

# An investigation on perceived constraints of teachers in relation to leisure activities

Umit Dogan USTUN, Adnan ERSOY, Halil BISGIN

*School of Physical Education and Sports, University of Dumlupınar, Kütahya, Turkey.*

*Address Correspondence to U. D. Ustun, e-mail: umit.dogan.ustun@gmail.com*

## Abstract

This paper examines perceived constraints of physical education and other branches teachers (music/arts) in relation to leisure activities. After legal permissions 228 teachers, who work in city center Kütahya (a city in the west part of Turkey), voluntarily participated in the study. Leisure Constraints Scale-18- was used to collect data. To analyze the data in addition to descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation, Mann Whitney U was used. According to findings of the study while "time" was found to be the most important factor, "lack of interest" was found to be the least important factor as leisure constraints for all participants jointly. Also, analyze results revealed that while physical education and sports teachers are more constrained by intrapersonal factors other branch teachers are constrained by interpersonal factors.

**Keywords:** Leisure, leisure activities, leisure constraints, physical education and sport teacher.

## INTRODUCTION

Participation in leisure activities can be both sociological and physiological. If we consider about sociological reasons, for instance, we can mention about culture or religion. But if we consider about physiological reasons we have to talk about motives that motivate us to take part in leisure activities (20). In the literature, leisure constraints are considered -in some ways- opposite to leisure motivation and commonly seen as reasons that hinder to take part in leisure (20). Scott defines leisure constraints as "factors that limit people's participation in leisure activities, use of services, and satisfaction or enjoyment of activities (19)." In the definition of Jackson, leisure constraints are seemed as "the factors that are assumed by researchers and/or perceived or experienced by individuals to limit the formation of leisure preferences and/or to inhibit or prohibit participation and enjoyment in leisure (14). Although existing literature has contributed to explaining leisure constraints and provided much into the relationship between leisure preferences and constraints, the efforts have gained considerable attention by 1980s after leisure constraints defined in a theory called hierarchical leisure constraints theory (11).

## Hierarchical Leisure Constraints Theory

While the background of the approaches to identify leisure constraints started with studies in the early 1980s (13) the theory was conceptualized with the efforts of Crawford & Godbey (3) and Crawford et al. (4). According to these conceptualizations leisure, constraints occur in three dimensions as intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural. And while intrapersonal constraints play the most important factor, structural constraints are the least important factor in leisure participation. Intrapersonal constraints refer to individuals' inner psychological states such as lack of confidence, lack of skills, or lack of social support, laziness, boredom, self-esteem and motivation while interpersonal constraints are related to the absence of social relationships such as reference groups. Structural constraints are characterized as external factors that hinder individuals from participating in leisure activities (3, 4, 8, 12, 18). Because of the theory has been well supported by subsequent research, in the literature it is possible to see cross-cultural (21) or certain culture-specific studies (9).

## Sampling Issues in Leisure Constraints and Perspectives from Turkey

Although current empirical studies show much about leisure constraints among Turkish people, these studies mainly associated with socio-demographic differences and concentrated on university students (1, 2, 5, 7, 16). For example, Bulut & Kocak studied leisure constraints of female university students and found "facilities" to be the most important factor in relation to leisure participation (1). Similarly in a study conducted on university students by Keskin et al. "transporting" was found to be the most important factor. As seen from the above studies university students are usually constrained mainly by structural constraints (15).

In the literature even they reflect a minority of leisure constraints studies among Turkish population, different focus groups have been considered by researchers. For example in their study Yaşartürk et al. concentrated on sedentary women and reported several leisure constraints factors such as marital status, lack of free time etc. (22). In a study conducted by Öztürk, the focus group of was the shopping centering employees. But in the present study unlike above studies, our focus group consisted of physical education and sports, music and art teachers (17).

Because of the lack of empirical studies conducted on teachers about leisure constraints in the existing Turkish literature, in this study, we examined perceived constraints of physical education and other branches teachers (music/arts) in relation to leisure activities according to their teaching branch and leisure preferences. In their study Drakau et al. stated that regular participation in physical activity is a part of healthy lifestyle and a preventer of diseases fostered by the under-mobility characterizing everyday life (6), in the study towards this idea leisure preferences divided into two sections as "sporting activities" such as body building and jogging etc. and restricted with participants who have been performing these activities regularly at least three months. The second section of leisure preferences created as "other activities" such as entertaining activities like going to the cinema or cultural activities made with family or friends.

## MATERIALS & METHODS

### Study sample

The sampling group of the study consisted of 64 physical education and sports teachers and 217 other branches teachers (music and arts) from Kutahya, a city in West part of Turkey. The teachers voluntarily took part in the study and were chosen in a random way.

### Data Gathering Tool

In the study as data gathering tool Leisure Constraints Scale was used. The scale consists of 18 items and six factors such as "individual psychology", "lack of information", "facilities", "lack of friends", "time" and "lack of interest". The answers are given for the scale evaluated with a 4-point Likert-type scale from 1 not important to 4 very important. Leisure Constraints Scale 18 is the revisited form of Turkish Leisure Constraints Questionnaire (10).

