International Education Studies; Vol. 13, No. 11; 2020
ISSN 1913-9020 E-ISSN 1913-9039
Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education

The Role of Leisure Management in Study-Leisure Conflict in Secondary Education

Tebessüm Ayyıldız Durhan[1]

[1] Faculty of Sports Science, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey

Correspondence: Tebessüm Ayyıldız Durhan, Faculty of Sports Science, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey. E-mail: tebessum@gazi.edu.tr

Received: June 4, 2020 Accepted: July 22, 2020 Online Published: October 25, 2020

doi:10.5539/ies.v13n11p74 URL: https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v13n11p74

Abstract

In the study where the relationship between study-leisure conflict and leisure management and the effect of leisure management on this conflict was investigated, it was also determined how certain variables changed the level of SLCS and LM. The study included 236 students studying in total 4 secondary and high schools in Ankara, and the data were obtained through personal information form as well as study-conflict and leisure management scales. Study and leisure conflict scale; "Study-Leisure Conflict Scale" is a measurement tool developed by Işık and Demirel (2018), inspired by the scale of "Measurement of Work-Leisure" (Tsaur et al., 2012), consisting of 20 questions and 5 sub-dimensions. "Leisure Management" scale is a measurement tool developed by Wang et al. (2011), consisting of 15 questions and 4 sub-dimensions and adapted to Turkish by Akgül and Karaküçük (2015). Parametric tests were applied since it was determined that the data showed normal distribution. In the analysis of the data, descriptive statistics, independent sample T test, one-way analysis of variance ANOVA test and Tukey (HSD-LSD) test were used for intra-group comparisons, and Pearson Correlation test and Regression analysis were used to determine the relationship and effect. The findings of the research show that the participants displayed a level of conflict below average; on the other hand, they showed a level of leisure management slightly above the average. Partial weak relations were determined between the study-leisure conflict scale and the leisure-time management scale, while at the same time; it decreased the level of leisure-study conflict of leisure time, although it was not significant. It is among other findings that certain variables change the measurement tools. As a result of the research, it is thought that the partial weak relations between study-leisure conflict and leisure management will return to the expected negative momentum by the students having effective knowledge and skills about leisure management. Accordingly, it is revealed by the findings of the study that more information on leisure time, management and conflict resolution should be transferred in education programs.

Keywords: study, leisure, conflict, management

1. Introduction

The balance in life; It is directly proportional to the fact that time slots are managed well and that they can easily fulfill their duties and responsibilities. Otherwise, the conflict elements to be experienced are considered as an inevitable result. The concept of conflict; It is a problem that occurs as a result of overloading when the high expectation occurs internally or externally in the individual in every area of life (Guest, 2001). Conflict again; lessons and leisure mismatch as work or work to be done for students; it is an imbalance that occurs when pressure occurs and there is a mismatch in roles for tasks (Sheng-Hshiung, Ying-Wen, & Huei, 2012). Individuals must be in great balance in fulfilling the roles they have or have to undertake in various parts of their lives. Disruption of this balance brings problems such as conflict (Özdevecioğlu & Çakmak Doruk, 2009).

According to the boundary theory, the comfort or difficulty of people is influenced by the movement and permeability of each space, between the two different living spaces. According to the boundary theory that emphasizes responsibilities and ensuring the balance of life; Individuals, regardless of their status, must correctly balance the balance between work and life. Border theory; It is also defined as the harmony between responsibility between work (lesson/study) and life (Özen Kapız, 2002). Good management and planning of time is of great importance in daily life (Kurtipek et al., 2016). In order to ensure that the balance in life is not disturbed and easily achieved, certain regulations are also included within the framework of education and training. According to this; The Ministry of National Education, which published in 12.01.2017, stated that it is among the primary goals of

educating our students as individuals who are only equipped with academic knowledge and who possess spiritual values and who have advanced social, cultural, artistic and sportive aspects in order to deliver a qualified education to every individual of our society at the highest level. With the circular numbered -200-E.486758, it emphasizes the need to encourage students to participate in artistic, cultural, sports and scientific activities that will contribute to self-knowledge, development and socialization. At this point, we once again encounter the importance of managing free time and minimizing the potential conflicts that can occur with an effective management approach.

Leisure management is an important tool in ensuring the balance of work (lesson/study), which is interpreted as having enough time to meet the responsibilities of the individual both in his spare time and study. Leisure management; is a type of time management that occurs with the effective implementation of time management. Individuals who realize the study time and the time allocated for leisure time will be able to get a distance in providing the balance in question more easily. Therefore, the study aims at determining the effect and relationship of leisure management on the element of study and leisure conflict, as well as the relationship and differences between the two concepts and certain variables, and suggestions in order to prevent study and leisure conflict.

