INTJORASS (2026) 10(1) 53-69
RESEARCH ARTICLE
DOI: 10.46463/ijrss.1868491

e-ISSN: 2618-5717
https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ijrss
intjorass@gmail.com

International Journal of Recreation & Sports Science

Year :2026
Volume. :10
Issue :1
Pages :53-69

Identifying Leisure Time Barriers in Campus Recreation for University Students

Tolga Hanayoğlu[1]

[1]Yozgat Bozok University, Faculty of Sport Science, Yozgat-Türkiye, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7747-5782
tolga.hanayoglu@yobu.edu.tr

Corresponding Author: tolga.hanayoglu@yobu.edu.tr

Please cite this paper as follows: Hanayoğlu T. (2026). Identifying Leisure Time Barriers in Campus Recreation for University Students. *International Journal of Recreation and Sport Science*, *10*(1), 53-69. https://doi.org/10.46463/ijrss.1868491

Article History

Received:
21.01.2026
Accepted:
12.04.2026
Available online:
04.05.2026

Edited By
Hüseyin Gümüş, Mersin University
Mersin, Türkiye.

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study is to identify the leisure constraints limiting the participation of university students in campus recreation activities and to examine whether these constraints vary according to demographic variables. The population of the study consists of students studying at Yozgat Bozok University, while the sample consists of a total of 366 participants selected through the simple random sampling method. The personal information form and the "Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale" which was adapted into Turkish culture by Yılmaz and Altunöz (2025), were utilized as the primary data collection instruments. The research design employed a general survey model among quantitative research methods. Following the acquisition of ethical committee approval, the administration of the questionnaires was conducted face-to-face and through digital forms under researcher coordination, in accordance with the principle of voluntary participation. All data were transferred to the SPSS 24.0 program for analysis. The analysis of the data was conducted using various statistical methods, including independent samples T-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and post-hoc analyses for differences. All analyses were evaluated at a significance level of $p<.05$. Consequently, it was determined that the highest level of perceived constraint among participants was in the time sub-dimension, while the lowest constraint perception was identified in the secure environment dimension. Furthermore, significant differences in constraint perceptions were observed based on gender, pre-university sport habits, daily technology usage, and accommodation status.

Keywords: Campus Recreation, Leisure Constraints, University Students, Time Management

Copyright ©
2026 Hanayoğlu. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY SA 4.0). The use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium are permitted, provided that the original author or authors and the source are credited, a link to the Creative Commons license is provided, and any changes are indicated

INTRODUCTION

The technological transformations brought by the twenty-first-century industrialization processes and the increase in the speed of access to information have radically changed the daily life practices and time management of individuals. The intense work pace and competitive environment of modern life have moved the time periods remaining outside working hours to a much more valuable and strategic position. In this context, leisure time is defined as a special area that remains after the individual fulfills the sleep, food, work, and other basic physiological requirements necessary for sustaining life. Within this period the individual can act entirely with free will without feeling any external pressure and turns towards internal satisfaction and pleasure without seeking financial gain (Ulutaş, 2019; Kocabıyık Önsoy, 2019; Bosna et al., 2018; Önen, 2023). Recreational activities carried out within this free time period are a vital tool that enables the individual not only to have fun but also to reach a state of holistic well-being by renewing physical, mental, and social capacity (Barakazı, 2022; Paksoy et al., 2016; Hekim, 2022).

Universities are one of the most efficient application areas of recreational services within educational levels and they represent a critical transition stage where young people build their personal identities, expand their socialization networks, and internalize adulthood roles in addition to gaining academic knowledge (Duran & Ünal, 2025). University campuses are dynamic ecosystems where lifelong learning

and physical or mental health are supported through a wide range of recreation opportunities. This process, referred to in the literature as campus recreation, involves the presentation of sporting, artistic, cultural, and social activities as a whole for the use of students and staff (Karaküçük, 1999; Yılmaz & Altunöz, 2025). Scientific research strongly emphasizes that such activities increase institutional belonging in university youth trigger academic motivation and make individuals more prepared for social life by reducing the risk of social isolation (Önal & Biricik, 2025; Çevik, Yılmaz, & Korkmaz, 2019; Astin, 1999).

Especially the adaptation difficulties experienced at the beginning of undergraduate education the intense stress created by academic competition and the inadequacy of social support mechanisms can lead to negative situations such as anxiety and mental burnout in students (Hamaideh, 2010; Qian et al., 2014; Saleh et al., 2017). At this point recreational areas function as strategic shelters where students can increase their mental and physical resilience (Demir et al., 2026; Uzun, 2022). However, despite these potential benefits offered on campuses the participation of individuals in recreational processes cannot always occur at the desired frequency. Leisure constraints of an individual social or structural nature that restrict the participation process reduce the efficiency of the services provided and negatively affect the life satisfaction of individuals (Allison et al., 1999; Weinberg & Gould, 2011). It is a necessity for university administrations to analyze these restrictive factors correctly to develop more inclusive and student-centered recreation policies. This study aims to identify the obstacles faced by students in campus recreation processes through the example of Yozgat Bozok University and to determine the impact of these obstacles on demographic variables such as gender, income, and age in the light of scientific data (Demir et al., 2026; Uzun, 2022; Güler et al., 2020).

The phenomenon of recreation is based on the word recreatio which means renewal, refreshment, and recreation in terms of its etymological origin. In the modern sense, it is defined as a series of activities that the individual turns to with internal motivation in free time to support self-development (Önder, 2003; Keltek & Karaçar, 2025). Within the framework of higher education institutions campus recreation is an institutional service area covering the physical infrastructure social facilities and organized programs created for campus stakeholders to evaluate their free time (Barakazı, 2022). In the context of Turkey these services gained a legal status with the forty seventh article of the Higher Education Law and universities were given the duty to create the necessary sporting and social spaces to protect the physical and mental health of students (Önder, 2003). Academic campuses are a whole with recreational areas that allow individuals to establish interdisciplinary interaction in addition to educational buildings administrative centers and housing areas (Turner, 1986; Erkman, 1990; Uzun, 2022).

The impact of regular participation in campus recreation on individual outcomes is widely documented in the literature. These activities not only help students maintain their physical fitness levels but also optimize their subjective vigor and general life satisfaction (Kara et al., 2025; Demir et al., 2026). Especially group-oriented sporting activities allow young people to gain soft skills such as teamwork, leadership, and time management thereby strengthening their capacity to cope with academic stress (Peker et al., 2023; Barakazı, 2022; Çevik et al., 2019). Conversely, it has been found that individuals deprived of recreational activities tend to withdraw socially experience loss of self confidence and turn to risky habits that threaten health (Forrester, 2015; Malinauskas et al., 2014; Swanepoel et al., 2015). Therefore recreation is a key element that determines the quality of campus life and creates a sense of community (Hall, 2006; Snodgrass & Tinsley, 1990).

Despite the high desire of individuals for these activities the factors preventing participation are categorized in the literature as leisure constraints (Jackson, 2000). These constraints are established in a hierarchical model at three basic levels (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Crawford et al., 1991). The first layer consisting of intrapersonal constraints refers to internal processes arising from the individual's own psychological state ability perception interest level or perceived self-efficacy (Duran & Ünal, 2025; Demir et al., 2026). The second layer involves interpersonal constraints which are related to external social pressures such as the lack of partners to accompany activities or social gender roles (Orhun, Altunöz, & Yaylı, 2024). The final layer of structural constraints includes environmental factors beyond the control of the individual such as lack of time economic inadequacies transportation constraints and the physical insufficiency of facilities (Keltek & Karaçar, 2025; Uzun, 2022).

