

## Full Length Research Paper

# The effects of motivation on leisure time management

Hüseyin Samet Aşikkutlu<sup>1</sup> and Haldun Müderrisoğlu<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of City and Regional Planning, University of Bozok, Turkey.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Duzce, Turkey.

Accepted 31 December, 2010

**The purpose of this study was to determine recreational motivations and present its effects on user properties (socio-economic properties and land use habits). In line with this purpose, a questionnaire was applied to fifty users in Ankara Goksu Park. According to the analysis, it was stated that user properties (socio-economic properties and land use habits) have an impact on socialization, entertainment and escape motivation factors.**

**Key words:** Recreation, motivation, urban park, satisfaction.

## INTRODUCTION

It can be said that currently, the cities with rapid strides prevent people from being close to nature and the urban parks serve the purpose at this point. Urban parks not only provide people with physical and physiological health, but also create an aesthetic view in the city.

Several resources on leisure time have tried to explain why many people travel (Shoemaker, 1994). Studies by Goodale and Witt (1985) explained why people preferred a recreational area to another and why it is an important issue for planners and managers of recreation resource. Therefore, it may be asserted that recreational motivations should be determined in order to make the best use of the urban parks that have a positive effect on the people of the city, to take appropriate management decisions and increase the user satisfaction. Additionally, determining the items affecting one's decision on doing recreation is very important to park, recreation offices and other related agencies.

Recreational preferences are shaped as a consequence of attitudes or motivations and they are the most effective characteristics in the choosing of the recreational area (Murphy, 1975). Determining motivations provide important tools in determining potential users, satisfaction of these users, proper marketing and management strategies (Pearce, 1993).

It has been presented in many studies that recreational

motivations change according to user property. Confer et al. (1996) stated in a study that was conducted in Delaware State Park that escape/loneliness, nature/learning, entertainment/recreation and socialization/curiosity motivates people. Kyle et al. (2005) emphasized in a study carried out in three different camping areas in Southeast National Forest of America that motivations have a positive effect on participation and they provide sustainability. Vogelsong et al. (1997) stated that the characteristics of a Park site have effects on the determination of motivations. Ewert (1993) conducted a study to assess the motivation of the sportsmen that climbed Rainer Mountain in Washington, and concluded that challenging, knowing, creating opportunity, blowing off steam and participating in the sport activities motivated the sportsmen. Also, he emphasized in his study that motivational factors depend on the demographic features of the people, the type of activity and the previous experience level of the users. Field and Cheek (1974) found out that social structure in the selection of recreation site had effects on both characteristics of the site and the activities aimed. Laundsbury and Hoops (1988) examined the stabilization of the motivations over time, and revealed that the change was possible. White and Gray (2001) also stated that motivations change in the course of time. Motivations that change in time are noted as watching the scenery, resting and relaxing, spending time with the family, socializing and making friendship with new people, being close to nature and feeling relaxed after the sport activities and meeting with new people.

Motivation of recreation has been subject to many

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: [haldunm@duzce.edu.tr](mailto:haldunm@duzce.edu.tr). Tel: 0903805421137. Fax: 0903805421136.

studies; although few studies explained the recreational motivation in Turkey. The majority of these studies are the subject of Ankara province. Oguz (2000) examined the characteristics of park users and user satisfaction, and reported the problems and requirements in Ankara's urban parks. The findings suggest that the use of each park has its own characteristics although there appear to be some similarities within some of the studied areas. Muderrisoglu et al. (2006) examined the recreational motivations in public sports areas of Ankara. According to the result, recreational motivations change according to the user's gender, age, working situation and specialities of the recreational area. Demir et al. (2010) examined how the methods of management of urban parks in Ankara affect user satisfaction. They reached the result that management methods are effective on user satisfaction. On the other hand, Müderrisoğlu et al. (2010) revealed that to increase the satisfaction of the users of urban parks in Ankara, the number of active recreation areas should be increased. Emerging from all these works, there is a positive relation between general satisfaction and the motivation factors like area features and management, experience, information and facility. However, Goksu Park is one of the highly used urban parks in Ankara, which is the capital city of Turkey. The purpose of this study is to reveal the recreational motivations of the users of Goksu Park. To explain the determined motivations, users' socioeconomic characteristics and land use habits were examined. A trial was made in this study to find answers to the following questions:

1. Are the socioeconomic characteristics effective on users' motivations of urban parks?
2. Do the motivations of urban parks' users vary according to their land use habits?

