



10.22282/v5.i4.05

EXAMINATION OF LIFE SATISFACTION AND LEISURE SATISFACTION LEVELS OF INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATING SPORT ACTIVITIES IN THEIR LEISURE TIME

AYYILDIZ, Tebessüm¹, KARAMAN, Merve¹, YAMAN, Metin¹
OKAN İlyas¹

¹Gazi University, Faculty of Sports Science, Ankara/Turkey
E-mail: tebessum@gazi.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

This research has aimed to find out the life fulfillment of the individuals who spare their leisure time by doing sports and their fulfillment in terms of leisure time activities by analyzing independent variables. It has been conducted in Ümitköy facility of Sportive Life Club (Sportif Yaşam Kulübü). The study group consists of 80 male and 170 female participants who were chosen among the members of Sportive Life club which is in business in the city of Ankara. During the data collection, Satisfaction with Life-Scale- SWLS which has been designed as one-dimensional by Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffin

(1985), whose validity and reliability have been tested by Durak, Durak and Gençöz (2010) has been used. Besides, Leisure Satisfaction Scale, which has been designed by Beard and Ragheb (1980), was brought into Turkish literature after the reliability and validity studies by Karlı et al. in 2008, made up of 39 questions and six other sub-dimensions, whose internal consistency reliability is .92 as a result of KMO sample measurement and analysis of significance is $p < .05$ as a result of Barrlett's test, was also utilized to determine the satisfaction of leisure time levels of the individuals (Beard and Ragheb, 1980).

Key Words: Life satisfaction, leisure satisfaction, sport

1. INTRODUCTION

The sub-dimensions were described as Educational Physiological, Aesthetical, Relaxation, Social and Psychological. T-test, one way ANOVA, Tukey's range test and correlation analyses were for the percentage, frequency and independent samples during the analysis of the data. According to the data of the research, the participants show a high level of life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction has come up as a result. While the variables such as gender, age, marital status and level of education do not affect life satisfaction level, the life satisfaction of the participants who perceive their income status as high has been determined as high. Besides, the gender variable has no effect on leisure satisfaction of the participants whereas the leisure satisfaction of the participants at the age of 20 or below is lower than the other age group participants' life satisfaction. It has been observed that there is a parallelism with the education level and leisure satisfaction, additionally; the participants who describe their marital status as married have a slightly higher leisure satisfaction than the ones identifying themselves as single. As a result of the research, we have found out that the individuals who spend their leisure time by joining sportive activities have high level of life and leisure satisfaction. Consequently, the individuals who spend their leisure time by participating in sport activities as long as their perceived income status gets higher, their level of life satisfaction gets higher. We can also claim that their feeling of leisure satisfaction shows itself as they age and their level of education gets higher.

Satisfaction, in other words content, means meeting expectations, needs, wants and wishes. The word "satisfaction" in English is defined as "contentedness, gladness, atone, reassurance, recovery; pleasing, gratifying" (Redhouse, 1988) is defined whereas according to Rycroft (1989: 37) it was defined as "the sensation that accompanies with reaching a purpose". According to Budak, it was stated as "restructuring the state of equilibrium as a result of fulfillment of basic biological needs such as hunger, thirst, sexuality etc or a psychological need such as curiosity, love, closeness, success etc." (Budak, 2000: 226). When we analyze life satisfaction, when the individual's perceived condition or standard of life meets the one which is a reality in their life, this individual's level of life satisfaction is high. Therefore, individuals' all cognitive judgment they consciously realize about their lives are totally about the individual. Individuals may have various standards about success in many different parts of their lives.

Because of that, it is required to assess individuals' general life satisfaction instead of their satisfaction of their private sphere. (Pavot and Diener, 1993).

According to Beard and Ragheb (1980) leisure satisfaction reveals positive perception, emotions, individual forms or provides acquisition as a result of leisure time activities and preferences. Leisure satisfaction is defined with the rate of the individual's satisfaction or fulfillment in certain leisure time activities. It is claimed that the positive feeling of this satisfaction is the result of the level of the fulfillment of the individual's feelings which are perceptible or imperceptible. Leisure satisfaction is about the quality individuals perceive from the way they spend their leisure time and it generally shows how much they are satisfied by their leisure time. (Kovacs, 2007).

