European Journal of Education Studies
ISSN: 2501 - 1111
ISSN-L: 2501 - 1111
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

doi: 10.5281/zenodo.3694138 Volume 7 | Issue 1 | 2020

EXPLORING INTRINSIC LEISURE MOTIVATIONS OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Ali Selman Özdemir[i]
Asst. Prof., Cyprus International University,
Physical Education and Sport Department, Nicosia,
Cyprus

Abstract:
The aim of the study to determine the intrinsic leisure motivation level of university students and to evaluate the relationship and differences between some variables. 739 university students from different fields participated in the study and the data were collected with "Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale'' developed by Weissinger and Bandalos (1995), adapted to Turkish which consists of 5 sub-dimensions and 23 items by Özdemir, Ayyıldız Durhan and Karaküçük (2020). Descriptive statistics, independent one-sample test, one-way ANOVA test and Tukey (HSD-LSD) test were used for data analysis. In this study, the intrinsic consistency coefficient of .83 for Competence-Challenge, .86 for Self-Determination, .77 for Commitment, .71 for Identification and .70 for Amotivation were obtained. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the intrinsic leisure motivation scores of the university students were above the average values (111.71 ± 21.00) for this sample group. The lowest average (13.76 ± 4.32) was obtained. Significant relationships and differences were determined according to gender, the field of study, school year and perceived welfare levels of the participants. According to this, a significant difference was found in favor of men according to the Identification sub-dimension and in favor of women according to Amotivation sub-dimension. When the differences between the learning fields and the measurement tool were examined, it was observed that sports science students showed higher ILM in all significant differences than the students in other learning fields. In the perceived welfare variable, it was found that the participants who perceived welfare levels as normal had higher levels of intrinsic leisure motivation than the other participants. At the same time, it can be said that the motivation for intrinsic leisure time increases as the school year increases. As a result of the research, it can be stated that the level of intrinsic leisure motivation of university students is high and variables such as gender, education field and year, perceived welfare level differ.

Keywords: intrinsic motivation, leisure motivation, university students

[i] Correspondence: email ozdemiraliselman@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Leisure is defined as a freely chosen activity, which involves meaningful, internally motivated, and enjoyable experiences outside of obligatory works, such as school or a job (Godbey, 1994). Motivation is defined as influences that initiate, direct, and sustain human behavior (Iso-Ahola, 1999). Leisure motivation can be defined as a need, reason or satisfaction that encourages participation of leisure activity (Crandall, 1980). Understanding motivational factors for participation and engagement in leisure activities has long been considered important in the field, as motivation has been found to influence participation (Crandall, 1980; Iso-Ahola, 1989; Frederick & Ryan, 1993; Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006; Caldwell et al., 2010; Kim, Brown & Yang 2019).

There are a number of theoretical perspectives that address motivation. For the conceptualisation of motivation in this study, the self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan, 1985) were used, which proposes that behaviour can be intrinsically motivated, extrinsically motivated or amotivated (Ryan and Deci, 2007). Of particular relevance to the leisure context is self-determination theory, which provides a differentiated approach to conceptualizing motivation. According to this theory, motivation exists along a continuum that represents variation in the degree to which one acts for internal or external reasons or rewards (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Three types of motivations are developed across the self-determination continuum, as an individual move from intrinsically motivated to extrinsically motivated behavior and finally to amotivation. Intrinsic motivation is defined as the performance of an activity for no reward except the direct enjoyment of the activity itself (Deci, 1971). It refers to engaging in an activity for the pleasure and satisfaction and in the absence of external rewards (Deci and Ryan, 1985). Intrinsic motivational processes identify individuals who are more oriented to being involved in and experiencing leisure as intrinsically rewarding (Weissinger & Bandalos, 1995; Weissinger & Iso-Ahola, 1984). Within the three types of motivation, intrinsic motivation is thought to be the highest source of human motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Leisure is a major context for the experience of intrinsic motivation as it provides an opportunity for agency and self-determined behavior, exploration of interests, identity development, skill development, and pursuit of meaningful and personally expressive experiences over time (Caldwell, 2005; Larson, 2000). Intrinsic motivation is usually privileged in the leisure literature as the hallmark of what leisure is.

