

Leisure Evaluation Behaviors and Attitudes of Students of Kilis 7 September University

FARUK GÜVEN¹, ALİ ÇEVİK², AHMET YILGIN³

¹*Karamanoğlu Mehmet Bey University University of Recreation Management, Karaman, Turkey.*

²*Marmara University Faculty of Sport Sciences Sport Management, Istanbul, Turke.*

³*Marmara University Faculty of Sport Sciences Sport Management, Istanbul, Turkey*

Correspondence to: Faruk Guven, Email: farukguven@kmu.edu.tr, Cell: 0000-0001-6186-8784

ABSTRACT

The aim of the research is to examine the leisure management, attitudes and behaviors of the students studying at Kilis 7 September University. With the study, determining the current attitudes and behaviors of the students, Creating resources for the relevant units at the national and international level, especially the province of Kilis and Kilis 7 September University, reveals the importance of the research. Age, gender, marital status, class, academic units and leisure activity days per week of 387 students participating in the study were examined in order to determine their leisure management. According to the age variable, It was understood that 220 students aged 18-20 (56.8%) , 148 students aged 21-23 (38.2%), 12 students aged 24-25 (3.1%), and 7 students aged 26 and over(1.8%) were participated in the study. It was understood that there were 222 women (57.4%) and 165 men (42.6%) according to the gender variable and 380 single people(98.2%) and 7 married people(1.8%) according to their marital status. Between the leisure management sub-dimensions and the gender variable, it was observed that there was no significant difference in the goal setting and programming sub-dimensions of male and female students. However, It was found that there was a significant difference in their leisure time attitude and evaluation sub-dimensions. It is seen that there is no significant difference between the sub-dimensions of the scale and age groups in goal setting and method programming and sub-dimensions, while there is a significant difference in the sub-dimension of leisure time attitude. It is seen that there is no significant difference between the sub-dimensions of the scale and age groups in programming and evaluation sub-dimensions, and there is a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of goal setting and method and leisure time attitude. It was understood that there was no significant difference in programming sub-dimension between academic unit groups It is seen that there is a significant difference in other sub-dimensions, which are the sub-dimensions of goal setting and method, leisure time attitude and evaluation. Between the sub-dimensions of the scale and the days when students participated in leisure time activities, It was observed that there was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of their leisure time attitude and programming. It is seen that there is significant difference in the sub-dimensions of goal setting and evaluation with method.

Keywords: Kilis, Rcreation, Leisure

INTRODUCTION

The concept of time has an important place in one's life so that the individual can develop. The concept of time has assumed the success of people in their personal, social and professional life. Therefore, using time inefficiently makes people's life meaningless [1, 2]. Class distinctions have also emerged along with the concept of leisure. Leisure has been associated with people with high cultural level and political and social status [3]. Over time, the awareness of people and the change of periods have led to differences. The concept of leisure time or the concept of evaluation of time has started to draw attention with the development of tools and equipment developed in contemporary societies, especially with the development of industry from labor-intensive to capital-intensive technology [4]. An increase in leisure time occurs with the development of technology in relation to industrialization, the decrease in the need for manpower and the increase in the welfare level of the society. Individuals also participated in activities, spending time with their loved ones and resting, in order to make the best use of these services[5-7]. Although the development in the concept of

leisure in our age is mostly seen in industrial countries, it is seen that it also occurs in developing countries such as Turkey. The change in routine hours in people's working life and the increase in holidays have

been associated with the importance of social structure in social life. As a result of this relationship, the ability of individuals to use free time in their lives has become a situation that can affect their quality of life [8]. Karaküçük (2008) explained this situation with the expression "to liken leisure to double-edged sword". If it is used in a positive and desired way, it can create personal and social development, and if it is used in a negative and undesirable way, it can cause problems such as depression and disorder [9]. This is a phenomenon that should be emphasized for the 'youth', which constitutes an important part of the society [10]. Activities made by participating in leisure can be called as reaching a beautiful future in human life. In addition, most of the people cannot adequately evaluate this situation with the ambition of making money [11]. People's participation in leisure time activities is associated with the type of activity and their participation interval needs [10, 12]. Hobbies have become a tool to reveal one's personal achievements, talents and skills. In

