

❖ **VARIA****MEASURING CONSTRAINTS TO LEISURE ACTIVITIES:  
DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES****GÜRBÜZ BÜLENT<sup>1</sup>, YENEL İ. FATİH<sup>2</sup>, AKGÜL M. BEYZA<sup>2</sup>, KARAKÜÇÜK SUAT<sup>2</sup>**<sup>1</sup>School of Physical Education and Sports, Ahi Evran University, Kırşehir, **TURKEY**<sup>2</sup>School of Physical Education and Sports, Gazi University, Ankara, **TURKEY****Email:** bulentgurbuz@gmail.com / 22.02.2010 / 15.03.2010**Abstract****Objective:** The aim of the study was to measure the constraints to leisure activities participation.**Method:** 270 (53.9 %) male and 231 (46.1 %) female, a total of 501 individuals aged between 18-54 ≥ voluntarily participated to this study. “Leisure Constraints Questionnaire” (LCQ) consists of 29 items as limiting factors in recreational activities as reasons for nonparticipants (Alexandris K., Carroll B., 1997). The Turkish form of the LCQ (T-LCQ) (Karaküçük S., Gürbüz B., 2006) includes 27 statements and 6 subscales: (a) facilities/services and accessibility, (b) social environment and lack of knowledge, (c) individual psychological, (d) lack of partners, (e) time and (f) lack of interests. The internal consistency for 501 adults were ranged from .73 (time) to .88 (individual psychological). Independent samples t-test and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to test the mean differences with respect to some demographic variables.**Results and Conclusion:** Independent samples t-test were revealed that there was a significant difference in individual psychological [ $t_{(498)} = 2.97$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ], facilities/services and accessibility [ $t_{(497)} = -3.16$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ], and time subscale [ $t_{(494)} = -2.35$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ] according to gender. There was also statistically mean differences according to the marital status in facilities/services and accessibility [ $t_{(498)} = 4.58$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ] and time subscale [ $t_{(494)} = 4.32$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ]. ANOVA analysis specified a significant mean differences in the individual psychological [ $F_{(3-496)} = 8.62$ ;  $p < .05$ ], social environment [ $F_{(3-495)} = 8.50$ ;  $p < .05$ ], facilities/services and accessibility [ $F_{(3-481)} = 6.46$ ;  $p < .05$ ] and time subscale [ $F_{(3-492)} = 4.15$ ;  $p < .05$ ], with regard to educational level. However no significant differences was found in the two other subscales ( $p > .05$ ). As a results, the participants rated “facilities/services and accessibility” as the most important constraints on their recreational activities participation.**Key Words:** Leisure, recreation, constraints, participation.**Introduction**

Over the past two decades the practical value of research in leisure constraints has been well documented (Alexandris K., Carrol, B., 1997). One of the most important reason to study leisure constraints is because it potentially exert a big impact on leisure experineces. It was also declared that to define the constraints on leisure participation helps to produce more effective plans and managing sport and such leisure time organizations in a good quality (Jackson E L., 1988).

General definition of the constraint as word means that “the factors that inhibit individuals to participate in leisure activities”. Jackson E., (1997) defines the concept as the perceived or experiences reasons why an individual can not participate leisure activity participation. There are number of theories and models that put effort to explain the constraints on leisure participation (Crawford D., Jackson E., Godbey, G., 1991; Jackson E., Crawford D., Godbey, G., 1993). For instance, Jackson et al. model argued that constraints on leisure activities participation can be classified in three categories. First one is, intrapersonel constraints, second one is interpersonal constraints and

the last one is structural constraints (Hawkins, B. A., Peng, J., Hsieh, C., Eklund S. J., 1999).

There has been very limited research in many populations especially in Turkey, even if the recognition of the theoretical and practical values of studying this concept (Liechty T., Freeman P. A., Zabriskie R. B., 2006; Little D. E., 2007; Stemerding M., Oppewall H., Timmermans H., 1999). Because of this reason, the main purpose of this study was to measure the constraints to leisure activities participation.

**Methods. Sample.**

Both samples were drawn from the population over the age of 18 years. All subjects were asked for some demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, education level etc.). The participants of this study included a total of 501 individuals aged between 18-54 ≥, 270 (53.9 %) male and 231 (46.1 %) female.