An understanding of individual motivation and subdimensions like intrinsic motivation, as it relates to participation, will help develop a deeper conceptualization of leisure motivation in a leisure activity setting and provide valuable information to administrators of leisure activity programs. Likewise, understanding motivations and motivation theories can help campus recreation professionals to better understand what motivates students to engage in leisure activities. There is a lot of research connecting intrinsic motivational orientation with leisure activities (Cooper, Schuett & Phillips, 2012; Kim & Trail, 2010; Roark & Ellis, 2009; Chang & Hsieh, 2006; Iwasaki & Mannell, 1999). On the other hand, the lack of leisure motivation researches is outstanding in Turkey

(Gürbüz, 2006; Mutlu, 2008; Güngörmüş, 2012; Özdemir vd., 2016). In the light of these evaluations, the purpose of the study is first to clarify the reasons of leisure behaviors and preferences in university students by intrinsic leisure motivations and second to determine the relationship and differences between some variables.

2. Methodology

2.1 Study Sample

The period in which the data were collected was from the end of April 2019 to the middle of May 2019 at the province of Ankara and Zonguldak in Turkey. A convenience sample method was used and 72 of the collected data were not evaluated in the research because of the missing. Aims of the study, the consent form, voluntary participation in the study, and confidentiality of the survey response were verbally explained by investigators before the distribution of the surveys to subjects. The survey were answered and completed within an average of 15 minutes. Finally, 739 university students from different faculties at Gazi University, Ankara University, Hacettepe University, and Bülent Ecevit University participated in the study. It is observed that the majority of the participants are male (63.2%), engineering students (34.0%) and 4th-grade students (26.0%).

2.2 Instrumentation

In this study, the Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale and demographic questions were used as data collection tools. Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale developed by Weissinger and Bandalos (1995), adapted to Turkish which consists of 5 sub-dimensions and 23 items by Özdemir, Ayyıldız Durhan and Karaküçük (2020); it aims to clarify the psychological and sociological factors underlying participation in leisure activities. Based on the proceeding discussion of work published by Weissinger & Bandalos (1995), the following conceptual definitions of the intrinsic leisure motivation components/subdimensions are slightly redefined.

These five subcomponents of ILM were: 1) ''Competence and Challenge''; Competence is characterized by attention to feedback that provides information about effectiveness, ability, and skill. Persons high in this intrinsic motivation component tend to seek out leisure behaviors which convey competence feedback. Challenge is characterized by a tendency toward seeking leisure experiences that stretch one's limits and provide novel stimuli. Persons high in this intrinsic motivation component tend to select leisure behaviors that slightly exceed their skills, and should perceive this state as challenging rather than aversive or threatening 2) ''Self-Determination'' is characterized by awareness of internal needs, and a strong desire to make free choices based on these needs. Persons high in this intrinsic motivation component tend to want to feel in control of their leisure behavior, and display a high degree of willfulness 3) ''Commitment'' is characterized by a tendency toward deep involvement in, rather than detachment from, leisure behaviors. Persons high in this intrinsic motivation component tend to value leisure behaviors, and feel dedicated to leisure in their lives 4) ''Identification'' is

characterized by the fact that the individual feels integrated with his leisure time and expresses himself with the best in leisure time. For persons high in this intrinsic motivation, the meaning of leisure time is particular 5) ''Amotivation'' is a state of lacking any motivation to engage in an activity, characterized by a lack of perceived competence and/or a failure to value the activity or its outcomes. The scale contains 23 items with 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 ''very strongly disagree'' to 7 ''very strongly agree''. In the present study, the internal consistencies coefficient for each of the subscales were satisfactory with Cronbach's alphas of .83 for Competence-Challenge, .86 for Self-Determination, .77 for Commitment, .71 for Identification and .70 for Amotivation.