line with the information, different ideas have emerged as a result of research on evaluation of leisure habits [13, 14]. The person increases his self-confidence and goes a long way towards gaining prestige. Along with these; it provides improvement in goal setting, determination and problem solving [15]. To manage our

time well in a personal sense; directing our career better, planning and working for the future, increasing our level of knowledge, being open to continuous development by following technology, strengthening our relations with people, offers the opportunity to have fun and rest, revealing new ideas with our thinking capacity [16]. Effective, efficient and useful time management reduces the level of stress and anxiety, while increasing the level of success in life. Uses of time to benefit are realized through the program, plan and success criteria[17]. At this point, there is the university education process among the fields where effective and efficient use of time is important. In addition to taking periodic courses, students who receive university education also carry out studies related to the courses, present the results of the studies as a whole in the form of a report and fulfill the examination regulations[18, 19]. While the importance of leisure time has increased, giving more space to such studies, distinguishing between work or school life and leisure time features, and studies aimed at increasing the quality and level of life of individuals can be seen as a quality supporting this study [20]. This study was conducted to measure the leisure management of students studying in different academic units of the university.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The Importance Of The Study: In line with the geographical and socio-economic structure of the province of Kilis and the campuses of Kilis 7 Aralık University, the sub-dimensions of the "Leisure Management Scale" Goal Setting and Method, Leisure Attitude, Programming and Evaluation of the students who continue their education and training were examined. With the study, determining the current attitudes and behaviors of the students, creating resources for the relevant units at the national and international level, especially the province of Kilis and Kilis 7 Aralık University, reveals the importance of the research.

The Method Of The Study: The aim of the study was to examine the leisure management attitudes and behaviors of the students studying Associate and Undergraduate education at Kilis 7 Aralık University. In order to determine Leisure Management, a 5-point likert-type questionnaire consisting of different question types, whose validity and reliability was made by Akgül and Karaküçük (2015), was used [8]. In the questionnaire used in the research, there are 15 questions to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants in the first part and the leisure management of the individuals in the second part. In the survey application, in line with the 5-point Likert scale, the rating was evaluated as "Totally Agree 5, Agree 4, Undecided 3, Disagree 2 and Never Agree 1 impact score.

The Model of The Study: Within the scope of the research, the survey model, one of the quantitative research methods, was applied to determine the current situation in the attitudes and behaviors of the participants for leisure time management.

The Universe and Sample: The universe of the research consists of students who continue their associate and undergraduate education at Kilis 7 Aralık University. The sample group consisted of total 387 students who were voluntarily included in the study and determined by random

method.

The Analysis of Data: In line with the answers given by the participants, the validity and reliability Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha=0.730$) value of the data set was found. In the study, it was observed that the data set did not have a normal distribution (skewness and kurtosis) from the parametric test assumptions, and the group variances were not equal (Levene Test, $p<0.05$), and it was decided to perform non-parametric tests. In the study, statistical analyzes were made with the frequency and cross tables of demographic information, non-parametric tests, Kruskal-Wallis and Mann Whitney U tests. Our research was decided to be ethically appropriate with the decision of the ethics committee dated 14.07.2021

RESULTS

Age, gender, marital status, class, academic units and leisure activity days per week of 387 students participating in the study were examined in order to determine their Leisure Management. According to age variable, it was understood that people (56.8%) of 18-20 age students, 148 people (38.2%) aged 21-23 12 people (3.1%) aged 24-25 and 7 people (%1,8) aged 26 and over participated in the study.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics

	N	%
Age		
18-20	220	56,8
21-23	148	38,2
24-25	12	3,1
26< Over	7	1,8
Gender		
Female	222	57,4
Male	165	42,6
Marital Status		
Single	380	98,2
Married	7	1,8
Level of Class		
1 class	209	54,0
2 class	85	22,0
3 class	31	8,0
4 class	62	16,0
Academic Units		
Physical Education and Sports College	120	31,0
Faculty of Science and Literature	148	38,2
Faculty of Education	14	3,6
Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences	36	9,3
Faculty of Engineering	40	10,3
Faculty of Theology	2	,5
Faculty of Health Sciences	18	4,7
Vocational School of Technical Sciences	9	2,3

