Recreational Tendencies of Tourists: Mugla Case

Mehmet DALLI

Mugla Sitki Kocman University, School of Physical Education and Sport, 48000 Mugla, Turkey. <u>dallim@mu.edu.tr</u>

Abstract: The purpose of the present research is determining the recreational tendencies of tourists who accommodate in the facilities in Icmeler town (Turkey, Mugla, Marmaris), and the factors that constrain them from participating in recreational activities; comparing these in terms of demographic factors; and providing suggestions for permanent solutions. 684 male (53.8%), and 588 female (46.2%); a total of 1272 people between the ages of 15-45 selected among fluent English speaking tourists who accommodated in one of the facilities in Icmeler town in 2014 voluntarily participated in the present research. "Leisure Constraints Questionnaire" developed by Alexandris and Carroll (1997); "Tourist Expectation-Information Form" developed by the researchers in English were used as data collection tools. One-way variance analysis (ANOVA) and independent samples t test analysis were conducted on the data related to the nationality, gender, age, opinion and holiday perspectives of the tourists who participated in the present research. According to the statistical analyses, sub-dimensions that constrain tourists from leisure activities vary according to age and gender. Consequently, it was observed that male tourists spend less time on leisure activities then female tourists, female tourists are in need of a company to participate that kind of activities, more constraints are encountered with increasing age and tourists of various nations don't present any differences in participating leisure activities. In accordance with the findings of the present research, it is suggested that related departments of tourism sector not discriminate between genders as they prepare and make leisure activities, and prepare activities that middle aged and older tourists can participate; and that researchers who study in the subject field conduct similar researchs on the tourists who participate in the activities out of the facilities.

[Dalli M. Recreational Tendencies of Tourists: Mugla Case. *Life Sci J* 2014;11(9):1051-1055] (ISSN:1097-8135). http://www.lifesciencesite.com. 155

Keywords: Tourism; tourist; leisure; recreation; tendency

1. Introduction

Tourism that can be defined as a leisure activity is one of the sectors that provide most income in Turkey. It is important for the promotion of our country and sustainable tourism that, tourists are satisfied with the facilities they accommodate in. In this context, high entertaining performance put in by the qualified staff working in the animation departments of accommodation facilities for their guests will contribute to national economy even minimal, by creating butterfly effect. In that case, a qualified entertaining concept in accommodation facilities should be shaped according to tourist expectations.

As stated by Russell, "using free time wisely is an important product created by civilization" (Zelinski, 2004). Especially, tourists' who want to spend their free time by having holidays using their free time positively will contribute to both themselves and touristic development of our country.

Holiday, is not a period of time in which individuals only rest and rehabilitate themselves completely. For many individuals, socio-cultural development is important as well during their holidays. In addition, recreative activities effect many parts of human life (job satisfaction, life satisfaction, family life etc.) positively (Aslan, 2009). For instance, Huang and Carleton (2003) found in their research that, participating in recreative activities increase life satisfaction levels of university students in Taiwan.

In other words, recreation programs offered by accommodation facilities are very important for tourists. Recreation activities is an important part of holidays. Today, every individual who spends most of their time at work, traffic or desks, feel the need for a holiday that includes recreation activities. For this reason, activity programs should provide individuals with opportunities to rest, and relieve their tiredness caused by the busy pace and routine works of modern life (Ergul, 2008).

Due to the development of accommodation facilities, and the efforts of their managers, tourist participation in recreational activities has increased recently. However, it is observed that many facilities are poor in recreational activities. One of the main reasons of this situation is the boom in the number of facilities in the recent years. But, there is also an increase in the number of trained individuals. In this recreation philosophy has context. become understandable, and therefore it is inevitable that individuals want environments in which they can present themselves more actively in both social and professional lives.

In accordance with these inferences, the

purpose of the present research is determining the recreational tendencies of tourists who accommodate in the facilities in Icmeler town (Turkey, Mugla, Marmaris), and the factors that constrain them from participating in recreational activities; comparing these in terms of demographic factors; and provide suggestions for permanent solutions.

Materials and Methods

Six hundred and eighty four (684) male (53.8%), and five hundred and eighty eight 588 female (46.2%); a total of 1272 people between the ages of 15-45 selected among fluent English speaking tourists who accommodated in one of the facilities in Icmeler town in 2014 voluntarily participated in the present research.

