



Examination of Leisure Negotiation, Self-Esteem, Life Satisfaction in Participants of Campus Recreational Sports

Evren Tercan Kaas¹, Haluk Çerez¹

¹Akdeniz University, School of Physical Education and Sport, Antalya, Turkey

evrentercan@akdeniz.edu.tr

Abstract

The aim of this study was to analyze participation in campus recreational sport activities, leisure negotiation, self-esteem and life satisfaction in university students. Population of the study consisted of 3625 students from Akdeniz University who were attending elective physical education lectures. Sample of the study was 694 individuals with a mean age of 21.20 ± 2.06 . The questionnaire used for data collection consisted of demographic information, information about participation in recreational activities, "Leisure Negotiation Strategies Scale", "Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale" and "Satisfaction with Life Scale". In statistical analyses, descriptive statistics, Spearman correlation coefficient and logistic regression were used. Negative significant correlations were obtained between self-esteem scores and skill acquisition, physical fitness, financial management and leisure negotiation total mean scores showing a positive relationship between self-esteem level and these leisure negotiation strategies. Positive significant correlations were obtained between life satisfaction and all leisure negotiation strategies mean scores except time management strategies mean score. Recommendations of future research will be to inquire these relationships in different populations and making comparisons according to demographic variables.

Keywords: Campus recreation, leisure participation, leisure constraints, leisure negotiation strategies, self-esteem, life satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

After the establishment of the approach of seeing the development of students as a whole rather than considering only their intellectual training, the relationship between extracurricular activities and their benefits gained attention (Bloland, 1987). In most campuses, a wide variety of programs and activities were provided as campus recreation opportunities for students (Lindsey and Sessoms, 2006). Researchers have found that, campus recreation, as a nonacademic aspect of campus can be positively influencing student success (Henchy, 2011). These findings were supported by student involvement concept defined by Astin (1999) as the involvement of students in university experience like academic work, participation in extracurricular activities and interaction with personnel. According to this theory, the greater the student involves in university, the greater the amount of student learning takes place (Henchy, 2013).

Literature Review

Campus recreation

In literature there are many studies mentioning campus recreational sport activities and benefits that students derive from these activities. Some of the research emphasized health issues and according to these studies, recreational sport activities provide protection from future chronic diseases, unhealthy weight gain (Miller et al, 2008; Todd et al, 2009). In another study, students were reported to benefit from recreational sport activities in terms of physical well-being, fitness and physical strength (Haines, 2001). According to the study conducted by Ellis et al (2002), students with greater levels of participation in campus recreational activities had higher scores on health and quality of life measures. In various studies, campus recreational sport activities were found to be helpful in overcoming the stress resulting from adjusting to university life and fulfilling academical obligations (Haines, 2001; Kanters, 2000; Miller et al, 2008; Todd et al, 2009). In campus recreational activities students have the chance to participate in activities with their peers, which will promote the social interaction by means of these activities (Belch et al, 2001; Kasim and Dazkira, 2001; Young et al, 2003). These social interactions supported by campus recreational activities may be transformed to social bonds which will show continuity (Henchy, 2013). Also students who are found to be involved in campus recreational activities perceived more sense of campus community than those who did not involve in these activities (Elkins et al, 2011). Further benefits of campus recreational sport activities were their contribution to self-esteem levels of

students. In a study of Gadbois and Bowker (2007), male students showed higher self-esteem levels with higher level of competitive sport participation as extracurricular activities. In another study conducted to university students, recreational physical activities were reported to affect the level of self-esteem positively (Yigiter and Bayazit, 2013).

Recreational sport activities in campus also contribute to curricular aspect of university education. According to a literature review realized by Haines (2001), participation in recreational activities contributes to acquiring skills for learning and preparing for professional life. In a study by Belch et al (2001), level of school recreation center usage increased the academical success of the students in a university setting. The positive strong correlation scores between grades of freshman students and their recreational participation level suggested that providing recreational opportunities to students will contribute to the academic mission of the university (Gibbison et al, 2011). In another study, a strong relationship was obtained between intensity of recreation participation and aspiration of the student in class learning (Kasım and Dzakiria, 2001). Campus recreation facility usage and both first year retention and 5-year graduation was positively associated in a study in a campus setting (Huesman et al, 2009).

Leisure Constraints

Despite the reported benefits gained by university students from campus recreational activities, all students may not be participating in a wide variety of activities provided in campus settings. Students may be perceiving leisure constraints that prevent them from participating in recreational activities sufficiently or acquiring benefits expected from these activities. Leisure constraints was one of the most common subjects that attracted attention among researchers of leisure (Alexandris, 2013; Alexandris and Carroll, 1997; Alexandris et al, 2011; Alexandris et al, 2008; Anaza and McDowell, 2013; Andronikidis et al, 2006; Brown et al, 2001; Carroll and Alexandris, 1997; Crawford and Godbey, 1987; Crawford et al, 1991; Dong and Chick, 2012; Fendt and Wilson, 2012; Hudson et al, 2013; Jackson et al, 1993; Wood and Danylchuk, 2012; Yusof and Shah, 2007). Studying leisure constraints is found to be valuable as it has the opportunity to improve our understanding of the decision making process of individual for leisure participation (Alexandris and Carroll, 1997; Alexandris, 2013). One of the well known classification of leisure constraints was made in Crawford and Godbey's (1987) study where three categories of constraints were defined as structural, intrapersonal and interpersonal. Later these categories were further conceptualized