The nature of the obstacles faced by university students varies according to the campus structure and the quality of services provided by the institutions. While lack of time resulting from an intense academic calendar stands out as the primary obstacle in many studies (Bosna et al., 2018), structural elements such as the distance of facilities from the center hygiene problems or equipment inadequacy minimize participation in some campuses (Mirza Sert & Onay, 2025; Duran & Ünal, 2025). Furthermore, it is observed that female students may use recreation areas more restrictively than male students due to social perceptions or security concerns (Coakley & White, 1992; Orhun et al., 2024). Continuity of participation depends on the individual's ability to negotiate and overcome these obstacles through motivation and planning rather than the complete disappearance of these barriers (Jackson et al., 1993; Demir et al., 2026; Keltek & Karaçar, 2025). In developing campuses like Yozgat Bozok University it is of vital importance for the social welfare of the campus community that recreational planning is constructed on a rational basis to minimize these obstacles and diversify usage preferences (Romsa & Hoffman, 1980; Boothby et al., 1981).

METHOD

This study was designed as a descriptive quantitative research aimed at identifying the barriers that restrict the participation of Yozgat Bozok University students in campus recreation activities. The research utilized the general survey model which aims to reveal the existing situation as it is through examinations conducted on a sample selected from the population. This model was preferred because it allows for the analysis of the perceptions attitudes and restrictive factors of a large group of participants regarding a specific phenomenon through standardized measurement tools.

The target population of the research consists of 25,735 students studying in different academic units, including associate degree, undergraduate, and graduate levels at Yozgat Bozok University during the 2025-2026 academic year. Based on the sample size calculation formula used for known populations (Cochran, 1977), the 366 participants reached in this study represent the target population with a 95% confidence level and an approximate 5.1% margin of error, which is considered statistically adequate. In determining the participants, the simple random sampling method was adopted, where each student has an equal chance of being included in the sample. The study was carried out by spreading across different faculties and campus locations of the university to ensure heterogeneity.

Data Collection Tools

The data in the research were collected through a Personal Information Form where socio-demographic characteristics were questioned and the Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale where recreational barriers were measured.

The Personal Information Form was developed by the researchers by scanning the relevant literature and consists of 10 items aimed at determining the basic demographic data of the participants such as gender age residence status and income level as well as leisure habits and on-campus activity memberships.

The Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale was used as the main measurement tool. The theoretical foundations of the scale were established by Powers and colleagues (2019), and it was adapted to the campus ecosystem by Goins (2020). The validity and reliability studies in Turkish culture were completed by Yılmaz and Altunöz (2025). The scale consists of a total of 25 items and is structured in six dimensions titled Time, Management, Social Support, Self-efficacy, Transportation, and Secure Environment. The scale, prepared in a 5-point Likert type ranging from 1 as strongly disagree to 5 as strongly agree, indicates that the severity of perceived barriers increases as the score obtained from the scale rises. In the validity study conducted by Yılmaz and Altunöz (2025), the Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient for the total score of the scale was calculated as 0.973, while the coefficients for the sub-dimensions ranged between 0.895 and 0.972.

In the reliability analysis of the scale for this specific research group, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated as 0.701 for the Social Support sub-dimension, 0.775 for the Management sub-dimension, and 0.734 for the overall scale. The fact that these internal consistency coefficients are above the accepted threshold of 0.70 in the relevant literature proves that the measurement tool provides a reliable measurement for the research group.

The data collection process was carried out using both face-to-face and digital survey forms under the coordination of academic advisors. A Voluntary Consent Form was presented to the participants before the research and ethical standards were maintained by emphasizing the principle that the data would be kept confidential and used only for scientific purposes.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using the SPSS 24.0 statistical analysis software. In the analysis of the data obtained as a result of the scales applied in the research p lower than 0.05 was taken as the significance level. Various analytical techniques appropriate for the research questions were used to test the data.

To assess whether the data followed a normal distribution normality tests were performed by examining the Kurtosis and Skewness values along with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The fact that Skewness and Kurtosis values were between +1.5 and -1.5 indicated that the data set showed a normal distribution. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, and standard deviation values were examined for demographic variables and scale score distributions.

After determining that the data exhibited a normal distribution parametric tests were used to determine the differences between groups. In this direction, the Independent Samples t-Test was used for two-group comparisons while One-Way Analysis of Variance referred to as ANOVA was performed for comparisons involving more than two groups. The variance homogeneity of the groups was checked with the Levene test. When the variances were determined to be homogeneous the Tukey HSD test among Post-hoc tests was preferred because it effectively controls the Type I error rate across multiple pairwise comparisons under the assumption of equal variances (Hair et al., 2014). In cases where the homogeneity assumption was not met the Games-Howell test was utilized, as it is specifically designed to provide robust and reliable results for unequal variances and varying sample sizes without inflating the error rate (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

RESULTS

In this section the findings obtained as a result of the analysis of the data collected within the scope of the research subject and the evaluations regarding these findings are presented.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	244	66.7
	Female	122	33.3
Age	18–20	127	34.7
	21–23	207	56.6
	≥ 24	32	8.7
Majority of Life Spent	Village or Town	76	20.8
	City	176	48.1
	Metropolitan	114	31.1
Current Place of Residence	State Dormitory	198	54.1
	Private Dormitory	47	12.8
	House with Friends	93	25.4
	House with Family	28	7.7
Monthly Income	0–5000 TL	184	50.3
	5001–10000 TL	105	28.7
	≥ 10001 TL	77	21.0
Leisure Activity	Social Activities	129	35.2
	Cultural or Artistic Activities	87	23.8
	Sporting Activities	60	16.4
	Other Social Activities	90	24.6
Student Club Membership	Yes	111	30.3
	No	255	69.7
Campus Recreation Sufficiency	Insufficient	99	27.0
	Partially	226	61.7
	Sufficient	41	11.3
Pre-University Sport	Yes	119	32.5
	No	247	67.5
Daily Technology Usage	1-4 hours	20	5.5
	5-7 hours	282	77.0
	8 hours and above	64	17.5
Total		**366**	**100.0**

When Table 1 is examined it is seen that the gender distribution of the 366 individuals participating in the study is 66.7% male with 244 individuals and 33.3% female with 122 individuals. Regarding the age variable of the participants it was determined that 34.7% were in the 18–20 age group

56.6% were in the 21–23 age group and 8.7% were in the group aged 24 and above. In terms of the settlement where the majority of their lives were spent it was found that 20.8% of the participants lived in a village or town 48.1% in a city and 31.1% in a metropolitan area. Considering the housing status of the participants it was found that 54.1% stayed in state dormitories 12.8% in private dormitories 25.4% in houses with friends and 7.7% in houses with their families. Examining monthly income levels it is observed that 50.3% of the participants have an income between 0 and 5000 TL 28.7% between 5001 and 10000 TL and 21.0% have an income of 10001 TL and above. According to the findings regarding the leisure time preferences of the participants 35.2% turn to social activities 23.8% to cultural or artistic activities 16.4% to sporting activities and 24.6% to other social activities. In terms of club membership status it was determined that 30.3% of the participants answered yes while 69.7% answered no. Regarding the sufficiency of campus recreation 27.0% of the participants stated insufficient 61.7% stated partially and 11.3% stated sufficient as their opinion. When the status of doing regular sports before university was examined it was seen that 32.5% of the participants did sports and 67.5% did not. Finally when the daily technology usage periods were examined it was determined that 5.5% of the participants used technology for 1-4 hours 77.0% for 5-7 hours and 17.5% for 8 hours and above.

