

# Investigation of the relationship between leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction levels of individuals participating in physical activity education programs in civil society organizations

Hayri Akyüz\* and İsmail Aydın

Sport Sciences Faculty, Bartın University, Bartın, Turkey.

---

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine relationship between leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction levels of individuals participating in physical activity education programs in Civil Society Organizations and to determine the differentiation status of leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction in terms of demographic variables. In the research, "Descriptive (Figurative) and Relational Search Model" was used. The research group consists of participating in physical activity education programs in Civil Society Organizations "selected by simple random sampling method" 280 (75 male, 205 female) people in Turkey in March and April in 2020. As a data collection tool, created by the researchers "Personal Information Form", "The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)" and "Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS)" were used. The data were analyzed in SPSS 23.0 program. Frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean and standard deviation for demographic variables, T-test and ANOVA for differentiation status, Correlation test for relationship status were used. In addition, Tukey test was used to describe the differences between groups. The level of significance was evaluated as  $p < 0.05$  in the analysis for the research. The significance level was taken into account in the correlation test results ( $p < 0.01$ ). In the research findings, it was determined that the life satisfaction levels of the participants differed significantly in favor of the female participants. It was found that the leisure satisfaction levels of the participants differed in terms of educational status and perceived leisure time variables. In addition, a low level positive significant relationship was found between life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction levels. As a result, it was found that some demographic variables differ in terms of life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction of the participants and as the leisure satisfaction levels of the participants increased, their life satisfaction levels also increased.

**Keywords:** Physical activity education, leisure satisfaction, life satisfaction, civil society organization.

---

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: [akyuz61@live.com](mailto:akyuz61@live.com).

---

## INTRODUCTION

Today, physical activity and sports are considered as an important service sector. In addition, physical activity and sports have protective and improving features for personal and social health (Can et al., 2000). Physical activity is defined as the action of the body to spend energy (Caspersen et al., 1985).

On the other hand, the concept of education has an important place in ensuring the welfare and happiness of the individual and society (Hosgorur and Gezgin, 2005).

The purpose of education is to train qualified manpower. Qualified manpower requires being healthy and competent physically, spiritually, mentally and socially. One of the most important tools of raising qualified people is physical activity. Physical activity is also a very important part of general education (Yetim, 2000). In this context, it can be mentioned how important physical activity education is in people's lives and the relationship between physical activity education and recreation and

life satisfaction.

Nowadays, with the increasing importance of time management, there have been developments in the concept of leisure time and the activities and evaluation methods in this field have gained importance (Yasarturk et al., 2017). The word leisure time is etymologically composed of "licere" which means to be free in Latin; "Loisir", which means giving opportunity or being free in French (Hemingwa, 1996; Torkildsen, 1999). The concept of leisure time is defined as the non-working time spent freely (Tanir, 2009). According to another definition, leisure time is a period of time that includes activities that individuals can participate voluntarily (Daniel et al., 2008). In other words, it is the time period in which individuals feel free and can express themselves (Henderson and Bialeschki, 2007).

Leisure satisfaction was first discussed by Beard and Ragheb in order to determine the leisure satisfaction levels of individuals. Leisure satisfaction is a type of satisfaction that includes life satisfaction and social satisfaction (Lapa, 2013). The concept of leisure satisfaction is expressed as the positive perceptions or feelings of individuals that emerge as a result of leisure time activities they prefer to participate (Beard and Ragheb, 1980; Dogan et al., 2019). In addition, leisure satisfaction shows to what extent people are satisfied with their free time (Du Cap, 2002).

Leisure time is also seen as a resource that offers various benefits in terms of social, physical, mental and emotional development in every period of life, especially in childhood and adolescence. In adulthood, leisure time activities are also considered as a factor that increases general satisfaction and contributes to getting rid of stress and routine (Parham, 1996). The positive effects of leisure time on life satisfaction have been proven (Edginton et al., 2002; Gokce, 2008; Kovacs, 2007) by many researchers.