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of 387 students who participated in the survey. Age, gender, marital status, class, academic units and leisure activity days per week of the individuals participating in the study were examined. According to age variable, it was understood that people (56.8%) of 18-20 age students, 148 people (38.2%) aged 21-23 12 people (3.1%) aged 24-25 and 7 people (%1,8) aged 26 and over participated in the study. It was understood that there were 222 (57.4%) women and 165 (42.6%) men according to the gender

variable and 380 (98.2%) single people and 7 (1.8%) married people according to their marital status. At the class level, it was understood that 1st graders consisted of 209 (54%), 2nd graders 85 (22%), 3rd graders 31 (8%) and 4th graders 62 (16%). In academic units; it was determined that 120 people (31%) from Physical Education and Sports College, 148 people (38.2%) from Faculty of Science and

Faculty of Education, 36 people (9.3%) from Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 40 people (10.3%) from Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, 2 people (0.5%) from Faculty of Theology, 18 people (4.7%) from Faculty of Health Sciences and 9 people (2.3%) from Technical Sciences Vocational School attended in the study ($p < 0.05$).

Table 2. Demographic characteristics leisure activity per week.

Group	N	%
1 day	72	18,6
2-3 days	190	49,1
4-5 days	55	14,2
6-7 days	25	6,5
No Activity	45	11,6
Total	387	100,0

Literature, 14 people (3.6%) from Muallim Rifat

In Table 2, it is seen in percentage and frequency analysis how many days a week students participate in leisure activities. In line with the preferences of the students, it was understood that 72 people (18.6%) are active for 1 day a week, 190 people (49.1%) are active for 2-3 days, 55 people (14.2%) are active for 4-5 days, 25 people (6.5%) are active for 6-7 days and those who stated they did not do activities are 45 people (11.6%) ($p < 0.05$).

Table 3. Percentage and frequency analysis of leisure activities per week according to gender.

		How many days a week do you do leisure activities?					Total
		1 day	2-3 days	4-5 days	6-7 days	No Activity	
Female	N	43	115	26	11	27	222
	Gender %	19,4	51,8	11,7	5,0	12,2	100,0
Male	N	29	75	29	14	18	165
	Gender %	17,6	45,5	17,6	8,5	10,9	100,0
Total	N	72	190	55	25	45	387
	Gender %	18,6	49,1	14,2	6,5	11,6	100,0

In Table 3; Considering the total number of activity days between genders; It is seen that there are 43 women who do leisure time activities for one day a week and the ratio of them to the total women is 19.4%, there are 29 men whose ratio to the total number of men is 17.6% and the ratio of 72 people in total to the academic units is 18.6%. It is seen that there are 115 women who do leisure activities for 2-3 days and the rate of them in total women is 51.8 %, there are 75 men whose rate in total men is 45.5 %, and in total, the rate of 190 people in the academic units is 49.1%. It is seen that there are 26 women who do leisure activities for 4-5 days, the ratio of them to the total women is 11.7%,

there are 29 men whose ratio to the total men is 17.6% and the ratio of 55 people in total to the academic units is 14.2%. It is seen that there are 11 women who do leisure activities for 6-7 days and the rate of them is 5% in total women, there are 14 men whose rate is 8.5% in total men and the ratio of 25 people to the academic units is 6.5%. It has been determined that there are 27 women who do not engage in leisure activities and the ratio of them in total women is 12.2%, there are 18 men whose ratio in total men is 10.9% and the ratio of 45 people in total to the academic units is 11.6% ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4. Percentage and frequency analysis of leisure activities per week according to academic units.

