

Perceived Social Support in Recreational Activity Participation: A Study on Students

Huseyin Gumus¹, Ayse Asli Honca² & Turan Cetinkaya³

¹Physical Education and Sports School, Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey

²Physical Education and Sports School, Kastamonu University, Kastamonu, Turkey

³Physical Education and Sports School, Ahi Evran University, Kirsehir, Turkey

Correspondence: Huseyin Gumus, Mersin University, Physical Education and Sports School, Mersin University Beden Egitimi ve Spor Yuksekokulu, Mersin Universitesi Ciftlikkoy Kampusu Beden Egitimi ve Spor Yuksekokulu 33343 Yenisehir / MERSIN, Turkey. E-mail: huseyinn.gumuss@gmail.com

Received: January 22, 2019

Accepted: February 18, 2019

Online Published: February 19, 2019

doi:10.5539/hes.v9n1p151

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v9n1p151>

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine university students' perceived social support level in recreational activity participation. 536 students who were selected from 3 different universities using convenience sampling participated in the study voluntarily. As data collection form; Perceived Social Support Scale (PSSS-R) and Preference Factors of Recreation Areas (PFRA) scale were used. For the analyses of the data; descriptive statistics, Independent Samples T Test used for two groups depending on the number of the variables and One Way ANOVA used for groups more than two were used. In order to find out which group demonstrated the difference found as a result of variance analyses, Tukey test -one of the multiple comparison tests- was used. In terms of recreational activity participation, the most effective factor in students' average scores of perceived social support scale was peer support (2.690 ± 0.372) while the least effective factor was teacher support (2.033 ± 0.535). Total average score was found to be 2.441 ± 0.274 . The most effective factor in students' average scores of Recreation Area Preference Agents Scale was sporting diversity (4.448 ± 0.776) and staff (4.128 ± 0.681) and these factors were followed by physical facilities (3.736 ± 0.562), location (3.185 ± 0.647) and activity diversity (3.074 ± 0.586); respectively. Besides, there were significant differences in perceived social support levels of the study group in terms of gender and accommodation variables. It was concluded that the highest support for students' recreational activity participation came from their peers while the lowest support was obtained from teachers. It may be argued that students staying at public dormitories used recreational areas built by municipalities more than other students. It was identified that criterion that all the student groups put the biggest emphasis on while preferring recreation areas was sporting diversity offered by the recreation areas.

Keywords: social support, recreation, activity, leisure, student

1. Introduction

Humans as social beings develop their personality by continuously interacting with the environment by their very nature and thus lead their lives by integrating themselves into the environment (Terzi, 2008). Humans, with a need to be loved and cared by their environment, expect to meet this need—primarily— from their families and peers. On the other hand; humans -also wanting to be supported by the social groups that they belong to- support this need with social relations they form (Oksuz et al., 2011). Social support as a term refers to providing individuals with knowledge, recommendations, financial help that contribute to their feelings and behaviors positively or supporting them in their relations to the environment and others (Gottlieb, 1983). Knowing perceived social support level in individuals may be helpful in different ways. For Caplan, (1974) knowing social support systems assist individuals to activate their psychobiological sources, to meet their wishes and to access to financial and monetary resource by making them skilled. Also, social support systems help individuals by guiding them and providing them with knowledge. Social support systems help individuals in three different manners. First, social support systems eliminate or reduce some elements that affect their experiences negatively. Second, social support systems enhance individuals' endurance strength in case of negative experiences and improve their health status. Third, social support systems lessen environmental effects of stressors. Studies done for the last 20 years on the role of social support in every area have played a key role in understanding the

importance of social support (Guler & Turkmen, 2018; Zhang et al., 2016; Yildirim, 2016; Feeney & Collins, 2015; Avci & Yildirim, 2014; Peker & Eroglu, 2015; Gungor et al., 2018).

