

The relationship between serious and casual leisure and leisure management and its education: A research on Generation Y

Mustafa Can Koç^{1*} and Mehmet Demirel²

¹Department of Recreation, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.

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

Accepted 13 May, 2020

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to reveal the relationship between, serious and indifferent leisure time and leisure management of Generation Y and its education in light of different variables. Leisure education was used in the study in terms of participation in activities, especially in terms of serious leisure participation information, and no measurement tool was needed in this respect. The study group consists of a total of 504 participants of Generation Y, including 164 women and 340 men born between 1980 and 1999. In addition to the personal information form, the "Leisure Management Scale" developed by Wang et al. (2011) and adapted to Turkish by Akgul and Karakucuk (2015) and the "Serious and Casual Leisure Scale" developed by Akyildiz (2013). It was determined that the data did not have a normal distribution, and the Mann Whitney-U Test was used to compare quantitative continuous data between two independent groups, and the Kruskal Wallis Test was used to compare quantitative continuous data between more than two independent groups. The Pearson Spearman Correlation Analysis was performed to determine the relationship between the sub-dimensions of the scale. As a result of the study, it was determined that there were significant differences according to the gender, leisure time and the adequacy of the recreation areas. At the same time, it was observed that there was a significant positive relationship between leisure management and serious and casual leisure sub-dimension.

Keywords: Generation Y, serious and casual leisure, leisure management.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: cankoc_01@hotmail.com.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of time is defined as "the duration in which an action or existence happens or will happen". In this definition, there are some features of the concept of time. At the top of these features are features such as failing to rent, buy, borrow, store, and save time (Belli and Gurbuz, 2012). The concept of time is divided into several groups according to the conditions people are in. One of these groups is the concept of "leisure time" (Er et al., 2019). Today's leisure studies - both theoretical and practical - have generally focused on the definition of leisure and the limitations of leisure research (Lockstone-Binney et al., 2010). In this context, it is possible to say that researchers make definitions that are similar but separate

with subtle nuances, although they are not very independent from each other when defining free time (Ustun and Ersoy, 2016). In its simplest definition, leisure can be defined as "the period of time in which the person is free from all necessities or connections for him/herself and others and will deal with an activity that s/he will choose" (Tezcan, 1978). According to another definition, leisure is "the time period that a person deserves to be able to linger, rest, have fun or develop himself as he wishes, except for necessities, in line with his tendencies and desires" (Tezcan Kardas, 2018). It is of great importance for both personal and social development that people learn about the contribution of leisure activities to

life, creating leisure awareness, motivation, transforming this information into behavior and adopting it as a life philosophy. The concept that gains importance at this point is leisure education. The higher the level of leisure education of an individual, in other words, the more s/he has the ability to evaluate his/her free time consciously, planned and rational, the more likely s/he is to benefit from the advantages of leisure (Munusturlar, 2014). The concept of management is very important in managing the concept of time that each individual is in, as in many areas in the life of the individual (Erani and Ozcan 2018). In order to manage time, the concept of time must first be understood well. According to Festjens and Janiszewski (2015), time is inherently a valuable resource that has a manageable value by its nature. Al Khatib (2014) defines time as a resource that every individual has the same level but cannot benefit equally for different reasons. These definitions reveal that time moves in a linear fashion and should be well-managed. When definitions on time management are analyzed (Burt and Kemp, 1994; Britton and Tesser, 1991; Hall and Hursch, 1982; Jex and Elacqua, 1999; King et al., 1986; Macan, 1994; Orpen, 1994; Slaven and Totterdell, 1993; Yavas et al., 2012), time management means planning in which goals, objectives, social life and tastes can be realized in the most beneficial way (Yavas et al., 2012). In addition, it is stated by the researchers that effective time management includes methods designed to help the individual achieve the desired goals (Hall and Hursch, 1982), that if educational success such as mental success in general takes time, this has the effect of time management skills (Britton and Tesser, 1991). In addition to all this information, serious and casual leisure time has arisen. As a result of his ethnographic studies, Stebbins (1997) defined serious leisure time as follows; "It is the time period spent to systematically participate in the selected event in order to obtain a career related to amateur, hobby or voluntary activities, which are very important, interesting and satisfying and which require special knowledge, skills and experience" (Akyildiz, 2013; Gould, 2005; Gould et al., 2011; Stebbins, 2007; Shen and Yarnal, 2010). However, Stebbins emphasized that the definition of serious leisure time does not fit into the definition of leisure time, and those who are dealing with wider contextual activities in their spare time are serious leisure participants of those who enjoy a more satisfying leisure activity. In addition, in a different definition, serious leisure time is amateur, hobby or voluntary activities that are very important, interesting and satisfying, and require specific knowledge, skills and experience" (Akyildiz, 2013; Gould, 2005; Gould et al., 2011; Kim et al., 2011; Stebbins, 2007; Barbieri and Sotomayor, 2013). To summarize, serious leisure time has brought a new dimension to today's world, where leisure activities will no longer be considered only leisure activities. It has enabled us to detail leisure activities. Generation can be defined as groups of people with

