

# Comparing the Motivational Factors of Recreational Fishers and Hunters, Life Satisfaction Level of Participants and Non Participants in These Activities: Turkey Case

Faik Ardahan [1], Tevfik Turgut [2]

[1] Corresponding Author,  
Assistant Prof. Dr. At Akdeniz  
University, School of Physical  
Education and Sport,  
Recreation Department

ardahan@akdeniz.edu.tr  
+90 505 456 2112

[2] Research Assistant at Akdeniz  
University, Institute of Social  
Sciences Sport Management  
Department

tevfikturgut@akdeniz.edu.tr

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to compare the motivational factors for participating in Recreational Hunting (RHG) and Recreational Fishing (RFG) and the Life Satisfaction (LS) level of Participants (PR) and Non-Participants (NP) of these activities with respect to some demographic variables in Turkey. This is a descriptive study and the sampling group of this study consists of 183 Recreational Hunters (RH) (Mage=35.96 ± 10.53), 359 RF (Mage=35.90 ± 9.80), 284 NP of these activities (Mage=31.35 ± 11.601), totally 846 male participants (Mage=34.35 ± 10.816). An electronic questionnaire form was sent to the RF and/or RH who are members of RHG and/or RFG groups and NP through social media as [www.facebook.com](http://www.facebook.com) by using the website [www.docs.google.com](http://www.docs.google.com) to gather data. The link was open for getting answers between the dates 01-12-2011 and 01-05-2012. In the process of assessing data, the descriptive statistic means such as frequency (f), percentage (%), average (M), standard deviation (SD), and to examine the correlation between demographic variables and the factors for RHG and RFG Pearson Correlation test and to examine the differences between demographic variables and the factors for RHG and RFG Independent Samples T-Test have been used. Results have been assessed according to significant level 0.01 and 0.05. As a result of this study, it was found that there aren't major differences between RH and RF in relation to the motivational factors for participating in RHG and RFG. There are no statistically meaningful differences between LS level of RH and RF and with respect to some demographic variables. But there were found meaningful differences between LS level of PR and NP with respect to some demographic variables except 15-24 age groups.

**Keywords:** *Recreational Fishing, Recreational Hunting, Motivational Factors, Life Satisfaction, Fishing in Turkey, Hunting in Turkey*

## INTRODUCTION

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 (McLean et al. 2008; Pigram and Jenkins 2006). As people used natural sources for nutritional purposes in ancient times, RHG and RFG can be accepted as the oldest outdoor activities which were obligated activities at that time. Today in modern society people participate in

these activities because of very 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 (Government of Alberta 1994). Burger (2002) stated in her study some reasons as relaxation, to be outdoors, 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 and Ditton (2001) 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' (2002). On the other hand, according to the results of the studies made by Safak et al. (2010), Safak (2009), Igircik et al. (2005), Ay et al. (2005), "love of nature", "to make exercise", "to be with friends", "to shoot", "to accommodate one's to friends", "to hunt", "to be alone in nature", "to obtain food", and "to make benefit" were found as the factors motivating people for RHG.

RHG and RFG are very popular among recreational outdoor activities in many countries and the factors motivating people for exercising outdoor activities had drawn attention of researchers. Among the main reasons of rising demand to outdoor activities are industrialization, urbanization (Aslan 1993), the desire of city inhabitants to get away from routine and crowd (Sagcan 1986), increasing incomes and education level (Lee et al. 2001; Solop et al. 2001; Scott and Munson 1994), broadening adventure sports coverage in media, falling costs of equipment, changing traditional way of life, changing individual, family and social perception, increase of the inclination towards outdoor activities are thought (Ardahan, 2011).

Crandall (1980) claimed that the personality and conditions in which individual live may lead people participate in outdoor activities, and Levy (1979) 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 (Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa 2011). 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 the 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, learning 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, the desire of success, rivalry (within and out), spending time and relaxation, intellectual esthetic (Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa 2011; Ibrahim and Cordes 2002).

As a result of motivational factors given above, it is claimed that RFG provides numerous social benefits as providing a vehicle for family cohesion (Buchanan 1985; Dann 1993; Hunt and Ditton 2002; Knopf et al. 1973; Toth and Brown 1997), releasing stress and mental relaxation (Driver et al. 1991; Knopf et al. 1973; Toth and Brown 1997), being away from others (Fedler and Ditton 1994), and nature enjoyment (Ditton 2004; Toth and Brown 1997). Hunt and Ditton (2001) 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 benefits given above and is also basis of our study to measure strength of the reasons for RFG and benefits from RFG.

Another possible effect of participating in recreational outdoor activities is claimed to be seen on the LS level. The benefits given above which are obtained by participating both in general outdoor activities and specifically in RHG and RFG activities, may cause higher LS level (Ardahan 2011) which is defined in different forms. While Hong and Giannakopoulos (1994) define LS as individual's emotional acts which out of work life and as an general attitude towards life, Telman (2004) 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. The LS of people exercising outdoor activities can be higher than the people who do not participate in outdoor activities (Ardahan 2011).

The factors affecting the LS of people are ordered by Dagdelen (2008), Otacioglu (2008), Schmitter (2003) 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 we believe that degree of effect on LS level by participating in outdoor activities 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 (Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa 2011; Ibrahim and Cordes 2002).

In spite of social and economic importance of RHG (Bauer and Giles 2002) and RFG, the profile of RH and RF, economic value of RHG and RFG, and related subjects haven't still been studied scientifically in Turkey. With current study, we hope to make up the lack of scientific studies on RHG and RFG.