When humans as social beings face with a negative and unwanted situation, support systems felt nearby contribute them positively in coping with struggles. Humans always want to be included in social webs because they are born, grow up and develop in society. These social webs influence well-being of individuals (Karatat, 2012). Another factor that influences people's well-being is recreational activities. Recreation is defined as activities chosen for being engaged after spending the necessary time for work and physiological needs and is a multi-faceted term that includes social, physical and mental dynamics (Broadhurst, 2001). Recreation is any voluntarily performed activity in order to gain some social and emotional behaviors in person or in groups during their free time. This term is a feeling that is formed for satisfaction and well-being (Kilbas, 2010). Particularly, increased free time thanks to –particularly- technological advancements of the 21st century has resulted in serious demand for recreational activities (Kozak, Aydin C & Aydin Ç, 2017). Recreational activities, in which individuals participate so that they can get rid of stress, regain psychological and physical health and have fun (Kocuyigit & Yildiz, 2014) play a crucial role in developing social relations, too (Broadhurst, 2001; Buchecker & Degenhardt, 2015). However, the studies done indicate that “Family” and “Peer” subdimensions are significant barriers to recreational activity participation (Soyer et al., 2017; Sarol, 2017; Gurbuz & Henderson, 2014; Gumus, Ozgul & Karakilic, 2017; Aydin, Kahraman & Hi çdurmaz, 2017; Mumcu & Ozgul, 2018).

There are numerous studies that emphasize positive correlation of social support with physiological and psychological health (Iskender & Tas, 2018; Dokmen, 2017; Turgut & Capan, 2017; Cavus & Pekkan, 2017; Uygur, 2018) whereas there are almost no studies on recreational activity participation and social support. Therefore, this study focused on examining university students' perceived social support level in recreational activity participation.

2. Materials and Methods

This section includes the group, the data collection tool, analyses, methods, and techniques related to the data.

2.1 Participants

A total of 622 students -234 female students and 302 male students- who studied at 3 different public universities in Türkiye (Mersin University, Kirsehir Ahi Evran University, Kastamonu University), were aged between 19 and 30 years and were recruited using convenience sampling participated in the study. 86 forms filled in wrongly or incompletely were excluded from the study. Eventually, the study sample consisted of 536 students.

2.2 Collection of Data

“Information Request Form”, “Perceived Social Support Scale” and “Recreation Areas Preference Agencies Scale” were administered to the students who studied at Mersin University, Kirsehir Ahi Evran University and Kastamonu University during the 2017-2018 academic year with voluntariness principle. Participants were informed of the data collection tools before the administration of the scales and they have explained the importance of responding questions candidly. Administration of the tools took averagely 8 minutes.

2.3 Data Collection Tools

In collecting data; an Information Request Form designed by the researchers in order to get information on participants' age, gender, income level and accommodation status, “Perceived Social Support Scale” and “Recreation Area Preference Agents Scale” were employed.

Perceived Social Support Scale (PSSS): PSSS, designed by Yildirim (1997) for the Turkish society PSSS, was revised in 2004. PSSS-R includes three subdimensions of Family Support (FS), Peer Support (PS) and Teacher Support (TS) with 50 items. 47 items of the scale are direct worded while 3 items are reverse worded. Therefore, three items are reverse scored and total scores are calculated. PSSS supports a structure of 46 items and 3 factors in this study and its reliability coefficients are 0.92 for FS, 0.78 for PS, 0.93 for TS and 0.93 for total scale. After varimax rotation of three factors found in the principal components factor analysis, items account for 61.109% of the scale.

Preference Factors of Recreation Areas (PFRA): PFRA, developed by Gumus and Ozgul (2017), is a 5-point Likert scale consisted of 24 items with 5 subdimensions- Sporting Diversity (SD), Staff (S), Location (L), Physical Facilities (PF) and Activity (A) (1: Not important at all, 5: very important) [30]. There are no reverse scored items. Internal consistency coefficients are 0.84 for Sporting Diversity, 0.80 for Staff, 0.70 for Location, 0.82 for Physical facilities and 0.81 for Activity.

