

## The Relationship between Leisure Satisfaction and Hopelessness

 Yeşim Avunduk

Phd, İstanbul Ayyansaray University, İstanbul, Turkey.

### ARTICLE INFORMATION

Original Research Paper  
Doi:  
Received December. 2020  
Accepted January. 2021

#### Keywords:

Leisure,  
Leisure Satisfaction,  
Hopelessness.

### ABSTRACT

The study aims to determine whether there is a significant difference between the satisfaction and hopelessness levels of individuals in leisure activities by certain variables. The study sample consisted of 250 volunteer students, 143 (% 62.4) males, and 107 (% 37.6) females, studying at Istanbul University-Cerrahpaşa Faculty of Sport Sciences. The participants were selected by random sampling method. Data collection instrument of the study involved a personal information form, the "Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS)" developed by Beard and Raghep (29) and adapted into Turkish by Gökçe and Orhan (30), and "Beck Hopelessness Scale (BHS)" that was developed by Beck et al. (31) and adapted into Turkish by Seber et al. (32). Since the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results revealed that the study data did not show a normal distribution, it was analyzed using T-Test, ANOVA, and Pearson Correlation Test. Significant differences were found between the LSS sub-dimensions by gender and department of the participants. Similar differences were also seen between the BHS sub-dimensions by gender. Besides, there was a significant negative relationship between LSS and BHS. It was concluded that leisure satisfaction and hopelessness levels vary by certain variables, and as satisfaction in leisure time increases, hopelessness decreases.

### 1. Introduction

Recent developments in technology and changes in the modern lifestyle have influenced agents' social environments and habits (1), which leads to a particular interest in leisure activities. (2). The research revealed that leisure contributes to protecting physical, cognitive, social, and emotional health and prevents the emergence of adverse outcomes. Leisure is not the only period when a person acts productively. However, the sense of freedom accompanying leisure is also a factor that a person subjectively makes the best sense of that period (3). Leisure activities allow people to voluntarily participate during the remaining time except for their work (4).

Yang (5) indicated that leisure activities help agents improve mental and physical health, increase participation in teamwork, develop creativity and productivity in daily life. Although leisure goals are diverse, the common goal is to be satisfied and gratified during leisure activities (6). Amestoy et al. (7) stated that leisure satisfaction is a complex human need met by the production and consumption of enjoyable experiences. In other words, it is closely related to the perceptions about leisure quality. In general, it refers to the pleasure and contentment with leisure activities (8). According to Chick et al. (9), leisure satisfaction is a function of the difference between conditions individuals think they deserve, expect or desire and the actual experiences.

Hope refers to the minimum expectations in achieving a future goal (10). Hopelessness can be explained as the absence of expectations for a specific outcome (11). A pessimistic point of view characterizes hopelessness and negative expectations for the future and generally involves the generalization of such an unfavorable perspective (12). Hopelessness and despair generally occur due to the interrelations between specific cognitive processes (13). According to the American Psychological Association (1997), the causes of hopelessness involve the followings:

- The loneliness that stems from the restriction of the activities,
- A health problem,
- Stress,
- Loss of faith in God (13).

In the literature, there have been several studies on leisure satisfaction (14-15-16-17-18-19-20-21-22-23) and hopelessness (24-10-25-26-27). However, there are very few studies addressing the relationship between leisure satisfaction and hopelessness. Hence, the current study aimed to clarify the relationships between leisure satisfaction and hopelessness.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Research Model

The quantitative method is an objective research approach based on observation or measurement that can be repeated (28). A quantitative research method- a scanning model- was used in the study.

### 2.2. Research Group

The group consisted of 250 students, 143 (57.2%) males and 107 (42.8%) females, studying at Istanbul University-Cerrahpaşa Faculty of Sport Sciences. The participants were chosen by the random sampling method.

### 2.3. Data Collection Tools

Personal Information Form consists of four items to collect information about the gender, department, and welfare.

Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS) was developed by Beard and Raghep (29) to assess leisure satisfaction and adapted into Turkish by Gökçe and Orhan (30). The 5-point Likert type scale includes 24 items and six sub-scales (Psychological, Educational, Social, Relaxation, Physical, Aesthetics). The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the scale was .90.

Beck Hopelessness Scale (BHS) was developed by Beck et al. (31) and adapted to Turkish by Seber et al. (32). The tool assesses negative expectations for the future. It includes 20 items and three sub-scales (Feelings about the Future, Loss of Motivation, Future Expectations). The minimum score in the inventory is 0; the highest point is 20. High scores indicate a high level of hopelessness. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was .85 for the total scale; .78 for the "Feelings about the Future"; .72 for the "Loss of Motivation," and .72 for the "Future Expectations" sub-scales.

### 2.4. Data Analysis

The analysis was carried out with SPSS 20.0 package program. The percentage and frequency methods were used to describe the distribution of personal information. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test was conducted to determine whether the data collected via an online Google Form had a normal distribution, and the test results indicated the unavailability of a normal distribution. After the normal distribution of the data was ensured, T-test and ANOVA tests were performed. Pearson Correlation test was also used for correlation analysis.



### 3. Results

*Table 1. Demographic Information of Participants*

		<b>f</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Gender</b>	Male	143	57.2
	Female	107	42.8
	<b>Total</b>	250	100.0
<b>Department</b>	Physical Education and Sports	92	36.8
	Coaching	75	30.0
	Sport management	83	33.2
	<b>Total</b>	250	100.0
<b>Welfare Status</b>	High	33	13.2
	Medium	167	66.8
	Low	50	20.0
	<b>Total</b>	250	100.0

Table 1 shows the demographic information about the participants. According to the table, 57.2% were "male", and 42.8% were "female". Among them, 36.8% studied at the department of "Physical Education and Sports Teaching," 30% at "Coaching," and 33.2% at "Sports Management." 13.2% had a "high," 66.8% had "normal," and 20% had "low" level of welfare.

*Table 2. T-Test Results between LSS-BHS Sub-Dimensions by Gender*

		<b>N</b>	<b>Ort.</b>	<b>Ss.</b>	<b>Sd.</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>LEISURE SATISFACTION SCALE (LSS)</b>	Male	143	3.65	0.69	248	2.449	<b>.000*</b>
	Female	107	3.80	0.66			
<b>Psychological</b>	Male	143	3.37	0.88	248	.352	.851
	Female	107	3.64	0.87			
<b>Educational</b>	Male	143	3.62	0.89	248	1.988	<b>.003*</b>
	Female	107	3.80	0.81			
<b>Social</b>	Male	143	3.58	0.85	248	2.205	<b>.004*</b>
	Female	107	3.85	0.79			
<b>Relaxation</b>	Male	143	3.86	0.79	248	2.485	<b>.000*</b>
	Female	107	3.97	0.80			
<b>Physical</b>	Male	143	3.43	0.87	248	2.374	<b>.010*</b>
	Female	107	3.68	0.85			
<b>Aesthetic</b>	Male	143	3.67	0.78	248	1.115	<b>.000*</b>
	Female	107	3.88	0.75			
<b>BECK HOPELESSNESS SCALE (BHS)</b>	Male	143	5.45	3.91	248	4.385	<b>.000*</b>
	Female	107	7.38	3.17			
<b>Feelings about the Future</b>	Male	143	2.35	1.31	248	-.135	.894
	Female	107	2.22	1.43			
<b>Loss of Motivation</b>	Male	143	3.87	2.30	248	-2.815	<b>.010*</b>
	Female	107	4.81	2.89			
<b>Future Expectations</b>	Male	143	2.87	1.38	248	5.684	<b>.000*</b>
	Female	107	1.83	1.45			

Table 2 presents the T-test analysis results between LSS and BHS sub-dimensions by gender. As seen in the table above, there was no statistically significant difference between the "psychological" sub-dimension ( $t_{(248)} = .352$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) by gender; but meaningful differences were found in "educational" ( $t_{(248)} = 1.988$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), "social" ( $t_{(248)} = 2.205$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), "relaxation" ( $t_{(248)} = 2.485$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), "physical" ( $t_{(248)} = 2.374$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and "aesthetics" ( $t_{(248)} = 1.115$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) sub-dimensions.



