

Full Length Research Paper

Problem solving skills of people doing sporty recreation activities in Karaman Province

Sefa Şahan BİROL

Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey.

Received 09 June, 2015; Accepted 18 June, 2015

The aim of the study is to examine the problem solving skills of people who are doing sporty recreation activities in Karaman Province. A total of 143 people participated in this study (51 females and 92 males) Their age mean was 1.2168 ± 0.41350 . Problem Solving Inventory, developed by Heppner and Peterson, was used to measure the problem solving skill level of an individual. The Turkish version of the problem Solving Inventory was realized by Şahin et al. For processing data, conventional statistical measures and methods were employed: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) test, tukey test, t-test, mean frequency distribution and standard deviation. SPSS was used for analyzing of data. Results showed that the people who participated in the study had problem solving skill total score of 101.9930 mean. When values which could be taken from the total score of the inventory (32 min - max 192) were considered, it could be said that the teachers had moderate problem-solving skills. Statistically meaningful difference was found for the gender variable in considering and planned approaches; for age variable in avoidant approach; for marital status variable in impetuous and evaluator approached and for place where people live variable in impetuous approach ($p < .05$).

Key words: Problem solving, recreation, sports.

INTRODUCTION

Leisure is complex concept with different meanings depending on the context and the person. From beginning of human history, leisure has been a part of every day life. Legacies from ancient cultures endure today. For example, ancient Greece has given us a spiritual interpretation of leisure, ancient Rome is recognized as the origin of mass recreation and the Middle ages has added that touch of guilt we sometimes feel when we choose our favorite pastime over work (Russell, 1996). As history shows, leisure has gained its

significance for both the individual and society. An understanding of the concepts of play, leisure and work is not only a basic requirement for any leisure scholar or professional, but it can also enhance individual leisure experience (Bull et al., 2003). Modern technology eliminated every need for a man to be physically active and the consequences are reflected in reducing physical and physiological factor of potential. Today's man, more than ever, needs daily body activity that he carries out during leisure (Sindik et al., 2009).

E-mail: veyselltemel@gmail.com, veyselltemel@kmu.edu.tr

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Playing, rest, entertainment oriented leisure time activities is important in every part of life. Thus, it is important to put forward how people spend their leisure time. Leisure time has found place not only in sports but also in many sciences like sociology, psychology and economics. According to French Sociologist Dumazedier, the description of leisure time is “ an activity which an individual prompts his own creative capacity to relax and to increase his knowledge and his participation into the community out of work, family and social obligations (Tel and Koksalan, 2008). At the same time, it is stated that recreative activities brought by leisure time provide economical benefit (Karakucuk, 2005). Nevertheless, leisure time is known as a notion which is used for the activities related to recreation, culture, sport and rest (Kooijman, 2002). Along with the raising technology, individuals have more leisure time, participating into the leisure time activities more depending on their income level and more leisure time activities in the sense of socialising has become an important element.

Leisure is often divided into a number of separate categories, such as indoor and outdoor leisure, sport, countryside recreation, arts and entertainment and tourism. When we look at the indoors' activities, home is the first alternative of the indoors activity. The home has always played some role in leisure provision, if for no other reason than that most people have always spent a good part of their lives there and have needed some amusements to occupy themselves. They include reading, music, painting and social entertaining (Bull, 2003). Since outdoor recreationists are in direct contact with nature, it is generally assumed that they are more likely to appreciate the natural surroundings and espouse a proenvironmental orientation (Thapa, 2010). Everyone has opportunities for leisure and recreation; and by understanding the nature of these activities, you may come to a better grasp of their potentials. By studying leisure and recreation in your society, you may enhance your own potential for participation and enjoyment (Bammel and Bammel, 1996).