2.3 Data Analysis

Data were analysed by using SPSS 24.0 version. The research has been prepared with the quantitative method, as a result of the analysis, it has been determined that the data is distributed homogeneously and parametric tests have been used. Descriptive statistics, independent one-sample test, one-way ANOVA test and Tukey (HSD-LSD) test were used for data analysis.

3. Results

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage Range of Demographic Variables

N=(739)			
	Variable	**f**	**%**
Gender	Female	272	36,8
	Male	467	63,2
Area of education	Science and Math	60	8,1
	Social and Humanity Sciences	177	24,0
	Architecture and Design	18	2,4
	Fine Arts	49	6,6
	Health Sciences	70	9,5
	Engineering	251	34,0
	Sports Sciences	57	7,7
	Religious Studies	57	7,7
Year of education	First year	112	15,2
	Second year	168	22,7
	Third year	177	24,0
	Fourth year	192	26,0
	Fifth and above	90	12,2
Perceived welfare	Very poor	68	9,2
	Below Average	106	14,3
	Average	389	52,6
	Above Average	123	16,6
	Excellent	53	7,2

When the data of the demographic information of the participants are examined, it is observed that the majority of the participants are male (63.2%), engineering (34.0%) and

social and humanity science students, perceived an average welfare (52.6%) and 4th-grade students (26.0%).

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation values of the intrinsic leisure motivation scale

N=(739)	**Min.**	**Max.**	$\bar{x}$	**ss**
ILM	41,00	165,00	111,71	21,00
Competence-Challenge	8,00	56,00	37,85	8,96
Self-Determination	6,00	42,00	29,78	7,33
Commitment	3,00	21,00	13,75	4,17
Identification	3,00	54,00	13,76	4,32
Amotivation	12,00	21,00	16,55	2,14

As a result of the analyzes, it was determined that the intrinsic leisure motivation scores of university students for this sample group are above the mean values (111,71 ± 21,00), the Competence-Challenge sub-dimension is the highest (37,85 ± 8.96) and the Identification sub-dimension is the lowest mean obtained (13.76 ± 4.32).

Table 3: *T*-test results between participants' gender variable and intrinsic leisure motivation

	Gender	**N**	$\bar{x}$	**ss**	**t**	**p**
ILM	Female	272	111,29	22,46	-0,423	0,673
	Male	467	111,96	20,13		
Competence-Challenge	Female	272	37,80	9,47	-0,104	0,917
	Male	467	37,88	8,66		
Self-Determination	Female	272	29,88	7,88	0,275	0,783
	Male	467	29,72	7,00		
Commitment	Female	272	13,64	4,47	-0,543	0,587
	Male	467	13,82	3,99		
Identification	Female	272	13,11	4,40	-3,119	0,002*
	Male	467	14,14	4,24		
Amotivation	Female	272	16,83	2,19	2,675	0,008*
	Male	467	16,39	2,10		

*p<0,05

When the t test results between the gender variable and the intrinsic leisure motivation scales of the participants were examined, according to the significant difference between the Identification and Amotivation sub-dimensions and the gender variable, the findings in favor of men in Identification sub-dimension were made in favor of women in Amotivation sub-dimension.

Table 4: ANOVA test results between intrinsic leisure motivation and study area

	Area of Education	N	$\bar{x}$	ss	F	p
ILM	Science and Math	60d	104,81	22,17	3,984	0,000*
	Social and Humanity Sciences	177c	109,15	21,58		
	Architecture and Design	18	116,94	10,75		
	Fine Arts	49	116,51	21,88		
	Health Sciences	70b	111,51	22,57		