and linked hierarchically by Crawford et al (1991) study. To see the acceptance of this hierarchical leisure constraints model in literature, Godbey et al (2010) conducted a review study and found out that the model was either adopted as a guiding theoretical framework or empirically validated. In this hierarchical model, intrapersonal constraints were defined as the first and strongest constraints (Alexandris and Carroll, 1997). These constraints were more related with individual psychological states and attributes occurring within the individual (Andronikidis et al, 2006). They included anxiety, self-esteem, personality traits, moral values and religion (Boo et al, 2014). This category of constraints is usually measured by assessing perceived skills, abilities, and beliefs concerning the activities (Casper et al, 2011). According to Crawford et al. (1991), if intrapersonal constraints allow individuals to participate in an activity, then, they will seek others to participate the concerned activity together with themselves. This situation will lead to considering interpersonal constraints (Boo et al, 2014). Interpersonal constraints were result of interactions with peers, family, friends or other people desired as co-participants (Harrole et al, 2013). Structural factors were concrete factors resulting from external conditions such as money, time, facility problems and transportation problems. These were constraints that intervene between preference and participation (Hawkins et al, 1999).

Leisure Negotiation

With the suggestion of hierarchical leisure constraints model (Crawford and Godbey, 1987; Crawford et al, 1991), the experience of people in removing, mitigating, accommodating or negotiating leisure constraints had become a matter of concern for leisure researchers. The concept of leisure constraints negotiation suggested that some individuals might initiate or continue involving in leisure activities instead of acting passively and abandoning leisure participation (Jackson et al, 1993). This proposition was supported by a study of Jackson and Rucks (1995) concerning the leisure constraints negotiation strategies of junior high school students. In this study the strategies were both cognitive (like changing leisure intentions) and behavioural (like developing skills, management of time) as suggested by Jackson et al (1993) and students were using mostly behavioural strategies classified under the titles of “Modify time”, “Acquire skills”, “Change interpersonal relations”, “Improve finances” “Physical therapy”, “Change leisure aspiration” and “Others”. Hubbard and Mannell (2001) formed a scale using the items detected by Jackson and Rucks (1995) and making informal discussions with the participants of their study. This scale consisted of 35 items divided to subscales as

“Time management” (15 items), “Skill acquisition” (8 items), “Interpersonal coordination” (5 items), “Financial resources and strategies” (7 items). In order to test four models of motivation, constraints, participation and negotiation, this scale was applied to staff of four companies giving recreation services. Results of the study revealed that constraints affected leisure participation negatively but had a positive influence on the utilization of negotiation resources and strategies which reduced the negative effects of constraints. Later the scale was further developed by adding some items of “Physical Fitness” and was adapted to campus recreational sports in a doctoral thesis study (Elkins, 2004). This scale was used by Beggs et al (2005) to find out how university students negotiated leisure constraints to participate in recreational sports. In this study it was argued that constraints do not necessarily prevent a student from participating recreational sports and many students are able to overcome these constraints and participate. Time management and skill acquisition were the mostly used strategies respectively by students. In another study by Elkins et al (2007), the relationship between leisure negotiation strategies and leisure satisfaction was inquired in university students and it was found out that leisure satisfaction of students was mostly effected by strategies with a social component. Cognitive and behavioural negotiation strategies were inquired in a group of graduate students by interviews and according to the results, cognitive strategies were devaluing the importance of leisure, seeking positive aspects of life, defined their situation as temporarily having constraints meanwhile their behavioural strategies included strategies like time management and learning English (Li and Stodolska, 2007). In a study where constraints and negotiation strategies were inquired in high school students, intrapersonal, interpersonal, structural and socio-cultural constraints were detected and students expressed that they had found ways to overcome interpersonal and structural constraints meanwhile they did not comment enough on strategies to overcome intrapersonal and socio-cultural constraints (Palen et al, 2010).

Leisure negotiation strategies were inquired in literature in different groups of individuals. In a study by Alexandris et al (2007), the relationship of motivation, negotiation and participation in skiers were examined and according to the results, time management and improving knowledge strategies contributed to intention to skiing. Recreational swimmers participated in a research examining the use of negotiation strategies with different involvement levels and it was found out that high involved individuals had the highest scores and low involved individuals had the lowest scores (Alexandris et al, 2013). In case of a group of amateur ice skaters, some of the negotiation strategies like rearranging schedules or

finances or switching to more appropriate activities were found familiar by the authors meanwhile strategies like becoming politically active, joining the executive or trying to influence decisions were claimed to be newly emerging (McQuarrie and Jackson, 1996). In a group of marathon runners, the relationship between negotiation-efficacy and leisure involvement to commitment was investigated and according to the results, involvement and negotiation-efficacy explained 72% of the psychological commitment to marathon running participation (Ridinger et al, 2012).