### Procedure and Data Analyse

The data obtained only after getting legal permission from Ministry of Education and oral appointments from teachers between March to April 2015. In the evaluation of the data first reliability of the scale was assessed and Cronbach's Alpha for total scale calculated as .877 and Split-Half Reliability calculated as .935. Than Kolmogorov-Smirnov applied and skewness and kurtosis values were examined and found that the data had not normal distributions in all subscales. Also, mean and standard deviation assessed. Lastly, Mann Whitney U test was used in order to determine significant differences at 95 % confidence level.

## RESULTS

According to analyze results when considered jointly while the most important factor was found to be "lack of time" the least important factor was found to be "lack of interest" as a hinder to participate in leisure activities. But when considered separately while the most important factor for physical education and sports teachers was "lack of time", and "facilities" was the most important factor for other branch teachers.

Analyze results revealed that perceived constraints according to teaching branch significantly differ in "individual psychology" ( $U=4132.5$ ;  $p=.000$ ), "lack of friends" ( $U=5257.5$ ;  $p=.003$ ), "lack of time" ( $U=5157.0$ ;  $p=.002$ ) and "lack of interest" ( $U=3846.5$ ;  $p=.000$ ) factors.

Table 1. Perceived constraints by the participants.

Leisure Constrains	Jointly		Physical Education and Sports		Other branch Teachers	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Individual psychology	2.612	.623	2.937	.585	2.516	.603
Lack of information	2.681	.660	2.862	.791	2.628	.608
Facilities	2.944	.406	2.964	.500	2.937	.375
Lack of friends	2.586	.669	2.395	.443	2.642	.713
Lack of time	2.968	.635	3.164	.560	2.910	.645
Lack of interest	2.499	.825	3.02	.906	2.345	.734

Table 2. Perceived constraints according to teaching branch.

Leisure Constraints	Teaching Branch	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Individual Psychology	PE and Sports teachers	64	184.93	11835.5	4132.5	.000*
	Other branches teachers	217	128.04	27785.5		
Lack of Information	PE and Sports teachers	64	148.02	9473.5	6494.5	.428
	Other branches teachers	217	138.93	30147.5		
Facilities	PE and Sports teachers	64	147.33	9429.	6539.0	.476
	Other branches teachers	217	139.13	30192.		
Lack of Friends	PE and Sports teachers	64	114.65	7337.5	5257.5	.003*
	Other branches teachers	217	148.77	32283.5		
Lack of Time	PE and Sports teachers	64	168.92	10811.	5157.0	.002*
	Other branches teachers	217	132.76	28810.		
Lack of Interest	PE and Sports teachers	64	189.4	12121.5	3846.5	.000*
	Other branches teachers	217	126.73	27499.5		

\* p&lt; .05

Table 3. Perceived constraints according to leisure preference.

Leisure Constraints	Leisure preference	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	Sig
Individual Psychology	Other activities	212	142.03	30110.	7096.	.708
	Physical activities	69	137.84	9511.		
Lack of Information	Other activities	212	148.36	31451.5	5754.5	.007*
	Physical activities	69	118.40	8169.5		
Facilities	Other activities	212	137.32	29111.	6533.	.181
	Physical activities	69	152.32	10510.		
Lack of Friends	Other activities	212	149.44	31680.5	5525.5	.002*
	Physical activities	69	115.08	7940.5		
Lack of Time	Other activities	212	140.37	29759.	7181.	.818
	Physical activities	69	142.93	9862.		
Lack of Interest	Other activities	212	141.46	29990.	7216.	.866
	Physical activities	69	139.58	9631.		

\* p&lt; .01

According to analyze results perceived constraints of the teachers significantly differ in "lack of information" (U=5754.5; p=.007) and "lack of friends" (U=5525.5; p=.002) factors according to leisure preferences.

## DISCUSSION

This study aimed to investigate perceived constraints by teachers in relation to leisure according

to teaching branch and leisure preference. When table 1 examined it can be seen that while the most important factor was the lack of time the least important factor was found to be the lack of interest for all participants. According to this result, it can be said that the teachers intend to participate in leisure activities but they lack necessary time. But if we look at the results separately for physical education and other branch teachers it is possible to say that while

physical education and sports teachers are more constrained by intrapersonal factors other branch teachers are constrained by interpersonal factors. In a study conducted by Gürbüz & Henderson while facilities factor was found to be the most inlying factor, lack of interest was found to be the most distal factor as leisure constraints for university students (9). Even though they did not perform their study on teachers it is important that both studies showed the lack of interest factor as the most distal factor as leisure constraints.

According to analyze results perceived constraints of teachers significantly differ according to teaching branch in "individual psychology", "lack of friends", "lack of time" and "lack of interest" factors. And when mean rank scores are taken into account (see table 2) it can be concluded that while physical education and sports teachers perceive more psychological constraints and lack of time and lack of interest other branch teachers perceive more lack of friends as constraints to participate in leisure.