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In the questionnaire that was conducted as face to face interviews with 250 users that visited Ankara Goksu Park, the motivations that had a positive effect on participation of the users in the activities were determined. The studies of Confer et al. (1996), Bowes and Dawson (1998), Graefe et al. (1999), Todd et al. (2001), White and Gray (2001) and Muderrisoglu et al. (2006) were used for the questionnaire. These studies were the most important resources in determining recreational motivations in Turkey and around the world. By utilizing the motivation items used in these studies, a motivation scale suitable for the Goksu Park conditions was created. This scale consisted of twenty-nine motivation criteria (Table 1). According to Baş (2003), a questionnaire that will be administered in an area with more than 100,000 users needs at least 100 questionnaires with 0.5 confidence level and 5% error level. Considering these criteria, 250 questionnaires were made.

### Working area

Goksu Park is located in the borders of Eryaman in Etimesgut District of Ankara. It is established on a 550 000 m<sup>2</sup> of land, in which 127 000 m<sup>2</sup> is a natural Susuz lake. Apart from many recreational activities in the facility, there are also a lot of picnic

sites, cafes, restaurants and shady places to rest. Ankara was chosen as the city for the study area because it is the capital city and it has a high potential for users with diverse socioeconomic characteristics. Gökusu Park was chosen as the study area because it is located in the center of the city and has high transportation possibilities. Also, it has the largest recreation area with rich recreation opportunities.

### Determination of user properties

The questionnaire study that was conducted between the months of February and December 2007 comprised 250 people. In the first part of the study, the age, gender, educational background, monthly income and job status of the users were presented and questions, such as: who did they come to the site with, how did they get to the site, how often did they visit the site, which district did they live and how many years did they live in Ankara, were answered. In the second part, thirty questions that aimed at determining the motivations were asked. A three point Likert scale was used in the study. "1" was determined as ineffective and "5" as highly effective.

### Assessment of the data

Statistical analysis of the whole study was made with SPSS 11 program, factor analysis was used to form motivation factors and reliability analysis was used to show the reliability of the factors. Unidirectional variance analysis was used to emphasize the effect of motivations on user properties (socio-economic properties and land use habits). Also, the questionnaire questions as regards age, gender, educational background, monthly income, job status and district of the users were grouped under the title of economic properties; the questions regarding settlement year in Ankara were grouped under the title of socio-economic properties, while the questions, regarding whom they come to the site with, how they get to the site, how often they visited the site, were grouped under the title of area of use.

### User properties

In the questionnaire study that was carried out in Goksu Park, it was figured out that 41% of the users were between 21 and 30 in number, 58% were male, 58% were postgraduate, 34% have an income of between 850 and 1250 TL, 51% were students, 43% were resident in Etimesgut, 34% have lived in Ankara from 15 to 25 years, 73% come to Goksu Park with their friends, 41% get there with their cars, 40% visit the site once a year or more, and 66% of them spend two hours or more at the site.

### User motivations in Goksu Park

Thirty criteria regarding the effect of motivation on participation were evaluated in this study. Factor analyses were used to explain these criteria. As a result of the analyses, the criteria were gathered under six factors. These factors were arranged as MFIV (entertainment), MFI (field properties), MFV (escape), MFVIII (economic properties), MFI (personal participation) and MFVII (socialization) according to their degree of influence. However, information about the analysis data and factor groups are shown in Table 1:

(i) Factor I (field properties) is explained with 16% variance and the Cronbach's alpha is 0.89. The calculated alpha value shows that this factor has high reliability (Ozdamar, 1999). Eight motivation criteria are included in the first group. The common trait of these criteria is that they are all about field property. The most effective criterion of this factor is that the picnic site is clean and orderly.

