



### Examination of the effects of using different teaching methods in leisure education: an experimental study

Suleyman Munusturlar<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Anadolu University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Department of Recreation, Eskisehir, Turkey.

suleymanmunusturlar@anadolu.edu.tr

#### Abstract

The main purpose of this study is to examine the effects of leisure education practices using different teaching methods. In this study, quasi-experimental research methodology has been used in the framework of pretest - posttest design without the use of a control group. In total, 155 students between the age of 9-13 (experimental I group: 76 students, experiment II group: 79 students) were selected through a convenience sampling method. The Leisure Education Scale (LES) developed by Munusturlar (2014) was used to measure leisure education levels of students in the study. In order to examine the difference between the pretest- posttest measurements of groups I and II; Paired Sample T-Test has been used. The Independent Samples T-Test was used to examine the difference between the pretest-posttest access results of experimental groups I and II. As a result of the statistical analyses, it was determined that the leisure education score averages in the experimental groups I and II were significantly different in favor of the posttest. When the difference between the pretest-posttest access results of the two groups was examined, it was found that the leisure education had a significant difference in favor of the experimental group I that experienced play-based teaching method in the sub-dimensions of problem-solving and social interaction skills. As a result, it can be concluded that both lecture-teaching and play-based teaching methods are effective in terms of leisure education applications.

**Keywords:** Leisure education, formal education, teaching methods, play-based teaching, and lecture based teaching.

## INTRODUCTION

---

Leisure Education (LE), which aims to improve skills to make a proper use of free time has become an important part of the modern society as working hours are evolving and enabling people to have more leisure time. The increasing importance is given to the concept of “life quality” also reinforce the role of leisure education in this context (Sivan, 2007).

Leisure education plays an important role in increasing the functionality of the educational process by both training individuals in terms of the wise use of leisure and supporting general education either directly or indirectly (Torkildsen, 1992, 25). The use of the concepts of leisure and education is not a new and up to date notion. The famous thinker Dewey (1916) states that the concepts of leisure and education are related to each other and have many common points. The ancient philosophers as Aristo, Plato and Socrates considered leisure as a part of personal development and learning (Goodale & Godbey, 1988). Another example that demonstrates the connection between education and leisure is the etymological link between the words ‘school’ and ‘schole’ which means free time in Ancient Greek (Hemingway, 1988; McLean & Hurd, 2012).

It is not possible to argue that there is only one certain definition that explains education for leisure or leisure education. Johnson, Bullock, & Ashton-Shaeffer, (1997) describe leisure education as teaching processes which enable individuals to develop their recreation and leisure-time skills, attitudes, and values. According to Sivan (2007: 52), leisure education can be defined as a lifelong process, in which people perceive themselves, their own skills, the place and importance of free time in their lives, and make expected changes with the aim of using their leisure time properly.

Leisure education is defined as provision of pedagogical, experiential and recreational experiences that serve to achieve cognitive, affective and kinesthetic domain learning objectives relative to the worthy use of leisure (WLRA, 2001, 203). Whether done in school or outside of it, the goal of leisure education is to enable individuals to enhance the quality of their lives through improving their leisure (Mundy, 1998). Formal leisure education practices are possible through properly designed leisure time programs (Sivan, 2007; Ruskin & Sivan, 2002).

As the concept of education is identified with the systematic, organized and time-constrained school concept; and leisure with personal choices, freedom and happiness; it can be questioned that how the concepts of education and leisure time can find a middle ground. However, it should not be forgotten that schools are one of the cornerstones of the lifelong education process that creates a systematic socialization and learning environment (Sivan, 2008). Due to the fact that the right use of leisure time has an effect on concepts that determine quality of life such as happiness and good life (Ruskin & Sivan, 2002: 6), schools are not only giving vocational training but also have a mission to prepare students for the life (Heyne & Schleien, 1996). In this regard, schools are unique places where students can gain leisure time skills and learn how to use their time properly (Sivan, 2007). The success- oriented education system which based on vocational training also requires curriculum restructuring that focuses on life skills in general such as leisure education. (Theeboom & Bollaert, 1987). In this context, schools are providing important formal education opportunities by creating curriculums that include leisure education (Sivan & Chan, 2012).

