuals who participate in weekly sportive recreational activities in the range of 120-179 minutes benefit more from the outputs of sportive recreational activities within the scope of possible leisure time in physical, psychological, social and educational terms and have a higher awareness in this regard than other individuals. As a result of the correlation analysis performed to

determine the relationship between the measurement tools, it was determined that there was a moderate positive relationship between the "Recreational Sports Well-Being Scale" and the "Leisure Time Satisfaction Scale" (Table 5). According to the study conducted by Argan et al. (4) aiming to create a theoretical model to examine the relationship between well-being, leisure satisfaction, life satisfaction and happiness, a significant relationship was found between well-being and leisure satisfaction. According to a study conducted by Brown et al. (12) to determine the effect of leisure satisfaction on psychological well-being, leisure satisfaction was found to be an important predictor of well-being. According to a study conducted by Liu (52) to determine the relationship between the personalities, leisure satisfaction and subjective well-being of serious leisure participants, it was found that there was a positive relationship between leisure satisfaction and subjective well-being and that leisure satisfaction positively affected subjective well-being. In a study conducted by Ito et al. (36) to determine whether leisure time satisfaction of university students affects their subjective well-being, it was determined that leisure time satisfaction positively affected the subjective well-being levels of the participants.

As a result, while there was no significant difference between gender variable and recreational sport well-being, there was a significant difference between perceived income status and leisure time satisfaction and recreational sport well-being. It can be said that the perceived income status of the participants is a factor affecting individuals' leisure time satisfaction and recreational sporting well-being. It can be stated that leisure time satisfaction and recreational sport well-being are two concepts that can positively affect each other.

University community member students were preferred as the sample in the study and different samples can be preferred for future research. The extent to which various demographic factors (such as age, educational status) mediate the relationship between recreational sport well-being and leisure satisfaction can be addressed. Since the research was designed according to quantitative method principles, different methods may be preferred in future research. For example, mixed methods principles may be preferred to investigate in depth the relationship between recreational sports well-being and leisure satisfaction. This may make it easier to determine the exact reasons for the findings in the research.

REFERENCES

1. Abbott RA, Croudace TJ, Ploubidis, GB, Kuh D, Richards M, Huppert FA. The relationship between early personality and midlife psychological well-being: Evidence from a UK birth cohort study. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 2008; 43: 679-687.
2. Agate JR, Zabriskie RB, Agate ST, Poff R. Family leisure satisfaction and satisfaction with family life. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 2009; 41(2): 205-223.
3. Ardahan F, Yerlisu Lapa, T. üniversite öğrencilerinin serbest zaman tatmin düzeylerinin cinsiyete ve gelire göre incelenmesi. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2010; 21(4): 129-136.
4. Argan M, Argan MT, Dursun MT. Examining relationships among well-being, leisure satisfaction, life satisfaction, and happiness. *International Journal of Medical Research & Health Sciences*, 2018; 7(4): 49-59.
5. Aygün N, Topkaya N. Akademik erteleme ve akademik mükemmeliyetçilik ile psikolojik iyi oluş arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2022; (61): 189-208.
6. Aypay A, Eryılmaz A. Ergen öznel iyi oluşu ile kimlik statüsü ilişkisinin incelenmesi. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2011; (16): 167-179.
7. Ayyıldız T, Gökyürek B. Examination of leisure satisfaction levels of individuals participating in recreative dance activities. *Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education & Sport/Science, Movement & Health*, 2016; 16(2): 147-155
8. Beard JG, Ragheb MG. Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1980; 12(1): 20-33.
9. Bolelli M. Psikolojik sermayenin öznel iyi oluş üzerindeki etkileri: Türkiye'den bir araştırma. *International Journal of Management and Administration*, 2020; 4(8): 245-259.
