The relationship between leisure time management and leisure time benefit: A study on private sector employees

Ümit Can Büyükakgül[1]

Abstract

Research aim. The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between leisure management and leisure benefits of individuals working in the private sector. **Method.** The sample of this study was formed by using the purposive sampling method. A total of 231 males and 118 females took part in the sample consisting of 349 participants. Free Time Management Scale and Leisure Benefit Scale were used to collect the data. To analyze the data MANOVA and Pearson-Correlation tests were performed. **Findings.** There are no significant differences between demographic variables and Free Time Management Scale total points. There is only a significant difference between work experience and Leisure Benefit Scale total points. Also, there is no significant correlation between the two scales' dimensions. **Conclusions.** Briefly, it can be said that no significant relationship was found between the benefit of the participants from recreational activities and their perceptions of managing their leisure time.

Keywords: Leisure time management, Leisure time benefit, Private sector employees.

1. Introduction

Leisure can be expressed as a period that includes activities that people can participate in voluntarily (Daniel et al., 2008; Güldür and Yaşartürk, 2020). People participate in leisure activities according to their wishes, and these activities are evaluated as a rest and renewal process, and it has been stated that they have an important position for a better quality of life (Karoğlu and Atasoy, 2018). It has been stated that the ability to manage leisure can affect people's stress levels, academic achievement, and socialization positively or negatively (Eranıl and Özcan, 2018). Fişekçioğlu and Özsarı (2017) have stated that leisure management can be defined as individuals acting in a planned and programmed manner to evaluate the time outside of the time they need to work and to meet their needs. People can evaluate their leisure in a variety of ways in line with their interests, needs and expectations (Polat et al., 2019).

The concept of leisure benefit is defined as the positive effects that individuals experience during leisure activities (Driver, 1990; Eskiler, Yıldız and Ayhan, 2019). Ajzen (1991) has evaluated leisure benefits as individuals' reaching their goals of participating in leisure activities (Chang et al., 2018). Chen (2001) on the other hand, addressed leisure benefits as individuals who subjectively evaluate the demand for satisfaction to improve physical and mental conditions

during and after participation in leisure activities (Akgül, Ertüzün and Karaküçük, 2018). Hung (2012) generally classifies leisure benefits into three groups as physical, psychological and social.

The fact that people work effectively and efficiently in working life and support the production process is also related to the activities performed in social life. Particularly, positive or negative emotions, situations and events experienced during non-working time can affect people at various levels by reflecting on their working lives (Demir and Demir, 2014). In this context, this study aimed to examine the relationship between leisure management and leisure benefits of individuals working in the private sector.

2. Method

2.1. Research Sample

The sample of this study was formed by using the purposive sampling method, which was one of the non-probability sampling methods. A total of 231 males and 118 females took part in the sample consisting of 349 participants. While the mean age of male participants was 38.11 (SD=7.56), the mean age of female participants was 33.99 (SD=7.70).

2.2. Data Collecting Tools

Questions were included in the questionnaire to determine the variables of gender, marital status, education level, working time at the institution and weekly leisure. Moreover, the "Free Time Management Scale" (FTMS), developed by Wang et al. in 2011 and adapted into Turkish by Akgül and Karaküçük in 2015, and the "Leisure Benefit Scale" (LBS) developed by Ho in 2008 and adapted into Turkish by Akgül, Ertüzün and Karaküçük in 2018 were used.

2.3. Analysis of Data

While examining the demographic variables of the participants, percentage and frequency tables were used. Evaluations were performed based on the mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis values of the total scores of the scales used. Besides, the MANOVA test was used to examine whether there was a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the scale according to gender, marital status, work experience and weekly leisure time.

