



## INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEISURE TIME MANAGEMENT AND QUALITY OF LIFE IN TERMS OF INTERGENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES<sup>i</sup>

Cüneyt Seydioğlu<sup>1iii</sup>,  
İsmail Kaya<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Istanbul Topkapı University,  
University Faculty of Sport Sciences,  
Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Dumlupınar University,  
Faculty of Sport Sciences,  
Kütahya, Turkey

### Abstract:

This study was conducted to examine the relationship between leisure time management and the quality of life of individuals of different generations who have received sports education and are still continuing their education. The population of the study consists of individuals who are currently studying or graduated from the Faculty of Sports Sciences and Physical Education and Sports School in Istanbul province. As the sample group, Istanbul Topkapı University, Marmara University, and Istanbul Cerrahpaşa University were selected because they have applied units (Faculty of Sports Sciences and School of Physical Education Sports). A total of 318 students of the Faculty of Sports Sciences and School of Physical Education and Sports who were studying and graduated from these universities participated voluntarily. After the participants were informed about the scales, the data were collected. The data were analysed in a computer environment using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) programme. The normal distribution of the scores was analysed by examining normal distribution curves, skewness kurtosis values, normal distribution curves employing histograms, and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test values used when the group size is greater than 50. As a result of the skewness and kurtosis analyses of the data, it was determined that the data were suitable for parametric test conditions. In the analysis of the data, frequency, arithmetic mean and standard deviation; independent group t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to examine the differences between variables, and the Tukey test,

<sup>i</sup> This study is based on the doctoral dissertation titled "Investigation of the Relationship between Leisure Time Management and Quality of Life of X, Y, Z Generation Individuals who are Educated in the Department of Physical Education on 20.07.2022 under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Dr. İsmail Kaya (PhD Thesis, Kütahya Dumlupınar University, Kütahya, Turkey, 2022)

<sup>iii</sup> Correspondence: email [cuneyt\\_seydioglu@hotmail.com](mailto:cuneyt_seydioglu@hotmail.com)

one of the Post Hoc tests, was used to determine between which groups the difference occurred. As a result of the statistics obtained; a significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of Goal Setting and Method sub-dimensions of the leisure time management scale according to the generations of the participants. It is thought that older individuals make life plans and time management better.

**Keywords:** sport, leisure, quality of life, generation

## 1. Introduction

Humanity has always been aware of the existence of the time phenomenon and the rapid passage of time by living, thinking, and acting according to this phenomenon from pre-civilisation to the present day. To control the time and the work done, people evaluated the transformation of night into day and day into night and used the sundial to make use of the sun (Gözel, 2009). Time is one of the most difficult phenomena to define. Even though it is not very clear, there are many thoughts about the definition of time in everyone's mind. Sometimes fast, sometimes slow, unstoppable to feel its presence, it is a spiritual perception concept that has no opportunity to regain the passing seconds. Time is actually life itself. There is nothing that can be done to define time other than relying on human perception. In human perception, you cannot give a clear answer to such a question whether the flow of time is regular or irregular, fast or slow. Therefore, it is difficult to explain the concept of time subjectively and it is full of philosophical problems (Akçınar, 2014). Some thinkers have focused on the functionality of time rather than making a definition of time.

In this context, Ovidius says "*time ends everything*" and Cervantes states that time should be given to him. According to Rabelais, "*time matures everything, everything becomes clear with time, time is the father of truth*". Corneille sees time as a great master and thinks that time will put many things in order. Pascal thinks that time will eliminate pains and conflicts (Sabuncuođlu et al., 2010). It is very important to use time effectively and efficiently. Disturbances arising from the wrong and inefficient use of time affect people and society as a whole. Time management is very important for many reasons. The fact that everyone spends time in their daily lives means that time is a part of their daily lives and the flow of time is irreversible, so it needs to be managed to end the day well.

Mücevher and Erdem (2019) argued that focusing on efficient time management is the key to success in life. The following steps can be followed to make time management successful:

- Goal setting: Goals should be written down, then priorities should be set and it should be clear what to expect from life.
- The focus should be on objectives, not activities, and the most important activities should help you achieve your most important objectives.
- Timesheets should be kept regularly and time use analysed.

- It is necessary to set important goals every day and strive to achieve them (Özsoy, 2016).