various common characteristics, who are born at certain time intervals, grow and survive, and are affected by the events they live in (Senturan et al., 2016). The concept of Generation is mainly based on age groups. Each Generation is influenced by the society in which it exists and lives, and at the same time, it can change to a certain extent by affecting other societies with its mindset and changes. Along with this change, it may be directed to ensure that some of its effects continue through other Generations according to the differences caused by the differences between Generations (Altuntug, 2012). Generation Y, the group of the study, is known as the Generation of those born between 1980 and 1999 (Kyles, 2005). This Generation is also known as "internet Generation", "Echo-Boomers", "Millennial" and "Nexters". These definitions are used to indicate the difference of Generation Y from the Generations that preceded it (Broadbridge et al., 2007). Many researchers claim that Generation Y is a new wave of transformation in social and business life (Ringer and Garma, 2006; Leahy et al., 2011; Lourdes et al., 2011; Barford et al., 2011; Jang, 2008; Shea, 2012). Generation Y members believe that they can achieve everything and they are transformative. Unlike their parents, they grew up in an environment surrounded by modern technologies and the consumer society (Aminul et al., 2011). In addition, Generation Y is a Generation that has grown up with internet and television, uses the internet in many areas, cares about expressing itself on social media, follows newspapers and magazines over the internet, loves shopping online and quickly loses its motivation (Erdogan, 2020). As can be seen, the Generation Y is in the image of a Generation that attracts attention in the literature. Therefore, scientists continue to consider this Generation in different dimensions. This study aims to determine whether leisure time management and serious and casual leisure scale sub-dimensions differ according to some demographic information and to reveal the relationship between leisure management and serious and casual leisure scale sub-dimensions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The purpose of this study is based on relational screening model, as it aims to determine the relationship between leisure time management and serious and casual leisure according to the variables including gender, leisure and the adequacy of recreation area, as well as to determine the relationship between leisure time management and serious and casual leisure time.

Study group

The population of the research (Generation Y) is the Generation born between 1980 and 1999. The sample of

the study consists of 164 women and 340 men, a total of 504 participants selected via the convenience sampling method. In addition, the Google form survey method was used to obtain the research results. In calculating the sample size, it was estimated that the acceptable sample for $n > 10000$ samples should have a 95% confidence interval and 370 with $p < 0.05$ error margin (Coskun et al., 2012). The sample of the study consists of 504 participants. According to this result, it can be said that the results obtained from the current sample can be generalized for the whole population.

The distribution of the participants in the study group according to demographic characteristics is given in Table 1.

Participants are distributed as 340 (67.5%) male and 164 (32.5%) female according to the gender. 105 (20.8%)

have 1-5 hours of leisure, 180 (35.7%) 6-10 hours and 219 (43.5%) 11 or more according to leisure. 153 (30.4%) find recreation areas as adequate, 168 (33.3%) as partially adequate and 183 (36.3%) as inadequate according to the adequacy of the recreation area.

Data collection tool

Demographic information form

The 'Demographic Information Form', prepared by the researchers and containing questions such as gender, leisure time and the adequacy of the recreation area, was presented as the data collection tool in the first part of the research.

Table 1. Descriptive Features.

Groups	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	340	67.5
Female	164	32.5
Leisure		
1-5 hours	105	20.8
6-10 hours	180	35.7
11 and over	219	43.5
The adequacy of the recreation area		
Adequate	153	30.4
Partially	168	33.3
Inadequate	183	36.3

Leisure management scale

In order to measure the leisure management of the participants, "Leisure Time Scale", which was developed by Wang et al. (2011) and adapted to Turkish by Akgul and Karakucuk (2015), was used. The scale is a 5-point Likert Type (1 = Totally Agree, 5 = Totally Disagree) and includes 15 items, four sub-dimensions, namely Setting an Objective and Method, Leisure Attitude, Programming and Evaluation. 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 6th, 7th and 8th Questions are related to the setting an objective sub-dimension, 10th, 11th and 12th Questions related to Leisure Attitude, 13th and 14th Questions related to the programming sub-dimension and 4th, 5th, and 9th questions related to the evaluation sub-dimension. Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was found as 0.83.