	Engineering	251c	111,32	20,58		
	Sports Sciences	57a	122,17	18,00		
	Religious Studies	57	112,70	18,15		
	Total	739	111,71	21,00		
Competence-Challenge	Science and Math	60c	35,73	10,49	3,888	0,000*
	Social and Humanity Sciences	177b	36,28	9,24		
	Architecture and Design	18	40,77	4,98		
	Fine Arts	49	40,61	8,41		
	Health Sciences	70	37,38	10,28		
	Engineering	251	37,92	8,64		
	Sports Sciences	57a	41,78	7,09		
	Religious Studies	57	37,96	7,38		
	Total	739	37,85	8,96		
Self-Determination	Science and Math	60	27,30	7,06	1,522	0,156
	Social and Humanity Sciences	177	29,71	7,86		
	Architecture and Design	18	30,94	2,53		
	Fine Arts	49	29,65	7,98		
	Health Sciences	70	30,42	7,53		
	Engineering	251	29,70	7,25		
	Sports Sciences	57	31,21	7,00		
	Religious Studies	57	30,49	6,48		
	Total	739	29,78	7,33		
Commitment	Science and Math	60d	12,78	4,74	4,048	0,000*
	Social and Humanity Sciences	177c	13,05	4,69		
	Architecture and Design	18	13,77	4,10		
	Fine Arts	49	14,81	3,73		
	Health Sciences	70b	13,12	4,41		
	Engineering	251	13,98	3,68		
	Sports Sciences	57a	15,80	3,57		
	Religious Studies	57	13,77	3,67		
	Total	739	13,75	4,17		
Identification	Science and Math	60e	12,28	4,75	5,341	0,000*
	Social and Humanity Sciences	177b	13,68	3,85		
	Architecture and Design	18	15,55	3,22		
	Fine Arts	49	15,00	3,90		
	Health Sciences	70	14,31	4,88		
	Engineering	251c	13,27	3,79		
	Sports Sciences	57a	16,07	6,03		
	Religious Studies	57d	13,14	4,22		
	Total	739	13,76	4,32		
Amotivation	Science and Math	60	16,71	2,12	2,822	0,007*
	Social and Humanity Sciences	177	16,41	2,17		
	Architecture and Design	18e	15,88	2,21		
	Fine Arts	49c	16,42	2,59		
	Health Sciences	70d	16,25	2,19		
	Engineering	251b	16,43	2,04		
	Sports Sciences	57a	17,29	2,05		
	Religious Studies	57	17,33	1,88		
	Total	739	16,55	2,14		

*p<0,05
a>b>c>d>e

It was observed that the results showed a significant difference in all sub-dimensions and total scores except for the Self-Determination sub-dimension with intrinsic leisure

motivation. In all sub-dimensions and total scores with significant differences, it was found that the intrinsic leisure motivation of sports science students was higher than the other students. When the findings are examined; Post hoc tests on the differences in total intrinsic leisure motivation scores within the group found significant differences between 5 learning areas.

Accordingly, there is a significant difference between the fields of study in the fields of sports sciences, health sciences, engineering, social and humanity sciences, science and math, respectively.

According to Competence-Challenge sub-dimension, the differences within the group determined as sports sciences>social and humanity sciences>science and math while determined as sports sciences>health sciences >social and humanity sciences>science and math in Commitment sub-dimension. When Identification sub-dimension is examined, the differences within the group determined as sports sciences>social and humanity sciences>engineering>science and math while determined as sports sciences>engineering> fine arts>health science>architecture and design in Amotivation sub-dimension.