**Table 1.** Goksu Park motivation factors.

Motivation	Motivation A.O.	MFI	MFII	MFIII	MFIV	MFV	MFVI
Clean and tidy area	3.23	0.69					
Good management of the area	2.96	0.72					
Well-planned area	2.81	0.70					
Clean and tidy picnic site	3.30	0.79					
Sense of a natural environment	3.19	0.59					
A large number of activities in the area	2.64	0.58					
Satisfactory safety and security	3.14	0.79					
Sufficient car parks	2.67	0.66					
Improving knowledge socially and culturally	2.04		0.72				
Being together with people from same field of interest	2.39		0.68				
Improving knowledge and skills	1.92		0.77				
Making friends with people from different cultures	2.02		0.73				
Meeting new people	1.98		0.66				
Starting a new hobby and improving it	2.22		0.58				
No other place to have a good time	2.42			0.60			
Proximity of the area	2.63			0.85			
Cheapness and convenience of transportation	2.53			0.81			
Low land use cost	2.68			0.61			
Being together with friends	3.54				0.72		
Having a good time	3.74				0.74		
Sharing a social environment	3.13				0.68		
Recreation	3.06				0.58		
Moving away from daily routine	2.97					0.70	
Relieving the stress of school and job	3.07					0.69	
Moving away from social enforcements	2.39					0.55	
Doing something for oneself	2.75					0.53	
Blowing off steam	3.45					0.49	
Being alone	2.20						0.48
Participating in sport activities	2.22						0.47
Arithmetic average		2.97	2.06	2.55	3.36	2.93	2.30
Alpha		0.89	0.83	0.80	0.74	0.75	0.49
Variance (%)		16	14	10	9	9	6

MFI: Field properties; MFII: Socialization; MFIII: Economic properties; MFIV: Entertainment; MFV: Escape; MFVI: Personal Participation. Degree of Influence of Motivation: 1 "ineffective", 5 "highly effective."

(2) Factor II (socialization) is explained with 14% variance and the Cronbach's alpha is 0.83. The calculated alpha value shows that this factor has high reliability. Six criteria are included in the second factor. The common trait of these criteria is that they are all talking about socialization. The most effective criterion of this factor is being together with people from the same field of interest.

(3) Factor III (economic properties) is explained with 10% variance and the Cronbach's alpha is 0.80. The calculated alpha value shows that this factor has high reliability. Four criteria are included in this factor. The common trait of these criteria is that they are all talking about economic properties. However, the most effective criterion of this factor is that land use cost is low.

(4) Factor IV (entertainment) is explained with 9% variance and the Cronbach's alpha is 0.74. The calculated alpha value shows that this factor has high reliability. Four criteria are included in this factor. The common trait of these criteria is that they are all talking about entertainment. Nonetheless, the most effective criterion of

this factor is enjoying oneself and having a great time.

(5) Factor V (escape) is explained with 9% variance and the Cronbach's alpha is 0.75. The calculated alpha value shows that this factor has high reliability. Five criteria are included in this factor. The common trait of these criteria is that they are all talking about escape. However, the most effective criterion of this factor is blowing off steam.

(6) Factor VI (personal participation) is explained with 6% variance and the Cronbach's alpha is 0.49. The calculated alpha value shows that this factor has low reliability. Therefore, this factor is not included in the evaluation.