**Instrumentation**

“Leisure Constraints Questionnaire” (LCQ) consists of 29 items as limiting factors in recreational activities as reasons for nonparticipants (Alexandris K., Carroll B., 1997). The Turkish form of the LCQ (T-LCQ) (Karaküçük S., Gürbüz B., 2006) includes 27 statements and 6 subscales. The subscales in the T-

LCQ named as: (a) facilities/services and accessibility, (b) social environment and lack of knowledge, (c) individual psychological, (d) lack of partners, (e) time and (f) lack of interests. The internal consistency for 501 adults were ranged from .73 (time) to .88 (individual psychological).

**Data Collection and Analysis**

The data were collected by the researchers in the house of the participants in capital city of Turkey in Ankara. Simple random sampling method was preferred to select the participants in this study.

Independent samples t-test and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to test the mean differences with respect to some demographic variables such as gender, marital status and also education level.

**Results**

Descriptive statistics of T-LCQ subscales for all participants presented in Table 1. The overall findings indicated that while “facilities/services and accessibility” (= 2.98) factor as the most important constraints for the participants to leisure participation, “lack of interests” (= 2.49) was the least important factors that inhibit participants to participate leisure activities.

**Table 1. Descriptive statistics of T-LCQ subscales for all participants**

Subscales	N	Mean	SD
Individual psychological	500	2.85	.72
Social environment	499	2.96	.67
Facilities/services and accessibility	485	2.98	.56
Lack of partners	498	2.65	.75
Time	496	2.88	.61
Lack of interests	501	2.49	.70

**Table 2. T-test results of the T-LCQ subscales for males and females**

Subscales	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	t	p
Individual psychological	Male	270	2.76	.71	2.97	.03
	Female	230	2.95	.71		
Social environment	Male	268	2.94	.65	.71	.47
	Female	231	2.98	.70		
Facilities/services and accessibility	Male	259	2.90	.54	3.16	.02
	Female	226	3.06	.57		
Lack of partners	Male	269	2.63	.68	.77	.44
	Female	229	2.68	.82		
Time	Male	268	2.82	.59	2.35	.01
	Female	228	2.95	.82		

**Table 4. T-test results of the T-LCQ subscales with respect to marital status**

Subscales	Education Level	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	f	p
Individual psychological	Primary School	82	3.13	.68	8.62	.00
	Secondary School	47	2.94	.65		
	High School	193	2.88	.70		
	University	178	2.67	.72		
Social environment	Primary School	80	3.16	.70	8.50	.00
	Secondary School	48	3.07	.59		

Lack of interests	Male	270	2.52	.73	.80	.43
	Female	231	2.47	.66		

Independent samples t-test were revealed that there were significant mean difference between male and female members in three subscales: “individual psychological”  $t_{(498)} = 2.97$ ;  $p < .05$ ], “facilities/services and accessibility” [ $t_{(483)} = 3.16$ ;  $p < .05$ ], and “time” subscale [ $t_{(494)} = 2.35$ ;  $p < .05$ ].

**Table 3. T-test results of the T-LCQ subscales with respect to marital status**

Subscales	Marital Status	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	t	p
Individual psychological	Married	250	2.89	.68	1.19	.23
	Single	250	2.81	.75		
Social environment	Married	248	3.02	.64	1.81	.07
	Single	251	2.91	.70		
Facilities/services and accessibility	Married	241	3.09	.53	4.58	.00
	Single	244	2.87	.57		
Lack of partners	Married	248	2.69	.74	1.25	.21
	Single	250	2.61	.76		
Time	Married	247	3.00	.59	4.32	.00
	Single	249	2.76	.61		
Lack of interests	Married	250	2.51	.64	.44	.66
	Single	251	2.48	.75		

Descriptive statistics and mean scores for all the six T-LCQ subscales with respect to marital status of the participants were shown in Table 3. When compared the marital status among participants, it was found that married members had higher mean scores than single members in all T-LCQ subscales. Nevertheless, results of the t-test analyses demonstrated that there were significant ( $p < .05$ ) differences between married and single participants mean scores both in facilities/services and accessibility [ $t_{(483)} = 4.58$ ;  $p < .05$ ] and time subscale [ $t_{(494)} = 4.32$ ;  $p < .05$ ]. ANOVA analyses as well as post hoc multiple comparisons indicated that there were statistically mean differences (Table 4) in the individual psychological [ $F_{(3-496)} = 8.62$ ;  $p < .05$ ], social environment [ $F_{(3-495)} = 8.50$ ;  $p < .05$ ], facilities/services and accessibility [ $F_{(3-481)} = 6.47$ ;  $p < .05$ ] and time subscale [ $F_{(3-492)} = 4.15$ ;  $p < .05$ ], with regard to educational level. However no significant differences was found in the two other subscales ( $p > .05$ ).