3. Results

Table 1. Table of demographic variables

Variables		F	%
Gender	Male	231	66,2
	Female	118	33,8
	Total	349	100
Marital status	Married	256	73,4
	Single	93	26,6
	Total	349	100
Educational status	High School	70	20,1
	Associate Degree	50	14,3
	Undergraduate	204	58,5
	Postgraduate	25	7,2
	Total	349	100
Work experience	Less than 1 year	49	14,0
	1-5 years	87	24,9
	6-10 years	72	20,6
	11-15 years	62	17,8
	16 years and more	79	22,6
	Total	349	100
Weekly leisure time	1-5 hours	133	38,1
	6-10 hours	90	25,8
	11-15 hours	50	14,3
	16 hours and more	76	21,8
	Total	349	100

Table 1 showed the distribution of demographic information of the participants in the research. According to the results of the analysis, 66.2% of the participants were "Male", 73.4% "Married", 58.5% "Bachelor" graduates, 24.9% of them were in the company "between 1-5 years". Besides, it was determined that 38.1% of them had leisure time between "1-5 hours" per week.

Table 2. Distribution of scale scores

	Sub-dimensions	Item number	n	Mean	Sd.	Skewness	Kurtosis
FTMS	Goal setting and evaluating	6	349	3.65	0.82	-0.74	0.47
	Technique	3	349	3.60	0.69	-0.69	0.94
	Free time attitudes	3	349	4.28	0.52	-0.07	-0.88
	Scheduling	3	349	4.47	0.53	-0.97	0.32
LBS	Physical Benefit	7	349	4.06	0.50	-0.28	1.68
	Psychological Benefit	8	349	4.05	0.51	-0.18	1.31
	Social Benefit	9	349	3.97	0.49	-0.21	1.21

In Table 2, the mean scores of the individuals participating in the research from the sub-dimensions of the scale were given. According to the analysis results, it was determined that the highest mean score in the sub-dimensions of FTMS was in the " Scheduling " (4.47) sub-dimension, and the lowest mean score was in the " Technique " (3.60) sub-dimension. In the sub-dimensions of LBS, it was determined that the highest mean score was in the "Physical Benefit" (4.06) sub-dimension, and the lowest average score was in the "Social Benefit" (3.97) sub-dimension.

Table 3. MANOVA Results of LBS-FTMS Scale Scores by Gender

Scales	Male (n=231)		Female (n=118)	
	Mean	Sd.	Mean	Sd.
FTMS				
Goal setting and evaluating	3.67	0.79	3.60	0.86
Technique	3.63	0.66	3.54	0.76
Free time attitude	4.32	0.53	4.22	0.50
Scheduling	4.49	0.53	4.44	0.54
LBS				
Physical Benefit	4.05	0.48	4.09	0.55
Psychological Benefit	4.04	0.50	4.08	0.52
Social Benefit	3.97	0.49	3.98	0.49

Results of MANOVA analysis in Table 3 showed that the main effect of gender on the sub-factors of FTMS was not significant, and there was no statistically significant difference between the sub-dimensions [λ= 0.989, F(4,344)=.940; p>0.05]. The main effect of the participants' genders on the sub-dimensions of LBS was not significant, and there was no statistically significant difference between the sub-dimensions. [λ= 0.997, F$_{(3,345)}$=.365; p>0.05].

Table 4. MANOVA Results of LBS-FTMS Scale Scores Regarding Marital Status

Scales		Married (n=256)		Single (n=93)	
		Mean	Sd.	Mean	Sd.
FTMS	Goal setting and evaluating	3.68	0.82	3.57	0.80
	Technique	3.63	0.68	3.52	0.73
	Free time attitude	4.30	0.52	4.22	0.52
	Scheduling	4.50	0.50	4.39	0.61
LBS	Physical Benefit	4.04	0.47	4.12	0.57
	Psychological Benefit	4.03	0.48	4.13	0.57
	Social Benefit	3.97	0.46	4.00	0.57

Results of MANOVA analysis in Table 4 showed that the main effect of marital status on the sub-factors of FTMS was not significant, and no statistically significant difference was found between the sub-dimensions [λ= 0.987, F$_{(4,344)}$=1.146; p>0.05]. The main effect of the participants'

marital status on the sub-dimensions of the LBS was not significant, and no statistically significant difference was found between the sub-dimensions [$\lambda = 0.985$, $F_{(3,345)}=1.791$; $p>0.05$].