Leisure negotiation studies were also conducted to elderly people. In today's environment where elderly people are supported for positive aging, physical activity and leisure, some of them were successful to manage the physical and psychological realities of aging (Dionigi, 2006). As public parks are recognized to have an impact on facilitating physical activity, park visitors were also subject to the attention of leisure literature (Stanis et al, 2009). In one of these studies, park visitors were found out to show healthier weight than average residents and different individual, social and environmental factors influenced the adoption and maintenance of physical activity (Stanis et al, 2010). In a study concerning middle-aged and older park recreation participants, Hubbard and Mannell's (2001) model of leisure constraints negotiation was tested and according to the results, the negative effect of constraints was nearly balanced by positive influence of negotiation strategies where motivation was fully mediated by negotiation strategies (Son et al, 2008). In a similar group, the relationship between age, gender, leisure constraints, leisure constraint negotiation, motivation and physically active leisure was inquired and age and gender were found to be important factors in the constraint negotiation process of physically active leisure for older adults (Son et al, 2008).

Studies specific to women are common among leisure negotiation research. In a study, negotiation strategies against constraints like rigid scheduling, feeling guilty and narrow programming were used where receiving social support from life partner and overcoming rigid work structures were supportive in participation (Dixon, 2009). When single mothers were inquired, children were observed to be changing the priorities of mothers and even creating constraints. However they were also contributing their mothers to broaden their leisure experiences (Irving and Giles, 2011). In another study, women attending to sport centres were found out to use negotiation strategies such as ignoring negative comments, convincing their families about the benefits of leisure activities and organizing their time (Koca et al, 2009). Patient groups were also inquired about leisure constraints and in a group

of people with fibromyalgia, participants were observed to have higher level of leisure participation with greater motivation and efforts due to increasing level of confidence in successful utilization of negotiation resources (Loucks-Atkinson and Mannell, 2007). People with disabilities were also subject to leisure negotiation research and the concept of extraversion as a personality trait was found out to have an impact on the negotiation process and participation in leisure (Lyu et al, 2013).

Although the importance of leisure negotiation in leisure participation was examined in literature (Hubbard and Mannell, 2001) and leisure participation was related to well-being aspects of life in literature (Brown and Frankel, 1993; Huang and Carleton, 2003; Nimrod, 2007; Rodriguez et al, 2008), the direct relationship of leisure negotiation with well-being was not often studied in leisure literature. An exception was a study conducted to university students testing a model of psychological well-being, leisure negotiation and leisure participation. In this study, autonomy and self-acceptance dimensions of psychological well-being had significant effects on leisure negotiation strategies (Ma et al, 2012). To meet the deficit in the literature leisure negotiation was related with self-esteem, life satisfaction and leisure participation in university students in this study. As university level education is recognized as the last stage of formal education for most people, it may be the last opportunity to shape leisure behavior before leaving the campus life (Cheng et al, 1995) and gaining healthy lifestyle. Hence, it is important to shed light on the issues of leisure constraints negotiation and its effect on the self-evaluation of the lives of university students. Based on the above mentioned literature, the study aims to reveal the relationship between leisure negotiation strategies utilized by university students, their level of self-esteem, life satisfaction and participation in campus recreational sports.

METHOD

The research is a descriptive, cross-sectional study. The model of the study is scanning where the aim is to describe a situation that was available in the past or is still available as it is (Sahin, 2013).

Population and Sample

Population of the study consisted of 3625 university students taking elective physical education lectures in Akdeniz University during 2013-2014 educational period. Sample size was calculated by the formula $n = \frac{Nt^2pq}{d^2(N-1) + t^2pq}$ (Sumbuloglu and Sumbuloglu,

1995). The values of p (probability of occurrence) and q (probability of non-occurrence) were taken as 0.5 in order to give the highest sample size in the formula. Meanwhile, t value for $\alpha=0.05$ was taken as 1.96 from the t table. d, accepted level of deviation was taken as 0.05. By this formula sample size was calculated as $n=347$. In case of data losses, two times the sample number was taken and 694 students were included in the study.

Instrumentation

Data collection tool of this study was a questionnaire consisting of 5 parts. In the first part demographic data was collected. In the second part, information about the participation in recreational activities were presented. In the third part of the data collection tool “Leisure Negotiation Strategies Scale” was used. The scale was first developed by Hubbard and Mannell (2001), modified to recreational sports by Elkins (2004) and validated by Beggs et al (2005). Adaptation of the scale to Turkish culture was conducted by Yerlisu Lapa (2012) and published (Yerlisu Lapa, 2014). The scale consisted of 31 items of 5-point Likert type. In the reliability analysis conducted by Yerlisu Lapa (2014), Cronbach’s alpha was found to be changing between 0.85-0.91 and the goodness of fit indexes of confirmatory factor analysis were found to be confirming the model (GFI=0.85, AGFI=0.82, NFI=0.87, TLI=0.90, CFI=0.91, RMSA=0.072, SRMR=0.074). In the explanatory factor analysis, 4 of the 31 items were excluded as they loaded on more than one factor. The remaining 27 questions were distributed to 6 sub-dimensions with an explained variance of %53.86 (Yerlisu Lapa, 2014) which were “Time management”, “Skill acquisition”, “Interpersonal relations”, “Intrapersonal validation”, “Physical fitness”, and “Financial management”. In this study the Cronbach’s alpha was found to be 0.796. In the fourth part of the data collection tool Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale was used which was developed by Rosenberg (1965) and the first 10 items were utilized by measuring self-esteem. Cross-cultural adaptation of the scale into Turkish was performed by Cuhadaroglu (1986). According to the evaluation of the items, 0-1 points means high; 2-4 points means medium and 5-6 points means low self-esteem. In the fifth part, “Satisfaction with Life Scale” developed by Diener et al. (1985) and adapted to Turkish by Koker (1991) was used. The scale consisted of 5 items scored from 1 (Not expressing me at all) to 7 (Totally expressing me). In Koker’s (1991) study, 0.85 was found as a test re-test reliability coefficient, meanwhile in this study Cronbach’s alpha was found as 0.832.