Life satisfaction concept is important for people to be happy in their lives. Life satisfaction is one of the important issues that have been the focus of attention of individuals from past to present (Diener, 1984). Life satisfaction is an individual cognitive assessment of life as a whole (Shin and Johnson, 1978). Life satisfaction indicates how one evaluates one's own life when taken as a holistic. Happy people generally feel positive emotions and evaluate the events they encounter with a positive mood and feelings of gratitude are high. Unhappy people have feelings of panic, hatred and fear in the face of the things they experience and encounter (Sonmez, 2016).

Diener and Suh (1997) stated in their study that life satisfaction is related to a cognitive / judgmental process and that individuals generally evaluate their own quality of life according to the criteria they have determined. According to another definition, life satisfaction is expressed as the totality of beliefs and evaluations of a person's life or as a general attitude towards one's life (Rice et al., 1992). According to Veenhoven (1996), life

satisfaction is defined as the degree of positive development in the whole quality of life. As can be understood from the definitions, life satisfaction reveals that it is not only related to a certain part of human life, but it is related to the whole.

Individuals' quality of life level provides positive development and satisfaction with leisure time activities provided in the community. Life satisfaction increases through these activities. Individuals who increase life satisfaction will use recreational activities as a tool for a more full, meaningful and productive life. Therefore, individual development and progress increase people's struggles with life and life satisfaction, and the contribution of leisure time activities is a fact that cannot be ignored (Benson, 1975; Hemingway, 1996).

Based on all this information in the literature, the purpose of this study is to examine relationship between leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction levels of individuals participating in physical activity education programs in Civil Society Organizations and to determine the differentiation status of leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction in terms of demographic variables.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research model, scope and limitations

- In the research, "Descriptive (Figurative) and Relational Search Model" was used.
- The research is limited to March and April 2019.
- The research covers individuals participating in physical activity education programs in Civil Society Organizations in Turkey.

### Purpose of the research

The purpose of this study is to examine relationship between leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction levels of individuals participating in physical activity education programs in Civil Society Organizations and to determine the differentiation status of leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction in terms of demographic variables.

### Data collection tools

As a data collection tool, created by the researchers "Personal Information Form", "The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)" and "Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS)" were used.

### Personal information form

The questions in this section consist of 5 demographic questions such as gender, marital status, educational

status, perceived income and perceived daily leisure time.

### **The satisfaction with life scale (SWLS)**

The scale was developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin in 1985. Turkish adaptation was made by Dagli and Baysal (2016). The scale is a 5-point Likert-type assessment: I strongly disagree (1) and I completely agree (5). The scale consists of a sub-dimension and five items.

### **Leisure satisfaction scale (LSS)**

The scale was developed by Beard and Ragheb (1980). Turkish adaptation of the scale was made by Gokce and Orhan (2011). The sub-dimensions of the scale consisting of 24 items and 6 sub-dimensions are; (1) Psychological, (2) Educational, (3) Social, (4) Physiological, (5) Relaxation, and (6) Aesthetics. As a result of the study conducted by Gökçe and Orhan (2011), the total internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be .90. The internal consistency coefficients of the sub-dimensions are respectively calculated as Psychological sub-dimension (.77), Educational sub-dimension (.77), Social sub-dimension (.76), Physiological sub-dimension (.79), Relaxation sub-dimension (.80) and Aesthetic sub-dimension (.79). Items in a scale calculated on a 5-point Likert type; 1 "Almost Not Right", 5 "Almost Always True" (Gokce and Orhan, 2011). Items related to the sub-dimensions of the scale are respectively Psychological sub-dimension (1-4 items), Educational sub-dimension (5-8 items) Social sub-

dimension (9-12 items), Physiological sub-dimension (13-16 items), Relaxation sub-dimension (17-20 items) and Aesthetics sub-dimension (21-24 items).

### **Research group**

The research group consists of participating in physical activity education programs in Civil Society Organizations "selected by simple random sampling method" 280 (75 male, 205 female) people in Turkey in March and April in 2020.