People participate in many activities in their free time for various purposes, both indoors and outdoors, actively or passively, in urban or rural areas. These activities included in free time are considered within the scope of recreation. Recreation, which comes from the word "recreatio", which means renewal and restructuring in Latin, is mostly used in our language in the sense of evaluating leisure time. Recreation means relaxing and entertaining activities that individuals or groups voluntarily participate in their free time in line with their own free will and wishes (Özbey & Çelebi, 2014).

The physical and spiritual needs of human beings are called needs. The individual takes action in order to reach the targeted phenomenon in line with his/her needs and these needs are the biggest source of motivation for him/her to act. The concept of need should not be perceived as motivation, it can be expressed as a state of deficiency for motivation. For this reason, it is different from desires. It is almost impossible for us to fulfil our needs in a complete way. People act in a way to satisfy the phenomena that they see as deficient through various actions (Karaküçük & Gürbüz, 2007).

Individuals direct their behaviours according to their needs. In this regard, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs is included in the literature in order to meet the various needs of individuals (Reynold, 1972).

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs is basically divided into three:

- Since man is a being who desires and wants, his behaviour changes in line with what he needs. Needs that we need and cannot be satisfied in our inner world motivate us, while satisfied needs do not have a great effect on our behaviour.
- The need follows an orderly path from simple to complex ones according to the degree of importance.
- If we think of needs in the form of a pyramid, we can move from the bottom to the top by fulfilling our needs in a basic way (Özgüç, 1984).

People have needs such as shelter, nutrition and physiological needs and these needs appear as primary needs in order to continue their lives. In addition, needs such as desire, responsibility, social relations, etc. can be defined as secondary needs of the individual (Karaküçük, 2008).

Recreational activities respond to many needs of the individual (physical, spiritual, personal, social, innovative, well-being, etc.) (Gümüşgöl, 2016).

According to the World Health Organisation, the concept of quality of life is "*the way individuals perceive their status in life according to their own hopes, expectations, standards, and interests based on their own culture and value judgements*" (World Health, 1996). The concept of quality of life is expressed as the perception of physical and mental health levels of individuals living in the same place (Liu et al., 1986). Quality of life is accepted as synonymous with various terms in the literature. Most researchers consider life satisfaction, life satisfaction, and happiness to be synonymous with the concept of quality of life (Bayrak, 2011). All these components are important and the absence of even one of them destroys the feeling of "*I live a quality life*" (Zorba, 2010).

The concept of generation can be defined as age groups that are created especially for determining consumer habits and separated from each other with certain characteristic features based on the date of birth variable. There are 7 generations defined in the literature. Although there are various classifications in the literature regarding the definitions, number and start and end dates of these generations, the most commonly used one is as follows (Howe and Strauss, 1992); pre-depression generation (born before 1930), depression generation (born between 1930-1945), baby boomer generation (born between 1946-1964), generation X (born between 1965-1976), generation Y (born between 1977-1994) and generation Z (born after 1994). Baby boomer generation (born between 1946-1964), Generation X (born between 1965-1979), Generation Y (born between 1980-2000) and Generation Z (born after 2000). Each generation has been affected by various social processes within its own period. This situation of being affected involves confusion. *"Generations are also affected by the historical development of a country. The macro-level social, political, and economic events experienced in this period affect the individuals at the age of development and thus the value and belief system, expectations, and behaviours of the generation they are in. These values, beliefs, expectations, and behaviours remain constant in the lives of individuals of the same generation"* (Çakır, 2017).

## **2. Method**

### **2.1 Research Design**

The general survey model, one of the quantitative research methods, was used in the study. The survey model is all of the processes that describe a situation in the past or present as it exists and that is applied for the realisation of learning and the development of desired behaviours in individuals. In the general survey model, in a universe consisting of a large number of elements, a survey is conducted on the whole universe or a group of samples or samples to be taken from it in order to make a general judgment about the universe (Karasar, 2011). The study was conducted in accordance with the "Directive on Scientific Research and Publication Ethics of Higher Education Institutions".

### **2.2 Universe and Sample**

The population of the research consists of individuals who are currently studying or graduated from the Faculty of Sports Sciences and the School of Physical Education and Sports in the province of Istanbul. Istanbul Topkapı University, Marmara University, and Istanbul Cerrahpaşa University were selected as the sample group because they have applied units (Faculty of Sports Sciences and School of Physical Education and Sports). A total of 318 students from the Faculty of Sports Sciences and the School of Physical Education and Sports who were studying and graduated from these universities participated voluntarily.