Data Collection Procedure

Participants of the study were assembled in a classroom in groups of 30 students. They were informed about the aim and subject of the study and voluntary participants were distributed the questionnaires. Researchers were present while participants answered the questions.

Statistical Analysis

As statistical analysis, frequency distributions, descriptive statistics, Spearman's rho correlation and logistic regression analyses were conducted. The normality of the data was tested by Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

FINDINGS

Demographic information of the sample was examined and according to the findings the participants had mean age 21.20 ± 2.06 , consisted of mostly men (51.9%). Participants were born mostly in cities (73.5%), they perceived their socio-economical level as medium (45.0%) and mostly had an income level between 1001 TL-3000 TL (56.5%)(Table1).

Table 1: Demographic data of participants

		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Men	360	51.9
	Women	334	48.1
	Total	694	100.0
Place of Birth	City	510	73.5
	Town	117	16.9
	Village	67	9.7
	Total	694	100.0
Perceived Socio-economical Level	Very good	67	9.7
	Good	236	34.0
	Medium	312	45.0
	Poor	69	9.9
	Very poor	10	1.4
	Total	694	100.0
Income Level	1000 TL and lower	140	20.2
	1001 TL-2000 TL	206	29.7
	2001 TL-3000 TL	186	26.8
	3001 TL-4000 TL	94	13.5
	4001 TL-5000 TL	34	4.9
	5001 TL and higher	34	4.9
	Total	694	100.0

Participants were asked with whom they preferred to participate in recreational sport activities and they were let to mark more than one choice. “Participating with friends” was marked with highest frequency. Among 694 students that constituted the sample 83.6% marked this choice.

Students were asked why they were participating in recreational sport activities and they were let to mark more than one choice. Among 694 students 64.8% marked “It is enjoyable” and 55.8% marked “I want to relax” (Table 2).

Table 2: People that participants prefer to participate with in recreational sport activities and their reasons to participate

		Frequency of ticks	%	N
I Participate Activities With	I participate alone	162	23.3	694
	Friends	580	83.6	694
	Family	166	23.9	694
	Other	26	3.7	694
I Participate Because	It is enjoyable	450	64.8	694
	I want to be with friends	383	55.2	694
	I want to relax	387	55.8	694
	I want to get rid of stress	347	50.0	694
	I want to enter a new environment	161	23.2	694
	People around me motivate me	181	26.1	694
	I want to get rid of loneliness	178	25.6	694
	I want to be happy	286	41.2	694
	I want to learn new skills	236	34.0	694

Participation levels of students in recreational sport activities were examined and it was found out that they mostly participated during 6-10 hours (%37.8) and 3-4 times (%40.8) a week. Participants preferred active participation in recreational sport activities (%73.9)(Table 3).

Table 3: Weekly duration and frequency of recreational sport participation in university students

		Frequency	Percentage
Weekly Duration of Participation	1-5 hours	240	34.6
	6-10 hours	262	37.8
	11-15 hours	142	20.5
	16 hours and over	50	7.2
	Total	694	100.0
Weekly Frequency of Participation	1-2 times	194	28.0
	3-4 times	283	40.8
	5-6 times	145	20.9
	7 times and over	72	10.4
	Total	694	100.0
Type of Participation	Actively	513	73.9
	Passively	181	26.1
	Total	694	100.0

In Table 4, mean scores that participants receive from the scales used in the study were demonstrated. From self-esteem scale, participants received a mean score of 1.20 ± 0.76 showing a high level of self-esteem. When leisure negotiation strategies scale was considered the highest mean was achieved from skill acquisition with 3.69 ± 0.76 and physical fitness with 3.62 ± 0.85 . Satisfaction with Life Scale was a 7-point Likert scale and participants received 4.44 ± 1.21 , a score over the average.

Table 4: Mean scores of self-esteem, leisure negotiation strategies and life satisfaction

		Mean	Standard Deviation
Self-esteem		1.20	0.76
Leisure Negotiation Strategies	Time Management	3.10	0.61
	Skill Acquisition	3.78	0.66
	Interpersonal Relations	3.48	0.66
	Intrapersonal Validation	3.56	0.80
	Physical Fitness	3.74	0.76
	Financial Management	3.61	0.72
	General Total	3.51	0.44
Satisfaction with Life		4.44	1.21

When the correlation of self-esteem with leisure negotiation strategies and life satisfaction was considered, it was found out that the highest negative correlation of self-esteem was with skill acquisition strategy mean scores ($r = -0.256$, $p < 0.001$) which is followed by physical fitness strategy mean scores ($r = -0.108$, $p < 0.01$) (Table 5).