The aim of this study is to compare the motivational factors for participating in RHG and RFG and the LS level of participants (PR) and non-participants (NP) of these activities with respect to some demographic variables in Turkey.

## METHODS

This is an online-based descriptive study which aims to compare the motivational factors for participating in RHG and RFG and the LS level of participants (PR) and non-participants (NP) of these activities with respect to some demographic variables 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 and RH and a list of questions to measure the factors motivating people for RHG and RFG which were used by different researchers in other studies (Safak et al. 2010; Safak 2009; Floyd et al. 2006; Igircik et al. 2005; Ay et al 2005; Ditton 2004; Burger 2002; Hunt and Ditton 2002; Hunt and Ditton 2001; Wilde et al. 1998; Toth and Brown 1997; Manfredo et al. 1996; Fedler and Ditton 1994; Dann 1993; Driver et al. 1991; Loomis and Ditton 1987; Buchanan 1985; Knopf et al. 1973) besides some other items which we added. The questionnaire form also contained the LS scale questions which were developed by Diener et al. (1985). The link was open for getting answers between the dates 01-12-2011 and 01-05-2012.

## SAMPLING

To gather data an electronic questionnaire form was prepared by using the website "www.docs.google.com". The link of this website was sent to the RH and RF who are members of RHG and RFG groups and NP through social media as www.facebook.com and RHG and RFG clubs by e-mail. 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 recreational fishing is not obligated. On the other hand, it was reported that there were 2,071,752 licensed RH in Turkey in year 1997 (Igircik et al., 2005). Survey was open for all fishing enthusiasts using different techniques of fishing as angling, spearing, hand gathering, and trapping. The sampling group of this study consists of 183 RH ( $M_{age}=35.96 \pm 10.53$ ), 359 RF ( $M_{age}=35.90 \pm 9.80$ ), 284 NP of these activities ( $M_{age}=31.35 \pm 11.601$ ), totally 846 males ( $M_{age}=34.35 \pm 10.816$ ). There were 12 females answered the survey, 11 RF and 1 RH. Because of the lack of numbers of females in RF and RH for statistical analyzing, 12 female participants were excluded.

## STATISTICAL ANALYSES

In the process of assessing data, the descriptive statistic means such as frequency (f), percentage (%), average (M) and standard deviation (SD), and to examine the correlation between demographic variables and the factors for fishing Pearson Correlation test (P) and to examine the differences between demographic variables and the factors for fishing One-Way ANOVA and Independent Samples T Test (t) have been used and Post-hoc Tukey test was run to find out the difference between groups. Results have been assessed according to significant level 0.01 and 0.05.

We presented the LS level in two rows. LS (a) row represents the difference between RH and RF in relation to age, education, and income. LS (b) row represents the difference between PR and NP in relation to age, education, and income.

## RESULTS

This study consists of 183 RH ( $M_{age}=35.96 \pm 10.53$ ), 359 RF ( $M_{age}=35.90 \pm 9.80$ ), 284 NP of these activities ( $M_{age}=31.35 \pm 11.601$ ), totally 846 males ( $M_{age}=34.35 \pm 10.816$ ). 67.4% of the participants were single; 61.1% was aged between 25 and 44 years; 72.0% of them had higher education which means at least 16 years schooling; monthly income of 58.6% was 800 € and less (Table 1).

**Table 1:** General Characteristics of RH, RF, and NP

	RH		RF		NP		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Marital Status								
Married	71	38.8	116	32.3	82	28.9	269	32.6
Single	112	61.2	243	67.7	202	71.1	557	67.4
Education Level								
High School and <	68	37.2	123	34.3	40	14.1	231	28.0
University and >	115	62.8	236	65.7	244	85.9	595	72.0
Age Classes (years)								
15-24	21	11.5	36	10.0	102	35.9	159	19.2
25-44	118	64.5	261	72.7	126	44.4	505	61.1
45->	44	24.0	62	17.3	56	19.7	162	19.6
Max-Min (years)	18-60		16-65		15-65		15-65	
$M_{age} \pm SD$	35.96 $\pm$ 10.53		35.90 $\pm$ 9.80		31.35 $\pm$ 11.60		34.35 $\pm$ 10.82	
Monthly Income								
0-800 €	103	56.3	193	53.8	188	66.2	484	58.6
801 € and over	80	43.7	166	46.2	96	33.8	342	41.4
Total	183	100.0	359	100.0	284	100.0	846	100.0

Correlations between some demographic variables of RH, RF, and NP and factors motivating for RHG and RFG are shown in Table 2. There were found statistically meaningful positive correlations between demographic variables of RH and RF and factors motivating people for participation ( $p < 0.05$  and/or  $p < 0.01$ ). Age of RH was correlated with N15, N19, and N20 negatively which means younger RH participate in RHG for the factors “to be happy”, “to make exercise” and “to be called as a good hunter/fisher”, and age of RF was correlated with N10, and N18 positively, but with N11, and N16 negatively, which means if age of RF decreases, participation in RFG for the factors, “to develop skills”, “to get away from crowd and routine” increase, and as age of RF increases, participation in RFG for the factor “to affect health positively” and “to get away from responsibilities” increase, too.

Variable “education” of RH and RF was correlated with N1, N4, N11, and N17 positively which means as education level increases RH and RF participate in RHG and RFG for the factors “relaxation”, “challenge or sport”, “to develop skills”, and “to get away from family”. Besides common correlations of RH and RF, education of RH was correlated with N8 negatively, and N15 positively which means that as education level increases, RH participate in RHG for the factor “to give away” less, but for the factor “to be happy” more; and education of RF was correlated with N6, and N9 negatively which means that as education level of RF increases participation in RFG for the factors “to be with friends” and “for fries and socials” decreases.