"Leisure Constraints Ouestionnaire" developed by Alexandris and Carroll (1997); "Tourist Expectation-Information Form" developed by the researchers in English were used as data collection tools. One-way variance analysis (ANOVA) and independent samples t test analysis were conducted on the data related to the nationality, gender, age, opinion and holiday perspectives of the tourists who participated in the present research. Sample is a small part that is selected from a universe according to some rules, and it is considered to represent the universe it is selected from. Researches are mostly conducted on samples and findings obtained from the sample are generalized to whole universe (Karasar, 2005).

According to the data provided by the Ministry of Tourism, the number of tourists who entered Turkey from different border gates and accommodated in the province of Mugla in the month the research was conducted (June) is 1.05-1.287 (T.C.K.T.B, 2014). 1272 tourists who participated in the present research form the sample of the research, and this number is adequate to represent the universe according to the calculations of Yazicioglu and Erdogan (2004). In all calculations, it is observed that in order to minimize the sampling errors, sample size needs to be increased. On the other hand, according to the selected error margin, sample size doesn't need to be increased over a specific value.

Results

		Ν	%
Gender	Male	684	53.8
	Female	588	46.2
Age	15-25	387	30.4
	26-35	613	48.2
	36-45	272	21.4
Nationality	Dutch	183	14.4
	French	78	6.1
	Scandinavian	201	15.8
	Russian	317	24.9
	German	167	13.1
	British	326	25.6
	Total	1272	

Table 1. Frequency of the demographics of tourists

Table 2. Leisure constraints according to the genders of the tourists

of the tourists					
Dimension	Gender	Ν	Х	t	р
Lack of	Male	684	2.83	2.456	.037*
time and	Female	588	2.56		
interest					
Individual	Male	684	2.74	2.654	.021*
Psychology	Female	588	2.52		
Lack of	Male	684	2.85	1.835	.119
information	Female	588	2.76		
Access	Male	684	2.63	.243	.781
problems	Female	588	2.60		
Poor	Male	684	2.99	815	0.191
facilities	Female	588	3.05		
Lack of	Male	684	2.78	1.985	.029*
company	Female	588	2.96		
*p<.05					

Table 3. Leisure constraints according to the ages	of
the tourists	

Age	Ν	Х	р	Tukey
15-25	387	2.54	0.012*	1 – 2
26-35	613	2.67		1 – 3
36-45	272	2.78		2 – 3
15-25	387	2.58	0.031*	1 – 3
26-35	613	2.63		
36-45	272	2.68		
15-25	387	2.73	0.048*	1 – 3
26-35	613	2.80		2 - 3
36-45	272	2.89		
15-25	387	2.58	0.213	-
26-35	613	2.63		
36-45	272	2.65		
15-25	387	3.07	.317	-
26-35	613	3.03		
36-45	272	2.98		
15-25	387	2.81	.042*	1 – 3
26-35	613	2.88		
36-45	272	2.93		
	$\begin{array}{r} 15\text{-}25\\ \hline 26\text{-}35\\ \hline 36\text{-}45\\ \hline 15\text{-}25\\ \hline 26\text{-}35\\ \hline 26\text{-}35\\ \hline 36\text{-}45\\ \hline 15\text{-}25\\ \hline 26\text{-}35\\ \hline 15\text{-}25\\ \hline 26\text{-}35\\ \hline 36\text{-}45\\ \hline 15\text{-}25\\ \hline 26\text{-}35\\ \hline 36\text{-}45\\ \hline 15\text{-}25\\ \hline 26\text{-}25\\ \hline 26\text{-}35\\ \hline 26\text{-}45\\ \hline$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

*p<.05

 Table 4. Correlations between ages and leisure constraints of tourists

		Age
Lack of time and interest	r	.784
Lack of time and interest	р	.009*
In dividual Developer	r	.674
Individual Psychology	р	.017*
Lack of information	r	.815
Lack of milor mation	р	.011*
A cooss problems	r	.312
Access problems	р	.114
Poor facilities	r	561
r oor facilities	р	.193
Look of company	r	.773
Lack of company	p	.039*