They prefer to spend their time for the activities which are both entertaining and beneficial for their health as well as increase their satisfaction level. In this research, also, studies were conducted to seek an answer for the questions whether they use their leisure time as much as they want and feel satisfied and also how much their level of life satisfaction is affected by it in this sense.

2. MATERIAL AND METHOD

Study group consists of 80 male and 170 female participants who were selected among the members of Sportive Life Club which is in business in city of Ankara. During the data collection, Satisfaction with Life-Scale- SWLS which has been designed as one-dimensional by Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffin (1985), whose validity and reliability have been tested by Durak, Durak and Gençöz (2010) has been used. Besides, Leisure Satisfaction Scale, which has been designed by Beard and Ragheb (1980), was brought into Turkish literature after the reliability and validity studies by Karlı et al. in 2008, made up of 39 questions and six other sub categories, whose internal consistency reliability is .92 as a result of KMO sample measurement and analysis of significance is $p < .05$ as a result of Barrlett's test, was also utilized to determine the satisfaction of leisure time levels of the individuals (Beard and Ragheb, 1980). The sub-dimensions were described as Educational, Physiological, Aesthetical, Relaxation, Social and Psychological. T-test, one way ANOVA, Tukey's range test and correlation analyses were for the percentage, frequency and independent samples during the analysis of the data.

3. FINDINGS

1- The frequency and percentage distribution of demographic variables of participators

		N=(250)	
	Variable	f	%
Gender	Female	80	32,0
	Male	170	68,0
Age	20<	17	6,8
	20-30	81	32,4
	31-40	84	33,6
	41>	68	27,2
Education Level	High School or less	55	22,0
	Undergraduate	167	66,8
	Graduate	28	11,2
Marital Status	Married	121	48,4
	Single	129	51,6
Percieved Income Level	Low	70	28,0
	Middle	117	46,8
	High	63	25,2

Table 1 shows the information about the individuals' gender, age group, education status, marital status and perceived income status. According to the collected data, it is observed that 68 % of the participants are males, 32 % of them are females, and the predominant age group is 31-40 with a rate of 33.6%. Education status of the participants is highly at undergraduate level with the rate of 66.8%. As marital status of the participants is assessed it is observed that while single individuals are 51.6%, married ones are 48.4%. When the perceived income status is observed, it is understood that 46.8% of participants belong to middle income group.

2- The arithmetic average and standard deviation values of life satisfaction, leisure satisfaction scales

	N=(250)			
	\bar{x}	ss	Min	Max.
Life Satisfaction	14,48	3,78	5,00	25,00
Leisure Satisfaction	146,00	29,42	39,00	195,00
Educational subdimension	33,49	7,14	9,00	45,00
Physiological subdimension	22,70	5,28	6,00	30,00
Aesthetic subdimension	14,87	3,44	4,00	20,00
Relaxation subdimension	14,98	3,27	4,00	20,00
Social subdimension	29,84	6,71	8,00	40,00
Psychological subdimension	30,10	6,56	8,00	40,00

Arithmetic average and standard deviation value of Life Satisfaction, LSS and its sub-dimensions are shown in Table 2. As Table 2 is analyzed, it is observed that a high frequency of life satisfaction (14,48 \square 3,78) and leisure satisfaction (146,00 \square 29,42). When sub-dimensions are analyzed, it was determined that the highest value of arithmetic average is in education sub-dimension (33,49 \square 7,14), and the lowest value of arithmetic average is aesthetics sub-dimension (14,87 \square 3,44).

It has been researched that whether the variables such as gender, age, education status, marital status and perceived income status have an impact on life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction of the individuals who spare their leisure time with sportive activities. According to the data collected, while level of life satisfaction does not change in terms of gender, marital status, age group and education status, it shows a significant difference in terms of perceived income status statistically. Additionally, whereas LSS average does not demonstrate any difference in terms of gender and perceived income status, it shows a variety in terms of the variables such as age, education status and marital status. With reference to these outcomes, the variables which show significant difference by affecting life and leisure satisfaction and the scale items aforesaid and their varieties are given place in the tables below.