Table 5: ANOVA test results between the intrinsic leisure motivation and the year of study

		N	$\bar{X}$	ss	F	p
ILM	First year	112	109,75	24,79	,998	,408
	Second year	168	111,75	22,49		
	Third year	177	110,12	21,83		
	Fourth year	192	113,58	17,42		
	Fifth and above	90	113,25	18,15		
	Total	739	111,71	21,00		
Competence-Challenge	First year	112	37,58	10,74		
	Second year	168	37,66	9,00	,090	,985
	Third year	177	38,03	9,48		
	Fourth year	192	37,86	7,60		
	Fifth and above	90	38,16	8,28		
	Total	739	37,85	8,96		
Self-Determination	First year	112d	28,33	8,46		
	Second year	168	30,05	7,88		
	Third year	177c	28,94	7,12	2,918	,021*
	Fourth year	192b	30,69	6,39		
	Fifth and above	90a	30,78	6,75		
	Total	739	29,78	7,33		
Commitment	First year	112c	13,33	4,43		
	Second year	168d	13,19	4,39		
	Third year	177b	13,45	4,35		
	Fourth year	192a	14,58	3,79	3,442	,008*
	Fifth and above	90	14,15	3,57		
	Total	739	13,75	4,17		
Identification	First year	112	13,77	4,44		
	Second year	168	14,22	5,28		
	Third year	177	13,41	3,77		
	Fourth year	192	13,79	3,93	,831	,506
	Fifth and above	90	13,52	4,02		
	Total	739	13,76	4,32		
Amotivation	First year	112	16,72	2,37		

	Second year	168	16,61	1,97	1,011	,401
	Third year	177	16,28	2,18		
	Fourth year	192	16,63	2,09		
	Fifth and above	90	16,62	2,18		
	Total	739	16,55	2,14		

*p<0,05

According to the results of ANOVA between the participants' intrinsic leisure motivation and the year of education, significant differences were obtained in the Self-Determination and Commitment sub-dimensions. When the differences within the group are analyzed, it has been determined that, the level of intrinsic leisure motivations increases depend on year of education. Accordingly, it has been observed significant differences in the group differences within the Self-Determination sub-dimension with the groups in the 4th, 3rd and 1st year, who have 5 or more years of education reveal (Self-Determination = 5> 4> 3> 1). In commitment, the differences within the group were determined as 4> 3> 1> 2.

Table 6: ANOVA test results between intrinsic leisure motivation and perceived welfare

	Perceived welfare	**N**	$\overline{X}$	**ss**	**F**	**p**
ILM	Very poor	68	103,73c	23,11	5,755	,000*
	Below Average	106	106,57b	20,97		
	Average	389	114,37a	19,41		
	Above Average	123	111,92	23,35		
	Excellent	53	112,26	20,09		
	Total	739	111,71	21,00		
Competence-Challenge	Very poor	68	35,05c	9,84		
	Below Average	106	36,11b	8,82	4,133	,003*
	Average	389	38,92a	8,18		
	Above Average	123	37,57	10,03		
	Excellent	53	37,71	9,90		
	Total	739	37,85	8,96		
Self-Determination	Very poor	68	26,11	9,11		
	Below Average	106	28,36c	7,22		
	Average	389	30,73a	6,74	7,177	,000*
	Above Average	123	30,14b	7,20		
	Excellent	53	29,52	7,85		
	Total	739	29,78	7,33		
Commitment	Very poor	68	12,48c	3,93		
	Below Average	106	12,56	4,11		
	Average	389	14,27a	3,84		
	Above Average	123	13,92b	4,61	5,456	,000*
	Excellent	53	13,54	5,11		
	Total	739	13,75	4,17		
Identification	Very poor	68	13,29	5,04		
	Below Average	106	13,43	3,75		
	Average	389	13,97	3,74		
	Above Average	123	13,37	5,82	1,128	,342
	Excellent	53	14,41	4,33		
	Total	739	13,76	4,32		
Amotivation	Very poor	68	16,77	2,35		
	Below Average	106	16,09b	1,85	3,120	,015*
	Average	389	16,47	2,17		
	Above Average	123	16,90a	1,97		

Excellent	53	17,05	2,39
Total	739	16,55	2,14

*p<0,05

According to the ANOVA test results, there is a statistically significant difference in all sub-dimensions and in the total score except the Identification sub-dimension between the level of perceived welfare by the participants and the intrinsic leisure motivation. Participants with average perceived welfare were found to exhibit higher levels of intrinsic leisure motivation than other groups. According to this; In total scores and in the sub-dimension of Competence-Challenge sub-dimension, the differences were determined as average>below average>very poor, average>above average>very poor in Self-Determination sub-dimension, average>above average>very poor in Commitment sub-dimension, average>below average in Amotivation.