Table 2. Distribution of Total and Sub-Dimension Scores of the Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale

Scale and Sub-Dimensions	Number of Items	N	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Time	2	366	3.10	.672	-.259	.857
Management	5	366	2.94	.576	-.406	.015
Social Support	5	366	2.46	.680	-.770	-.963
Self-efficacy	5	366	2.63	.462	-.383	-1.056
Transportation	2	366	2.53	.680	.133	.403
Secure Environment	6	366	2.14	.338	-.718	-.389

When Table 2 is examined the score distributions regarding the sub-dimension scores of the Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale for the participants within the scope of the research are seen. It is observed that the participants have the highest mean score in the Time sub-dimension with 3.10 and a standard deviation of 0.67. This is followed respectively by the sub-dimensions of Management with a mean of 2.94, Self-efficacy with a mean of 2.63, Transportation with a mean of 2.53, and Social Support with a mean of 2.46. The sub-dimension where the participants have the lowest mean score is the Secure Environment dimension with 2.14 and a standard deviation of 0.33. Furthermore it is observed that the skewness values for all sub-dimensions range between minus 0.770 and 0.133 while the kurtosis values range between minus 1.056 and 0.857. The fact that these values are within the limits of plus 1.5 and minus 1.5 is accepted as evidence that the data exhibit a normal distribution as stated by George and Mallery in 2010 and Tabachnick and Fidell in 2013. Based on these results it was determined that the data meet the assumption of normal distribution and parametric test methods were utilized in the analyses.

Table 3. T-Test Results of Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale Scores According to Gender Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df	P
Time	Female	122	2.96	.564	-2.992	296.45	.003*
	Male	244	3.16	.711			
Management	Female	122	2.85	.649	-1.990	204.11	.048*
	Male	244	2.98	.531			
Social Support	Female	122	2.40	.622	-1.304	271.09	.193
	Male	244	2.49	.706			
Self-efficacy	Female	122	2.72	.391	2.985	294.15	.003*
	Male	244	2.58	.488			
Transportation	Female	122	2.44	.689	-1.853	364	.065
	Male	244	2.58	.672			
Secure Environment	Female	122	2.05	.325	-3.800	364	.000*
	Male	244	2.19	.335			

*$p < .05$

According to the Independent Samples T-Test results in Table 3 it was determined that there is a significant difference between the gender variable of the participants and the sub-dimensions of Time, Management, Self-efficacy, and Secure Environment where p is lower than 0.05. When the mean scores are examined it was found that male participants had higher constraint scores in the sub-dimensions of Time, Management, and Secure Environment while female participants had higher constraint scores in the Self-efficacy sub-dimension. On the other hand it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the sub-dimension scores of Social Support and Transportation as the p value was higher than 0.05.

Table 4. T-Test Results of Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale Scores According to Student Club Membership Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Student Club Membership	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Time	Yes	111	3.05	0.78	-.781	172.1	.436
	No	255	3.12	0.61			
Management	Yes	111	2.82	0.63	-2.514	364	.012*
	No	255	2.99	0.54			
Social Support	Yes	111	1.55	0.37	-32.510	172.92	.000*
	No	255	2.85	0.29			
Self-efficacy	Yes	111	2.61	0.35	-.503	288.78	.615
	No	255	2.63	0.50			
Transportation	Yes	111	2.72	0.81	3.166	162.94	.002*
	No	255	2.45	0.59			
Secure Environment	Yes	111	1.94	0.25	-8.953	265.95	.000*
	No	255	2.23	0.33			

*$p < .05$

According to the Independent Samples T-Test results in Table 4, it was determined that there is a significant difference between the student club membership variable of the participants and the sub-dimensions of Management, Social Support, Transportation, and Secure Environment, where the p value is less than 0.05. When the mean scores are examined, it was found that participants without a student club membership had higher constraint scores in the sub-dimensions of Management, Social Support, and Secure Environment. Conversely, participants with a club membership had higher constraint scores specifically in the Transportation sub-dimension. On the other hand, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference in the sub-dimension scores of Time and Self-efficacy, as the p value was higher than 0.05.

Table 5. T-Test Results of Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale Scores According to Pre-University Sport or Recreation Status Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Pre-University Sport or Recreation	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Time	Yes	119	3.27	0.84	3.023	168.99	.003*
	No	247	3.10	0.55			
Management	Yes	119	3.10	0.72	3.409	165.9	.001*
	No	247	2.85	0.46			
Social Support	Yes	119	2.64	0.51	4.072	314.7	.000*
	No	247	2.37	0.73			
Self-efficacy	Yes	119	2.11	0.28	-23.284	364	.000*
	No	247	2.87	0.29			
Transportation	Yes	119	2.63	0.59	2.021	364	.044*
	No	247	2.48	0.71			
Secure Environment	Yes	119	2.14	0.39	.017	187.92	.987
	No	247	2.14	0.3			

*$p < .05$

According to the Independent Samples T-Test results presented in Table 5 it was determined that there is a significant difference between the pre-university sport or recreation status variable of the participants and the sub-dimensions of Time, Management, Social Support, Self-efficacy, and Transportation where the p value is less than 0.05. Conversely, no significant difference was found in the Secure Environment sub-dimension scores as the p value was higher than 0.05. When the mean scores are examined it was found that participants who engaged in pre-university sport or recreation had higher constraint scores in the dimensions of time, management, social support, and transportation. On the other hand participants who did not engage in pre-university sport or recreation were found to have higher constraint scores specifically in the self-efficacy sub-dimension.

Table 6. ANOVA Results of Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale Scores According to Age Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Age	N	Mean	SD	F	p
	1. 18-20	127	2.93	0.54		
Time	2. 21-23	207	3.24	0.73	1.854	.158
	3. 24 and above	32	2.78	0.43		
	1. 18-20	127	2.86	0.52		
Management	2. 21-23	207	3.00	0.60	1.521	.219
	3. 24 and above	32	2.80	0.49		
	1. 18-20	127	2.50	0.63		
Social Support	2. 21-23	207	2.41	0.71	1.759	.174
	3. 24 and above	32	2.63	0.61		
	1. 18-20	127	2.63	0.45		
Self-efficacy	2. 21-23	207	2.60	0.47	1.540	.216
	3. 24 and above	32	2.76	0.39		
	1. 18-20	127	2.48	0.58		
Transportation	2. 21-23	207	2.57	0.75	1.032	.358
	3. 24 and above	32	2.45	0.48		
	1. 18-20	127	2.12	0.35		
Secure Environment	2. 21-23	207	2.15	0.33	.688	.503
	3. 24 and above	32	2.19	0.24		

*$p < .05$

According to the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results presented in Table 6, no statistically significant difference was identified between the age variable of the participants and the sub-dimensions of the Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale, including Time, Management, Social Support, Self-efficacy, Transportation, and Secure Environment, as the p value was greater than 0.05. This finding indicates that the leisure constraints encountered in campus recreation show similarity according to the age groups of the participants.