Problem was defined as an obstacle against available difficulties gathered by an individual to reach his target (Bingham, 1983). Keeneland described the problem as the difference between the available and expected situation of something (Keeneland, 1999). According to Morgan, problem was described as the case of conflict when the individual encountered and hindrance while reaching a target and he defended that it would be harder to reach the target with this hindrance and finding the best way to overcome the hindrance meant solving the problem (Morgan, 1982). People face a lot of situations for solving problems in their daily lives. Problem solving is reasoning and problem-overcoming process starting from

the individual's feeling the difficulties that he faces in reaching a target and to the duration that he spends till he finds a solution to it (Ülküer, 1988). This process aims to look for the ways to restore organisms' inner balance and to get rid of the stress through obeying the rules and decreasing the hindrances. Therefore, problem solving is a comprehensive knowledge and skill which should be learnt and obtained and it should always be enhanced (Bingham, 1983; Sungur, 1992). Problem solving varies with the types of problem. Problems are solved by different ways: some need to be approached emotional, while others need to be approached with a new perception. The common way of solving problem is to remove obstacles that hinder one from achieving one's aim (Cüceoğlu, 2003).

METHODS

Study universe and sample

In this study, it was aimed to investigate problem solving skills of people doing sporty recreation activities in Karaman Province. The study comprises a descriptive study. The result obtained from the research was restricted to 143 people of 155 participants, but the 12 survey was excluded from evaluation (a total of 51 females and 92 males; age: 1.2168 ± 0.41350).

Data collection tool

In the study, The participants were given questionnaires. Problem Solving Inventory, developed by Heppner and Peterson (1982), was used to measure the problem solving skill level of the individuals. The Turkish version of the problem Solving Inventory has been realized by Şahin et al. (1993) and the personal information sheet of 12 questions was used.

Problem solving inventory

This inventory scored between 1 and 6 is Likert type and measures one's own perceptions about one's problem solving skills. In the course of scoring 9th, 22nd and 29th items were left aside from scoring. The 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 11th, 14th, 15th, 17th, 21st, 25th, 30th and 34th items are scored in the inventory. The Problem Solving Inventory has six sub-dimensions which are: Impetuous Approach, Considering Approach, Avoidant Approach, Evaluator Approach, Self-assured Approach and Planned Approach. The least point is one and the utmost point is 6 in the answer key. At least, 32 and utmost 192 points can be taken in the whole Problem Solving Inventory. The total high score from the scale indicates that the individuals are perceived to be inadequate with regards to problem solving (Şahin et al., 1993).

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Descriptive frequency and percentage distributions to the students'

personal characteristics forming the sample group are created. One sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to know whether the scale used in the analysis of data is appropriate to the normal distribution ($p > .05$). Analysis of variance of the parametric tests instead of Kruskal Wallis- H test and t test instead of Mann-Whitney-U test were used. To evaluate the statistics, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Windows version 21,00 package programme was used. And also mean frequency distribution and standard deviation were done.

FINDINGS

In the first part of the study, problem solving levels of people were determined. In the first phrase of the research, demographic characteristics were analyzed. This study was done with the aim of presenting people doing sports recreation activities in Karaman, Turkey, problem solving skills. The information obtained was interpreted as follows: in the first phase of the study, the demographic features of the participating people were determined. According to this, 51(35.7%) participants were females and 92(64.3%) were male. The age distribution of the people was: 112(78.3%) of them were 25 and less; 31(21.7%) of them were between 26 and 30 (Age (1.2168 ± 0.41350)). The marital status dispersion of the people was such: 123(86.0%) were singles and 20(14.0%) were married. The education status dispersion of the participants was as such: 49(34.3%) of them had a Bachelor degree, 78(54.5%) of them graduated from high school and also 16(11.2%) of them graduated from secondary school. When the residence of the people was analyzed, rate of the people living in a metropole was 31(21.7%), in a city was 50(35.0%), in a town was 38(26.6%) and in a village and small town was 24(16.8%). The rate of the people's income was; 67(46.9%) of them in 750 TL, 56(39.2%) of them between 751 TL and 1500 TL and 20(14.0%) of them between 1501 TL and 2250 TL. When free time activity hours were analyzed; 35(24.5%) of them spent for 1-2 h, 46(32.2%) of them spent for 3-4 h, 45(31.5%) of them spent for 5-6 h and 17(11.9%) of them spent for 7 h and over. For free time enough for them, rate of said "enough" was 91(63.6%) and "not enough" was 52(36.4%). In the reason for doing the activities, 35(24.5%) of them said for "avoidance of daily routine activities", 20(14.0%) for "getting social society", 36(25.2%) for "relaxing spiritually and mentally", 39(27.3) for having healthy life and 13(9.1) for avoidance of working life". For sports facilities, 53(37.1) of them said "yes" and "no", 90(62.9). According to the doing sports recreation frequency, 48(33.6%) said "once a week"; "twice a week", 52(36.4%); "three times a week", 30(21.0%) and "four times a week", 13(9.1%). In sports centre, how many hours you spent, people said

"one hour" 35(24.5%), "two hours" 64(44.8%) and "three hours" 44(30.8%).