4. Discussion

The main purpose of this study is to clarify intrinsic leisure motivations of university students. In addition, it aimed to determine the relationship and differences between some variables with intrinsic leisure motivations. There are different measurement tools (Beard & Ragheb, 1983; Pelletier et al., 1991; Baldwin & Caldwell, 2003) which are frequently used in the literature to measure leisure motivations. Various sub-dimensions of these scales measure intrinsic motivations. These sub-dimensions that measure intrinsic motivation compared with the sub-dimensions which are in the data collection tool that we used in our study. Overlapping sub-dimensions have been handled within the scope of the discussion to compare the results obtained.

As a result of the analysis, it was found that the intrinsic leisure motivation scores of the university students were above the average values and high for this sample group. In their study, Kim, Brown & Yang (2019) states the cross-sectional descriptive research between students demonstrated that intrinsic leisure motivation is the single strongest predictor for leisure satisfaction even after controlling for leisure in elementary and high schools, extrinsic leisure motivation, and perceived stress. This is noticeable in that leisure which involves a self-determined, freely chosen, and meaningful activity is derived inherently from intrinsic motivation, which, in turn, may lead to stress relief. Walker and Wang (2008) indicated that, Chinese and Canadian students were motivated by intrinsic, integrated, identified, and introjected reward, but not by introjected punishment, external reward, or external punishment during their spare time. Finally of the four relevant leisure motivations, intrinsic motivation was the most important for both cultural groups.

Significant relationships and differences were determined according to gender, field of study, school year and perceived welfare levels of the participants. According to this, a significant difference was found in favor of male according to Identification sub-dimension and in favor of female according to Amotivation sub-dimension in this study. The previous researches by Iso-Ahola and Allen (1982) and Gill, Gross, and Huddleston

(1983) suggests that males and females differ in their motivation for leisure participation. According to Beggs, Stitt and Elkins (2004) findings, while males indicated that the most important motivational factor was the competency/mastery factor, females was the intellectual dimension. In the study of Chen, Xue and Shi (2018), overall residents' leisure motivations, including intellectual, social, competence mastery, and stimulus avoidance, all had higher levels. Female and male residents both had the highest scores in competence mastery and stimulus avoidance, but female residents had a much stronger desire to pursue peaceful and calm leisure items than did male residents.

When the differences between the learning fields and the measurement tool were examined, it was observed that sports science students showed higher ILM in all significant differences than the students in other learning fields. Ramos, Anderson & Lee (2018) mentions the competency-mastery motivational factors were rated substantially higher than the motivational constructs of intellectual and stimulus-avoidance in their researche. This indicates that, for this population of college club swimmers, motivational factors related to the competency-mastery and social functions of the recreational pursuit were more important than other motivational factors. The competency-mastery construct contains motivational factors related to achievement, challenge, and competition (Beard & Ragheb, 1983). Intrinsic motivation refers to doing an activity for its own sake, in the absence of external rewards (Deci and Ryan, 1985). Subsequently; in the study which 200 recreational tennis players measured by Alexandris (2013), tennis players should, first of all, be intrinsically motivated in order to develop high involvement levels. On answering the question which factors lead to intrinsically motivated behaviour, Ryan and Deci (2007) emphasized the needs of Competence, Autonomy and Relatedness. Individuals, who feel competent, autonomous and 'connected' with an activity and its environment are more likely to develop intrinsic motivation (Alexandris, 2013). The results of this study support previous researches.