Serious and casual leisure scale

The "Serious and Casual Leisure Scale" was used to

decide whether the participants were serious and casual leisure participants. The Serious and Casual Leisure Scale was developed by Akyildiz in 2013. This data collection tool, which decides whether individuals are serious and casual leisure participants, has a total of 42 items and a total of 9 sub-dimensions including: (1) leisure career, (2) sense of competence, (3) psycho-social benefit, (4) therapeutic benefit, (5) social benefit, (6) commitment, (7) personality, (8) perseverance and (9) personal effort. The questionnaire form primarily requests the participant to choose whether s/he is a serious leisure participant in any leisure activity according to this definition of the serious leisure participation accepted in the international literature. Later, the participants filled the 42-item scale, taking into account this activity. Akyildiz developed its scale by taking into account other inventories in the world literature and conducted its validity and reliability. As a result of these studies carried out by Akyildiz, the total internal consistency coefficient of the scale was 0.95. Answers to the scale are as follows: 1 "Absolutely Disagree", 5 "Absolutely Agree". And they

are calculated on a 5-point Likert type scale (Akyildiz, 2013). The sub-dimensions of the scale include the following items: Leisure Career sub-dimension (5, 6, 7, 8, 9,10), The sense of competence sub-dimension (34, 35, 36, 37, 38), Psycho-social benefit sub-dimension (15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20), Therapeutic benefit sub-dimension (21, 22, 23, 24, 25), Social benefit sub-dimension (26, 27, 28, 29), Commitment sub-dimension (30, 31, 32, 33), Personality sub-dimension (39, 40, 41, 42), Perseverance sub-dimension (1, 2, 3, 4) and Personal effort sub-dimension (11, 12, 13, 14).

Statistical analysis

SPSS.22 program was used in the analysis of the data to reveal whether there were differences in terms of mean scores between variables and serious and casual leisure and leisure management. As a result of the normality test conducted to determine whether the data was normally distributed, the Mann Whitney-U Test was used to compare quantitative continuous data between two independent groups, and the Kruskal Wallis Test was used to compare quantitative continuous data between more than two independent groups. Spearman Correlation Analysis was used to determine the relationship between the sub-dimensions of the scale. In the analysis, the confidence interval was determined as 95% (significance level 0.05, $p < 0.05$). The Cronbach Alpha correlation coefficient of the serious and casual leisure scale was 0.67 and the Cronbach Alpha correlation coefficient of the leisure scale was 0.95.

FINDINGS

According to Table 2, it is seen that the leisure management scale of the participants does not differ according to gender variable in the setting an objective and method and evaluation sub-dimensions ($p > 0.05$). However, there was a significant difference in favor of women in the sub-dimension of leisure, and in favor of men in the programming sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$).

There was no significant difference in terms of gender variable in the sub-dimensions of participants' serious and casual leisure including leisure career, sense of competence, psycho-social benefit, therapeutic benefit, social benefit and commitment ($p > 0.05$). However, there was a significant difference in favor of women in perseverance and personal effort sub-dimensions ($p < 0.05$).

According to Table 3, there is a significant difference in favor of those who have 1-5 hours of leisure in the sub-dimension of leisure scale of the participants according to leisure ($p < 0.05$). However, there is no significant difference in the setting an objective and method, evaluation, and programming sub-dimensions ($p > 0.05$).

There is a significant difference in the commitment sub-dimension of the participants' serious and casual leisure scale in favor of those with 1-5 hours of leisure ($p < 0.05$). However, there is no significant difference in other sub-dimensions of leisure management compared to leisure ($p > 0.05$).

According to Table 4, there is a significant difference in favor of those who find inadequate according to the adequacy of the recreation area of the programming sub-dimension of the participants' leisure management scale ($p < 0.05$). However, there is no significant difference in other sub-dimensions of the serious leisure scale ($p > 0.05$).

There is a significant difference in favor of those who find adequate in the psycho-social benefit, perseverance and personal effort sub-dimensions of the serious and casual leisure scale of the participants ($p < 0.05$). However, there is no significant difference in other sub-dimensions of the leisure management scale ($p > 0.05$).

There is a low level, significant and positive relationship between setting an objective and method and leisure career ($r = .248$), sense of competence ($r = .194$), psychosocial benefit ($r = .263$), therapeutic benefit ($r = .216$), social benefit ($r = .158$), commitment ($r = .168$), personality ($r = .160$), perseverance ($r = .335$), and personal effort ($r = .245$) (Table 5).

There is a low level, significant and positive relationship between the evaluation sub-dimensions of the leisure management scale and the sub-dimensions of the serious and indifferent leisure scale including leisure career ($r = .348$), sense of competence ($r = .272$), psychosocial benefit ($r = .338$), therapeutic benefit ($r = .349$), social benefit ($r = .289$), commitment ($r = .254$), personality ($r = .273$), personal effort ($r = .277$). There is a moderately significant and positive relationship between evaluation and perseverance ($r = .450$).

There is a low-level, significant, and positive relationship between leisure attitude and leisure career ($r = .310$), sense of competence ($r = .228$), psychosocial benefit ($r = .296$), therapeutic benefit ($r = .279$), social benefit ($r = .219$), commitment ($r = .244$), personality ($r = .221$), perseverance ($r = .365$), and personal effort ($r = .257$).