3- The results of ANOVA among life satisfaction and perceived income variable

Percieved Income Level	N	\bar{x}	ss	F	p
Low	78	12,11	3,12	25,196	0,00*
Middle	186	14,98	3,15		
High	597	16,19	4,29		
Total	250	14,48	3,78		

*p<0,05 is statistically significant.

When Table 3 is analyzed, there is a significant difference between perceived income status and life satisfaction scale. While it is stated that the participants whose perceived income status is high have a higher life satisfaction compared to the ones whose perceived income status is low, it is observed that the participants who define their income status as middle income have a higher life satisfaction compared to the ones who claims low income status. If this outcome is analyzed we can conclude that as much as the income rate gets higher, level of life satisfaction goes up, as well.

4- The results of ANOVA among leisure satisfaction, LSS' sub-dimensions and age variable

	Age	N	\bar{x}	ss	F	p
Leisure Satisfaction	20<	17	101,64	45,01	19,363	0,00*
	20-30	81	143,04	30,77		
	31-40	84	154,20	21,65		
	41>	68	150,50	20,17		
Educational subdimension	20<	17	24,55	10,13	12,654	0,00*
	20-30	81	32,84	7,71		
	31-40	84	35,26	5,61		
	41>	68	34,32	7,14		
Physiological subdimension	20<	17	15,47	8,45	15,619	0,00*
	20-30	81	22,17	5,26		
	31-40	84	24,11	4,17		
	41>	68	23,41	3,95		
Aesthetic subdimension	20<	17	9,95	4,92	16,675	0,00*
	20-30	81	14,61	3,56		
	31-40	84	15,78	2,61		
	41>	68	15,29	2,67		
Relaxation subdimension	20<	17	10,92	4,86	10,920	0,00*
	20-30	81	14,94	3,33		
	31-40	84	15,41	2,84		
	41<	68	15,50	2,50		
Social subdimension	20<	17	19,69	9,34	20,001	0,00*
	20-30	81	29,07	7,34		
	31-40	84	31,85	4,72		
	41<	68	30,80	4,69		
Psychological subdimension	20<	17	21,04	9,49	15,897	0,00*
	20-30	81	29,40	6,96		
	31-40	84	31,76	5,03		
	41<	68	31,16	4,81		

*p<0,05 is statistically significant.

In Table 4, there is a significant difference between the age and leisure satisfaction of the participants. As reference to this, the highest leisure satisfaction is observed at the age group of 31-40, the lowest leisure satisfaction is found out among the participants who are 20 or below. Still, the participants between the ages of 20 and 30 have a higher level of leisure satisfaction compared to the ones at the age of 41 and above. A significant difference is observed between the age variables of the participants and all the sub-dimensions of LSS. Following this, the highest rate of sub-dimensions; physiological, aesthetical, social and psychological is at the 31-40 age group whereas the lowest rate belongs to 20 and lowest age

group. Under the relaxation sub-dimension participants who belong to 41 and above age group show the highest rate of LS while the age group with the lowest LS rate is the age of 20 and lower.

5- The results of ANOVA among life satisfaction, leisure satisfaction, LSS' subdimensions and and education level variable

	Education Level	N	\bar{x}	ss	F	p
Leisure Satisfaction	High School or less	55	144,18	28,14	4,566	0,01*
	Undergraduate	167	149,05	28,79		
	Graduate	28	131,42	31,88		
Educational subdimension	High School or less	55	32,99	6,59	6,192	0,02*
	Undergraduate	167	34,35	6,88		
	Graduate	28	29,39	8,39		
Physiological subdimension	High School or less	55	22,53	5,04	5,243	0,06
	Undergraduate	167	23,24	5,11		
	Graduate	28	19,82	5,95		
Aesthetic subdimension	High School or less	55	14,30	3,58	5,216	0,06
	Undergraduate	167	15,32	3,16		
	Graduate	28	13,32	4,18		
Relaxation subdimension	High School or less	55	15,19	6,30	2,390	0,09
	Undergraduate	167	15,12	6,81		
	Graduate	28	13,71	6,65		
Social subdimension	High School or less	55	29,47	6,30	2,232	0,10
	Undergraduate	167	30,35	6,81		
	Graduate	28	27,53	6,65		
Psychological subdimension	High School or less	55	29,69	6,15	2,707	0,06
	Undergraduate	167	30,65	6,41		
	Graduate	28	27,64	7,72		

*p<0,05 is statistically significant.