Table 7. ANOVA Results of Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale Scores According to Place of Residence for Majority of Life Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Place of Residence	N	Mean	SD	F	p	Difference
	1. Village or Town	76	2.70	0.55			
Time	2. City	176	3.20	0.68	12.451	.000*	2, 3 > 1
	3. Metropolitan	114	3.35	0.62			
	1. Village or Town	76	2.65	0.42			
Management	2. City	176	3.05	0.61	10.123	.000*	2, 3 > 1
	3. Metropolitan	114	3.10	0.45			
Social Support	1. Village or Town	76	2.20	0.68	9.884	.000*	2, 3 > 1

	2. City	176	2.55	0.58			
	3. Metropolitan	114	2.65	0.71			
	1. Village or Town	76	2.40	0.35			
Self-efficacy	2. City	176	2.70	0.44	8.421	.000*	2, 3 > 1
	3. Metropolitan	114	2.80	0.38			
	1. Village or Town	76	2.50	0.51			
Transportation	2. City	176	2.55	0.57	1.124	.328	-
	3. Metropolitan	114	2.58	0.85			
	1. Village or Town	76	1.95	0.28			
Secure Environment	2. City	176	2.25	0.34	14.502	.000*	2, 3 > 1
	3. Metropolitan	114	2.35	0.31			

*$p < .05$

According to the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results presented in Table 7, it was determined that there is a statistically significant difference between the variable of the place where participants spent the majority of their lives and the sub-dimensions of Time, Management, Social Support, Self-efficacy, and Secure Environment, where the p value is less than 0.05. However, no significant difference was identified in the Transportation sub-dimension scores since the p value was greater than 0.05. Based on the (Tukey HSD) post-hoc test results, it was found that in all sub-dimensions where significance was observed, the constraint scores of participants who grew up in urban areas, including cities and metropolises, were significantly higher than those of participants who grew up in rural areas such as villages or towns.

Table 8. ANOVA Results of Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale Scores According to Accommodation Status Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Accommodation Status	N	Mean	SD	F	p	Difference
	1. State Dormitory	198	3.19	0.70			
Time	2. Private Dormitory	47	2.68	0.58	13.055	.000*	4 > 1, 3 > 2
	3. House with Friends	93	2.96	0.44			
	4. House with Family	28	3.65	0.74			
	1. State Dormitory	198	3.10	0.61			
Management	2. Private Dormitory	47	2.72	0.46	11.241	.000*	1 > 2, 3, 4
	3. House with Friends	93	2.82	0.47			
	4. House with Family	28	2.75	0.31			
	1. State Dormitory	198	2.50	0.64			
Social Support	2. Private Dormitory	47	2.48	0.63	18.402	.000*	1, 2, 3 > 4
	3. House with Friends	93	2.66	0.56			
	4. House with Family	28	1.58	0.62			
	1. State Dormitory	198	2.52	0.45			
Self-efficacy	2. Private Dormitory	47	2.68	0.41	10.887	.000*	3 > 1, 2, 4
	3. House with Friends	93	2.85	0.44			
	4. House with Family	28	2.70	0.27			
	1. State Dormitory	198	2.57	0.41			
Transportation	2. Private Dormitory	47	1.43	0.31	178.54	.000*	4 > 1, 3 > 2
	3. House with Friends	93	2.57	0.37			
	4. House with Family	28	3.92	0.23			
	1. State Dormitory	198	2.18	0.33			
Secure Environment	2. Private Dormitory	47	1.98	0.27	5.116	.001*	1, 3 > 2
	3. House with Friends	93	2.18	0.37			

4. House with Family	28	2.10	0.18	

*$p < .05$

According to the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results presented in Table 8, it was identified that there is a statistically significant difference between the accommodation status of the participants and all of the sub-dimensions of the Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale, including Time, Management, Social Support, Self-efficacy, Transportation, and Secure Environment, where the p value is less than 0.05. Based on the (Tukey HSD) post-hoc test results, it was determined that participants living with their families had the highest constraint scores in the Time and Transportation dimensions, while those staying in state dormitories had the highest scores in the Management dimension, and participants staying in a house with friends had the highest scores in the Self-efficacy dimension. In the Social Support dimension, it was found that those living with their families had the lowest constraint scores, indicating the highest support, while the lowest constraint perception in the Transportation and Time dimensions was found among participants staying in private dormitories.

Table 9. ANOVA Results of Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale Scores According to Monthly Income Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Income Group	N	Mean	SD	F	p	Difference
Time	1. 0–5000 TL	184	2.98	0.56	21.821	.000*	3 > 1, 2
	2. 5001–10000 TL	105	2.99	0.57			
	3. 10001 TL and above	77	3.52	0.84			
Management	1. 0–5000 TL	184	2.90	0.59	3.740	.025	3 > 1, 2
	2. 5001–10000 TL	105	2.88	0.57			
	3. 10001 TL and above	77	3.90	0.51			
Social Support	1. 0–5000 TL	184	2.41	0.68	3.391	.135	-
	2. 5001–10000 TL	105	2.60	0.57			
	3. 10001 TL and above	77	2.37	0.77			
Self-efficacy	1. 0–5000 TL	184	2.65	0.41	1.307	.272	-
	2. 5001–10000 TL	105	2.63	0.55			
	3. 10001 TL and above	77	2.55	0.41			
Transportation	1. 0–5000 TL	184	2.35	0.62	20.701	.000*	3 > 2 > 1
	2. 5001–10000 TL	105	2.58	0.61			
	3. 10001 TL and above	77	2.90	0.72			
Secure Environment	1. 0–5000 TL	184	2.09	0.32	4.808	.009	2 > 1
	2. 5001–10000 TL	105	2.20	0.37			
	3. 10001 TL and above	77	2.19	0.30			

*$p < .05$

According to the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results presented in Table 9, it was identified that there is a statistically significant difference between the monthly income levels of the participants and the sub-dimensions of Time, Management, Transportation, and Secure Environment, where the p value is less than 0.05. However, no significant difference was found between the sub-dimension scores of Self-efficacy and Social Support since the p value was greater than 0.05. Based on the (Games-Howell) post-hoc test results, it was determined that participants with a monthly income of 10001 TL and above have the highest constraint scores in the dimensions of Time, Management, and Transportation. Particularly in the Transportation dimension, it was observed that the perception of constraints increases gradually as income level rises, as seen in the 3 greater than 2 greater than 1 order. In the Secure Environment dimension, it was identified that the constraint perception of participants in the 5001 to 10000 TL income group is significantly higher than those in the 0 to 5000 TL group.

Table 10. ANOVA Results of Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale Scores According to Leisure Activity Type Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Activity Type	N	Mean	SD	F	p	Difference
Time	1. Sporting	60	2.74	0.62	21.570	.000*	2 > 1, 3
	2. Social	219	3.27	0.70			

	3. Cultural/Artistic	87	2.91	0.44			
	1. Sporting	60	2.73	0.54			
Management	2. Social	219	3.06	0.60	12.646	.000*	2 > 1, 3
	3. Cultural/Artistic	87	2.79	0.43			
	1. Sporting	60	2.57	0.60			
Social Support	2. Social	219	2.32	0.74	13.728	.000*	3 > 2; 1 > 2
	3. Cultural/Artistic	87	2.75	0.45			
	1. Sporting	60	2.56	0.47			
Self-efficacy	2. Social	219	2.54	0.41	25.296	.000*	3 > 1, 2
	3. Cultural/Artistic	87	2.92	0.46			
	1. Sporting	60	2.42	0.74			
Transportation	2. Social	219	2.62	0.70	4.672	.010	2 > 3
	3. Cultural/Artistic	87	2.39	0.54			
	1. Sporting	60	2.00	0.33			
Secure Environment	2. Social	219	2.15	0.31	9.393	.000*	2, 3 > 1
	3. Cultural/Artistic	87	2.24	0.37			

*p < .05

According to the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results presented in Table 10, it was identified that there is a statistically significant difference between the leisure activity type preferred by the participants and all sub-dimensions of the Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale, including Time, Management, Social Support, Self-efficacy, Transportation, and Secure Environment, where the p value is less than 0.05. Based on the (Games-Howell) post-hoc test results, it was found that participants who prefer cultural or artistic activities have the highest constraint scores in the dimensions of Self-efficacy and Secure Environment. Regarding the dimensions of Time, Management, and Transportation, the highest constraint perception was found among participants who prefer social activities. Notably, participants preferring sporting activities were found to have significantly lower constraint scores in the dimensions of Time, Management, and Secure Environment compared to the other groups.

