

Motivational factors for recreational fishing, the profile and life satisfaction level of recreational fishers and non-participants of fishing in Turkey

Faik ARDAHAN¹, Tevfik TURGUT²

¹ School of Physical Education and Sports, Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey, (e-mail: ardahan@akdeniz.edu.tr).

² Kanlı Kavak Secondary School, Kahramanmaraş, Turkey.

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the profile and the life satisfaction (LS) of male Recreational Fishers (RF) and to find out the motivational factors for participating in recreational fishing (RFG) in Turkey and compare the LS of RF and non-participants of recreational fishing (NPF). The sampling of this study consisted of 359 RF, 284 NPF, totally 643 participants. As a result of this study, it was found that the major factors motivating for fishing are "commune with nature", "relaxation", "to affect health positively", "to get away from demand", and "to be happy". It was found that the factors motivating for fishing have statistically meaningful correlations with demographic variables and LS as well as each other and there are statistically meaningful differences among groups of the demographic variables as marital status, occupation, and with whom one goes for fishing, RF and NPF. Namely, strength of the factors motivating people for fishing is dependent to the demographic variables. Furthermore, it was found statistically meaningful correlations between LS and the demographic variables.

Keywords: Recreational fishing, life satisfaction, motivational factors, fishing in Turkey.

Bireyleri rekreasyonel balıkçılığa motive eden faktörler, rekreasyonel balıkçılıkla uğraşan ve uğraşmayan bireylerin profilleri ve yaşam doyum düzeyleri: Türkiye örnek uygulaması

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı Türkiye’de Rekreasyonel Balıkçılıkla (RF) uğraşan erkek bireylerin profillerini ve yaşam doyumlarını (LS) ve bu bireyleri Rekreasyonel Balıkçılığa (RFG) yönelten motivasyonel faktörleri belirlemek ve rekreasyonel balıkçılıkla uğraşan ve uğraşmayan (NPF) bireylerin LS’lerini karşılaştırmaktır. Çalışmanın örneklemini 359 RF, 284 NPF toplam 643 katılımcıdan oluşmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın sonucuna göre, bireyleri rekreatif balıkçılığa motive eden önemli faktörler "doğayla baş başa olmak", "dinlenme", "sağlığını pozitif etkilemek", "şehirden uzaklaşmak" ve "mutlu olmak"tır. Bireyleri RF’e motive eden faktörle ile demografik değişkenler ile LS arasında istatistik olarak bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Buna ilave olarak RF ve NPF’lerin LS’leri karşılaştırıldığında, demografik değişkenlerden "medeni durum", "eğitim" ve "balık yakalamaya kimle gidildiği" arasında istatistik olarak anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmuştur. Bireyleri RF’e motive eden faktörler demografik değişkenlere bağlı olarak değişmektedir. Bu çalışmanın sonucu olarak, rekreatif balıkçılık bireylerin yaşam doyumlarını arttırmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Rekreasyonel balıkçılık, yaşam doyumunu, motivasyonel faktörler, Türkiye’de balıkçılık.

INTRODUCTION

Everyday living in modern Western societies is dominated by mundane activities performed routinely, many motivated by obligations, although needs and desires are also common motives (e.g., 78, 81). Since these activities constitute such a large part of everyday life, they are likely to have an impact on people’s overall life satisfaction (LS) and emotional

well-being (57). This was recently demonstrated by Ardahan (1) for a subset of routine out-of-home activities. If people experience positive feelings frequently and negative feelings rarely and highly satisfied from their lives, then they have a high level of subjective well-being (24). As a further indication of such an impact, research has shown that satisfaction with life domains including work or school, family life, and leisure (associated with

performance of particular mundane routine activities) is positively correlated with overall LS (61). For that reason many people do many things to increase their LS as participating in recreational and leisure activities which we believe that they are the main contributing factors for high LS.

Happiness is the one thing everyone wants from life (28) and also commonly referred to as subjective well-being has attracted a plethora of cross-disciplinary research in recent years (e.g., see reviews by 22; 51). In line with this research, we refer to happiness or subjective well-being as a higher-order construct consisting of a cognitive and two affective components (12). The cognitive component consists of a judgment of LS. Becchetti et al. (7) conclude that "happiness data offer a way to calculate the elasticity of the indirect utility function of agents with respect to the availability of any good which cannot be bought directly on the market. An important class of non traded goods is represented by non instrumental social relationships or "relational goods", as they are sometimes defined in the literature. Examples are interactions with friends, participation in the life of clubs, religious bodies, political parties, unions, civic and cultural organizations etc". It can be concluded that relational goods are positively associated with well-being and LS. Buss (11) concludes that closing the gap between modern and ancestral conditions, increase closeness of extended kin, reducing subjective distress, selecting a mate who is similar-reducing jealousy and infidelity, managing competitive mechanisms, education about evolved psychological sex differences, extended kin-reducing incest, child abuse, and spousal battering, creating and increasing social, friendship and family relation, is a powerful strategy for increasing subjective well-being.

The affective components of happiness include the positive and negative moods and emotional episodes that people experience. Several self-report methods have been devised to measure these affective components. A distinction is whether the methods are on-line such that they assess immediate affects (70) or retrospective and memory based (66). The positive and negative affect of the motivating factors (79) has frequently been used either on-line to measure current mood or retrospectively to assess the frequency and intensity of affects for a specified timeframe. On this measure happiness increases with the frequency and intensity of positive affect,

including emotions such as joy and delight, and decreases with the frequency and intensity of negative effect, including emotions such as anger and fear (57).

Possible effect of participating in recreational outdoor activities is claimed to be seen on the LS level and so on happiness. The benefits obtained by participation both in general outdoor activities and specifically in recreational fishing (RFG) activities may cause higher LS level (3) which is defined in different forms. While Ardahan (3) define LS as individual's emotional stance or general attitude towards life, Telman (73) defines LS as the judgments relating quality of life and subjective prosperity which individual reach on the facts in his/her life. From this point of view, it can be claimed that having a hobby and/or participating in outdoor activities affect LS positively. To sum up, LS is the level of satisfaction which individual gain in turn of what s/he does throughout life. It was found that the LS of people exercising outdoor activities is higher than the people who do not participate in outdoor activities (1).

The factors affecting the LS level of people are ordered by Otacioglu (58), Schmitter (64) as following; getting pleasure from daily life, finding life meaningful, harmony about reaching goals, positive individual personality, confidence on physical health, economic security and positive social relationships. On the other hand, the effect of participating in outdoor activities on LS level may differ according to demographic variables as gender, marital status, age, income, occupation, education. It is claimed that the factors motivating people to exercise outdoor activities and the level of benefit which people gain from participation differ from individual to individual (2, 36).