### **Data analysis techniques**

Cronbach's Alpha test for reliability for research findings, frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean and standard deviation for demographic variables, T-test and ANOVA for differentiation status, Correlation test for relationship status were used. In addition, TUKEY test was used to describe the differences between groups. The level of significance was evaluated as ( $p < 0.05$ ) in the analysis for the research. The significance level was taken into account in the correlation test results ( $p < 0.01$ ).

### **Reliability**

"Cronbach's Alpha" values were calculated in order to test the reliability level for the scales. Table 1 contains Cronbach's Alpha values for the scales used in the research.

It can be stated that the values specified in Table 1 are at a reliable level (Can, 2014).

**Table 1.** Internal consistency coefficients of life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction scale.

<b>Sub dimensions</b>	<b>Number of items</b>	<b>Internal consistency coefficient</b>
Life Satisfaction Scale Total	5 items	.935
Psychological	4 items	.895
Educational	4 items	.889
Social	4 items	.891
Physiological	4 items	.896
Relaxation	4 items	.904
Aesthetic	4 items	.900
Leisure Satisfaction Scale Total	24 items	.881

## **FINDINGS**

According to Table 2, 73.2% of the participants are women and 26.8% are men. 44 of the participants stated that they were married and 236 were single. While 25.7% of the individuals participating in the study have a high

school and below education level, 74.3% of them have undergraduate and above education level. 181 of the participants stated that they were in the low income group, 60 were in the middle and 39 were in the high income group. In addition, 14.3 of the participants have a low, 46.8% middle and 38.9% high level daily leisure time.

**Table 2.** Table of demographic values for research.

Gender	N	%
Male	75	26.8
Female	205	73.2
<b>Marital status</b>		
Married	44	15.7
Single	236	84.3
<b>Education status</b>		
High school and below	72	25.7
Undergraduate and above	208	74.3
<b>Perceived income</b>		
Low	181	64.6
Middle	60	21.4
High	39	13.9
<b>Perceived daily leisure time</b>		
Low	40	14.3
Middle	131	46.8
High	109	38.9

According to Table 3, it has been determined that the participants' mean SWLS total scores differed

significantly in favor of female participants ( $p < 0.05$ ). On the other hand, there was no significant difference in LSS total score averages and sub-dimensions ( $p > 0.05$ ).

According to Table 4, no significant difference was found between the marital status variable of the participants and their SWLS total score averages, LSS total score averages and sub-dimensions ( $p > 0.05$ ).

According to Table 5, a significant difference was found between the education status variable and LSS "educational" and "social" sub-dimensions ( $p < 0.05$ ). When the average values are analyzed, it is seen that these significant differences are in favor of the "undergraduate and above" group in both sub-dimensions.

According to Table 6, no significant difference was found between the perceived income variable of the participants and their SWLS total score averages, LSS total score averages and sub-dimensions ( $p > 0.05$ ).

According to Table 7, a significant difference was found in the perceived daily leisure time variable and the LSS total score averages, "educational", "social", "physiological", "relaxation" and "aesthetic" sub-dimensions ( $p < 0.05$ ). As a result of the Tukey test, these significant differences are between the "middle" group and "low" group, in favor of the "middle" group.

According to Table 8, a low level positive significant correlation was found between the SWLS total score averages and the LSS total score averages and sub-dimensions ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 3.** T-test table for life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction in terms of gender variable.