Table 11. ANOVA Results of Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale Scores According to Campus Recreation Area Sufficiency Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Sufficiency Perception	N	Mean	SD	F	p	Difference
	1. Insufficient	99	3.49	0.71			
Time	2. Partially	226	2.98	0.55	28.556	.000*	1 > 2, 3
	3. Sufficient	41	2.79	0.73			
	1. Insufficient	99	3.65	0.18			
Management	2. Partially	226	2.82	0.24	19.575	.000*	1 > 2 > 3
	3. Sufficient	41	1.85	0.28			
	1. Insufficient	99	2.58	0.58			
Social Support	2. Partially	226	2.49	0.70	10.880	.000*	1, 2 > 3
	3. Sufficient	41	2.02	0.60			
	1. Insufficient	99	2.24	0.38			
Self-efficacy	2. Partially	226	2.83	0.37	86.116	.000*	2 > 3 > 1
	3. Sufficient	41	2.44	0.40			
	1. Insufficient	99	2.82	0.40			
Transportation	2. Partially	226	2.45	0.72	14.033	.000*	1 > 2, 3
	3. Sufficient	41	2.29	0.73			
Secure Environment	1. Insufficient	99	2.22	0.35	24.259	.000*	1, 2 > 3

2. Partially	226	2.17	0.30
3. Sufficient	41	1.82	0.31

*$p < .05$

According to the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results presented in Table 11, it was identified that there is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of the participants regarding the sufficiency of campus recreation areas and all sub-dimensions of the Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale, where the p value is less than 0.05. Based on the (Tukey HSD) post-hoc test results, it was determined that participants who find the campus areas insufficient have the highest constraint scores in the dimensions of Time, Management, and Transportation. In the Social Support and Secure Environment dimensions, it was found that both those who find the area insufficient and those who find it partially sufficient have significantly higher constraint scores compared to those who find the area sufficient. As a noteworthy finding, while the highest constraint score in the Self-efficacy dimension was observed in the group that finds the campus areas partially sufficient, it was determined that those who find the area sufficient are the group with the lowest constraint perception in most sub-dimensions.

Table 12. ANOVA Results of Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale Scores According to Daily Technology Usage Time Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Technology Usage	N	Mean	SD	F	p	Difference
Time	1. 1-4 Hours	20	2.02	0.8	168.204	.000*	3> 2> 1
	2. 5-7 Hours	282	2.97	0.44			
	3. 8 Hours and above	64	3.99	0.55			
Management	1. 1-4 Hours	20	2.59	0.53	12.114	.000*	3> 2> 1
	2. 5-7 Hours	282	2.93	0.55			
	3. 8 Hours and above	64	3.35	0.61			
Social Support	1. 1-4 Hours	20	1.90	0.53	22.105	.000*	3> 2> 1
	2. 5-7 Hours	282	2.56	0.62			
	3. 8 Hours and above	64	2.95	0.75			
Self-efficacy	1. 1-4 Hours	20	2.15	0.41	18.442	.000*	3> 2> 1
	2. 5-7 Hours	282	2.67	0.46			
	3. 8 Hours and above	64	3.10	0.45			
Transportation	1. 1-4 Hours	20	2.12	0.68	24.560	.000*	3> 2> 1
	2. 5-7 Hours	282	2.46	0.60			
	3. 8 Hours and above	64	2.98	0.80			
Secure Environment	1. 1-4 Hours	20	1.75	0.29	19.874	.000*	3> 2> 1
	2. 5-7 Hours	282	2.17	0.32			
	3. 8 Hours and above	64	2.45	0.35			

*$p < .05$

According to the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results presented in Table 12, a statistically significant difference was identified between the daily technology usage periods of the participants and all sub-dimensions of the Leisure Constraints for Campus Recreation Scale, where the p value is less than 0.05. Based on the (Tukey HSD) post-hoc test results, it was found that as the technology usage period increases, the perception of constraints in all sub-dimensions increases linearly. Notably, participants with a technology usage period of 8 hours and above were found to have the highest constraint scores in all areas, particularly in the Time and Management dimensions. The group with a technology usage period between 1 and 4 hours was identified as the group with the lowest constraint perception in all sub-dimensions.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study examined in detail the leisure constraints affecting the participation of university students in campus recreation activities through the case of Yozgat Bozok University. The findings indicate that the obstacles limiting recreational participation are predominantly driven by structural limiters and time management issues, rather than security or social support concerns. This demonstrates that participation is shaped by systemic inadequacies and the daily life routines of

students more than their interpersonal interactions. This study contributes to the literature by revealing how these constraints differ according to various demographic and behavioral variables.

The identification of the time factor as the primary obstacle to the recreational participation of students overlaps with numerous findings in the literature (Bosna et al., 2018; Duran & Ünal, 2025; Karadeniz et al., 2019; Önen, 2023). However, interpreting this 'lack of time' merely as a consequence of intense academic programs and social responsibilities (Hekim, 2022; Paksoy et al., 2016) would be an incomplete evaluation. When the 'time' constraint is analyzed together with the behavioral data of the participants, a deeper crisis of time management emerges. As the findings regarding daily technology usage in this study reveal, the perceived lack of time is heavily exacerbated by the students' digital habits. Extended screen times, especially exceeding 8 hours, directly impair time management skills, creating an artificial time constraint for physical and social activities. Therefore, the 'time' barrier experienced by university youth is not only a structural limitation imposed by the academic calendar but also an intrapersonal time management problem triggered by modern sedentary lifestyles and intense technology consumption.

Another fundamental finding of the study is the determination of the Management dimension which includes the insufficiency of facilities in terms of quantity and quality the lack of equipment and service quality as the second most important factor preventing the recreational participation of students. The fact that the constraint scores of the participants who evaluated the campus recreation areas as insufficient were significantly high with a mean of 3.65 clearly demonstrates the decisive effect of physical infrastructure and managerial arrangements on participation. Indeed it has been stated that the lack of facilities is one of the leading leisure constraints (Hekim, 2022). In the case of Düzce University it was found that the vast majority of students found sports and green areas insufficient (Uzun, 2022). Similarly it was reported that a significant portion of students evaluate their free time outside the campus due to the inadequacy of on-campus facilities (Karadeniz et al., 2019). In the current study the evaluation of campus recreation areas as insufficient or partially sufficient by 88.7% of the participants supports the limiting role of the management and infrastructure dimension on recreational participation. It is emphasized in the literature that the quantity and quality of campus recreation areas have a direct impact on the frequency of use and satisfaction levels of students. Recently, Yüksel (2026) strongly supported this by highlighting that the inadequacy of sports fields and socio-cultural activities is a primary source of student dissatisfaction, emphasizing that limited infrastructure prevents sports from becoming a sustainable campus practice. While it was stated in the Düzce University example that the insufficiency of walking paths and gymnasiums restricted the use of students and created dissatisfaction (Uzun, 2022) research on Abdullah Gül University students showed that 65% of the participants evaluated the insufficiency of facilities as the most important problem (Paksoy et al., 2016). These findings show parallelism with studies that reached similar results in the Selçuk University sample years ago and indicate that physical infrastructure and management problems in universities are a continuous structural problem area (Önder, 2003).