Variables marital status, age, education, and monthly income were correlated with each other and statistically meaningful positive correlations between monthly income, education, and age of both RH and RF were found ( $p < 0.05$  and/or  $p < 0.01$ ). As income of RH was correlated with N8, N9, N12 negatively, income of RF was correlated with N6, and N14 negatively, but with N4 positively which means as monthly income of RH and RF increases, RH’s participation for the factors “to give away”, “for fries and socials”, “to enter into a new society” and participation of RF “to be with friends” and “to get rid of loneliness” decrease, but participation of RF for the factor “challenge or sport” increases. LS was correlated with monthly income of RH and RF and age of RF positively which means as monthly income of RH and RF increases, PR’s LS level increases, too, and older RF have higher LS.

**Table 2:** Correlations between Some Demographic Variables of RH, RF, and Factors Motivating for RHG and

RFG

		RH			RF		
		Age	Education	Income	Age	Education	Income
N1: Relaxation	P	-0.17	0.158*	0.019	-0.040	0.184**	0.018
N2: To be outdoors	P	-0.051	0.145	0.120	-0.043	0.063	0.005
N3: To get away from demand	P	-0.001	0.023	-0.034	-0.090	-0.042	-0.032
N4: Challenge or sport	P	-0.064	0.279**	0.132	0.049	0.143**	0.115*
N5: Commune with nature	P	-0.111	-0.026	0.003	-0.086	0.055	-0.012
N6: To be with friends	P	-0.070	-0.130	-0.053	0.033	-0.118*	-0.067
N7: To eat	P	-0.055	0.101	0.023	-0.067	0.075	-0.162**
N8: To give away	P	-0.017	-0.184*	-0.199**	-0.035	0.040	-0.005
N9: For fries or socials	P	-0.010	-0.114	-0.237**	0.028	-0.142**	-0.096
N10: To affect health positively	P	0.038	0.023	-0.017	0.141**	0.071	0.056
N11: To develop skills	P	-0.145	0.211**	-0.080	-0.120*	0.126*	-0.038
N12: To enter into a new society	P	-0.023	-0.069	-0.208**	-0.028	-0.011	-0.091
N13: To meet new people	P	0.072	-0.073	-0.118	0.050	-0.087	-0.085
N14: To get rid of loneliness	P	-0.077	0.072	-0.069	-0.008	-0.047	-0.107*
N15: To be happy	P	-0.168*	0.154*	-0.111	-0.101	0.098	0.032
N16: To get away from crowd and routine	P	-0.122	0.101	-0.107	-0.152**	0.087	-0.018
N17: To get away from family	P	-0.131	0.194**	-0.054	-0.071	0.202**	0.010
N18: To get away from responsibilities	P	-0.106	-0.026	-0.108	-0.177**	0.085	0.055
N19: To make exercise	P	-0.151*	0.117	0.006	-0.026	0.083	-0.006
N20: To be called as a good hunter/ fisher	P	-0.210**	0.097	-0.062	0.001	-0.023	-0.014
LS	P	0.066	0.083	0.259**	0.109*	0.008	0.131*
Age	P	1	-0.086	0.207**	1	-0.080	0.280**
Education	P	-0.086	1	0.473**	-0.080	1	0.316**
Monthly Income	P	0.207**	0.473**	1	0.280**	0.316**	1

\*: The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level, \*\*: The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

Differences between RH and RF in relation to the factors motivating for RHG and RFG regarding the demographic variables are demonstrated in Table 3. The weakest factors motivating people for participation in these activities are “challenge or sport”, “to get away from family” and “to get away from responsibilities”. There were found statistically meaningful differences between RH and RF in relation to the factors N2, N6, N8, N11, and N20 ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Furthermore, it was found statistically meaningful differences between RH and RF who are in the same demographic classes in relation to the factors motivating people for participation. It was found statistically meaningful differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) as following: between married RH and RF in relation to the factors N7; between single RH and RF in relation to the factor N6; between 15-24 year aged RH and RF in relation to the factor N10; between 25-44 years aged RH and RF in relation to the factors N8, N11, and N13; between RH and RF whose education level is high school and lower in relation to the factor N11; between high educated RH and RF in relation to the factors N2, N19, and N20; between RH and RF whose monthly income is 800€ and less in relation to the factor N20; between RH and RF whose monthly income is 801€ and more in relation to the factors N2, N8, N11, N15, and N18. Additionally there were found statistically meaningful differences between almost all demographic variables of PR and NP except 15-24 years aged PR and NP in relation to the LS (LS b) ( $p < 0.05$ ). On the other hand, there weren't found any statistically meaningful differences between RH and RF from the same demographic classes in relation to LS (LS b) ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 3: Factors Motivating for RHG and RFG and Differences between RH, RF, and NP in relation to the Factors regarding Some Demographic Variables