		How many days a week do you do leisure activities?					Total
		1 day	2-3 days	4-5 days	6-7 days	No Activity	
PEd&SCol.	N	19	63	23	10	5	120
	Academic Unit %	15,8	52,5	19,2	8,3	4,2	100,0
FSc&Litt.	N	28	74	14	8	24	148
	Academic Unit %	18,9	50,0	9,5	5,4	16,2	100,0
FEEd.	N	2	6	5	1	0	14
	Academic Unit %	14,3	42,9	35,7	7,1	0,0	100,0
FEcon&ASc.	N	8	11	6	3	8	36
	Academic Unit %	22,2	30,6	16,7	8,3	22,2	100,0
FEng.	N	11	18	3	2	6	40
	Academic Unit %	27,5	45,0	7,5	5,0	15,0	100,0
FTheol.	N	1	0	0	0	1	2
	Academic Unit %	50,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	50,0	100,0
FHSc.	N	2	13	2	1	0	18
	Academic Unit %	11,1	72,2	11,1	5,6	0,0	100,0
TScVSch.	N	1	5	2	0	1	9
	Academic Unit %	11,1	55,6	22,2	0,0	11,1	100,0
Total	N	72	190	55	25	45	387
	%	18,6	49,1	14,2	6,5	11,6	100,0

In Table 4; In the study, it is seen in the table of percentages and frequencies how many days a week the academic units do leisure activities. When these data are examined; In academic units that participate in leisure activities 1 day a week; The rate of PEd&SCol for 19 people in academic units is 15.8%, the rate of FSc&Litt for 28 people in academic units is 18.9%, the rate of FEd for 2 people in academic units is 14.3%, the rate of FEcon&ASc for 8 people in academic units is 22.2%, the rate of FEng for 11 people in academic units is 27.5%, the rate of FTheol for 1 person in academic units is 50%, the rate of FHSc for 2 people in academic units is 11.1%, the ratio of TScVSch for 1 person in academic units is 11.1%, the ratio of 72 students in total to the academic units is 18.6% .In academic units that participate in leisure activities for 2-3 days; The rate of PEd&SCol for 63 people in academic units is 52.5%, the rate of FSc&Litt for 74 people in academic units is 50%, the rate of FEd for 6 people in academic units is 42.9%, the rate of FEcon&ASc for 11 people in academic units is 30.6%, the rate of FEng for 18 people in academic units is 45%, the rate of FTheol for 0 person in academic units is 0%, the rate of FHSc for 13 people in academic units is 72.2%, the ratio of TScVSch for 5 people in academic units is 55.6%, the ratio of 190 students in total to the academic units is 49.1%. In academic units that participate in leisure activities for 4-5 days; The rate of PEd&SCol for 23 people in academic units is 19.2%, the rate of FSc&Litt for 14 people in academic units is 9.5%, the rate of FEd for 5 people in academic units is 35.7%, the rate of FEcon&ASc for 6

people in academic units is 16.7%, the rate of FEng for 3 people in academic units is 7.5%, the rate of FTheol for 0 person in academic units is 0%, the rate of FHSc for 2 people in academic units is 11.1%, the ratio of TScVSch for 2 people in academic units is 22.2%, the ratio of 55 students in total to the academic units is 14.2%. %. In academic units that participate in leisure activities for 6-7 days; The rate of PEd&SCol for 10 people in academic units is 8.3%, the rate of FSc&Litt for 8 people in academic units is 5.4%, the rate of FEd for 1 person in academic units is 7.1%, the rate of FEcon&ASc for 3 people in academic units is 8.3%, the rate of FEng for 2 people in academic units is 5%, the rate of FTheol for 0 person in academic units is 0%, the rate of FHSc for 1 person in academic units is 5.6%, the ratio of TScVSch for 0 person in academic units is 0%, the ratio of 25 students in total to the academic units is 6.5%. In academic units that prefer the expression "I don't do any activity"; It was determined that the rate of PEd&SCol for 5 people in academic units is 4.2%, the rate of FSc&Litt for 24 people in academic units is 16.2%, the rate of FEd for 0 person in academic units is 0%, the rate of FEcon&ASc for 8 people in academic units is 22.2%, the rate of FEng for 6 people in academic units is 15%, the rate of FTheol for 1 person in academic units is 50%, the rate of FHSc for 0 person in academic units is 0%, the ratio of TScVSch for 1 person in academic units is 11.1%, the ratio of 45 students in total to the academic units is 11.6%(p<0.05).