2. Method

The research was done by quantitative method. The research findings made with the survey model tried to determine the relationship and influence of the students' leisure management levels with the study-leisure conflict, and at the same time, analyzes were carried out to determine how different variables and measurement tools differ.

2.1 Participants

The study included 236 middle school and high school students who were included in the study through volunteer participation from Bahçelievler Anatolian High School, Mustafa Azmi Doğan Anatolian High School, TVF Sports High School and Tevfik İleri Imam Hatip Secondary School in Ankara. Descriptive statistics for the participants are given below.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics about the participants

N=(236)			
	Variable	f	%
Gender	Female	157	66.5
	Male	79	33.5
Class	5	70	29.7
	6	40	16.9
	9	28	11.9
	10	45	19.1
	11	35	14.8
	12	18	7.6
Daily leisure time	Less than 1 hour	38	16.1
	Between 1-2 hour	87	36.9
	3-4 hour	72	30.5
	5-6 hour and more	39	16.5
Daily study time	Less than 1 hour	60	25.4
	Between 1-2 hour	131	55.5
	Between 3-4 hour	45	19.1
Planning leisure	Yes	143	60.6
	No	93	39.4
Attending the course	Yes	97	41.1
	No	139	58.9
Favorite lesson	Numerical	132	55.9
	Verbal	50	21.2
	Sportive	54	22.9
Active/passive leisure	Passive	155	65.7
	Active	81	34.3

The majority of secondary school students included in the study is female (66.5%), 5th grade students (29.7%),

who have 1 to 2 hours of daily leisure (36.9%) and have homework between 1 and 2 hours a day (55.5%). Also planned their leisure (60.6%), did not attend a course in their leisure time (58.9%), their favorite course is numerically mostly (55.9%) and passively evaluates their leisure time (65.7%) was determined to consist of participants.

The data in the study were obtained with the study-conflict and leisure-time management scales as well as the personal information form. "Study-Leisure Conflict Scale" was developed by Işık and Demirel (2018) inspired by the scale of "Measurement of Work-Leisure" (Tsaur et al., 2012) is used which is a 5-point Likert type scale, consisting of 20 questions and 5 sub-dimensions. Measurement tool consisting of the sub-dimensions of the study-leisure conflict; study interfering with leisure (time), study interfering with leisure (strain), study interfering with leisure (intensity), leisure interfering with study (strain), leisure interfering with study (intensity) aim to measure stud-leisure conflict directly. On the other hand, the "Leisure Time Management" scale is a 5-point likert type scale which is developed by Wang et al. (2011), consisting of 4 sub-dimensions under the name of goal setting and method, evaluating, leisure attitude and scheduling, adapted to Turkish by Akgül and Karaküçük (2015) is also used while obtaining the data.

When the normality distribution was examined, parametric tests were used since it was determined that the data were normally distributed. Descriptive statistics, independent sample T test, one-way analysis of variance ANOVA test and Tukey (HSD-LSD) test and Pearson Correlation test were used for data analysis. Internal reliability coefficient for the study and leisure conflict scale was .94 and .80 for the leisure management scale is found.

3. Results

Table 2. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values for measurement tools

N=236				
	Min.	Max.	$\bar{x}$	sd
Study-leisure conflict	20.00	100.00	54.81	18.95
Study interfering with leisure (time)	3.00	15.00	8.62	3.90
Study interfering with leisure (strain)	6.00	30.00	17.77	6.41
Study interfering with leisure (intensity)	4.00	20.00	11.45	4.88
Leisure interfering with study (strain)	2.00	10.00	4.95	2.49
Leisure interfering with study (intensity)	5.00	25.00	12.00	5.04
Leisure management	15.00	75.00	50.65	10.22
Goal setting and technique	6.00	30.00	18.63	6.41
Evaluating	3.00	15.00	10.66	2.90
Leisure attitude	3.00	15.00	8.63	3.74
Scheduling	3.00	15.00	9.71	3.05

Table 2 shows the minimum and maximum scores received from the study/leisure conflict and leisure management scales, as well as the average values and standard deviation scores of these values. Accordingly, participants' study and leisure conflict scores are below average, and leisure management scores are slightly above average values. In the study and leisure conflict scale, the highest average was still below the average, but the conflict of the course with leisure time (tension) was obtained (17.77 ± 6.41), and the lowest mean was taken as the conflict of leisure time (intensity). In the leisure management scale, the lowest sub-dimension score was the leisure attitude sub-dimension that was below the average values (8.63 ± 3.74), while the highest mean was the scheduling sub-dimension (9.71 ± 3.05) which was just above the average. Therefore, it is revealed by the finding that the participants did not have a high level of conflict in terms of studying and leisure conflict but did not turn leisure management into a leisure attitude.