Schools have an important responsibility to educate people about the right use of leisure time (Sivan & Chan, 2012). Stumbo and Peterson (2004) state that appropriate systematic programs that can

accomplish the goals of leisure education are important for the attainments towards the right use of leisure time. Achieving these gains at the highest level is possible through the integration of well-organized and systematic leisure curriculum into the school system. (Dattilo, 1991). Systematic leisure education programs become effective with defined objectives, content and teaching environment (Dattilo, 2008). It is vital to include the right target, content and process combinations in school curriculums that are leisure education oriented (Sivan, 2004). Even though leisure education practices are organized within the framework of formal education within the school, using teaching methods that enable socialization will increase the effectiveness of education (Ruskin & Sivan, 2002: 34). A curriculum consists of objectives, content, methods and evaluation elements (Tanner & Tanner, 2007). The content, which is created to reach predetermined cognitive, emotional and psychomotor goals, is transferred to the target group through a method (Glatthorn, Boschee, Whitehead & Bosche, 2012). Teaching methods refer to the question "How to teach?" in order to reach the specified goals and present the use and organization of teaching tools, materials, subjects and teaching techniques within this framework (Clark & Starr, 1991: 25). Teaching methods are commonly categorized as child-centered, teacher-centered, and community-based approaches (Marsh, 1992), under the general classification of instructional strategies: presentation, invention, and research-through teaching (Sharma, 2005). However, teacher and children centered teaching methods are widely preferred in schools (Paris & Gespass, 2001). In the teacher-centered teaching approach, the instructor is the active and the student is the passive subject in the teaching-learning environment. On the other hand, the student is active in the children-centered approach (Weimar, 2013).

One of the most common teaching method in teacher-centered teaching approaches is lecture-teaching method and in this method the teacher prepares students for course objectives by taking help from specific materials and documents (Madi, 2011: 154). Due to the fact that it is a teacher-centered, the lecture-teaching method is also known as the traditional method as the teacher is the instructor and student is the learner (Tan, 2011). Play-based teaching methods play an important role in the framework of children-centered approaches (Vygotsky, 1997). Although play-based teaching methods seem to have a non-systematic structure due to the concept of the game that based on fun and freedom, these methods actually utilize the games as a tool to achieve formal educational goals with educational purposes. (Van Oers & Duijkers, 2013). Educational games help to increase learning motivation and boost the learning outcomes and provide other experiential outcomes beyond the curriculum (Charles, Bustard & Black, 2009). The concepts of competition, discovery, unity and challenge which constitute educational games increase the motivation and concentration of students and increase the effectiveness of learning environment (Zin and Yue, 2009: 271). Due to the change in the educational understanding of the human generation, the new generation of children now prefers children-centered approaches such as teaching through games instead of classroom-oriented lecture-teaching methods (Prensky, 2001).

When the literature is examined, it has seen that there are leisure education models and approaches aiming to give information and to provide values and behaviors for the proper use of leisure time within the scope of informal and formal education (Caldwell, Baldwin, Walls & Smith, 2004; Clark & Anderson, 2011; Dunn & Wilhite, 1997; Mundy, 1998; Mundy & Odum, 1979; Rancourt, 1982; Weber, 2010). These models and approaches seem to suggest different leisure time components as leisure time contents for proper use of leisure time. However, it has been seen that the number of researches on the appropriateness of teaching methods - in which ways these leisure education contents are transferred to individuals- are very limited. This deficiency has shaped the problem statement of the research and revealed the need to carry out the research. It is believed that this

research is significant to demonstrate how important the teaching methods, techniques and strategies of leisure education are within the formal education concept and how important it is to include leisure education into the contents. In accordance with the importance of the research, the purpose of this study is to examine the effects of formal leisure education methods using play-based leisure education (educational games) and lecture-teaching methods on leisure education levels of children aged between the ages of 9-13.

## **METHODS**

---

In this study, quasi-experimental research model has been implemented in the form of pretest-posttest design without the use of a control group. In this model, without a control group, research group or groups are taken, and the success status is determined by testing the subjects before the experiment. After conducting the experiment, the group or groups are retested and the result of the experiment is evaluated according to the difference between the two tests (Kaptan, 1995: 81). In the direction of the research design, the study group, the data collection tool, the analysis of the data and the information about the experimental pattern setup are given below.