## 2.3 Data Collection

The questionnaire method was used as a data collection tool in the research. The questionnaire used in the research consists of three parts. In the first part, there are questions to determine demographic information, in the second part, the Leisure Time Management Scale, which evaluates the leisure time management of the participants, and in the last part, the Quality of Life Scale was used.

### 2.3.1 Leisure Time Management Scale

The leisure time management scale was developed by researchers Wei-Ching Wang, Chin-Hsung Kao, Tzung-Cheng Huan Chung-Chi Wu in 2011. The Turkish validity and reliability study of the scale was conducted by Akgül and Karaküçük (2015). The scale consists of a total of 4 sub-dimensions and 15 items: "Goal setting and method" (6 items), "Evaluation" (3 items), "Leisure attitude" (3 items) and "Programming" (3 items). The response codes for each item vary between 1.00 and 5.00. The rating items consist of "1- Strongly disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Undecided, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree" options. In their study, Akgül and Karaküçük (2015) found the internal consistency coefficient for the first sub-dimension "Goal Setting and Method" as 81, for the second sub-dimension "Leisure Time Attitude" as 79, for the third sub-dimension "Evaluation" as 71 and for the fourth sub-dimension "Programming" as 73. The internal consistency coefficient for the whole scale was found to be 83.

### 2.3.2 Quality of Life Scale

WHOQOL-BREF scale does not have a total score. Four sub-dimension scores are calculated with the scale. The first sub-dimension is "Physical Domain". The second sub-dimension is "Spiritual Domain". The third sub-dimension is "Social Domain". The last sub-dimension is "Environmental Domain". The score of each sub-dimension is important in itself. The score obtained in each sub-dimension indicates a better quality of life. Although the first two questions of the quality of life scale are not included in the scoring, they will be evaluated separately. There are 26 questions in the original version of the scale and 27 questions are used in the Turkish version. The 27th question used in the Turkish version is also not included in the scoring and is evaluated differently. The mean scores of the answers obtained from the questions are used to determine the sub-dimension scores.

After these calculations, for the calculation of the physical sub-dimension score, the numerical averages of the scores of questions 3, 4, 10, 15, 16, 17, and 18 are taken and multiplied by four. For the calculation of the mental sub-dimension score, the numerical averages of questions 5, 6, 7, 11, 19, and 26 are taken and multiplied by four. The social sub-dimension score is calculated by multiplying the numerical average of the scores of questions 20, 21, and 22 by 4. The fourth sub-dimension, the Environment Domain score, is calculated by multiplying the numerical values of the scores of questions 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24 and 25 by 4. The validity and reliability test of the WHOQOL-BREF scale was

conducted in our country by Fidaner et al. in 1998 and the scale was deemed appropriate for the Turkish population.

The scope of the questions in which the sub-dimensions are determined is as follows:

- **Physical Domain:** Includes activities such as the ability to carry out daily tasks, compliance with medication and treatment, vitality and fatigue, mobility, pain and discomfort, sleep and rest, and ability to work.
- **Spiritual Domain:** Body image and appearance, negative emotions, self-esteem, positive emotions, spirituality, religion, personal beliefs, thinking, learning, memory, and concentration.
- **Social Domain:** Interpersonal relationships, social support, sexual life.
- **Environment Area:** Material resources, physical safety and security, health care and social assistance, accessibility, and quality, home environment, i.e. the opportunity to acquire knowledge and skills, rest and leisure.

## 2.4 Analysing the Data

The data obtained from the personal information form, Leisure Time Management, and Quality of Life scales were analysed using the SPSS 25.00 statistical package program. In the study, demographic factors were subjected to frequency analysis. Firstly, to determine which tests will be applied to the data obtained, the normality of the distribution of variables was examined by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. According to the results obtained, independent groups t-test and one-way variance analysis were used.

## 3. Findings

In this section, the findings and tables obtained as a result of the analyses performed with statistical techniques related to the purpose of the study are included in the data collected by using the methods specified in the third section.

**Table 1:** Demographic Characteristics

	Variables	N
<b>Gender</b>	Male	193
	Woman	135
<b>Age</b>	Generation X	106
	Generation Y	139
	Generation Z	73
<b>Marital status</b>	Married	93
	Single	225
<b>Total</b>		318

A total of 318 participants, 135 women, and 193 men, participated in our research voluntarily. 106 of the participants are Generation X, 139 of them are Generation Y and

73 of them are Generation Z individuals. 93 of the participants were single and 225 were married.