Table 3. Comparison of measurement tools and sub-dimensions by gender

	Gender	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	t	p
Study-leisure conflict	Female	157	52.74	19.29	-2.392	0.018*
	Male	79	58.93	17.67		
Study interfering with leisure (time)	Female	157	8.18	3.93	-2.454	0.015*
	Male	79	9.49	3.72		
Study interfering with leisure (strain)	Female	157	17.39	6.56	-1.301	0.194
	Male	79	18.54	6.06		
Study interfering with leisure (intensity)	Female	157	10.74	5.03	-3.220	0.001*
	Male	79	12.87	4.25		
Leisure interfering with study (strain)	Female	157	4.75	2.43	-1.738	0.084
	Male	79	5.35	2.59		
Leisure interfering with study (intensity)	Female	157	11.66	5.14	-1.452	0.148
	Male	79	12.67	4.79		
Leisure management	Female	157	51.07	10.04	-0.564	0.573
	Male	79	49.81	10.58		
Goal setting and technique	Female	157	19.00	6.04	1.232	0.219
	Male	79	17.91	7.07		
Evaluating	Female	157	10.64	2.80	-0.116	0.908
	Male	79	10.69	3.13		
Leisure attitude	Female	157	8.14	3.85	-2.883	0.004*
	Male	79	9.60	3.34		
Scheduling	Female	157	9.96	2.97	1.747	0.082
	Male	79	8.77	3.17		

*$p<0.05$.

In the table, there are independent sample t test findings between gender variable and measurement tools. Study and leisure conflict total scores ($t = -2.392$; $p<0.05$), course conflict with time, temporal ($t = -2.454$; $p < 0.05$) and intensity ($t = -3.220$; $p<0.05$), a statistically significant relationship was determined between its sub-dimensions and gender. According to this; all significant differences are in favor of male students. Therefore, considering the conflict of the study and leisure, it is revealed that the group experiencing the time and intensity conflict is mostly male students. In leisure time management, it was determined that male students showed a higher leisure attitude value than female students in the meaningful relationship determined in the leisure attitude sub-dimension ($t = 2.883$; $p<0.05$).

Table 4. Comparison of measurement tools and sub-dimensions by class

	Class	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	F	p
Study-leisure conflict	5	70	42.67[f]	15.53	13.650	0.000*
	6	40	51.80[e]	19.25		
	9	28	56.89[d]	17.36		
	10	45	64.04[b]	13.78		
	11	35	64.45[a]	18.30		
	12	18	63.72[c]	18.97		
	Total	236	54.81	18.95		
Study interfering with leisure (time)	5	70	6.27[f]	3.21	12.774	0.000*
	6	40	8.00[e]	3.51		
	9	28	8.82d	3.27		
	10	45	10.13[c]	3.47		
	11	35	10.37[b]	3.96		
	12	18	11.66[a]	3.91		
	Total	236	8.62	3.90		
Study interfering with leisure (strain)	5	70	14.24[f]	5.34	11.242	0.000*
	6	40	16.85[e]	6.56		
	9	28	17.03[d]	5.43		
	10	45	20.53[c]	5.65		
	11	35	21.48[a]	5.88		
	12	18	20.66[b]	6.54		
	Total	236	17.77	6.41		
Study interfering with leisure (intensity)	5	70	8.47[f]	3.79	12.076	0.000*
	6	40	10.67[e]	4.74		
	9	28	12.60[d]	4.39		
	10	45	14.02[b]	4.64		
	11	35	12.74[c]	4.56		
	12	18	14.11[a]	4.80		
	Total	236	11.45	4.88		
Leisure interfering with study (strain)	5	70	4.02b	2.21	3.667	0.003*
	6	40	4.85	2.53		
	9	28	5.39	2.31		
	10	45	5.24	1.90		
	11	35	5.91[a]	3.03		
	12	18	5.55	2.99		
	Total	236	4.95	2.49		
Leisure interfering with study (intensity)	5	70	9.65[d]	4.21	6.710	0.000*
	6	40	11.42	5.73		
	9	28	13.03[c]	5.01		
	10	45	14.11[a]	3.91		
	11	35	13.94[b]	5.21		
	12	18	11.72	5.05		
	Total	236	12.00	5.04		
Leisure management	5	70	52.27	11.14	0.619	0.686
	6	40	50.45	9.67		
	9	28	50.67	9.52		
	10	45	49.02	7.79		
	11	35	50.14	11.37		
	12	18	49.83	12.11		
	Total	236	50.65	10.22		
Goal setting and technique	5	70	19.41	6.72	0.369	0.869
	6	40	18.45	7.12		
	9	28	18.46	7.07		

