

Analysis of the relationship between leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction among students participating in outdoor recreational activities

Fatih Yaşartürk^{1ABDE}, Gürkan Elçi^{1ACD}, Sercan Kural^{1ABE}, Yusufcan Keskin^{2ADE}

¹ Bartın University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Bartın, Turkey

² İstanbul Gedik University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Turkey

Authors' Contribution: A – Study design; B – Data collection; C – Statistical analysis; D – Manuscript Preparation; E – Funds Collection

Abstract

Background and Study Aim Participation in outdoor recreational activities contributes to psychological well-being and overall life satisfaction. Since leisure satisfaction is closely associated with quality of life, examining this relationship can offer valuable insights into the role of recreation in academic settings. The objective of this study is to examine the relationship between students' life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction during outdoor recreational activities.

Material and Methods The study group consisted of 647 willing participants (413 men and 234 women) randomly selected from a larger pool of university students who engage in various leisure activities during their free time. Researchers utilized a personal information form, the Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS), and the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) as data collection instruments. The data were analyzed using frequency analysis, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, independent samples t-test, ANOVA, and Pearson correlation.

Results The t-test results showed no significant differences between gender and the sub-dimensions of the LSS and SWLS. The ANOVA test revealed that students in the Recreation Department scored higher on average compared to those in the Coaching Education and Sports Management departments in the LSS sub-dimensions. Additionally, students in the Physical Education and Sports Teaching Department scored higher on the SWLS compared to those in the Coaching Education Department. A statistically significant difference was found between the mean scores of the LSS's Curriculum and Instruction, Social, Physiological, and Aesthetic components based on the variable of sports participation. Students who participated in sports for leisure scored higher. Furthermore, as levels of life satisfaction increased, levels of leisure satisfaction also increased.

Conclusions Engaging in leisure activities contributes to higher levels of life satisfaction by fulfilling psychological and social needs. The findings suggest that participation in outdoor recreational activities can positively influence well-being, helping students manage stress, develop social connections, and improve their overall quality of life. Encouraging leisure activities within academic environments may serve as an effective strategy for enhancing both personal and academic outcomes.

Keywords: outdoor recreation, leisure satisfaction, satisfaction with life

Introduction

Today, outdoor recreational activities are essential for people to escape daily work stress, relax, boost motivation, and establish social relationships. These activities are considered an important tool for meeting physical, psychological, and social needs. They offer many positive effects, such as improving health, coping with stress, enhancing quality of life, and fostering a connection with nature [1, 2, 3]. The increasing stress of daily life and growing dependence on technology have heightened the need for outdoor activities [4, 5]. It is well established that outdoor recreation increases physical activity levels, helping individuals lead healthier lives and preventing chronic diseases such as obesity and diabetes [6, 7]. Furthermore,

outdoor recreation activities strengthen social ties and support psychological resilience by enhancing individuals' self-efficacy. Regular participation in these activities also develops environmental awareness and contributes to social solidarity.

Outdoor recreation activities are highlighted as an ideal tool for enhancing the quality of life of university students, supporting their physical and mental health, and strengthening social bonds [8, 9]. Furthermore, participation in outdoor recreational activities has been shown to positively contribute to university students' stress management, academic performance, overall life satisfaction, and leisure satisfaction [10, 11, 12, 13].

The meaningful and productive use of leisure time increases individuals' satisfaction levels, providing both personal and societal benefits. The joy, contentment, and sense of personal

significance that people experience when engaging in leisure activities are referred to as leisure satisfaction [14, 15, 16]. Leisure satisfaction significantly contributes to strengthening social bonds, fostering personal development, and enhancing overall happiness [17, 18].

Leisure satisfaction refers to the happiness, fulfillment, and sense of personal meaning individuals experience through participation in leisure activities. This satisfaction depends on how individuals spend their leisure time, the benefits they gain from these activities, and how well these experiences meet their psychological, social, and physical needs [19]. Participation in outdoor recreational activities is considered an effective way to enhance leisure satisfaction. These activities offer opportunities to connect with nature, engage in physical exercise, and build social relationships [20, 21]. Leisure fulfillment plays a crucial role in maintaining psychological health and significantly increasing overall happiness [22, 23]. Therefore, leisure satisfaction, as a measure of happiness and fulfillment derived from leisure activities, is closely related to life satisfaction.

Satisfaction with life is described as the state or outcome derived from comparing what individuals wish to achieve with what they actually possess [24, 25]. It serves as a subjective indicator of well-being, reflecting individuals' overall assessments of their lives and the satisfaction they derive from these evaluations [26].

Satisfaction with life not only enhances personal well-being but also fosters positive interactions and social cohesion within society [27, 28]. Participation in leisure activities plays a fundamental role in improving university students' satisfaction with life by meeting their psychological, social, and physical needs. While leisure satisfaction refers to the happiness and fulfillment individuals experience from leisure activities, life satisfaction represents a holistic evaluation of the contentment individuals derive from various aspects of their lives [25, 29].