In the second part of the study, problem solving skills of the people doing sporty recreation activities in Karaman province were determined.

In Table 1, problem solving sub-dimension and total points of people participating in the search were analyzed. At the end of this search, impetuous approach was found as $\bar{X} = 32,8182$ (min 9 – max 54). So it can be said that its point is high-level. Considering approach was $\bar{X} = 14,2937$ (min 5 – max 30), avoidant approach was $\bar{X} = 13,9720$ (min 4 – max 24) and self-assured approach was $\bar{X} = 21,78232$ (min 7 – max 42). So it can be said that their points are over the mid-level. And also evaluator approach was $\bar{X} = 8,2308$ (min 3 – max 18) and planned approach was $\bar{X} = 10,8951$ (min 4 – max 24). So it can be said that their points are mid-level.

Finally, problem solving total point was $\bar{X} = 101,9930$. Problem solving total point regarded as the minimum score was 32 and maximum score was 192 total point of the scale. Where people's total point was $\bar{X} = 101,9930$ in the problem solving inventory examined, it can be said that people participating in the research have high level problem solving skills.

In Table 2, problem solving sub-dimension and t-test results were analysed whether or not they differ according to "Gender Variable". According to the table, while the women's point in Impetuous Approach is $\bar{X} = 31,2745$, the men's point is $\bar{X} = 33,6739$ and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of impetuous approach point (t:-1, 969 p: ,279<0,05).

While the women's point in Considering Approach is $\bar{X} = 14,1176$, the men's point is $\bar{X} = 14,3913$ and a meaningful difference was found in terms of Considering Approach point (t:-0,355 p: ,000>0,05). While the women's point in Avoidant Approach is $\bar{X} = 12,8824$, the men's point is $\bar{X} = 14,5761$ and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of Avoidant Approach point (t:-1, 841 p: ,167<0,05). While the women's point in Evaluator Approach is $\bar{X} = 7,5294$, the men's point is $\bar{X} = 8,6196$ and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of Evaluator Approach point (t:-2,177 p: ,099<0,05). While the women's point in Self-assured Approach is $\bar{X} =$

Table 1. Results of people related to \bar{X} and Ss values of problem solving sub-dimensions and total point.

| Sub-dimensions of problem solving inventory | n | \bar{X} | Ss | Min. | Max. | The max. and min. points in the inventory |
|---|-----|-----------|----------|-------|--------|---|
| Impetuous Approach | 143 | 32,8182 | 7,04976 | 13,00 | 54,00 | 9-54 |
| Considering Approach | 143 | 14,2937 | 4,39883 | 5,00 | 25,00 | 5-30 |
| Avoidant Approach | 143 | 13,9720 | 5,31533 | 4,00 | 24,00 | 4-24 |
| Evaluator Approach | 143 | 8,2308 | 2,90626 | 3,00 | 16,00 | 3-18 |
| Self-assured Approach | 143 | 21,7832 | 5,12401 | 7,00 | 38,00 | 7-42 |
| Planned Approach | 143 | 10,8951 | 3,98892 | 4,00 | 22,00 | 4-24 |
| Total Point | 143 | 101,9930 | 16,85376 | 47,00 | 145,00 | 32-192 |

Table 2. According to gender variable, problem solving skills related to the sub-dimensions and total score t- test results.