Recreation and leisure are important elements of human life, and both of them have multiple meanings on individual perceptions which provide a different meaning for each individual (59, 55). Leisure is an element that can be found in any activity (indoor or outdoor), and it plays a substantial role in the person's life and/or global society. Many people find their leisure more satisfying than their work; leisure can be a major source of pleasure and provide a sense of achievement. In previous literature demonstrates a positive correlation between involvement and participation specific activities, recreation behavior and leisure satisfaction (13). Beard and Ragheb (6)

stated that "Leisure plays a dynamic role in individuals' lives, and it would be useful to know how the satisfaction gained from leisure activities relates to mental and physical health, personal and social adjustment, and overall happiness". The activities in which a person participate active or passive have positive affect on leisure satisfaction which would have a positive affect on LS, if they have positive experience and if it satisfies the known and unknown expectation.

As an attractive recreational pastime RFG is a very popular activity of individuals among outdoor activities in many countries (21, 26) as well as in Turkey. RFG can be defined as fishing activity in leisure and it contrasts with commercial fishing because it is not made for profit. In addition, RFG can be described as a "relational good" which need interpersonal relation and creates interaction between nature and individual.

RFG is one of the water dependent outdoor activities (59) and may be the oldest (38) which can be done as a unique activity or can be connected with other activities as picnicking, boating, yachting which was also found by Demiroglu (19). RFG was examined by researchers broadly. While some examined the economic dimension of RFG (64, 61), some others approached the subject from ecological dimension (14, 15). Similar studies on the profile of recreational fishers (RF) and factors motivating people for RFG were also examined by some researchers (10, 83). While Burger (10) examined the consumption patterns and why people go for fishing by correlating the results with ethnic groups, Wilde et al. (83) compared the difference in attitudes, fishing motives, and demographic characteristics between tournament anglers and non-tournament anglers.

The research named "National Survey on Recreation and the Environment 2000" made by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) pointed out that 28.9% of United States (US) population aged 16 years and older participated in RFG activity which makes RFG one of the most popular activities among water-based activities (59). It was projected for 2005 and 2010 that the numbers of RF would increase as the US population increases. It was expected that more than 23.31 million people in 2005 and 24.54 million people in 2010 would participate in RFG (46). In Turkey it was reported by Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK) that 0.2% of Turkey's population

participate hunting/fishing activities in 2006 (75) which we believe that the percentage of RF is in fact higher than what TUIK presents.

Besides its recreational value, RFG also creates a very high economic value. NOAA (49) states that only saltwater RF spend approximately \$31 billion annually which represents \$82 billion in total economic impact and RFG industry employs half a million people in US. It was reported that in US 85 million of fishing trips were taken by 12.4 million anglers in 2008 of which 44% were shore based and 3.9% were for hire fishing trips (56).

Literature Review

The factors motivating people for RFG can be explained by two dimensions, macro dimension explains why people participate in outdoor activities and micro dimension explains why people participate in RFG specifically.

Crandall (16) claimed that the personality and conditions in which individual live make people participate in outdoor sports, and Ardahan (3) claimed that a behavior emerge as a result of interaction between personality and social conditions. Many researchers have examined the cause of individual acts and the emerged data has been classified as motivational factors and needs (2, 36). Scientists who worked on the motivational factors agreed on that needs are the main factors motivating people to participate in recreational activities. This was first claimed by Ibn-i Haldun, and then Maslow grouped needs. According to Maslow's "hierarchy of needs", needs were divided in two groups. These are primary and secondary needs. The primary needs are food, security, warmth, belonging and mental fitness. Secondary needs are success, being with friends, creativeness, curiosity, risk, getting rid of ego, building self. According to a study conducted in Illinois University the factors relating primary and secondary needs which motivate people to exercise outdoor recreation are "nature love", "getting away from routine and family", "escaping from responsibility", "the need of physical activity", "creativeness", "relax", "realization of self", "improve and learn new skills", "building relationships", "making friends and observing them", "expectation of meeting with a famous person", "spend time with family", "the desire to be recognized", "helping other people", "social responsibility", "motivating and inviting factors as

waterfalls, large forests, gaining social statue", "realization of self", "the desire of success", "rivalry (within and out)", "spending time and relaxation", "intellectual esthetic" (2, 36).

Besides the theories and factors given above, Manfredo et al. (52) examined the Recreation Experience Preference scales to provide a summary integrative analysis of the structure of the scales which were used in thirty-six different studies. Manfredo et al. (52) sorted the factors and grouped them in nineteen domains. These are achievement/stimulation, autonomy/leadership, risk taking, equipment, family togetherness, similar people, new people, learning, enjoy nature, introspection, creativity, nostalgia, physical fitness, physical rest, escape personal-social pressures, escape physical pressure, social security, teaching-leading others, and risk reduction. These domains were then sorted in thirty-three sub-domains which included 109 possible motivators for recreational participation.

As another key indicator socioeconomic status of people was explained by using the opportunity theory by Lindsay & Ogle (44). According to this theory leisure participation is directly affected by the cost as well as the availability of outdoor recreation resources to the public (26).

The main reasons of rising demand to outdoor recreation and outdoor activities are industrialization, urbanization (5), the desire of city inhabitants to get away from routine and crowd (63), increasing incomes and education level (45, 67, 69), broadening adventure sports coverage in media, falling costs of equipment, changing traditional way of life, changing individual, family and social perception the inclination towards outdoor activities has risen (3).

People engage in RFG for different reasons. Main reasons for RFG can be ordered as pleasure, enjoyment of nature, relaxation, doing something different from work, excitement, being with the family, challenge, and physical health or exercise (28). Burger (10) stated in her study some reasons as "relaxation", "to be outdoors", "to get away from demand", "challenge or sport", "commune with nature", "to be with friends", "to eat", "to give away", "for fries and socials", "to sell", and "recreation". Hunt & Ditton (34) pointed out some other reasons as "to be close to water", "to experience adventure and excitement", "for the

experience of the catch", "for the fun of catching fish", "to develop one's skills", and "to test one's equipment" besides same reasons of Burgers' (10) as "relaxation", "to be outdoors", "to get away from demand and regular routine", etc.

It is claimed that RFG provides numerous social benefits as providing a vehicle for family cohesion (8, 17, 35), releasing stress and mental relaxation (23, 42, 74), being away from others (24), and nature enjoyment (20). Hunt & Ditton (34) developed a scale to measure the perceived benefits from RFG under four constructs as "escaping, individual, and stressors", "being in a natural environment", "interacting with fish", and "achievement". These constructs have eleven items which are very similar to the motivational factors and benefits given above and is also basis of our study to measure strength of the reasons for RFG and benefits from RFG.

Unfortunately, studies on correlation between LS and RFG are lacking. But some studies on outdoor activities (1, 3) points out differences on LS between participants of outdoor activities and non-participants of these activities. In these studies it was concluded that LS have statistically meaningful correlations with demographic variables as gender, income, and occupation which is aimed to measure with the current study.

In spite of social and economic importance of RFG, the profile of RF, economic value of RFG and related subjects haven't still been studied sufficiently in Turkey. With current study, we hope to make up the lack of scientific studies on RFG and related subjects.

The aim of this study is to examine the profile and LS of RF and to find out the motivational factors for participating in RFG in Turkey.