Dimensions	Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	S	sd	t	p																																																																																
SWLS total	Male	75	2.8773	.78767	278	-2.019	.045																																																																																
	Female	205	3.0976	.86265				Psychological	Male	75	3.5033	.76725	278	-.610	.543	Female	205	3.5671	.79139	Educational	Male	75	3.8967	.84739	278	.884	.378	Female	205	3.7963	.82303	Social	Male	75	3.7400	.87615	278	.138	.890	Female	205	3.7244	.71804	Physiological	Male	75	3.9267	.85698	278	-.543	.588	Female	205	3.9866	.69804	Relaxation	Male	75	3.1167	.89418	278	.446	.657	Female	205	3.0646	.78029	Aesthetic	Male	75	3.5533	.85453	278	.119	.905	Female	205	3.5402	.68234	LSS Total	Male	75	3.6228	.73814	278	.100	.920
Psychological	Male	75	3.5033	.76725	278	-.610	.543																																																																																
	Female	205	3.5671	.79139				Educational	Male	75	3.8967	.84739	278	.884	.378	Female	205	3.7963	.82303	Social	Male	75	3.7400	.87615	278	.138	.890	Female	205	3.7244	.71804	Physiological	Male	75	3.9267	.85698	278	-.543	.588	Female	205	3.9866	.69804	Relaxation	Male	75	3.1167	.89418	278	.446	.657	Female	205	3.0646	.78029	Aesthetic	Male	75	3.5533	.85453	278	.119	.905	Female	205	3.5402	.68234	LSS Total	Male	75	3.6228	.73814	278	.100	.920	Female	205	3.6132	.60837								
Educational	Male	75	3.8967	.84739	278	.884	.378																																																																																
	Female	205	3.7963	.82303				Social	Male	75	3.7400	.87615	278	.138	.890	Female	205	3.7244	.71804	Physiological	Male	75	3.9267	.85698	278	-.543	.588	Female	205	3.9866	.69804	Relaxation	Male	75	3.1167	.89418	278	.446	.657	Female	205	3.0646	.78029	Aesthetic	Male	75	3.5533	.85453	278	.119	.905	Female	205	3.5402	.68234	LSS Total	Male	75	3.6228	.73814	278	.100	.920	Female	205	3.6132	.60837																				
Social	Male	75	3.7400	.87615	278	.138	.890																																																																																
	Female	205	3.7244	.71804				Physiological	Male	75	3.9267	.85698	278	-.543	.588	Female	205	3.9866	.69804	Relaxation	Male	75	3.1167	.89418	278	.446	.657	Female	205	3.0646	.78029	Aesthetic	Male	75	3.5533	.85453	278	.119	.905	Female	205	3.5402	.68234	LSS Total	Male	75	3.6228	.73814	278	.100	.920	Female	205	3.6132	.60837																																
Physiological	Male	75	3.9267	.85698	278	-.543	.588																																																																																
	Female	205	3.9866	.69804				Relaxation	Male	75	3.1167	.89418	278	.446	.657	Female	205	3.0646	.78029	Aesthetic	Male	75	3.5533	.85453	278	.119	.905	Female	205	3.5402	.68234	LSS Total	Male	75	3.6228	.73814	278	.100	.920	Female	205	3.6132	.60837																																												
Relaxation	Male	75	3.1167	.89418	278	.446	.657																																																																																
	Female	205	3.0646	.78029				Aesthetic	Male	75	3.5533	.85453	278	.119	.905	Female	205	3.5402	.68234	LSS Total	Male	75	3.6228	.73814	278	.100	.920	Female	205	3.6132	.60837																																																								
Aesthetic	Male	75	3.5533	.85453	278	.119	.905																																																																																
	Female	205	3.5402	.68234				LSS Total	Male	75	3.6228	.73814	278	.100	.920	Female	205	3.6132	.60837																																																																				
LSS Total	Male	75	3.6228	.73814	278	.100	.920																																																																																
	Female	205	3.6132	.60837																																																																																			

**Table 4.** T-test table for life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction in terms of marital status variable.

Dimensions	Marital status	N	$\bar{x}$	S	sd	t	p
SWLS Total	Married	44	3.1045	.93758	278	.517	.607
	Single	236	3.0263	.83119			
Psychological	Married	44	3.5114	.76810	278	-.362	.719
	Single	236	3.5572	.78849			
Educational	Married	44	3.7898	.89726	278	-.273	.786
	Single	236	3.8294	.81788			
Social	Married	44	3.6420	.77647	278	-.808	.422
	Single	236	3.7447	.75985			
Physiological	Married	44	3.9886	.68190	278	.188	.851
	Single	236	3.9672	.75494			
Relaxation	Married	44	2.9716	.83912	278	-.927	.358
	Single	236	3.0985	.80595			
Aesthetic	Married	44	3.6420	.76705	278	.934	.354
	Single	236	3.5254	.72412			
LSS Total	Married	44	3.5909	.62414	278	-.286	.776
	Single	236	3.6204	.64920			

**Table 5.** T-test table for life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction in terms of education status variable.