2.4 Analysis of Data

For the analyses of the data; descriptive statistics (percentages, frequencies etc.), explanatory factor analysis, Independent Samples T-Test used for two groups depending on the number of the variables and One Way ANOVA used for groups more than two were used. In order to find out which group demonstrated the difference obtained as a result of variance analyses, Tukey test -one of the multiple comparison tests- was used.

3. Results

In this section, findings of the variables of the study are included.

Table 1. PFRA and PSSS average scores

	Subdimension	N	\bar{x}	sd
PFRA	Sporting Diversity	536	4.24	.766
	Staff	536	4.24	.680
	Location	536	4.15	.699
	Physical Facilities	536	4.17	.562
	Activity	536	4.07	.708
PSSS	Family Support	536	2.60	.372
	Peer Support	536	2.69	.316
	Teacher Support	536	2.03	.535
	Total Perceived Social Support (PSS)	536	2.44	.274

Table 2. ANOVA results of PFRA according to Perceived Social Support Level

Subdimension	PSS Level	N	\bar{x}	sd	F	p
Sporting Diversity	Low	52	4.24	.96	1.594	.204
	Moderate	279	4.18	.79		
	High	205	4.31	.67		
Staff	Low	52	4.25	.71	2.668	.070
	Moderate	279	4.18	.69		
	High	205	4.33	.64		
Location	Low	52	4.26	.51	4.304	.014*
	Moderate	279	4.19	.68		
	High	205	4.11	.56		
Physical Facilities	Low	52	4.26	.67	1.95	.143
	Moderate	279	4.10	.74		
	High	205	4.20	.63		
Activity	Low	52	4.17	.77	.540	.583
	Moderate	279	4.06	.72		
	High	205	4.06	.67		

When participants' average scores of recreation areas preference agencies scale was investigated in terms of perceived social support level; it was noted that location subdimension produced a significant difference in individuals' perceived social support level. Individuals whose PSS (perceived social support) level was lower attached more importance to location subdimension in comparison with those individuals with moderate and high perceived social support level (Table 2).

Table 3. T-test results of PFRA and PSSS average scores in terms of gender

Subdimension		Gender	N	\bar{x}	sd	t	p	
PFRA	Sporting Diversity	Men	302	4.16	.78	-2.568	.011*	
		Women	234	4.33	.72			
	Staff	Men	302	4.16	.66	-3.087	.002*	
		Women	234	4.35	.69			
	Location	Men	302	4.10	.68	-2.073	.039*	
		Women	234	4.23	.71			
	Physical Facilities	Men	302	4.06	.56	-5.409	.001*	
		Women	234	4.32	.51			
	Activity	Men	302	3.99	.73	-3.315	.001*	
		Women	234	4.19	.65			
	PSSS	Family Support	Men	302	2.56	.39	-2.745	.006*
			Women	234	2.65	.33		
Peer Support		Men	302	2.64	.34	-3.742	.001*	
		Women	234	2.74	.26			
Teacher Support		Men	302	2.03	.52	.094	.925	
		Women	234	2.03	.55			
Total Perceived Social Support		Men	302	2.41	.28	-2.605	.009*	
		Women	234	2.47	.25			

When participants' average scores of recreation area preference agencies scale were examined in terms of gender, it was found that there were significant differences in all subdimensions. It may be argued that in perceived social support levels, gender was the variable that produced significant differences in all the subdimensions except Teacher support.

Table 4. ANOVA results of PFRA and PSSS according to accommodation

Subdimension		Accommodation	N	\bar{x}	Sd	F	p	
PFRA	Sporting Diversity	Dormitory	161	4.38	.68	3.927	.020*	
		Home	94	4.19	.68			
		Family	281	4.17	.82			
	Staff	Dormitory	161	4.24	.72	.685	.505	
		Home	94	4.31	.64			
		Family	281	4.22	.66			
	Location	Dormitory	161	4.19	.69	.289	.749	
		Home	94	4.13	.69			
		Family	281	4.14	.70			
	Physical Facilities	Dormitory	161	4.30	.54	7.236	.001*	
		Home	94	4.19	.50			
		Family	281	4.09	.57			
Activity	Dormitory	161	4.12	.71	.775	.461		
	Home	94	4.10	.66				
	Family	281	4.04	.72				
Family Support	Dormitory	161	2.64	.33	1.838	.160		
	Home	94	2.58	.43				
	Family	281	2.57	.37				
PSSS	Peer Support	Dormitory	161	2.71	.30	6.983	.001*	
		Home	94	2.77	.27			
		Family	281	2.64	.33			
	Teacher Support	Dormitory	161	2.06	.52	1.202	.302	
		Home	94	1.95	.58			
		Family	281	2.04	.52			
	Total Perceived Social Support	Dormitory	161	2.47	.25	2.071	.127	
		Home	94	2.44	.26			
			Family	281	2.42	.28		