MATERIAL & METHOD

This is a descriptive study which aims to examine the profile and the LS of RF and reasons for participating in RFG and comparison of LS level of RF and NPF in Turkey.

Instrumentation and Gathering Data

An electronic questionnaire form was used to gather data which involves questions prepared by researchers to define the profile of RF, NPF and a list of questions to measure the factors motivating persons for fishing which were used by different researchers in other studies (8, 10, 17, 23, 25, 26, 34,

35, 42, 48, 52, 74, 83) besides some other items which we added. Participants were asked about how often they go, with whom they go for fishing, how they started fishing as well. Additionally, survey involved LS Scale which was developed by Diener et al. (18). The reliability of factors motivating persons for fishing which is 21 items (Cronbach Alpha as 0.843) and the LS scale (Cronbach Alpha as 0.833) are in the limits of reliability.

Sampling

An electronic questionnaire form was prepared by using the website "www.docs.google.com". The link of this website was sent to the RFG enthusiasts who are members of RFG groups through social media as www.facebook.com and fishing clubs. Link was open for getting answers between the dates 01-12-2011 and 01-05-2012.

The number of RF is not known exactly in Turkey, because possessing any license for RFG is not obligated. Survey was open for all fishing enthusiasts using different techniques of fishing as angling, spearing, trapping and hand gathering. There have been 364 persons of which only five were females. Because of the lacking numbers of females for statistical analyzing, females were excluded. Finally, sampling of this study is based on 359 RF, 284 NPF, totally 643 participants.

Statistical Analyses

In the process of assessing data, the descriptive statistic means such as frequency (f), percentage (%), average (M) and standard deviation, and to examine the correlation between demographic variables and the factors for fishing Pearson Correlation test and to examine the differences between demographic variables and the factors for fishing One-Way ANOVA and Independent Samples T- Test have been used and when equal variance assumed Post-hoc Tukey test and when equal variance not assumed Tamhane's T2 test were run. Results were assessed according to significant level 0.01 and 0.05.

RESULTS

359 RF and 284 NPF answered the electronic questionnaire and general characteristics participants were shown in table 1 and Table 2. Majority of fishers ($M_{age}=35.90 \pm 9.80$) are between 25-34 years (38.4%); 66.9% of them go for fishing more than 10 years. The frequency they go for fishing is mostly 1-3 times in a month (56.0%), 50.2% of them have higher education degree, 68.8% of

them live in provinces and started fishing mostly by their own preferences. RF mostly go for fishing with their friends (65.2%), majority of them work in private sector (34.3%), have monthly income between US\$ 501 and 1500 (58.0%) and spend US\$ 99.54 per month for fishing, 69.9% of fishers possesses formal licenses for fishing which is not obligated by laws. Majority of NPF ($M_{age}=31.35 \pm 11.10$) are between 34 and below years (70.4%), 66.9% of them have higher education degree, have monthly income of 1000\$ and below (66.2%), employed in private sector (31.0%).

Correlation and mean difference results between factors for fishing and some characteristics of fishers were given in table 3. As seen in the table, people are very strongly encouraged to participate in RFG for the factors "commune with nature", "to be happy", "to get away from demand", "to be outdoors", and "to make exercise". Motivating factors which have the lowest scores are "to get rid of loneliness", "to get away from responsibilities", "to get away from family", "challenge or sport", and "to sell".

As seen in Table 3, it was found statistically meaningful correlation between education level and the factors motivating people for fishing as "relaxation", "challenge or sports", "to be with friends", "for fries and socials", "to get away from family", "to get away from responsibilities". As education level increases, the factors motivating for fishing as "relaxation", "challenge or sport", "to get away from family" and "to get away from responsibilities" increase, but, "to be with friends", "for fries and socials" decrease.

There were found statistically positive correlations between LS and the motivational factors "to be with friends", "to affect health positively", and "to develop skills" which means as LS level increases, participation for these factors increase, too. On the other hand, the motivational factors "to get rid of loneliness", "to get away from crowd and routine", "to get away from family", and "to get away from responsibilities" were statistically correlated negatively with LS. Namely, as LS level increases, participation for these factors decrease.

It was found statistically meaningful correlations between age and the factors motivating people for fishing as "to affect health positively", "to develop skills", "to be happy", "to get away from crowd and routine", and "to get away from

responsibilities". As people getting older, going for fishing "to affect health positively" increase, but, "to develop skills", "to be happy", "to get away from

crowd and routine", and "to get away from responsibilities" decrease.

	Recreational Fishers		Non-participants		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Marital Status						
Married	116	32.3	82	28.9	198	30,8
Single	243	67.7	202	71.1	445	69,2
Education Level	f	%	f	%	f	%
Elementary School	17	4.7	8	2.8	25	3,9
High School	106	29.5	32	11.3	138	21,5
University	206	57.4	224	78.9	430	66,9
Msc/Ph.D.	30	8.4	20	7.0	50	7,8
Occupation	f	%	f	%	f	%
Private Sector	123	34.3	88	31.0	211	32,8
Public Sector	78	21.7	50	17.6	128	19,9
Self-Employer	66	18.4	26	9.2	92	14,3
Professional	24	6.7	8	2.8	32	5,0
Student	30	8.4	74	26.1	104	16,2
Retired	32	8.9	26	9.2	58	9,0
Unemployed	6	1.7	12	4.2	18	2,8
Monthly Income	f	%	f	%	f	%
500 \$ and less	79	22.0	114	40.1	193	30,0
501-1000 \$	114	31.8	74	26.1	188	29,2
1001-1500 \$	94	26.2	50	17.6	144	22,4
1501\$ and more	72	20.1	46	16.2	118	18,4
Age Range (years)	f	%	f	%	f	%
24 and below	36	10.0	102	35.9	138	21,5
25-34	138	38.4	98	34.5	236	36,7
35-44	123	34.3	28	9.9	151	23,5
45-54	42	11.7	36	12.7	78	12,1
55 and over	20	5.6	20	7.0	40	6,2
M _{age}	35.9 ± 9.80		31.35 ± 11.10		33.89 ± 10.86	
Total	359	100.0	284	100.0	643	100.0

Frequency in a month	f	%	Got license	f	%
1-3 times	201	56.0	Yes	251	69.9
4-6 times	104	29.0	No	108	30.1
7-10 times	38	10.5	How long (years)	f	%
11 and more times	16	4.5	0-9	119	33.1
With whom	f	%	10-19	102	28.4
Alone	81	22.6	20-29	86	24.0
With friends	234	65.2	30 and longer	52	14.5
With family members	22	6.1	How started fishing	f	%
With a group	22	6.1	Effect of friends	60	16.7
Residence	f	%	Effect of family	66	18.4
Rural	112	31.2	Own preferences	233	64.9
Urban	247	68.8	Monthly Budget Mean = 99.54 \$ ± 157.11		
Total	359	100.0			

Table 3. Correlation and relation between demographics Variables of RF and Motivating Factors for Fishing.