Despite the existence of numerous studies exploring the relationships between leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction, the specific dynamics among university students participating in outdoor recreational activities remain insufficiently understood. Previous research has highlighted general benefits, but gaps persist in identifying how different factors, such as demographic characteristics and types of activities, influence these outcomes. Therefore, this topic requires a more in-depth investigation to comprehensively understand the role of leisure satisfaction in enhancing life satisfaction among students.

Considering the strong relationship between outdoor recreational activities, leisure satisfaction, and life satisfaction, students who engage in leisure activities can enhance both their quality of life and

overall life satisfaction. Given this, the objective of this study is to examine the relationship between students' life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction during outdoor recreational activities.

Materials and Methods

This study employed a relational survey model, a type of correlational research designed to identify relationships between two or more variables and provide insights into potential cause-and-effect dynamics [30, 31].

Participants

The research group consisted of 647 voluntary university students: 413 males ($M_{\text{age}} = 21.42 \pm 1.89$) and 234 females ($M_{\text{age}} = 20.79 \pm 1.96$). The overall mean age of the participants was 21.19 years ($M_{\text{age}} = 21.19 \pm 1.93$). Participants were selected through convenience sampling from students engaged in various leisure activities, including social, cultural, and physical activities.

Research Design

Data Collection Tools

The data were collected using a personal information form developed by the researchers. This form inquired about independent variables, including gender, age, academic department, and participation in sports during leisure time.

The data were collected using a personal information form developed by the researchers. This form inquired about independent variables, including gender, age, academic department, and participation in sports during leisure time.

The Leisure Time Satisfaction Scale (LTSS), created by Beard and Ragheb and translated into Turkish by Karlı et al., was used to measure the degree of participants' satisfaction with leisure activities [32, 33]. According to validity and reliability tests, the 39 items in the LTSS were divided into six sub-dimensions: psychological, educational, social, relaxation, physiological, and aesthetic.

The internal consistency coefficient of the Turkish adaptation of the LTSS was determined to be 0.92 for the overall scale, and the sub-dimension values were as follows: 0.96 for psychological, 0.84 for educational, 0.82 for social, 0.79 for relaxation, 0.82 for physiological, and 0.79 for aesthetic. In this study, the internal consistency coefficient was 0.96 for the overall scale. The sub-dimension coefficients were 0.86 for psychological, 0.89 for educational, 0.84 for social, 0.85 for relaxation, 0.80 for physiological, and 0.80 for aesthetic.

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) created by Diener et al. and translated into Turkish by Yetim, was used to measure the life satisfaction of the participants [25, 34]. The five-item life satisfaction scale was constructed using a seven-point Likert scale for scoring. "Strongly disagree (1)", 'disagree

(2)', 'partially disagree (3)', 'undecided (4)', 'partially agree (5)', 'agree (6)' and 'strongly agree (7)' are seven-point Likert possibilities. While the internal consistency coefficient of the scale used in the adaptation study was .86, the internal consistency coefficient determined for the data collected for this study was .85.

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), created by Diener et al. and translated into Turkish by Yetim, was used to measure participants' life satisfaction [25, 34]. The scale consists of five items, each rated on a seven-point Likert scale: "Strongly disagree (1)", "Disagree (2)", "Partially disagree (3)", "Undecided (4)", "Partially agree (5)", "Agree (6)", and "Strongly agree (7)". The internal consistency coefficient of the scale in the adaptation study was 0.86, while the internal consistency coefficient for the data collected in this study was 0.85.

Data Collection Process

Participants were asked to complete the scales using their mobile devices, and all data collection tools were administered digitally. The instructions provided necessary explanations regarding the study's purpose and detailed guidance on how to complete the data collection tools. The responses were submitted voluntarily by individuals who engaged in various leisure activities. After collecting the forms, the researcher reviewed them and excluded those with missing information or errors. The valid and complete data were then transferred to a computer for analysis.

Ethical Standards

This study was conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines for research involving human participants. Before participating, all students were provided with detailed information about the purpose and procedures of the study. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, emphasizing the voluntary nature of their participation and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. To ensure confidentiality and privacy, no identifying information was collected, and all data were anonymized and securely stored. The study received ethical approval from the University Ethics Committee.

Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS 20.0. The methods applied to assess the data included frequency analysis, numerical mean, standard deviation, independent samples t-test, ANOVA, and Pearson correlation tests. To determine the suitability of parametric tests, the results of Levene's test for equality of variances and the Skewness and Kurtosis values for normality of the data were analyzed [35]. The equality of variances was confirmed, as the significance value for Levene's test was greater than $p < 0.05$ [30]. Additionally, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated to assess the reliability of the scales.

Results

The various dimensions of satisfaction, including psychological, educational, social, relaxation, physiological, and aesthetic factors, were assessed in this study. These dimensions are summarized in Table 1.