When participants' average scores of recreation area preference agencies scale were examined in terms of accommodation, it was found that there were significant differences in the subdimensions of sporting diversity and physical facilities. According to the Tukey test performed, the significant difference was created by those students who stayed at dormitories. In perceived social support scale scores, peer support subdimension produced a significant difference. This difference was caused by those individuals who stayed with families.

Table 5. Correlation coefficients between PFRA and PSSS

N:536		PSSS	SD	S	L	PF
SPORTING DIVERSITY (SD)	Pearson Correlation	.074				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.087				
STAFF (S)	Pearson Correlation	.071	.627**			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.101	.000			
LOCATION (L)	Pearson Correlation	.001	.450**	.451**		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.973	.000	.000		
PHYSICAL FACILITIES (PF)	Pearson Correlation	.064	.543**	.593**	.471**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.138	.000	.000	.000	
ACTIVITY (A)	Pearson Correlation	-.032	.454**	.469**	.321**	.662**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.459	.000	.000	.000	.000

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

When Table 5 was looked at, no significant correlation was found between the scores of Recreation Areas Preference Agencies Scale and Perceived Social Support Scale.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

In this study, where perceived social support was investigated in relation to recreational activities, it was concluded that participants perceived the highest social support from their peers (Table 1). The studies done emphasize that peer factor is one of the most important factor in recreational activity participation (Mumcu & Alay Ozgul, 2018; Uzun et al., 2017; Ayhan et al., 2018; Chick et al., 2015; Ayhan et al., 2017). We are of the opinion that in university years during which friendship and peer relations grow more important, social support level that individuals feel is maximized because they feel that they belong to a peer group and enter into close relations with their peers. Actually, the study of Yardimci & Basbakkal (2009) point out similar results and concur with this study. Peer factor is particularly an important motivation for participating in campus recreation areas and those built by municipalities (Brock et al., 2015; Henchy, 2011). It was found that factors to which study group attached the most importance while preferring recreation areas were "Sporting diversity" and "Staff" subdimensions. Therefore, it may be suggested that recreation areas that provide tools as well as auxiliary staff such as security staff, cleaning staff, sports counselors of different sportive branches play a key role in choosing recreation areas where individuals want to visit. According to Gumus (2016); presence of sports staff, cleaning staff and security staff and presence of sports counselors in a recreation area makes it more desirable than others. Similarly, a recreation area that provides walking trail and bicycle lane, offer facilities for different sports branches makes it possible for more individuals to benefit from it.

According to another finding of the study, when participants' scores of recreation areas preference agencies scale were investigated in terms of perceived social support level, it was seen that individuals' perceived social support level produced a significant difference in location subdimension. It may be suggested that individuals with lower PSS level cared more location subdimension as compared to those with moderate and high perceived social support level (Table 2). According to what this finding indicated, individuals with lower PSS level paid more attention to such factors as recreation areas being closer to their house and city center and being accessible by mass transportation –while choosing recreation areas-. Actually, studies done emphasize that lack of security and social support is a crucial factor in participating in recreation area (Coleman, 1993; Iso-Ahola & Park, 1996; Twenge et al., 2010).