There is a low level of significant and negative relationship between programming and leisure career ($r = -.165$), sense of competence ($r = -.197$), psychosocial benefit ($r = -.116$), therapeutic benefit ($r = -.140$), personality ($r = -.227$), perseverance ($r = -.155$), and personal effort ($r = .140$). There is no significant relationship between programming and social benefit and commitment.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to the results of the research conducted to reveal the relationship between the Generation Y and

Table 2. The Differentiation of participants' serious and casual leisure scale and leisure management sub-dimension scores according to the gender.

Leisure management	Gender	N	Mean rank	Rank sum	U	P
Setting an objective and method	Male	340	248.99	84656.00	26686.00	0.43
	Female	164	259.78	42604.00		
	Total	504				
Evaluation	Male	340	249.61	84867.50	26897.50	0.52
	Female	164	258.49	42392.50		
	Total	504				
Leisure attitude	Male	340	240.88	81897.50	23927.50	0.01
	Female	164	276.60	45362.50		
	Total	504				
Programming	Male	340	267.52	90957.00	22773.00	0.00
	Female	164	221.36	36303.00		
	Total	504				
Serious and casual leisure						
Leisure career	Male	340	250.12	85041.50	27071.50	0.60
	Female	164	257.43	42218.50		
	Total	504				
Sense of competence	Male	340	247.37	84104.50	26134.50	0.25
	Female	164	263.14	43155.50		
	Total	504				
Psycho-social benefit	Male	340	250.80	85273.50	27303.50	0.71
	Female	164	256.02	41986.50		
	Total	504				
Therapeutic benefit	Male	340	250.25	85085.50	27115.50	0.62
	Female	164	257.16	42174.50		
	Total	504				
Social benefit	Male	340	248.28	84414.50	26444.50	0.35
	Female	164	261.25	42845.50		
	Total	504				
Commitment	Male	340	259.41	88199.00	25531.00	0.12
	Female	164	238.18	39061.00		
	Total	504				
Personality	Male	340	234.63	79773.50	27175.50	0.64
	Female	164	289.55	47486.50		
	Total	504				
Perseverance	Male	340	250.43	85145.50	21803.50	0.00
	Female	164	256.80	42114.50		
	Total	504				
Personal effort	Male	340	241.96	82266.00	24296.00	0.02
	Female	164	274.35	44994.00		
	Total	504				

Table 3. The differentiation of participants' serious and casual leisure scale and leisure management sub-dimension scores according to leisure.

Leisure management	Leisure	N	Mean rank	χ^2	P
Setting an objective and Method	1-5	105	277.08	3.90	.142
	6-10	180	243.42		
	11 and over	219	248.18		
	Total	504			
Evaluation	1-5	105	268.00	3.86	.145
	6-10	180	236.21		
	11 and over	219	258.46		
	Total	504			
Leisure Attitude	1-5	105	275.55	10.12	.006
	6-10	180	225.83		
	11 and over	219	263.37		
	Total	504			
Programming	1-5	105	251.22	1.58	0.45
	6-10	180	242.81		
	11 and over	219	261.08		
	Total	504			
Serious and casual leisure					
Leisure career	1-5	105	253.48	2.50	0.29
	6-10	180	239.58		
	11 and over	219	262.65		
	Total	504			
Sense of competence	1-5	105	262.50	0.83	0.66
	6-10	180	246.25		
	11 and over	219	252.84		
	Total	504			
Psycho-social benefit	1-5	105	230.58	3.42	0.18
	6-10	180	253.34		
	11 and over	219	262.32		
	Total	504			
Therapeutic benefit	1-5	105	254.72	0.86	0.65
	6-10	180	244.66		
	11 and over	219	257.88		
	Total	504			
Social benefit	1-5	105	259.03	1.65	0.44
	6-10	180	260.18		
	11 and over	219	243.05		
	Total	504			
Commitment	1-5	105	276.44	5.12	0.08
	6-10	180	256.04		
	11 and over	219	238.11		
	Total	504			

Table 3. Continues.

Personality	1-5	105	269.70	1.99	0.37
	6-10	180	245.34		
	11 and over	219	250.14		
	Total	504			
Perseverance	1-5	105	264.59	4.37	0.11
	6-10	180	234.47		
	11 and over	219	261.53		
	Total	504			
Personal effort	1-5	105	258.84	2.91	0.23
	6-10	180	237.79		
	11 and over	219	261.55		
	Total	504			

Table 4. The differentiation of participants according to the adequacy of the recreation area of serious and casual leisure scale and leisure management sub-dimension scores.