The "Relaxation" sub-dimension had the greatest mean (3.68), while the "Physiological" sub-dimension had the lowest mean (3.51) when the arithmetic means of the participants' scores on the Leisure Satisfaction Scale were analyzed by factor (see Table 1). Participants' overall Satisfaction with Life Scale scores had an arithmetic mean of 4.36. Furthermore, it was determined that the data has a normal distribution after looking at the skewness and kurtosis values of the scale scores.

Table 2 reveals the results of the t-test, indicating no statistically significant differences in the scores of any LSS sub-dimension based on the gender variable. Additionally, the t-test results for the gender variable showed no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of the SWLS.

Table 3 shows statistically significant differences in the mean scores of all LSS sub-dimensions based on the participants' department of study. A comparison of the mean scores for all LSS sub-dimensions indicates that students in the "Recreation" department had higher mean scores than those in the "Coaching Education" and "Sports Management" departments. Additionally, the mean

Table 1. Distribution of scale scores

Well-Being Categories	n	Mean	Sd	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min.	Max.
SWLS	647	4.36	1.46	-0.19	-0.76	1.00	7.00
LSS	Psychological	647	3.53	0.81	-0.40	1.00	5.00
	Education	647	3.57	0.82	-0.34	1.00	5.00
	Social	647	3.61	0.76	-0.40	1.00	5.00
	Relaxation	647	3.68	0.94	-0.49	1.00	5.00
	Physiological	647	3.51	0.80	-0.36	1.00	5.00
	Aesthetics	647	3.59	0.89	-0.49	1.00	5.00

Table 2. T-test results by gender variable

Well-Being Categories	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	sd	t	p	
SWLS	Female	234	4.32	1.44	645	-.343	.732	
	Male	413	4.37	1.47				
LSS	Psychological	Female	234	3.50	.82	645	-.746	.456
		Male	413	3.55	.79			
	Education	Female	234	3.56	.84	645	-.182	.856
		Male	413	3.57	.80			
	Social	Female	234	3.62	.77	645	.237	.813
		Male	413	3.60	.74			
	Relaxation	Female	234	3.68	.96	645	.088	.930
		Male	413	3.67	.91			
	Physiological	Female	234	3.48	.84	645	-.443	.658
		Male	413	3.51	.77			
	Aesthetics	Female	234	3.53	.93	645	-1.071	.284
		Male	413	3.61	.86			

Table 3. ANOVA results by department variable

Source of Variance		Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p	Difference*
SWLS	Intergroup	19.075	3	6.358			
	Intragroup	1360.638	643	2.116	3.005	.030	1 > 2
	Total	1379.713	646				
Psychological	Intergroup	16.291	3	5.430			
	Intragroup	402.402	643	.626	8.677	.000	3 > 2.4
	Total	418.693	646				
Education	Intergroup	15.674	3	5.225			
	Intragroup	414.635	643	.645	8.102	.000	3 > 2.4
	Total	430.309	646				
Social	Intergroup	9.086	3	3.029			
	Intragroup	360.562	643	.561	5.401	.001	3 > 2.4
	Total	369.648	646				
Relaxation	Intergroup	17.176	3	5.725			
	Intragroup	547.610	643	.852	6.723	.000	3 > 2.4
	Total	564.786	646				
Physiological	Intergroup	8.625	3	2.875			
	Intragroup	404.188	643	.629	4.574	.004	3 > 2.4
	Total	412.813	646				
Aesthetics	Intergroup	13.291	3	4.430			
	Intragroup	499.468	643	.777	5.703	.001	3 > 2.4
	Total	512.759	646				

*p<0,05 - 1. Physical Education and Sports Teaching 2. Coaching Education, 3. Recreation, 4. Sports Management

scores varied statistically significantly depending on the students' study major ($F(3, 646) = 3.005$; $p < 0.05$). The results of the Tukey test revealed that students in the "Physical Education and Sports

Teaching" department had higher average scores than those in the "Coaching Education" department.

Table 4 shows that the mean scores for the "Psychological" and "Relaxation" sub-dimensions

Table 4. T-test results according to the variable of participation in sports activities

Participation in Sports Events		N	Mean	Sd	sd	t	p
LSS	SWLS	No	231	4.28	1.47	-0.958	.732
		Yes	416	4.39	1.45		
	Psychological	No	231	3.43	.80	-2.249	.456
		Yes	416	3.58	.79		
	Education	No	231	3.44	.84	-2.875	.004*
		Yes	416	3.64	.79		
	Social	No	231	3.48	.76	-3.178	.002*
		Yes	416	3.68	.74		
	Relaxation	No	231	3.59	.96	-1.754	.080
		Yes	416	3.72	.91		
	Physiological	No	231	3.37	.80	-3.220	.001*
		Yes	416	3.58	.78		
	Aesthetics	No	231	3.43	.93	-3.238	.001*
		Yes	416	3.67	.85		