*p<.05

Dimension Nat. N X F p Lack of time and interest Dutch 183 2.61 .846 .349 French 78 2.64	tourists in terms of nationality							
Trench 78 2.64 Scandin. 201 2.69 Russian 317 2.67 German 167 2.61 British 326 2.73 Individual Dutch 183 2.66 Psycho. French 78 2.67 Scandin. 201 2.59 . Russian 317 2.69 . . Scandin. 201 2.59 . . . Russian 317 2.69 German 167 2.65 Russian 317 2.69 British 326 2.68 British 326 2.82 British 326 2.84 Brench	Dimension	Nat.	N	Х	-			
interestScandin.2012.69Russian3172.67German1672.61British3262.73IndividualDutch1832.66Psycho.French782.67Scandin.2012.59Russian3172.69German1672.65British3262.68British3262.68Lack ofDutch1832.82Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84Scandin.2012.67Russian3172.65German1672.56British3262.58PoorDutch1833.02facilitiesFrench783.04French783.04Scandin.2013.07Russian3173.01German1672.99British3263.04Lack ofDutch1832.87Scandin.2013.07Russian3173.01German1672.90British326	Lack of	Dutch	183	2.61	.846	.349		
Num 200 200 Russian 317 2.67 German 167 2.61 British 326 2.73 Individual Dutch 183 2.66 Psycho. French 78 2.67 Scandin. 201 2.59 .675 Russian 317 2.69 .675 Scandin. 201 2.59 .675 Russian 317 2.69 .675 German 167 2.65 .789 .867 British 326 2.68 .789 .867 German 167 2.81 .789 .867 British 326 2.84 .789 .867 German 167 2.81 .913 .340 British 326 2.84 .913 .340 German 167 2.56 .913 .340 British 326 2.58 .913 .491 <th></th> <th>French</th> <th></th> <th>2.64</th> <th></th> <th></th>		French		2.64				
German1672.61British3262.73Individual Psycho.Dutch1832.66French782.67Scandin.2012.59Russian3172.69German1672.65British3262.68Lack of info.Dutch1832.82Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84Scandin.2012.67Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84ProblemsFrench782.61Scandin.2012.67Russian3172.65German1672.96PoorDutch1833.02French783.04Scandin.2013.07Russian3173.01German1672.99British3263.04French782.85Scandin.2013.04French782.85German1672.90British <th>interest</th> <th>Scandin.</th> <th>201</th> <th>2.69</th> <th></th> <th></th>	interest	Scandin.	201	2.69				
British3262.73Individual Psycho.Dutch1832.66.976.675French782.67675Scandin.2012.59Russian3172.69German1672.65British3262.68Lack of info.Dutch1832.82.789.867Kussian3172.80German1672.81Mussian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80French782.61Scandin.2012.67Match1832.62PoorDutch1832.62Match1833.02PoorDutch1833.02French783.04Match1672.99British3263.04		Russian	317	2.67				
Individual Psycho. Dutch French 183 2.66 .976 .675 French 78 2.67 .976 .675 Scandin. 201 2.59 .		German	167	2.61				
Psycho.French782.67Scandin.2012.59Russian3172.69German1672.65British3262.68Lack ofDutch1832.82Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84AccessDutch1832.62Dutch1832.62Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84Scandin.2012.67Russian3172.65German1672.56British3262.58PoorDutch1833.02facilitiesFrench783.04French783.04Scandin.2013.07Russian3173.01German1672.99British3263.04French783.04French783.04French782.85Scandin.2013.07Russian3173.01German1672.99British3263.04French782.85Scandin.2012.93Russian3172.83German1672.90British3263.04French78<		British	326					
Scandin. 201 2.59 Russian 317 2.69 German 167 2.65 British 326 2.68 Lack of info. Dutch 183 2.82 .789 .867 Kessian 317 2.80 .789 .867 Scandin. 201 2.77 Russian 317 2.80 German 167 2.81 .789 .867 Russian 317 2.80 .789 .867 German 167 2.81	Individual	Dutch	183	2.66	.976	.675		
