

Examination of the Relationship between the University Students' Course-Leisure Conflict and Curiosity

YUSUF ER¹, ABDULLAH ÇUHADAR², MEHMET DEMİREL³, ALPER KAYA⁴, HASAN SUAT AKSU⁵

¹Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, School of Applied Sciences, Department of Recreation Management, Karaman, Turkey.

²Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, School of Applied Sciences, Department of Recreation Management, Karaman, Turkey.

³Necmettin Erbakan University, Tourism Faculty, Department of Recreation Management, Konya, Turkey.

⁴Necmettin Erbakan University, Tourism Faculty, Department of Recreation Management, Konya, Turkey.

⁵Selçuk University, Tourism Faculty, Department of Recreation Management, Konya, Turkey.

Correspondence to: Dr Yusuf Er, Email. erylusuf@kmu.edu.tr, Cell: +903382265710

ABSTRACT

Background: Improving learning and instilling an investigative personality in the student is also one of the main elements of education. Therefore, a relationship has been established between curiosity and inquisitiveness, and it can be seen that at the root of this relationship, inquisitiveness plays a differentiating role in the learning of both young people and children.

Aim: This study examines the relationship between university students' course-leisure conflict and curiosity levels based on different variables.

Methods: The sample group was determined through convenience sampling and consists of 764 university students, including 406 female and 358 male participants.

Results: In the study, Curiosity Scale and Lesson Leisure Conflict Scale were used as data collection tools. In the analysis of the data obtained in the study, percentage and frequency were used to determine the distribution of the personal information of the participants, and the values of the data were checked with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the Shapiro test to determine whether the data showed a normal distribution. As a result, it was determined that the data did not have a normal distribution and thus showed a "Non-Parametric" distribution. Therefore, apart from descriptive statistical models, Mann-Whitney U, Kruskal-Wallis test, and correlation analysis methods were used in the statistical analysis of the data.

Conclusion: According to the findings, there was a significant difference in the variables of "Gender, Age, and Level of Welfare" of the curiosity scale of the participants, and a significant difference was found only according to the "Level of Welfare" variable in the course-leisure conflict scale. A significant positive correlation was found between the participants' curiosity levels and course-leisure conflict scores.

Result: It was concluded that the curiosity levels of the participants and the course-leisure conflict scale differed according to some variables, and the curiosity levels of the participants affected the course-leisure conflicts.

Keywords: University Students, Leisure Conflict, Curiosity

INTRODUCTION

Curiosity is one of the most important motivating forces in human behaviour. It has a developmental line, from a state of alert wakefulness in the infant to active investigation of the environment, which includes body products and anatomical differences, and then includes a wide range of interests in the outer world as well as in the inner psychological world¹. Philosophers have made a great number of definitions of curiosity. In general, they define the concept of curiosity in three different ways. Aristotle and Cicero defined the concept of curiosity as an intrinsically motivated desire. Saints Augustine and David Hume defined it as a passion, associating curiosity with the desire for knowledge. Jeremy Bentham and Kant, on the other hand, Bentham and Kant referred to curiosity as being appetitive, similar to Ferbach's idea that curiosity results from an unsatisfied knowledge drive². The main thoughts on curiosity are as follows: the first one refers to the thought that curiosity causes to reduce negative situations such as uncertainty, novelty, arousal, impulse, and knowledge gaps; the second one refers to the thought that curiosity is an intrinsic source of motivation that encourages individuals to learn and explore for their own good, and; the third and last one refers to the thought that curiosity is a stable difference in motivation among people, with differences in knowledge, goals, achievements, and

experiences. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to define the scope of psychological thinking that affects curiosity in a simple way. However, it offers inspiration for researchers curious about why people learn and explore in the absence of obvious external rewards³. Literature in psychology has shown that curiosity is the intrinsic motivation for exploration, learning, and creativity⁴. The views, theories, and definitions about curiosity establish common grounds on the assumption that curiosity is to learn, explore, and surrender to interesting elements. In the long run, curiosity greatly affects the function of building knowledge and competence. It encourages learning new things, discovering new things, meeting new people, and developing new skills. When the individual is curious, s/he becomes aware of everything that exists and will exist and accepts everything that is or will be in the process. Curiosity motivates people to act, think, research, and learn in different and new ways⁵. Being seen as an important criterion in the learning process, curiosity enables the achievement of educational success. Current research shows that there is a relationship between curiosity and academic achievement. In general, youngsters with high curiosity tend to ask more and better questions, select more adventurous activities, have more information about the world around them, recall more specific facts, and persist longer at problem-solving⁶. Curiosity, which has