Dimensions	Education status	N	$\bar{x}$	S	sd	t	p
SWLS total	High school and below	72	3.0194	.96190	278	-.204	.839
	Undergraduate and above	208	3.0452	.80654			
Psychological	High school and below	72	3.3958	.92000	278	-1.736	.086
	Undergraduate and above	208	3.6034	.72616			
Educational	High school and below	72	3.6285	.92214	278	-2.156	.033
	Undergraduate and above	208	3.8906	.78582			
Social	High school and below	72	3.5243	.80618	278	-2.550	.012
	Undergraduate and above	208	3.7993	.73494			
Physiological	High school and below	72	3.8819	.82540	278	-1.093	.277
	Undergraduate and above	208	4.0012	.71158			
Relaxation	High school and below	72	3.0139	.87803	278	-.744	.458
	Undergraduate and above	208	3.1010	.78752			
Aesthetic	High school and below	72	3.5139	.83380	278	-.367	.714
	Undergraduate and above	208	3.5541	.69358			
LSS total	High school and below	72	3.4931	.72368	278	-1.735	.086
	Undergraduate and above	208	3.6583	.61063			

**Table 6.** ANOVA test table for life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction in terms of perceived income variable.

Dimensions	Source of variance	Sum of squares	SD	Square average	F	p
SWLS total	Between groups	.843	2	.421	.585	.558
	Within groups	199.541	277	.720		
	Total	200.383	279			
Psychological	Between groups	1.367	2	.683	1.112	.330
	Within groups	170.183	277	.614		
	Total	171.550	279			
Educational	Between groups	1.649	2	.825	1.201	.303
	Within groups	190.225	277	.687		
	Total	191.874	279			
Social	Between groups	1.401	2	.700	1.208	.300
	Within groups	160.595	277	.580		
	Total	161.996	279			
Physiological	Between groups	.990	2	.495	.896	.409
	Within groups	152.955	277	.552		
	Total	153.944	279			
Relaxation	Between groups	2.615	2	1.308	2.002	.137
	Within groups	180.906	277	.653		
	Total	183.521	279			
Aesthetic	Between groups	.454	2	.227	.423	.655
	Within groups	148.572	277	.536		
	Total	149.027	279			
LSS total	Between groups	.960	2	.480	1.157	.316
	Within groups	114.867	277	.415		
	Total	115.827	279			

**Table 7.** ANOVA test table for life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction in terms of perceived daily leisure time variable.

Dimensions	Source of variance	Sum of squares	SD	Square average	F	p	Significant differences
SWLS Total	Between groups	2.814	2	1.407	1.973	.141	
	Within groups	197.569	277	.713			
	Total	200.383	279				
Psychological	Between groups	2.908	2	1.454	2.388	.094	
	Within groups	168.642	277	.609			
	Total	171.550	279				
Educational	Between groups	5.662	2	2.831	4.211	.016	Medium > Low
	Within groups	186.212	277	.672			
	Total	191.874	279				
Social	Between groups	3.745	2	1.872	3.277	.039	Medium > Low
	Within groups	158.252	277	.571			
	Total	161.996	279				

**Table 7.** Continues.

Physiological	Between groups	3.723	2	1.861	3.432	.034	Medium > Low
	Within groups	150.222	277	.542			
	Total	153.944	279				
Relaxation	Between groups	4.780	2	2.390	3.704	.026	Medium > Low
	Within groups	178.741	277	.645			
	Total	183.521	279				
Aesthetic	Between groups	4.298	2	2.149	4.113	.017	Medium > Low
	Within groups	144.728	277	.522			
	Total	149.027	279				
LSS Total	Between groups	3.935	2	1.968	4.871	.008	
	Within groups	111.892	277	.404			
	Total	115.827	279				

**Table 8.** Results of the correlation test between life satisfaction scale and leisure satisfaction scale.

	Psychological	Educational	Social	Physiological	Relaxation	Aesthetic	LSS
SWLS	.222**	.277**	.275**	.286**	.200**	.308**	.314**

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

73.2% of the participants are women and 26.8% are men. 44 of the participants stated that they were married and 236 were single. While 25.7% of the individuals participating in the study have a high school and below education level, 74.3% of them have undergraduate and above education level. 181 of the participants stated that they were in the low income group, 60 were in the middle and 39 were in the high income group. In addition, 14.3 of the participants have a low, 46.8% middle and 38.9% high level daily leisure time.