Table 5. MANOVA Results of FTMS-LBS Scale Scores Regarding Experience in the Institution

Scales	Less than 1 year (n=49)		1-5 Years (n=87)		6-10 Years (n=72)		11-15 Years (n=62)		16 Years and more (n=79)	
	Mean	Sd.	Mean	Sd.	Mean	Sd.	Mean	Sd.	Mean	Sd.
LTMS										
Goal setting and evaluating	3.56	0.87	3.69	0.78	3.59	0.80	3.77	0.88	3.62	0.79
Technique	3.51	0.68	3.70	0.69	3.53	0.75	3.67	0.63	3.57	0.70
Free time attitude	4.15	0.54	4.33	0.52	4.29	0.52	4.32	0.47	4.28	0.54
Scheduling	4.40	0.63	4.43	0.55	4.42	0.57	4.58	0.44	4.54	0.47
LBS										
Physical Benefit	4.20	0.54	4.08	0.54	4.08	0.45	4.05	0.44	3.94	0.51
Psychological Benefit	4.21	0.54	4.08	0.50	4.10	0.44	4.02	0.55	3.92	0.50
Social Benefit	4.11	0.49	3.97	0.47	4.01	0.43	3.94	0.55	3.89	0.51

The results of MANOVA analysis in Table 5 showed that the main effect of experience in the institution on the sub-factors of FTMS was not significant, and no statistically significant difference was found between the sub-dimensions [$\lambda = 0.962$, $F_{(16,1042)}=.839$; $p>0.05$]. It was determined that the main effect of the participant's experience in the institution on the sub-dimensions of LBS was not significant [$\lambda=0.962$, $F_{(12,905)}=1.104$; $p<0.05$]. However, at the sub-dimensions level, only the "Psychological Benefit" sub-dimension [$F_{(4,344)} =2.780$; $p<0.05$] was determined to be a significant difference. It was determined that the mean scores of individuals who have worked in the institution for less than 1 year were higher than the scores of other individuals.

Table 6. MANOVA Results of FTMS-LBS Scale Scores According to Weekly Leisure

Scales	1-5 hours (n=133)		6-10 hours (n=90)		11-15 hours (n=50)		16 hours and more (n=76)	
	Mean	Sd.	Mean	Sd.	Mean	Sd.	Mean	Sd.
FTMS								
Goal setting and evaluating	3.72	0.77	3.67	0.88	3.60	0.83	3.55	0.81
Technique	3.66	0.65	3.56	0.75	3.62	0.64	3.53	0.73
Free time attitude	4.30	0.51	4.30	0.55	4.37	0.51	4.18	0.51
Scheduling	4.47	0.50	4.50	0.55	4.52	0.52	4.43	0.59
LBS								
Physical Benefit	4.07	0.52	4.01	0.44	4.00	0.47	4.14	0.55
Psychological Benefit	4.01	0.50	4.03	0.44	4.08	0.60	4.14	0.53
Social Benefit	3.93	0.52	3.94	0.43	3.99	0.54	4.08	0.48

Results of MANOVA analysis in Table 6 showed that the main effect of weekly leisure periods on the sub-dimensions of LBS was not significant, and no statistically significant difference was found between the sub-dimensions [$\lambda = 0.975$, $F_{(12,905)}=.716$; $p>0.05$]. The main effect of the participants' weekly leisure on the sub-dimensions of LBS was not significant, and no statistically significant difference was found between the sub-dimensions [$\lambda = 0.965$, $F_{(9,834)}=1.358$; $p>0.05$].