Table 5: Correlation coefficients between self-esteem, life satisfaction and leisure negotiation strategies

	Self-esteem	Life Satisfaction
Self-esteem	1	-0.218 ^{***}
Leisure Negotiation Strategies		
Time Management	0.100 ^{**}	-0.015
Skill Acquisition	-0.256 ^{***}	0.302 ^{***}
Interpersonal Relations	-0.026	0.161 ^{***}
Intrapersonal Validation	-0.072	0.210 ^{***}
Physical Fitness	-0.108 ^{**}	0.285 ^{***}
Financial Management	-0.085 [*]	0.233 ^{***}
Leisure Negotiation Strategies Total	-0.106 ^{**}	0.291 ^{***}
Life Satisfaction	-0.218 ^{***}	1

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

The influence of leisure negotiation strategies on active or passive participation in recreational sport activities were examined by logistic regression analysis. In the beginning model including only constant, -2LL was 796.572. In the table of variables not in the equation, “skill acquisition”, “interpersonal relations”, “intrapersonal validation”, “physical fitness” and “financial management” were found to be significant which stated that the contribution of some explanatory variables might be contributory for the model. In the first model where explanatory variables were included, -2LL level decreased to 771.727, with $\chi^2=24.845$ from Omnibus test supporting the significant relationship of one or more explanatory variables with the dependent variable. According to the Hosmer and Lemeshow test the difference between observed values and values predicted by the model were not significant ($\chi^2=6.096$, $p > 0.05$). When Wald statistics was considered, the only significantly contributing explanatory variable was physical fitness with and $\exp(B) = 1.482$ which indicates that an increase in the level of physical fitness strategy results with an odds of 1.482 in active recreational sport participation (Table 6).

Table 6: The effect of leisure negotiation strategies on active recreational sport participation

Variables in the Model	B	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Exp(B)
Time Management	-0.081	0.158	.263	1	0.608	0.922
Skill Acquisition	0.155	0.147	1.100	1	0.294	1.167
Interpersonal Relations	0.086	0.159	0.293	1	0.589	1.090
Intrapersonal Validation	0.051	0.130	0.154	1	0.695	1.052
Physical Fitness	0.393	0.134	8.568	1	0.003	1.482
Financial Management	0.121	0.147	0.683	1	0.409	1.129
Constant	-1.638	0.714	5.269	1	0.022	0.194

(Model -2LL=771.727, $\chi^2=24.845$, $p < 0.001$)

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to analyze the relationship of leisure negotiation strategies utilized by university students with their level of self-esteem, life satisfaction and participation in campus recreational sports. According to findings, students preferred to participate in recreational sport activities during 6-10 hours weekly (37.8%) and 3-4 times a week (40.8%). Participants also stated that they prefer active participation in recreational sport activities (73.9%).

Participants received a mean of 4.44 ± 1.21 from life satisfaction scale which is a seven-point Likert scale. This yields a life satisfaction over average. Among leisure negotiation strategies scores, the highest mean was obtained from skill acquisition strategy (3.78 ± 0.66) which was followed by physical fitness strategy (3.62 ± 0.85). University students were investigated in the literature about their constraints and the ways they negotiate with these constraints. Some of these studies were focused on campus recreational sport activities as it was the case in this current study (Beggs et al, 2005; Elkins et al, 2007). In one of these studies time management strategy was the most utilized strategy followed by skill acquisition strategy (Beggs et al, 2005). Although time management strategy was not so much utilized in this current study, skill acquisition was the highest followed by physical fitness strategy, showing that students were willing to learn the necessary skills for physical activities and trying to improve their physical conditions in order to have achievement. In another similar study students were found to be utilizing interpersonal relations, physical fitness and skill acquisition strategy respectively (Elkins et al, 2007). Our findings concerning skill acquisition strategy and physical fitness strategy seem to have a connection with the feeling of accomplishment in physical activity and therefore were consistent with the literature in this way. In another study focusing on high school students some of the behavioural strategies like efficient management of time and taking courses were found out to be utilized more often (Jackson and Rucks, 1995) and taking courses might be related with skill acquisition strategy utilized in this present study. Meanwhile there are also studies in the literature where students utilized mostly other behavioural strategies than the ones found in this current study (Palen et al, 2010) such as substituting recreation activities, using various time management strategies (Li and Stodolska, 2007).

The correlations between leisure negotiation strategies and self-esteem were examined and it was observed that except time management strategy, all the other strategies had negative correlation coefficients with self-esteem, which means a positive correlation between level of self-esteem and negotiation strategies. Among them the significant ones were skill acquisition and self-esteem ($r=-0.256$, $p<0.001$), physical fitness and self-esteem ($r=-0.108$, $p<0.01$) respectively. These results lead us to the conclusion that learning new skills and developing physical fitness may be contributory to increasing self-esteem. Although the relationship between self-esteem and leisure negotiation was not very frequently studied, there are studies mentioning the contribution of campus recreational sport activities to self-esteem levels of students (Gadbois and Bowker, 2007; Yigiter and Bayazit, 2013).

The correlations between leisure negotiation strategies and life satisfaction were examined in order to understand the relationship between leisure negotiation strategies and the way students look at their lives as a whole. It was observed that except time management strategy, all other negotiation strategies had positive correlations with life satisfaction. Among them the highest was between skill acquisition and life satisfaction ($r=0.302$, $p<0.001$) followed by physical fitness strategy and life satisfaction ($r=0.291$, $p<0.001$). In a study conducted to university students about their leisure negotiation strategies, the highest correlation coefficient with life satisfaction was physical fitness strategy followed by skill acquisition strategy (Tercan, 2014).