Leisure management	Recreation area	N	Mean rank	X²	P
Setting an objective and method	Adequate	153	263.63	2.79	0.25
	Partially	168	237.71		
	Inadequate	183	256.77		
	Total	504			
Evaluation	Adequate	153	255.19	0.10	0.95
	Partially	168	252.65		
	Inadequate	183	250.12		
	Total	504			
Leisure Attitude	Adequate	153	263.03	1.50	0.47
	Partially	168	252.49		
	Inadequate	183	243.70		
	Total	504			
Programming	Adequate	153	221.93	11.19	0.00
	Partially	168	256.29		
	Inadequate	183	274.58		
	Total	504			
Serious and casual leisure					
Leisure career	Adequate	153	285.62	16.70	0.00
	Partially	168	219.49		
	Inadequate	183	255.11		
	Total	504			
Sense of competence	Adequate	153	265.74	1.83	0.40
	Partially	168	247.12		
	Inadequate	183	246.37		
	Total	504			

Table 3. Continues.

Psycho-social benefit	Adequate	153	287.01	12.52	0.00
	Partially	168	235.52		
	Inadequate	183	239.24		
	Total	504			
Therapeutic benefit	Adequate	153	272.21	4.42	0.11
	Partially	168	248.61		
	Inadequate	183	239.59		
	Total	504			
Social benefit	Adequate	153	259.46	2.15	0.34
	Partially	168	259.80		
	Inadequate	183	239.98		
	Total	504			
Commitment	Adequate	153	256.36	0.22	0.90
	Partially	168	252.84		
	Inadequate	183	248.96		
	Total	504			
Personality	Adequate	153	266.30	2.14	0.34
	Partially	168	249.42		
	Inadequate	183	243.79		
	Total	504			
Perseverance	Adequate	153	292.71	17.60	0.00
	Partially	168	228.31		
	Inadequate	183	241.09		
	Total	504			
Personal effort	Adequate	153	272.89	12.51	0.00
	Partially	168	220.57		
	Inadequate	183	264.77		
	Total	504			

serious and casual leisure and leisure management, there was no significant difference in the setting an objective and method and evaluation sub-dimensions of the leisure management scale according to the gender, and there was a significant difference in favor of men in the sub-dimension of leisure attitude and in favor of women in the sub-dimension of leisure programming ($p < 0.05$). When the literature is analysed, there are results showing that although there are no significant differences in the setting an objective and method and evaluation sub-dimensions (Akgul et al., 2016; Alay and Koçak, 2003; Cuhadar et al., 2019; Eranil and Ozcan, 2018; Yasarturk et al., 2018). There are studies in which significant differences were found and these findings support our findings (Covic et al., 2003; Macan et al., 1990; Misra and McKean, 2000; Trueman and Hartley, 1996; Fisekcioglu and Ozsari 2017). According to these studies, men's ability to manage and program leisure is

higher than women (Beville et al., 2014). When the literature and our research findings are compared, similarities and differences are seen. Despite the high rates of men compared to women in planning, it was observed that women were better in terms of leisure attitude compared to men. The reason for this is that women grow at a young age by taking their mothers as role models. The abilities of mothers in terms of attitude are also known. In this context, it can be said that this Generation received this feature from the mother. In addition, this is because both in business life and social life women are better at leisure attitude than men in terms of organizing things, putting things in order, taking them seriously and adjusting their time well. There was no significant difference in terms of the gender variable in the sub-dimensions of participants' serious and casual leisure including leisure career, sense of competence, psycho-social benefit, therapeutic benefit, social benefit

Table 5. Correlation test results for the participants' serious and casual leisure scale and leisure management analysis.

Serious and casual leisure		Leisure management								
		Leisure career	Sense of competence	Psycho-social benefit	Therapeutic benefit	Social benefit	Commitment	Personality	Perseverance	Personal effort
Setting and objective and method	R	.248**	.194**	.263**	.216**	.158**	.168**	.160**	.335**	.245**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	504	504	504	504	504	504	504	504	504
Evaluation	R	.348**	.272**	.338**	.349**	.289**	.254**	.273**	.450**	.277**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	504	504	504	504	504	504	504	504	504
Leisure attitude	R	.310**	.228**	.296**	.279**	.219**	.244**	.221**	.365**	.257**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	504	504	504	504	504	504	504	504	504
Programming	R	-.165**	-.097*	-.116**	-.140**	.015	.040	-.227**	-.155**	-.140**
	p	.000	.030	.009	.002	.734	.376	.000	.000	.002
	N	504	504	504	504	504	504	504	504	504

and commitment ($p > 0.05$). However, there was a significant difference in favor of women in perseverance and personal effort sub-dimensions ($p < 0.05$).