Another finding of the study results demonstrated that gender created significant differences in all subdimensions while preferring a recreation area (Table 3). It may be argued that in perceived social support levels, gender was the variable that produced significant differences in all the subdimensions but teacher support. This finding emphasizes that gender is an important variable in recreation areas preference. The study of Aradahan & Yerlisu Lapa (2011) reports that men are more comfortable and active in recreation preference because they are supported by such social institutions as work, family, social responsibilities while women have

more restricted opportunities in recreational preferences due to the roles that they adopt. The study of Thapa, Confer & Mendelson (2004) tell that men join more activities in recreation areas than women. Since men's habits to use sportive free time are stronger than women's habits (Iskender et al., 2015), women are more restricted in having opportunities in recreational preferences than men; as a result of which women are bound to take more factors into consideration while choosing recreation areas. Similarly; perceived social support scale demonstrated that women perceived more support as compared to men. In literature, there are studies stating that women perceive more social support as compared to men (Allen & Stoltenberg, 1995; Antonucci, 1987; Stokes & Wilson, 1984).

When participants' scores of recreation area preference agencies scale were examined in terms of accommodation, it was found that there were significant differences in the subdimensions of sporting diversity and physical facilities. According to the Tukey test performed, the significant difference was created by those students who stayed at dormitories. According to this finding, students who stay at dormitories attach more importance to physical facilities than other students who stay with their families; upon which the fact that students who stay at dormitories have fewer and restricted physical facilities is effective. Similarly; since times to enter and to exit dormitories are predetermined, students with a limited time prefer those recreation areas that offer more range of sporting diversity. The study of Bedimo-Rung et al. (2005) reports that parks with different physical activity opportunities are preferred by those individuals with the bigger time problem.

Acknowledgment

This study was presented as an oral presentation at the 16th International Sports Sciences Congress

References

- Allen, S. F., & Stoltenberg, C. D. (1995). Psychological separation of older adolescents and young adults from their parents: An investigation of gender differences. *Journal of Consulting and Development, 73*, 542-546. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1995.tb01791.x>
- Antonucci, T. C., & Akiyama, H. (1987). An examination of sex differences in social support among older men and women. *Sex Roles, 17*(11/12), 737-749. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00287685>
- Ardahan, F., & Lapa, Y. T. (2011). Açık alan rekreasyonu: Bisiklet kullanıcıları ve yürüyüşçülerin doğa sporu yapma nedenleri ve elde ettikleri faydalar. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 8*(1), 1327-1341.
- Avcı, Ö. H., & Yıldırım, İ. (2014). Ergenlerde şiddet eğilimi, yalnızlık ve sosyal destek. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 29*(29-1).
- Aydın, A., Kahraman, N., & Hiçdurmaz, D. (2017). Hemşirelik Öğrencilerinin Algılanan Sosyal Destek ve Psikolojik İyi Olma Düzeylerinin Belirlenmesi. *Psikiyatri Hemşireliği Dergisi, 8*(1), 40-47.
- Ayhan, C., Ekinci, N., Yalçın, I., & Yiğit, S. (2018). Investigation of Constraints that Occur during Participation in Leisure Activities by High School Students: A Sample of Turkey. *Education Sciences, 8*(2), 86. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci8020086>
- Ayhan, C., Eskiler, E., & Soyer, F. (2017). Aktif Sporcuların Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılımlarına Engel Oluşturabilecek Faktörlerin Yaşam Tatmini ve Yaşam Kalitesi Üzerine Etkisi, *Erpa Int. Congresses on Education, Hungary*, 164-175.
- Bedimo-Rung, A. L., Mowen, A. J., & Cohen, D. A. (2005). The significance of parks to physical activity and public health: a conceptual model. *American journal of preventive medicine, 28*(2), 159-168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2004.10.024>
- Broadhurst, R. (2001). *Managing Environments for Leisure and Recreation*, GBR: Routledge, London.
- Brock, M., Carr, J. W., & Todd, M. K. (2015). An examination of campus recreation usage, academic performance, and selected health indices of college freshmen. *Recreational Sports Journal, 39*(1), 27-36. <https://doi.org/10.1123/rsj.2014-0061>
- Buchecker, M., & Degenhardt, B. (2015). The Effects of Urban Inhabitants' Nearby Outdoor Recreation on Their Well-Being and Their Psychological Resilience. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism, 10*, 55-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2015.06.007>
- Caplan, G. (1974). *Support Systems and Community Mental Health*. New York: Behavioral Publications.
- Çavuş, M. F., & Pekkan, N. Ü. (2017). Algılanan Sosyal Destegın Sosyal Girişimciliğe Etkisi: Üniversite Öğrencileri Üzerinde Bir Araştırma 1. *Business and Economics Research Journal, 8*(3), 519. <https://doi.org/10.20409/berj.2017.64>