Table 5. Gender mann whitney u test

Sub-Dimensions	Group	N	Mean Rank	Rank Total	U	P
Goal Setting and Method	Female	222	195,55	43411,00	17972,000	,752
	Male	165	191,92	31667,00		
Leisure Attitude	Female	222	184,07	40862,50	16109,500	,038*
	Male	165	207,37	34215,50		
Programming	Female	222	188,81	41916,00	17163,000	,287
	Male	165	200,98	33162,00		
Evaluation	Female	222	203,69	45219,00	16164,000	,046*
	Male	165	180,96	29859,00		

In Table 5, according to leisure management sub-dimensions and gender variable, it was seen that there was no significant difference in goal setting, method and programming sub-dimensions of male and female students. However, it was found that there was a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of leisure attitude and evaluation. In

the leisure attitude sub-dimension of meaningful differentiation, the mean rank of male students was higher than that of females, and in the evaluation sub-dimension, the mean rank of female students was higher than that of males (p<0.05).

Table 6. Marital status mann whitney u test

Sub-Dimensions	Group	N	Mean Rank	Rank Total	U	P
Goal Setting and Method	Single	380	193,59	73563,00	1173,000	,591
	Married	7	216,43	1515,00		
Leisure Attitude	Single	380	193,71	73611,00	1221,000	,703
	Married	7	209,57	1467,00		
Programming	Single	380	194,30	73834,50	1215,500	,695
	Married	7	177,64	1243,50		
Evaluation	Single	380	193,68	73596,50	1206,500	,671
	Married	7	211,64	1481,50		

In Table 6, in the variable of marital status in the sub-dimensions of leisure management, it was seen that there was no significant difference between single and married students (p<0.05).

Table 7. Age groups kruskal-wallis test.

Sub-Dimensions	Age	N	Mean Rank	SD	χ^2	P
Goal Setting and Method	18-20	220	183,94	3	5,333	,149
	21-23	148	205,08			
	24-25	12	207,83			
	26<	7	252,14			
Leisure Attitude	18-20	220	183,22	3	9,046	,029*
	21-23	148	202,12			
	24-25	12	259,17			
	26<	7	249,36			
Programming	18-20	220	196,59	3	2,794	,424
	21-23	148	186,13			
	24-25	12	238,08			
	26<	7	203,43			
Evaluation	18-20	220	190,86	3	4,291	,232
	21-23	148	194,50			
	24-25	12	195,83			
	26<	7	279,00			

In Table 7, according to the scale sub-dimensions and age groups, it is seen that there is no significant difference in goal setting and method and programming sub-dimensions, while there is a significant difference in the leisure attitude sub-dimension. [χ^2 (3) =9,046; p=0.029; p<0.05].It is seen

that the significant differentiation stems from the students aged 24-25 according to the mean rank of the age groups in the leisure attitude sub-dimension (p<0.05).

Table 8. Interclass kruskal-wallis test.

Sub-Dimensions	Class	N	Mean Rank	SD	χ^2	P
Goal Setting and Method	1 class	209	177,26	3	11,698	,008*
	2 class	85	220,97			
	3 class	31	221,32			
	4 class	62	199,80			
Leisure Attitude	1 class	209	177,81	3	10,873	,012*
	2 class	85	220,76			
	3 class	31	202,24			
	4 class	62	207,77			
Programming	1 class	209	200,10	3	1,385	,709
	2 class	85	185,64			
	3 class	31	187,16			
	4 class	62	188,33			
Evaluation	1 class	209	184,93	3	6,171	,104
	2 class	85	204,16			
	3 class	31	233,89			
	4 class	62	190,69			

In Table 8, according to the scale sub-dimensions and age groups, it is seen that there is no significant difference in programming and evaluation sub-dimensions and there is a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of goal setting and method and leisure attitude.It was understood that the significant differentiation in the sub-dimension of goal

setting and method resulted from the 3rd grade students according to the average rank of the classes in the sub-dimension of leisure time attitude, it was seen that the significant difference was due to the 2nd grade students according to the average rank of the classes (p<0.05).