The LSS total points of the participants who are postgraduates are significantly higher when compared to the other two education statuses. Participants who state their education level as graduate show higher leisure satisfaction than the ones who state their status high school or

below graduates. Hereunder, we are able to conclude that as much as the education status is high, leisure satisfaction level becomes high. There is a significant difference between education status and education sub-dimension among the sub-dimension of the LSS. While the highest points of education sub-dimension belong to the ones who are graduates, the points of the postgraduate participants in education sub-dimension is the lowest compared to graduates, graduate of high school and below.

6- The results of t-test among leisure satisfaction, LSS' subdimensions and and marital status variable

	Marital Status	N	\bar{x}	ss	sd	t	p
Leisure Satisfaction	Married	121	149,18	26,11	250	1,658	0,09
	Single	129	143,03	32,03			
Educational subdimension	Married	121	34,22	6,63	250	-1,562	0,11
	Single	129	32,81	7,56			
Physiological subdimension	Married	121	23,22	4,70	250	1,495	0,13
	Single	129	22,22	5,75			
Aesthetic subdimension	Married	121	15,18	2,89	250	1,367	0,17
	Single	129	14,58	3,87			
Relaxation subdimension	Married	121	15,27	3,02	250	1,371	0,17
	Single	129	14,70	3,48			
Social subdimension	Married	121	30,80	5,80	250	2,204	0,02*
	Single	129	28,94	7,38			
Psychological subdimension	Married	121	30,47	6,18	250	0,868	0,386
	Single	129	29,75	6,90			

*p<0,05 is statistically significant.

In Table 6; there is no significant relationship between total LSS points and marital status variable, meanwhile there is a statistically significant relationship between social subdimension and marital status. According to this result; married participants has higher lesiure satisfaction levels than single participants.

4.DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this research, life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction of the participants who spare their leisure time by doing sport activities are analyzed. It has been researched whether there is an impact of the variables such as age, gender, perceives income, education status and marital status of the participants who take part in sport activities in Sportive Life Club on their life and

leisure satisfaction. In reference to data collected at the end of the research the results below are found out:

Participants have shown a high rate of life satisfaction (14,48 \square 3,78). Other researches analyzing life satisfaction show similarly high or medium level of life satisfaction (Çelik and Tümkaya, 2012; Şimşek, 2011; Öner, 2014; Özgen, 2012). Besides this result, while participants show a high level of life satisfaction (146,00 \square 29,42), the fact that the highest arithmetic average in sub-dimensions is education status among the sub-dimensions of the scale (33,49 \square 7,14) , and the lowest average is in aesthetical sub-dimension(14,87 \square 3,44) is found out. When other researchers are examined, the relaxation sub-dimension has the highest arithmetic average is observed (Ayyıldız, 2014; Sönmezoğlu et al., 2014; Yerlisu Lapa, 2013, Misra and Kean, 2000).

The fact that gender has no effect on life satisfaction is found out when the outcomes of the research are examined. We also come across many other researches in literature which conclude that gender has no effect on life satisfaction (Çelik and Tümkaya, 2012; Gündoğar et al., 2007; Öner, 2014; Özgür et al., 2010; Tümkaya et al., 2011; Yavuzer and Çivildağ, 2014). The fact that age has no effect on life satisfaction is also among the data of our research. There are other researchers parallel to this data (Gündoğar et al., 2007; Öner, 2014; Özgür et al., 2010; Yavuzer and Çivildağ, 2014). In contrast to this outcome, Kırıcı and Korkmaz (2014), Çavuş and Cumaliyeva (2013), Akandere et al. (2009) determined that as the age goes up, life satisfaction level also increases.