	10	45	18.08	4.48		
	11	35	18.65	6.59		
	12	18	17.61	6.73		
	Total	236	18.63	6.41		
Evaluating	5	70	11.40[a]	2.78	2.316	0.045*
	6	40	10.70	2.91		
	9	28	10.82	2.43		
	10	45	10.35	2.68		
	11	35	10.25	3.19		
	12	18	9.05[b]	3.45		
	Total	236	10.66	2.90		
Leisure attitude	5	70	6.45[f]	2.99	0.936	0.000*
	6	40	8.22[e]	3.73		
	9	28	9.42[d]	3.33		
	10	45	10.60[a]	3.62		
	11	35	9.37[c]	3.54		
	12	18	10.38[b]	3.66		
	Total	236	8.63	3.74		
Scheduling	5	70	10.14	3.11	1.292	0.268
	6	40	9.67	3.29		
	9	28	8.78	2.88		
	10	45	9.33	2.60		
	11	35	9.65	3.19		
	12	18	10.66	3.19		
	Total	236	9.71	3.05		

*p<0.05; a>b>c>d>e>f.

According to the findings of the Anova test between the class and measurement tools of the participants, a statistically significant relationship was found in the total scores and all sub-dimensions of the study and leisure conflict scale, as well as in the leisure management assessment and leisure management scales's sub-dimensions. In the total scores of study and conflict (F = 13,650; p <0.05) and in the sub-dimension of the conflict (tension) of the course (F = 11,242; p < 0.05), the conflict of the course with leisure time (time) In the sub-dimension (F = 12,774; p<0.05) and in the sub-dimension of the lesson conflict (intensity) (F = 12,076; p < 0.05), conflict scores appeared in favor of the 12th grades. In the sub-dimension of the conflict of leisure (intensity) (F = 6.710; p < 0.05), the conflict levels were determined in favor of the 10th grades. The differences within the group reveal that as the grade level increases in general, especially until the 11th grade level, study and conflict increase. In leisure time scores, it was determined that 5th grades showed higher evaluation level in the group difference between 5th and 12th grades in evaluation sub-dimension (F = 2,316; p < 0.05). Differences determined between all groups in leisure attitude are in favor of grade 10th (F = 0.936; p<0.05).

Table 5. Comparison of measurement tools and their sub-dimensions according to the leisure planning variable

	Planning of leisure	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	t	p
Study-leisure conflict	Yes	143	53.34	19.76	-1.486	0.139
	No	93	57.08	17.50		
Study interfering with leisure (time)	Yes	143	8.43	4.00	-0.922	0.357
	No	93	8.91	3.75		
Study interfering with leisure (strain)	Yes	143	17.46	6.60	-0.924	0.356
	No	93	18.25	6.10		
Study interfering with leisure (intensity)	Yes	143	11.15	5.03	-1.186	0.237
	No	93	11.92	4.63		
Leisure interfering with study (strain)	Yes	143	4.86	2.55	-0.689	0.491
	No	93	5.09	2.41		
Leisure interfering with study (intensity)	Yes	143	11.41	5.04	-2.209	0.028*

	No	93	12.89	4.94		
Leisure management	Yes	143	53.85	10.41	6.460	0.000*
	No	93	45.73	7.69		
Goal setting and technique	Yes	143	21.06	5.95	8.152	0.000*
	No	93	14.90	5.21		
Evaluating	Yes	143	11.10	2.91	2.925	0.004*
	No	93	9.98	2.77		
Leisure attitude	Yes	143	8.37	3.87	-1.328	0.186
	No	93	9.03	3.52		
Scheduling	Yes	143	10.07	3.27	2.267	0.024*
	No	93	9.16	2.61		

*p<0.05.

When the independent sample t test findings between leisure planning and measurement tools were analyzed, statistically significant relationships were determined in the collision of leisure inferring with study (intensity) and in the total scores and sub-dimensions of leisure management. According to this; It was determined that the participants who did not plan their leisure time showed more leisure conflict with study (intensity) level (t = -2,209; p<0.05). Therefore, it can be said that planning leisure time will prevent conflict of leisure time with the study. In leisure time management total scores (t = 6.460; p<0.05), goal setting and method (t = 8.152; p<0.05) and evaluation (t = 2.925; p<0.05) sub-dimensions it is seen that the participants who are planning have developed a more favorable leisure management than those who are not planning.