### **Research Universe and Sample**

The universe of the study consists of children between the ages of 9-13, living in the province of Eskişehir. The study group consisted of 155 students who were selected by convenience sampling method in the province Eskişehir. 76 of the students were in the classrooms where the play-based method (Experimental Group I) and 79 of them were in the classrooms where the lecture-teaching method was implemented (Experimental Group II). The research sample was selected from the secondary school – the second step of compulsory education- students who live in the province of Eskişehir. The branches A, B and C of the middle school where the study is conducted were assigned to the experimental group I, the branches of I, D, E, F were assigned to the experimental group II. Before the study groups were established, information about the study and the research process was presented to the students and the students who do not want to participate in the study were determined. All of the students in the secondary school who registered to the elective course, Sport and Physical Activities, stated that they participate in the research study voluntarily. The voluntary participation of the students has played a significant role in the conduct of the research study as the sample was appropriate to the objectives of the research.

Prior to the research, The Leisure Education Scale (LES) developed by Munusturlar (2014) was used to examine the readiness of the students in the two groups on their Leisure Education Level (LEL); LES was also used as a measurement tool of the research. For the purpose of determining whether the leisure education readiness levels in the experimental groups I and II are equal, analyses have been made to see if pretest scores of students in two different groups are normally distributed and also to examine the homogeneity of variances (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and Levene Test). As the scores are not normally distributed, non-parametric tests are preferred in the study. For this reason, the pretest scores obtained in the study were compared with the T-test and it was determined that there is no meaningful difference between the groups (awareness:  $t = 2.427$ ,  $p = .660$ , intrinsic motivation:  $t = 1.362$ ,  $p = .517$ ,  $P = .414$ , social interaction skills:  $t = 2.364$ ,  $p = .759$ , problem solving:  $t = 1.125$ ,  $p = .190$ , time management:  $t = .600$ ,  $p = .694$ ;  $t = -1.911$ ,  $p = .812$  and total LEL score:  $t = 3.456$ ,  $p = .719$ ). According to these results, it can be said that the LEL results of students who belong to two different groups are similar to each other.

### Data Collection Tools

Two different data collection tools have been used to collect research data. The first one is the personal information form prepared to identify the demographic information of the participants. The second data collection tool is the "Leisure Education Scale (LES)" which was developed by Munusturlar (2014) with the purpose to measure the leisure education levels of the participants in the sample of Turkey.

Leisure Education Scale (LES) was designed as a 5 point Likert scale which consist of: awareness (5 items), intrinsic motivation (5 items), extrinsic motivation (7 items), social interaction skills (6 items), time management (4 items), problem solving (4 items), boredom (5 items). In total there are 7 dimensions and 36 items. A total of 12 items is calculated by reverse coding since there is a negative correlation between the dimensions of extrinsic motivation, social interaction skills, boredom and the concept of leisure education (Munusturlar, 2014; Munusturlar and Bayrak, 2016). In the development process of the scale, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) was defined as .85, awareness as a scale lower-dimension was .80, intrinsic motivation was .82, extrinsic motivation was .86, social interaction skills were .84, time management (4 items), problem-solving was .79 and boredom was defined as .77.

### Data Collection and Analysis

The data were gathered from 155 students who were studying in the center of Eskişehir province between March-May 2017. The students participate the research on a volunteer basis and selected by convenience sampling method.

According to the Levene test results- which is conducted to make the decision of using parametric and nonparametric test before the difference statistics- the variances were homogeneous ( $p > 0.05$ ) and according to Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results, the groups showed a normal distribution ( $p > 0.05$ ). In the light of this information, in order to identify the development within the experimental groups I and II; Paired Samples T-Test and in order to determine whether there is a difference between the access values of the two groups The Independent Samples T-Test was used. Statistical significance level was set as 0.05.