been defined as a desire for information, is a motivation that drives educational attainment, knowledge, and achievements⁷. The satisfaction of curiosity through acquiring knowledge brings pleasure⁸. Curiosity is an aspect of intrinsic motivation that has great potential to enhance student learning⁹. Improving learning and instilling an investigative personality in the student is also one of the main elements of education. A researcher is characteristically defined as someone who is genuinely motivated to inquire well. Therefore, a relationship has been established between curiosity and inquisitiveness, and it can be seen that at the root of this relationship, inquisitiveness plays a differentiating role in the learning of both young people and children. It is also stated that this phenomenon, which is distinguished both intellectually and in terms of life, is ultimately a virtue. Therefore, it is concluded that inquisitiveness is a primary intellectual virtue that should be trained¹⁰. Education is seen as a process that occurs throughout life and especially in the work and leisure of individuals rather than certain institutions and organizations and during childhood and youth. It makes great contributions to increasing the quality of human resources, which are important supporters of development and progress. Students are a core resource that underlies the potential that needs to be developed through education. On the other hand, education is a conscious effort to develop and direct students' personalities and abilities both inside and outside the school^{11,12}. Since one of the main tasks of the students is to participate in the school-course and to participate and organize leisure activities in the remaining time, they experience some lack of time and the need to balance their lives in managing these two concepts¹³. Students experience many situations in which they have many opportunities for leisure activities, but it is difficult to evaluate and realize these situations in the same way¹⁴. The concept of course-leisure conflict is a concept for this situation. The importance of leisure education is once again revealed to ensure progress in course-leisure conflicts, leisure activities, especially in terms of individual and social development, and to make sense of this process. Leisure education is accepted as an emerging need for increasing the quality of life of both students and society¹⁵. Taking this need into consideration and meeting it will lead students, young people, and society in general in a more conscious and positive way. Based on the abovementioned considerations, this study examines the concepts of university students' course-leisure conflicts and curiosity.

MATERIAL & METHODS

In addition to the "Personal Information Form" created by the researchers as a data collection tool in the study, the "Curiosity Scale (CS)" and the "Course-Leisure Conflict Scale (CLCS)" were used. The "Curiosity Scale", which was adapted into Turkish by Demirel and Coşkun was applied¹⁶. The original scale consists of two dimensions: breadth and depth. The curiosity scale consists of 47 items in total. The responses to the scale items are on a Likert-type grading scale as "1 Fits Well", 2. "Partially Fits", 3. "Slightly Fits", "4 Slightly Does Not Fit", 5. "Partially Does Not Fit", and 6. "Does Not Fit At All". The "Course-Leisure Conflict Scale (CLCS)" used in the third section of the

research was developed by Tsaur and Tang and adapted into Turkish by Işık and Demirel^{17,18}. The scale consists of 5 dimensions and 20 items. In the scale, there are 3 dimensions of the Conflict of the Course with Leisure, namely Time-based, Strain-based, and Intensity, while there are 2 dimensions of the Conflict of Leisure with the Course), namely Strain-based and Intensity. It is a 5-point Likert type graded as 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neither agree nor disagree, 4-Agree, and 5-Strongly agree.

The population of the research consists of individuals studying in various departments of universities. Participants were included in the sampling using the convenience sampling method and the sampling group is comprised of 406 female participants (53.1%) and 358 male participants (46.9%). This sampling is also known as grab sampling, accidental sampling or opportunity sampling). Convenience sampling involves the sample that is close to hand for the study¹⁹.

In the analysis of the data obtained in the study, percentage and frequency were used to determine the distribution of the personal information of the participants, and the values of the data were checked with the Kolmogorov Smirnov test and the Shapiro test to determine whether the data showed a normal distribution. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the data did not have a normal distribution, that is, the data showed a "Non-Parametric" distribution. Therefore, apart from descriptive statistical models, Mann Whitney U, Kruskal Wallis test, and correlation analysis methods were used in the statistical analysis of the data ($\alpha = 0.05$).