10. Broughton K, Beggs BA. Leisure satisfaction of older adults. *Activities, Adaptation & Aging*, 2007; 31(1): 1-18.

11. Brown BA, Frankel, BG. Activity through the years: Leisure, leisure satisfaction, and life satisfaction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 1993; 10(1): 1–17.
12. Brown BA, Frankel BG, Fennell M. Happiness through leisure: the impact of type of leisure activity, age, gender and leisure satisfaction on psychological well-being. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 1991; 16(4): 368-392.
13. Campbell A. Subjective measures of well-being. *American Psychologist*, 1976; 31(2): 117–124.
14. Chick G, Dong E, Moreira JC, Burns R, Yeh CK, Sidik K. Leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction in Mainland China, Taiwan, and Brazil: a meta-analysis. *Leisure Studies*, 2023; 00(00): 1–10.
15. Chick G, Hsu YC, Yeh CK, Hsieh CM. Leisure constraints, leisure satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self-rated health in six cities in Taiwan. *Leisure Sciences*, 2015; 37(3): 232-251.
16. Chun S, Heo J, Ryu J. Leisure participation, physical health, and mental health in older adults. *Activities, Adaptation & Aging*, 2023; 47(2): 195–213.
17. Csikszentmihalyi M, LeFevre J. Optimal experience in work and leisure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1989; 56(5): 815–822.
18. Demir GT, Namlı S, Hazar Z, Türkeli A, Cicioğlu Hİ. Bireysel ve takım sporcularının karar verme stilleri ve mental iyi oluş düzeyleri. *CBÜ Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2018; 13(1): 176-191.
19. Diener E, Ryan K. Subjective well-being: A general overview. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 2009; 39(4): 391–406.
20. Diener E, Seligman MEP. Beyond money. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 2004; 5(1): 1–31.
21. Dost MT. Güney Afrika ve Türkiye'deki üniversite öğrencilerinin bazı değişkenlere göre öznel iyi oluş ve yaşam doyumlarının incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 2010; 35(158): 75-89.
22. Duman N., Göksu P., Köroğlu C., Talay A. Üniversite öğrencilerinde mental iyi oluş ile psikolojik dayanıklılık ilişkisi. *Yaşam Becerileri Psikoloji Dergisi*, 2020; 4(7): 9-17.
23. Dumith SC, Gigante, DP, Domingues MR, Hallal PC, Menezes AMB, Kohl HW. A longitudinal evaluation of physical activity in Brazilian adolescents: Tracking, change and predictors. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 2012; 24(1): 58–71.
24. Elmas L, Yüceant M, Ünlü H, Bahadır Z. Üniversite öğrencilerinin fiziksel aktivite düzeyleri ile psikolojik iyi oluş durumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Sportive*, 2021; 4(1): 1-17.
25. Ertürk A, Kara SBK, Güneş DZ. Duygusal emek ve psikolojik iyi oluş: Bir yordayıcı olarak yönetsel destek algısı. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2016; 16(4): 1723-1744.
26. Fox KR. The influence of physical activity on mental well-being. *Public Health Nutrition*, 1999; 2(3a): 411–418.
27. Geçgin FM, Sahranç Ü. Belirsizliğe tahammülsüzlük ile psikolojik iyi oluş arasındaki ilişki. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 2017; 7(4): 739-755.
28. Gelissen J. How stable is leisure satisfaction over time? A latent trait-state-occasion analysis of Dutch panel data. *Leisure Sciences*, 2022; 44(3): 267-288.
29. Gökbulut N, Bal Z. Mental iyi oluşluğun sağlıklı yaşam farkındalığıyla ilişkisi. *Anatolian Journal of Health Research*, 2021; 2(2): 51-56.
30. Gümüşay M, Koç MC, Turhan M. Kick boks sporcularının rekreasyonel spor iyi oluş düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Öğrenci Çalışmaları*, 2023; 5(1): 46-59.
31. Gündoğdu R, Yavuzer Y. Öğretmen adaylarının öznel iyi oluş ve psikolojik ihtiyaçlarının demografik değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2012; 1(23): 115-131.