Russian3172.69German1672.65British3262.68Lack of info.Dutch1832.82Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84Carman1672.81British3262.84Mathematical Scandin.2.012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84Scandin.2012.65German1672.61Scandin.2012.67Russian3172.65German1672.56British3262.58Poor facilitiesDutch1833.02French783.04Scandin.2013.07Russian3173.01German1672.99British3263.04French782.85Scandin.2012.93Russian3172.83German1672.90Russian3172.83German1672.90British3263.04Lack of CompanyDutch1832.85Scandin.2012.93Russian3172.83German1672.90British3262.83British3262.83	Psycho.	French	78	2.67				
German1672.65British3262.68Lack of info.Dutch1832.82French782.82Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84Mathematical Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84Scandin.2012.61Scandin.2012.67Russian3172.65German1672.56German1672.56British3262.58Poor facilitiesDutch1833.02French783.04Scandin.2013.07Russian3173.01German1672.99British3263.04French782.85Scandin.2012.93Russian3173.01German1672.90British3263.04Lack of companyDutch1832.85Scandin.2012.93Russian3172.83German1672.90British3262.88Scandin.2012.93Russian3172.83German1672.90Russian3172.83German1672.90 <th< th=""><th></th><th>Scandin.</th><th>201</th><th>2.59</th><th></th><th></th></th<>		Scandin.	201	2.59				
British3262.68Lack of info.Dutch1832.82.789.867French782.82.789.867Scandin.2012.77Russian3172.80German1672.81British3262.84AccessDutch1832.62.913.340problemsFrench782.61Scandin.2012.67Russian3172.65German1672.56PoorDutch1833.021.549facilitiesFrench783.04Scandin.2013.07British3262.58PoorDutch1833.04Scandin.2013.07French783.04Scandin.2013.07German1672.99British3263.04Lack ofDutch1832.87Scandin.2012.93Russian3172.83German1672.90Russian3172.83German1672.90British3262.88Scandin.2012.93Russian3172.83German1672.90British3262.88Scandin.2.90		Russian	317	2.69				
Lack of info. Dutch 183 2.82 .789 .867 info. French 78 2.82 .789 .867 Scandin. 201 2.77 Russian 317 2.80 .789 .867 Russian 317 2.80 .789 .867 German 167 2.81 .789 .867 British 326 2.81		German						
info. French 78 2.82 Scandin. 201 2.77 Russian 317 2.80 German 167 2.81 British 326 2.84 Access Dutch 183 2.62 problems French 78 2.61 Scandin. 201 2.67 Russian 317 2.65 German 167 2.61 Scandin. 201 2.67 Russian 317 2.65 German 167 2.56 British 326 2.58 Poor Dutch 183 3.02 facilities French 78 3.04 Scandin. 201 3.07 .491 facilities French 78 3.04 German 167 2.99 .491 German 167 2.99 .967 .564 company French 78		British						
Scandin. 201 2.77 Russian 317 2.80 German 167 2.81 British 326 2.84 Access Dutch 183 2.62 .913 .340 problems French 78 2.61		Dutch			.789	.867		
Russian 317 2.80 German 167 2.81 British 326 2.84 Access Dutch 183 2.62 .913 .340 French 78 2.61 .913 .340 French 78 2.61 .913 .340 German 167 2.56 .913 .340 Russian 317 2.65 .913 .340 German 167 2.56 .913 .340 British 326 2.58 .913 .340 Poor Russian 317 2.65 .913 .340 French 78 3.04 .91 .91 .91 facilities French 78 3.04 .91 .491 German 167 2.99 .91 .91 .91 British 326 3.04 .91 .91 .91 Lack of company French 78 <	info.	French		2.82				
German1672.81British3262.84AccessDutch1832.62.913.340problemsFrench782.61.913.340Scandin.2012.67Russian3172.65.German1672.56PoorDutch1833.021.549.491facilitiesFrench783.04491German1672.99.491.491facilitiesFrench783.04491German1672.99.491.491facilitiesFrench783.04491German1672.99.491.491German1672.99.491.491Kussian3173.01.491German1672.99.564Scandin.2012.93.564German1672.93.564British3262.83.564British3262.83.564German1672.90.564British3262.83.564British3262.83British3262.83British3262.83British3262.83British3262.83British3262.83British3262.83British3262.83		Scandin.						