Table 6. Comparison of measurement tools and sub-dimensions according to the favorite course variable

	Favorite Course	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	F	p
Study-leisure conflict	Numerical	132	54.81	19.16	1.019	0.363
	Verbal	50	52.06	18.46		
	Sportive	54	57.37	18.86		
	Total	236	54.81	18.95		
Study interfering with leisure (time)	Numerical	132	8.81	3.98	1.654	0.193
	Verbal	50	7.74	3.29		
	Sportive	54	8.96	4.19		
	Total	236	8.62	3.90		
Study interfering with leisure (strain)	Numerical	132	17.78	6.45	0.097	0.907
	Verbal	50	17.48	6.42		
	Sportive	54	18.03	6.40		
	Total	236	17.77	6.41		
Study interfering with leisure (intensity)	Numerical	132	11.84	5.12	1.336	0.265
	Verbal	50	10.52	4.38		
	Sportive	54	11.38	4.67		
	Total	236	11.45	4.88		
Leisure interfering with study (strain)	Numerical	132	4.81	2.41	1.057	0.349
	Verbal	50	4.88	2.65		
	Sportive	54	5.38	2.55		
	Total	236	4.95	2.49		
Leisure interfering with study (intensity)	Numerical	132	11.56b	4.72	3.576	0.030*
	Verbal	50	11.44	5.37		
	Sportive	54	13.59a	5.26		
	Total	236	12.00	5.04		
Leisure management	Numerical	132	50.91	9.95	0.955	0.386
	Verbal	50	51.68	8.64		
	Sportive	54	49.05	12.07		
	Total	236	50.65	10.22		

Goal setting and technique	Numerical	132	18.83	6.20	0.323	0.724
	Verbal	50	18.78	6.18		
	Sportive	54	18.01	7.15		
	Total	236	18.63	6.41		
Evaluating	Numerical	132	10.70	2.74	1.054	0.350
	Verbal	50	11.04	2.74		
	Sportive	54	10.22	3.40		
	Total	236	10.66	2.90		
Leisure attitude	Numerical	132	8.87	3.92	1.313	0.271
	Verbal	50	7.88	3.42		
	Sportive	54	8.72	3.55		
	Total	236	8.63	3.74		
Scheduling	Numerical	132	9.65	2.93	0.239	0.787
	Verbal	50	9.98	3.50		
	Sportive	54	9.61	2.94		
	Total	236	9.71	3.05		

*p<0.05; a>b.

The research findings, which analyze how the favorite lesson is directed to study/leisure conflict and leisure management reveal a statistically significant difference between the sub-dimension of leisure interfering with study (strain)and the favorite course ($F = 3.576$; $p < 0.05$). According to the post hoc analysis, it was determined that the students who love sportive courses more in the group difference between numerical and sportive lessons show the level of leisure interfering with study (strain). It has been determined that the students who enjoy the most sporting lessons between the study and leisure conflict scale among numerical, verbal or sporting lessons tend to have more conflict tendency, although not statistically. On the other hand, it was found that students who like numerical lessons have more positive leisure management level even though there is no significant difference.

Table 7. Comparison of measurement tools and sub-dimensions according to active or passive leisure variable

	The style of leisure	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	t	p
Study-leisure conflict	Passive	155	54.03	18.98	-0.873	0.384
	Active	81	56.30	18.92		
Study interfering with leisure (time)	Passive	155	8.46	3.96	-0.861	0.390
	Active	81	8.92	3.81		
Study interfering with leisure (strain)	Passive	155	17.74	6.44	-0.125	0.901
	Active	81	17.85	6.38		
Study interfering with leisure (intensity)	Passive	155	11.33	4.92	-0.531	0.596
	Active	81	11.69	4.83		
Leisure interfering with study (strain)	Passive	155	4.90	2.47	-0.407	0.684
	Active	81	5.04	2.54		
Leisure interfering with study (intensity)	Passive	155	11.58	5.00	-1.747	0.082
	Active	81	12.79	5.06		
Leisure management	Passive	155	49.65	10.49	-2.095	0.037*
	Active	81	52.56	9.45		
Goal setting and technique	Passive	155	17.99	6.29	-2.144	0.033*
	Active	81	19.86	6.49		
Evaluating	Passive	155	10.51	3.02	-1.090	0.277
	Active	81	10.95	2.67		
Leisure attitude	Passive	155	8.55	3.82	-0.433	0.665
	Active	81	8.77	3.60		
Scheduling	Passive	155	9.86	2.97	-1.031	0.303
	Active	81	9.43	3.21		

*p<0.05.