| Sub-dimensions of problem solving inventory | Gender | n | \bar{X} | s | Sd | t | p-Value |
|---|--------|----|-----------|----------|-----|--------|---------|
| Impetuous Approach | Woman | 51 | 31,2745 | 7,30227 | 141 | -1,969 | ,279 |
| | Man | 92 | 33,6739 | 6,79546 | | | |
| Considering Approach | Woman | 51 | 14,1176 | 3,27809 | 141 | -,355 | ,000 |
| | Man | 92 | 14,3913 | 4,92573 | | | |
| Avoidant Approach | Woman | 51 | 12,8824 | 5,65561 | 141 | -1,841 | ,167 |
| | Man | 92 | 14,5761 | 5,04754 | | | |
| Evaluator Approach | Woman | 51 | 7,5294 | 2,54836 | 141 | -2,177 | ,099 |
| | Man | 92 | 8,6196 | 3,03040 | | | |
| Self-assured Approach | Woman | 51 | 20,4706 | 4,44681 | 141 | -2,316 | ,182 |
| | Man | 92 | 22,5109 | 5,34830 | | | |
| Planned Approach | Woman | 51 | 10,2745 | 3,12460 | 141 | -1,390 | ,003 |
| | Man | 92 | 11,2391 | 4,37367 | | | |
| Total Point | Woman | 51 | 96,5490 | 15,22014 | 141 | -2,953 | ,929 |
| | Man | 92 | 105,0109 | 17,03358 | | | |

*p<.05.

20,4706, the men's point is $\bar{X} = 22,5109$ and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of Self-

assured Approach point (t:-2,316 p:,182<0,05). While the women's point in Planned Approach is $\bar{X} = 10,2745$, the

Table 3. According to age variable, problem solving skills related to the sub-dimensions and total score t- test results.

| Sub-dimensions of problem solving inventory | Age | n | \bar{X} | Ss | Sd | t | p-Value |
|---|--------------|-----|-----------|----------|-----|--------|---------|
| Impetuous Approach | 25 and lower | 112 | 32,9196 | 6,80241 | 141 | ,326 | ,613 |
| | 26-30 | 31 | 32,4516 | 7,99099 | | | |
| Considering Approach | 25 and lower | 112 | 14,1250 | 4,41767 | 141 | -,871 | ,838 |
| | 26-30 | 31 | 14,9032 | 4,34630 | | | |
| Avoidant Approach | 25 and lower | 112 | 14,3661 | 5,47557 | 141 | 1,696 | ,011 |
| | 26-30 | 31 | 12,5484 | 4,48582 | | | |
| Evaluator Approach | 25 and lower | 112 | 7,8750 | 2,90425 | 141 | -2,851 | ,502 |
| | 26-30 | 31 | 9,5161 | 2,56737 | | | |
| Self-assured Approach | 25 and lower | 112 | 21,3661 | 5,09371 | 141 | -1,867 | ,671 |
| | 26-30 | 31 | 23,2903 | 5,02788 | | | |
| Planned Approach | 25 and lower | 112 | 10,8750 | 4,08055 | 141 | -,114 | ,700 |
| | 26-30 | 31 | 10,9677 | 3,70121 | | | |
| Total Point | 25 and lower | 112 | 101,5268 | 16,08926 | 141 | -,627 | ,069 |
| | 26-30 | 31 | 103,6774 | 19,56934 | | | |

*p<.05.

men's point is $\bar{X} = 11,2391$ and a meaningful difference was found in terms of Planned Approach point (t:-1,390 p:,.003>0,05). While the women's point in Total Point is $\bar{X} = 10,2745$, the men's point is $\bar{X} = 11,2391$ and a meaningful difference was found in terms of Total Point (t:-2,953 p:,.929<0,05).

In Table 3, problem solving sub-dimension and t-test results were analysed whether or not they differ according to "Age Variable". According to the table, while 25 and lower point of the people in Impetuous Approach is $\bar{X} = 32,9196$, their point between 26-30 age is $\bar{X} = 32,4516$ and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of impetuous approach point (t:,.326 p:,.613<0,05).

While 25 and lower point of the people in Considering Approach is $\bar{X} = 14,1250$, their point between 26-30 age is $\bar{X} = 14,9032$ and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of Considering Approach point (t:,-0,871 p:,.838<0,05). While 25 and lower point of the people in

Avoidant Approach is $\bar{X} = 14,3661$, their point between 26-30 age is 12,5484, and a meaningful difference was found in terms of Avoidant Approach point (t:1, 696 p:,.011>0,05). While 25 and lower point of the people in Evaluator Approach is $\bar{X} = 7,8750$, their point between 26-30 age is $\bar{X} = 9,5161$ and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of Evaluator Approach point (t:-2,851 p:,.502<0,05). While 25 and lower point of the people in Self-assured Approach is $\bar{X} = 21,3661$, their point between 26-30 age is $\bar{X} = 23,2903$ and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of Self-assured Approach point (t:,-1,867 p:,.671<0,05).