It has been determined that the participants' mean SWLS total scores differed significantly in favor of female participants ( $p < 0.05$ ). In this context, it can be said that the life satisfaction levels of female participants are higher than male participants. According to the studies in the literature, it has been determined that female students in universities have more positive attitudes to participate in recreational activities than male students (Akyuz and Turkmen, 2016), and parallel to this, female students' life satisfaction level is higher than men (Dost, 2007). Similarly, Cenkseven and Akbas (2007) found that the life satisfaction level of females are higher than men in their study on university students. In her study on adolescents, Koker (1991) found that females have higher life satisfaction than males. In another study, Yasarturk et al. (2017) concluded in their study on university students participating in recreational activities that female students' life satisfaction levels were higher than male students. All these studies in the literature

support the research findings. However, there are studies indicating that life satisfaction does not differ by gender (Gundogar et al., 2007; Hintikka, 2001). In another finding, there was no significant difference in LSS total score averages and sub-dimensions ( $p > 0.05$ ). This situation can be explained by the fact that male and female participants reach a similar level of satisfaction in activities they participate in leisure time. Berg et al. (2001) found no significant relationship between the gender variable and leisure satisfaction in their studies. This finding is in parallel with the research findings.

No significant difference was found between the marital status variable of the participants and their SWLS total score averages, LSS total score averages and sub-dimensions ( $p > 0.05$ ). Although no significant difference was found between the marital status variable and life satisfaction, when the average scores are analyzed, it can be stated that married individuals have higher life satisfaction levels compared to single individuals. On the other hand, Yasarturk et al. (2018) on the leisure time satisfaction scale did not find a significant difference in terms of the marital status variable in their study on elite wrestlers. The finding of Yasarturk et al. (2018) overlaps with the research findings.

A significant difference was found between the education status variable and LSS "educational" and "social" sub-dimensions ( $p < 0.05$ ). When the average values are analyzed, it is seen that these significant differences are in favor of the "undergraduate and above" group in both sub-dimensions. In line with this finding, it can be said that the leisure satisfaction levels of the

people in the “undergraduate and above” group are higher than those in the “high school and below” group in educational and social terms. When the studies supporting the research findings in the literature are examined, Koksall (2019) stated that there is a significant difference in psychological, educational and social sub-dimensions in his study, which examines the leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction of physical education teachers and this difference is in favor of the participants with good economic status. This finding supports the research finding. In another finding, there was no significant difference between life satisfaction and education status variable ( $p > 0.05$ ). Dikici (2020) did not find a statistically significant difference between the educational status variable and life satisfaction in his master’s thesis with university students. It can be stated that the finding of Dikici (2020) supports the research finding.

No significant difference was found between the perceived income variable of the participants and their SWLS total score averages, LSS total score averages and sub-dimensions ( $p > 0.05$ ). According to this finding, it can be stated that the perceived income variable does not have a significant effect on the life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction of the participants. Yaşartürk et al. (2017) did not find a significant difference between the family income variable and life satisfaction in their study on university students participating in recreational activities. Dikici (2020) did not find a significant difference in terms of leisure satisfaction sub-dimensions and family income variable in his master’s thesis with university students. It is seen that all these findings give results in the same direction with the research findings.

A significant difference was found in the perceived daily leisure time variable and the LSS total score averages, “educational”, “social”, “physiological”, “relaxation” and “aesthetic” sub-dimensions ( $p < 0.05$ ). As a result of the Tukey test, these significant differences are between the “middle” group and “low” group, in favor of the “middle” group. According to this finding, it can be said that people who have more daily free time have higher levels of leisure satisfaction compared to those who have less daily free time. In this context, the importance of free time emerges. With the increase in free time, individuals can participate in different types of activities and increase their leisure satisfaction. In a study supporting the research findings, when Yasarturk (2019) compared leisure time and leisure satisfaction levels, he reached a significant difference in the “social” sub-dimension. Yasarturk et al. (2019) did not find a significant relationship between the leisure time variable and leisure satisfaction levels in their study on university students. This finding differs with the research finding.