*p<0,05

Table 5. Correlation results of the participants between LSS and SWLS according to independent variables

Variables		SWLS	LSS					
			Psychological	Education	Social	Relaxation	Physiological	Aesthetics
Age	r	0.00	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02	-0.05	-0.02	-0.02
	p	0.99	0.50	0.67	0.69	0.22	0.67	0.57
Monthly Income	r	.125	.124	.116	.103	.087	.114	.078
	p	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.04
Participation Duration in Leisure Time	r	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.00	0.02
	p	0.91	0.52	1.00	0.75	0.31	0.96	0.64
SWLS	r	-	.398	.365	.361	.369	.356	.303
	p	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

of the LSS were not statistically significantly different based on the t-test results for participants' engagement in sports activities ($p > 0.05$). However, for the "Education", "Social", "Physiological", and "Aesthetic" sub-dimensions of the LSS, there were statistically significant differences in mean scores depending on participation in leisure sports activities ($p < 0.05$). Analysis of these mean scores revealed that participants who engaged in sports activities during their leisure time had higher scores in these sub-dimensions. Additionally, the t-test results for the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) showed no statistically significant differences based on sports participation ($t(645) = -0.958$; $p > 0.05$).

According to Table 5, the results of the correlation analysis conducted to test the relationships between participants' age, monthly income, duration of participation in leisure activities, SWLS, and LSS sub-dimensions show the following:

- A positive, low-level statistically significant relationship was found between monthly income and the SWLS average scores ($r = .12$, $p < 0.05$).

- Similar low-level positive correlations were observed between monthly income and the LSS sub-dimensions:
 - Psychological ($r = .12$),
 - Educational ($r = .11$),
 - Social ($r = .10$),
 - Relaxation ($r = .08$),
 - Physiological ($r = .11$), and
 - Aesthetic ($r = .07$), all at $p < 0.05$.
- Additionally, a positive, moderate-level statistically significant relationship was found between the SWLS average scores and the following LSS sub-dimensions:
 - Psychological ($r = .39$),
 - Educational ($r = .36$),
 - Social ($r = .36$),
 - Relaxation ($r = .36$),
 - Physiological ($r = .35$), and
 - Aesthetic ($r = .30$), all at $p < 0.05$.

These findings suggest that as monthly income levels increase, both life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction levels tend to increase.

Discussion

The current research aims to explore how university students participating in outdoor recreational activities perceive their life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction. The obtained results have been analyzed within the context of existing research findings.

Outdoor recreation refers to leisure activities conducted in natural environments, where individuals engage directly with the outdoors [36]. In recent years, activities that involve close contact with nature have gained increasing popularity [37]. Given this trend, the present study investigates the relationship between students' levels of life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction as they participate in outdoor recreational activities.

There was no discernible variation in the LSS sub-dimensions based on the gender of the participants. Similar findings were reported by Mamak [38], who found no significant difference in leisure satisfaction levels according to gender among university students participating in leisure activities. Consistent with these results, Ardahan and Yerlisu [39] also found no significant gender differences in leisure satisfaction levels among university students. Likewise, Yiğit [40] observed no significant gender-based differences in leisure satisfaction among students involved in university recreational activities. Furthermore, Gökçe [41] found no significant difference in leisure satisfaction levels among students preparing for the university entrance exam.

Ragheb and Griffith [29] determined that gender did not create a significant difference among the factors influencing individuals' leisure satisfaction levels. Additionally, Iso-Ahola and Weissinger [42] suggested that while participation in leisure activities enhances individuals' perceptions of satisfaction, these perceptions are independent of demographic variables such as gender. In conclusion, it can be inferred that the leisure satisfaction levels of both female and male individuals may be similar. This finding suggests that the nature of the activities and individual preferences might have a more significant effect on leisure satisfaction than gender.

Regarding the gender variable, there was no discernible variation in the participants' mean SWLS scores. A study by Küçük Kılıç et al. [43] found no significant difference in life satisfaction based on gender among attendees of summer sports schools. Similarly, Yaşartürk and Bilgin [44] found no clear variation in life satisfaction between male and female college students. Ayhan and Özel [45] also reported no significant difference in life satisfaction based on gender among university students.

This conclusion aligns with existing research suggesting that factors such as personal experience,

individual values, and living circumstances, rather than gender, determine life satisfaction [46]. Furthermore, Pavot and Diener [26] concluded that life happiness is not significantly influenced by gender.

The results of this study reveal that life satisfaction levels among male and female university students participating in outdoor activities are quite similar. This could reflect the shared sources of pleasure, rejuvenation, and relaxation that outdoor activities provide. Additionally, the similarity in living circumstances and access to outdoor activities among university students may contribute to reducing gender disparities in life satisfaction.

Based on the findings, university students of both sexes perceive leisure and life satisfaction at equivalent levels. In this context, gender may not be a determining factor for personal evaluations like leisure and life satisfaction, which depend more on personal interests, expectations, and experiences. Therefore, the degrees of satisfaction and fulfillment derived from leisure activities can develop independently of gender.