Table 9. Academic units kruskal-wallis test.

Sub-Dimensions	Academic Units	N	Mean Rank	SD	χ^2	P
Goal Setting and Method	PEd&SCol.	120	161,15	7	22,922	,002*
	FSc&Litt.	148	200,52			
	FEEd.	14	210,50			
	FEcon&ASc.	36	245,83			
	FEng.	40	216,18			
	FTheol.	2	78,75			
	FHSc.	18	206,44			
TScvSch.	9	194,06				
Leisure Attitude	PEd&SCol.	120	163,52			,007*
	FSc&Litt.	148	194,91			
	FEEd.	14	228,68			

	FEcon&ASc.	36	237,26	7	19,571	
	FEng.	40	208,36			
	FTheol.	2	224,00			
	FHSc.	18	221,56			
	TScVSch.	9	232,78			
Programming	PEd&SCol.	120	218,27	7	13,216	,067
	FSc&Litt.	148	180,31			
	FEd.	14	195,68			
	FEcon&ASc.	36	200,51			
	FEng.	40	184,18			
	FTheol.	2	89,25			
	FHSc.	18	196,25			
	TScVSch.	9	129,22			
Evaluation	PEdSCol.	120	177,55	7	15,028	,036*
	FSc&Litt.	148	188,74			
	FEd.	14	221,68			
	FEcon&ASc.	36	232,06			
	FEng.	40	232,95			
	FTheol.	2	94,25			
	FHSc.	18	179,33			
	TScVSch.	9	183,00			

According to Table 9, between the academic unit groups, it was understood that there was no significant difference in the programming sub-dimension. It is seen that there is a significant difference in other sub-dimensions; goal setting and method, leisure time attitude and evaluation. In the meaningful differentiation within academic units in the sub-dimensions of goal setting and method, leisure attitude and evaluation, it is seen that the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences has higher rank averages in the

sub-dimensions of goal setting and method than other academic units. It is seen that the students of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences have a higher average rank in the sub-dimension of leisure attitude than the students in other academic units, and in the evaluation sub-dimension, the students of the Faculty of Architecture and Engineering have a higher average rank than the students in other academic units ($p < 0.05$).

Table 10. Weekly leisure activity Kruskal-Wallis test.

Sub-Dimensions	Academic Units	N	Mean Rank	SD	χ^2	P
Goal Setting and Method	1- day	72	196,39	26,086 4	26,086	,000*
	2-3 days	190	182,46			
	4-5 days	55	168,51			
	6-7 days	25	193,24			
	No Activity	45	270,49			
Leisure Attitude	1 day	72	198,15	4	,, 6,654	,155
	2-3 days	190	189,07			
	4-5 days	55	186,55			
	6-7 days	25	171,46			
	No Activity	45	229,79			
Programming	1 day	72	193,53	4	4,849	,303
	2-3 days	190	196,93			
	4-5 days	55	210,75			
	6-7 days	25	191,70			
	No Activity	45	163,16			
Evaluation	1 day	72	193,53	4	25,213	,000*
	2-3 days	190	196,93			
	4-5 days	55	210,75			
	6-7 days	25	191,70			
	No Activity	45	163,16			