- Chick, G., Hsu, Y. C., Yeh, C. K., & Hsieh, C. M. (2015). Leisure constraints, leisure satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self-rated health in six cities in Taiwan. *Leisure Sciences*, 37(3), 232-251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2014.967897>
- Coleman, D. (1993). Leisure based social support, leisure dispositions and health. *Journal of Leisure research*, 25(4), 350-361. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1993.11969933>
- Dökmen, Z. Y. (2017). Yakınlarına bakım verenlerin ruh sağlıkları ile sosyal destek algıları arasındaki ilişkiler. *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(1).
- Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2015). A new look at social support: A theoretical perspective on thriving through relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 19(2), 113-147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314544222>
- Gottlieb, B. H. (1983). Social support as a focus for integrative research in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 38(3), 278-287. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.38.3.278>
- Guler, H., & Turkmen, M. (2018). Investigation of the effects of leisure time constraints of the university students in physical education and sport schools on their leisure time motivation: Bartın university sample. *International Journal of Recreation and Sport Science*, 2(1), 39-52. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/ijrss/issue/41363/490963>
- Gümüş, H. (2016). *Rekreasyonel Alanların Kullanım Etkenlerinin İncelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Gümüş, H., & Özgül, S. A. (2017). Development of scales for barriers to participation and preference factors in the use of recreation area. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 14(1), 865-882. <https://doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v14i1.4448>
- Gümüş, H., Özgül, S. A., & Karakılıç, M. (2017) Fiziksel Aktivite İçin Park ve Rekreasyon Alanlarına Gelen Kullanıcıların Mekân Seçimini ve Fiziksel Aktiviteye Katılımını Etkileyen Faktörler. *Sportmetre*, 15(1), 31-38.
- Gungor, N., Kurtipek, S., & Yenel, F. (2018). The needs for cognition and cognitive avoidance: The example of the faculty of sports science. *International journal of recreation and sport science*, 2, 30-38. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/ijrss/issue/41363/468427>
- Gürbüz, B., & Henderson K. A. (2014). Leisure Activity Preferences and Constraints: Perspectives from Turkey. *World Leisure Journal*, 56(4), 300-316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16078055.2014.958195>
- Henchy, A. (2011). The influence of campus recreation beyond the gym. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 35(2), 174-181. <https://doi.org/10.1123/rsj.35.2.174>
- İskender, A., Avcı, C., & Yaylı, A. (2015). Gençlerin serbest zaman değerlendirme aracı olarak rekreatif faaliyetlere katılım düzeylerinin belirlenmesi. *Journal of Recreation and Tourism Research*, 2(1), 36-42.
- İskender, M., & Taş, İ. (2018). Ergenlerde Savunma Biçimleri ve Sosyal Desteğin Şiddet Eğilimine Etkisi. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(2).
- Iso-Ahola, S. E., & Park, C. J. (1996). Leisure-related social support and self-determination as buffers of stress-illness relationship. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28(3), 169-187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1996.11949769>
- Karataş, Z. (2012). Ergenlerin algılanan sosyal destek ve sürekli kaygı düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9(19), 257-271.
- Kılbaş, Ş. (2010). *Rekreasyon (Boş Zamanı Değerlendirme)*, Gazi Kitapevi, 4. Baskı, Ankara.
- Koçyiğit, M., & Yıldız, M. (2014). Yerel Yönetimlerde Rekreasyon Uygulamaları: Konya örneği. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, 2, 211-223. <https://doi.org/10.14486/IJSCS193>
- Kozak, M. A., Aydın, Ç., & Aydın, C. (2017). Rekreasyon Faaliyetlerine Katılan Kişilerin (Rekreasyonistlerin) Örtük Liderlik Algıları. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 28(2), 227-243. <https://doi.org/10.17123/atad.362528>
- Mumcu, H., & Alay, O. S. (2018). Outdoor and indoor sports that require skill executive branches of the personality types of athletes. *International journal of recreation and sport science*, 2(1), 19-29. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/ijrss/issue/41363/457042>
- Öksüz, Y., Ayvalı, M., Coşkun, K., Baba, M., & İnci, A. (2011). Algılanan sosyal destekle akılcı olmayan