RESULT

Table 1. Distribution of Scale Scores

Dimensions	Number of Items	Average	S.Error	p
CS 1 (Breadth)	27	62,477	21,1798	.000
CS 2 (Depth)	20	44,050	17,9073	.000
CS T (Total)	13	105,59	37,4726	.000
CLCS 1 (Time-based)	2	2,7373	1,34064	.000
CLCS 2 (CL Strain-based)	7	2,8938	1,24052	.000
CLCS 3 (CLIntensity)	4	2,8899	1,26645	.000
CLCS 4 (LCStrain-based)	2	2,8326	1,30221	.000
CLCS 5 (LCIntensity)	5	2,7190	1,17423	.000
CLCS (Total)	20	2,8197	1,16148	.000

Table 1 includes the average scores of the participants in the Curiosity Scale (CS) and the Course-Leisure Conflict Scale (CLCS) dimensions and the significance values of the Kolmogorov Smirnov test and Shapiro test, which were made to determine the structure of the data. Accordingly, it was determined that the highest average for CS was in the "Breadth" dimension with 62.7, and for CLCS in the "Conflict of the Course with Leisure (CLStrain-based)" dimension with 2.89. The significance values (p) revealed that the data had a non-parametric structure.

Table 2. Demographic Information of Participants

Variables		f	%
Gender	Female	406	53,1
	Male	358	46,9
	Total	764	100,0
Age	17-20	330	43,2
	21-25	336	44,0
	26 and over	98	12,8
	Total	764	100,0
Class	Freshman	259	33,9
	Sophomore	208	27,2
	Junior	152	19,9
	Senior	145	19,0
	Total	764	100,0
Level of welfare	Poor	175	22,9
	Normal	468	61,3
	Good	121	15,8
	Total	764	100,0
How often do you have difficulties in taking advantage of your leisure?	Always	143	18,7
	Sometimes	444	58,1
	Never	177	23,2
	Total	764	100,0
Sufficiency of time	Definitely insufficient	94	12,3
	Insufficient	152	19,9
	Normal	335	43,8
	Sufficient	117	15,3
	Definitely sufficient	66	8,6
	Total	764	100,0

Table 3. Distribution of Participants' Curiosity and Course-Leisure Conflict Scores by Gender Variable

Dimensions	Variable	Mean Rank	Average	Z	p
CS 1 (Breadth)	Female	297,50	62,4779	-1,240	,215
	Male	315,22			
CS 2 (Depth)	Female	305,34	44,0502	-1,962	,050
	Male	333,96			
CS T (Total)	Female	270,37	105,5968	-1,402	,161
	Male	289,52			
CLCS 1 (Time-based)	Female	377,18	2,7373	-,503	,615
	Male	369,31			
CLCS 2 (CLStrain-based)	Female	376,82	2,8938	-,381	,703
	Male	370,80			
CLCS 3 (CLIntensity)	Female	366,72	2,8899	-,173	,863
	Male	369,42			
CLCS 4 (LCStrain-based)	Female	357,87	2,8326	-,763	,446
	Male	369,65			
CLCS 5 (LCIntensity)	Female	362,48	2,7190	-,813	,416
	Male	375,22			
CLCS (Total)	Female	374,02	2,8197	-,268	,789
	Male	378,27			

Table 4. Distribution of Participants' Curiosity and Course-Leisure Conflict Scores by Age Variable

Dimensions	Variable	Mean Rank	Average	X2	p
CS 1 (Breadth)	17-20	309,34	62,4779	6,428	,040
	21-25	290,65			
	26 and over	347,15			
CS 2 (Depth)	17-20	326,64	44,0502	2,714	,257
	21-25	306,02			
	26 and over	337,58			
CS T (Total)	17-20	279,61	105,5968	3,106	,212
	21-25	270,68			
	26 and over	308,36			
CLCS 1 (Time-based)	17-20	393,21	2,7373	5,645	,059
	21-25	363,30			
	26 and over	340,99			
CLCS 2 (CLStrain-based)	17-20	377,83	2,8938	,908	,635
	21-25	375,82			
	26 and over	354,23			
CLCS 3 (CLIntensity)	17-20	372,80	2,8899	,303	,859
	21-25	363,63			
	26 and over	367,10			
CLCS 4 (LCStrain-based)	17-20	355,52	2,8326	1,382	,501
	21-25	373,59			
	26 and over	354,85			
CLCS 5 (LCIntensity)	17-20	362,49	2,7190	,610	,737
	21-25	370,77			
	26 and over	380,92			
CLCS (Total)	17-20	379,60	2,8197	,251	,882
	21-25	374,95			
	26 and over	367,18			