Table 2 shows the results of the Independent Sample T-Test Analysis regarding the comparison of the Leisure Time Scale and Quality of Life Scale scores of participants according to gender variables. There was no statistical difference in the scores of Leisure Time Scale and Quality of Life Scale sub-dimensions according to gender variables ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 2:** t-Test Results According to Participants' Gender Variable

		Gender	n	X̄	t	p
Leisure Time Management Scale	Objective Determination and Method	Male	193	85,90	-,065	,948
		Woman	135	85,35		
	Evaluation	Male	193	88,32	-,457	,648
		Woman	135	86,46		
	Leisure Attitude	Male	193	78,90	-,072	,284
		Woman	135	77,95		
	Programming	Male	193	85,72	-,035	,972
		Woman	135	85,42		
Bos Time Management General	Male	193	84,80	,055	,778	
	Woman	135	84,15			
Quality of Life Scale	General Health Status	Male	193	12,07	,074	,443
		Woman	135	12,09		
	Physical Health	Male	193	12,99	,250	,212
		Woman	135	15,39		
	Psychological Health	Male	193	18,30	-,484	,520
		Woman	135	18,23		
	Social Relations	Male	193	13,17	,197	,128
		Woman	135	15,89		
	Environmental Health	Male	193	11,51	-2,663	,177
		Woman	135	11,78		

Table 3 shows the results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) regarding the comparison of Leisure Time Scale and Quality of Life Scale scores according to generation. According to this, no numerical difference was detected in the Evaluation, Leisure Attitude, and Programme sub-dimensions of the Leisure Time Management Scale and in the Overall score of Leisure Time Management ( $p>0.05$ ). In the sub-dimensions of Goal Setting and Method, a numerical difference was detected according to the Generation variable ( $p<0.05$ ). As a result of the analysis, it is seen that this situation is due to the difference between Generation X and Generation Y in the sub-dimension of 'Leisure time attitude'. When the scores of the participants according to their generations were analysed, a numerical difference was found in the Physical Health and Environmental Health sub-dimensions ( $p<0.05$ ). As a result of the analysis, it was determined that this situation was in favour of Generation X in the Physical Health sub-dimension and in favour of Generation X between Generations X and Z in the

Environmental Health sub-dimension. No statistical difference was found in other sub-dimensions.

**Table 3: One-Way Variance Analysis Results According to Generation Groups**

		Generations	N	X	f	P	Tukey
Leisure Time Management Scale	Objective Determination and Method	Generation X <sup>1</sup>	106	81,48	6,335	,027	1-2
		Generation Y <sup>2</sup>	139	78,96			
		Generation Z <sup>3</sup>	73	76,72			
	Evaluation	Generation X <sup>1</sup>	106	86,31	,969	,077	
		Generation Y <sup>2</sup>	139	75,45			
		Generation Z <sup>3</sup>	73	85,08			
	Leisure Attitude	Generation X <sup>1</sup>	106	78,85	2,754	,012	
		Generation Y <sup>2</sup>	139	78,42			
		Generation Z <sup>3</sup>	73	84,90			
	Programming	Generation X <sup>1</sup>	106	79,89	,267	,010	
		Generation Y <sup>2</sup>	139	81,48			
		Generation Z <sup>3</sup>	73	88,96			
Bos Time Management General	Generation X <sup>1</sup>	106	76,72	3,239	,412		
	Generation Y <sup>2</sup>	139	76,31				
	Generation Z <sup>3</sup>	73	77,45				
Quality of Life Scale	General Health Status	Generation X <sup>1</sup>	106	34,289	,188	,905	
		Generation Y <sup>2</sup>	139	41,620			
		Generation Z <sup>3</sup>	73	37,028			
	Physical Health	Generation X <sup>1</sup>	106	37,840	4,594	,003	1-2
		Generation Y <sup>2</sup>	139	34,796			
		Generation Z <sup>3</sup>	73	34,517			
	Psychological Health	Generation X <sup>1</sup>	106	32,659	,922	,430	
		Generation Y <sup>2</sup>	139	33,649			
		Generation Z <sup>3</sup>	73	34,766			
	Social Relations	Generation X <sup>1</sup>	106	40,200	,879	,452	
		Generation Y <sup>2</sup>	139	36,792			
		Generation Z <sup>3</sup>	73	39,087			
Environmental Health	Generation X <sup>1</sup>	106	41,704	5,358	,001	1-3	
	Generation Y <sup>2</sup>	139	42,830				
	Generation Z <sup>3</sup>	73	41,299				