#### **Relationship between socio-economic properties of Goksu Park users and motivation**

In Table 2, the variance analysis results of user properties (age,

**Table 2.** Relationship between the socio-economic properties of Goksu Park users and motivation.

User property		MFI	MFII	MFIII	MFIV	MFV
Age (Years)	<20	2.93	2.17	2.30	3.47	2.99
	21–30	2.89	1.92	2.44	3.30	2.86
	31–40	2.80	2.04	2.70	3.40	2.81
	41–50	3.67	2.23	3.25	3.17	3.31
	50>	3.90	2.00	3.93	3.33	3.55
	F	3.39*	1.02	4.80***	0.57	1.61
Gender	Female	2.89	2.01	2.55	3.57	3.07
	Male	3.03	2.10	2.56	3.21	2.83
	F	1.07	0.53	0.01	10.33**	4.48*
Educational background	Primary school	3.32	2.23	2.93	3.59	2.68
	High school	3.08	2.31	2.82	3.19	2.88
	Collage	2.86	1.92	2.39	3.44	2.97
	Postgraduate	3.75	1.86	2.29	3.79	3.13
	F	2.05	3.19*	3.31*	1.89	0.61
Monthly income (TL)	<500	2.58	1.83	2.20	3.41	2.83
	500–850	2.77	2.04	2.29	3.52	2.99
	850–1250	3.03	2.06	2.71	3.36	2.93
	1250–2250	2.95	1.99	2.64	3.31	2.85
	2250>	3.27	2.24	2.57	3.27	3.10
	F	1.77	0.67	1.60	0.48	0.53
Job status	Employed	3.14	2.18	2.80	3.20	2.92
	Student	2.80	2.02	2.31	3.45	2.95
	Unemployed	2.98	2.11	2.54	3.49	2.78
	Retired	3.44	1.88	3.38	3.22	3.04
	F	3.11*	0.67	6.94***	1.48	0.33
District	Sincan	2.34	1.98	2.49	3.13	2.38
	Etimesgut	3.18	2.05	3.02	3.35	3.00
	Yenimahalle	3.13	2.02	2.25	3.46	3.04
	Keçiören	2.97	1.77	2.07	3.31	3.02
	Altındağ	2.42	2.39	2.00	3.00	2.53
	Çankaya	2.75	1.94	2.02	3.48	2.93
	Mamak	2.96	2.12	1.62	3.92	3.50
	Yenikent	0	3.67	2.25	4.00	0
	Kazan	2.50	1.33	1.75	2.50	2.40
	Gölbaşı	2.37	3.05	2.50	3.33	2.90
	Outside Ankara	3.12	2.61	2.55	3.38	2.94
F	1.86	1.58	4.83***	0.62	1.39	
Residence time in Ankara (Years)	1–5	3.07	1.98	2.17	3.55	3.03
	5–15	2.91	2.09	2.67	3.30	2.88
	15–25	2.81	1.98	2.58	3.23	2.91
	25	3.23	1.97	2.84	3.46	2.94
	F	1.45	0.22	3.39*	1.82	0.32

\*p&lt;0.05; \*\*p&lt;0.01; \*\*\*p&lt;0.001.

MFI: Field properties; MFII: Socialization; MFIII: Economic properties; MFIV: Entertainment; MFV: Escape. Degree of influence of motivation: 1 “ineffective”, 5 “highly effective.”

**Table 3.** Relationship between land use habits of Goksu Park users and motivation.

User property		MFI	MFII	MFIII	MFIV	MFV
Attendant of the users	Family	3.12	2.12	3.05	3.28	2.93
	Friends	2.95	2.12	2.40	3.46	2.91
	Alone	3.21	1.85	3.53	2.53	3.60
	F	0.75	0.39	10.40***	5.29**	3.03*
Transportation type	Car	2.97	1.97	2.39	3.39	2.85
	On foot	3.11	2.10	3.23	3.10	2.86
	Bus	2.97	2.21	2.43	3.54	3.10
	Bicycle	3.25	2.83	2.87	3.12	4.00
	Motorcycle	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.25	1.20
	F	1.26	1.51	5.81***	3.62**	2.56*
Visiting frequency	Less than once a year	2.90	2.01	2.12	3.27	3.04
	Once a year or more often	2.90	1.87	2.15	3.50	2.93
	Once a month or more often	2.92	2.08	2.87	3.32	2.88
	Once a week or more	3.33	2.53	3.26	3.23	3.02
	Everyday	3.35	2.73	3.20	3.00	2.76
	F	1.47	3.97**	11.97***	1.01	0.31
Time spent in the area	Less than half an hour	2.12	1.67	2.75	2.50	2.60
	Half an hour to an hour	3.10	1.99	3.27	2.93	2.77
	From one two hours	3.10	2.14	2.84	3.25	2.94
	Two hours or more	2.91	2.04	2.32	3.49	2.97
	F	0.83	0.25	8.62***	4.35**	0.46

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001.

MFI: Field properties; MFII: Socialization; MFIII: Economic properties; MFIV: Entertainment; MFV: Escape. Degree of influence of motivation: 1 "ineffective", 5 "highly effective".

gender, educational background, monthly income status, job status, district and residence time in Ankara) and motivation factors (field properties, socialization, economic properties, entertainment and escape) can be arranged thus:

1. Field properties and economic properties factors change statistically according to age from user properties. The users that are above 50 years of age have been stated to be motivated by field properties and economic properties for recreational activities more than the other age groups. It has been figured out that field property is the most ineffective motivation for the users that are below 31 to 40 years of age and economic property is the most ineffective motivation for the users that are below 20 years of age.
2. Entertainment and escape factors change statistically according to gender from user properties. Female users have been motivated by entertainment and escape factors for recreational activities more than male users. Entertainment and escape have been stated to be the most ineffective motivation for male users.
3. Socialization and economic properties factors change statistically according to educational background from user properties. High school graduate users stated that socialization is more important for recreational activities, while primary school graduates find economic properties more important for recreational activities. Socialization and economic properties are stated to be the most

ineffective motivation for postgraduate users.