Table 5. Distribution of Participants' Curiosity and Course-Leisure Conflict Scores by Level of Welfare Variable

Dimensions	Variable	Mean Rank	Average	X2	p
CS 1 (Breadth)	Poor	332,87	62,4779	11,118	,004
	Normal	286,57			
	Good	338,04			
CS 2 (Depth)	Poor	345,12	44,0502	9,314	,009
	Normal	300,96			
	Good	348,32			
CS T (Total)	Poor	302,77	105,5968	9,571	,008
	Normal	261,93			
	Good	307,72			
CLCS 1 (Time-based)	Poor	380,45	2,7373	17,289	,000
	Normal	390,07			
	Good	298,72			
CLCS 2 (CLStrain-based)	Poor	395,79	2,8938	11,997	,002
	Normal	381,64			
	Good	312,05			
CLCS 3 (CLIntensity)	Poor	402,11	2,8899	12,499	,002
	Normal	369,43			
	Good	311,98			
CLCS 4 (LCStrain-based)	Poor	385,01	2,8326	10,839	,004
	Normal	370,09			
	Good	306,70			
CLCS 5 (LCIntensity)	Poor	410,77	2,7190	13,229	,001
	Normal	365,11			
	Good	319,30			
CLCS (Total)	Poor	411,09	2,8197	15,147	,001
	Normal	379,32			
	Good	311,35			

As seen in Table 2, 53.1% of the participants were female, 44% were in the 21-25 age group, 33.9% were freshmen, 61.3% had a normal level of welfare, 58.1% had difficulty in taking advantage of their leisure, and 43.8% had normal leisure time.

According to the Mann-Whitney U test results in Table 3, it was determined that there is a significant difference between the gender and Curiosity levels of the participants in the "Depth" dimension ($p < 0.05$), while there is no

significant difference in all dimensions and total scores of the course-leisure conflict.

According to the Kruskal-Wallis test in Table 4, it was determined that there is a significant difference between the ages of the participants and their Curiosity levels in the "Breadth" dimension ($p < 0.05$), while there is no significant difference in all dimensions and total scores of the course-

leisure conflict.

According to the Kruskal-Wallis test in Table 5, it was determined that there is a significant difference in all dimensions and total scores according to the welfare levels of the participants and their Curiosity and course-leisure time conflict scores ($p < 0.05$).

Table 6. Correlation Analysis Results of the Relationship between Participants' Curiosity Levels and Leisure and Course Conflict Attitudes

		CS 1	CS 2	CS T	CLCS 1	CLCS 2	CLCS 3	CLCS 4	CLCS 5	CLCS T
CS 1 (Breadth)	R	1,000								
	p	.								
	N	611								
CS 2 (Depth)	R	,893**	1,000							
	p	,000	.							
	N	558	637							
CS T (Total)	R	,980**	,962**	1,000						
	p	,000	,000	.						
	N	558	558	558						
CLCS 1 (Time-based)	R	-,057	-,027	-,036	1,000					
	p	,158	,502	,394	.					
	N	605	631	552	746					
CLCS 2 (CLStrain-based)	R	-,011	,031	,012	,828**	1,000				
	p	,789	,431	,774	,000	.				
	N	606	632	553	744	747				
CLCS 3 (CLIntensity)	R	,036	,062	,054	,764**	,897**	1,000			
	p	,373	,118	,207	,000	,000	.			
	N	604	631	552	733	735	735			
CLCS 4 (LCStrain-based)	R	,051	,064	,056	,682**	,836**	,848**	1,000		
	p	,211	,107	,194	,000	,000	,000	.		
	N	600	627	548	726	726	725	726		
CLCS 5 (LCIntensity)	R	,129**	,156**	,150**	,676**	,818**	,830**	,832**	1,000	
	p	,001	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	.	
	N	605	632	553	732	734	730	725	736	
CLCS (Total)	R	,036	,067	,055	,844**	,969**	,946**	,898**	,911**	1,000
	p	,380	,095	,198	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	.
	N	606	632	553	746	747	735	726	736	751

As a result of the correlation analysis, it was determined that there was a positive significant relationship between the Curiosity levels of the participants and their course-leisure conflict scores.