While 25 and lower point of the people in planned approach is $\bar{X} = 10,8750$, their point between 26-30 age is $\bar{X} = 10,9677$ and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of planned approach point (t:,-,114 p:,.700<0,05). While 25 and lower people' point

Table 4. According To marital status variable, problem solving skills related to the sub-dimensions and total score t- test results.

| Sub-dimensions of Problem Solving Inventory | Age | n | \bar{X} | Ss | Sd | t | p-Value |
|---|---------|-----|-----------|----------|-----|-------|---------|
| Impetuous Approach | Single | 123 | 33,0569 | 6,50132 | 141 | 1,004 | ,029 |
| | Married | 20 | 31,3500 | 9,86901 | | | |
| Considering Approach | Single | 123 | 14,3984 | 4,44961 | 141 | ,704 | ,639 |
| | Married | 20 | 13,6500 | 4,12023 | | | |
| Avoidant Approach | Single | 123 | 14,3333 | 5,36178 | 141 | 2,038 | ,077 |
| | Married | 20 | 11,7500 | 4,52915 | | | |
| Evaluator Approach | Single | 123 | 8,2602 | 3,03757 | 141 | ,299 | ,007 |
| | Married | 20 | 8,0500 | 1,95946 | | | |
| Self-assured Approach | Single | 123 | 21,9756 | 5,21578 | 141 | 1,114 | ,551 |
| | Married | 20 | 20,6000 | 4,45327 | | | |
| Planned Approach | Single | 123 | 10,9675 | 4,08904 | 141 | ,537 | ,224 |
| | Married | 20 | 10,4500 | 3,36350 | | | |
| Total Point | Single | 123 | 102,9919 | 16,41645 | 141 | 1,771 | ,762 |
| | Married | 20 | 95,8500 | 18,60751 | | | |

*p<.05.

participating the research in Total Point is $\bar{X} = 101,5268$, people's point between 26-30 age is $\bar{X} = 103,6774$ and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of total point (t: -,627 p: ,069<0,05).

In Table 4, problem solving sub-dimension and t-test results were analysed whether or not they differ according to "Marital Status Variable". According to the table, while single people's point in impetuous Approach is $\bar{X} = 33,0569$, married people's point is $\bar{X} = 31,3500$; a meaningful difference was found in terms of impetuous approach point (t:1,004 p: ,029>0,05).

While single people's point in Considering Approach is $\bar{X} = 14,3984$, married people's point is $\bar{X} = 13,6500$; a meaningful difference was not found in terms of Considering Approach point (t:-0,704 p: ,639<0,05).

While single people's point in Avoidant Approach is $\bar{X} = 14,3333$, married people's point is $\bar{X} = 11,7500$, and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of Avoidant Approach point (t:2,038 p: ,077<0,05).

While single people' point participating the research in Evaluator Approach is $\bar{X} = 8,2602$, married people's point is $\bar{X} = 8,0500$ and a meaningful difference was found in terms of Evaluator Approach point (t:0,299 p: ,007>0,05). While single people' point participating the research in Self-assured Approach is $\bar{X} = 21,9756$, married people's point is $\bar{X} = 20,6000$ and a meaningful difference was not found in terms of Self-assured Approach point (t:1,114 p: ,551<0,05). While single people's point in Planned Approach is $\bar{X} = 10,9675$, married people's point is $\bar{X} = 10,4500$; a meaningful difference was not found in terms of Planned Approach point (t: ,537 p: ,224<0,05). While single people's point in total point is $\bar{X} = 102,9919$, married people's point is $\bar{X} = 95,8500$; a meaningful difference was not found in terms of Total Point (t:1,771 p: ,762<0,05).