Demographics Variables	LS	Age	M. Income	Monthly Budget	How long	Frequency	Education	Residence	Mar. Status	Occupation	With whom	Motivating Factors for Fishing	
												$\bar{X} \pm SD$	P
1. Relaxation	3.94±1.15	0.035	-0.047	0.008	0.138**	0.058	0.05	kw 11.243*	1.851	0.865	0.895	kw 4.660	
2. To be outdoor	4.10±1.09	0.038	-0.048	-0.041	0.155**	-0.04	0.056	kw 0.697	-0.165	2.307*	kw 4.242	kw 10.931*	
3. To get away from demand	4.19±1.02	0.028	-0.081	-0.060	0.166**	-0.142**	-0.071	kw 9.897*	-1.960*	1.075	1.734	2.012	
4. To challenge or sport	1.66±0.97	-0.004	0.043	0.131*	-0.003	-0.019	0.037	kw 9.454*	-0.780	-0.570	kw 19.754*	kw 4.769	
5. To commune with nature	4.64±0.66	0.041	-0.088	-0.028	-0.018	-0.101	-0.014	0.452	-0.280	1.085	kw 4.105	0.328	
6. To be with friends	3.60±1.03	0.127*	-0.040	-0.083	0.207**	-0.056	-0.051	kw 11.655*	-0.189	0.424	kw 8.304	21.876*	
7. To eat	3.08±1.12	0.096	-0.051	-0.029	-0.053	0.032	0.073	1.302	-0.650	0.352	kw 18.906*	1.834	
8. To give away	2.49±1.03	0.099	-0.026	-0.001	0.056	0.001	0.144**	1.122	2.610*	0.378	kw 3.417	kw 5.641	
9. For fries or socials	2.27±0.96	-0.027	-0.023	-0.127*	0.072	-0.075	0.108*	kw 6.074	4.154*	0.991	kw 15.411	kw 11.348*	
10. To sell	1.36±0.99	0.024	-0.009	-0.037	-0.104*	0.075	0.139**	0.355	2.529*	0.939	kw 11.557	kw 13.031*	
11. To affect health positively	4.00±0.99	0.119*	0.152**	0.088	0.204**	0.08	0.113*	1.352	-0.725	-1.367	2.838*	kw 0.379	
12. To use and develop skills	3.66±1.13	0.131*	-0.127*	-0.095	0.070	-0.103	0.116*	kw 6.204	1.049	1746	kw 19.098*	kw 14.106*	
13. To enter into a new society	2.60±1.10	0.080	-0.028	-0.132*	0.085	-0.069	0.063	0.089	2.350*	2.157*	kw 23.989*	5.781*	
14. To meet new people	2.76±1.10	0.073	0.050	-0.102	0.039	-0.02	0.133*	1.095	2.953*	-0.446	3.621*	8.719*	
15. To get rid of loneliness	2.13±0.95	-0.109*	0.027	-0.138**	-0.056	0.007	0.040	kw 2.696	1.898*	1853	kw 23.308*	0.808	
16. To be happy	4.20±0.92	0.021	-0.118*	0.017	0.064	0.003	-0.004	1.610	-1.004	2.613*	kw 28.710*	4.100*	
17. To get away from crowd and routine	3.92±1.07	-0.155**	-0.166**	-0.025	0.039	-0.143**	-0.108*	2.380	-2.290*	0.710	6.565	6.355	
18. To get away from family	1.87±0.96	-0.293**	-0.060	0.014	0.121*	0.034	-0.007	5.900*	0.082	2.755*	kw 26.376*	kw 7.303	
19. To get away from responsibilities	2.13±1.14	-0.127*	-0.177**	0.035	0.082	-0.126*	0.016	1.908	-0.835	2.446*	kw 23.981*	kw 1.737	
20. To make exercise	4.10±0.97	0.084	-0.025	-0.009	0.016	-0.023	0.070	2.785*	0.557	0.470	2.971*	1.051	
21. To be called as a good fisherman	2.22±1.18	0.084	0.015	-0.012	0.092	0.005	0.155**	kw 0.496	3.435*	0.779	8.526	kw 5.166	

P: Pearson Correlation Test. F: Oneway ANNOVA test. t= t-test.

* P value is significant at the 0.05, ** P value is significant at the 0.01 level, kw: Kruskal Wallis Test

It was found statistically meaningful correlation between monthly income and the factors motivating people for fishing in some factors. As monthly income increases, "challenge and sport" increases, but, "for fries and socials", "to enter into a new society", "to get rid of loneliness" decrease.

It was found statistically meaningful correlation between monthly budget and the factors motivating people for fishing in some factors. As budget increases, "relaxation", "to be outdoors", "to get away from demand", "to be with friends", "to affect health positively", "to get away from family" increase, but, "to sell" decreases.

It was found statistically meaningful negative correlation between how long one goes for fishing and the factors motivating people for fishing as "to get away from demand", "to get away from crowd and routine", and "to get away from responsibilities".

It was found statistically meaningful positive correlation between frequency of fishing in a month and the factors motivating people for fishing as "to

give away", "for fries and socials", "to sell", "to affect health positively", "to develop skills", "to meet new people", "to be called as a good fisherman", but, as frequency of fishing increases, "to get away from crowd and routine" decreases.

There are statistically meaningful differences between marital status and factors for fishing. While differences by the factors as "to be outdoors", "to enter into a new society", "to be happy" are in favor of singles; the factors as "to get way from family", "to get away from responsibilities", "to get rid of loneliness" are in favor of married people.

There are statistically meaningful differences between the occupations in relation to the factors as "challenge or sport", "to eat", "for fries and socials", "to affect health positively", "to develop skills", "to enter into a new society", "to meet new people", "to get rid of loneliness", "to be happy", "to get away from family", "to get away from responsibilities", and "to make exercise". Post-hoc Tukey test revealed statistically significant differences between students and people working in public sector in

relation to factor “challenge or sport”; between retired, professional and unemployed people in relation to factor “to eat”; between unemployed and the other occupational groups in relation to factors “for fries and socials”, “to affect health positively”, “to meet new people” and “to make exercise”; between students and people working in private sector, retired and unemployed people in relation to factor “to develop skills”; between students and people working in private sector, public sector and unemployed people in relation to factor “to enter into a new society”; between students and people working in private sector, public sector, professional and unemployed people in relation to factors “to get rid of loneliness” and “to get away from responsibilities”; between students and people working in private sector, professional and retired people in relation to factor “to be happy”; between students and people working in private sector and professional people in relation to factor “to get away from family”.

There are statistically significant differences between with whom one goes for fishing and factors for fishing as “to be outdoors”, “to be with friends”, “for fries or socials”, “to sell”, “to develop skills”, “to enter into a new society”, “to meet new people”, “to be happy”, “to get away from crowd and routine”, “to get away from family” and “to be called as a good fisherman”. Post-hoc Tukey test revealed statistically significant differences between people going for fishing alone, with friends and with organized group in relation to factors “to be

outdoors” and “for fries or socials”; between people going for fishing with organized group, alone, with friends and with family in relation to factor “to be with friends”; between people going for fishing alone, with family and with organized group in relation to factors “to sell” and “to enter into a new society”; between people going for fishing with friend, people going for fishing alone and with organized group in relation to factor “to develop skills”; between people going for fishing alone and the others in relation to factors “to meet new people” and “to get away from crowd and routine”; between people going for fishing with friends and with family in relation to factor “to be happy”; between people going for fishing alone and with friends in relation to factor “to get away from family”; between people going for fishing with friends and with organized group in relation to factor “to be called as a good fisherman”.