In the perceived welfare variable, it was found that the participants who perceived welfare levels as average had higher levels of intrinsic leisure motivation than the other participants. According to the study which 453 Chinese residents measured by Chen, Xue and Shi (2018), the results indicated that there were no significant differences among leisure motivations by income. Income did not seem to have any influence on leisure participation and leisure motivation at all. However, in this study it was found that the participants who perceived welfare levels as average had higher levels of intrinsic leisure motivation than the other participants.

At the same time, it can be said that the motivation of intrinsic leisure time increases as the school year increases. Analysis of data from 1280 12–17-year-old Western Australian metropolitan high school students, Fawcett, Garton & Dandy (2009) found that, the type of motivation that adolescents perceived was the most important influence on their involvement in the structured leisure activity in which they participated, with a large majority reporting being intrinsically motivated. According to the study which 631 university students measured by Beggs, Stitt and Elkins (2004), students are motivated to participate in leisure activities to achieve, master, challenge, and compete. Also, in the

study of Kanters and Forrester (1997) on a similar sample group, competence/mastery factor are the most important in leisure participation.

5. Conclusion

One of the most important factors that encourage and sustain individuals' participation in leisure activities is their motivation. Given the influence of motivation on participation, and the positive outcomes associated with leisure and recreational activities, motivation within recreation has been well studied previously. Many researchers emphasize that the sources of intrinsic motivation are particularly relevant because it is important to know how to improve intrinsic motivation in applied settings. Leisure motivations, both intrinsic and extrinsic, are in direct relation with leisure and recreation opportunities and programs on campus. Understanding what motivates student participation in campus recreational programs may qualify campus recreation professionals to design better programs that maximize student activity. Therefore, by identifying individuals' motivations for an activity, professionals can use this knowledge to create awareness on an individual level but also help the community. As a conclusion, research in which the relationship between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation is investigated, along with an examination of how those types of motivation are related to leisure experience, is needed. Hence, leisure motivation and its relationship to other factors should be studied further.

References

Alexandris, K. (2013). Segmenting recreational tennis players according to their involvement level: a psychographic profile based on constraints and motivation, Managing Leisure, 18:3, 179-193.

Baldwin, C. K. & Caldwell, L. L. (2003). Development of the Free Time Motivation Scale for Adolescents, Journal of Leisure Research, 35:2, 129-151.

Beard, J. G. & Ragheb, M. G. (1983). Measuring leisure motivation. Journal of Leisure Research, 15, 3, 219-228.

Beggs, B. A., Stitt, J. E., & Elkins, D. J. (2004). Leisure Motivation of Participants and Nonparticipants in Campus Recreational Sports Programs. Recreational Sports Journal, 28(1), 65–77.

Caldwell, L. L. (2005). Recreation and youth development. In P. A. Witt & L. L. Caldwell Recreation and youth development (pp. 169-192). State College, PA: Venture.

Caldwell, L., Patrick, M., Smith, E., Pale, L. and Wegner, L. (2010). Influencing adolescent leisure motivation: Intervention effects of health wise South Africa. Journal of Leisure Research, 42(2): 203–220.

Chang, J., & Hsieh, A. T. (2006). Leisure motives of eating out in night markets. Journal of Business Research, 59, 1276-1278.

Chen, M., Xue, S., Shi, Y. (2018). Leisure activities and leisure motivations of Chinese residents. PLoS ONE 13(11): e0206740.

Cooper, N., Schuett, P. A., & Phillips, H. M. (2012). Examining intrinsic motivations in campus intramural sports. Recreational Sports Journal, 36, 25-36.

Crandall, R. (1980). Motivations for leisure. Journal of Leisure Research, 12, 45–54.

Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 18, 105-115.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York: Plenum.

Fawcett, L. M., Garton, A. F. & Dandy, J. (2009). Role of motivation, self-efficacy and parent support in adolescent structured leisure activity participation, Australian Journal of Psychology, 61:3, 175-182.

Frederick, C. M., & Ryan, R. M. (1993). Differences in motivation for sport and exercise and their relations with participation and mental health. Journal of Sport Behavior, 16(3), 124–146.