		Total	Married	Single	15-24 years	25-44 years	Over 45 year	High school and below	University and over	0-800 €	801 € and more
N1	RH	3.87	3.93	3.84	3.76	3.93	3.77	3.63	4.02	3.85	3.90
	RF	3.94	4.02	3.91	3.94	3.97	3.81	3.65	4.09	3.92	3.96
	t	-0.639	-0.474	-0.516	-0.448	-0.336	-0.138	-0.092	-0.637	-0.458	-0.431
N2	RH	4.32	4.45	4.23	4.43	4.32	4.25	4.13	4.43	4.21	4.45
	RF	4.10	4.29	4.01	4.28	4.09	4.06	4.01	4.15	4.10	4.11
	t	2.240*	1.119	1.750	0.641	1.887	1.047	0.711	2.442*	0.848	2.586*
N3	RH	4.18	4.27	4.13	3.95	4.26	4.07	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.14
	RF	4.19	4.28	4.15	4.44	4.19	4.06	4.25	4.16	4.22	4.16
	t	-0.125	-0.053	-0.227	-1.963	0.628	0.019	-0.627	0.338	-0.071	-0.137
N4	RH	1.73	1.66	1.77	1.76	1.65	1.91	1.34	1.96	1.60	1.89
	RF	1.66	1.62	1.68	1.44	1.69	1.68	1.47	1.76	1.56	1.78
	t	0.698	0.275	0.732	1.659	-0.334	1.023	-1.127	1.577	0.373	0.711
N5	RH	4.62	4.80	4.51	4.86	4.61	4.55	4.65	4.61	4.62	4.63
	RF	4.64	4.69	4.61	4.78	4.64	4.55	4.59	4.66	4.64	4.63
	t	-0.198	1.257	-1.242	0.652	-0.339	-0.021	0.557	-0.716	-0.270	-0.015
N6	RH	3.78	3.65	3.87	3.67	3.76	3.89	3.94	3.69	3.83	3.73
	RF	3.60	3.64	3.59	3.61	3.58	3.71	3.77	3.52	3.67	3.53
	t	1.994*	0.065	2.552*	0.232	1.658	0.918	1.110	1.568	1.295	1.405
N7	RH	2.95	2.76	3.06	3.00	2.98	2.82	2.79	3.03	2.92	2.98
	RF	3.08	3.10	3.06	3.17	3.10	2.90	2.96	3.14	3.24	2.88
	t	-1.264	-2.284*	0.006	-0.643	-0.944	-0.372	-0.889	-0.829	-2.356	0.621
N8	RH	2.26	2.14	2.33	2.05	2.31	2.20	2.53	2.10	2.46	2.00
	RF	2.49	2.52	2.47	2.33	2.56	2.29	2.43	2.52	2.49	2.48
	t	-2.376*	-2.417*	-1.151	-1.005	-2.011*	-0.427	0.575	-3.623	-0.273	-3.395*
N9	RH	2.22	2.08	2.31	2.52	2.13	2.34	2.38	2.13	2.45	1.94
	RF	2.27	2.34	2.23	2.28	2.28	2.19	2.46	2.17	2.35	2.17
	t	-0.480	-1.638	0.749	0.935	-1.400	0.772	-0.459	-0.338	0.755	-1.822
N10	RH	4.04	3.96	4.10	4.10	3.99	4.16	4.01	4.06	4.06	4.03
	RF	4.00	3.90	4.05	3.56	4.02	4.16	3.90	4.05	3.95	4.06
	t	0.485	-1.031*	0.419	2.231*	-0.278	-0.012	0.662	0.096	0.852	-0.285
N11	RH	3.42	3.52	3.35	4.05	3.34	3.32	3.10	3.60	3.50	3.31
	RF	3.66	3.81	3.59	3.89	3.69	3.39	3.46	3.76	3.70	3.61
	t	-2.380*	-1.731	-1.842	0.581	-2.838*	-0.297	-1.978*	-1.336	-1.465	-1.979*
N12	RH	2.69	2.77	2.63	3.19	2.53	2.86	2.79	2.63	2.90	2.41
	RF	2.60	2.79	2.51	3.17	2.47	2.84	2.62	2.59	2.69	2.49
	t	0.849	-0.100	1.016	0.066	0.565	0.110	0.990	0.263	1.545	-0.530
N13	RH	2.90	2.85	2.93	3.05	2.77	3.16	3.00	2.83	3.01	2.75
	RF	2.76	2.72	2.78	2.89	2.69	3.00	2.89	2.69	2.85	2.66
	t	1.338	0.690	1.214	0.490	0.694	0.706	0.616	1.152	1.234	0.571
N14	RH	2.25	2.49	2.09	2.48	2.24	2.16	2.15	2.30	2.31	2.16
	RF	2.13	2.28	2.07	2.61	2.01	2.39	2.20	2.10	2.23	2.02
	t	1.245	1.284	0.227	-0.479	2.031*	-1.083	-0.319	1.800	0.712	0.984
N15	RH	4.04	4.45	3.78	4.57	4.00	3.89	3.84	4.16	4.14	3.91
	RF	4.20	4.38	4.11	4.61	4.15	4.16	4.07	4.26	4.17	4.23
	t	-1.856	0.612	-2.951	-0.220	-1.358	-1.644	-1.505	-1.052	-0.307	-2.428*
N16	RH	3.88	4.11	3.73	4.43	3.81	3.82	3.74	3.97	3.78	4.01
	RF	3.92	3.98	3.90	4.17	3.97	3.58	3.80	3.99	3.94	3.90
	t	-0.459	0.819	-1.330	1.063	-1.404	1.114	-0.362	-0.221	-1.229	0.740
N17	RH	1.85	1.94	1.79	2.29	1.81	1.75	1.60	1.99	1.89	1.79
	RF	1.87	2.07	1.77	2.22	1.82	1.87	1.60	2.01	1.86	1.88
	t	-0.253	-0.845	0.112	0.246	-0.133	-0.787	0.010	-0.151	0.279	-0.707
N18	RH	2.02	2.04	2.01	2.43	1.98	1.93	2.06	2.00	2.13	1.89
	RF	2.13	2.34	2.02	2.72	2.10	1.87	1.99	2.19	2.07	2.19
	t	-1.022	-1.635	-0.096	-0.808	-0.962	0.340	0.401	-1.563	0.428	-2.003*
	RH	4.09	4.30	3.96	4.62	4.04	3.98	3.94	4.18	4.09	4.10