In Table 10, according to the scale sub-dimensions and the days when the students participated in leisure activities, it was seen that there was no significant difference in the leisure attitude and programming sub-dimensions. It is seen that there is a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of goal setting and method and evaluation. In the sub-dimensions of goal setting, method and evaluation, according to the mean rank of students' leisure activities; In the sub-dimension of goal setting and method, it is understood that the students who participate in leisure time

activities 1 day a week have a higher rank average than the other days. In the evaluation sub-dimension, it was observed that the students who participated in leisure activities 4-5 days a week had a higher rank average than the other days.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The aim of the research is to examine the leisure management, attitudes and behaviors of the students studying at Kilis 7 September University. Age, gender,

marital status, class, academic units and leisure activity days per week of 387 students participating in the study were examined in order to determine their leisure management. According to the age variable, it was understood that 220 students aged 18-20 (56.8%), 148 students aged 21-23 (38.2%), 12 students aged 24-25 (3.1%), and 7 students aged 26 and over (1.8%) were participated in the study. It was understood that there were 222 women (57.4%) and 165 men (42.6%) according to the gender variable and 380 single people (98.2%) and 7 married people (1.8%) according to their marital status. At the class level, it was understood that 1st graders consisted of 209 (54%), 2nd graders 85 (22%), 3rd graders 31 (8%) and 4th graders 62 (16%). In academic units; it was determined that 120 people (31%) from Physical Education and Sports College, 148 people (38.2%) from Faculty of Science and Literature, 14 people (3.6%) from Muallim Rifat Faculty of Education, 36 people (9.3%) from Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 40 people (10.3%) from Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, 2 people (0.5%) from Faculty of Theology, 18 people (4.7%) from Faculty of Health Sciences and 9 people (2.3%) from Technical Sciences Vocational School attended in the study. In line with the preferences of the students, it was understood that 72 people (18.6%) are active for 1 day a week, 190 people (49.1%) are active for 2-3 days, 55 people (14.2%) are active for 4-5 days, 25 people (6.5%) are active for 6-7 days and those who stated they did not do activities are 45 people (11.6%). Considering the total number of activity days between genders; it is seen that there are 43 women who do leisure activities for one day a week and the ratio of them to the total women is 19.4%, there are 29 men whose ratio to the total number of men is 17.6% and the ratio of 72 people in total to the academic units is 18.6%. It is seen that there are 115 women who do leisure activities for 2-3 days and the rate of them in total women is 51.8 %, there are 75 men whose rate in total men is 45.5 %, and in total, the rate of 190 people in the academic units is 49.1%. It is seen that there are 26 women who do leisure activities for 4-5 days, the ratio of them to the total women is 11.7%, there are 29 men whose ratio to the total men is 17.6% and the ratio of 55 people in total to the academic units is 14.2%. It is seen that there are 11 women who do leisure activities for 6-7 days and the rate of them is 5% in total women, there are 14 men whose rate is 8.5% in total men and the ratio of 25 people to the academic units is 6.5%. It has been determined that there are 27 women who do not engage in leisure activities and the ratio of them in total women is 12.2%, there are 18 men whose ratio in total men is 10.9% and the ratio of 45 people in total to the academic units is 11.6%. According to leisure management sub-dimensions and gender variable, it was seen that there was no significant difference in goal setting, method and programming sub-dimensions of male and female students. However, it was found that there was a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of leisure attitude and evaluation. In the leisure time attitude sub-dimension of meaningful differentiation, the mean rank of male students was higher than that of females, and in the evaluation sub-dimension, the mean

rank of female students was higher than that of

males. According to the scale sub-dimensions and age groups, it is seen that there is no significant difference in goal setting and method and programming sub-dimensions, while there is a significant difference in the leisure attitude sub-dimension. It is seen that the significant differentiation stems from the students aged 24-25 according to the mean rank of the age groups in the leisure attitude sub-dimension. According to the scale sub-dimensions and age groups, it is seen that there is no significant difference in programming and evaluation sub-dimensions and there is a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of goal setting and method and leisure attitude. It was understood that the significant differentiation in the sub-dimension of goal setting and method resulted from the 3rd grade students according to the average rank of the classes. In the sub-dimension of leisure attitude, it was seen that the significant difference was due to the 2nd grade students according to the average rank of the classes. Between the academic unit groups, it was understood that there was no significant difference in the programming sub-dimension. It is seen that there is a significant difference in other sub-dimensions; goal setting and method, leisure attitude and evaluation. In the meaningful differentiation within academic units in the sub-dimensions of goal setting and method, leisure time attitude and evaluation, it is seen that the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences has higher rank averages in the sub-dimensions of goal setting and method than other academic units. It is seen that the students of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences have a higher average rank in the sub-dimension of leisure attitude than the students in other academic units, and in the evaluation sub-dimension, the students of the Faculty of Architecture and Engineering have a higher average rank than the students in other academic units. According to the scale sub-dimensions and the days when the students participated in leisure activities, it was seen that there was no significant difference in the leisure attitude and programming sub-dimensions. It is seen that there is a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of goal setting and method and evaluation. In the sub-dimensions of goal setting, method and evaluation, according to the mean rank of students' leisure activities; In the sub-dimension of goal setting and method, it is understood that the students who participate in leisure activities 1 day a week have a higher rank average than the other days. In the evaluation sub-dimension, it was observed that the students who participated in leisure activities 4-5 days a week had a higher rank average than the other days.