### Experimental Research Design

The leisure education objectives and contents applied to the experimental groups were determined according to the dimensions of leisure education that presented as a result of the research conducted by Munusturlar (2014) on the sample of Turkey. The dimensions which are covered by the leisure education curriculum of the educational groups of I and II are; awareness, social interaction skills, problem-solving and time management. Before the implementation, the current levels of leisure time education of the students in the both groups were determined by using Leisure Education Scale. The process has lasted for 5 weeks for both of the groups. After the implementations, the students have subjected to the Leisure Education Scale again in order to determine the post-implementation leisure education levels. During the implementation process, a course hour was regarded as 40 minutes. The leisure education curriculum was planned as two games in each class hour in the experimental group I which is imposed to play-based education. In the experimental group II which is imposed to lecture-teaching method, the leisure education curriculum was planned as one leisure education activity in each class hour. The leisure education practices were delivered by the same instructor in both groups, so as to control the access differences arising from the tutors. The leisure education practices were

implemented by five instructors in total. The leisure education course plan was designed for both groups in detail by the researcher and explained to the instructors in detail by pre-training.

**Table 1.** Information on experimental application

	Experimental group I (Play-based teaching, Educational Games)				Experimental group II (Lecture-teaching)			
	Number of Games	Practice Duration	Practice Number Per Week	Weekly Practice Duration	Number of Topics	Course Length	Number of Courses Per Week	Course Length per Week
Awareness	4	40 min	2	80min	4	40 min	2	80min
Motivation	4	40 min	2	80min	4	40 min	2	80min
Social Int. Skills	4	40 min	2	80min	4	40 min	2	80min
Time Management	4	40min	2	80min	4	40 min	2	80min
Problem Solving	4	40 min	2	80min	4	40 min	2	80min
<b>Total</b>	20	200 min	10	400min	20	200 min	10	400min

## RESULTS

To determine whether there is a meaningful difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the total LE score and its sub-dimensions of the students in the experimental group I that leisure education contents were delivered by game based teaching methods and in the experimental group II that contents were delivered by lecture-teaching method; Paired Sample Test has been conducted and the findings are presented in Table 2 and Table 3.

**Table 2.** Comparison of Pre-Post Test Scores of the Group (Experiment I) in which Leisure Education was delivered through Play-based Teaching Methods

Variable		N	$\bar{X}$	sd	t	p
Awareness	Pre test	76	3,68	0,61	3,426	.00**
	Post test	76	4,27	0,79		
Intrinsic Motivation	Pre test	76	4,02	0,73	1,513	.04*
	Post test	76	4,59	0,76		
Extrinsic Motivation.	Pre test	76	3,60	0,72	,712	.02*
	Post test	76	3,78	0,73		
Social Interaction Skills	Pre test	76	3,69	0,68	2,302	.00**
	Post test	76	4,47	0,79		
Time Management	Pre test	76	3,24	0,82	1,048	.00**
	Post test	76	3,69	0,94		
Problem Solving	Pre test	76	3,09	0,78	3,902	.00**
	Post test	76	4,00	0,97		
Boredom	Pre test	76	3,02	0,61	2,104	.00**
	Son test	76	3,60	0,72		
Total Leisure Education Scores	Pre test	76	3,01	0,58	1,218	.00**
	Post test	76	3,78	0,61		

\* $p < 0.05$  \*\* $p < 0.01$

According to the results of Paired Sample Test - conducted to determine whether pretest and posttest results of LE applications based on play-based teaching method differed - it was found that there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest results in favor of posttest scores ( $p < 0.05$ ). This meaningful difference was found in both the leisure total education scores ( $t = 1,218$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ), and in the subscale awareness ( $t = 3,426$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ), intrinsic motivation ( $t = P = 0,00$ ), time management ( $t = 1,048$ ,  $p = 0,00$ ), problem solving ( $t=3.930$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ) and boredom ( $t = 2.104$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ). According to this data, when the input and output behaviors related to leisure education and its sub-dimensions of the students imposed to play-based teaching method are compared, it can be said that a significant increase is recorded in favor of output behaviors (Table 2).

**Table 3.** Comparison of Pre-Post Test Scores of the Group (Experiment II) in which Leisure Education was delivered through Lecture-teaching Method