In Table 5, problem solving sub-dimension and The Oneway Anova test results were analysed to know

Table 5. According to place where people live variable, problem solving skills related to the sub-dimensions and total score The Oneway Anova test results.

| Sub-dimensions of problem solving inventory | Entered the lesson hour | n | \bar{X} | Ss | Sd | F | p-value | Meaningful differences Tukey test |
|---|-------------------------|----|-----------|----------|-----|-------|---------|-----------------------------------|
| Impetuous Approach | Metropole | 31 | 31,7419 | 7,71565 | | | | |
| | City | 50 | 32,0000 | 7,49694 | | | | |
| | Town | 38 | 35,7105 | 5,52590 | 139 | 3,082 | ,030 | 4-2 |
| | Towns and villages | 24 | 31,3333 | 6,41782 | | | | 4-3 |
| Considering Approach | Metropole | 31 | 13,6129 | 4,93070 | | | | |
| | City | 50 | 14,9800 | 3,59983 | | | | |
| | Town | 38 | 13,3158 | 4,88298 | 139 | | | |
| | Towns and villages | 24 | 15,2917 | 4,18568 | | 1,717 | ,166 | ---- |
| Avoidant Approach | Metropole | 31 | 13,0645 | 5,11166 | | | | |
| | City | 50 | 13,7200 | 4,98995 | | | | |
| | Town | 38 | 15,1316 | 5,44839 | 139 | | | |
| | Towns and villages | 24 | 13,8333 | 6,00483 | | ,946 | ,420 | ---- |
| Evaluator Approach | Metropole | 31 | 7,7419 | 2,46262 | | | | |
| | City | 50 | 8,7400 | 2,67116 | | | | |
| | Town | 38 | 7,7368 | 3,25231 | | | | |
| | Towns and villages | 24 | 8,5833 | 3,25599 | 139 | 1,296 | ,278 | ---- |
| Self-assured Approach | Metropole | 31 | 19,9677 | 5,60645 | | | | |
| | City | 50 | 22,6600 | 4,39206 | | | | |
| | Town | 38 | 22,1842 | 4,79783 | | | | |
| | Towns and villages | 24 | 21,6667 | 6,04812 | 139 | 1,902 | ,132 | ---- |
| Planned Approach | Metropole | 31 | 10,6452 | 4,32472 | | | | |
| | City | 50 | 11,3000 | 3,97569 | | | | |
| | Town | 38 | 10,6053 | 3,71658 | | | | |
| | Towns and villages | 24 | 10,8333 | 4,16681 | 139 | ,277 | ,842 | ---- |
| Total Point | Metropole | 31 | 96,7742 | 18,78778 | | | | |
| | City | 50 | 103,4000 | 16,26314 | | | | |
| | Town | 38 | 104,6842 | 12,03397 | | | | |
| | Towns and villages | 24 | 101,5417 | 21,06301 | 139 | 1,449 | ,231 | ---- |

*p<.05.

whether or not they differ according to “Place where the people live Variable”. According to the table, the people’s point living in a Metropole in impetuous Approach is $\bar{X} = 31,7419$, people’s point living in a city is $\bar{X} = 32,0000$, the people’s point living in a town is $\bar{X} = 35,7105$ and the people’s point living in a town and a village is $\bar{X} =$

35,7105; a meaningful difference was found in terms of impetuous approach point (F:3,082 p: ,030>0,05).

The people’s point living in a metropole in Considering Approach is $\bar{X} = 13,6129$, the people’s point living in a city is $\bar{X} = 14,9800$, the people’s point living in a town is $\bar{X} = 13,3158$ and people’s point living in a Town and a

village is $\bar{X} = 15,2917$; a meaningful difference was found in terms of considering approach point (F:1,717 p: ,166<0,05).

The people's point living in a metropole in Avoidant Approach is $\bar{X} = 13,0645$, people's point living in a city is $\bar{X} = 13,7200$, people's point living in a town is $\bar{X} = 15,1316$ and people's point living in a Town and a village is $\bar{X} = 13,8333$; a meaningful difference was found in terms of avoidant approach point (F:0,946 p: ,420<0,05).

The people's point living in a metropole in Evaluator Approach is $\bar{X} = 7,7419$, the people's point living in a city is $\bar{X} = 8,7400$, people's point living in a town is $\bar{X} = 7,7368$ and the people's point living in a Town and a village is $\bar{X} = 8,5833$; a meaningful difference was found in terms of evaluator approach point (F:1,296 p: ,278 <0,05).