The findings obtained in terms of the gender variable revealed noteworthy results that partially differ from the general trend in the literature. In the research it was determined that male participants had a statistically significant higher perception of constraints in the Time and Management dimensions compared to females where p was less than 0.05 while female participants felt the Self-efficacy constraint which relates to self-confidence and skill perception more intensely than males. The higher perception of structural constraints by males differs from the studies that generally emphasize that women experience more obstacles due to gender roles security concerns and environmental pressures (Emir et al., 2022; Orhun et al., 2024). Indeed it has been reported that female students perceive especially individual and psychosocial obstacles at a higher level (Karadeniz et al., 2019; Hekim, 2022). Conversely, a recent study by Şahin, Means, and Bayram (2026) revealed that male students exhibited significantly higher self-efficacy constraints compared to females, demonstrating that gender-based constraint perceptions can vary dynamically depending on campus culture and sample characteristics. The higher perception of constraints in the Management dimension among male students in the present study can be explained by a mismatch between expectation and satisfaction resulting from their relatively more intense demand to use on-campus sports facilities and the failure of the existing infrastructure and organizational capacity to meet this demand. On the other hand the fact that female students are more sensitive in the Self-efficacy and Secure Environment dimensions is consistent with findings showing that self-confidence skill perception and security concerns are important limiters in the recreational participation of women (Güler et al., 2020; Orhun et al., 2024). These results show that gender-based obstacle perceptions are not one-dimensional but are shaped by the interaction of structural and individual factors.

The findings obtained regarding the use of technology in the research show that digital habits play a decisive role in the formation of leisure constraints. With the increase in daily technology usage time a linear increase was observed in all constraint dimensions especially in usage of 8 hours and above. This situation overlaps with findings indicating that intense technology use limits active recreational participation by directing individuals to passivity (Duran & Ünal, 2025). Yüksel (2026) also draws attention to this modern crisis, noting that intensive technology consumption confines youth to sedentary lifestyles and negatively affects their cognitive and social development. Indeed it was found that the leisure constraint perceptions of students who use technology for 8 hours and above per day are statistically significantly higher compared to those who use it less. In the literature it is

emphasized that with the increase of digitalization students turn to passive forms of recreation and this situation creates a vicious circle that reinforces physical inactivity (Duran & Ünal, 2025; Peker et al., 2023). It is stated that the pleasure taken from physical activity is directly related to happiness but excessive technology use weakens this relationship (Peker et al., 2023). Current findings suggest that intensive technology use negatively affects time management skills increases the perception of lack of time and indirectly limits recreational participation. Furthermore considering the positive predictive effect of participation in recreational activities on subjective vitality as mentioned in the literature (Kara et al., 2025) it can be said that this state of passivity developed due to technology addiction also constitutes a potential risk factor for the psychological well being of students. Expanding on this psychological risk, Şahin, Means, and Bayram (2026) conceptualized recreation anxiety as a key intrapersonal constraint, finding that increased constraints in social support and self-efficacy directly trigger higher levels of social and safety anxiety among students.

Regarding income levels it was determined that the high income group receiving 10001 TL and above has a higher perception of constraints specifically in the dimensions of Time, Management, and Transportation. Although this result seems to contradict the general opinion in the literature that constraints decrease as income increases it can be explained by the fact that income level raises expectations and facility quality standards (Paksoy et al., 2016). Finally it was found that students with a sports background and those who are members of student clubs perceive structural constraints such as management and transportation at a higher level. This situation indicates that individuals with high recreational awareness can see the disruptions in the existing system more clearly and their demands for quality service are higher.

The findings of the research regarding the variable of the place where the majority of life was spent revealed a remarkable result contrary to the common belief in the literature. It was found that the constraint scores of students who grew up in urban areas such as cities and metropolises were significantly higher than those of students coming from rural areas like villages or towns where p was less than 0.05. The higher perception of constraints among city-origin students especially in the Management and Social Support sub-dimensions can be explained by their familiarity with developed urban recreation opportunities and their expectations not being met in a smaller scale campus environment like Yozgat. There are studies in the literature that both support and differ from this finding. For instance Önen found a significant difference in the motivation of knowing and achieving according to the place of residence variable of university students but reported similarities between rural and urban origin students in constraint dimensions (Önen, 2023). Conversely Duran and Ünal stated that students from rural areas experience more obstacles regarding adaptation to the city and lack of information (Duran & Ünal, 2025). This reverse situation in the current study can be explained by the expectation disconfirmation theory as individuals accustomed to metropolitan opportunities feel more deprivation in provincial campuses.

When the club membership variable was examined in the research it was determined that students who are members of any community within the university perceive Social Support and Secure Environment constraints significantly lower meaning they experience fewer obstacles compared to non members. This finding is in complete harmony with the literature arguing that participation in recreational communities increases social integration. Önal and Biricik emphasized the role of campus recreation in the socio-cultural adaptation process stating that such participation strengthens the sense of belonging (Önal & Biricik, 2025). Similarly Demir and colleagues revealed that the social benefit dimension of recreational activities reduces the feelings of loneliness in students and breaks down the friend obstacle barrier (Demir et al., 2026). Therefore club membership functions as a strategic tool for students to overcome obstacles such as lack of friends or lack of social support.

When the relationship between the pre-university sport status of the participants and their constraint perceptions was examined it was observed that individuals who did regular sports in the past perceived the Self-efficacy constraint lower but the Management and Transportation constraints higher. In other words students with a sports background trust themselves more but exhibit a more critical attitude regarding the quality of facilities and management. This situation overlaps with the findings in the study by Peker and colleagues which examined the enjoyment levels of students who engage in regular physical activity where the quality expectation of individuals with high sports awareness increases and the perception of constraints rises when existing standards such as insufficient facilities and lack of organization do not meet this expectation (Peker et al., 2023). Hekim similarly reported that individuals with a habit of doing sports are more sensitive to structural problems such as transportation and facility inadequacy (Hekim, 2022).

Finally, in the analysis conducted according to the preferred activity type variable it was determined that students who prefer cultural and artistic activities scored Facility and Time constraints higher than those who prefer sporting activities. This situation can be associated with the fact that recreational investments on campuses generally focus on sporting facilities such as carpet pitches or gymnasiums while cultural or artistic areas like theaters or workshops remain relatively in the background. In the study conducted by Önen it was observed that the obstacles faced by students who prefer e-sports or artistic activities differ from those who prefer physical activity and concentrate on dimensions such as lack of information (Önen, 2023). Additionally Uzun supported the activity based constraint difference in this study by stating in the Düzce University case that students found cultural areas like amphitheaters more inadequate compared to sporting areas (Uzun, 2022).