		Total	Married	Single	15-24 years	25-44 years	Over 45 year	High school and below	University and over	0-800 €	801 € and more
N19	RF	4.10	4.14	4.09	4.17	4.10	4.06	3.99	4.16	4.11	4.10
	t	-0.114	1.139	-1.060	1.886	-0.551	-0.464	-0.312	2.407*	-0.192	0.025
	RH	2.45	2.55	2.38	3.33	2.36	2.25	2.29	2.54	2.51	2.36
N20	RF	2.22	2.29	2.19	2.28	2.21	2.26	2.26	2.20	2.24	2.20
	t	2.075*	1.439	1.421	3.512*	1.209	-0.032	0.183	2.407*	1.974*	0.924
	RH	3.36	3.37	3.35	3.29	3.35	3.43	3.29	3.40	3.21	3.56
LS (a)	RF	3.38	3.24	3.45	3.28	3.36	3.55	3.38	3.39	3.30	3.48
	t	-0.332	1.106	-1.251	0.036	-0.090	-1.011	-0.757	0.223	-0.965	0.854
	PR	3.38	3.29	3.42	3.28	3.36	3.50	3.35	3.39	3.27	3.51
LS (b)	NP	2.98	3.08	2.94	3.02	2.93	3.02	2.62	3.04	3.12	3.41
	t	6.295*	2.017*	6.332*	1.773	4.446*	4.275*	4.780*	5.099*	4.776*	3.330*

\*: The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

## DISCUSSION

As a descriptive study which aims to compare the motivational factors for participating in RHG and RFG and the LS level of PR and NP of these activities with respect to some demographic variables in Turkey consists of totally 846 RH, RF, and NP.

RHG and RFG are important outdoor recreational activities. It is claimed that 4.5% of the population, 14% of males aged between 20 and 59 years are recreational hunters in New Zealand (Fraser and Sweetapple 1992), and it was reported by U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (US DIFW) (1996) totally 40 million United States (US) residents had gone hunting, or fishing in 1996. It was reported that each tenth individual of active male population in Turkey is hunter and the number of licensed RH increased from 1,153,417 (1990) to 2,071,752 (1997) which points out an 8% average increase for each year (Igiricik et al. 2005). As it was expressed, participation of female RH and RF in the survey was lacking. However we believe that there are female RH and RF. On the other hand, it was concluded by many researchers that (Floyd et al. 2006; Lee et al. 2001; Manning 1999; Wearing 1999; Henderson and Bialeschki 1991) gender has a strong effect on recreational motivation in favor of males, namely men are advantaged because of social and traditional behaviors and attitudes which lead men participate in leisure activities more active and easier in general. More specifically for RFG, Wilde et al.'s (1998) study showed that men have hegemony in RFG. It is stated that fishing is more likely to be favorite type of activities for males (Government of Alberta 1994). As 27% of US males older than 16 years old are RF, only 9% of females older than 16 years old were RF in 1996 according to the US DIFW (1996). Similar results were found for RHG. Results of Ay et al.'s (2005) and Igircik et al.'s (2005) studies show very clearly the hegemony of male gender in RHG. However Pinker (2008) 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 the amount of free time, it was concluded that women were slightly more constrained than men (Harrington and Dawson 1995; Jackson and Henderson 1995). Shaw and Henderson (2005) stated that time stress and a lack of time are major constraints on women's leisure. While a 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 free time, women continue to shoulder the majority of household responsibilities regardless of employment outside home. Further, behaviors of women as caring/looking after others may lead women to prioritize others' leisure before their own (Kindal et al. 2007; Herridge et al. 2003).

Most of the participants of current study are single RH and RF which may be caused that single people have less responsibility than married ones and relating to the variable marital status, it was found statistically meaningful differences between married and single RH and RF in relation to some motivational factors as N6, N7, N8, and N10. According to the results, married RH and RF participate in activities to get away from demand, "to get rid of loneliness", "to be happy", and "to get away from crowd and routine". On the other hand, single RH and RF prefer these activities "to be with friends", "to affect their health positively", and "to meet new people". Even in literature the relationship between marital status of RH and/or RF and the motivational factors hasn't been studied specifically, it can be thought that having meaningful and satisfying marriage can motivate people to participate in outdoor activities and can help building relations (Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa 2010; Hicks and Platt 1970; Laws 1971). The results which were reached in the current study are supporting this conclusion as single RH and RF prefer participating in RHG and RFG "to be with friends", and "to meet new people", married RH and RF prefer these activities "to get away from demand", "to get rid of loneliness", "to be happy", and "to get away from crowd and routine". According to these

findings it can be claimed that RH and RF creates a runaway opportunity for married RH and RF. Similar findings were found in studies on outdoor recreation participation and LS by Ardahan (2011; 2012).