The influence of leisure negotiation strategies on active participation in recreational sport activities was also examined in this study and the only significantly contributing explanatory variable was physical fitness in this study. In some studies the relationship between leisure negotiation and leisure participation were inquired. In a study by Ma et al (2012), a significant relationship was obtained between negotiation and participation where this process was influenced by psychological well-being dimensions such as autonomy and self-acceptance. In other studies this process was also examined and impact of different variables were found out in this process such as extraversion in physically disabled individuals (Lyu et al, 2013). In another study by Alexandris (2007), the influence of negotiation and motivation on intention to continue participation in recreational skiing was examined and improving knowledge and time management strategies were found to be positively affecting the intention of participation. In this current study the influence of physical fitness strategy on participation may be used by leisure providers so that they can give counselling on how students may develop their physical fitness levels in order to participate in activities. These may include

advices about nutrition, improving physical fitness, protection from injuries, utilizing right equipments. If leisure providers support students to use physical fitness strategy more, this might result with an increase in recreational sports participation in the campus. As stated at the beginning of this article, the benefits of participation in campus recreational activities range from improving or maintaining a healthy life style (Haines, 2001; Miller et al, 2008; Todd et al, 2009) to coping with stress (Kanters, 2000; Haines, 2001; Miller et al, 2008; Todd et al, 2009), developing social interactions with others (Belch et al, 2001; Kasim and Dazkira, 2001; Young et al, 2003) or even increasing academical success (Gibbison et al, 2011). University students are in a transition period from adolescence to adulthood, where they can have more occasions to reach leisure activities than they had done before. As university education is the last stage of formal education for a majority of people, this may be the last opportunity to gain a healthy lifestyle and to structure a certain leisure behaviour. Increasing the number of such studies concerning campus recreational participation in university students would provide more insights into the subject and recommendations could be based on scientific evidence.

References

- Alexandris, K. (2013). Segmenting recreational tennis players according to their involvement level: A psychographic profile based on constraints and motivation. *Managing Leisure*, 18(3), 179-193. doi: 10.1080/13606719.2013.796178
- Alexandris, K., Carroll, B. (1997). Demographic differences in the perception of constraints on recreational sport participation: Results from a study in Greece. *Leisure Studies* 16, 107–125. DOI: 10.1080/026143697375449
- Alexandris, K., Funk, D.C., Pritchard, M. (2011). The impact of constraints on motivation, activity attachment and skier intentions to continue. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 43(1), 56-79.
- Alexandris, K., Kouthouris, C., Funk, D., Chatzigianni, E.(2008). Examining the relationships between leisure constraints, involvement and attitudinal loyalty among Greek recreational skiers.*European Sport Management Quarterly*, 8(3), 247-264. DOI:10.1080/16184740802224175
- Alexandris, K., Kouthouris, C., Funk, D., Tziouma, O. (2013). The use of negotiation strategies among recreational participants with different involvement levels: The case of recreational swimmers, *Leisure Studies*. 32(3), 299-317. DOI: 10.1080/02614367.2012.660189
- Alexandris, K., Kouthouris, C., Girgolas, G. (2007). Investigating the relationships among motivation, negotiation and Alpine skiing participation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 39(4), 646-667.
- Anaza, E., McDowell, J. (2013).An investigation of constraints restricting urban Nigerian women from participating in recreational sport activities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 45(3), 324-344.

- Andronikidis, A., Vassiliadis, C.A., Priporas, C., Kamenidou, I. (2006). Examining leisure constraints for ski centre visitors: Implications for services marketing. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 15(4), 69-86.
- Astin, A.W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 518-529.
- Beggs, B.A., Elkins, D.J., Powers, S. (2005). Overcoming barriers to participation in campus recreational sports. *Recreational Sport Journal*, 29, 143-155.
- Belch, H.A., Gebel, M., Maas, G.M. (2001). Relationship between student recreation complex use, academic performance and persistence of first-time freshmen. *NASPA Journal*, 38(2), 69-86.
- Bloland, P.A. (1987). Leisure as a campus resource for fostering student development. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65, 291-294.
- Boo, S., Carruthers, C.P., Busser, J.A. (2014). The constraints experienced and negotiation strategies attempted by nonparticipants of a festival event. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 31(2), 269-285. DOI: 10.1080/10548408.2014.873317.
- Brown, B.A., Frankel, B.G. (1993). Activity through the years: Leisure, leisure satisfaction and life satisfaction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10: 1-17.
- Brown, P.R., Brown, W.J., Miller, Y.D., Hansen, V.H. (2001). Perceived constraints and social support for active leisure among mothers with young children. *Leisure Sciences*, 23, 131-144.
- Carroll, B., Alexandris, K. (1997). Perception of constraints and strength of motivation: Their relation to recreational sport participation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29, 279-299.
- Casper, J., Bocarro, J.N., Kanters, M.A., Floyd, M.F. (2011). "Just let me play!"- Understanding constraints that limit adolescent sport participation. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 8 (Suppl 1), S32-S39.
- Cheng, S-T, Stier, W.F., Kim, C., Xu, B-L, Koshimizu, E., Koozechian, H. (1995). A comparison of recreational sports and leisure time participation of college/university students in China, Japan, Korea, Iran, the United States and Canada –with students in the Republic of China (Taiwan). *Recreational Sports Journal*, 28, 60-75.
- Crawford, D.W., Godbey, G. (1987). Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, 9, 119-127.
- Crawford, D.W., Jackson, E.L., Godbey, G. (1991). A hierarchical model of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 13, 309-320.
- Cuhadaroglu, F. (1986). *Self-esteem in adolescents*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, R., Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.
- Dionigi, R. (2006). Competitive sport as leisure in later life: Negotiations, discourse and aging. *Leisure Sciences*, 28, 181-196. DOI: 10.1080/01490400500484081
- Dixon, M.A. (2009). From their perspective: A qualitative examination of physical activity and sport programming for working mothers, *Sport Management Review*, 12, 34-48. DOI:10.1016/j.smr.2008.09.002