	High School	193	3.03	.63		
	University	178	2.77	.68		
Facilities/ services and accessibility	Primary School	80	3.20	.60	6.46	.00
	Secondary School	47	3.08	.57		
	High School	187	2.94	.51		
	University	171	2.89	.56		
Lack of partners	Primary School	82	2.78	.81	2.37	.07
	Secondary School	48	2.65	.70		
	High School	192	2.69	.74		
	University	176	2.54	.74		
Time	Primary School	79	3.05	.59	4.15	.00
	Secondary School	48	2.85	.67		
	High School	193	2.90	.57		
	University	176	2.77	.63		
Lack of interests	Primary School	82	2.54	.63	.59	.62
	Secondary School	48	2.59	.77		
	High School	193	2.48	.69		
	University	178	2.46	.72		

### Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to measure the constraints to leisure activities participation. The leisure constraints in this study mainly tried to determine by using Turkish version of the Leisure Constraints Questionnaire (T-LCQ) which includes six different subscales. Analsis revealed that “facilities/services and accessibility” is the most effective factors that contraits participants to participate leisure activities and also “social environment” is the second factor that effect contraits participants. This findings were dissimilar with results of the study (Gürbüz B., 2006) which reported that “time” was the main factor that constraints individuals to participate this activities.

T-test analysis indicated that female participants had higher scores than the males participants in five sub-scales of the T-LCQ. However, this study found that married participants were more constrained than the single participants in all six subscales. This was consistent with the previous study done by Gürbüz B., (2006). In addition to, the results of ANOVA analysis indicated that While the mean scores of the participants graduated from primary school were higher than the other groups in all five subscales of T-LCQ: facilities/services and accessibility, social environment and lack of knowledge, individual psychological, lack of partners, time. The participants graduted from secondary school however, had the highest mean scores in “lack of interests” subscales than the others. This findings is parallel to study in the literature (Karaküçük, S., Gürbüz, B., 2007).

As a conclusion, the findings of present study suggest that organizers of leisure activities should take into consider the all groups preferences and the factors that constrained individuals to participate these activities.

### References

- ALEXANDRIS, K., CARROL, B., 1997,** *Demographic Differences in the Perception of Constraints on Recreational Sport Participation: Results from a Study in Greece.* Leisure Studies, 16, p. 107-125.
- CRAWFORD, D., JACKSON, E., GODBEY G. 1991,** *A Hierarchial Model of Leisure Constraints.* Leisure Sciences, 13, p. 309-320.
- GÜRBÜZ, B., 2006,** *Problems of Recreational Participation in Urban Life.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Gazi University, Ankara.
- HAWKINS, B. A., PENG, J., HSIEH, C-M., EKLUND, S. J., 1999,** *Leisure Constraints: A Replication and Extension of Construct Development.* Leisure Sciences, 21, p. 179-192.
- JACKSON E.L., 1988,** *Lesiure constraints: A survey of past research.* Lesiure Sciences, 10, 203-215.
- KARAKÜÇÜK, S., GÜRBÜZ, B., 2006,** *The reliability and validity of the Turkish version of "Leisure Constraints Questionnaire"* 9th International Sport Sciences Congress, Congress Proceedings Book, Muğla, Turkey
- KARAKÜÇÜK, S., GÜRBÜZ, B., 2007,** *Rekreasyon ve Kent(li)leşme.* Gazi Kitapevi. Ankara.
- LIECHTY, T., FREEMAN, P. A., ZABRISKIE, R. B., 2006,** *Body Image and Beliefs About Appearance: Constraints on the Leisure of College-Age and Middle-Age Women.* Leisure Sciences, 28, p. 311-330.
- LITTLE, D. E., 2007,** *Conceptions of Leisure Constraints Negatiation: A Response to Schneider and Wilhelm Stanis Coping Model.* Leisure Sciences, 29, 403-408.
- STEMERDING, M., OPPEWAL, H., TIMMERMANS, H., 1999,** *A Constraints\_Induced Model of Park Choice.* Leisure Sciences, 21, 145-158.