The people's point living in a metropole in Self-assured Approach is $\bar{X} = 19,9677$, the people's point living in a city is $\bar{X} = 22,6600$, the people's point living in a town is $\bar{X} = 22,1842$ and the people's point living in a Town and a village is $\bar{X} = 21,6667$; a meaningful difference was found in terms of self assured approach point (F:1,902 p: ,132 <0,05).

The people's point living in a metropole in Planned Approach is $\bar{X} = 10,6452$, the people's point living in a city is $\bar{X} = 11,3000$, people's point living in a town is $\bar{X} = 10,6053$ and people's point living in a Town and a village is $\bar{X} = 10,8333$; a meaningful difference was found in terms of self assured approach point (F:.,277 p: ,842 <0,05).

The people's point living in a metropole in Total Point is $\bar{X} = 96,7742$, the people's point living in a city is $\bar{X} = 103,4000$, the people's point living in a town is $\bar{X} = 104,6842$ and the people's point living in a Town and a village is $\bar{X} = 101,5417$; a meaningful difference was found in terms of total point (F:1,449 p: ,231 <0,05).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study was carried out to find out whether or not problem solving skills of people doing sporty recreation

activities in Karaman Province differ according to the variables of gender, age, marital status, the place where he/she lives, income status, leisure time, having enough leisure time, doing the activities, enough facilities of sports, how often you do, how many hours you do in a day.

As a result of the study, impetuous approach was found as $\bar{X} = 32,8182$ (min 9 – max 54). So it can be said that its point is high-level. Considering approach was $\bar{X} = 14,2937$ (min 5 – max 30), avoidant approach was $\bar{X} = 13,9720$ (min 4 – max 24) and self-assured approach was $\bar{X} = 21,78232$ (min 7 – max 42). So it can be said that their points are over mid-level. And also Evaluator approach was $\bar{X} = 8,2308$ (min 3 – max 18) and planned approach was $\bar{X} = 10,8951$ (min 4 – max 24). So it can be said that their points are mid-level. Finally, problem solving total point was $\bar{X} = 101,9930$. Problem solving total point was minimum 32 and maximum 192 total point of the scale. Where people's total point was $\bar{X} = 101,9930$ in the problem solving inventory examined, it can be said that people participating in the research have high level problem solving skills. According to the gender variable, a meaningful difference was found in terms of Considering Approach point (t:-0,355 p: ,000>0,05). According to the age variable, a meaningful difference was found in terms of Avoidant Approach point (t:1, 696 p: ,011>0,05). According to the marital status, a meaningful difference was found in terms of impetuous approach point (t:1,004 p: ,029>0,05); a meaningful difference was found in terms of Evaluator Approach point (t:0,299 p: ,007>0,05) and also according to the place where people live variable, a meaningful difference was found in terms of impetuous approach point (F:3,082 p: ,030>0,05); so people who live in town and city have impetuous behave.

Temel (2015) found that problem solving mean score of teachers who participated in the study was 101.1569. When values which can be taken from the total score of the inventory (32 min - max 192) are considered, it can be said that the teachers have moderate problem-solving skills.

Mutlu and Ark (2011) studied the people who participated in health and wellness programme in Sport Centre in Kayseri. Besides Mutlu and Ark (2011), it was seen that "Amotivation" points were higher in males and knowing and achieving points were higher in females.

In the study of Griffin and McKenna (1998) and Riddick

(1986), it appeared as a variance-causing variable in the study of Gökçe (2008), which is consistent with the findings in this study. The fact that perceived freedom in leisure scores cause a variation according to age in this study is not consistent with the findings of Stelzer (2000). This might have resulted from the fact that Stelzer (2000) included very young individuals in the study and kept age range rather low.

Borke et al. (2009) found that there was a positive relationship between economic satisfaction and leisure satisfaction. The literature contains studies which are similar to or differ from the findings of the present study. For example, Mancini (1978) carried out a study on the elderly and found that leisure satisfaction level was not affected by income level. Tze (2005) carried out a study on a total of 993 participants in Macao region of Peoples Republic of China and reported that leisure satisfaction level did not vary according to income. The fact that perceived freedom in leisure did not vary according to income is consistent with the study of Samuel (2003).