- Dong, E., Chick, G. (2012) Leisure constraints in six Chinese cities. *Leisure Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 34(5), 417-435. DOI: 10.1080/01490400.2012.714702
- Elkins, D.J.(2004). Levels of perceived constraint: A comparative analysis of negotiation strategies in campus recreational sports. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Indiana University, Indiana.
- Elkins, D.J., Beggs, B.A., Choutka, E. (2007).The contribution of constraint negotiation to the leisure satisfaction of college students in campus recreational sports. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 2007, 31, 107-118
- Elkins, D.J., Forrester, S.A., Noel-Elkins, A.V. (2011). The contribution of campus recreational sports participation to perceived sense of campus community. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 35, 24-34.
- Ellis, G.D., Compton, D.M., Tyson, B., Bohlig, M. (2002).Campus recreation participation, health and quality of life. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 26, 2, 51-60.
- Fendt, L.S., Wilson, E. (2012). I just push through the barriers because I live for surfing: How women negotiate their constraints to surf tourism. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 15(1), 4-8.
- Gadbois, S., Bowker, A. (2007). Gender differences in the relationships between extracurricular activities participation, self-description and domain-specific and general self-esteem. *Sex Roles*, 56, 675-689.
- Gibbison, G.A., Henry, T.L., Perkins-Brown, J. (2011). The chicken soup effect: The role of recreation and intramural participation in boosting freshman grade point average. *Economics of Education Review*, 30, 247-257.
- Godbey, G., Crawford, D.W., Shen, X.S. (2010).Assessing hierarchical leisure constraints theory after two decades, *Journal of Leisure Research*, 42, 1, 111-134.
- Haines, D.J. (2001). Undergraduate student benefits from university recreation. *NIRSA Journal*, 25, 25-33.
- Harrole, M.G., Floyd, M.F., Casper, J.M., Kelley, K.E., Bruton, C.M. (2013).Physical activity constraints among Latinos, identifying clusters and acculturation differences.*Journal of Leisure Research*, 45, 1, 74-90.
- Hawkins, B.A., Peng, J., Hsieh, C-M, Eklund, S.J. (1999). Leisure constraints: A replication and extension of construct development.*Leisure Sciences*, 21, 179-192.
- Henchy, A. (2011). The influence of campus recreation beyond the gym. *Recreational Sport Journal*, 35, 174-181.
- Henchy, A. (2013). The perceived benefits of participating in campus recreation programs and facilities: A comparison between undergraduate and graduate students. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 37, 97-105.
- Huang, C.Y., Carleton, B. (2003).The relationships among leisure participation, leisure satisfaction, and life satisfaction of college students in Taiwan, *Journal of Exercise Science and Fitness*, 1(2), 129-132.
- Hubbard, J., Mannell, R.C. (2001).Testing competing models of the leisure constraint negotiation process in a corporate employee recreation setting. *Leisure Sciences*, 23, 145-163.
- Hudson, S., Walker, G.J., Simpson, B., Hinch, T. (2013).The influence of ethnicity and self-construal on leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 35(2), 145-166. DOI: 10.1080/01490400.2013.761906.