Correlations between LS and demographic variables were given in table 4. As seen in the Table, there is statistically meaningful difference between LS_{RF} and LS_{NPF} in favor of RF. In addition to this statement; there are statistically meaningful correlations between LS_{RF} and some demographic variables as age, education, monthly income, frequency of fishing in a month. Furthermore, statistically meaningful correlations between LS_{NPF} and some demographic variables as age, education and monthly income were found.

The Differences Between LS_{RF} and LS_{NPF}		RF $\bar{X} \pm SD$		NPF $\bar{X} \pm SD$		Total Participants $\bar{X} \pm SD$			
M _{LS}		3.38 ± 0.71		2.98 ± 0.93		3.20 ± 0.84, t = 6.209*			
Demographic Variables		LS		Monthly Income		Monthly Budget		Frequency per month	
		Age	Education	Age	Education	Age	Education	Age	Education
RF	LS	P	1	0.124*	0.026	0.195**	0.144**	0.138**	
	Age	P	0.124*	1	-0.38	0.331**	0.145**	-0.054	
	Education	P	0.026	-0.38	1	0.402**	0.052	-0.001	
	Monthly Income	P	0.195**	0.331**	0.402**	1	0.357**	0.011	
	Monthly Budget	P	0.144**	0.145**	0.052	0.357**	1	0.199**	
Frequency per month	P	0.138**	-0.054	-0.001	0.011	0.199**	1		
NPF	LS	P	1	0.028	0.193**	0.159**			
	Age	P	0.028	1	0.048	0.523**			
	Education	P	0.193**	0.048	1	0.100			
	Monthly Income	P	0.159**	0.523**	0.100	1			

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

LS_{RF} is correlated with age, monthly income, monthly budget, and frequency per month positively which means as monthly income, monthly budget, and frequency per month increase, LS level of RF increases, too. Education level is correlated with monthly income positively which means as education level increases, monthly income increase, too. An interesting finding is that budget is correlated with frequency of fishing positively which means as monthly budget increases, the frequency of fishing increases, too. But monthly income is not correlated with frequency of fishing. However there is a positive correlation between monthly income and monthly budget. LS_{NPF} is correlated with education and monthly income which means as education and monthly income increase, LS level of NPF increases, too. At the same time, there is a positive correlation between NPF_{Age} and NPF_{NPF_{Monthly income}}.

DISCUSSION

This descriptive study which aims to examine the profile and the LS of male RF and to find out the motivational factors for participating in RFG in Turkey and to compare the LS level of RF and NPF included RF and NPF.

Water based recreation participation in all over the world tends to increase continuously (72), and participation in RFG as a water dependent activity (59) is also expected to increase in the future (46). For that reason, it is important to know the profile of participants and the factors motivating for fishing.

Although female fishers were not included because of lacking participation for statistical analyses, we expect that there is also female RF. We expect that there are also female RF. It was concluded that gender affect recreational motivation and men are advantaged because of social and traditional behaviors and attitudes which lead men participate in leisure activities more actively and easily (26, 31, 45, 53, 80). Supportive statements were also claimed by other researchers, too. Wilde et al. (83) found that men's hegemony is very clear in RFG with the findings of their study. It is stated that RFG is more likely to be favorite type of activities for males (29). Pinker (60) stated that, interests and hobbies of women are broader than men in fact, while men more often focus on a few specific areas as fishing. But regarding quantity of leisure it was concluded that women were slightly more constrained than men (30, 37). Shaw & Henderson

(68) claimed that time stress and lack of time are major constraints on women's leisure. While lack of time can be an intrapersonal constraint, empirical evidence suggested that time is also a structural constraint for women. As a result of lack of women's time, women continue to shoulder the majority of household responsibilities regardless of employment outside home which results as lack of time for women. Furthermore, caring behavior may lead women to prioritize others' leisure before their own (32, 41).

Loomis & Ditton's (48) study showed that tournament anglers ($M_{age}=38.9$) were younger than salt water sport fishermen ($M_{age}=47.0$). Wilde et al. (83) found that tournament anglers were mean aged 39.9 years and non-tournament anglers were mean aged 42.9 years which are similar to Loomis & Ditton's (48) study. Burger (10) found that RF from different ethnic groups was mean aged between 40 and 47 years. According to other researcher's findings it can be stated that RF in Turkey ($M_{age}=38.9$) are some younger than the ones in other countries. Ardahan & Yerlisu Lapa (2) stated that age affects strongly the recreational preferences of an individual. According to Kelly (40) as an individual gets older, his/her active participation in recreational activities decreases. RFG, especially angling, can be accepted as one of the activities in which participant doesn't need much strength and can be undertaken by elderly people. It is stated that as age increases, interest in RFG increases (29). In current study, age was correlated with why one goes for fishing. It was found that as people getting older, they go for fishing more "to affect their health positively" which shows that people pay more attention on their health, but less "to develop skills", "to enter into a new society", "to be happy", "to get away from crowd and routine" and "to get away from responsibilities" as they are getting older. Ardahan (1) also stated that 55 years and below individuals' participation in outdoor activities are statistically positive correlated with health purpose, but as age increases, expectation for "challenge or sport" and "socialization and entertainment" decreases. But in current study, "challenge or sport" is not correlated with age. The result of this study overlaps with these conclusions.

Individual's educational levels affect income and where one life and they are correlated positively with each other. Income has positive effect on one's budget for RFG which is correlated positively with

frequency of fishing. But statistically meaningful correlation between income and frequency of fishing hasn't been found. Lee et al.'s (45), Solop et al.'s (69) and Scott & Munson's (67) statements about income on outdoor activities participation are very similar with the current study's findings. As income increases, the participation in RFG for the purposes "for fries or socials", "to enter a new society" and "to get rid of loneliness" decreases. This overlaps with the conclusion as income level increases; individuals join an outdoor activity alone or with close friends and can travel long distance and buy expensive products and trips (36, 82). On the other hand, a negative correlation between budget and the factor "to sell" was found. As budget increases, the frequency and LS level of participants and the participation in RFG for the purpose "relaxation", "to be outdoor", "to get away from demand", "to be with friends" and "to affect healthy positively" increases too, but people do not eager to sell what they catch. This results overlaps with the conclusions in income.

