

ORIGINAL ARTICLE



Intrinsic Leisure Motivation and Recreation Experience Preference among Individuals Attending Family Life Centers

¹Tebessüm Ayyıldız Durhan *, ¹Ceren Suveren , ¹Yasin Arslan 

¹Faculty of Sports Sciences, Gazi University, Ankara, Türkiye.

Submitted December 11, 2023; Accepted in final form February 17, 2024.

ABSTRACT

Background. The study involves determining individuals' intrinsic leisure motivations and experience preferences for recreation when using various recreational areas such as family life centers. **Objectives.** The study aims to analyze intrinsic leisure motivation and recreation experience preference in individuals attending family life centers. **Methods.** The study was conducted with 240 participants who participated in recreational activities in Family Life Centers in Ankara. Data were collected by face-to-face survey method. In addition to the demographic data form, "Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale" and "Recreation Experience Preference Scale" were collected. As a result of the analysis, parametric tests were applied since it was determined that the data showed normal distribution. Descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test, one-way variance analysis ANOVA, and Tukey test were used to determine the relationships between groups. **Results.** The findings indicate that the participants' intrinsic leisure motivation scores are high and their recreation experience preference scores are similarly high. There are statistically significant differences between the participants' gender, age, education level, daily leisure duration, and efficient use of leisure and measurement tools. **Conclusion.** It is suggested that various variables of the participants participating in recreational activities in family centers differentiate their intrinsic leisure motivation and recreational experience preferences, so it is recommended that programs that will make their motivation and preference factors sustainable should be continued in the centers.

KEYWORDS: *Intrinsic Leisure Motivation, Recreation Experience, Preference, Family Life, Centers.*

INTRODUCTION

Recreation refers to active or passive leisure activities which individuals participate in their leisure. Individuals are expected to reveal some intrinsic and extrinsic motives for participating in recreational activities and to offer an experience preference for recreational activities in this direction. The factors that motivate individuals to participate in recreational activities can be intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation arises from an individual's enjoyment of or interest in a task rather than extrinsic rewards and involves working on activities without an extrinsic incentive (1).

Intrinsic motivation, a type of motivation based on intrinsic pressure, arises from an individual's enjoyment of or interest in the task at hand. Intrinsic motivation does not involve working on activities for the sake of an extrinsic reward; rather, it involves a feeling of intrinsic pleasure in the activity itself. A type of motivation as a force that involves engaging in activity without an external incentive. Without any reward, a person is willing to act as long as he or she is interested in or personally enjoys the task (1). Intrinsic motivation in leisure behavior is linked to better mental health and physical well-

*. Corresponding Author:

Tebessüm Ayyıldız Durhan, Ph.D.

E-mail: tebessum@gazi.edu.tr

being and reduces the likelihood of individuals becoming ill despite stress (2). Intrinsic motivation in leisure activities has typically been viewed as being determined by factors in the social situation (e.g., extrinsic rewards, supervision). However, it has been suggested that individual differences exist that increase the likelihood that some people experience intrinsic motivation in leisure regardless of the situation (3).

The preference for recreational experiences offers various opportunities for individuals to return to nature, to keep their physical fitness under control, to relax, to experience a sense of solitude, to get away from crowds, to get away from various stressors and to spend time with their families. Accordingly, family life centers provide participants with many of these options. Family life centers that offer active family leisure (4) can be a valuable resource that benefits individuals, communities, and society as a whole by integrating practice and empowerment. Through integrated practices, family centers can empower individuals and communities and promote social justice and community development (5). Family life centers, which provide recreational experiences for participants and aim to provide this experience to individuals through activities in which they voluntarily participate, offer a number of practices that directly target the intrinsic leisure motivation of individuals. Considering that there are insufficient studies examining intrinsic leisure motivation in areas that affect individuals' recreational preferences such as family life centers, which are outside the tests conducted on sportive activities and working individuals (6, 7), the current research is expected to contribute to the field.

While participation in activities in family life centers offers various opportunities reflected in individuals' recreational preferences, it also uses individuals' intrinsic leisure motivation as a tool. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine the intrinsic leisure motivation and recreational experience preferences of individuals participating in recreational activities in family life centers. At the same time, it is aimed to examine the differences with various variables after determining intrinsic leisure motivation and preferences.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Method. The study is a survey study prepared with the quantitative method. Survey model; It is a research approach that aims to describe a situation in the past or still as it exists.

Participants. The study was conducted with 240 participants who participated in recreational activities in Family Life Centers in Ankara. Considering the number of individuals participating in activities in family life centers in Ankara, it is possible to talk about a sample group of 217 participants (8). Within the scope of the study, 240 participants included in the study are sufficient to represent the universe. Data were collected by face-to-face survey method. In addition to the demographic data form, "Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale" and "Recreation Experience Preference Scale" were collected.

Measurement Tools.

Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale. The Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale developed by Weissinger and Bandalos (9) and adapted into Turkish by Özdemir, Ayyıldız Durhan, and Karaküçük (10) was used in the study. The measurement tool consists of 5 sub-dimensions and 23 items. While the total internal consistency coefficient was determined as .91 in the adaptation study, the internal consistency coefficient was determined as .84 in the current study.

Recreation Experience Preference Scale. Manfredo et al. developed it in 1996 (11) and adapted it into Turkish by Ayar, Ayyıldız Durhan, and Karaküçük in 2023 (12). A recreation experience preference scale consisting of seven sub-dimensions was used. While the internal consistency coefficient of the total scale was determined as 0.83 in the adaptation study, the internal reliability coefficient was determined as 0.89 in the current study.