Goklemen (2019) did not find any significant differences in any sub-dimension according to gender in his research. It does not show parallelism with our research. In his research, Isik (2014) found a significant difference in sense of competence and personality sub-dimensions and stated that in general, women had higher scores than men's sub-dimensions. This result is similar to the results that we have achieved in comparison of men with women. The reason for this is that women are more ambitious and determined than men, and they are one step ahead in terms of dealing with difficulties. There was a meaningful difference in favor of those who have 1-5 hours of leisure in the leisure attitude sub-dimension of the participants ($p < 0.05$). However, there was no significant difference in the setting an objective and method, evaluation, and programming sub-dimensions ($p > 0.05$). With these results, it can be concluded that people have time to spare after compulsory jobs and physiological needs, as well as know what leisure means for them, its importance and the value of this time to be happy. There was a significant difference in the commitment sub-dimension of the participants' serious and casual leisure scale in favor of those with 1-5 hours of leisure ($p < 0.05$). However, there was no significant difference in other sub-dimensions of leisure

management compared to those of leisure ($p > 0.05$). Isik (2014) concluded that the participants had 6-10 hours of leisure. Although this result is not similar to our research findings, it supports our research. It can be said that the activities that the participants attended in their leisure and similar activities and their commitment are known to everyone and that they continue their lives without disruption. There was a significant difference in favor of those who were inadequate according to the adequacy of the recreation area in the programming sub-dimension of the Y Generation leisure management scale ($p < 0.05$). However, there was no significant difference in other sub-dimensions of the leisure management scale ($p > 0.05$). It can be said that due to the inadequate recreation areas, individuals do not have the opportunity to plan ahead for participation in these areas, and that this Generation is unable to act within plans, as this Generation experiences a loss of motivation very quickly (Erdogan, 2020). There was a significant difference in favor of those who were adequate in terms of leisure, psycho-social benefit, perseverance and personal effort sub-dimensions of the serious and casual leisure scale of the participants ($p < 0.05$). However, there was no significant difference in the other sub-dimensions of the serious and casual leisure management scale ($p > 0.05$).

As a result of these results, the participants have knowledge about the activities they take part in their leisure, benefit from those activities, experience

improvements in the name of social and human relations, love and participate in whatever they are interested in to carry themselves to a better level than their peers with their skills (Leahy et al., 2011; Lourdes et al., 2011). As the sub-dimensions of the leisure management scale sub-dimensions, there is a low level of significant and positive relationship between setting an objective and method, leisure career ($r = .248$), sense of competence ($r = .194$), psychosocial benefit ($r = .263$), therapeutic benefit ($r = .216$), social benefit ($r = .158$), commitment ($r = .168$), personality ($r = .160$), perseverance ($r = .335$), and personal effort ($r = .245$). There is a low level of significant and positive relationship between the evaluation of the sub-dimensions of the leisure management scale and the sub-dimensions of serious and casual leisure scale which is as follows: leisure career ($r = .348$), sense of competence ($r = .272$), psychosocial benefit ($r = .338$), therapeutic benefit ($r = .349$), social benefit ($r = .289$) commitment ($r = .254$), personality ($r = .273$), personal effort ($r = .277$). There was a moderately significant and positive relationship between evaluation and perseverance ($r = .450$) sub-dimensions. There as a low-level, significant, and positive relationship between leisure attitude and leisure career ($r = .310$), sense of competence ($r = .228$), psychosocial benefit ($r = .296$), therapeutic benefit ($r = .279$), social benefit ($r = .219$), commitment ($r = .244$), personality ($r = .221$), perseverance ($r = .365$), and personal effort ($r = .257$). There was a low level, significant, and negative relationship between the programming sub-dimension and serious and leisure-time career ($r = -.165$), sense of competence ($r = -.197$), psychosocial benefit ($r = -.116$), therapeutic benefit ($r = -.140$), personality ($r = -.227$), perseverance ($r = -.155$), personal effort ($r = .140$). There was no significant relationship between programming and social benefit and commitment. It is considered that serious leisure time participation or the prevention of participation is related to leisure management. However, considering that all of the casual leisure activities are related to pleasure and entertainment (Akyildiz, 2013), it is also expected that the relationships in our findings will be positive but low. For, being able to manage leisure requires individuals to evaluate their time, integrate them into their life in a program and do appropriate jobs at the right time. It may be possible for individuals to act according to their level of satisfaction, even without a program or evaluation in leisure. As a result, it can be said that there are statistically significant differences between the serious and casual leisure and leisure management according to the variables including gender, leisure and the adequacy of the recreation areas, and there is a low positive relationship between serious and casual leisure and leisure management.