A low level positive significant correlation was found between the SWLS total score averages and the LSS total score averages and sub-dimensions ( $p < 0.05$ ). Within the scope of the finding regarding the general

problem statement of the research, it can be said that as the leisure satisfaction levels of the individuals participating in the research increase, their life satisfaction levels also increase. Dikici (2020) found a positive and low level relationship between life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction in his master’s thesis with university students. This finding supports the research finding.

As a result, it was found that some demographic variables differ in terms of life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction of the participants and as the leisure satisfaction levels of the participants increased, their life satisfaction levels also increased.

## REFERENCES

- Akyuz, H., and Turkmen, M. (2016). Investigation of university students' attitudes towards leisure time activities: Bartın University sample. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, 4(S1), 340-357.
- Beard, J. G., and Ragheb, M. G. (1980). Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 12: 20-33.
- Benson, H. (1975). *The Relaxation Response*. New York: Morrow.
- Berg, E., Trost, M., Schneider, I. E., and Allison, M. T. (2001). Dyadic exploration of the relationship of leisure satisfaction, leisure time, and gender to relationship satisfaction. *Leisure Sciences*, 23(1): 35-46.
- Can, A. (2014). *Quantitative Data Analysis in the Scientific Research Process with SPSS*. (Third Edition). Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Can, Y., Soyer, F., and Guven, H. (2000). Evaluation of factors affecting efficiency in sports services. *Psycho-Social Fields in Sport, Sport Management Sciences 1*. Gazi Physical Education and Sport Sciences Congress, 26-27 May 2000. Ankara: 183.
- Caspersen, C. J., Powell, I. C. E., and Christenson, G. M. (1985). Physical activity, exercise and physical fitness: Definitions and distinctions for health-related research. *Public Health Reports*, 100(2): 126-130.
- Centkseven, F., and Akbas, T. (2007). Examining the predictors of subjective and psychological well-being in university students. *Turkish Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance*, 3(27): 43-65.
- Dagli, A., and Baysal, N. (2016). Adaptation of the satisfaction with life scale into Turkish: the study of validity and reliability. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(59): 1250-1262.
- Daniel, D. M., Army, R. H., and Nancy, B. R. (2008). *Kraus' Recreation and Leisure in Modern Society*. Eighth Edition. Jones and Barlett Publishers: Boston.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95: 542-575.
- Diener, E., and Suh, E. (1997). Measuring quality of life: Economic, social, and subjective indicators. *Social Indicators Research*, 40: 189-216.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., and Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49: 71-75.
- Dikici, İ. (2020). *The Investigation of Leisure Time Satisfaction, Life Satisfaction and Happiness of University Students Who Spend Their Leisure Times in Youth Centres*. Master Thesis, Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University Institute of Social Sciences, Mugla.
- Dogan, M., Elci, G., and Gurbuz, B. (2019). Examination of relationship between leisure satisfaction, leisure boredom and job satisfaction: a research on academicians. *Sportmetre Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 17(1): 154-164.
- Dost, T. M. (2007). Examining the life satisfaction of university students according to some variables. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education Faculty*, 2(22): 132-143.
- Du Cap, M. C. (2002). *The Perceived Impact of the Acadia Advantage Program on the Leisure Lifestyle and Leisure Satisfaction of the*