Based on the participants' majors, there was a notable variation among the LSS sub-dimensions. Students in the "Recreation" department outperformed those in the "Coaching Education" and "Sports Management" departments across all LSS sub-dimension mean scores. Research suggests that students' leisure experiences and satisfaction may be influenced by various factors, including their lifestyles, hobbies, and stress levels associated with different academic disciplines [47]. However, a study by Bakar and Yaşartürk [48] reported results contrary to ours, showing no significant variation in LSS sub-dimensions based on students' academic departments. Considering that students in the Recreation department typically receive more training in efficiently and effectively evaluating leisure activities, our findings align with the existing literature. Furthermore, the observed differences in leisure satisfaction among students from different departments suggest that leisure activities should be designed to align with the academic needs, interests, and lifestyles of students.

The SWLS mean scores of the participants varied significantly based on their academic department. The results showed that students in the "Coaching Education" department had lower mean scores than those in the "Physical Education and Sports Teaching" department. A study by Yaşartürk et al. [49] similarly found a significant difference in life satisfaction based on department. Their findings indicated that students in the "Physical Education and Sports Teaching" department had higher life satisfaction compared to those in the "Sports Management" department. This suggests that the academic field of study may be a key factor influencing life satisfaction among university

students. The study supports this view, indicating that individuals' professional or academic fields can directly or indirectly affect their life satisfaction [25]. Conversely, a study by Aktop and Göksel [50] found significant differences in life satisfaction based on department, while Çolak and Ünal [51] reported no such significant differences. In this context, academic expectations, career goals, and daily life routines of students in different departments likely play a determining role in their life satisfaction [52]. To help university students maximize the benefits of outdoor recreational activities and enhance their life satisfaction, it is essential to design these activities to meet both their physical and psychological needs.

The mean scores of the LSS sub-dimensions "Education," "Social," "Physiological," and "Aesthetic" showed a statistically significant difference based on participation in sports activities. In contrast, the "Psychological" and "Relaxation" sub-dimensions showed no statistically significant difference. Further analysis revealed that these significant differences favoured individuals who engage in sports during their free time. The literature supports these findings, indicating that sports activities positively impact leisure satisfaction by fulfilling both physical and psychological needs [53, 54]. Individuals who participate in sports activities tend to experience benefits such as strengthened social bonds, improved physical health, and opportunities for self-actualization. Additionally, the positive effects of sports, such as competition, a sense of achievement, and the release of endorphins through physical activity, directly enhance leisure satisfaction [55, 56].

As a result, it is suggested that sports activities should play an important role in the planning of outdoor recreation programs. Encouraging university students to participate in these activities can enhance their leisure satisfaction and support both their physical and psychological well-being. Moreover, such activities can contribute to overall satisfaction with university life by fostering social engagement and participation.

No statistically significant difference was found in satisfaction with life mean scores based on participants' involvement in sports activities. This suggests that life satisfaction may emerge independently of participation in sports during outdoor activities. The literature highlights that life satisfaction is influenced by various factors, including overall living conditions, psychological well-being, and social environment [25].

Research indicates that university students' life satisfaction is affected not only by sports activities but also by multidimensional factors such as academic success, social relationships, economic status, and the achievement of personal goals [57]. Therefore, strategies aimed at increasing life satisfaction should not focus solely on one type of

activity. Offering a variety of activities that cater to different interests and needs can encourage broader participation in outdoor activities alongside sports events.

The following LSS sub-dimensions: "Psychological," "Educational," "Social," "Relaxation," "Physiological," and "Aesthetic" were investigated in conjunction with the SWLS mean scores. The findings revealed a statistically significant, moderately positive relationship between these variables. Küçük Kılıç et al. [43] reported a strong positive association between the Leisure Satisfaction Scale and the Satisfaction with Life Scale sub-dimensions. Their study also found that individuals' levels of leisure satisfaction are strong predictors of their life satisfaction. Similarly, among international college students, Uluç et al. [58] identified a positive and statistically significant relationship between life satisfaction and leisure satisfaction. Moreover, considerable positive correlations between SWLS and the LSS sub-dimensions (psychological, educational, social, relaxation, and aesthetic) were reported by Huang [59] and Acar and Yılmaz [60].

The correlation analysis reveals several reasons for the positive and significant connections between SWLS and LSS sub-dimensions. Psychological well-being and, consequently, overall life satisfaction may improve when individuals effectively and satisfactorily use their spare time. Leisure activities, particularly those addressing psychological, social, educational, relaxation, and artistic aspects, can enhance mental and emotional health, thereby increasing life satisfaction levels. Moreover, leisure activities can strengthen social bonds, help individuals manage stress more effectively, and promote self-actualization, all of which significantly improve the overall quality of life. Therefore, the positive relationship between SWLS and LSS sub-dimensions can be explained by the way leisure activities fulfill various needs, thus fostering life satisfaction. Additionally, the study examined the effects of gender, academic department, and participation in sports on the relationship between LSS and SWLS. The findings suggest that gender has a limited impact on leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction. Differences in LSS and SWLS scores based on academic department may be attributed to variations in students' academic fields and interests.