In conclusion, the participation of Yozgat Bozok University students in campus recreation is primarily hindered by time management problems and deficiencies in facility management. Campus recreation is a strategic tool that facilitates the socio-cultural adaptation of students and increases the sense of belonging (Önal & Biricik, 2025). In this context it is recommended that university administrations increase the quality of existing facilities (Mirza Sert & Onay, 2025) provide guidance to students on time management and develop active recreation programs that will balance technology use.

The study conducted on Yozgat Bozok University students has demonstrated that the barriers to participation in campus recreation are multi-layered and influenced by various systemic and individual factors. One of the primary conclusions of the research is that the most significant limiters for students are the lack of time resulting from academic density and managerial problems arising from the deficiency of physical opportunities provided by the university. Furthermore gender plays a decisive role in the perception of obstacles. While male students are more likely to be hindered by structural factors such as time and management female students carry self-efficacy concerns regarding their own physical and technical skills. Another critical finding pertains to the impact of technology on inertia. Daily technology use exceeding 8 hours both consumes the time of students and distances them from recreation by raising the perception of constraints across all sub-dimensions. The data also suggests that institutional belonging and satisfaction are closely linked. The constraint scores of students who find campus recreation areas sufficient are significantly lower in most sub-dimensions, proving that qualified recreation services are a strategic tool for student satisfaction and campus adaptation. Additionally students who prefer social and cultural activities perceive higher constraints in specific dimensions such as Time, Management, and Self-efficacy compared to those who are sports-oriented.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the data obtained from the research several recommendations are presented for university administrations and recreation planners. To overcome management problems which are a major obstacle the operating hours of facilities should be made flexible according to the course schedules of students and the standards of cleanliness and equipment should be raised. To help students overcome the time obstacle micro-recreation areas should be created within the campus and time management training should be provided. Furthermore to minimize the self-efficacy obstacles of women non-competitive courses aimed at skill development such as yoga pilates and dance should be organized. To break the inactivity caused by intense technology use applications that integrate technological elements into recreation should be developed and digital detox events should be organized. To eliminate the lack of information among students the activities of student clubs and campus facilities should be announced more effectively through social media. Finally transportation facilities such as ring services and bicycle paths should be increased to facilitate access to recreation areas especially for students living with their families outside the campus. Campus recreation is the beating heart of the university and every obstacle overcome is a step taken for a more vigorous and successful university generation.

FUTURE STUDIES

Based on the findings of this study, several directions for future research can be suggested. First, considering the significant limiting effect of prolonged technology use on recreational participation, future studies should focus on longitudinal or experimental designs that measure the impact of digital habits and digital detox interventions on student time management and leisure constraints. Second, since this research was conducted on a single developing campus, it is recommended to replicate and extend future research by comparing multiple universities with different campus infrastructures, historical backgrounds, and financial statuses. This comparative approach could provide deeper insights into how structural and management constraints vary across different institutional ecosystems. Furthermore, while this study utilized quantitative methods, future research could benefit from qualitative or mixed-methods approaches to explore the underlying psychological reasons behind gender-based constraint differences, particularly investigating why male students perceive higher management constraints while female students experience lower self-efficacy. Finally, experimental studies evaluating the effectiveness of targeted campus recreation policies, such as non-competitive skill-building courses or flexible micro-recreation scheduling, on reducing student constraints would provide valuable practical guidelines for university administrations.

Author Contributions

T.H

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

The research was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki after obtaining legal permission from the Yozgat Bozok University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee on November 19, 2025 (Decision number: 30/19)

Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in this study.

Data Availability Statement

The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon

reasonable request.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the students of Yozgat Bozok University who participated in this study and contributed to the data collection process.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Copyright & License

© The Author(s) 2026.

This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0).

Authors retain copyright and grant the journal a non-exclusive license to publish the article.

REFERENCES

Allison, K. R., Dwyer, J. J. M., & Makin, S. (1999). Perceived barriers to physical activity among high school students. *Preventive Medicine, 28*(6), 608–615. https://doi.org/10.1006/pmed.1999.0489

Astin, A. W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(5), 518–529.

Barakazı, E. (2022). Campus recreation. In A. Öztürkçü Akçay (Ed.), *International research in social, human and administrative sciences III* (pp. 121–129). Eğitim Publishing.

Boothby, J., Tungatt, M. F., & Townsend, A. R. (1981). Ceasing participation in sports activity: Reported reasons and their implications. *Journal of Leisure Research, 13*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1981.11969464

Bosna, O. Ş., Bayazıt, B., & Yılmaz, O. (2018). Investigation of the factors preventing university students from participating in recreational activities: The case of Uskudar University. *CBU Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 13*(2), 200–211.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2020). *Manual of data analysis for social sciences* (26th ed.). Pegem Akademi.

Coakley, J. J., & White, A. (1992). Making decisions: Gender and sports participations among British adolescents. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 9*(1), 20–35. https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.9.1.20

Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Crawford, D. W., & Godbey, G. (1987). Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure. *Leisure Sciences, 9*(2), 119–127. https://doi.org/10.1080/01490408709512151

Crawford, D. W., Jackson, E. L., & Godbey, G. (1991). A hierarchical model of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences, 13*(4), 309–320. https://doi.org/10.1080/01490409109513147

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Çevik, H., Yılmaz, E., & Korkmaz, A. (2019). Sport experience on campus: Investigation of university students' campus recreational sport experience. *Gaziantep University Journal of Sport Sciences, 4*(3), 346–359. https://doi.org/10.31680/gaunbesbd.615174

Çuhadar, A. (2024). The mediating role of physical and psychosocial benefits in the effect of leisure involvement on happiness (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University.

Çuhadar, A. (2025). The correct use of free time: The importance of recreational sports in preventing internet gambling addiction. *Sportive, 8*(2), 33–49. https://doi.org/10.53025/sportive.1727840

Demir, S., Geyik, H., Arı, B., Evirgen, Ş., Türker, A., & Güzel, E. (2026). Investigation of recreation benefits and recreation area participation barriers in undergraduate students. *Nortis Journal of Sport Sciences, 2*(1), 21–35. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18109993

Duran, S., & Ünal, A. (2025). Factors hindering leisure and recreation activities as a touristic and social right: The case of Sinop University. *Journal of Gastronomy, Hospitality and Travel, 8*(1), 28–43. https://doi.org/10.33083/joghat.2025.152

Emir, E., Küçük Kılıç, S., Gürbüz, B., & Öncü, E. (2022). Participation of Turkish women in leisure activities: Barriers and facilitators. *Turkiye Klinikleri Journal of Sports Sciences, 14*(1), 69–78. https://doi.org/10.5336/sportsci.2021-84473

Erkman, U. (1990). *Planning and design problems on university campuses in terms of growth and development problems*. ITU Faculty of Architecture Press.

Forrester, S. (2015). The benefits of recreational sports participation in college: Results of the 2013 NASPA assessment and knowledge consortium study. *Recreational Sports Journal, 39*(1), 2–15. https://doi.org/10.1123/rsj.2014-0046

Gegez, A. E. (2010). *Marketing research*. Beta Publishing.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference (Version 17.0 update)*(10th ed.). Pearson.

Goins, B. (2020). Generation Z's leisure constraints for campus recreation: Technology's influence on constraints (Unpublished master's thesis). Oklahoma State University.