Variable		N	$\bar{X}$	sd	T	p
Awareness	Pre test	79	3,55	0,60	,932	.00**
	Post test	79	3,99	0,61		
Intrinsic Motivation	Pre test	79	4,03	0,65	1,116	.00**
	Post test	79	4,51	0,74		
Extrinsic Motivation	Pre test	79	3,58	0,69	2,066	.03*
	Post test	79	3,89	0,71		
Social Interaction Skills	Pre test	79	3,70	0,68	4,090	.00**
	Post test	79	4,06	0,79		
Time Management	Pre test	79	3,36	0,79	3,125	.00**
	Post test	79	3,89	0,86		
Problem Solving	Pre test	79	2,78	0,82	1,113	.00**
	Post test	79	3,11	0,87		
Boredom	Pre test	79	3,11	0,63	,604	.00**
	Post test	79	3,76	0,78		
Total Leisure Education Scores	Pre test	79	3,12	0,59	3,768	.00**
	Post test	79	3,84	0,67		

\*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$

According to the results of Paired Sample Test - conducted to determine whether pretest and posttest results of LE applications based on lecture-teaching method differed - it was found that there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest results in favor of posttest scores ( $p < 0.05$ ). This meaningful difference was found in both the leisure total education scores ( $t= 3,768$ ;  $p= 0,00$ ), and in the subscale awareness ( $t=,932$ ;  $p= 0,00$ ), intrinsic motivation ( $t= 1,116$ ;  $p= 0,03$ ), time management ( $t= 3,125$ ;  $p= 0,00$ ), problem solving( $t= 1,113$ ;  $p= 0,00$ ) and boredom ( $t=,604$ ,  $p= 0,00$ ). According to this data, when the input and output behaviors related to LE and its sub-dimensions of the students imposed to play-based teaching method are compared, it can be said that a significant increase is recorded in favor of output behaviors (Table 3).

**Table 4.** Comparison of Pre-Post Test Leisure Education Score Accesses of Experimental Group I and Experimental Group II

Variable		N	$\bar{X}$	sd	t	p
Awareness	Experimental Group I	76	0,59	0,11	2,979	1.34
	Experimental Group II	79	0,44	0,08		
Intrinsic Motivation	Experimental Group I	76	0,57	0,12	1,546	4.14
	Experimental Group II	79	0,48	0,11		
Extrinsic Motivation	Experimental Group I	76	0,18	0,05	,366	.89
	Experimental Group II	79	0,31	0,06		
Social Interaction Skills	Experimental Group I	76	0,79	0,15	1,398	.00**
	Experimental Group II	79	0,36	0,07		
Time Management	Experimental Group I	76	0,45	0,06	4,028	.76
	Experimental Group II	79	0,53	0,10		
Problem Solving	Experimental Group I	76	0,82	0,14	3,930	.00**
	Experimental Group II	79	0,33	0,05		
Boredom	Experimental Group I	76	0,58	0,11	,104	1.12
	Experimental Group II	79	0,64	0,13		
Total Leisure Education Scores	Experimental Group I	76	0,61	0,14	3,218	.90
	Experimental Group II	79	0,79	0,16		

\* $p < 0.05$  \*\* $p < 0.01$

Determining whether there is a significant difference between the accession values of the total LE score and its sub-dimensions of the students in the experimental group I that leisure education contents were delivered by game based teaching methods and in the experimental group II that contents were delivered by lecture-teaching method; Independent Groups T-Test was conducted and the findings are presented in Table 4. As a result of the statistical analysis, it was found out that there is a meaningful difference between the pretest-posttest access scores of the two groups in favor of the sub-dimensional play-based teaching method (Experiment I) in terms of problem-solving ( $t=1,398$ ,  $p= 0,00$ ) and social interaction skills ( $t= 3,930$ ,  $p= 0,00$ ). When the pre-test test access averages for the LE total score, awareness, motivation and time management sub-dimensions of Experimental Group I and II groups were examined, no significant difference was found between the two groups (Table 4).

## **DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION**

One of the primary results of this research, which was conducted in order to determine the contribution of the teaching methods to be used in formal leisure education to the improvement of the leisure education level, is that the leisure education provided by both the play-based and the lecture-teaching methods have improved the leisure education levels of the participants. A significant difference between the pre and post test results of both groups leads us to this result. In other words, both methods have generated a positive difference in the leisure education levels of the participants. In support of this finding, Janssen (2004) found a difference in favor of the experimental group in his experiment-control group study, which was designed as an eight-week leisure education program, in favor of both the leisure time habits and the quality of life scores. Searle, Mahon, Iso-Ahola, Sdrolias and Dyck (1995) found that the subjective well-being and life satisfaction scores of the programmed leisure education were higher in favor of the experimental group as a result of their experimental studies. On the other hand, Weber (2010) did not find any significant difference in the pre- and post-

test results of the 10-hour curriculum-based leisure education program that he conducted. The results Weber found can be assumed as a result of a relatively small sample size. In the study, which share great similarities with the sample and the methodology of our research, Caldwell et al. (2004) conducted a curriculum-based leisure education consisted of 6 courses last 50 minutes.