DISCUSSION

This study aims to examine whether university students' future expectations and leisure management levels differ according to gender, family income level, communication level, and course success variables. In the study, data were collected from 764 students studying at universities through a questionnaire. Of the participants within the scope of the study, 53.1% were female, 44% were in the 21-25 age group, 33.9% were freshmen, 61.3% had a normal level of welfare, 58.1% had difficulty in taking advantage of leisure, and 43.8% had normal leisure time in terms of sufficiency of time. Considering the participants' gender, it was found that students' curiosity levels differed significantly only in the "Depth" dimension, while there was no significant difference in terms of gender in all dimensions of students' course-leisure conflict scores and

total scores. Among the reasons for this situation are that the subjects or activities that arouse the curiosity of the participants are diverse but not permanent. And considering that the participants are going through the process of questioning their career choices or the process of gaining experience to develop in their field, it can be argued that the participants have different interests and are open to dealing with a wide variety of different topics they are curious about. In a similar study, Demirel and Coşkun concluded that there was a significant difference in the curiosity levels of the participants according to the gender variable in favour of male students¹⁶. Along with the same lines, Turan examined the curiosity levels of physical education and sports college students and concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in the total scores of "Breadth, Depth and Curiosity" arising from female students according to the gender variable²⁰. According to another study conducted by Deringöl et al. the curiosity levels of female students were statistically significantly higher than the levels of male students²¹. It was concluded in another study that as a result of the

comparison of curiosity levels with gender, the average scores of female and male physical education and sports teachers differed significantly and the difference was high in favour of female teachers²².

In a study conducted with undergraduate students, Bökeoğlu and Yılmaz found that research anxiety, which is a factor that can suppress the participants' curiosity, did not differ in terms of gender, on the other hand; in terms of the gender of the participants, there was a significant difference in the dimensions of analytical and open-mindedness as well as their attitudes towards critical thinking within the framework of curiosity tendency²³. In particular, they found that male participants had higher scores on attitudes towards critical thinking than female participants. In particular, they found that male participants had higher scores on attitudes towards critical thinking than female participants. In a study conducted on students, Akgül and Özdilek examined the curiosity levels of the participants in terms of gender and found that there was no significant difference between male and female participants according to the curiosity level dimensions²⁴. In the study conducted by Karademir et al. it was found that the curiosity levels of the individuals participating in the study differed significantly in all dimensions and in favour of female participants when examined in terms of gender²⁵. Deringöl reported that there was a significant difference in terms of the gender of the participants in terms of the "Depth, Breadth and competence" dimensions in favour of the female participants²⁶. İskender and Yaylı examined leisure conflict and reported that there was a significant difference between the gender of the individuals participating in the study and the work-leisure conflict²⁷.

It was determined that there was a significant difference in the "Breadth" dimension among the curiosity levels according to the age variable, while no significant difference was found in all dimensions and total scores of course-leisure conflict scores. Turan found that there was a significant difference in the total dimension of "Depth, curiosity"²⁰. İskender stated in his study that there is no significant difference in leisure time conflict scores according to the age variable²⁸. Bahadır and Certel found a significant relationship between the total and dimensions of curiosity and age in their study on physical education and sports teachers²². Cihan and Ilgar found that the curiosity levels of the students who participated in their research showed a significant difference according to the ages of the participants²⁹. It was observed that the scores of the participants included in the study from the Breadth dimension did not differ significantly according to their ages, while a significant difference was found in the Depth dimension according to age. According to the results of this study, it was concluded that younger participants had higher levels of curiosity compared to other age groups. According to the findings of the research conducted by Akgül and Özdilek, the curiosity levels of the participants did not differ depending on the age²⁴.