A positive and significant correlation was found between the LSS and SWLS sub-dimensions, indicating that leisure activities are a factor that enhances life satisfaction. The study highlights that leisure activities improve quality of life and satisfaction by addressing individuals' physical, social, and psychological needs [53, 61, 62]. Leisure satisfaction is known to support various aspects such as self-actualization, building social connections, and managing stress. The role of leisure satisfaction

in enhancing life satisfaction can be explained by the positive emotions individuals derive from leisure activities and the contribution these activities make to their overall happiness.

Research Limitations

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. The research relied on self-reported data, which may introduce biases such as social desirability or inaccurate recall. The sample consisted solely of university students, limiting the generalizability of the findings to other populations. Additionally, the study focused on outdoor recreational activities; therefore, the results may not fully capture the effects of other types of leisure activities on life satisfaction.

This study confirms the significant relationship between leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction among university students participating in outdoor recreational activities, consistent with findings from another research. The results align with the general understanding that leisure activities contribute to psychological, social, and physical well-being, thereby enhancing overall life satisfaction. While some variations exist depending on factors such as academic department or personal preferences, the overall trend supports the positive influence of leisure satisfaction on life satisfaction.

Future research should build on these insights by exploring different demographic groups and using longitudinal approaches. Examining various types of leisure activities and contextual factors can provide a more comprehensive understanding of how leisure satisfaction impacts life satisfaction.

Conclusions

This study aimed to examine the relationship between leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction, and the findings revealed a significant positive correlation between these two variables. Outdoor activities support life satisfaction by allowing individuals to connect with nature, engage in physical exercise, and spend quality time with their social circles. The results indicate that satisfaction derived from leisure activities positively influences overall life satisfaction.

These findings align with the broader understanding that leisure activities contribute to individuals' physical, psychological, and social well-being. Regular and fulfilling participation in leisure activities can play a crucial role in enhancing life satisfaction. In conclusion, leisure activities that meet psychological and social needs significantly enhance individuals' overall satisfaction with life.

References

1. Ho YCJ, Chang D. To whom does this place belong? Whiteness and diversity in outdoor recreation and education. *Annals of Leisure Research*. 2022;25(5): 569-582. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2020.1859389>
2. Pröbstl-Haider U, Gugerell K, Maruthaveeran S. Covid-19 and outdoor recreation – Lessons learned? Introduction to the special issue on “Outdoor recreation and Covid-19: Its effects on people, parks and landscapes”. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 2023;41: 100583. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2022.100583>
3. Martin AL, Adams AE, Stein TV. Equity, identity, and representation in outdoor recreation: ‘I am not an outdoors person’. *Leisure Studies*, 2024;43(4): 531–544. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2023.2232558>
4. Chiesura A. The role of urban parks for the sustainable city. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 2004;68(1): 129–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2003.08.003>
5. Fagerholm N, Eilola S, Arki V. Outdoor recreation and nature's contribution to well-being in a pandemic situation - Case Turku, Finland. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 2021;64: 127257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2021.127257>
6. Pretty J, Peacock J, Sellens M, Griffin M. The mental and physical health outcomes of green exercise. *International Journal of Environmental Health Research*, 2005;15(5): 319–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09603120500155963>
7. Høyem J. Outdoor recreation and environmentally responsible behavior. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 2020;31: 100317. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2020.100317>
8. Henderson KA, Bialeschki MD. Leisure and Active Lifestyles: Research Reflections. *Leisure Sciences*, 2005;27(5): 355–365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400500225559>
9. Wray-Lake L, Flanagan CA, Osgood DW. Examining Trends in Adolescent Environmental Attitudes, Beliefs, and Behaviors Across Three Decades. *Environment and Behavior*, 2010;42(1): 61–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916509335163>
10. Bailey R, Hillman C, Arent S, Petitpas A. Physical Activity: An Underestimated Investment in Human Capital? *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 2013;10(3): 289–308. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jpah.10.3.289>
11. Tian HB, Qiu YJ, Lin YQ, Zhou WT, Fan CY. The Role of Leisure Satisfaction in Serious Leisure and Subjective Well-Being: Evidence From Chinese Marathon Runners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2020;11: 581908. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.581908>
12. Tokay Argan M, Mersin S. Life satisfaction, life quality, and leisure satisfaction in health professionals. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 2021;57(2): 660–666. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ppc.12592>
13. Lee KJ, Casper J, Powell R, Floyd MF. African Americans' outdoor recreation involvement, leisure