REFERENCES

Akgul B. M., and Karakucuk, S. (2015) Leisure management scale

- (valid reliability study). *International Journal of Human Science*, 12(2): 1867-1880.
- Akgul, B. M., Yenel, F. I., and Karakucuk, S. (2016). Evaluating free time management and its relation to life satisfaction, most participated free activities and gender among college students in Turkey. *Social Sciences and Humanities Journal*, 11(2): 2-18.
- Akyildiz, M. (2013). A serious view of leisure: Serious leisure theory in leisure researches, *Pamukkale Journal of Sport Sciences*, 4(2): 46-59.
- Akyildiz, M. (2013). Relationship between Personality Traits and Leisure Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction of Serious and Indifferent Participants. Ph.D. Thesis, Anadolu University Institute of Health Sciences, Eskişehir.
- Al Khatib, A. S. (2014). Time management and its relation to students' stress, gender and academic achievement among sample of students at Al Ain University of science and technology, UAE. *International Journal of Business and Social Research*, 4(5): 47-58.
- Alay, S., and Kocak, S. (2003). The relationship between university students' time management and academic achievement. *Education Management in Theory and Practice*, 35: 326-335.
- Altuntug, N. (2012). Generation to generation consumption and the consumer profile of the future. *Süleyman Demirel University Journal of Organization and Management Sciences*, 4(1): 203-212.
- Aminul, I., Cheong T. W., Yusuf, H., and Desa, H. (2011). A study on generation at workplace in Penang. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 7(11): 1802-1805.
- Barbieri, C., and Sotomayor, S. (2013). Surf travel behavior and destination preferences: An application of the serious leisure inventory and measure. *Tourism Management*, 35: 111-121.
- Barford, Ian N., Hester, and Patrick T. (2011). Analysis of Generation Y Workforce Motivation using Multi-attribute Utility Theory. A Publication of the Defence Acquisition University, Year: 2011, pp. 64-80.
- Belli, E., and Gurbuz, A. (2012). Investigation of Recreational Activities of Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University Academic Staff. I. Recreation Research Congress, Antalya.
- Beville, J. M., Umstatted Meyer, M. R., Usdan, S. L., Turner, L. W., Jackson, J. C., and Lian, B. E. (2014). Gender differences in college leisure time physical activity: application of the theory of planned behaviour and integrated behavioural model. *Journal of American College Health*, 62(3): 173-184.
- Britton, B. K., and Tesser, A. (1991). Effects of timemanagement practices on college grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(3): 405-410.
- Broadbridge, A., Gill, M., and Ogden, S. (2007). Experiences, perceptions and expectations of retail employment for Generation Y. *Career Development International*, 12(6): 523-544.
- Burt, C. D., and Kemp, S. (1994). Construction of activity duration and time management potential. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 8(2): 155-168.
- Coskun, R., Bayraktaroglu, S., Yildirim, E., and Altunisik, R. (2012). Research methods in social sciences: SPSS applied. Sakarya Publishing.
- Covic, T., Adamson, B., Lincoln, M., and Kench, P. (2003). Health science students' time organization and management skills: A cross-disciplinary investigation. *Medical Teacher*, 25(1), 47-53.
- Cuhadar, A., Demirel, M., Er, Y., and Serdar, E. (2019). Leisure management and future expectation relationship in high school students. *Journal of International Social Research*, 12(66).
- Er, Y., Koc, M. C., Demirel, M., and Cuhadar, A. (2019). The meaning of leisure and life satisfaction: The sample of university students. *International Journal of Culture and History*, 6(2): 1-16.
- Erani, A. K., and Ozcan, M. (2018). Investigation of leisure management skills of high school students. *Anemon Muş Alparslan University Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(6): 779-785.
- Erdogan, U. (2020). Online Shopping Trend in Generation Y. Master Thesis, Bahçeşehir University Institute of Science, Istanbul.
- Festjens, A., and Janiszewski, C. (2015). The value of time. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42(2): 178-195.
- Fisekcioglu, I. B., and Ozsari, A. (2017). Leisure time management and the attitudes of disabled athletes. *International Journal of Sport Culture and Science*, 5(4): 302-318.