Table 4 shows the results of the Independent Sample T-Test Analysis regarding the comparison of the Leisure Time Scale and Quality of Life Scale scores according to the marital status of the participants. According to this, there was no statistically significant difference between the marital status and the sub-dimensions of the Leisure Time Management Scale and the Bos Time Management General score ( $p>0.05$ ). When the Quality of Life Scale scores of the participants according to their marital status were examined, a statistically significant difference was found in the General Health Status and Psychological Health sub-dimensions ( $p<0.05$ ). As a result of the analysis, it is seen that this situation is because the General Health and Psychological Quality of Life of single individuals are higher than married participants ( $p<0.05$ ). No statistically significant difference was found in other sub-dimension scores ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 4:** t-Test Results According to the Marital Status Variable of the Participants

		Marital Status	N	X	SS	t	p
Leisure Time Management Scale	Objective Determination and Method	Married	93	22,173	4,276	,801	,423
		Single	225	21,898	4,738		
	Evaluation	Married	93	11,336	2,687	,950	,342
		Single	225	11,142	2,647		
	Leisure Attitude	Married	93	10,798	2,836	-,841	,401
		Single	225	10,980	2,806		
	Programming	Married	93	9,375	2,863	-1,395	,164
		Single	225	9,686	2,986		
Bos Time Management General	Married	93	53,684	7,895	-,039	,969	
	Single	225	53,708	8,447			
Quality of Life Scale	General Health Status	Married	93	33,072	19,011	-5,074	,000
		Single	225	40,602	19,825		
	Physical Health	Married	93	34,734	12,079	1,250	,212
		Single	225	33,494	14,096		
	Psychological Health	Married	93	34,664	12,997	-4,484	,000
		Single	225	39,488	15,391		
	Social Relations	Married	93	39,409	18,305	-,197	,428
		Single	225	42,630	20,232		
	Environmental Health	Married	93	40,299	13,177	1,663	,708
		Single	225	43,230	15,894		

#### 4. Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

This study was conducted in order to examine the difference between the leisure time management and quality of life of different generations of individuals who have received sports education and are still continuing their education according to the generations they are in.

The results of the Independent Sample T-Test Analysis regarding the comparison of the participants' Leisure Time Scale and Quality of Life Scale scores according to gender variables are given. There was no statistical difference in the scores of Leisure Time Scale and Quality of Life Scale sub-dimensions according to gender variables.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results regarding the comparison of Leisure Time Scale and Quality of Life Scale scores according to generations are given. Accordingly, no numerical difference was found in the Evaluation, Leisure Attitude, and Programme sub-dimensions of the Leisure Time Management Scale and in the General score of Leisure Time Management. In the sub-dimensions of Goal Setting and Method, a numerical difference was detected according to the Generation variable. As a result of the analysis, it is seen that this situation is due to the difference between Generation X and Generation Y in the sub-dimension of 'Leisure Time Attitude'. When the scores of the participants according to their generations were analysed, a numerical difference was found in the Physical Health and Environmental Health sub-dimensions. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that this situation was in favour of Generation X in the Physical Health sub-dimension and in favour of Generation X between Generations X

and Z in the Environmental Health sub-dimension. No statistical difference was found in other sub-dimensions.

The results of the Independent Sample T-Test Analysis regarding the comparison of the Leisure Time Scale and Quality of Life Scale scores of the participants according to their marital status are given. Accordingly, there was no statistically significant difference between the marital status and the sub-dimensions of the Leisure Time Management Scale and the overall score of Leisure Time Management. When the Quality of Life Scale scores of the participants were examined according to their marital status, a statistically significant difference was found in the General Health Status and Psychological Health sub-dimensions. As a result of the analysis, it is seen that this situation is because the General Health and Psychological Quality of Life of single individuals are higher than married participants. No statistically significant difference was found in other sub-dimension scores.