British3262.84AccessDutch1832.62.913.340problemsFrench782.61.913.340French782.61.913.340Scandin.2012.67.913.340Russian3172.65.913.340German1672.56.913.340PoorDutch1833.02.549facilitiesFrench783.04Scandin.2013.07.491facilitiesFrench783.04German1672.99.907British3263.04Lack of companyDutch1832.87French782.85Scandin.2012.93Russian3172.83German1672.90British3262.88		Russian						
Access problems Dutch 183 2.62 .913 .340 French 78 2.61 -		German						
French 78 2.61 Scandin. 201 2.67 Russian 317 2.65 German 167 2.56 British 326 2.58 Poor Dutch 183 3.02 facilities French 78 3.04 Scandin. 201 3.07 .491 German 167 2.99 .564 Scandin. 201 2.93 .564 German 317 2.83 .564 German 317 2.83 .564 British 326 2.83 .564 British 326 2.		British						
Scandin. 201 2.67 Russian 317 2.65 German 167 2.56 British 326 2.58 Poor facilities Dutch 183 3.02 French 78 3.04 Scandin. 201 3.07 Russian 317 3.01 German 167 2.99 British 326 3.04 Company French 78 2.87 French 78 2.85 .967 .564 German 167 2.93 .967 .564 German 317 2.83 .967 .564 British 326 2.93 .967 .564 German 167 2.90 .967 .564 British 326 2.83 .967 .564		Dutch			.913	.340		
Russian 317 2.65 German 167 2.56 British 326 2.58 Poor Dutch 183 3.02 1.549 .491 facilities French 78 3.04 .491 German 107 2.99 .491 German 167 2.99 .491 British 326 3.04 .491 German 167 2.99 .491 British 326 3.04 .491 German 167 2.99 .491 British 326 3.04 .491 Lack of company French 78 2.85 Scandin. 201 2.93 .564 German 317 2.83 .564 German 167 2.90 .564 British 326 2.88 .564	problems	French						
German 167 2.56 British 326 2.58 Poor Dutch 183 3.02 1.549 .491 facilities French 78 3.04 .491 Garman 201 3.07 .491 German 167 2.99 .491 German 167 2.99 .491 British 326 3.04 .491 Lack of company French 78 2.87 .491 Kussian 317 3.01 .491 Kussian 317 2.93 .491 British 326 3.04 .564 German 167 2.93 .564 British 317 2.83 .564 British 317 2.83 .564 British 326 2.88 .564		Scandin.						
British 326 2.58 Poor Dutch 183 3.02 1.549 .491 facilities French 78 3.04 5.64 6.66 Scandin. 201 3.07 7.67 6.66								
Poor facilities Dutch 183 3.02 1.549 .491 facilities French 78 3.04 - <td< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td<>								
French 78 3.04 Scandin. 201 3.07 Russian 317 3.01 German 167 2.99 British 326 3.04 Lack of company Dutch 183 2.87 French 78 2.85 .967 .564 German 107 2.93 .967 .564 Brench 78 2.85 .967 .564 Brench 78 2.85 .967 .564 Brench 78 2.85 .967 .564 Brench 78 2.83 .967 .564 British 317 2.83 .967 .564		British						
Scandin. 201 3.07 Russian 317 3.01 German 167 2.99 British 326 3.04 Lack of company Dutch 183 2.87 .967 .564 Scandin. 201 2.93 .967 .564 Brench 78 2.85 .967 .564 Brench 78 2.83 .967 .564 Brench 78 2.83 .967 .564 British 317 2.83 .967 .564 British 326 2.83 .967 .564		Dutch			1.549	.491		
Russian 317 3.01 German 167 2.99 British 326 3.04 Lack of company Dutch 183 2.87 .967 .564 Scandin. 201 2.93 .967 .564 German 167 2.93 .967 .564 British 317 2.83 .967 .564 British 317 2.83 .967 .564 British 326 2.93 .967 .564	facilities	French						
German 167 2.99 British 326 3.04 Lack of company Dutch 183 2.87 .967 .564 French 78 2.85 .967 .564 Scandin. 201 2.93 .967 .564 British 317 2.83 .967 .564 British 326 2.93 .564								
British 326 3.04 Lack of company Dutch 183 2.87 .967 .564 Scandin. 201 2.93 .967 .564 German 317 2.83 .967 .564 British 320 2.93 .967 .564								
Lack of company Dutch 183 2.87 .967 .564 French 78 2.85								
Company French 78 2.85 Scandin. 201 2.93 Russian 317 2.83 German 167 2.90 British 326 2.88								
Scandin. 201 2.93 Russian 317 2.83 German 167 2.90 British 326 2.88					.967	.564		
Russian3172.83German1672.90British3262.88	company							
German1672.90British3262.88								
British 326 2.88								
		British	326	2.88				