- satisfaction, and subjective well-being. *Current Psychology*, 2023;42(31): 27840–27850. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03905-2>
14. Coleman D, Iso-Ahola SE. Leisure and Health: The Role of Social Support and Self-Determination. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1993;25(2): 111–128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1993.11969913>
 15. Yaşartürk F, Akay B, Ayhan B. The Relationship Between Leisure Management and Exam Anxiety Levels of University Students. *Pakistan Journal of Medical and Health Sciences*, 2021;15(10): 2915–2921. <https://doi.org/10.53350/pjmhs2115102915>
 16. Özkan A, Yaşartürk F, Elçi G. The relationship between leisure satisfaction, physical activity level and healthy life-style behaviors of sport science students during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Physical education of students*, 2021;25(5): 257–264. <https://doi.org/10.15561/20755279.2021.0501>
 17. Ragheb MG, Beard JG. Measuring Leisure Attitude. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1982;14(2): 155–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1982.11969512>
 18. Stebbins RA. Project-based leisure: theoretical neglect of a common use of free time. *Leisure Studies*, 2005;24(1): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0261436042000180832>
 19. Iso-Ahola SE. Exercise and freedom. *World Leisure Journal*, 2009;51(3): 134–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04419057.2009.9728266>
 20. Driver BL, Brown PJ, Peterson GL. *Benefits of leisure*. Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing; 1991.
 21. Tarrant MA, Smith EK. The use of a modified importance-performance framework to examine visitor satisfaction with attributes of outdoor recreation settings. *Managing Leisure*, 2002;7(2): 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13606710210137246>
 22. Ragheb MG, Tate RL. A behavioural model of leisure participation, based on leisure attitude, motivation and satisfaction. *Leisure Studies*, 1993;12(1): 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614369300390051>
 23. Đuranović M. Leisure Activities of Young People as a Predictor of Life Satisfaction. *International Journal of Instruction*, 2024;17(3): 475–490. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2024.17326a>
 24. Neugarten BL, Havighurst RJ, Tobin SS. The Measurement of Life Satisfaction. *Journal of Gerontology*, 1961;16(2): 134–143. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronj/16.2.134>
 25. Diener E, Emmons RA, Larsen RJ, Griffin S. The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 1985;49(1): 71–75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
 26. Pavot W, Diener E. Review of the Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 1993;5(2): 164–172. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.5.2.164>
 27. Cummins RA. On the trail of the gold standard for subjective well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 1995;35(2): 179–200. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01079026>
 28. Diener E. Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1984;95(3): 542–575. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542>
 29. Ragheb MG, Griffith CA. The Contribution of Leisure Participation and Leisure Satisfaction to Life Satisfaction of Older Persons. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1982;14(4): 295–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1982.11969527>
 30. Büyüköztürk Ş, Çakmak EK, Akgün ÖE, Karadeniz Ş, Demirel F. *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri* [Scientific Research Methods]. Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing; 2021. (In Turkish).
 31. Karasar N. *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi: Kavramlar İlkeler Teknikler*. Ankara: Nobel Academic Publishing; 2022. (In Turkish).
 32. Beard JG, Ragheb MG. Measuring Leisure Satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1980;12(1): 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1980.11969416>
 33. Karlı Ü, Polat E, Yılmaz B, Koçak S. Validity and reliability study of the Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS-Long Version). *Journal of Sports Sciences*. 2008;19(2): 80–91.
 34. Yetim Ü. Life satisfaction: A study based on the organization of personal projects. *Social Indicators Research*, 1993;29(3): 277–289. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01079516>
 35. Kline RB. *Principles and practice of structural equation modelling* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press Publishing; 2011.
 36. Plummer R. *Outdoor Recreation*. New York and London: Routledge Publishing; 2009.
 37. Gözen E. Açık Alan Rekreasyon Aktivitelerine Katılmayı Motive Eden Faktörlere Yönelik Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması [Scale Development Study for Factors Motivating Participation in Outdoor Recreation Activities]. *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2020;4(3): 2197–2209. (In Turkish). <https://doi.org/10.26677/TR1010.2020.475>
 38. Mamak H. An Analysis of Life Satisfaction, Psychological Well-Being and Leisure Satisfaction in University Students Doing Exercise as Leisure Activity. *Social Mentality and Research Thinkers Journal*, 2020;6(28): 211–216. <https://doi.org/10.31576/smryj.444>
 39. Ardahan F, Yerlisu LT. Examination of university students' leisure satisfaction levels by gender and income. *Journal of Sports Sciences*. 2010;1(4): 129–136.
 40. Yiğit I. *Examination of leisure satisfaction levels of individuals participating in recreational activities in university communities*. (Master's thesis, Institute of Health Sciences). Malatya: İnönü University; 2018.
 41. Gökçe H. The impact of recreational activities on self-efficacy, exam anxiety, and leisure satisfaction levels of individuals preparing for university entrance exams (PhD Thesis, Institute of Health Sciences). Ankara: Ankara University; 2015.
 42. Iso-Ahola SE, Weissinger E. Perceptions of Boredom in Leisure: Conceptualization, Reliability and Validity of the Leisure Boredom Scale. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1990;22(1): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1990.11969811>
 43. Küçük Kılıç SK, Lakot Atasoy KL, Gürbüz B, Öncü E. Examination of the relationship between recreational satisfaction and life satisfaction.