It was also found out that participants' awareness, motivation, social interaction skills and leisure skills increased after LE application. In another study focused on curriculum-based leisure education, it was found that there was a significant difference in favor of the experimental group on variables such as leisure time satisfaction, happiness and active lifestyle (Desrosiers, Noreau, Rochette, Carbonneau, Fontaine, Viscogliosi & Bravo, 2007). Hughes & Keller (1992) also found that leisure education, which applied on caregivers, improved participants' awareness, leisure skills, leisure time resources and communication skills. As a result of the research study, it can be considered that the findings were significant as all five leisure time dimensions covered in the research were developed. The findings are regarded as significant as they can be interpreted in the sense that it is possible to achieve the goals of the targeted leisure education despite the difference in the teaching method used by the instructor.

In the research findings, it was found that both play-based and lecture teaching methods were effective in terms of leisure education, and play-based teaching method was found to be more effective than lecture-teaching method in problem-solving and social interaction skills dimensions when the difference between the two groups' pre-posttest accesses was examined. Since problem-solving and social interaction skills are not only about cognitive and emotional dimensions but related to the kinesthetic dimension, it can be concluded that the play-based teaching method which offers to practice may have been more effective in this context. In support of this finding, Rancourt (1982) stated that he found a meaningful difference in the kinesthetic dimension of the leisure time attitude in favor of the experimental group in the results of the experimental study in which the Mundy Odum Leisure Education Model designed as a three lecture workshop was applied. In the qualitative findings of his experimental research, Weber (2010) pointed out that in the framework of leisure time education themes such as awareness, socialization and leisure time management came to the forefront. It is considered that these themes also support the finding of high social interaction skills and problem-solving scores that are in favor of experimental group I. In particular, it has been observed that leisure education practices for therapeutic purposes have improved leisure skills and problem solving skills in favor of the experimental group (Bedini, Bullock & Driscoll, 1993; Bullock & Howe, 1991).

Sivan and Chan (2012) concluded that the results of the research on students' opinions on leisure education in the classroom environment demonstrated that students find lectures on the proper use of leisure time in the formal classroom environment boring and unable to meet their expectations. Green and Heyne (1997) suggest that well-placed practical leisure education in the school curriculum strengthens the social interaction skills and friendship of the students. It can be said that the play-based teaching method is more effective when it is compared with the pre-test access scores of the lecture-teaching method. This finding may also mean that the teaching method may be a decisive component in reaching the specified goals or in transferring the content of the education to the students. Hey, Lvett, Church and Hey (2016) stated that children-centered teaching methods provide more permanent learning than teacher-centered methods when the instructor play a role as a good observer and control the process. Goldberger, Ashworth and Byra (2012) emphasize the need for teachers to use different teaching methods depending on the learning characteristics of the students, the context and the learning environment.

As a conclusion, it can be argued that that leisure education using that based on play-based and lecture-teaching methods improves the leisure time education levels (leisure literacy). In addition,

play-based teaching method is more effective than the lecture-teaching method on developing social interaction and problem-solving skills. It is thought that the results of this research will shed light on the question and doubts arising from the curriculum-based leisure education, which is carried out in the formal education system in dozens of countries all over the world, regarding the necessity and applicability in Turkey.

#### Limitations and Recommendations

This research was carried out in the same school as it provides great convenience in terms of implementation. Therefore, including different schools into the research may also reveal differences that may arise from differences between schools. Another limitation of this study is that the curriculum for leisure education is prepared according to Munusturlar (2014). It is believed that the implementation of different leisure education curricula for different applications would also provide important findings.