According to the findings, RH was mean aged  $M_{age}=35.96$  years, and RF was mean aged  $M_{age}=35.90$  years. Loomis and Ditton's (1987) study showed that tournament anglers  $M_{age}=38.9$  were younger than salt water sport fishermen  $M_{age}=47.0$ . Wilde et al. (1998) found that tournament anglers were mean aged  $M_{age}=39.9$  years and non-tournament anglers were mean aged  $M_{age}=42.9$  years which are similar to Loomis and Ditton's (1987) study. Burger (2002) found in her study that recreational fishers from different ethnic groups were mean aged between 40 and 47 years. US DIFW (1996) found that 27% of RH was aged between 35 and 44 years, 20% between 25 and 34, and 20% between 45-54 years. In the same study 27% of RF was aged between 35 and 44 years and 20% were aged between 25 and 34 years. On the other hand, studies which were made in Turkey presented different results. While Igcirk et al. (2005) found that 44.1% of RH was aged between 35 and 49 years and 24% between 50 and 59 years, Ay et al., (2005) found that 47% of RH was aged between 41 and 50 years and 24.5% between 50 and 59 years. Safak (2009) found that 39.6% of RH was aged between 35-49 and 34.4% between 50 and 59 years. In current study it was found that 64.5% of RH was aged between 25 and 44 years, and 72.7 of RF were aged between 25 and 44 years. According to the results the majority of RH and RF are aged very close to each other. Compared to results of other studies, it can be stated that recreational fishers in Turkey are younger than the ones in the other countries, but RH in Turkey are aged similarly as the others. Ardahan and Yerlisu Lapa (2011) stated that age affects strongly the recreational preferences of an individual. According to Kelly (1983) as an individual gets older, his/her active participation in recreational activities decreases. Recreational fishing, 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 recreational fishing increases, too (Government of Alberta 1994). In current study, age of RH and RF was correlated with the factors motivating for RHG and RFG. It was found that as people getting older, they go for fishing more for N10 which shows that people pay more attention on their health which was also stated by Ardahan (2012). But RF participate in RFG less for N11, N16, and N18. As age of RH increases, their participation for the factors N15, N19, and N20 decreases. On the other hand, statistically meaningful differences between RH and RF in relation to age classes were only found for the factors N11, and N21 (15-24 age class); N8, N12, and N15 (25-44 age class). Ardahan (2012) stated that 55 years and below individuals' participation in outdoor activities are statistically positive correlated with health related factors, but as age increases, challenge or sport and socialization/entertainment expectation decreases. But in current study, N4 was not correlated either with the age of RH or RF.

Related to educational level of RH it was found different results by researchers. Vast majority of RH was in high school and below education class in Safak's (2009) study. Ay et al. (2005) found that 16.2% of RH was in university and more education class. On the other hand, US DIFW (1996) stated that 44% of RH in US was in university and more education class. According to the current study, it was found that 62.8% of RH and 65.7% of RF are in university and more education class. According to the results of current study it can be claimed that educational level of both RH and RF are higher than general educational level of Turkish citizens, according to the education level data in 2011 which was presented by Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK 2012), 9.6% of population had higher education. There were found differences between the current study and studies of Ay et al. (2005) and Safak (2009). It may be because of the choice of method. Because as they used interview techniques for the surveys, but for the current study it was chosen online survey application which needs internet connection and internet usage habit. On the other hand, the results are similar to the results of US DIFW (1996).

A positive correlation between educational level and participating in outdoor activities was claimed by different studies on outdoor recreation (White 1975; Bultena and Field 1980; Kelly 1983; Lucas 1990; Burger 2002). Namely, people who have higher educational level tend to participate in outdoor activities. Furthermore it was found statistically meaningful common correlations between RH's and RF's education level which are N1, N4, N11, and N17. Namely, as educational level of both RH and RF increases, participation for factors "relaxation", "challenge or sport", "to develop skills", "to be happy", and "to get away from crowd and routine" increase, too. In contrast, participation for the factors "to eat", "to give away" decrease. On the other hand, statistically meaningful differences between RH and RF from same education classes were found only in relation to N11 (High school and below education class), for the factors N2, N19, and N20 (University and over education class). These findings can be accepted as there are not many differences between RH and RF in relation to the factors regarding the educational level. However there are statistically common correlations between education and the factors of RH and RF.

Lee et al.'s (2001), Solop et al.'s (2001), and Scott and Munson's (1994) state that as income of individuals increase, their participation in outdoor activities increases, too. Individual's educational level affects his/her income and in the current study, education and monthly income were correlated positively with each other. The positive correlations between education and monthly income of both RH and RF points out that if educational level increases, monthly income increases, too. On the other hand, to become more income people need to work more which causes



time pressure and time stress. This statement is supported by the findings of current study as it was found high mean values for the motivational factors as N1, N1, N3, N5, N11, N17, and N20 both for RH and RF. According to the findings discussed above, RH and RF who have high educational level would like to relax and get away from crowd and routine. Aslan (1993) and Sagcan (1986) stated that as industrialization and urbanization increases, demand to outdoor recreation of people increases, and 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 (Sagcan, 1986). Aslan (1993) and Sagcan (1986) statements support the findings of the current study.

It is expected that people who participate in outdoor activities, in particular RH and RF have higher LS level than others who don't participate. According to the results of this study, this hypothesis was proved as it was found statistically significant differences between the LS level of PR and NP in relation to all demographic variables except age class 15-24 years. On the other hand, to claim that participation in outdoor activities, in particular RH, or RF is the only determinant for high LS level is not correct. Dagdelen (2008), Otacioglu (2008), and Schmitter (2003) stated that LS is affected by many other factors. On the other hand, it wasn't found any statically meaningful differences between the LS level of RH and RF in relation to none of demographic variables.

Variable monthly income of both RH and RF was correlated with LS positively. Namely RH and RF with higher income have higher LS level. The highest LS level was measured for RH and RF with 801 € and more monthly income.