The result that marital status does not affect life satisfaction is another data collected in our research. As parallel to this result, same data was reached in the research conducted by Öner (2014). Additionally, there are researchers which conclude that marital status affects life satisfaction level (Şimşek, 2011; Çelik and Tümkaya, 2012; Kırıcı and Korkmaz, 2014; Tuzgöl, 2007; Yılmaz and Altınok, 2009). Having examined the findings of our research, there is a significant difference between the education status and life satisfaction. Kırıcı and Korkmaz (2014) and Öner (2014) have also found out similar results.

A significant difference has been found out between the life satisfaction scale and perceived income status of the participants who spare their leisure time by doing sports. While it is stated that the participants who declare their perceived income status as high have a higher

life satisfaction compared to the ones who declare it as low, it is also observed that the participants who define their income status as middle income have a higher life satisfaction compared to the ones who claims low income status. Following this outcome, we can conclude that as much as income is higher, life satisfaction level rises. There are other researches which supports this outcome in literature (Kırıcı and Korkmaz, 2014; Öner, 2014; Özgür et al., 2010; Yılmaz and Altınok, 2009).

There is no difference between the gender and perceived income variables and leisure satisfaction levels whereas in the researches conducted by Sönmezoğlu et al. (2014) and Shin and You (2013) leisure satisfaction level was found higher in male's favor. In the research conducted by Demir and Demir (2006) and Shin and You (2013), leisure satisfaction level was found higher in favor of female participants. As parallel to our research data, there are many other researches in literature which prove that gender does not affect leisure satisfaction level (Amestoy et al., 2008; Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa, 2010; Berg, Trost, Schneider and Allison 2001; Broughten and Beegs, 2006; Gökçe, 2008; Kabanoff, 1982; Lu and Hu, 2005; Vong Tze, 2005).

There is a significant difference between the age variable and leisure satisfaction level of participants. In the light of this, the highest leisure satisfaction is observed at the age group of 31-40 whereas the lowest leisure satisfaction level is demonstrated by the participants who are at the age of 20 or below. Yet, participants between the ages of 20 and 30 show higher level of leisure satisfaction compared to the ones who are 41 years old or older. Moreover, a significant difference is observed between the age variety of participants and all sub-dimensions of LSS. In accordance with this, the highest leisure satisfaction points were taken by 31-40 age group participants for the sub-dimension of physiological, aesthetical, social and psychological, also the lowest points were taken by the participants who are 20 years old or younger. While the individuals who are 41 or older show the highest LSS level, the lowest level of LSS is demonstrated by the individuals who are 20 years old or younger. As parallel to the data of our research, Broughten and Beggs (2006) have also indicated that age has an effect on leisure satisfaction with the research conducted with 187 individuals. Amestoy et al (2008) and Ayyıldız (2014) have also observed in their research that there is a decrease in leisure satisfaction as the age increases.

In accordance with another result, total LSS points on individuals who declare their education level as postgraduate has been found higher compared to undergraduates or graduates of high school participants' leisure satisfaction level. Individuals declaring their education status as undergraduate have demonstrated higher level of leisure satisfaction than the ones declaring it as graduate of high school or lower. Following this outcome, we conclude that when education status is higher, leisure satisfaction level rises. Arslan (2010), Ayyıldız (2014), Lu and Hu (2005) also contributed some other researchers which conclude some similar facts. Furthermore, there is a significant difference between the participants' education status and education sub-dimension of the scale. While undergraduate participants have the highest points under education sub-dimension, it was found out that the points of the individuals who are postgraduates are lower than the points of the participants who are undergraduates, graduates of high school or lower.

While there is no connection between total LSS points and marital status, there is a significant connection between the social sub-dimension of LSS and LSS. Following this, married individuals show a really slightly higher leisure satisfaction level compared to the single ones. There are some other researches in literature revealing the fact that single individuals show higher leisure satisfaction level (Ayyıldız, 2014; Liang, Yamashita and Brown, 2013, Siegenthaler and O'dell 2000).