Gill, D., Gross, J., & Huddleston, S. (1983). Participation motivation in youth sports. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 14, 1-14.

Godbey, G. (1994). Leisure in your life: An exploration. State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.

Gungormus, H. A., (2012). The Study of Validity and Reliability of Turkish Version of Leisure Motivation Scale, Energy Education Science and Technology Part B: Social and Educational Studies, 4(3), p.p. 1209-1216.

Gürbüz, B., Aşçı, F. H., Çelebi, M. (2006). The Reliability and Validity of the Turkish Version of the Recreational Exercise Motivation Measure, 9th International Sport Sciences Congress, 1044, 3-5 November, Muğla, Turkey.

Iso-Ahola, S. E. & Allen, J. R. (1982). The dynamics of leisure motivation: The effects of outcome on leisure needs. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 53, 2, 141-149.

Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1989). Motivation for leisure. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), Understanding leisure and recreation: Mapping the past, charting the future (pp. 247–279). State College, PA: Venture.

Iso-Ahola, S. (1999). Motivational foundations of leisure. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), Leisure Studies: Prospects for the Twenty-First Century (pp. 35-51). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Iwasaki, Y., & Mannell, R. C. (1999). Situational and personality influences on intrinsically motivated leisure behavior: Interaction effects and cognitive processes. Leisure Sciences, 21, 287-306.

Kanters, M. A. & Forrester, S. (1997). The motivations and self-esteem of intramural sports participants. NIRSA Journal, 21, 3-7.

Kim, J. H., Brown, S. L. & Yang, H. (2019). Types of leisure, leisure motivation, and well-being in university students, World Leisure Journal, 61:1, 43-57

Kim, K. and Trail, G. (2010). Constraints and motivators: A new model to explain sport consumer behavior. Journal of Sport Management, 24(2): 190–210.

Larson, R. W. (2000). Toward a psychology of positive youth development. American Psychologist, 55, 170-183.

Mutlu, İ. (2008). Egzersiz Yapan Kişilerin Boş Zamanlarına Yönelik Tutumları Üzerine bir Araştırma (Kayseri İli Örneği), Niğde Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Niğde.

Özdemir, A. S., Ayyıldız Durhan, T. & Karaküçük, S. (2020). İçsel Boş Zaman Motivasyonu Ölçeği Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. OPUS-Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, (forthcoming).

Özdemir, A. S., Büyüköztürk, Ş. & Karaküçük, S. (2016). Explaining destination choices based upon recreational opportunities through intrinsic and extrinsic travel motivations. Journal of Human Sciences, 13(2), 3002-3021.

Ramos, W. D., Anderson, A. R., & Lee, D. (2018). Collegiate Club Swimming: An Examination of Leisure Motivations. Recreational Sports Journal, 42(1), 75–89.

Roark, M. and Ellis, G. (2009). Effect of self-determination theory-based strategies for staging recreation encounters on intrinsic motivation of youth recreational campers. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 27(4): 1–16.

Ryan, R. M., and Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist. 55 (1): 68–78.

Ryan, R. & Deci, E. (2007). Active human nature: Self-determination theory and the promotion and maintenance of sport, exercise, and health. In Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in exercise and sport, Edited by: Hagger, M. and Chatzisarantis, N. 1–21. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Tsorbatzoudis, H., Alexandris, K., Zahariadis, P., & Grouios, G. (2006). Examining the relationship between recreational sport participation and intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and amotivation. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 103(2), 363–374.

Walker, G. J. & Wang, X. (2008). A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Canadian and Mainland Chinese University Students' Leisure Motivations, Leisure Sciences, 30:3, 179-197.

Weissinger, E., & Bandalos, D. (1995). Development, reliability and validity of a scale to measure intrinsic motivation in leisure. Journal of Leisure Research, 27, 379-400.

Weissinger, E., & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1984). Intrinsic leisure motivation, personality and physical health. Society and Leisure, 7, 217-228.