4. Field and economic properties factors change statistically according to job status from user properties. Retired users stated that field and economic properties are the most important factor for recreational activities. However, field and economic properties are stated to be the most ineffective motivation for student users.
5. Economic properties factor changes statistically according to the district from user properties. The users that live in Etimesgut find economic properties more essential for recreational motivations. As such, economic properties are stated to be the most ineffective motivation for the users that live in Mamak.
6. Economic properties factor changes statistically according to residence time in Ankara from user properties. The users that lived in Ankara for 25 years or more stated that economic properties are the most important factor for recreational activities. Nonetheless, economic properties are stated to be the most ineffective motivation for the users that lived in Ankara for 1 to 5 years.

#### Relationship between land use habits of Goksu Park users and motivation

In Table 3, one-directional variance analysis results of user properties (how the users got to the area, the persons the users came

to the site with, and how much time they spent there) and motivation factors (field patterns, socialization, economic properties, entertainment and escape) can be arranged as follows:

1. Economic properties change statistically according to the criteria such as entertainment, escape, and the persons the users came to the site with. The users that come to the site alone find escape and economic properties factor to be more important for recreational activities, while the users that come to the site with their friends find entertainment factor to be more appealing for motivation activities. Economic properties and escape are stated to be the most ineffective motivation for the users that come to the site with their friends, while entertainment factor is considered to be the most ineffective motivation for the users that come to the site alone.

2. Economic properties, escape and entertainment factors change statistically according to the criterion of how the users got to the site. The users that came to the site on foot find economic properties to be more important for recreational activities, those that came to the site by bus find entertainment factor to be more appealing for motivation activities, while those that came to the site by bicycle find escape to be more essential for motivation activities. However, economic properties, escape and entertainment are stated to be the most ineffective motivation for the users that come to the site by motorcycle.

3. Socialization and economic properties factor changes statistically according to the visiting frequency of the users. The users that came to the site everyday find socialization factor to be more important for recreation activities. The users that came to the site once a week or more often state that economic properties motivated them to participate more in recreational activities. Nonetheless, socialization is stated to be the most ineffective motivation for the recreational activities of the users that came to the site once a year or more often, while economic properties are stated to be the most ineffective motivation for the users that came to the site once a year or less often.

4. Economic properties and entertainment factors change statistically according to how much time the users spend at the site. The users that spend time between half an hour and an hour at the site, state that economic properties motivate them more for recreational activities, while those that spend two hours or more at the site find entertainment more motivating for recreational activities. However, economic properties are stated to be the most ineffective factor for the users that spend two hours or more at the site. Also, entertainment is stated to be the most ineffective factor for the users that spend time between half an hour and an hour at the site.

## DISCUSSION

Within the context of these studies, motivations that have an effect on the users have been presented and it has been observed that recreational motivations change according to the user properties (socio-economic properties and land use habits). As a result of the findings regarding motivation, it is stated that four motivation factors (socialization, economic properties, entertainment and escape) are effective. As stated in the study's introduction, user motivations can change according to different recreational activities (Kyle et al., 2005; Ewert, 1985). Motivations can be grouped under more general titles in the areas that present opportunity for different recreational uses than in the ones that present limited recreational opportunity. So, this makes the details that were entered difficult for management decisions. It will be more appropriate to classify the area according to recreational opportunities

and to manage these opportunities in it. As stated in the findings, the majority of the users are the ones that are young and in need of socialization. Consequently, they come to the site as a group. Those who were from low income groups lived in Ankara for a long time and had the habit of coming to the site. As it can be concluded from the questionnaire data, the area carrying the characteristics of an urban park serves Etimesgut more than the whole Ankara. However, that kind of an urban park should attract people from all over Ankara. So, while taking management decisions for Goksu Park, apart from the motivations, the factors that prevented people from using the area should be taken into consideration as well.