As a result of this study, it can be stated that both RH and RF have similar motivational factors for participation in RHG and RFG. Furthermore, RH and RF have very close LS levels and there is not statistically meaningful difference between them. On the other hand, participating in RHG and RFG increases the LS level, so it was found statistically meaningful difference between PR and NP in relation to LS level. For that reason, people should be encouraged to participate in RHG and RFG particularly as well as outdoor activities.

## REFERENCES

- Ardahan, F., (2011). The Profile of the Turkish Mountaineers and Rock Climbers: The Reasons and the Carried Benefits for Attending Outdoor Sports and Life Satisfaction Level. 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference Sport and Quality of Life. 10-11 November 2011, Congress Center Brno/Czech Republic.
- Ardahan, F., (2012). The examine of Recreational Exercise Motivation Measure with Respect to Some Demographic Variables: Antalya Case. 1. Rekreasyon Arastirmalari Kongresi Proceedings Book. 12-15 April 2012, Antalya, Turkey, pp: 57-72.
- Ardahan, F., and Yerlisu Lapa T. (2011). Outdoor recreation: the reasons and carried benefits for attending outdoor sports of the participants of cycling and/or trekking activities. *Int. J. Human Sciences*, 8 (1), 1327-1341.
- Aslan, Z. (1993), The effect of Industrialization and Urbanization on the Need of Participating in Outdoor Activities. *Journal of Ecology and Environment*, 2 (8), 22-24.
- Ay, Z., Bilgin, F., Safak, I., and Akkas, M. E., (2005). Determining the profile of Licensed Hunters in Ege Region, Turkey. Ministry of Environment and Forestry Ege Forestry Research Institute, Technical Bulletin No: 27. Retrieved from [http://www.efri.gov.tr/yayinlar/Teknik\\_Bulten/tb27/tb27.pdf](http://www.efri.gov.tr/yayinlar/Teknik_Bulten/tb27/tb27.pdf) on 24th April 2012.
- Bauer, J., and Giles, J., (2002). Recreational Hunting, Wildlife Tourism Research Report Series: No. 13. Retrieved from [http://www.cic-wildlife.org/uploads/media/Bauer\\_recreational\\_hunting\\_2002\\_eng.pdf](http://www.cic-wildlife.org/uploads/media/Bauer_recreational_hunting_2002_eng.pdf) on 22nd April 2012.
- Buchanan, T., (1985). Commitment and leisure behavior: A theoretical perspective. *Leisure Sciences*, 7, 401-420.
- Bultena, G., and Field, D., (1980). Structural effects in national park going. *Leisure Sciences*, 3 (3), 221-240.
- Burger, J. (2002). Consumption Patterns and Why People Fish. *Environmental Research Section A*, 90, 125-135.
- Crandall, R., (1980). Motivation for Leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 12 (1), 45-54.

Dagdelen, M., (2008), The comparison of mental health level, distribution of mental signs, perceived health, occupational satisfaction, life satisfaction and socio-demographic characteristics among workers of production and service industries. Inonu University, Medicine Faculty Dissertation, Malatya.

Dann, S. (1993). 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.

Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J., and Griffin, S., (1985), The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49: 71-75

Ditton, R. (2004). Human dimensions of fisheries. In M. Manfredi, 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.

Driver, B. L., Brown, P., and Peterson, G. (1991). *Benefits of leisure*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.

Fedler, A., and Ditton, R. (1994). Understanding angler motivations in fisheries management. *Fisheries*, 19, 6-13.

Floyd, M.F., Nicholas, L., Lee, I., Lee, J., and Scott, D. (2006) Social stratification in recreational fishing participation: Research and policy implications. *Leisure Sciences*, 28 (4), 351-368.

Fraser, K.W., and Sweetapple P. J., (1992). Hunters and hunting patterns in part of the Kaimanawa Recreational Hunting Area, *New Zealand Journal of Zoology*, 19 (3-4): 91-98.

Government of Alberta Tourism, Parks and Recreation, (1994). A Look at Leisure. No: 34. Retrieved from [http://www.tpr.alberta.ca/recreation/ars/survey/pdf/LL34\\_favourite\\_activities.pdf](http://www.tpr.alberta.ca/recreation/ars/survey/pdf/LL34_favourite_activities.pdf) on 24 April 2012.

Harrington, M., and Dawson, D., (1995). Who has it best? Women's labor force participation, perceptions of leisure and constraints to leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27: 4-25.

Henderson, K., and Bialeschki, D. (1991). A sense of entitlement to leisure as constraint and empowerment for women. *Leisure Sciences*, 12, 51-65.

Herridge, K.L., Shaw, S.M., and Mannell, R.C., (2003). An exploration of women's leisure within hetero sexual romantic relationships. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 35:274-291.

Hicks, M.W., and Platt, M. (1970). Marital happiness and stability: A review of the research in the sixties. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 32, 553-574.

Hong, S.M., and Giannakopoulos, E., (1994). The relationship of satisfaction with life to personality characteristics. *Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 128 (5): 547-559.

Hunt, K., and Ditton, R.B. (2001). Perceived Benefits of Recreational Fishing to Hispanic-American and Anglo Anglers. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife: An International Journal*, 6 (3), 153-172.

Hunt, K., and Ditton, R.B. (2002). Freshwater fishing participation patterns of racial and ethnic groups in Texas. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 22, 52-65.

Ibrahim, H., Cordes, K. A., (2002). *Outdoor Recreation, Enrichment for a Lifetime* (2nd Edition). Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing.