Table 5. Leisure Constraint differences between tourists in terms of nationality

*p<.05

Discussions

There is a significant difference between male and female tourists in terms of "lack of time and interest" dimension (p=0.037). Male tourists are less interested in utilizing their free time less than female tourists. Many previous researchers have found that there are significant differences between men and women in terms of participating leisure activities, and experience more constraints women from participating in leisure activities than men. Women believe that they are not given enough chances to participate in leisure activities, and they state that they don't receive enough support from their families and friends (Hudson, 2000; Henderson, 1995). Unlike other researches, according to the findings of the present research, "lack of time and interest" factor is a smaller constraint in favor of women. This indicates that, as the work group of the present research is formed by tourists, the women within the scope of the study are free of their routine works, work pace, parenting responsibilities etc. and therefore they are more interested in leisure activities that they can choose freely, and have the advantage of spending their time and interest in these activities. In other words, individuals who are free of various stressing factors and pressures in their holidays can overcome leisure constraints (Table 2). Besides, Coruh obtained similar results in the research conducted in 2013.

Findings of the present research show that the difference between male and female tourists in terms of individual psychology sub-dimension is higher in favor of female tourists (p=0.021). The findings of the research conducted by Tolukan show that women are more involved in individual psychology subdimension or they internalize the questions in the scale more than men (Tolukan, 2010). This finding doesn't comply with the findings of the present research. It is understood that male participants of the present research don't feel ready to participate in this kind of activities psychologically and they feel that they can get hurt in this kind of activities. However, leisure activities also help avoiding from intense thoughts and therefore distract individuals from stressing thoughts caused by the stressful living conditions. Leisure activities help people avoid from stress temporarily, feel refreshed psychologically, and deal with problems more easily (Sharp and Mannell, 1996) (Table 2).

According to the analyses, there is a significant difference between male and female tourists in terms of "lack of company" factor (p=0.029). Male tourists suffer from lack of company less than female tourists, and female tourist don't participate in leisure activities because of this problem. In other words, women feel the need for a company when they spend their free time. This factor is an important constraint for women (Table 2). This finding doesn't comply with the findings of the research conducted by Coruh. Coruh (2013) found that lack of company factor is not a factor that constrains from participating in leisure activities for both genders.

There are significant differences between age groups in terms of "lack of time and interest" dimension (p=0.012). Research findings show that younger participants are effected from these constraints less. According to Tukey results, this difference is caused by the differences between all groups (Table 3).

Another finding of the present research is that, there are significant differences between age groups in terms of "individual psychology" dimension (p=0.031). This problem is important for all tourists of all ages, but it is less important for younger participants in the 15-25 age group than the participants in 36-45 age group. This difference is not unexpected. Because, younger individuals are different from other individuals in terms of health and self-confidence (Table 3).

Statistically significant differences were found between age groups in terms of other leisure constrains; "Lack of time and interest", "Individual Psychology", "Lack of Information", and "Lack of Company". It was found that, these factors are more important problems for older tourists, and younger tourists participate in leisure activities more than older tourists (Table 4).

According to ANOVA test results, there are no significant differences between nations in terms of individual psychology (p=0.675). In other words, this kind of problems are of equal and high importance for tourists of various nationalities.

Analyses show that, there is a significant difference between age groups in terms of "lack of information" factor (p=0.048). This difference is caused by the fact that information required for participating in leisure activities is lower among 36-45 age group participants than others. On the other hand, it is observed that this factor is of equal and high importance in terms of all variables. There are similar researches in the literature that found significant differences for lack of knowledge sub-dimension. For instance, Alexandris and Carrroll (1997) conducted a research on university students about their frequencies of participating in sportive activities, and the factors that constrain their participation. They found that there is a significant correlation between lack of information, motivation level of individuals and their levels of perceiving constraints.