Different studies on outdoor recreation pointed out that there is a positive correlation between educational level, income and with whom people participating in outdoor activities and participating in outdoor activities, as individual's educational level and income increases, participating in outdoor activities increases, too. On other hand, as education level increases, individuals join an outdoor activity alone or with close friends and can travel long distance and buy expensive products and trips, people who have less income usually join outdoor activities with others (with organized groups, with family member and neighbors) for decreasing the cost of activity (2, 3, 9, 10, 36, 40, 82). Namely, well-educated people tend to participate in outdoor activities. Current study proved this situation, as it was found that educational level of RF is higher than general education level of Turkish citizens. According to the education level data in 2011 which was presented by Turkish Statistical Institute (76), 9.6% of population had higher education. There are statistically meaningful differences between education level on the factor as "relaxation", "to get away from family and responsibilities", "to challenge or sport", "to be with friends", "to get away from family" and "to make exercise". As education level increases, the participation in RFG for the purpose "relaxation" and "to make exercise" increases, too. Conversely, as education level decreases the participation in RFG for the purpose

"to get away from family and responsibilities", "to challenge or sport", "to be with friends", "to get away from family" increases, too. This results overlaps with the conclusions. As a result of these correlations it can be claimed that the more people are well educated, the more they are willing to stay alone.

There are also statistically meaningful differences between the participation in RFG for the purpose "to be outdoor", "to enter into a new society", "to meet new people", "for fries or socials" in favor of "alone" participation, "to be with friends", "to use and develop skills" in favor of "with friends" participation, "to sell" in favor of "with friends and with family members" participation and with whom participating in RFG. This results of current study overlaps with the conclusion of Burger (10) and Ibrahim & Cordes (36).

As people are well-educated, they mostly live in urban areas, and they work under time pressure and with time stress. According to the findings discussed above, they might be willing to get away from crowd, routine and responsibilities. As industrialization and urbanization increases, demand to outdoor recreation of people increases, too (5). Sagcan (63) states that desire to get away from routine of life and to cope with depression are very important factors affecting participation in leisure activities for the people who live in urban areas. Findings of the current study are similar to Aslan (5) and Sagcan (63) statements.

The relation between occupation and participation in outdoor recreation has been examined in detail. Students, retired, unemployed and public sector employer can find enough time and arrange weekend to participate some outdoor activity. Self-employed, in private sector employed and professional usually have great pressure and responsibility of work life (36, 45, 69). This conclusion overlaps with the result of current study. There are statistically meaningful differences between the participation in RFG for the purpose "to get away from crowd and routine", "to get away from responsibilities", "to get away from family", "to be happy", "to use and develop skills" in favor of private sector employed, "to challenge or sport" in favor of professionals, "to eat" in favor of retired, "to effect healthy positively", "to enter a new society", "to meet new people", "to get rid of

loneliness" in favor of unemployed and with whom participating in RFG.

It is expected that people who participate in outdoor activities, in particular RF have higher LS level than others who don't participate because of the benefits they gain with their participation. This expectation is realized; LS_{RF} is higher than LS_{NPF} and this difference is statistically meaningful in favor of RF. In other word, RF has a positive affect on LS. Ardahan (4) found that LS level of outdoor activity participants as mountaineers, cyclists and trekkers were medium. In other study of Ardahan (1), it was found that participants of outdoor activities ($M=3.27$) and non-participants of outdoor activities ($M=3.08$), and the difference between LS level of participants and non-participants was statistically meaningful in favor of participants. But, participation in outdoor activities, in particular RFG is not the only determinant for high LS level, but it can be claimed that it has a strong effect on LS. Otacioglu (58) and Schmitter (64) stated that LS is affected by many other factors as age, income, occupation. This statement was proven according to the findings of the current study as it was found that LS was correlated with age, monthly income, monthly budget, and frequency of participation per month of RF positively which means RF has higher LS as far as they are getting older, earning more, having more budget for RFG, and can go for fishing oftener. In addition to this conclusion, Fordyce (27, 28) concluded that to have a change to participate in a new and/or usual leisure activity, to have positive and optimistic think, to participate in social activities and to have extraversion personality have positive affect on subjective well-being and LS. This conclusion supports the results.

There is statistically meaningful and positive correlation between frequency of fishing and the motivating factors for fishing as "to give away", "for fries and socials", "to sell", "to effect healthy positively", "to meet new people", "to be called as a good fisherman" except "to get away from crowd and routine". As urbanizing increases, going for fishing "to get away from demand" and "to get away from crowd and routine" increase, but, "to give away", "for fries and socials", "to meet new people" and "to be called as a good fisherman" decrease. The results of factors as "to give away" and "for fries and socials" overlap with the results of Burger's (10). Results of current study differ from Toth & Brown's (74) study as it was found people

tend to share fish they catch or go for fishing for these purposes. This situation may be a result of stronger social relations of people who live in smaller areas as villages. So they are willing to share the fish they catch with their friends and neighbors.

Social and family reasons are quite important to participate in leisure activities and especially in RFG pursuits as well as exercise-oriented activities, team sports, golf, and camping (11, 29). People participating in mountaineering and rock climbing (3) and in cycling and/or trekking activities (2) also prefer participating in these activities with their friends mostly and family members. The result of current study overlaps these conclusions. Even it can be thought that having meaningful and satisfying marriage can motivate people to participate in outdoor and indoor recreative activities and help building relations (33, 43). The results which were reached in this study are supporting this conclusion. As single persons are willing "to enter into a new society" and "to be happy", married persons prefer "to get away from family, responsibilities" and "to get rid of loneliness". According to these findings it can be claimed that RFG is a runaway opportunity for married persons. Another finding which supports this situation is that despite 32.3% of participants are married; the portion of participants who participate in RFG with their families is only 6.1%. Majority of participants both single and married prefer to participate in RFG with friends. These findings overlap with Ardahan's (1, 3) studies.

We expect that factors motivating people to participate in RFG and participating in outdoor activities are very similar, because RFG is an outdoor activity. The findings of the current study overlap with the conclusions of many researchers in relation to the motivational factors for outdoor activities (2, 3, 36, 47, 54).

On the other hand, the factors "to sell", "challenge or sport", "to get away from family" reached the least mean scores which means disagree. But according to Burger's (10) findings the factor "challenge or sport" was scored 3.79 (agree), in Wilde et al.'s (83) study it was scored 4.2 (agree) and in Loomis & Ditttons' (48) 3.12 (agree). It is possible to state that Turkish RF do not prefer going for fishing for the factor "challenge or sport", when compared to other studies.

In conclusion, according to findings of current study, there is a statistically meaningful difference between LS_{RF} and LS_{NPF} in favor of RF. It can be concluded that RF has positive affect on LF. RF in Turkey can be described as an outdoor activity who is 25 and 44 years aged single, well-educated males who mostly go for fishing with friends, 1-3 times a month.

As a result of this study, it was found that factors motivating for RFG have correlations with demographic variables as age, monthly income, monthly budget, how long, frequency and there are meaningful differences among groups of the variables as marital status, residence, occupation, and with whom one goes for fishing. Namely, strength of the factors motivating people for RFG is dependent to the demographic variables. Especially, one's occupation and with whom one goes for fishing affect the purpose of fishing. Furthermore, statistically meaningful correlations between LS and the motivational factors and the other demographic variables point out that LS of RF is affected by these variables. Briefly, it can be concluded that, the motivational factors and demographic variables are determinants of LS level of RF.