Igircik, M., Yadigar, S., Bekiroglu, S., Okan, T., and Akkas, E., (2005). Profile of Hunters that Hunt within The Marmara Region. Ministry of Environment and Forestry Ege Forestry Research Institute, Technical Bulletin No: 29. Retrieved from [http://www.efri.gov.tr/yayinlar/Teknik\\_Bulten/tb29/tb29.pdf](http://www.efri.gov.tr/yayinlar/Teknik_Bulten/tb29/tb29.pdf) on 25th April 2012.

Jackson, E.L., and Henderson K.A., (1995). Gender-based analysis of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 17: 31-51.

Kelly, J. (1983). Leisure style: A hidden core. *Leisure Sciences*, 5 (4): 321-337.

Kindal A. Shores, D.S., and Myron, F.F., (2007). Constraints to Outdoor Recreation: A Multiple Hierarchy Stratification Perspective, *Leisure Sciences*, 29: 227-246.

Knopf, R., Driver, B., and Bassett, J. R. (1973). Motivations for fishing. *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*, 38, 191-204.

Laws, J. L. (1971) A feminist review of marital adjustment literature: The rape of locke. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 33, 483-516.

- Lee, J., Scott, D., and Floyd, M.F. (2001) Structural inequalities in outdoor recreation participation: A multiple hierarchy stratification perspective. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 33 (4), 427-449.
- Levy, J., (1979), Motivation for leisure: An interreactionist approach. In H. Ibrahim and R. Crandall (Eds.), *Leisure: A psychological approach*. Los Alamitos, CA: Hwong Publishing.
- Loomis, D.K., and Ditton, R.B. (1987). Analysis of Motive and Participation Differences between Saltwater Sport and Tournament Fishermen. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 7 (4), 482-487.
- Lucas, R. (1990). 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.
- Manfredo, M., Driver, B.L., and Tarrant M.A. (1996). Measuring leisure motivation: a meta-analysis of the recreation experience preference scales. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28 (3), 188-213.
- Manning, R.E. (1999). *Studies in Outdoor Recreation: Search and Research for Satisfaction*. Second Edition. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press.
- McLean, D.D., Hurd, A.R., and Rogers, N.B. (2008). *Kraus' Recreation and Leisure in Modern Society*. Sudbury: Jones and Barlett Publishers.
- Otacıoğlu, G. S., (2008). Analysis of Job and Life Satisfaction of Music Teachers. *Turkish Journal Music Education*, 1 (1): 37-45.
- Pigram, J.J., and Jenkins, J.M. (2006). *Outdoor Recreation Management*. New York: Routledge.
- Pinker, S. (2008). *The sexual paradox: Men, women and the real gender gap*. New York: Scribner.
- Safak, I., (2009). Avcı Derneklerine Üye Avcıların Kültürel Özellikleri (İzmir İli Örneği). *Online Thematic Journal of Turcic Studies*, 1 (1), 327-344.
- Safak, I., Ay, Z., Bilgin, F., and Ekkas, M. E., (2010). Ege Bolgesinde Av ve Yaban Hayati Yönetimindeki Sorunlar ve Manisa İli Avcı Profili. *Sarıgöl İlcesi ve Degerleri Sempozyumu Proceeding Book*, 17-19th February 2010, p. 377-387.
- Sagcan, M. (1986). *Recreation and Tourism*. Izmir: Cumhuriyet Publishing.
- Schmitter, C., (2003). Life satisfaction in centenarians residing in long-term care. Retrieved from <http://www.mmhc.com/articles/NHM9912/cutillo.html> on 19th April 2012.
- Scott, D., and Munson, W. (1994). Perceived constraints to park usage among individuals with low incomes. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 12 (4), 79-96.
- Shaw, S.M., and Henderson, K.A. (2005). Gender analysis and leisure constraints: An uneasy alliance. In E.L. Jackson (Ed.), *Constraints to leisure* (pp.23-34). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Solop, F.I., Hagen, K.K., and Ostergen, D. (2001). Back to nature: Visiting or not visiting our national parks. *Public Perspective*, 12 (4), 41-43.
- Telman, N., and Unsal, P., (2004). *Calisan Memnuniyeti*. Istanbul: Epsilon Yayınevi.
- Toth, J.F. Jr., and Brown, R.B. (1997). Racial and gender meanings of why people participate in recreational fishing. *Leisure Sciences*, 19, 129-136.
- TUIK (2012). Population with respect to education level, gender and age groups in Turkey - 2011. TUIK. Retrieved from [http://rapor.tuik.gov.tr/reports/rwservlet?adnksdb2&ENVID=adnksdb2Env&report=wa\\_turkiye\\_cinsiyet\\_ya\\_sgrp\\_egitim\\_top.RDF&p\\_xkod=egitim\\_kod&p\\_yil=2011&p\\_dil=1&desformat=html](http://rapor.tuik.gov.tr/reports/rwservlet?adnksdb2&ENVID=adnksdb2Env&report=wa_turkiye_cinsiyet_ya_sgrp_egitim_top.RDF&p_xkod=egitim_kod&p_yil=2011&p_dil=1&desformat=html) on 03 April 2012.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, (1996). 1996 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/3/97pubs/fhw96nat.pdf> on 22nd April 2012.
- Wearing, B. (1999). *Leisure and Feminist Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- White, T.H. (1975). Relative importance of education and income as predictors in outdoor recreation participation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 7 (3), 191-199.
- Wilde, G.R., Riechers, R.K., and Ditton, R.B. (1998). Differences in Attitudes, Fishing Motives, and Demographic Characteristics between Tournament and Non-tournament Black Bass Anglers in Texas. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 18 (2), 422-431.