Akgül et al. (2016) did not find a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of "Goal setting and method", "Evaluation" and "Leisure time attitude" of the scale they used in their study. Studies reporting that quality of life differs according to gender (Koçođlu & Akın 2009; Yıldırım & Hacıhasanođlu 2011) and that there is no difference according to gender (Akyüz 2018; Tetik & Koç, 2021) have found a place in the literature. Kardađ (2019) examined the relationship between life skills and social integration levels of the students of the Faculty of Sports Sciences and found no statistical difference between the gender of the participants and their level of social integration in sports. In the same study, no statistical difference was found between the age variable and the level of social integration in sport.

Seydiođlu (2022) found that there was no statistically significant difference in the sub-dimensions and general score of the Leisure Time Scale according to the gender of the participants in his study titled Investigation of the Relationship Between Leisure Time Management and Quality of Life of X, Y, Z Generation Individuals Educated in the Department of Physical Education. According to the study conducted by Kaya (2011), when the total and subscale mean scores of the Leisure Time Motivation Scale were compared according to the gender of the students, it was found that the difference between the groups was significant in terms of the total score, amotivation, knowing and achieving, identification and introjection mean scores of the scale. These results are considered as a remarkable finding in terms of showing that female students spend their leisure time more actively than male students. Akgül (2011) found that male individuals have higher leisure time motivation than female individuals due to the differences between girls and boys in traditional societies such as Turkey. In a study conducted in Sweden, it was found that female individuals had a lower perception of quality of life than male individuals (Bingefors & Isacson, 2004). It is stated that this different result may be due to psychological and environmental reasons such as working conditions, health status and lifestyle of individuals. In the BELLA study conducted in Germany, it was stated that the life satisfaction level of individuals between the ages of 14 and 17

years was lower in physical, psychological, and environmental areas for girls than for boys (Sieberer et al., 2008).

Arı (2017) did not find a statistical difference in the sub-dimensions of "Leisure time attitude" and "Programming" in the comparison of students' age variables and leisure time management scale sub-dimensions. Seydiođlu (2022) found a numerical difference in the sub-dimensions of 'Leisure time attitude' and 'Programming' sub-dimensions of the leisure time management scale with age variables according to the generation variable. This study does not overlap with our research.

In the study of Koçođlu and Akın (2009), when the relationship between marital status and quality of life was examined, it was found that those whose marital status was single had the highest score from quality of life, while those whose marital status was widowed had the lowest score (Koçođlu & Akın 2009). Aktürk (2015) concluded that there was no significant difference in the physical, mental, social, and environmental fields in the findings of the study conducted with the final-year students of the health department. These studies coincide with our research.

People who manage their leisure time correctly can generally improve their quality of life. Utilising leisure time effectively can bring many benefits. Firstly, people who manage their leisure time properly can reduce stress, improve their mental health, and feel more spiritually balanced. Adopting an active lifestyle, utilising leisure time with sports or exercise can improve physical health. This in turn can improve overall quality of life. Using leisure time to learn new skills, engage in hobbies, or spend time on activities such as reading can contribute to an individual's personal development. People who manage their leisure time well can spend more time in social interactions and build strong social connections. This can increase overall happiness and life satisfaction. Devoting leisure time to artistic or creative activities can enhance an individual's creativity, which can contribute to being more innovative in various areas of life. Managing leisure time well allows for a better balance between working life and personal life. This can increase overall life satisfaction.

The important thing is to consciously manage leisure time and use it for personal development and happiness.

### **Conflict of Interest Statement**

There are no conflicts of interest for the contributing author.

### **About the Author(s)**

**Cüneyt Seydiođlu** has a BS degree in recreation and a MA degree in Physical Education and Sports and a PhD in Physical Education and Sports Education.

ORCID: [orcid.org/0000-0002-4595-0574](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4595-0574).

**İsmail Kaya**, Dumlupınar University Faculty of Sport Sciences, Department of Coaching Science, Turkey.

ORCID: [orcid.org/0000-0003-3810-2857](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3810-2857).