REFERENCES

- Ardahan F. *Rekreasyonel Egzersiz Gdleme lcegi'nin (REMM) Cesitli Demografik Degiskenlere Gre Incelenmesi: Antalya Ornegi. I. Rekreasyon Arastirmalari Konresi 12-15 Nisan 2012, Proceedings Book, 57-72, Kemer, Antalya, 2012.*
- Ardahan F, Yerlisu Lapa T. Outdoor recreation: the reasons and carried benefits for attending outdoor sports of the participants of cycling and/or trekking activities. *Int. J. Human Sciences*, 2010; 8(1), 1327-1341.
- Ardahan F. The Profile of the Turkish Mountaineers and Rock Climbers: The Reasons and the Carried Benefits for Attending Outdoor Sports and Life Satisfaction Level. 8th International Conference Sport and Quality of Life. 10-11 November 2011, Congress Center Brno/Czech Republic, 2011.
- Ardahan F. *Duygusal Zeka ve Yasam Doyumu Arasindaki Iliskinin Doga Sporu Yapanlar Orneginde Incelenmesi, International Congress on Sports, Economics and Management, Izmir, Turkey, 2011.*
- Aslan Z. Sanayilesme ve kentlesmenin dogada rekreasyon faaliyetlerine duyulan gereksinimi arttirici etkisi. *Ekoloji ve Cevre Dergisi*, 1993; (8), 22-24.
- Beard J G, Ragheb MG. Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1980; 12(1): 20-33.
- Becchetti L, Rica EG, Pelloni A. The Relationship between Social Leisure and Life Satisfaction: Causality and Policy Implications, *Soc Indic Res.* 2011; DOI 10.1007/s11205-011-9887-5.
- Buchanan T. Commitment and leisure behavior: A theoretical perspective. *Leisure Sciences*, 1985; 7: 401-420.
- Bultena G, Field D. Structural effects in national park going. *Leisure Sciences*, 1980; 3(3), 221-240.
- Burger, J. 2002. Consumption patterns and why people fish. *Environmental Research Section A.* 2002; 90, 125-135.
- Buss DM. The evolution of happiness. *Am Psychol.* 2000; 55:15-23.
- Busseri MA, Sadava SW. A review of the tripartite structure of subjective well-being: Implications for conceptualization, operationalization, analysis, and synthesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2011; 15, 290-314.
- Chen YC, Li RH, Chen SH. Relationships Among Adolescents' Leisure Motivation, Leisure Involvement, and Leisure Satisfaction: A Structural Equation Model, *Soc Indic Res*, 2011: DOI 10.1007/s11205-011-9979-2
- Coleman FC, Figueira WF, Ueland JS, Crowder LB. The Impact of United States Recreational Fisheries on Marine Fish Populations. *Science*, 2004; 305, 1958.
- Cooke SJ, Cowx IG. The Role of Recreational Fishing in Global Fish Crises. *BioScience*, 2004; 54(9), 857-859.
- Crandall R. Motivation for leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1980; 12(1): 45-54.
- Dann S. Youth recruitment into fishing: The influence of familial, social, and environmental factors ad implications for education intervention strategies to develop aquatic stewardship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1993.
- Diener E, Emmons RA, Larsen RJ, Griffin S. The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 1985; 49, 71-75.
- Demiroglu C. A Questionnaire Study on Yachting in Gcek Bays, Middle East Technical University, The Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences Master Thesis, Ankara, 2003.
- Ditton RB, Holland SM, Anderson DK. Recreational Fishing as Tourism. *Fisheries*, 2002; 27(3): 17-24.
- Ditton R. Human dimensions of fisheries. In M. Manfredo, J. Vaske, B. Bruyere, D. Field, P. Brown (Eds.), *Society and natural resources: A summary of knowledge* (pp. 199-208). Jefferson City, MO: Modern Litho, 2004.

22. Dolan P, Peasgood T, White M. Do we really know what makes us happy: A review of the economic literature on the factors associated with subjective well-being? *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 2008; 29: 94–122.
23. Driver BL, Brown P, Peterson G. *Benefits of leisure*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc., 1991.
24. Eryılmaz A. The relationship between adolescents' subjective well-being and positive expectations towards future, *The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences*, 2011; 24:209-215.
25. Fedler A, Ditton R. Understanding angler motivations in fisheries management. *Fisheries*, 1994; 19: 6–13.
26. Floyd MF, Nicholas L, Lee I, Lee JH, Scott D. Social Stratification in Recreational Fishing Participation: Research and Policy Implications, *Leisure Sciences*, 2006; 28(4): 351-368.
27. Fordyce MW. Development of a program to increase happiness. *J Couns Psychol*, 1977; 24:11–521.
28. Fordyce MW. A Program to Increase Happiness: Further Studies, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1983; 30(4): 483-498.
29. Government of Alberta Tourism, Parks and Recreation, 1994. A Look at Leisure. No: 34. http://www.tpr.alberta.ca/recreation/ars/survey/pdf/LL_34_favourite_activities.pdf. Accessed on 24 April 2012.
30. Harrington M, Dawson D. Who has it best? Women's labor force participation, perceptions of leisure and constraints to leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1995; 27; 4–25.
31. Henderson K, Bialeschki D. A sense of entitlement to leisure as constraint and empowerment for women. *Leisure Sciences*, 1991; 12, 51-65.
32. Herridge KL, Shaw SM, Mannell RC. An exploration of women's leisure within hetero sexual romantic relationships. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 2003; 35, 274–291.
33. Hicks MW, Platt M. Marital happiness and stability: A review of the research in the sixties. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1970; 32, 553-574.
34. Hunt K, Ditton RB. Perceived Benefits of Recreational Fishing to Hispanic-American and Anglo Anglers. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 2001; 6(3), 153-172.
35. Hunt K, Ditton RB. Freshwater fishing participation patterns of racial and ethnic groups in Texas. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 2002; 22: 52–65.
36. Ibrahim H, Cordes KA. *Outdoor Recreation, Enrichment for a Lifetime (2nd Edition)*, Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing, 2002.
37. Jackson EL, Henderson KA. Gender-based analysis of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 1995; 17: 31–51.
38. Jennings G. *Water-Based Tourism, Sport Leisure, and Recreation Experiences*, Elsevier, New York, 2007.
39. Kelly JR, Steinkamp MW, Kelly JR. Later-life satisfaction: Does leisure contribute? *Leisure Sciences*, 1987; 9(3): 189-199.
40. Kelly J. Leisure style: A hidden core. *Leisure Sciences*, 1983; 5(4): 321-337.
41. Kindal A, Shores DS, Myron FF. Constraints to Outdoor Recreation: A Multiple Hierarchy Stratification Perspective, *Leisure Sciences*, 2007; 29: 227–246.
42. Knopf R, Driver B, Bassett JR. Motivations for fishing. *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*, 1973; 38: 191–204.
43. Laws JL. A feminist review of marital adjustment literature: The rape of Locke. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1971; 33: 483-516.
44. Lindsay JJ, Ogle RA. Socioeconomic patterns of outdoor recreation use near urban areas. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1972; 4(2), 19–24.
45. Lee J, Scott D, Floyd MF. Structural inequalities in outdoor recreation participation: A multiple hierarchy stratification perspective. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 2001; 33(4): 427-449.
46. Leeworthy VR, Bowker JM, Hospital JD, Stone EA. *Projected Participation in Marine Recreation: 2005 & 2010*. U.S. Department of Commerce National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. http://coastalsocioeconomics.noaa.gov/core/nsre/nsrefo_recast.pdf. Accessed on 25 March 2012.
47. Levi J. Sign of the times: an outdoor education Project with profoundly deaf and hearing children. *The Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 1994; 11(2): 23-25.
48. Loomis DK, Ditton RB. Analysis of Motive and Participation Differences between Saltwater Sport and Tournament Fishermen. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 1987; 7(4): 482-487.
49. Lubchenko J. *Saltwater Recreational Fishing*. NOAA Fact Sheet, 2010. http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/PartnershipsCommunications/rec_fishing_facts.pdf. Accessed 22 February 2011.
50. Lucas R. Wilderness use and users: Trends and projections. In J.C. Hendee, G. H. Stankley and R.C. Lucas (Eds.), *Wilderness management* (pp. 356-390), Colorado: North American Press, 1990.