Although there was no significant difference in the analysis of the data obtained through the examples given for the active or passive evaluation of leisure time, it was determined that the participants who evaluated their leisure time actively showed more leisure and lesson conflicts. Leisure management in favor of the participants who are also active in the sub-dimensions of goal setting and technique ($t = -2.144$; $p<0.05$) with leisure management total scores ($t = -2,095$; $p<0.05$) levels were determined to be revealed.

There was no significant difference between the participants' daily leisure time and study conflict and leisure management. On the other hand, when the study hours are examined, participants who have less than 1 hour daily homework time in the difference in the sub-dimension of the conflict of leisure interfering with study (intensity) and less than 1 hour in the group difference between the lesson students have a higher concentration It was determined that it shows the averages. In addition, it is a remarkable finding that there is a significant difference in favor of those who do not attend a course in the sub-dimension of the Leisure interfering with study (strain) with the participation of any course. In the light of the findings obtained, the relationship between measurement tools and sub-dimensions is given in Table 8.

Table 8. Relationship analysis between measurement tools and sub-dimensions

	Study-leisure conflict	Study interfering with leisure (time)	Study interfering with leisure (strain)	Study interfering with leisure (intensity)	Leisure interfering with study (strain)	Leisure interfering with study (intensity)	Leisure management	Goal setting and technique	Evaluating	Eisure attitude	Scheduling
Study-leisure conflict	1										
Study interfering with leisure (time)	.818**	1									
Study interfering with leisure (strain)	.894**	.723	1								
Study interfering with leisure (intensity)	.873**	.719**	.723**	1							
Leisure interfering with study (strain)	.768**	.502**	.612**	.584**	1						
Leisure interfering with study (intensity)	.761**	.433**	.525**	.547**	.660**	1					
Leisure management	-.044	.005	-.027	-.046	-.038	-.071	1				
Goal setting and technique	-.002	-.006	-.025	-.020	.032	.034	.865	1			
Evaluating	-.100	-.079**	-.096	-.106	-.015	-.080	.724**	.547**	1		
Leisure attitude	.862**	.716**	.720**	.982**	.558**	.543**	-.070	-.043	-.113	1	
Scheduling	-.238**	-.170**	-.184**	-.165**	-.223**	-.258**	.283**	.056	-.090	-.183**	1

*p<0.01; *p<0.05.

When Pearson Correlation Analysis between course study and leisure conflict scale and leisure management scale was examined, no statistically significant relationship was determined between total scores ($r = -0.044$; $p<0.05$). However, goal setting and method ($r = -0.002$; $p<0.05$) and evaluation ($r = -0.100$; $p <0.05$) sub-dimensions negatively weak, leisure attitude ($r = -0.882$; $p<0.05$) positive and weak relations in programming ($r = -0,238$; $p<0.05$) subdimensions.

Table 9. Multiple linear regression analysis results for the effect of leisure management on study and leisure conflict

	B	Std. Error	β	t	p
Study interfering with leisure (time)	0.227	0.273	0.087	0.830	0.407
Study interfering with leisure (strain)	-0.013	0.176	-0.008	-0.071	0.943
Study interfering with leisure (intensity)	0.147	0.228	-0.070	-0.642	0.522
Leisure interfering with study (strain)	0.058	0.397	0.014	0.146	0.884
Leisure interfering with study (intensity)	-0.153	0.184	-0.075	-0.828	0.408
R=0.093	R^2=0.009				
$F_{(0.404)}$=0.846	p<0.001				

Dependent Variable: Leisure Management.

According to the regression analysis findings, in which the effect of leisure management scale on study and conflict was examined, no statistically significant effect was found. However, although it is not statistically significant, leisure management; course conflict with study interfering with leisure (strain) (β = -0.008, t = -0.071; p<0.00), course study interfering with leisure (intensity) (β = -0.070, t = -0.664, p < 0.00) and conflict with leisure time it is observed that there is a tendency to decrease values for Leisure interfering with study (strain) (β = -0.075, t = -0.828, p<0.00) subdimension. According to these results; leisure time management data has been found to have a small effect in explaining study and leisure conflict values (R = 0.009).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Findings obtained in the study show that participants showed less than average study-leisure conflict level, and also achieved average leisure time assessment scores. It was observed that certain variables changed these levels and partial relationships and effects were determined between the two measurement tools. The concept of lesson study-leisure conflict in the study is covered in the literature as work-life balance, work and leisure conflict. At this point, the phenomenon of work for students is perceived as equivalent to study within the education and training life. Therefore, being able to manage the balance between study and leisure time is important to minimize the conflict between these two elements.