Conflict of Interests

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank Assistant Professor Veysel TEMEL, Physical Education and Sports Department, for helping in the data acquisition.

REFERENCES

- Bammel G, Bammel LLB (1996). *Leisure&Human Behaviour*, Third Edition, Brown&Benchmark Publishers,4.
- Bingham A (1983). *Development of problem solving ability in children*. Trans .: Dr. A. Ferhan Oğuzkan, 4th edition, Ministry of Education Publications, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Bingham A (1983). *Development of problem solving ability in children*. Trans .: Dr. A. Ferhan Oğuzkan, 4th edition, Ministry of Education Publications, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Borke J, Dedding M, Lausten M (2009). Time and money: A simultaneous analysis of men's and women's domain satisfactions. *J. Happiness Stud.* 10(2):113–131.
- Bull C, Hoose J, Weed M (2003). *An Introduction To Leisure Studies*, Prentice Hall, Financial Times, 26:60.
- Cüceoğlu D (2003). *Human and Behavior*. Remzi Publishing House, İstanbul, Turkey. Pp.18.
- Gokce H (2008). *Examining of the leisure satisfaction with the relation between life satisfaction and socio-demographic variables* (Master Thesis). Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey.
- Griffin J, McKenna K (1998). Influences on leisure and life satisfaction of elderly people. *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Geriatrics*, 15(4):1-16.
- Heppner PP, Peterson CH (1982). The development and implications of a personal problem-solving inventory. *J. Counsel. Psychol.* 29:66- 75.
- Karakucuk S (2005). *Recreation*, Ankara: Gazi Publishing.
- Kooijman D (2002). A third revolution in retail? The Dutch approach to leisure and urban entertainment, *J. Retail Leisure Property*, 2 (3):214-229.
- Mancini JA (1978). Leisure satisfaction and psychologic well-being in old age: Effects of health and income. *J. Am. Geriatrics Society*, 26(12):550-552.
- Morgan CT (1982). *Introduction to psychology*. Trans.:Arıcı H. et al., Meteksan, Ankara-Turkey.
- Mutlu I, Yılmaz B, Gungormus HA, Sevindi T, Gurbuz B (2011). The comparison of the factors making motivate to the individuals with the aim of the recreation to the exercises in terms of the some variables. *Selcuk University, Physical Educational and Sports Scientific J.* pp. 54-61.
- Riddick CC (1986). Leisure satisfaction precursors. *J. Leisure Res.* 18(4):259-265.
- Russell RV (1996). *Pastimes, The Context of Contemporary, Leisure*, Brown&Benchmark Publishers, 3.
- Sahin N, Nesrin HS, Heppner P (1993). Psychometric Properties of The Problem Solving Inventory in A Group of Turkish University Student. *Cognit. Ther. Res.* 17(3):379-385.
- Samuel BF (2003). *Perceived measure of women 50 to 65 years of age* (Doctoral Thesis). Purdue University, USA.
- Sindik J, Andrijasevic M, Curkovic S (2009), Relation of Student Attitude Toward Leisure Time Activities and Their Preferences Toward Sport Recreation Activities, *Acta Kinesiologica* 3(1):54-58.
- Stelzer J (2000). *The relationship between perceived freedom in leisure and delinquency behaviors in middle school students* (Doctoral Thesis). The University of New Mexico, New Mexico, USA.
- Sungur N (1992). *Creative thinking*. Acer Printing, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Tel M, Köksalan B (2008). The investigation of the academics' sports activities sociologically (East Anatolia Sample), *Firat University, Social Scientific J.* 18:261-278.
- Temel V (2015). The problem-solving skills of the teachers in various branches. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10(5):641-647.
- Thapa B (2010). *The Mediation Effect Of Outdoor Recreation Participation on Environmental Attitude-Behaviour Correspondence*, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA, *J. Environmental Educ.* 41(3): 133-150.
- Ulkuer NS (1988). How do children acquire problem solving skills? *Lifelong Education*, n = 5.
- Tze Vong N (2005). Leisure satisfaction and quality of life in Macao, China. *Leisure Studi.* 24(2):195-207.