REFERENCES

1. Adair, J. (2006). *Effective time management*. (Translated by Ö. Çolakoğlu). Istanbul: Babiali Culture.
2. Sabuncuoğlu, Z., Paşa, M., and Kaymaz, K. (2010). *Time management*. Istanbul: Beta Publishing.
3. Torkildsen, G. (2005). *Leisure and Recreation Management*, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, London and New York.
4. Terzioglu, E. (1992). "Psycho-Social Characteristics of Folk Dance Players in Turkish Folklore and the Effect of Dances on Personality Development", Istanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Istanbul.
5. Şahin C. K, Akten, S., Erol, U. E. (2009). *A Study on Determining the Participation of Egridir Vocational School*

- Students in Recreation Activities, Artvin Coruh University Journal of Forestry Faculty, 10 (1), p.62-71.
6. Tezcan, M. (1977). Leisure Sociology, Doğan Printing House, Ankara.
 7. Karakucuk, S. (1987). Leisure Tendencies of Open Education Faculty Students, Anadolu University Press, Eskişehir.
 8. Akgul, B. M., and Karakucuk, S. (2015). Leisure management scale: A validity-reliability study. International Journal of Human Sciences, 12(2), 1867-1880.
 9. Karakucuk, S. (2008). "Recreation" evaluation of leisure. Ankara: Gazi Bookstore.
 10. Aydogan, I. (2006). Leisure Evaluation Activities of Female Instructors. Erciyes University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 1(21), 217-232.
 11. Pearce, R. (2004). "How To Stretch Time – 24 Hours Is Enough!". www.leader-values.com (Erişim Tarihi: 29.06.2019).
 12. Kilbas, S. (1994). Youth and Evaluation of Leisure, Çukurova University Press, Adana.
 13. Aytaç, O. (2002). Theoretical Approaches to Leisure, Fırat University Journal of Social Sciences, Vol: 12, Issue: 1, p. 232-233, Elazığ.
 14. Kocaekşi, S. (Ed.) (2012). Leisure and Recreation Management, Anadolu University Web-offset Facilities, Eskişehir.
 15. Misra, R., & Mckean, M. (2000). College students' academic stress and its relation to their anxiety, time management, and leisure satisfaction. American Journal of Health Studies, 16(1), 41-45.
 16. Sayan, I. (2005). Time Management in Executive Nurses. Master Thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul.
 17. Yaşartürk, F., Akyüz, H., and Karataş, İ. (2018). Investigation of the Relationship between Leisure Management and Organizational Factors Affecting Academic Achievement of Recreation Department Students. Journal of Sport Sciences Research, 3(2), 233-243.
 18. Çağlayan, V. and Göral, R. (2009). Time management skills: An evaluation on vocational school students. KMU FEdo and ASc. Journal, 17.
 19. Basak, T., Uzun S. and Arslan, F. (2008). Time management skills of nursing college students. TAF Preventive Medicine Bulletin, 7(5), 429-434.
 20. Covey, S. R., Merrill, A. R. and Merrill, R. R. (2004). First things first: To live, to love, to learn, to leave a legacy. NY: Covey Leadership Center, Inc.