When the data of the research is overviewed generally, it has been found out that participants show high level of life and leisure satisfaction. While gender, age, marital status and education level do not affect life satisfaction level, it was determined that individuals who spare their leisure time by doing sports and whose perceived income status is high have a higher life satisfaction level. Besides, gender variable does not affect their leisure satisfaction level whereas the participants who are 20 or younger have the lowest leisure satisfaction level compared to other age groups. A parallel increase is observed between the level of education status and their feeling of leisure satisfaction, and it is also concluded that participants who declare their marital status as married have a slightly higher leisure satisfaction level compared to the ones declaring themselves as single.

Hereby, as much as the income status of the participants who spare their leisure time by doing sports increases their life satisfaction level also shows an increase. The feeling of leisure satisfaction of the individuals show an increase when they get older and their education level

gets higher. In this sense, life satisfaction comes out as an awareness of the employed, educated individuals with a significant amount of income.

This research can be conducted with other sample groups by increasing the number subjects. It can be included into literature by assessing the feeling of satisfaction of individuals while spending their leisure time and the fulfillments they have from their lives may vary as different socio-demographic data can be collected in different cities.

REFERENCES

- Akandere, M., Acar, M., ve Baştuğ, G. (2009). *Investigating The Hopelessness And Life Satisfaction Levels of The Parents With Mental Disabled Child*. Selçuk University, The Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, 22, 23-32.
- Amestoy, V. C., Rosal, R., S., Toscano, E.V.(2008). The leisure experience. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37,64-78.
- Ardahan, F., Yerlisu, Lapa, T.(2010). An Examination of Leisure Satisfaction Level of University Students with regard to Gender and Income. *Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences* . 21 (4), 129–136.
- Arslan, S.(2010). *The Opinions of the Urban Adult Population on the Presentation of the Recreation Activities and the Leisure Education Provided by the Municipalities and Their Effect on the Quality of Life (The Case of Ankara Municipality)* PhD, Department of Lifelong Learning and Adult Education , Ankara University, Ankara, 160.
- Ayyıldız, T. (2014). Examination of Leisure Satisfaction Levels Of Individuals Participating in Recreative Dance Activities. M. Sc. Thesis. Gazi University Institute Of Health Sciences, Ankara, 36-51.
- Beard, J.,G., Ragheb, M.,G. (1980). Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 12 (1), 20–33.
- Berg, E., C.,Trost, M., Schneider,I.E.,Allison, M.T.(2001). Dyadic Exploration of the Relationship of Leisure Satisfaction,Leisure Time,and Gender to Relationship Satisfaction. *Leisure Sciences*,23:25-46.
- Broughten, K., Beggs, A.(2006) Leisure satisfaction of older adults. *Activities, Adaptation & Aging*, 31(1).
- Budak, S. (2000). *Psikoloji sözlüğü*. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayıncılık. 226.

Çavuş, Ş., Cumaliyeva, D. (2013). The Relationship Between Job And Life Satisfaction: The Case Of Private Security Personnel. *Akademik Bakış Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 37, 1-17.

Çelik, M. ve Tümkaya, S. (2012). The Relationship between Job Variables of Life Satisfaction and Marital Satisfaction of Lecturers. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (KEFAD)*. 13(1), 223-238.

Demir, C., Demir, N. (2006). Bireylerin boş zaman faaliyetlerine katılmalarını etkileyen faktörler ile cinsiyet arasındaki ilişki: lisans öğrencilerine yönelik bir uygulama. *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi*. 6(1), 36-48.

Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., and Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.

Durak, M., Senol-Durak, E., ve Gencoz, T. (2010). Psychometric properties of the satisfaction with life scale among turkish university students, correctional officers, and elderly adults. *Social Indicators Research*, 99(3), 413-429.

Gökçe, H. (2008) *Examining Of The Lisure Satisfsaction With The Relation Between Life Satisfaction and Socio - Demographic Variables* M. Sc. Thesis in Psycho – Social Fields in Sports, Pamukkale University, Denizli, 20.