- Istanbul University Journal of Sports Sciences*. 2016;6(3): 56-70.
44. Yaşartürk F, Bilgin B. Examination of leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction levels of university handball players. *International Journal of Current Educational Research*. 2018;4(2): 50-60. <https://doi.org/10.38021/asbid.1311046>
 45. Ayhan B, Özel B. Examining the relationship between leisure attitude and life satisfaction levels of university students. *International Journal of Sport Culture and Science*. 2020;8(3): 154-166.
 46. Diener E. Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, 2000;55(1): 34-43. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.34>
 47. Haworth JT, Veal AJ, [eds.]. *Work and Leisure*. 0 ed. Routledge; 2004. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203489321> [Accessed 9th December 2024].
 48. Bakar M, Yaşartürk F. The relationship between leisure satisfaction and emotional intelligence level. *CBU Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*. 2023;18(1): 124-137. <https://doi.org/10.33459/cbubesbd.1206424>
 49. Yaşartürk F, Akyüz H, Karataş I. Examination of the relationship between boredom perception in leisure time and life satisfaction levels of university students participating in recreational activities. *International Journal of Cultural and Social Studies*. 2017;3(2): 239-252.
 50. Aktop M, Göksel AG. Examination of the relationship between leisure interests and life satisfaction of sports science students. *Journal of Sports and Recreation for All*. 2023; 5(2): 99-109. <https://doi.org/10.56639/jsar.1386.975>
 51. Çolak H, Ünal H. Investigation of the effect of life satisfaction and hopelessness on substance use tendency in students of the Faculty of Sports Sciences. *IBAD Journal of Social Sciences*. 2020;7: 344-357. <https://doi.org/10.21733/ibad.685268>
 52. Ryan RM, Deci EL. On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 2001;52(1): 141-166. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141>
 53. Beard JG, Ragheb MG. Measuring Leisure Motivation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1983;15(3): 219-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1983.11969557>
 54. Iso-Ahola SE. Motivation for leisure. In: Jackson EL, Burton TL. (eds.) *Understanding leisure and recreation: Mapping the past, charting the future*. Pennsylvania: State College PA, Venture Publishing; 1989.
 55. Csikszentmihalyi M. *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. Harper & Row; 1990.
 56. Akay B, Ayhan B, Yaşartürk F. The relationship between coping strategies through leisure time and happiness levels. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*. 2022;8(2): 593-607.
 57. Lyubomirsky S, Sheldon KM, Schkade D. Pursuing Happiness: The Architecture of Sustainable Change. *Review of General Psychology*, 2005;9(2): 111-131. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.111>
 58. Uluç EA, Duman S, Acar H. Examination of the effect of leisure satisfaction levels on life satisfaction of international students studying at university. *Mediterranean Journal of Sport Sciences*. 2020;3(2): 407-419. <https://doi.org/10.38021/asbid.8405>
 59. Huang CY. *The relationships among leisure participation, leisure satisfaction, and life satisfaction of college students in Taiwan* [PhD Thesis]. Texas: University of the Incarnate Word; 2003.
 60. Acar K, Yılmaz AK. The relationship between university students' leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*. 2021;15(1): 25-35.
 61. Brown BA, Frankel BG. Activity through the Years: Leisure, Leisure Satisfaction, and Life Satisfaction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 1993;10(1): 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.10.1.1>
 62. Wang EST, Chen LSL, Lin JYC, Wang MCH. The relationship between leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction of adolescents concerning online games. *Adolescence*. 2008;43(169): 177185.

Information about the authors:

Fatih Yaşartürk; (Corresponding Author); <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4934-101X>; fatihyasarturk@gmail.com; Faculty of Sport Sciences, Bartın University; Bartın, Turkey.

Gürkan Elçi; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8889-9692>; gurkanelci@gmail.com; Faculty of Sport Sciences, Bartın University; Bartın, Turkey.

Sercan Kural; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2452-068X>; sercankural@hotmail.com; Faculty of Sport Sciences, Bartın University; Bartın, Turkey.

Yusufcan Keskin; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3604-4713>; yusufcankeskin10@gmail.com; Faculty of Sport Sciences, İstanbul Gedik University; İstanbul, Turkey.

Cite this article as:

Yaşartürk F, Elçi G, Kural S, Keskin Y. Analysis of the relationship between leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction among students participating in outdoor recreational activities. *Physical Education of Students*, 2024;28(6):371–381.

<https://doi.org/10.15561/20755279.2024.0606>

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en>

Received: 23.11.2024

Accepted: 28.12.2024; Published: 30.12.2024