Another finding of the present research is that, there is a significant difference between age groups in terms of "lack of company" factor (p=0.042). Tourists in 15-25 age group experience less difficulty in "lack of company" than tourists in 36-45 age group; and older tourists don't participate in leisure activities because of lack of company. Generally, younger tourists spend their holiday time more actively, and older tourists prefer having rest, and so it is thought that they don't need the company of a friend. This factor is an important constraint for tourists in 36-45 age group.

Last finding of the present research is that, there are no significant differences between tourists from different nations in terms of sub-dimensions of leisure constraints scale (Table 5). The researchers evaluate this finding as that all nations are similar in using their free time during holiday. In other words, these kinds of problems are of equal importance for all tourists from different nations.

Conclusion

Statistical analyses conducted within the score of present research indicate that, factors that constrain tourists from leisure activities vary in terms of age and gender.

Consequently, it was observed that male tourists spend less time in leisure activities than female tourists, female tourists feel the for a company to participate in this kind of activities, with increasing age more constraints are encountered and tourists from different nations don't present any differences in participating in leisure activities.

Suggestion

In accordance with the findings of the present research, it is suggested that related departments of tourism sector not discriminate between genders as they prepare and make leisure activities, and prepare activities that middle aged and older tourists can participate; and that researcher who study in the subject field conduct a similar research on the tourists who participate in the activities out of the facilities.

References

- 1. Yazicioglu, Y. and Erdogan, S. *Spss uygulamali bilimsel arastirma yontemleri*. Ankara: Detay Publication, (2004).
- 2. Karasar, N. *Bilimsel arastirma yontemi*. Nobel Publication. Ankara. (2005).
- 3. T.C. Kultur ve Turizm Bakanligi http://yigm.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,9854/sinirgiris-cikis-istatistikleri.html (erisim tarihi: 29.08.2014).
- Zelinski EJ. Calisma(ma)'nin Keyfi, Iskolikler, Issizler ve Emekliler Icin Bir Rehber. Birinci Baski. Colakoglu D (Cev), Istanbul: Boyner Publication, 2004.
- 5. Aslan N. An examination of family lesiure and family satisfaction among traditional Turkish families. J Leisure Res, 2009: 41(2); 157–176.
- Huang CY, Carleton B. There lationship samong leisure participation, leisure satisfaction, and life satisfaction of college students in Taiwan. J Exerc Sci Fit, 2003: 1(2); 129-132.
- Ergul OK. Universite Gencliginin Sportif Rekreasyon Etkinliklerine Yonelik Ilgileri ve Katilma Duzeylerinin Belirlenmesi. Yuksek Lisans Tezi. Manisa: Celal Bayar University; 2008.
- 8. Alexandris K, Carroll B. Demographic Differences in the Perception of Constraints on

Recreational Sport Participation: Results from a Study in Greece. Leisure Studies, 1997;16:107-125.

- Hudson S. The Segmentation of Potential Tourists: Constraint Differences between Men and Women. Journal of Travel Research 2000; 38(4): 363-368.
- Henderson KA. Women's Leisure: More Truththan Facts? World Leisure and Recreation 1995; 37(1): 9-13.
- 11. Tolukan E. Ozel Yetenekle Ilgili Bolumlerde Okuyan Universite Ogrencilerinin Rekreasyonel Aktivitelere Katilimlarina Engel Olabilecek Unsurlarin Belirlenmesi. Yuksek Lisans. Nigde:

9/2/2014

Nigde University; 2010.

- Sharp A, Mannell RC. Participation in Leisure as a Coping Strategy Among Bereaved Women. D. Dawson (ed.), Proceedings of the Eighth Canadian Congress on Leisure Research, 1996; 241-244.
- 13. Coruh Y Universite Ogrencilerinin Rekreasyonel Egilimleri ve Rekreasyonel Etkinliklere Katilimina Engel Olan Faktorler (Agri Ibrahim Cecen Universitesi Ornegi). Gazi Universitesi, Saglik Bilimleri Enstitusu, Beden Egitimi Ve Spor Anabilim Dali. Unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara. 2013.