Table 7. Results of Correlation Analysis Between FTMS-LBS Scale Scores

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
F1	1						
F2	.723**	1					
F3	.224**	.200**	1				
F4	.366**	.228**	.329**	1			
F5	.036	.049	.025	.103	1		
F6	-.050	.045	.055	.063	.805**	1	
F7	-.012	.047	.052	.097	.713**	.843**	1

**(p<0.01) F1= Goal Setting and Evaluating, F2=Technique, F3= Free Time Attitude, F4=Scheduling, F5=Physical Benefit, F6=Psychological Benefit, F7=Social Benefit

In Table 7, the Pearson Correlation coefficient was evaluated for the determination of the relationship between FTMS and LBS. According to the results of the analysis, it was determined that there was no statistically significant relationship between the sub-dimensions of LBS and the sub-dimensions of FTMS.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

When the literature on leisure was examined, it can be said that some demographic characteristics affect leisure time management and the benefit to be gained from this time (Çakır, 2017; Demir and Alpullu, 2020). It is assumed that the variables of gender, marital status, educational status, experience in the institution and weekly leisure in this study will create significant differences in the answers given by the participants to the questions in the scales.

First of all, as a result of the examination of the scale total scores of the participants, it was determined that their perceptions of leisure time management were high. When the situation regarding the sub-dimensions of the scale was examined, it was seen that the leisure attitude and scheduling sub-dimensions have high means. It was seen that this situation was different from some studies (Çakır, 2017; Demir and Alpullu, 2020). In the mentioned studies, it was seen that the Scheduling sub-dimension was high, and the leisure attitude sub-dimension was low. In this study, it was seen that both were high. It was thought that different demographic characteristics of the participants affected the formation of this difference. In the studies of Çakır (2017) and Demir and Alpullu (2020), the fact that the sample consisted of university students may have caused similar results. Besides, according to the results of a similar study conducted by Çuhadar et al. (2019) with high school students, while leisure attitude and Scheduling among the sub-dimensions of FTMS reached the highest mean, they remained at similar levels with university students.

Similarly, it was determined that the perceptions of the participants regarding the recreational benefit were high. In the study conducted by Ertüzün, Gaye, and Fidan (2020) with sports club members and using LBS, it was seen that the participants had lower means in the sub-dimensions of the scale compared to the participants in this research. In the study of Ertüzün, Gaye and Fidan, the mean age of the participants (Mean$_{age}$ = 22.76) was quite low compared to the mean age of this study (Mean$_{age}$ = 36.05). Depending on this difference, it can be considered as a normal situation that the benefit of young individuals from recreational activities and the benefit of older individuals were different. However, the situation that the recreational benefit perceptions of young individuals may be higher can be evaluated differently following the results obtained from the study of Serdar (2020). In fact, in Serdar's (2020) study, which examined the relationship between the benefit of university students from their leisure and their happiness levels, it was concluded that younger individuals (Mean$_{age}$ = 20.98) may have higher perceptions of recreational benefit. Based on this information, it should not be forgotten that although the gender variable was an important variable in understanding individuals' perceptions of recreational benefit, other variables may also be related to this perception.

The total scores of both scales used in this study and the mean scores of their sub-dimensions did not show significant differences according to the variables of gender, marital status and weekly leisure. In this context, it was determined that only the variable of experience in the institution made a significant difference in the psychological sub-dimension of LBS. It can be stated that those who had just started working in the institution had a higher perception of a psychological benefit than those who were working in the past.

Finally, according to the answers of the participants, it was examined whether there was a relationship between the dimensions of LBS and FTMS. No significant relationship was found between the two scales. Depending on this situation, no significant relationship was found between the benefit of the participants from recreational activities and their perceptions of managing their leisure.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). Benefits of Leisure: A Social Psychological Perspective. In Benefits of Leisure; Driver, B.L., Brown, P.J., Peterson, G.L., Eds.; Venture Publishing: Stage College, PA, USA, pp. 411–417.

Akgül, B. M., & Karaküçük, S. (2015). Free time management scale: Validity and reliability analysis Boş zaman yönetimi ölçeği: Geçerlik-güvenirlik çalışması. Journal of Human Sciences, 12(2), 1867-1880.