Greendorfer, S. L. (1993). Gender role stereotypes and early childhood socializations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*(3), 327–340. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1987.tb00907.x

Güler, C., Harmandar Demirel, D., Çakır, V. O., & Budak, D. (2020). Strategies for coping with leisure constraints: The case of university students. *Turkish Studies - Social, 15*(4), 1919–1930. https://doi.org/10.29228/TurkishStudies.43477

Haines, D. J. (2000). Undergraduate student benefits from

university recreation. *Recreational Sports Journal, 25*(1), 25–33. https://doi.org/10.1123/rsj.25.1.25

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.

Hall, D. A. (2006). Participation in a campus recreation program and its effect on student retention. *Recreational Sports Journal, 30*(1), 40–45. https://doi.org/10.1123/rsj.30.1.40

Hamaideh, S. (2010). Stressors and reactions to stressors among university students. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 57*(1), 69–80. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764010348442

Hekim, Ö. (2022). Investigation of participation reasons and leisure constraints of university students in nature-based sporting leisure activities (Unpublished master's thesis). Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University.

Jackson, E. L. (2000). Will research on leisure constraints still be relevant in the twenty-first century? *Journal of Leisure Research, 32*(1), 62–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2000.11949887

Jackson, E. L., Crawford, D. W., & Godbey, G. (1993). Negotiation of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences, 15*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/01490409309513182

Kara, F. M., Demirhan, E., Gürkan, R. K., & Karaca, G. (2025). The predictive power of leisure involvement of university students participating in campus recreation on their subjective vitality. *Ekev Akademi Dergisi, 102*, 316–326. https://doi.org/10.17753/sosekev.1602415

Karadeniz, F., Müftüler, M., & Gülbeyaz, K. (2019). Investigation of attitudes and barriers of university students towards leisure activities: The case of Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University. *Journal of Sports and Recreation Research, 1*(2), 21–36.

Karakaya, İ. (2012). *Scientific research methods*. Anı Publishing.

Karaküçük, S. (1999). *Recreation: Free time evaluation*. Bağırgan Publishing.

Karasar, N. (2020). *Scientific research method: Concepts, principles, techniques*. Nobelyum Publishing.

Keltek, S., & Karaçar, E. (2025). Investigation of factors hindering and facilitating recreation activities of Sinop University staff. *Journal of Gastronomy, Hospitality and Travel, 8*(2), 421–435. https://doi.org/10.33083/joghat.2025.188

Kocabıyık Önsoy, İ. (2019). Investigation of recreational tendencies and factors preventing participation in recreational activities of foreigners living in the Aegean region (Unpublished master's thesis). Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University.

Malinauskas, R., Dumciene, A., & Lapeniene, D. (2014). Social skills and life satisfaction of Lithuanian first- and senior-year university students. *Social Behavior and Personality, 42*(2), 285–293. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.2.285

Mirza Sert, E., & Onay, B. (2025). Classification of recreational needs of university students using the Kano model: The case of Ahmet Necdet Sezer Campus. *Kent Akademisi, 18*(2), 735–752. https://doi.org/10.35674/kent.1399821

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Orhun, B. N., Altunöz, Ö., & Demir, İ. H. (2024). Recreation anxiety: A scale development study. *Journal of Gastronomy, Hospitality and Travel, 7*(2), 609–624. https://doi.org/10.33083/joghat.2024.133

Orhun, B. N., Altunöz, Ö., & Yaylı, A. (2024). An examination of women's participation in recreational activities from the perspective of gender roles. *Journal of Gastronomy, Hospitality and Travel, 7*(1), 176–190. https://doi.org/10.33083/joghat.2024.112

Önal, L., & Biricik, Y. S. (2025). The role of campus recreation in the socio-cultural adaptation process. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 19*(1), 71–83. https://doi.org/10.61962/bsd.1615014

Önder, S. (2003). A study on determining the recreational tendencies and demands of Selcuk University students. *Selcuk University Journal of Agriculture Faculty, 17*(32), 31–38.

Önen, L. (2023). Investigation of factors preventing university students' participation in recreational activities and their leisure motivations (Unpublished master's thesis). Necmettin Erbakan University.

Paksoy, M., Çalık, F., Yaşartürk, F., & Çimen, K. (2016). Factors affecting the participation of Abdullah Gul University students in recreation activities. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport, 4*(Special Issue 1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.14486/IntJSCS491

Peker, H., Teke, C., Çakar, B., Kabadayı, Y., & Caner, N. (2023). The relationship between enjoyment of physical activity, intention to participate again, and happiness: The case of university students participating in campus recreation. *International Journal of Current Educational Research, 9*(2), 206–220. https://doi.org/10.61087/IntJCES.2023.8

Powers, S. L., Trauntvein, N. E., Barcelona, R. J., & Hartman, C. L. (2019). Constraints and negotiations to student recreational sport center usage. *Journal of Amateur Sport, 5*(2), 18–38. https://doi.org/10.17161/jas.v5i2.8174

Qian, X., Yarnal, C., & Almeida, D. (2014). Does leisure time moderate or mediate the effect of daily stress on positive affect? An examination using eight-day diary data. *Journal of Leisure Research, 46*(1), 106–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2014.11950314

Romsa, G., & Hoffman, W. (1980). An application of non-participation data in recreation research: Testing the opportunity theory. *Journal of Leisure Research, 12*(4), 321–328. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1980.11969458

Saleh, D., Camart, N., & Romo, L. (2017). Predictors of stress in college students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00019

Snodgrass, M. L., & Tinsley, C. E. (1990). Recreation and wellness: Identifying motivations for participation in recreational sports. *Recreational Sports Journal, 15*(1),

34–48. https://doi.org/10.1123/rsj.15.1.34

Swanepoel, E., Surujlal, J., & Dhurup, M. (2015). Attitudes toward sport and physical activity, self-esteem, and life satisfaction relationships and variations in terms of gender: Perspectives from university students. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance, 1*, 14–28.

Şahin, E., Means, W. T., & Bayram, A. (2026). The relationship between campus recreation constraints and recreation anxiety among university students. *Eurasian Journal of Sport Sciences and Education, 8*(1), 50–59. https://doi.org/10.47778/ejsse.118

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Turner, P. V. (1986). Campus: An American planning tradition. *Landscape Journal, 5*(1), 66–67. https://doi.org/10.3368/lj.5.1.66

Ulutaş, A. E. (2019). The relationship between leisure and recreation and happiness (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University.

Uzun, S. (2022). A study on the use of spaces for recreational purposes: The case of Duzce University Konuralp Campus. *Duzce University Journal of Science and Technology, 10*(1), 483–496. https://doi.org/10.29130/dubited.844331

Weinberg, R. S., & Gould, D. (2011). *Foundations of sport and exercise psychology*. Human Kinetics.

Yılmaz, O., & Altunöz, Ö. (2025a). A bibliometric analysis of campus recreation within the scope of Web of Science. *Tourism and Recreation, 7*(1), 321–332. https://doi.org/10.53601/tourismandrecreation.1568719

Yılmaz, O., & Altunöz, Ö. (2025b). Adapting the leisure constraints for campus recreation scale into Turkish culture: A validity and reliability study. *GSI Journals Serie A: Advancements in Tourism, Recreation and Sports Sciences, 8*(1), 32–53. https://doi.org/10.53353/atrss.1489640

Yüksel, M. (2026). Evaluation of university students' sports profiles and their opinions on sports facilities and activities: The case of Ordu University. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 16*(1), 508–534. https://doi.org/10.30783/nevsosbilen.1827217