- Huesman, R.L., Brown, A.K., Lee, G., Kellogg, J.P., Radcliffe P.M. (2009). Gym bags and motorboards: Is use of campus recreational facilities related to student success? *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) Journal*, 46(1), 50-71.
- Irving, H.R., Giles, A.R. (2011). Examining the child's impacts on single mothers' leisure. *Leisure Studies*, 30(3) 365-373 DOI: 10.1080/02614361003716974.
- Jackson, E.L., Crawford, D.W., Godbey, G. (1993). Negotiation of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 15, 1-11.
- Jackson, E.L., Rucks, V.C. (1995). Negotiation of leisure constraints by junior-high and high-school students: An exploratory study. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27, 85-105.
- Kanters, M.A. (2000). Recreational sport participation as a moderator of college stress. *NIRSA Journal*, 24(2), 10-23.
- Kasim, A., Dzakiria, H. (2001). Influence of recreation on education aspiration. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 6(2), 53-64.
- Koca, C., Henderson, K.A., Asci, F.H., Bulgu, N. (2009). Constraints to leisure-time physical activity and negotiation strategies in Turkish women. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(2), 225-251.
- Koker, S. (1991). Comparison of Life Satisfaction between normal and problematical adolescents. Unpublished Master Thesis. Ankara University, Ankara
- Li, M.Z., Stodolska, M. (2007). Working for a dream and living for the future: Leisure constraints and negotiation strategies among Chinese international graduate students. *Leisure/Loisir*, 31(1), 105-132. DOI: 10.1080/14927713.2007.9651375
- Lindsey, R., Sessoms, E. (2006). Assessment of a campus recreation program on student recruitment, retention and frequency of participation across certain demographic variables. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 30, 30-39.
- Loucks-Atkinson, A., Mannell, R.C. (2007). Role of self-efficacy in the constraints negotiation process: The case of individuals with fibromyalgia syndrome. *Leisure Sciences*, 29, 19-36.
- Lyu, S.O., Oh, C-O, Lee, H. (2013). The influence of extraversion on leisure constraints negotiation process, a case of Korean people with disabilities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 45(2), 233-252.
- Ma, S-M, Tan, Y., Ma, S-C. (2012). Testing a structural model of psychological well-being, leisure negotiation and leisure participation with Taiwanese college students. *Leisure Sciences*, 34, 55-71.
- McQuarrie, F., Jackson, E.L. (1996). Connections between negotiation of leisure constraints and serious leisure: An exploratory study of adult amateur ice skaters. *LoisiretSociété / Society and Leisure*, 19(2), 459-483. DOI: 10.1080/07053436.1996.10715528
- Miller, K.H., Noland, M., Rayens, M.K. & Staten, R. (2008). Characteristics of users and nonusers of a campus recreation center. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 32, 87-96.
- Nimrod, G. (2007). Retirees' leisure: Activities, benefits, and their contribution to life satisfaction. *Leisure Studies*, 26(1), 65-80.
- Palen, L-A, Patrick, M.E., Gleeson, S.L., Caldwell, L.L., Smith, E.A., Wegner, L., Flisher A.J. (2010). Leisure constraints for adolescents in Cape Town, South Africa: A qualitative study. *Leisure Sciences*, 32, 434-452. DOI: 10.1080/01490400.2010.510975

- Ridinger, L.L., Funk, D.C., Jordan, J.S., Kaplandion, K. (2012). Marathons for the masses: Exploring the role of negotiation-efficacy and involvement on running *Journal of Leisure Research*, 44(2), 155-178.
- Rodriguez, A., Latkova, P., Sun, Y-Y, (2008). The relationship between leisure and life satisfaction: Application of activity and need theory. *Social Indicators Research*, 86, 163–175.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Son, J.S., Kerstetter, D.L., Mowen, A.J. (2008). Do age and gender matter in the constraint negotiation of physically active leisure? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 40(2), 267-289.
- Son, J.S., Mowen, A.J., Kerstetter, D.L. (2008). Testing alternative leisure constraint negotiation models: An extension of Hubbard and Mannell's study. *Leisure Sciences*, 30, 198-216.
- Stanis, S.A.W., Schneider, I.E., Russell, K.C. (2009). Leisure time physical activity of park visitors: Retesting constraint models in adoption and maintenance stages. *Leisure Sciences*, 31, 287–304. DOI: 10.1080/01490400902837886.
- Stanis, S.A.W., Schneider, I.E., Pereira, M.A. (2010). Parks and health: Differences in constraints and negotiation strategies for park-based leisure time physical activity
- Sumbuloglu, K., Sumbuloglu, V. (1995). *Biyoistatistik (Biostatistics)*, Ankara: Özdemir Yayıncılık, 6. Baskı.
- Sahin, A. (2013), The effect of text types on reading comprehension. *Mevlana International Journal of Education (MIJE)*, 3(2), 57-67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.13054/mije.13.27.3.2>
- Tercan, E. (2014). Perceived Social Support from Family, Participation in Recreational Sport Activities, Leisure Negotiation and Life Satisfaction in University Students. *Mevlana International Journal of Education (MIJE)*, 4(1), 260-273 <http://dx.doi.org/10.13054/mije.13.82.4.1>
- Todd, M.K., Cayszczon, G., Carr, J.W., Pratt, C. (2009). Comparison of health and academic indices between campus recreation facility users and nonusers. *Recreation Sport Journal*, 33, 43-53.
- Wood, L., Danylchuk, K. (2012). Constraints and negotiation processes in a women's recreational sport group. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 44, 4, 463-485.
- Yerlisu Lapa, T. (2012). Leisure negotiation strategies scale, validity and reliability study for university students. 12th International Sport Sciences Congress, Denizli, Turkey.
- Yerlisu Lapa, T. (2014). Leisure negotiation strategies scale, validity and reliability study for university students. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 36(3), 201-215.
- Yigiter, K., Bayazit, B. (2013). Impact of the recreational physical activities on university students' problem-solving skills and self-esteem in Turkey, *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(3), 424-429.
- Young, S.J., Ross, C.M., Barcelona, R.J. (2003). Perceived constraints by college students to participation in campus recreational sports programs. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 27 (2), 47-62.
- Yusof, A., Shah, P.M. (2007). Sport participation constraints of Malaysian University students. *The International Journal of the Humanities*, 5(3), 189-195.