Besides, no statistically significant difference was found between the "feelings about the future" sub-dimension ( $t_{(248)} = -.135$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) by gender, but a statistically significant difference was seen in "loss of motivation" ( $t_{(248)} = -2.815$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and "future expectations" sub-dimensions ( $t_{(248)} = 5.684$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 3.** Relationships between Leisure Time Satisfaction and Hopelessness

Hopelessness	Leisure Satisfaction	
	r	
		-.205
	p	.000*

Table 3 describes the relationships between the participants' leisure satisfaction and hopelessness levels. According to the analysis, there was a negative and low-level correlation between leisure satisfaction and hopelessness ( $p < 0.05$ ) ( $r = -.20$ ).

## 5. Discussion and Conclusion

This study aimed to describe leisure satisfaction and hopelessness levels by certain variables and clarify the relationship between leisure satisfaction and hopelessness.

According to the analysis, there was a statistically meaningful difference between leisure satisfaction by gender. In terms of the sub-dimensions, a significant difference was found between all sub-dimensions except the "psychological." It was observed that the mean scores of the female participants were higher than the male participants in those sub-dimensions. In other words, women got higher satisfaction during leisure activities than men. The studies in the literature also revealed that the participants achieved satisfaction during leisure activities in at least one sub-dimension, which is in parallel with the current findings (15-14-23-16-33-34).

A statistically significant difference was also seen in "loss of motivation" and "future expectations" sub-dimensions, except for "feelings about the future" by gender. Besides, a significant difference was measured in the total hopelessness scores by gender. It was determined that females' hopelessness scores were higher than males, so it can be inferred that women were more hopeless about the future than men. Özben and Argun (25) and Gençay (24) also emphasized a significant difference in the "loss of motivation" sub-dimension by gender, which shows similarity with the current findings. However, some studies found no significant difference (10-35).

There was a significant difference in the "social" sub-dimension by the departments of the participants. The students at the "coaching" department had a higher average than the students at other departments, which refers to a high level of leisure satisfaction. Kayabaşı et al. (36) also revealed a significant difference by department variable. Those results were parallel with the current findings. On the other hand, no significant difference was measured in hopelessness levels by the department. Kırmoğlu (26) also found no significant difference by the department variable.

The primary purpose of the study was to determine whether the leisure satisfaction levels of individuals affected their future expectations. The analysis results highlighted a negative and low-level relationship between leisure satisfaction and hopelessness scores of the participants. It was concluded that a high level of leisure satisfaction leads to less hopelessness. In this sense, previous studies have shown that leisure satisfaction enhanced the well-being of people (37), job satisfaction (38), life quality (39), motivation (40), and relieving depression (41) and loneliness (23). Thus, it can be stated that leisure satisfaction reduces hopelessness about the future.

## References

1. Roberts, K. (2018). Writing about leisure. *World Leisure Journal*, 60(1), 3-13.
2. Gürbüz, B. and Henderson, K.A. (2014). Leisure activity preferences and constraints: Perspectives from Turkey. *World Leisure Journal*, 56(4), 300-316.