32. Hartman CL, Barcelona RJ, Trautwein NE, Hall SL. Well-being and leisure-time physical activity psychosocial factors predict physical activity among university students. *Leisure Studies*, 2020 39(1): 156–164.
33. Helliwell JF, Layard R, Sachs JD. *World Happiness 2017 World Happiness*. 2017; 188.
34. Hughes JP, McDowell MA, Brody DJ. Leisure-time physical activity among US adults 60 or more years of age: Results from NHANES 1999–2004. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 2008; 5(3): 347–358.
35. Inglehart R. Gender, aging, and subjective well-being. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 2022; 43(3–5): 391–408.
36. Ito E, Walker GJ, Liu H, Mitas O. A cross-cultural/national study of Canadian, Chinese, and Japanese university students' leisure satisfaction and subjective well-being. *Leisure Sciences*, 2017; 39(2): 186-204.
37. Kando TM, Summers WC. The impact of work on leisure: Toward a paradigm and research strategy. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 1971; 14(3): 310–327.
38. Kanning M, Schlicht W. (2010). Be active and become happy: An ecological momentary assessment of physical activity and mood. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 2010; 32(2): 253–261.
39. Karlı Ü, Polat E, Yılmaz B, Koçak S. Serbest zaman tatmin ölçeği'nin (SZTÖ-uzun versiyon) geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences*, 2008; 19(2): 80–91.
40. Kaufman JE. Leisure and Anxiety: A Study of Retirees. *Activities, Adaptation & Aging*, 1988; 11(1): 1–10.
41. Kelly JR, Steinkamp MW, Kelly JR. Later-life satisfaction: Does leisure contribute? *Leisure Sciences*, 1987; 9(3): 189–199.

42. Kermen U, Tosun Nİ, Doğan U. Yaşam doyumu ve psikolojik iyi oluşun yordayıcısı olarak sosyal kaygı. Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2016; 2(1): 20-29.
43. Kirk MA, Rhodes RE. Occupation correlates of adults' participation in leisure-time physical activity. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 2011; 40(4): 476-485.
44. Koç, M. C. (2022). Rekreasyonel Spor İyi Oluş Ölçeği (RSİÖÖ) Türkçe Versiyonu: Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. Journal of Recreation and Tourism Research, 9(4), 86-97.
45. Kuo CT. A study on leisure satisfaction and quality of life-based on badminton participants. Journal of Global Business Management, 2011; 7(2): 1-9.
46. Kuyumcu B. Türk ve İngiliz üniversite öğrencilerinin psikolojik iyi oluş duygusal farkındalık ve duygularını ifade etmelerinin ülke ve cinsiyet değişkenlerine göre incelenmesi. Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2012; 14(2): 1-24.
47. Lamarca FJ, Lamarca CAJ. Determinants of leisure satisfaction among tourists in Pattaya City, Thailand. Journal of Politics and Governance, 2019; 9(2): 27-42.
48. Lapa TY. Life satisfaction, leisure satisfaction and perceived freedom of park recreation participants. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2013; 93: 1985-1993.
49. Layard R. Measuring subjective well-being. Science, 2010; 327(5965): 534-535.
50. Li X, Peng A, Li L, Chen L. Association between walking and square dancing-oriented leisure-time physical activity and cognitive function among middle-aged and elderly people in Southwest China. BMC Geriatrics, 2023; 23(1): 28.
51. Lin YT, Chen M, Ho CC, Lee TS. Relationships among leisure physical activity, sedentary lifestyle, physical fitness, and happiness in adults 65 years or older in Taiwan. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2020; 17(14): 5235.
52. Liu H. Personality, leisure satisfaction, and subjective well-being of serious leisure participants. Social Behavior And Personality: An International Journal, 2014; 42(7): 1117-1125.