One of the reasons why the users choose this area is that they can spend cost-effective time there. Majority of the people that state this reason are the users that are above 50 and who live in the neighborhood of the area. So it can be concluded that transportation cost poses an obstacle for distant district comers. The ones that have an obstacle like this are generally retired and unemployed users. If transportation fee is lowered or free transportation is provided, then the area will gain urban park qualification with user diversity. It should not be forgotten that the older the users are, the more they expect from the area. Briefly, it is easier to satisfy the young, recreationally. However, the conducted study shows that the opportunities of the area are considered to be a motivation resource by the users that are above 50 years of age. This proves that the opportunities that Goksu Park provides are sufficient.

Many studies have been carried out to examine the effect of gender on motivations. Kinnaird (1994), Annett et al. (1995), Thapa et al. (2004), Papadakis et al. (2004), Johnson et al. (2001), Barnett and Klitzing (2006) and Todd et al. (2001) stated in their studies that gender has an effect on motivation. The users of Goksu Park are mostly male. For a recreation area, the user diversity should be more balanced in terms of gender. So, it will be appropriate to take management decisions which provide that balance in Goksu Park. It is stated in our study that entertainment and escape are the reasons why the female users come to the site. The management decisions that meet those motivational needs will increase the number of female users.

According to the questionnaire results, the area is a highly preferred place for the primary and high school students in Etimesgut. This shows that the area meets the social expectations of this age group. It should be aimed to keep this situation safe in the management of the area. As stated in the findings of this study, it should be remembered that another motivation of the area for the student is entertainment. So, the activities, such as games, competitions and concerts that provide socialization, entertainment and opportunity will meet the recreational needs of this group.

According to the findings, transportation type and the attendants of the users are important for motivation. While the users that come to the site through public

transportation as a group expect entertainment from the area, the users that come alone to the site on foot expect escape. Therefore, different management decisions devoted to these user types should be taken. For example, the majority of Goksu Park users come to the site as a crowded group. For this reason, a big part of the area should be managed according to this user type. However, it should be kept in mind that these rations can always show changes; so, management decisions should be updated according to these changes.

Chen et al. (1997) and Graefe et al. (1999) stated in their studies that frequency of the visiting site is directly related to motivation. The user experiences about the area have an effect on motivation. This shows that user expectations can be shaped by the management decisions of the park managers. For example, if cost-effective recreational activities are provided, the user will come to the site more often. When the visiting frequency increases, economic factors that are reasons for motivation will be replaced by socialization motivation, but it should not be forgotten that those kind of alterations in motivations show changes according to the user types. The feedback of management decisions should be given as a result of the questionnaire studies and field observations.

## Conclusion

In this study, the following results were obtained:

- (1) Motivations vary according to recreation area characteristics.
- (2) Providing low cost active recreation resources will improve land use motivations.
- (3) Easy and inexpensive transportation to the recreation area will increase the number of land users.
- (4) Precautions are needed that will increase the number of female users.
- (5) Precautions are needed that will increase the socialization motivation.
- (6) Precautions are needed that will increase the elderly users' satisfaction.
- (7) Along with determining the users' motivations, determining the impediments is needed.

In this study, it was found that recreational motivations were affected by users' socioeconomic features. The most important features that were found are age and sex. It was found that recreation motivations were also affected by the land use habits. In this study, it was observed that users' land use habits are more effective on recreation motivations than their socioeconomic features. However, the most effective land use habit is the attendants of users.

In conclusion, apart from planning and designing a site, it is also important to manage that site. Managers should determine recreational activities, area experiences and expectations of the users that have a potential to come to

the site. Then they should manage the planned and designed present potentials according to these expectations. Feedbacks on management decisions should be given every year and as a result of this, the needed alterations in management decisions should be made.

In the oncoming studies which will take recreational field management as the subject, how the area will be classified according to the recreational facilities it offer, and what the management criteria of these classifications will be, should be examined. Apart from the recreational motivations of the users, the obstacles should be determined for more suitable management decisions.