Akgül, B.M., Ertüzün, E. & Karaküçük, S. (2018). Leisure benefit scale: A study of validity and reliability. Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi. 23(1), 25-34.

Çakır, V. O. (2017). Üniversite öğrencilerin serbest zaman doyum düzeyleri ile serbest zaman yönetimleri arasındaki ilişki. Gaziantep Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2(3), 17-27.

Chang, Y.C., Yeh, T.M., Pai, F.Y. & Huang, T.P. (2018). Sport activity for health!! The effects of karate participants' involvement, perceived value, and leisure benefits on recommendation intention. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 15, 953.

Chen, Z. Y. (2001). The study of elementary teachers' leisure participation, experience in leisure benefits, and work satisfaction in Taipei Country. National Taiwan Normal University.

Çuhadar, A., Demirel, M., Er, Y., & Serdar, E. (2019). Lise öğrencilerinde boş zaman yönetimi ve gelecek beklentisi ilişkisi. Journal of International Social Research, 12(66).

Daniel, D. M., Army, R. H. & Nancy, B. R. (2008). Kraus' recreation and leisure in modern society. (8th Edition). Boston: Jones and Barlett Publishers.

Demir, G., & Alpullu, A. (2020). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Boş Zaman Yönetiminin Değerlendirilmesi. Eurasian Research in Sport Science, 5(1), 94-102.

Demir, M. & Demir, Ş.S. (2014). İş görenlerin serbest zaman gereksinimi ve serbest zaman doyumunu etkileyen faktörler. İşletme ve İktisat Çalışmaları Dergisi. 2(3), 74-84.

Driver, B.L. (1990). The North American experience in measuring the benefits of leisure. In Proceedings National Workshop on Measurement of Recreation Benefits. Bandoora, Australia: Phillip Institute of Technology. 1-57.

Eranıl, A.K. & Özcan, M. (2018). Lise öğrencilerinin boş zaman yönetimi becerisinin incelenmesi. Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 6(6), 779-785.

Ertüzün, E., Gaye, H. & Fidan, E. (2020). Spor merkezine üye bireylerin rekreasyon fayda düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. Spor ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi, 11(3), 231-244.

Eskiler, E., Yıldız, Y. & Ayhan, C. (2019). The effect of leisure benefits on leisure satisfaction: Extreme Sports. Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise. 21(1), 16-20.

Fişekçioğlu, İ.B. & Özsarı, A. (2017). Leisure time management and the attitudes of disabled athletes. İnternational Journal of Science Culture and Sport. 5(4), 302-318.

Güldür, B.B. & Yaşartürk, F. (2020). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin rekreasyon faaliyetlerine katılımındaki fayda ve yaşam doyum düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. International Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies. 6(2), 495-506.

Ho, T. K. (2008). A study of leisure attitudes and benefits for senior high school students at PingTung City and country in Taiwan. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). United States Sports Academy, Daphne, AL.

Hung, H. J. (2012). A study on leisure benefits breaking through leisure activities. Journal of National Taiwan Normal University, 3(4), 77-92.

Karoğlu, A.K. & Atasoy, B. (2018). Sosyal medya kullanımı ile serbest zaman tatmini arasındaki ilişki. Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 42(2), 826-839.

Polat, E., Yoka, K., Can, B. & Yılmaz, K. (2019). Taraftar özdeşleşme düzeyi, yaşam tatmini ve serbest zaman tatmini arasındaki ilişkilerin karşılaştırılması. Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi. 13(2), 116-127.

Serdar, E. (2020). The effects of perceived freedom in leisure on leisure benefits: students of the faculty of sports science. Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise, 22(2), 208-213.

Wang, W. C., Kao, C. H., Huan, T. C., & Wu, C. C. (2011). Free time management contributes to better quality of life: A study of undergraduate students in Taiwan. Journal of Happiness Studies, 12(4), 561-573.