53. Liu H, Yu B. Serious leisure, leisure satisfaction and subjective well-being of Chinese University students. Social Indicators Research, 2015; 122(1): 159-174.
54. London M, Crandall R, Seals GW. The contribution of job and leisure satisfaction to quality of life. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977; 62(3): 328-334.
55. Lu L, Hu CH. Personality, Leisure Experiences and Happiness. Journal of Happiness Studies, 2005; 6(3): 325-342.
56. Lubans DR, Smith JJ, Morgan PJ, Beauchamp MR, Miller A, Lonsdale, C, Dally K. Mediators of psychological well-being in adolescent boys. Journal of Adolescent Health, 2016; 58(2): 230-236.
57. Lubben JE. Gender differences in the relationship of widowhood and psychological well-being among low income elderly. Women & Health, 1989; 14(3-4): 161-189.
58. Lucas RE, Brent Donnellan M. Estimating the reliability of single-item life satisfaction measures: Results from four national panel studies. Social Indicators Research, 2012; 105(3): 323-331.
59. Mansfield L, Daykin N, Kay T. Leisure and wellbeing. Leisure Studies, 2020; 39(1): 1-10.
60. Martin Ginis KA, Ma JK, Latimer-Cheung AE, Rimmer JH. A systematic review of review articles addressing factors related to physical activity participation among children and adults with physical disabilities. Health Psychology Review, 2016; 10(4): 478-494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2016.1198240>
61. Mathew J, Paulose CS. (). The healing power of well-being. Acta Neuropsychiatrica, 2011; 23(4): 145-155.
62. Mishra PP, Dash S. (2023). World Happiness Report. In The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Global Security Studies (pp. 1595-1599). New York: Springer International Publishing.
63. Mouratidis K. Built environment and leisure satisfaction: The role of commute time, social interaction, and active travel. Journal of Transport Geography, 2019; 80: 102491.
64. Newman DB, Tay L, Diener E. Leisure and subjective well-being: A model of psychological mechanisms as mediating factors. Journal of Happiness Studies, 2014; 15(3): 555-578.
65. Ngai VT. Leisure satisfaction and quality of life in Macao, China. Leisure Studies, 2005; 24(2): 195-207.
66. Okun MA, Stock WA, Haring MJ, Witter RA. Health and subjective well-being: A meta-analysis. The International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 1984; 19(2): 111-132.
67. Özbay G. Developing a scale aiming at determining the problem areas of university students: study of validity and reliability. 1997; Unpublished Master's Thesis, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon.
68. Pearson QM. Job satisfaction, leisure satisfaction, and psychological health. The Career Development Quarterly, 1998; 46(4): 416-426.
69. Pi LL, Chang CM, Lin HH. Development and validation of recreational sport well-being scale. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2022; 19(14): 8764.
70. Pluta B, Bronikowska M, Tomczak M, Laudańska-Krzemińska I, Bronikowski M. (). Family leisure-time physical activities – results of the "Juniors for Seniors" 15-week intervention programme. Biomedical Human Kinetics, 2017; 9(1): 165-174.

71. Ragheb, M. G. (1993). Leisure and perceived wellness: A field investigation. *Leisure Sciences*, 15(1), 13–24.
72. Riddick, C. C., & Daniel, S. N. (1984). The Relative Contribution of Leisure Activities and Other Factors to the Mental Health of Older Women. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 16(2), 136–148.
73. Rosa, C. D., Collado, S., Profice, C. C., & Larson, L. R. (2019). Nature-based recreation associated with connectedness to nature and leisure satisfaction among students in Brazil. *Leisure Studies*, 38(5), 682–691.
74. Russell, R. V. (1987). The Importance of Recreation Satisfaction and Activity Participation to the Life Satisfaction of Age-segregated Retirees. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 19(4), 273–283.
75. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 141–166.
76. Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081
77. Schulenberg JE, Bryant, AL, & O'malley, PM. Taking hold of some kind of life: How developmental tasks relate to trajectories of well-being during the transition to adulthood. *Development and Psychopathology*, 2004; 16(04): 1119-40.
78. Serdar E, Demirel M, Harmandar Demirel D. The relationship between the leisure boredom, leisure satisfaction, and smartphone addiction: A study on university students. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 2022; 5(1): 30-42.
79. Serdar E, Harmandar Demirel D. The relationship between perceived freedom, leisure involvement, and happiness of individuals participating in physical activities. *Baltic Journal of Health and Physical Activity*, 2021; 13(7): 13-22.
80. Sevil T, Şimşek KY. Yaşlıların boş zaman aktivitelerine katılımlarında algıladıkları boş zaman tatmininin demografik özelliklere göre analizi. *GSI Journals Serie A: Advancements in Tourism Recreation and Sports Sciences*, 2019; 1(2): 54-70.
81. Şahin M, Aydın B, Sarı SV, Sezen K, Havva P. Öznel iyi oluşu açıklamada umut ve yaşamda anlamın. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 2012; 20(3): 827-836.
82. Tokay Arğan M, Mersin S. Life satisfaction, life quality, and leisure satisfaction in health professionals. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 2021; 57(2): 660-666.
83. Torkildsen G. *Leisure and recreation management* (5th ed.). 2005; London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
84. Tunç AÇ. Anxiety and psychological well-being levels of faculty of sports sciences students. *International Education Studies*, 2020;13(5): 117-124.
85. Vera-Villaruel P, Celis-Atenas K, Lillo S, Contreras D, Díaz-Pardo N, Torres J, Páez D. Towards a model of psychological well-being. The role of socioeconomic status and satisfaction with income in Chile. *Universitas Psychologica*, 2015; 14(3): 1055-1066.
86. Walker GJ, Halpenny EA, Deng J. Leisure satisfaction and acculturative stress: The case of Chinese-Canadian immigrants. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 2011; 43(2): 226–245.
87. Wang H, Shen B, Bo J. Profiles of health-related quality of life and their relationships with happiness, physical activity, and fitness. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 2022; 93(2): 260–269.
88. Wang WC. Exploring the relationship among free-time management, leisure boredom, and internet addiction in undergraduates in Taiwan. *Psychological Reports*, 2019; 122(5): 1651–1665.
89. Watson D, Slack AK. (). General factors of affective temperament and their relation to job satisfaction over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 1993; 54(2): 181–202.
90. Wiese CW, Kuykendall L, Tay L. Get active? A meta-analysis of leisure-time physical activity and subjective well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 2018; 13(1): 57–66.
91. Wilensky H. Work, careers and social integration. *International Social Science Journal*, 1960; 12: 543–560.
92. Yaman B, Akgül BM, Karaman M, Ayyıldız T, Karaküçük S. Examination of leisure satisfaction levels of individuals participating in youth center activities. *Niğde University Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 2016; 10(3): 474-487.
93. Yaşartürk F, Akyüz H, Gönülateş S. The investigation of the relationship between university students' levels of life quality and leisure satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 2019; 7(3): 739-745.
94. Yoo J. Attitude toward leisure, satisfaction with leisure policy, and happiness are mediated by satisfaction with leisure activities. *Scientific Reports*, 2022; 12(1): 11723.
95. George, D., & Mallery, M. *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*, 2010.
96. Tabachnick, Barbara G., Linda S. Fidell, and Jodie B. Ullman. *Using multivariate statistics*. Vol. 6. Boston, MA: pearson, 2013.
97. Gorsuch, R. L., & Venable, G. D. Development of an "age universal" IE scale. *Journal for the scientific study of religion*, 1983, 181-187.
98. Fox, N., Hunn, A., & Mathers, N. *Sampling and sample size calculation*. East Midlands/Yorkshire: The National Institutes for Health Research. Research Design Service for the East Midlands/Yorkshire & The Humber, 2009.