- Students at Acadia University, Master Thesis, Acadia University, Ottawa, ss. 139.
- Edginton, C. R., Jordan, D. J., DeGraaf, D. G., and Edginton, S. R. (2002).** *Leisure and Life Satisfaction* (3rd edition.). Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill.
- Gokce, H. (2008).** Examining of the Leisure Satisfaction with the Relation Between Life Satisfaction and Socio-Demographic Variables, Master Thesis, Pamukkale University Institute of Health Sciences, Denizli.
- Gokce, H., and Orhan, K. (2011).** Validity and reliability study of the leisure satisfaction scale (LSS) into Turkish. *Hacettepe University Journal of Sport Sciences*, 22(4): 139-145.
- Gundogar, D., Gul, S. S., Uskun, E., Demirci, S., and Kecici, D. (2007).** Investigation of the predictors of life satisfaction in university students. *Clinical Psychiatry*, 10: 14-27.
- Hemingway, J. L. (1996).** Emancipating leisure: the recovery the freedom in leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28(1): 27-43.
- Henderson, K. A., and Bialeschki, M. D. (2007).** Leisure and active lifestyles: research reflections. *Leisure Sciences*, 27(5): 355-365.
- Hintikka, J. (2001).** Religious attendance and life satisfaction in the Finnish general population. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 29(2): 158.
- Hosgorur, V., and Gezgin, G. (2005).** Education in economic and social development. *Yuzuncu Yil University, Journal of Electronic Education*, Vol: 2, Issue: 2, obtained from the Internet on January 05, 2010. [www.efdergi.yyu.edu.tr](http://www.efdergi.yyu.edu.tr).
- Koker, S. (1991).** Comparison of Life Satisfaction Levels of Normal and Problem Adolescents, Master Thesis, Ankara University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Koksal, G. (2019).** The Relationship between Leisure Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction: A Simple of Physical Education Teachers, Master Thesis, Selcuk University Institute of Health Sciences, Konya.
- Kovacs, A. (2007).** The Leisure Personality: Relationships Between Personality, Leisure Satisfaction, And Life Satisfaction. Doctorate Thesis, School of Health. Physical Education and Recreation, Indiana University, s.153.
- Lapa, T. Y. (2013).** Life satisfaction, leisure satisfaction and perceived freedom of park recreation participants. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93: 1985-1993.
- Parham, L. D. (1996).** Perspective on Play. (R Zemke, F Clark Der) *Occupational Science: The Evolving Discipline*. Philadelphia, PA: FA Davis.
- Rice, R. W., Frone, M. R., and McFarlin D. B. (1992).** Work-Nonwork conflict and the perceived quality of life. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2): 155-168.
- Shin, D., and Johnson, D. M. (1978).** Avowed happiness as an overall assessment of the quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 5: 475-492.
- Sonmez, M. (2016).** Communication and Happiness Relationship, Master Thesis, Marmara University Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Tanir, Z. (2009).** Distribution and Evaluation of Leisure Time Activities of Students in Secondary Education Institutions in Istanbul Province, Master Thesis, Beykent University Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Torkildsen, G. (1999).** Leisure and recreation management. (Fourth edition), London: E&FN Spon Press, 73.
- Veenhoven, R. (1996).** *Chapter 1 in:* Saris, W.E., Veenhoven, R., Scherpenzeel, A.C. & Bunting B. (Eds.). 'A comparative study of satisfaction with life in Europe. *Eotvos University Press*, 2, 11-48.
- Yasarturk, F. (2019).** Analysis of the relationship between the academic self-efficacy and leisure satisfaction levels of university students. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 7(3): 106-115.
- Yasarturk, F., Akyuz, H., and Gonulates, S. (2019).** The investigation of the relationship between university students' levels of life quality and leisure satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7(3): 739-745.
- Yasarturk, F., Akyuz, H., and Karatas, I. (2017).** Examination of university students' levels of leisure boredom perception and life satisfaction towards recreative activities. *International Journal of Cultural and Social Studies*, 3(SI): 239-252.
- Yasarturk, F., Akyuz, H., Karatas, I., and Turkmen, M. (2018).** The relationship between free time satisfaction and stress levels of elite-level student-wrestlers. *Education Sciences*, 8(3): 133-144.
- Yetim, A. A. (2000).** *Sociology and Sport*. Ankara: Topkar Printing House, 128-131.

---

**Citation:** Akyüz, H., and Aydın, İ. (2020). Investigation of the relationship between leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction levels of individuals participating in physical activity education programs in civil society organizations. *African Educational Research Journal*, 8(2): S211-S219.

---