51. Lyubomirsky S, Sheldon KM, Schkade D. Pursuing happiness: The architecture of sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology*, 2005; 9: 111–131.
52. Manfredi M, Driver BL, Tarrant MA. Measuring leisure motivation: a meta-analysis of the recreation experience preference scales. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1996; 28(3): 188-213.
53. Manning RE. *Studies in Outdoor Recreation: Search and Research for Satisfaction*. (2nd Edition). Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press, 1999.
54. McKenzie MD. How are adventure education program outcomes achieved? A review of the literature. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 2000; 5(1): 19-28.
55. McLean DD, Hurd AR, Rogers NB. *Kraus' Recreation and Leisure in Modern Society*. Jones and Barlett Publishers, Sudbury, 2008.
56. National Marine Fisheries Service. *Fisheries Economics of the United States*, 2008. U.S. Dept. Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-109. <http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/publication/econ/2008/FEUS%202008%20ALL.pdf>. Accessed on 25.03.2012.
57. Olsson LE, Garling T, Ettema D, Friman M, Fujii S. Happiness and Satisfaction with Work Commute, 2012; doi: 10.1007/s11205-012-0003-2.
58. Otacioglu GS. Analysis of job and life satisfaction of music teachers. *Turkish Journal Music Education*, The Refereed Scholarly journal of the Muzik Egitim Yayinlari, 2008; 1(1): 37-45.
59. Pigram JJ, Jenkins JM. *Outdoor Recreation Management*. Routledge, Oxon, 2006.
60. Pinker S. *The sexual paradox: Men, women and the real gender gap*. New York: Scribner, 2008.
61. Pinguat M, Silbereisen RK. Patterns of fulfillment in the domains of work, intimate relationship, and leisure. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 2010; 5: 145–164.
62. Prayaga P, Rolfe J, Stoeckl N. The value of recreational fishing in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia: A pooled revealed preference and contingent behavior model. *Marine Policy*, 2010; 34: 244-251.
63. Sagcan M. *Recreation and Tourism (Rekreasyon ve Turizm)*. İzmir: Cumhuriyet Press (Basimevi), 1986.
64. Schmitter C, Zisselman M, Woldow A. Life satisfaction in centenarians residing in long-term care. *Annals of Long Term Care*, 2003; 7(2): 437-442.
65. Schrestha RK, Seidl AF, Moraes AS. Value of recreational fishing in the Brazilian Pantanal: a travel cost analysis using count data models. *Ecological Economics*, 20002; 42: 289-299.
66. Schwarz N, Kahneman D, Xu J. Global and episodic reports of hedonic experience. In R. Belli, F. Stafford, & D. Alwin (Eds.), *Calendar and diary methods in life course research* (pp. 157–174). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2009.
67. Scott D, Munson W. Perceived constraints to park usage among individuals with low incomes. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 1994; 12(4): 79-96.
68. Shaw SM, Henderson KA. Gender analysis and leisure constraints: An uneasy alliance. In E.L. Jackson (Ed.). *Constraints to leisure* (pp.23 34). State College, PA: Venture Publishing, 2005.
69. Solop FI, Hagen KK, Ostergen D. Back to nature: Visiting or not visiting our national parks. *Public Perspective*, 2001; 12 (4): 41-43.
70. Stone AA, Shiffman SS, DeVries MW. Ecological momentary assessment. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 26–39). New York: Russell-Sage, 1999.
71. Sung-Mook H, Giannakopoulos E. The Relationship of satisfaction with life to personality characteristics. *Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary & Applied*; 1994; 128(5): 547.
72. Tanrivermis E. A Research about the planning of water recreation-sports activities in Ankara circumstances (Not published doctoral thesis in Ankara University in Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences) [Original in Turkish: Ankara Kosullarında suya dayali rekreasyon-spor faaliyetlerinin planlanmasi uzerine bir arastirma]. Ankara, 2000.
73. Telman N, Unsal P. *Calisan Memnuniyeti*. Epsilon Yayınevi, 2004.
74. Toth JF Jr, Brown RB. Racial and gender meanings of why people participate in recreational fishing. *Leisure Sciences*, 1997; 19: 129–136.
75. TUIK. *Time Usage Statistics 2006* (Original in Turkish: Zaman Kullanım İstatistikleri 2006). Ankara: TUIK Publishing, 2008.
76. TUIK. (2012). *Bitirilen eğitim düzeyi, cinsiyet ve yaş grubuna göre nüfus – 2011*.
77. TUIK. http://rapor.tuik.gov.tr/reports/rwservlet?adnksdb2&ENVID=adnksdb2Env&report=wa_turkiye_cinsiyet_yasgrp_egitim_top.RDF&p_xkod=egitim_kod&p_yil=2011&p_dil=1&desformat=html. Accessed on 03.04.2012.
78. Vilhelmsen B. Daily mobility and the use of time for different activities: The case of Sweden. *Geo Journal*, 1999; 48: 177–185.
79. Watson D, Clark LA, Tellegen A. Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative

- affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1988; 54: 1063–1070.
80. Wearing B. *Leisure and Feminist Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1999.
81. White MP, Dolan P. Accounting for the richness of daily activities. *Psychological Science*, 2009; 20: 1000–1008.
82. White TH. Relative importance of education and income as predictors in outdoor recreation participation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1975; 7(3): 191-199.
83. Wilde GR, Riechers RK, Ditton RB. Differences in Attitudes, Fishing Motives, and Demographic Characteristics between Tournament and Non-tournament Black Bass Anglers in Texas, North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 1988; 18(2): 422-431.