It was determined that there was a significant difference in all dimensions and total scores according to the levels of welfare of the participants and their curiosity and course-leisure conflict scores. Social development and the future of society are closely related to the efforts made to develop it by taking into account the creativity of the

individuals who make up that society. Creativity turns into inventions over time, and these inventions turn into technological knowledge and indirectly into production, and as a result, economic development can be experienced. In other words, the general level of welfare of the society increases. On the contrary, individuals whose creativity potentials are not supported become individuals who lack various productive skills, slowing down or hindering the development of the societies in which these individuals are located³⁰. It can be easily stated that the "curiosity" factor plays an important role in creativity. Özşaker determined that there was a significant difference between the level of welfare of the participants and individual success and between time and lack of friends as a result of the examination of the dimensions according to the level of welfare in his study on students³¹. It was determined that there was no significant difference according to the departments and grades of the participants. The literature review shows that there is a statistically significant difference in participation in leisure activities in favour of those with a high level of welfare compared to those with a low welfare level. In sum, it was emphasized that the level of welfare is an important factor in participating in leisure activities. Burton et al. reported that the level of income is an important factor in participation in leisure activities³². Gratton reported that the most important factor in an individual's participation in leisure activities is "money"^{33,34}. In a study conducted by Alexandris and Carroll, it was reported that there was a significant relationship between the individual's level of motivation and lack of knowledge and the level of perception of obstacles³⁵. Cihan and Ilgar reported that there was a significant difference in terms of the curiosity levels in the "curiosity, Breadth" dimensions according to the level of welfare variable and based on the economic framework of the participants²⁹. Contrary to the results obtained from the research, Akgül and Özdilek found that the curiosity levels of the participants did not differ according to the economic situation²⁴.

CONCLUSION

According to the correlation analysis between the curiosity scale and the course-leisure conflict scale, it was concluded that there was a positive significant relationship between the two scales. According to the result, as the university students' curiosity levels increase, the course-leisure conflict dimensions also increase.

REFERENCES

1. Beiser, H. R. On Curiosity: A Developmental Approach. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 1984; 23(5), 517–526. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-7138\(09\)60341-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-7138(09)60341-1).
2. Jirout, J., & Klahr, D. Children's scientific curiosity: In search of an operational definition of an elusive concept. *Developmental Review*, 2012; 32(2), 125–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2012.04.002>
3. Silvia, P. J. Curiosity and Motivation. In *The Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation*. 2012; <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399820.013.0010>
4. Wu, Q., & Miao, C. Curiosity: From psychology to computation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 2013; 46(2), 26–47. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2543581.2543585>.
5. Kashdan, T. B., & Silvia, P. J. Curiosity and Interest: The