- davranışlar ilişkisi. *International Journal of Social Science*, 4(1), 119-136.
- Peker, A., & Eroğlu, Y. (2015). Ergenlerde algılanan sosyal destek ve siber zorbalığa eğilim arasındaki ilişkiler: Arkadaştan ve öğretmenenden algılanan sosyal desteğin aracı rolü. *Turkish Studies*, 10(3), 759-778. <https://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.7693>
- Sarol, H. (2017). Examination of the constraints and facilitators to physical activity participation of individuals. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 14(4), 4354-4364. <https://doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v14i4.5121>
- Soyer, F., Yıldız, N. O., Demirel, D. H., Serdar, E., Demirel, M., Ayhan, C., & Demirhan, O. (2017). The investigation of the relationship between the factors that prevent university students from attending to the recreational activities and the life satisfaction of the participants. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 14(2), 2035-2046. <https://doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v14i2.4647>
- Stokes, J. P., & Wilson, D. G. (1984). The inventory of socially supportive behaviors: Dimensionality, prediction, and gender differences. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 12(1), 53-69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00896928>
- Terzi, S. (2008). Üniversite öğrencilerinin psikolojik dayanıklılıkları ve algıladıkları sosyal destek arasındaki ilişki. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, III(29), 1-11.
- Thapa, B., Confer, J. J., & Mendelsohn, J. (2004). Trip motivations among water-based recreationists. In Paper presentation at the 2nd International Conference on Monitoring and Management of Visitor Flows in Recreational and Protected Areas. *Rovaniemi*, Finland, 208-212.
- Turgut, Ö., & Çapan, B. E. (2017). Ergen Psikolojik Sağlık Düzeyinin Yordayıcıları: Algılanan Sosyal Destek ve Okul Bağlılığı. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 44, 162-183. <https://doi.org/10.21764/maeuefd.309934>
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of management*, 36(5), 1117-1142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352246>
- Uygur, S. S. (2018). Yaşam doyumunun yordanmasında kendini açma ve sosyal desteğin rolü. *Ulusal Eğitim Akademisi Dergisi (UEAD)*, 2(1), 16-33.
- Uzun, M., İmamoğlu, O., Yamaner, F., Deryahanoğlu, G., & Yamaner, G. (2017). Examination of the factors which prevent to participate the recreative activities: Example of girls high school Rekreatif etkinliklere katılımı engelleyen faktörlerin incelenmesi: Kız lisesi örneği. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 14(1), 950-962. <https://doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v14i1.4174>
- Yardımcı, F. & Basbakkal, Z. (2010). Çocuk-ergen sosyal destek ölçeği'nin türkiye'deki geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Anadolu Hemsirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12, 41-50. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/ataunihem/issue/2645/34026>
- Yıldırım, İ. (2004). Algılanan sosyal destek ölçeğinin revizyonu. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 17, 221-236.
- Yıldırım, İ. (2016). Akademik başarı düzeyleri farklı olan lise öğrencilerinin bazı değişkenlere göre sosyal destek düzeyleri. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 2(10).
- Zhang, J., Brackbill, D., Yang, S., Becker, J., Herbert, N., & Centola, D. (2016). Support or competition? How online social networks increase physical activity: A randomized controlled trial. *Preventive medicine reports*, 4, 453-458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2016.08.008>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).