- Goklemen, T. Y. (2019).** Investigation of Individuals Participating in Archery Sport in Terms of Serious Leisure Time. Master Thesis, Akdeniz University Institute of Social Sciences, Antalya.
- Gould, J. M. (2005).** The Development of a Serious Leisure Inventory and Measure. Phd Thesis Clemson University, Park, Recreation and Tourism Management, South Carolina
- Gould, J., Moore, D., Karlin, N. J., Gaede, D. B., Walker, J., and Dotterweich, A. R., (2011)** Measuring serious leisure in chess: Model confirmation and method bias. *Leisure Sciences*, 33(4): 332-340.
- Hall, B. L., and Hursch, D. E. (1982).** An evaluation of the effects of a time management training program on work efficiency. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 3(4): 73-96.
- Isik, U. (2014).** Investigation of Personality Traits of Serious Leisure Participants Studying at School of Physical Education and Sports. Ph.D. Thesis, Dumlupinar University Institute of Health Sciences, Kütahya.
- Jang, J. (2008).** The Impact of Career Motivation and Polychronicity on Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention among Hotel Industry Employees", Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of North Texas, USA.
- Jex, S. M., and Elacqua, T. C. (1999).** Time management as a moderator of relations between stressors and employee strain. *Work and Stress*, 13(2): 182-191.
- Kim, J., Dattilo, J., and Heo, J. (2011).** Taekwondo participation as serious leisure for life satisfaction and Health. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 43(4): 545-559.
- King, A. C., Winett, R. A., and Lovett, S. B. (1986).** Enhancing coping behaviours in at-risk populations: The effects of time-management instruction and social support in women from dual-earner families. *Behaviour Therapy*, 17(1): 57-66.
- Kyles, D. (2005).** Managing your multi-generational workforce. *Strategic Finance*, 87(6): 53-55.
- Leahy K., McGinley J., Thompson J., and Weese T. (2011).** Intelligence community assessment: generational difference in workplace motivation. *Intelligence Reform and Transformation*, 29(1): 1-16.
- Lockstone-Binney, L., Holmes, K., Smith, K., and Baum, T. (2010).** Volunteers and volunteering in leisure: Social science perspectives. *Leisure Studies*, 29(4): 435-455.
- Lourdes, S., Jose, R. P., Sandra, I., Maria, J. B., Alvaro, E., Angela, G., Marisa, A., and Eugenio, A. P. (2011).** Generation or Culture? Work Attitude Drivers: An Analysis in Latin America and Iberian Countries. Working Paper No: 919, University of Navarra.
- Macan, T. H. (1994).** Time management: Test of a process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(3): 381-391.
- Macan, T. H., Shahani, C., Dipboye, R. L., and Phillips, A. P. (1990).** College students' time management: Correlations with academic performance and stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(4): 760-768.
- Misra, R., and McKean, M. (2000).** College students' academic stress and its relation to their anxiety, time management, and leisure satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Studies*, 16(1): 41-51.
- Munusturlar, S. (2014).** The effect of leisure education on self-esteem and subjective well-being. Ph.D. Thesis, Anadolu University Institute of Health Sciences Physical Education and Sports Department Eskişehir.
- Orpen, C. (1994).** The effect of time-management training on employee attitudes and behaviour: A field experiment. *The Journal of Psychology*, 128(4): 393-396.
- Ringer, A., and Garma, R. (2006),** "Does the Motivation to Help Differ Between Generation X and Y?" Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference, University of Otago, School of Business, Department of Marketing, Dunedin, New Zealand, pp. 1067-1073.
- Senturan, S., Kose, A., and Dertli, E. M. (2016).** Investigation on X-Y generation managers' perception and differences in business values. *Journal of Business and Economics Researches*, 7(3): 171-183.
- Shea, C. E. (2012).** Generational Differences in Intrinsic and Extrinsic Workplace Motivation. Unpublished Master's Thesis, San Jose State University, USA.
- Shen, X. S., and Yarnal, C. (2010).** Blowing open the serious leisure-casual leisure dichotomy: What's in there? *Leisure Sciences*, 32: 162-179.
- Slaven, G., and Totterdell, P. (1993).** Time management training: does it transfer to the workplace? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 8(1): 20-28.
- Stebbins, R. A. (1997).** Casual leisure: A conceptual statement. *Leisure Studies*, 16: 17-25
- Stebbins, R. A. (2007).** Serious Leisure, A perspective for Our Time, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick.
- Tezcan Kardas, N. (2018).** Recreation. In K. Karacabey, (Ed.), *Introduction to Recreation* (p.12-15). Istanbul: Ergun.
- Tezcan, M. (1978).** Sociological and educational aspects of leisure time problem. *Journal of Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 11(1): 165-179.
- Trueman, M., and Hartley, J. (1996).** A comparison between the time-management skills and academic performance of mature and traditional-entry university students. *Higher Education*, 32(2): 199-215.
- Ustun, U. D., and Ersoy, A. (2016).** Recreation in sociological and psychological terms. Istanbul: (s 18) Ergun.
- Wang, W. C., Kao, C. H., Huan, T. C., and Wu, C. C. (2011).** Free time management contributes to better quality of life: A study of undergraduate students in Taiwan. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 12(4): 561-573.
- Yasarturk, F., Akyuz, H., and Karatas, I. (2018).** Examining the relationship between recreational department students' leisure management and organizational factors affecting their academic success. *Journal of Sports Science Research*, 3(2): 233-243.
- Yavas, U., Ozturk, G., Acikel, C. H., and Ozer, M. (2012).** Evaluation of medical school students' time management skills. *TAF Preventive Medicine Bulletin*, 11(1): 5-10.

Citation: Koç, M. C., and Demirel, M. (2020). The relationship between serious and casual leisure and leisure management and its education: A research on Generation Y. *African Educational Research Journal*, 8(2): 210-220.