By researching many psychometric features that negatively affect the quality of life with the deterioration of the balance between work and leisure, such as studying, important suggestions were developed to eliminate this conflict (Gülertekin Genç, Genç, & Gümüş, 2016; İskender & Yaylı, 2017; Lin, Huang, & Yang, 2013; Lin, Wong, & Ho, 2013; Lin, Wong, & Ho, 2015; Lin et al., 2014; Kurtipek & Çolakoğlu, 2014; Mansour & Tremblay, 2016; Özdevecioğlu & Çakmak Doruk, 2009; Sop, 2014; Wang et al., 2020; Wayne et al., 2020). However, the insufficiency of the studies conducted in terms of study and leisure conflict stands out. In this context, research findings indicate an important gap in terms of study and leisure conflict by determining the effect of leisure management on this conflict.

Research findings revealed that participants showed a less than average study time leisure conflict level. In a study, the level of work (lesson/study) - leisure time conflict of hotel employees was determined as medium level. In other words, the employees declared that they could not spare enough time for their free time due to their profession (İskender & Yaylı, 2017). This finding has similar consequences for students who study at full-time schools. Time devoted to work, lesson and responsibilities causes problems in the balance of life and leads individuals to an increasingly negative cycle.

Staines and O'Connor (1980) obtained similar findings with the determination that the level of study leisure time conflict of the men in our research findings was higher than the girls. On the other hand, as the duration of work/study increases, the level of study and leisure conflict increases with the same rate (İskender & Yaylı, 2017; Sop, 2014; Wang et al., 2020), but the current findings are less than 1 hour in contrast to these studies shows that participants with study time show more level of study-leisure conflict. The fact that individuals working mostly for long hours experience low levels of work (lessons) and leisure time conflicts indicate possible consequences due to the disconnection in life balance. In this context, decisions such as flexibility in working hours and reduction of working days today stand out as applications that contribute to minimize conflict between leisure time and tasks and increase efficiency.

Research has demonstrated flexibility in working hours and emphasis that employees can help balance work and leisure time (Lin, Wong, & Ho, 2013; Mansour & Tremblay, 2016; Wayne et al., 2020). Otherwise, increased work (lesson)-life (leisure) conflict causes burnout. However, it is anticipated that this level of conflict can be minimized through leisure participation (Lin et al., 2014; Tsaur & Yen, 2018). Another study has determined that the flexibility that can be brought about leisure time has positive effects on leisure satisfaction, job efficiency and job satisfaction (Liang, 2020). On the other hand, it is revealed by research findings that leisure conflict reduces quality of life (Lin, Wong, & Ho, 2013; Özdevecioğlu & Aktaş, 2007; Özdevecioğlu & Çakmak Doruk, 2019). Study-leisure conflict scale was compared with variables such as life satisfaction, job satisfaction, job adequacy rather than demographic variables, and it was determined that many variables affect work (leisure) conflict. Leisure management, which is one of these variables, revealed a partial and weak relationship and influence between study and leisure conflict. Higher inversion threshold in question will be an important factor in minimizing the level of study-leisure conflict through leisure-time management.

Based on the finding that leisure management partially reduces the level of study and leisure conflict, the necessity of programming for leisure time management of disadvantaged groups emerges. Eranıl and Özcan (2018), who put forward a similar study by researching the leisure management skill level of high school students, obtained similar results with the research findings, and stated that the leisure management level of the participants was average.

Similar to the finding of a statistically significant relationship between the gender variable of the participants and leisure management, Misra and McKean (2000) determined that gender changes leisure management. Contrary to the research findings, researchers found that women show a higher level of leisure time management than men. Within the scope of the study investigating the relationship between leisure time management and quality of life, a positive relationship was found between leisure time management and quality of life (Wang et al., 2011). Therefore, it can be stated in the direction of the research that the quality of life, which is in a negative relation with the conflict, can be increased with the correct management of free time.

As a result, the research findings present important findings in determining the conflict between study and leisure. At the same time, examining the findings of research, which determines the effect of leisure management on study and conflict, by examining them with larger and different sample groups, analyzing the conflict situation between study and leisure, and doing various studies in order to eliminate this problem situation of students, adults in the context of work. is recommended. Leisure and study conflict, where more findings are needed in academic sense; It should be analyzed with qualitative, quantitative and mixed approaches to be analyzed in depth by comparing with different psychometric features and different disciplines. In the light of the findings, it is understood that the importance of the evaluation of leisure time in education and education programs, the details of the plans that will eliminate the conflict elements are shared with the students and the necessity of restructuring the current programs is revealed. In this context, with the support of the literature, it is recommended that the practitioners make studies and plans to reduce the conflict levels of the students through effective and efficient leisure management.