- Benefits of Thriving on Novelty and Challenge. In *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology*, 2012; (2 Ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195187243.013.0034>
6. Olson, E. Measurement of Curiosity in Junior High School Students (Dissertation). 1986; In Dissertation. <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rt/8285>
 7. Markey, A., & Loewenstein, G. Curiosity. In *International handbook of emotions in education*. 2014; (pp. 228–245). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
 8. Perlovsky, L. I., Bonniot-Cabanac, M. C., & Cabanac, M. (2010). Curiosity and pleasure. *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IJCNN.2010.5596867>
 9. Pluck, G., & Johnson, H. Stimulating Curiosity To Enhance Learning. *Education Sciences And Psychology*, 2011; 2(19), 24–31. <https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>
 10. Watson, L. Why should we educate for inquisitiveness? In *Intellectual Virtues and Education: Essays in Applied Virtue Epistemology* 2015; (pp. 38–53). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315714127>
 11. Hardianti, T., Pohan, L. A., Maulina, J., & Hasanah, U. Relationship between Curiosity and Intrinsic Motivation for Science Process Skills. 2020; 723–727. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0008893007230727>
 12. Wimbush, E. J., & Duffield, B. S. Integrating education and leisure: Conflict and the community school. *Leisure Studies*, 1985; 4(1), 69–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614368500390051>
 13. Kuhnle, C., Hofer, M., & Kilian, B. The relationship of value orientations, self-control, frequency of school-leisure conflicts, and life-balance in adolescence. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 2010; 20(3), 251–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2010.02.003>
 14. Hofer, M., Schmid, S., Fries, S., Zivkovic, I., & Dietz, F. Value orientations and studying in school-leisure conflict: A study with samples from five countries. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 2009; 19(1), 101–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2008.09.007>
 15. Sivan, A. Leisure education in schools: Challenges, choices and consequences. *World Leisure Journal*, 2017; 59, 15–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16078055.2017.1393871>
 16. Demirel, M. ve Diker-Coşkun, Y. Üniversite öğrencilerinin meraklılık düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2009; 9 (18), 111-134.
 17. Tsaor, S.-H., Liang, Y.-W., & Hsu, H.-J. A multidimensional Measurement of work Leisure Conflict. *Leisure Science: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. 2012; 34:5,395- 416, doi:10.1080/01490400.2012.714701
 18. Işık, U., & Demirel, M. Turkish adaptation of study-leisure conflict scale, its validity and reliability. 2018; *European Journal of Education Studies*.
 19. Özen, Y., & Gül, A. Sosyal ve Eğitim bilimleri Araştırmalarında Evren-Örneklem Sorunu. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2007; (15), 394-422.
 20. Turan, M. B. (2015). Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenliği bölümünde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin meraklılık düzeyleri ile öğrenme stilleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Erciyes Üniversitesi, Kayseri*.
 21. Deringöl, Y., Yaman, Y., Özsan, İ., Çağırhan GD. İlköğretim Öğretmen Adaylarının Meraklılık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 2010; 11-13 Kasım, Antalya.
 22. Bahadır, Z., & Certel, Z. A Research on Curiosity Levels of Physical Education and Sports Teachers (Kayseri Province Sample). *Journal of Physical Education & Sports Science/Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2012; 6(3).
 23. Bökeoğlu, O. Ç., & Yılmaz, A. G. K. Üniversite öğrencilerinin eleştirel düşünmeye yönelik tutumları ile araştırma kaygıları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 2005; 41(41), 47-67.
 24. Akgül, S., & Özdelek, Ç. Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Meraklılık Düzeylerinin Araştırılması (Kütahya İli Örneği). *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2014; (41).
 25. Karademir, Ç. A., Çaylı, B., & Deveci, Ö. Öğretmen Adaylarının Sorgulama Becerileri ve Meraklılık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *Elementary Education Online*, 2019; 18(3).
 26. Deringöl, Y. Öğretmen Adaylarının Eleştirel Düşünme Standartlarının Belirlenmesi. *Iğdır University Journal of Social Sciences*, 2017; (13).
 27. İskender, A., & Yaylı, A. İşgörenlerin iş ve serbest zaman çatışma düzeyleri ile mesleki tükenmişlik ve yaşam tatmini ilişkisi: Ankara'daki 4-5 yıldızlı otel çalışanları üzerine bir uygulama. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2017; 6(1), 95-112.
 28. İskender A. (2015). İşgörenlerin İş ve Serbest Zaman Çatışma Düzeyleri ile Mesleki Tükenmişlik ve Yaşam Tatmini İlişkisi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara*.
 29. Cihan, B. B., & Ilgar, E. A. Spor Yapan ve Spor Yapmayan Sedanter Lise Öğrencilerinin Meraklılık Düzeylerinin Belirlenmesi. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2018; 19(2), 1649-1660.
 30. Şahin, Ç. Değişen dünyada sınıf öğretmenlerinin değişen toplumsal ve yaratıcılık rolleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2003; 1(1), 1-9.
 31. Özşaker, M. Gençlerin serbest zaman aktivitelerine katılamama nedenleri üzerine bir inceleme. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilim Dergisi*, 2012; 14(1), 126-131.
 32. Burton N, Turrell G And Oldenburg B. Participation in Recreational Physical Activity: Why do Socioeconomic Groups Differ? *Health Education, Behavior*, 2003; 30(2), 225-244.
 33. Gratton C. (2000). *Economics Of Sport And Recreation*, London, U.K., Sport Pres.
 34. Güler, C., Harmandar Demirel, D., Çakır, V. O., Budak, D. Serbest zaman engelleri ile baş etme stratejileri: Üniversite öğrencileri örneği. *Turkish Studies - Social*, 2020; 15(4), 1919-1930. <https://dx.doi.org/10.29228/TurkishStudies.43508>
 35. Alexandris K, Carroll B. Demographic Differences In The Perception Of Constrains On Recreational Sport Participation:Results From A Study In Greece. *Leisure Studies*, 1997; 16, 107-125.