## References

- Akçınar, S. (2014). *Organisational Time Management and Effective Time Use*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Beykent University Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Akgül B. M. & Karaküçük, S. (2015) Leisure Time Management Scale (Valid Reliability Study). *International Journal of Human Science*, 12, (2), 1867-1880.
- Akyüz, H. (2018). Examining the relationship between quality of life and happiness levels of leisure time consumers: Olympic winter festival example. *Unpublished PhD Thesis, Gazi University, Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Ankara*.
- Arı, Ç. (2017). *Investigation of the relationship between leisure time management and quality of life of teacher candidates enrolled in pedagogical formation* (Doctoral dissertation, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University Institute of Health Sciences).
- Bayrak, M. (2011). *Evaluation of depression levels of professional football players who quit sports in terms of quality of life* (Published Master's Thesis). Ondokuz Mayıs University, Institute of Health Sciences, Samsun.
- Bingefors, K. & Isacson, D. (2004). Epidemiology, Co-Morbidity, and Impact on Health-Related Quality of Life of Self-Reported Headache and Musculoskeletal Pain A Gender Perspective. *European Journal of Pain*, 8(5), 435-450.
- Çakır, O. (2017). *Recreation Concept and Theories*. In M. A. Kozak (Ed.), *Recreation Leadership and Tourist Guidance* (pp. 35-60). Detay Publishing, Ankara.
- Gözel, E. (2009). *Primary School Teachers' Opinions on Time Management*. *Afyon Kocatepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Master's Thesis*.
- Gümüřgöl, O. (2016). *Investigation of the effect of participation in leisure time activities on the prevention of aggression, violence, and hooliganism behaviours in football spectators*. Doctoral Thesis (Published), Dumlupınar University Institute of Health Sciences, Physical Education and Sports Department, Kütahya, p.90.
- Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2007). The next 20 years: how customer and workforce attitudes will evolve. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(7), 8, 41-52.
- Karaküçük, S. & Gürbüz, B. (2007). *Recreation and Urbanisation*. Gazi Bookstore, Ankara.
- Karaküçük, S. (2008). *Recreation (Leisure Time Utilisation)*. 6th Edition. Ankara: Gazi
- Karasar, N. (2011). *Scientific research method*, (11th edition). Nobel Publishing House.
- Karadağ, A. (2019). *Investigation of the relationship between life skills and social integration in sports sciences faculty students*. Master's Thesis. Celal Bayar University, University of Health Sciences, Manisa.
- Kaya, İ. (2016). The effect of life skills programme (LBSP) on problem behaviours and social skills of 4-year-old children. *İlköğretim Online* 19(2):612-623  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2020.692983>
- Koçođlu, D. & Akin, B. (2009). The relationship between socioeconomic inequalities and healthy lifestyle behaviours and quality of life.
- Liao, P.A., Chang, H.H. & Sun, L.C., (2012). National Health Insurance Programme and Life Satisfaction of the Elderly, *Aging & Mental Health*, 16(8), 983-992.

- Özbey, S. & Çelebi, M. (2014). *Recreation. In: Introduction to Sport Sciences. Ed. Nevzat Mirzeođlu*. Ankara: Spor Publishing House and Bookstore.
- Özgüç, N. (1984). *Tourism geography*. Istanbul University Publications, Istanbul.
- Özsoy, D. (2016). *Investigation of Time Management Attitudes and Skills of Individuals Working in Sports Organisations in Edirne City Centre*. Trakya University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Interdisciplinary Recreation Management, Master's Thesis.
- Reynold, E. (1972). *Recreation in a life*. Wods Warth Publishing Company, California.
- Sabuncuođlu, Z., Pařa, M., & Kaymaz, K. (2010). *Time Management*. Istanbul: Beta Publishing.
- Seydiođlu, C. (2022). *Investigation of the Relationship between X, Y, Z Generation Individuals, Leisure Time Management and Life Quality* (Doctoral Dissertation, Kütahya Dumlupınar University Graduate School of Education).
- Sieberer, U.R., Erhart, M., Wille, N. & Bullinger, M. (2008). Health-related quality of life in children and adolescents in Germany: results of the BELLA study, *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 17:148-156.
- Tetik, S. & Koç, H. (2021). The relation between physical activity and life quality on students of sports sciences during the covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Sports Sciences Research*, 6(2), 322-334.
- World Health Organization. (2019). *WHOQOL: measuring quality of life: World Health Organization*. World Health Organization.
- Yıldırım, A. & Hacıhasanođlu, R. (2011). Quality of life and affecting variables in health workers.
- Zorba, E. (2010). Quality of life and physical activity. 10th International Sports Sciences Congress, Congress Booklet, Bolu. 82-85.

Cüneyt Seydiođlu, İsmail Kaya  
INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEISURE TIME MANAGEMENT  
AND QUALITY OF LIFE IN TERMS OF INTERGENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES

---

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).