3. Caldwell, L.L. (2005). "Leisure and health: why is leisure therapeutic?". *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*. 33(1): 7-26.
4. Ragheb, MG, Tate, RL. (1993). A behavioral model of leisure participation based on leisure attitude, motivation and satisfaction. *Leisure Studies*, 12, 61-70.
5. Yang, Y.S. (2006). A Study on the Relationship among Participation of Leisure Activities, Leisure Constraints and Well-Being of the Students in National Changhua Senior School of Commerce. Ta-Yeh University, Taiwan.
6. Çelik, G. (2011). Kamu kuruluşlarında çalışan engelli bireylerin serbest zaman engellerinin ve tatmin düzeylerinin incelenmesi (Antalya merkez örneği). Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Antalya.
7. Amestoy, V.A., Rosal, R.S. ve Toscano, V.E. (2008). The Leisure Experience. *The Journal of SocioEconomics*. 37: 64-78.
8. Kovacs, A. (2007). The Leisure Personality: Relationships Between Personality, Leisure Satisfaction, and Life Satisfaction. (Doctoral Dissertation). USA: Indiana University, School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.
9. Chick, G., Hsu, Y.C., Yeh, C.K., Hsieh, C.M., Bae, S.Y. ve Iarmolenko, S. (2016). Cultural Consonance in Leisure, Leisure Satisfaction, Life Satisfaction, and SelfRated Health in urban Taiwan. *Leisure Sciences*, 38(5): 402-423.
10. Tekin, M. ve Filiz, K. (2007). Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokullarının antrenörlük eğitimi ve spor yöneticiliği bölümlerinde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin umutsuzluk ve boyun eğici davranış düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *SPORMETRE Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, VI (1) 27-37.
11. Dilbaz, N. ve Seber, G. (1998). Umutsuzluk Kavramı: Depresyon ve intiharda önemi. *Kriz Dergisi*, 1(3), 134-138.
12. Abramson, L.Y., Metalsky, G.I., Alloy, L.B. (1989) Hopelessness depression: A theory-based subtype of depression. *Psychol Rev*, 96: 358-372.
13. Ağır, M. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin bilişsel çarpıtma düzeyleri ile problem çözme becerileri ve umutsuzluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. Doktora Tezi. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı. İstanbul.
14. Doğan, M., Elçi, G. ve Gürbüz, B. (2019). Serbest zaman doyum, serbest zamanda sıkılma algısı ve iş tatmini ilişkisi: akademisyenler üzerine bir araştırma. *SPORMETRE*, 17(1),154-164.
15. Çakır, V.O. (2017). Üniversite Öğrencilerin Serbest Zaman Doyum Düzeyleri İle Serbest Zaman Yönetimleri Arasındaki İlişki. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(3), 17-27.
16. Serdar, E., Demirel, M., Harmandar Demirel, D. ve Donuk, M. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinin serbest zaman doyum düzeyleri ile mutluluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(28), 428-438.
17. Serdar, E., and Mungan Ay, S., (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin serbest zaman etkinliklerine katılım biçimlerine göre tatmin olma ve algılanan özgürlük düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*,3(365), 365-374.
18. Ardahan, F. ve Yerlisu Lapa, T. (2010). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Serbest Zaman Tatmin Düzeylerinin Cinsiyete ve Gelire Göre İncelenmesi. *Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences*, 21(4), 129-136.
19. Wu, H.C., Liu, A. ve Wang, C.H. (2010). Taiwanese university students' perceived freedom and participation in leisure. *Annals of Leisure Research*.; 13(4): 679-700.
20. Kim, B.A. (2010). conceptual framework for leisure and subjective well-being. *International Journal of Tourism Sciences*, 10(2): 85-11.
21. Doğaner, S. ve Balcı, V. (2018). Effect of regular physical activity on individuals' stress, happiness and leisure satisfaction levels. *SPORMETRE*, 16(3),132-148.
22. Ayhan, C., Eskiler, E., ve Ekinci, N.E. (2018). Extreme Sporcuların Serbest Zaman Tatmin Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *International 2nd Academic Sports Research Congress*.
23. Siyahtaş, A. (2020). Serbest zaman etkinliklerine katılan bireylerin yalnızlık düzeyleri ile doyum düzeylerinin



- incelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İstanbul Üniversitesi-Cerrahpaşa Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü. İstanbul.
24. Gençay, S. (2009). Beden eğitimi öğretmeni adaylarının umutsuzluk ve yaşam doyumlarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(27), 380- 388.
25. Ozben, Ş. ve Argun, Y. (2003). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin umutsuzluk ve tükenmişlik düzeyleri üzerine bir araştırma, *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 36-48.
26. Kırımoğlu, H. (2010). Türkiye'deki beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu son sınıf öğrencilerinin istihdam sorunu açısından umutsuzluk düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 18(1), 37-46.
27. Tümkaya, S., Aybek, B. ve Çelik, M. (2007). KPSS'ye girecek öğretmen adaylarındaki umutsuzluk ve durumluk-sürekli kaygı düzeylerini yordayıcı değişkenlerin incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 7(2), 953-974.
28. Bedir Erişti, S.D. (2013). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. Açıköğretim Fakültesi Yayını, Eskişehir.
29. Beard, J.G., Ragheb, M.G. (1980). Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 12 (1), 20-33.
30. Gökçe, H. and Orhan, K. (2011). Serbest Zaman Doyum Ölçeğinin Türkçe Geçerlilik Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Hacettepe J. of Sport Sciences*, 22 (4), 139-145.
31. Beck A.T. (1988). "Beck Hopelessness Scale." [The Psychological Corporation](#).
32. Seber, G., Dilbaz, N., Kaptaoğlu, C. and Tekin, D. (1993). Umutsuzlukölçeği: geçerlilik ve güvenirliliği. *Kriz Dergisi*.
33. Ekinci, Ü. (2019). Bedensel engelli bireylerin katıldıkları serbest zaman etkinliklerinden tatmin olma ve algılanan özgürlük düzeylerinin incelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Antalya.
34. Yazgeç, G. (2019). Doğa ve macera rekreasyonu etkinliklerine katılan bireylerin serbest zaman doyum ve mutluluk düzeylerinin incelenmesi: fethiye destinasyonu örneği. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Rekreasyon Anabilim Dalı Rekreasyon Programı. Manisa.
35. Aras, A. (2011). Müzik bölümü lisans öğrencilerinin umutsuzluk düzeylerinin belirlenmesi: hacettepe üniversitesi ankara devlet konservatuvarı örneği. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(2), 509-524.
36. Kayabaşı, A., Kapuçam, M., Yılmaz, B., Karakuza, F. Ve Özkan, O.A. (2019). Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin serbest doyum düzeylerinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. 2. Avrasya Spor Bilimleri Kongresi. Tam Metin Kitabı 347-354.
37. Liu, H. (2014). Personality, leisure satisfaction, and subjective well-being of serious leisure participants. *Social Behavior And Personality*, 42(7), 1117-1126.
38. Winslow, R.M. (1984). An analysis of the leisure satisfaction, life satisfaction, and work satisfaction of pre-retirement workers. Ph.D. Dissertation. New York University.
39. Spiers, A. Ve Walker, G.J. (2008). The effects of ethnicity and leisure satisfaction on happiness, peacefulness, and quality of life. *Leisure Sciences*, 31(1), 84-99.
40. Beşikçi, T., İrkin, F. Ve Güzel, P. (2019). Serbest zaman motivasyonu ve serbest zaman doyum ilişkisi mücadele sporları ile ilgilenen bireyler üzerine bir araştırma. 2.Dünya Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları Kongresi. Tam Metin Bildiri Kitabı.
41. Chang, P., Lin, Y. Ve Song, R. (2018) Leisure Satisfaction Mediates the Relationships between Leisure Settings, Subjective Well-Being, and Depression among Middle-Aged Adults in Urban China. *Springer Nature and The International Society for Quality of-Life Studies*, 14(1), 1001-1017.