Sivan (1997) states that successful leisure time education may be possible when a well-planned leisure time curriculum in schools is considered in conjunction with the leisure time experience. For this reason, it is suggested to implement leisure education curriculums planned as elective or compulsory courses in schools primarily. It is suggested that individuals who receive leisure education at younger ages through a planned curriculum should also be provided with well-programmed leisure time opportunities to ensure permanent behavior change. For future research, it is suggested to investigate how to improve leisure literacy through deliberate and unintentional ways of enculturation. It should not be forgotten that leisure is a blessing to achieve happiness and life satisfaction we seek for. When we develop ourselves about how to use leisure time more efficiently, we will have found the formula for happiness and high level of life satisfaction.

#### References

---

- Bedini, L. A., Bullock, C. C., & Driscoll, L. B. (1993). The effects of leisure education on factors contributing to the successful transition of students with mental retardation from school to adult life. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 27(2), 70-82.
- Bullock, C. C., & Howe, C. Z. (1991). A model for therapeutic recreation program for the reintegration of persons with disabilities into the community. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 25(1), 7-17.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Dunn, N. J., & Wilhite, B. (1997). The effects of a leisure education program on leisure participation and psychosocial well-being of two older women who are home-centered. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 30(3), 197-212.
- Caldwell, L.L., Baldwin, C.K., Walls, T., & Smith, E., (2004). Preliminary effects of a leisure education program to promote healthy use of free time among middle school adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 36(3), 310-335.
- Charles, M., Bustard, D., & Black, M. (2009). *Experiences of promoting engagement in game-based learning*. Proceedings of the European Conference on Games Based Learning, 397-403. Retrieved from Education Research Complete Database.

- Clark, B.S. & Anderson, D.M., (2011). I'd be dead if I didn't have this class: The role of leisure education in college student development. *Recreational Sport Journal*, (35), 45-54.
- Clark, L.H. ve Starr, I.S. (1991). *Secondary and Middle School Teaching Method*. Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, USA.
- Dattilo, J. (1991). Recreation and leisure: A review of the literature and recommendations for future directions. In L. Meyer, C. Peck, & L. Brown (Eds.), *Critical issues in the lives of people with severe disabilities* (pp. 126137). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Dattilo, J. (2008). *Leisure education program planning: A systematic approach* (3rd ed.). State College, PA: Venture.
- Desrosiers, J., Noreau, L., Rochette, A., Carbonneau, H., Fontaine, L., Viscogliosi, C. & Bravo, G., (2007). Effect of a Home Leisure Education Program After Stroke: A Randomized Controlled Trial, *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 88, (9), 1095-1100.
- Glatthorn, A. A., Boschee, F., Whitehead, B. M. & Bosche, B. F. (2012). *Curriculum Leadership: Strategies For Development and Implementation*. Third Edition, Sage, Washington.
- Goldberger, M., Ashworth, S. & Byra, M. (2012). Spectrum of Teaching Styles Retrospective 2012. *Quest*, 64:268–282.
- Goodale, T., & Godbey, G. (1988). *The evolution of leisure*. State College, PA: Ventura.
- Green, F., & Heyne, L. (1997). Friendship. In S. Schleien, M. Ray, & F. Green (Eds.), *Community recreation and people with disabilities: Strategies for inclusion* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Hemingway, J. (1988). Leisure and civility: Reflections on a Greek ideal. *Leisure Sciences*, 10, 179-191.
- Hey, W., Lovett, M., Church, T. & Hey, D. (2016). Understanding the Intentions of Teaching Styles to Improve Student Learning in Physical Education. *KAHPERD Journal*, 54, (1), 53-65.
- Heyne, L.A., & Schleien, S.J. (1996). Leisure education in the schools: A call to action. *Journal of Leisurability*, 23(3), 3-14.
- Hughes, S. & Keller, M., J. (1992). Leisure Education: A Coping Strategy for Family Caregivers. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 19, (1), 115-128.
- Janssen, M. (2004). The effects of leisure education on quality of life in older adults. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 38(3), 275–288.
- Johnson, D. E., Bullock, C. C., & Ashton-Shaeffer, C. (1997). Families and leisure: A context for learning. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 30, 30-34.
- Kaptan S. (1995). *Bilimsel Araştırma ve İstatistik Teknikleri*. Ankara: Tekişik Web Ofset Tesisleri.
- Madi, B. (2011). *Öğrenme Beyinde Nasıl Olur*, Efil Yayınevi, Ankara.
- Marsh, C. (1992). *Key concepts for understanding the curriculum*. Falmer Press, London.
- McClean, D. D., Hurd, A. R., Roger, N. B. (2008). *Kraus' Recreation and Leisure in Modern Society*. Jones and Bertlett Publishers, Sudbury, Massachusetts.