References

Eranıl, A. K., & Özcan, M. (2018). Investigation of high school students' leisure time management ability. *Journal of Social Sciences of Mus Alparslan University, 6*(6), 779-785.

Guest, D. E. (2001). *Perspectives on the study of work-life balance*. A Discussion Papared for the 2001 ENOP Symposium, Paris. Social Science Information (pp. 255-279). Sage Publication, London.

Işık, U., & Demirel, M. (2018). Turkish adaptation of study-leisure conflict scale, its validity and reliability. *European Journal of Education Studies, 4*(3), 31-43. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1188630

İskender, A., & Yaylı, A. (2017). Work and leisure conflict level of employees: Job burnout and life satisfaction relationship: A case study on 4-5 stars hotel employees in Ankara. *MANAS Journal of Social Studies, 6*(1), 95-112.

Kurtipek S., Çelik, O. B., Yenel, İ. F., & İlhan E. L. (2016). Investigation of time management skills according to personality characteristics of university students who study sport education. *Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport/Science, Movement and Health, 16*(2), 520-525

Kurtipek, S., & Çolakoğlu, T. (2014). Examination of personality characteristics of students at high schools giving sports education. *Nigde University Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 8*(1), 112-120.

Liang, Y. W. (2020). Consequences of work–leisure facilitation from tour leaders'/guides' perspectives: Self-efficacy and satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research, 51*(2), 206-229. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2019.1670586

Lin, J. H., Wong, J. Y., & Ho, C. H. (2013). Promoting frontline employees' quality of life: Leisure benefit systems and work-to-leisure conflicts. *Tourism Management, 36*, 178-187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.12.009

Lin, Y. S., Huang, W. S., Yang, C. T., & Chiang, M. J. (2014). Work–leisure conflict and its associations with well-being: The roles of social support, leisure participation and job burnout. *Tourism Management, 45*, 244-252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.04.004

Mansour, S., & Tremblay, D. G. (2016). How the need for "leisure benefit systems" as a "resource passageways" moderates the effect of work-leisure conflict on job burnout and intention to leave: A study in the hotel industry in Quebec. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 27*, 4-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.02.002

Misra, R., & McKean, M. (2000). College students' academic stress and its relation to their anxiety, time management, and leisure satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Studies, 16*(1), 41-51.

Özdevecioğlu, M., & Aktaş, A. (2007). The effects of career commitment, occupational commitment and organizational commitment on life satisfaction: the role of work-famly conflict. *Erciyes University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 28*, 1-20.

Özdevecioğlu, M., & Çakmak Doruk, N. (2009). The effects of work-family conflict and familywork conflict on employee's job and life satisfaction in organizations. *Erciyes University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 33*, 69-99.

Özen Kapız, S. (2002). İş-aile yaşamı dengesi ve dengeye yönelik yeni bir yaklaşım: sınır teorisi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 4*(3), 139-153.

Sheng-Hshiung, T., Ying-Wen, L., & Huei-Ju, H. (2012). A multidimensional measurement of work-leisure conflict. *Leisure Sciences, 34*, 395-416. https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2012.714701

Sop, S. A. (2014). An investigation on the relationship between job strain, work-to-leisure conflict, occupational satisfaction and life satisfaction. *Tourism Academic Journal, 1*(1), 1-14.

Staines, G. L., & O'Connor, P. (1980). Conflicts among work, leisure, and family roles. *Monthly Labor Review, 103*(8), 35-39.

Tsaur, S. H., & Yen, C. H. (2018). Work–leisure conflict and its consequences: Do generational differences matter? *Tourism Management, 69*, 121-131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.05.011

Tsaur, S. H., *f*, Y. W., & Hsu, H. J. (2012). A multidimensional measurement of work-leisure conflict. *Leisure Science: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 34*(5), 395-416. https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2012.714701

Wang, W. C., Kao, C. H., Huan, T. C., & Wu, C. C. (2011). Free time management contributes to better quality of life: A study of undergraduate students in Taiwan. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 12*(4), 561-573. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-010-9217-7

Wang, Y. C., Qu, H., Yang, Y., & Yang, C. E. (2020). Leisure-work preference and hotel employees' perceived subjective well-being. *The Service Industries Journal, 40*(1-2), 110-132. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2018.1529170

Wayne, J. H., Matthews, R., Crowford, W., & Casper, W. J. (2020). Predictors and processes of satisfaction with work–family balance: Examining the role of personal, work, and family resources and conflict and enrichment. *Human Resource Management, 59*, 25-42. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21971