Gündoğar, D., Gül, S. S., Uskun, E., Demirci S., ve Keçeci, D. (2007). Investigation of the Predictors of Life Satisfaction in University Students. *J Clin Psy*, 10, 14-27.

Kabanoff, B.(1982). Occupational and sex differences in leisure needs and leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 3, 233-245.

Karlı, Ü., Polat, E., Yılmaz, B., Koçak, S. (2008). Reliability And Validity Study of Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS- Long Version) [“Serbest Zaman Tatmin Ölçeği’nin (SZTÖ-Uzun Versiyon) Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması”], *Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences*, 19 (2). 80-91.

Kırcı, Çevik, N. ve Korkmaz, O. (2014). Türkiye’de yaşam doyumu ve iş doyumu arasındaki ilişkinin iki değişkenli sıralı probit model analizi. *Niğde Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 7(1), 126-145.

Kovacs, A.(2007). *The leisure personality: relationships between personality, leisure satisfaction, and life satisfaction*, PhD Thesis, Indiana University School of Health, Indiana, 29-42.

Liang, J., Yamashita, T., Brown, J., S.(2013) Leisure satisfaction and quality of life in China, Japan and South Korea : a comparative study using Asia Barometer 2006. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. 14 (3), 753-769.

Lu, L., Hu, C., H., (2005). Personality, leisure experiences and happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 6, 325-342.

Misra, R., Kean, 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.

Öner, F. (2014). *The Factors That Affect Life Satisfaction of The Elderly People In Nursing Home* M. Sc. Thesis İstanbul Bilim University, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul, 4-49.

Özgen, F. (2012). *Ç.O.M.Ü. Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Yaşam Doyum Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi*, Undergraduate Thesis, Çanakkale On Sekiz Mart University, School of Physical Education and Sports Çanakkale, 2-32.

Özgür, G., Babacan Gümüş, A., ve Durdu, B. (2010). Life Satisfaction of University Students Living at Home or in the Dormitor. *Journal of Psychiatric Nurses* 2010;1(1):25-32

Pavot, W. and Diener, E. (1993). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5(2), 164-172.

Redhouse. (1988). *Redhouse İngilizce-Türkçe Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Redhouse Publications, 858.

Rycroft, C. (1989). *Psikanaliz sözlüğü*. (Translate. Associate Prof.. M. Sağman Kayatekin). İstanbul: Ara Publications, 37.

Shin, K., You, S.(2013). Leisure type, leisure satisfaction and adolescents' psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*,7(2),53-62.

Siegenthaler, K., L., O'dell, I.(2000). Leisure attitude, leisure satisfaction, and perceived freedom in leisure within family dyads. *Leisure Sciences*,22,281-296.

Sönmezoğlu, U., Polat E., Aycan , A.(2014). Youth Center Members and According to Some Variables Levels of Leisure Satisfaction. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport. Special Issue*,1,219-229.

Şimsek, E. (2011). *The Effects of Organizational Communication and Personality Traits On Life Satisfaction* PhD Thesis, Anadolu University, , Graduate School of Social Sciences, Eskişehir, 8-186.

Tuzgöl Dost, M. (2007). Examining Life Satisfaction Levels of University Students in Terms of Some Variables. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22(2), 132-143.

Tümkaya, S., Çelik, M., ve Aybek, B. (2011). Investigation of Submissive Behavior, Automatic Thoughts, Hopelessness and Life Satisfaction of High School Students. *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20 (2), 77-94.

Vong, Tze, N.(2005). Leisure satisfaction and quality of life in Macao, China. *Leisure Studies*,24(2),195-207.

Yavuzer, Y. ve Çivildağ, A. (2014). Mediator role of depression on the relationship between mobbing and life satisfaction of health professionals. *Düşünen Adam Psikiyatri ve Nörolojik Bilimler Dergisi*, 27(2), 115-125.

Yerlisu, Lapa, T.(2013). Life satisfaction, leisure satisfaction and perceived freedom of park recreation participants. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93,1985-1993.

Yılmaz, E. ve Altınok, V. (2009). Okul yöneticilerinin yalnızlık ve yaşam doyum düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 15(59), 451-469.