- Mundy, J., (1998). *Leisure education: theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Champagne, Ill., Sagamore.
- Mundy, J., & Odum, L. (1979). *Leisure education: Theory and practice*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Munusturlar, S. (2014). *Boş Zaman Eğitiminin Benlik Saygısı ve Öznel İyi Oluş Üzerine Etkisi*. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı, Eskişehir, Türkiye.
- Munusturlar, S. & Bayrak, C. (2016). Developing the Leisure Education Scale. *World Leisure Journal*, DOI: 10.1080/16078055.2016.1251489, 1-20., 14/11/2016.
- Paris, C. & Gespass, S. (2001). Examining the mismatch between learner-centered teaching and teacher-centered supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 52, No. 5, November/December, 398-412.
- Prensky, M. (2001). *Computer games and learning: Digital game-based learning*. In J. Raessens, & J. Goldstein, Handbook of computer game studies (s. 97- 122). Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Rancourt, A. M. (1982). *The Mundy-Odum Leisure Education Model: Changing leisure attitude and leisure knowledge* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation; Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, PQDT). Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.
- Ruskin, H., & Sivan, A. (2002). *Leisure education in school systems*. Jerusalem: Magness Press.
- Searle M. S., Mahon M. J., Iso-Ahola S. E., Sdrolias H. A., van Dyck J., (1995). Enhancing a sense of independence and psychological well-being among the elderly: A field experiment. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27:107-124.
- Sharma, P. L. (2005). *Discovery Teaching and Learning*. Sarup& Sons, New Delhi.
- Sivan (1997): Recent Developments In Leisure Education Research And Implementation, *World Leisure & Recreation*, 39 (2), 41-44.
- Sivan, A., (2007). Educating for leisure. In E. Cohen-Gewerc & R. A. Stebbins (Eds.), *The pivotal role of leisure education: Finding personal fulfillment in this Century* (pp.51-62). Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.
- Sivan, A. (2008). Leisure education in educational settings: From instruction to inspiration. *Society and Leisure*, 31(1), 49-68.
- Sivan, A. & Chan, D. W. K. (2012): Leisure education in schools from students' perspectives: the case of Hong Kong, *World Leisure Journal*, 54:1, 26-37.
- Sivan, A. (2014). Leisure education and the role of schools : Planning and implementation in times of change. *African Journal for Physical Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, , 20, (4), 1524-1536.
- Stumbo, N. J. & Peterson, C. A. (2004). *Therapeutic recreation program design: Principles and procedures* (3rd. Ed.) San Francisco: Pearson.
- Tan, L. (2011). Comparison of PBL and The Traditional Teaching Method in The Teaching of Economics. In D. Jin & S. Lin (Eds.), *Advances in Computer Science, Intelligent System and Enviroment* (pp.565-572). Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. (2007). *Curriculum development : theory into practice* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J. : Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

- Theeboom, M. & Bollaert, L. (1987). Leisure Education and the School. *European Journal of Education*, 22, (3/4), pp. 299-308.
- Torkildsen, G. (1992). *Leisure and recreation management* (3rd ed.). London: E&FN Spon: An Imprint of Chapman & Hall
- Van Oers, B. & Duijkers, D. (2013). Teaching in a play-based curriculum: Theory, practice and evidence of developmental education for young children, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 45:4, 511-534, DOI: 10.1080/00220272.2011.637182
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). *Educational psychology*. Boca Raton, FL: St Lucie Press.
- Weber, M. F. (2010). *A leisure education program for postsecondary students with intellectual disabilities* (Unpublished master's thesis; Retrieved from All Theses at Tiger Prints) Clemson University, South Carolina.
- Weimar, M. (2013). *Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. ISBN: 9781118119280
- WLRA, (2001). World Leisure and Recreation Association International Position Statement on Leisure Education and Youth at Risk, *Leisure Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 23:3, 201-207.
- Zin, N. A., & Yue, W. S. (2009). *History Educational Games Design*. 2009 International Conference on Electrical Engineering and Informatics (s. 269-275). Selangor, Malaysia.