## REFERENCES

- Annett S, Dabrowski C, Robertson RA (1995). Motivations and constraints to spring break travel: A cross gender. Proceedings of the Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. New York, pp. 217-221.
- Barnett LA, Klitzing SW (2006). Boredom in free time: relationships with personality effect and motivation for different gender racial and ethnic student groups. *Leisure Sci.*, 28: 223-244.
- Baş T (2003). Poll. Distinguished Bookstore. Ankara (in Turkish).
- Bowes S, Dawson CD (1998). Watercraft user motivations. Perceptions of problems. and preferences for management actions: Comparisons between three levels of past experience. Proceedings of the 1998 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. New York, 149-155.
- Chen JS, Graefe AR, Kerstetter DL (1997). Trip experience and tourists' motivation. Proceedings of the Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. New York, pp. 106-107.
- Confer JJ, Vogelsong HG, Graefe AR, Solan DS (1996). Relationships between motivations and recreation activity preferences among Delaware State Park visitors: An exploratory analysis. Proceedings of the 1996 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. New York, pp. 146-153.
- Demir Z, Muderrisoğlu H, Asikkutlu HS, Bollukçu PA (2010). Determination of user satisfaction for management practices on recreational areas. *Afr. J. Agric. Res.*, 5(8): 692-699.
- Ewert A (1985). Why people climb: the relationship of participant motives and experience level to mountaineering. *J. Leisure Res.*, 17: 241-250.
- Ewert A (1993). Differences in the level of motive importance based on trip outcome. experience level and group type. *J. Leisure Res.*, 25: 335-349.
- Field DR, Cheek NH (1974). A basis for assessing differential participation in water-based recreation. *Water Resour. Bull.*, 10(6): 1218-1227.
- Goodale T Witt P (1985). Recreation and Leisure: Issues in an Era of Change. State College. PA: Venture Publishing.
- Graefe AR, Thapa B, Confer JJ, Absher JD (1999) Relationships between trip motivations and selected variables among Allegheny National Forest visitors. Wilderness Science in a Time of Change Conference. Montana, pp. 107-112.
- Johnson CY, Bowker JM, Cordell K (2001). Outdoor recreation constraints: An examination of race, gender and rural dwelling. *South. Rural Sociol.*, 12: 111-133.
- Kinnaird V, Hall D (1994). Tourism: A gender analysis. Chichester. England: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kyle G, Absher J, Hammit W (2005). An examination of the motivation-enduring involvement relationship. Proceedings of the Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. New York, pp. 238-246.
- Laundsbury JW, Hoopes L (1988). Five Year Stability of Leisure Activity and Motivation Factors. *J. Leisure Res.*, 20(2): 118-134.
- Muderrisoglu H, Asikkutlu HS, Kalayci A, Salantur B (2006). Determination of recreational motivations: an example of a fitness facility. *Duzce University, J. For.*, 2(2): 15-23 (in Turkish).
- Muderrisoglu H, Oguz D, Sensoy N (2010). An evaluation of green

- areas from the point of user satisfaction in Ankara. Turkey: Gap analyses method. *Afr. J. Agric. Res.*, 5(10): 1036-1042.
- Murphy P (1975). The Role of Attitude in The Choice Decisions of Recreation Boaters. *J. Leisure Res.*, 7(3): 216-224
- Ozdamar K (1999). With the statistical data analysis software packages. Carroll Bookstore. Eskisehir (in Turkish).
- Papadakis K, Griffin T, Frater J (2004). Understanding volunteers' motivations. Proceedings of the 2004 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. New York, pp. 321-326.
- Pearce PL (1993). Fundamentals of Tourist Motivation. In Pearce DG, Butler RW (Ed.). *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges*. New York: Routledge, pp. 113-134.
- Shoemaker S (1994). Segmenting the U.S. Travel Market According to Benefits Realized. *J. Travel Res.*, 23: 17-21.
- Thapa B, Confer JJ, Mendelson J (2004). Trip motivations among water-based recreationists. <http://www.metia.fi/julkaisut/workingpapers/2004/mwp002.htm>.
- Todd S, Graefe AR, Mann W (2001). Differences in scuba diver motivations based on level of development. Proceedings of the 2001 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. New York, pp. 107-114.
- Vogelsong H, Graefe AR, Confer JJ, Solan DS, Kramp JK (1997). Relationships between motivations and recreation activity preferences among Delaware State Park visitors: an exploratory analysis. Proceedings of the Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. New York, pp. 124-127.
- White E, Gray LP (2001). Skier motivations: do they change over time? Proceedings of the 2001 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. New York, pp. 115-117.