Analyze results also revealed significant differences in the perceived leisure constraints of teachers according to their leisure preference in the "lack of information" and "lack of friend" factors. When subscale points were taken into account it can be said that these significant differences were in favor of participants who choose "other activities" as leisure activities. In other words, teachers who prefer other activities rather than physical activities are more constrained by lack of information and lack of a friend. Similar to our findings in their study Ekinci et al. reported significant differences according to leisure preferences of university students (7). Another study finding revealed "facilities" factor as the most inlying leisure constraints according to leisure preference and significant differences among university students who prefer sporting activities and who don't (9). Our study's finding is similar with Gürbüz & Henderson's findings.

Although this study revealed empirical evidence on leisure constraints of teachers had some limitations. Because we conducted our study in one city we had a limited number of teachers and couldn't compare our results with teachers from other cities. So, future studies may focus on a mutual investigation from multiple cities or cross-cultural studies.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

An earlier version of this study was presented as an oral presentation at International Conference on

Education, Law, and Disaster Management (ELDM-16) May 24-25, 2016 at Paris (France).

#### REFERENCES

1. Bulut M, Koçak F. Hazırlık Öğrenimi Gören Kadın Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılımlarını Engelleyen Faktörlerin Belirlenmesi. Spor ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2016; 7(2): 61-71.
2. Çoruh Y, Karaküçük S. Recreational tendencies and the factors preventing university students participating to recreational activities according to gender. International Journal of Science Culture and Sport, 2014; SI1: 854-862.
3. Crawford DW, Godbey G. Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure. Leisure Sciences, 1987; 9(2): 119-127.
4. Crawford DW, Jackson EL, Godbey G. A Hierarchical model of leisure constraints. Leisure Sciences, 1991; 13(2): 309-320.
5. Demirel M, Harmandar D. Üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreasyonel etkinliklere katılımlarında engel oluşturabilecek faktörlerin belirlenmesi. Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 2009; 6(1): 838-846.
6. Drakau A, Tzetzis G, Mamantzi K. Leisure constraints experienced by university students in Greece. The Sport Journal, 2008; 11(1).
7. Ekinci NE, Kalkavan A, Üstün ÜD, Gündüz B. Üniversite öğrencilerinin sportif ve sportif olmayan rekreatif etkinliklere katılmalarına engel olabilecek unsurların incelenmesi. Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 2014; 1(1): 1-13.
8. Godbey G, Crawford DW, Shen XS. Assessing hierarchical leisure constraints theory after two decades. Journal of Leisure Research, 2010; 42(1): 111-134.
9. Gürbüz B, Henderson KA. Leisure activity preferences and constraints: Perspectives from Turkey. World Leisure Journal, 2014; 56(4): 300-316.
10. Gürbüz B, Öncü E, Emir E. Boş zaman engelleri ölçeği: Yapı geçerliğinin test edilmesi. 12. Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi, 12-14 Aralık, Denizli, 2012.
11. Hultsman W. Recognizing patterns of leisure constraints: An extension of the exploration of dimensionality. Journal of Leisure Research, 1995; 27: 228-244.
12. Jackson EL, Rucks VC. Negotiation of leisure constraints by junior high and high school students: An exploratory study. Journal of Leisure Research, 1995; 27: 85-105.
13. Jackson EL. Activity specific barriers to recreation participation. Leisure Sciences, 1983; 6(1): 47-60.
14. Jackson EL. Will research on leisure constraints still be relevant in the twenty-first century? Journal of Leisure Research, 2000; 32(1): 62-68.
15. Keskin M, Akova O, Öz M. Turizm eğitimi alan öğrencilerin rekreasyonel etkinliklere katılımlarının önündeki engellerin belirlenmesine yönelik bir çalışma. Journal of Recreation and Tourism Research, 2015; 2(4): 37-45.
16. Özşaker M. Gençlerin serbest zaman aktivitelerine katılmama nedenleri üzerine bir inceleme. Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilim Dergisi, 2012; 14(1): 126-131.
17. Öztürk H. The obstacles affecting shopping center employees' participation in recreational activities. J Soc Sci, 2016; 47(1): 41-48.

18. Samdahl DM, Jekubovich NJ. A critique of leisure constraints: Comparative analyses and understandings. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1997; 29: 430-452.
19. Scott D. Constraints. In Jenkins JM, Pigram JJ (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Leisure and Outdoor Recreation*. (pp. 75-78). London: Routledge, 2003.
20. Üstün ÜD, Ersoy A. *Sosyolojik ve Psikolojik Açılardan Rekreasyon*. (1<sup>st</sup> Press), İzmir: Ergün Basın Yayın, 2016.
21. Walker GJ, Jackson EL, Deng J. Culture and leisure constraints: A comparison of Canadian and Mainland Chinese university students. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 2007; 39: 567-590.
22. Yaşartürk F, Uzun M, İmamoğlu O, Yamaner F. Sedarter kadınların rekreatif etkinliklere katılımlarının önündeki engellerin incelenmesi. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, 2016; SI3: 789-803.