Statistical Analysis. As a result of the analysis, parametric tests were applied since it was determined that the data showed normal distribution. Descriptive statistics, independent sample T-test, one-way variance analysis ANOVA, and Tukey test were used to determine the relationships between groups. The distribution table of the study group in the research is given in [Table 1](#).

Table 1. Percentage and frequency distributions for the participation

		N=(240)	
	Variable	F	%
Gender	Male	96	40.0
	Female	144	60.0
Age	20<	180	75.0
	20>	60	25.0
Education	High School and Below	176	73.3
	Bachelor's Degree	64	26.7
Daily leisure time	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	22.5
	1-2 hours	77	32.1
	3-4 hours	70	29.2
	5-6 hours	29	12.1
	7 hours and more	10	4.2
Leisure productivity	Sufficient	47.5	114
	Insufficient	52.5	126

RESULTS

The findings on the differentiation of intrinsic leisure motivation and recreation experience preferences of individuals attending family life centers with various variables and their relationships with each other are given below.

It is observed that the participants have high levels of intrinsic leisure motivation and recreation experience preference. The highest sub-dimension score is observed in the challenge sub-dimension and the lowest sub-dimension score is observed in the amotivation sub-dimension. When the recreation experience preference is analyzed, it is observed that the participants have the highest sub-dimension score in the escape crowds sub-dimension and the lowest sub-dimension score in the spending time with family sub-dimension (Table 2).

It is observed that the participants have high levels of intrinsic leisure motivation and recreation experience preference. The highest sub-dimension score is observed in the challenge sub-dimension and the lowest sub-dimension score is observed in the amotivation sub-dimension. When the recreation experience preference is analyzed, it is observed that the participants have the highest sub-dimension score in the escape crowds sub-dimension and the lowest sub-dimension score in the spending time with family sub-dimension (Table 3).

When the analyses between the age variable of the participants and the measurement tools are examined in Table 4, the participants' intrinsic leisure motivation and recreation experience preferences differ according to the age change.

Accordingly, in the commitment sub-dimension of intrinsic leisure motivation, the intrinsic leisure motivation of participants over the age of 20 was determined to be higher. When the recreation experience preference scale was examined, a significant difference was found in favor of participants under the age of 20 in the escape crowds, escape physical stressors, and spending time with family sub-dimensions in total scores (Table 4).

The intrinsic leisure motivation of the participants in the study group differs according to their educational level. Accordingly, it is observed that bachelor's degree graduates exhibit higher intrinsic leisure motivation in total scores and commitment sub-dimension. In the escape physical stressors sub-dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of recreation experience preference, it was determined that those who graduated from high school and below exhibited higher sub-dimension scores (Table 5).

While the change in participants' daily leisure time duration did not differentiate their intrinsic leisure motivation, a statistically significant difference was found only in the physical rest sub-dimension of recreation experience preferences. The relevant difference was in favor of the participants who reported lower than 1-2 hours (Table 6).

Intrinsic leisure motivation showed a significant difference in total scores and all sub-dimensions in favor of the participants who stated that they evaluate their leisure time effectively, except for competence and amotivation sub-dimensions (Table 7).

Table 2. Arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and kurtosis-skewness values between measurement tools

N=(240)						
	Min.	Max.	\bar{x}	sd	Skewness	Kurtosis
<i>Intrinsic Leisure Motivation</i>	38.00	109.00	80.70	10.55	-0.622	1.173
Challenge	8.00	40.00	28.80	5.14	-1.054	2.325
Self-Determination	6.00	30.00	23.44	3.74	-0.805	1.973
Commitment	3.00	15.00	10.52	2.43	-0.332	0.020
Competence	3.00	15.00	9.23	2.73	0.054	-0.376
Amotivation	3.00	15.00	8.69	2.366	-0.199	0.097
<i>Recreation Experience Preference</i>	43.00	100.00	81.91	11.69	-0.561	0.294
Nature	3.00	15.00	13.20	2.19	-1.555	3.450
Physical Fitness	3.00	15.00	12.22	2.55	-1.379	2.260
Physical Rest	2.00	10.00	8.45	1.45	-1.271	2.637
Loneliness	4.00	20.00	14.85	4.06	-0.454	-0.392
Escape Crowds	5.00	20.00	16.92	3.00	-0.952	0.709
Escape Physical Stressors	2.00	10.00	7.96	2.11	-1.225	1.063
Spending time with family	2.00	10.00	8.28	1.94	-1.274	1.392

Table 3. Independent sample t-test results between measurement tools and gender variable

N=(240)						
	Gender	n	\bar{x}	sd	t	p
<i>Intrinsic Leisure Motivation</i>	Male	96	81.20	9.55	0.603	0.547
	Female	144	80.36	11.18		
Challenge	Male	96	29.50	4.93	1.707	0.089
	Female	144	28.34	5.24		
Self-Determination	Male	96	23.38	3.73	-0.190	0.850
	Female	144	23.47	3.75		
Commitment	Male	96	10.42	2.54	-0.508	0.612
	Female	144	10.59	2.36		
Competence	Male	96	9.29	2.63	0.269	0.788
	Female	144	9.19	2.81		
Amotivation	Male	96	8.60	2.39	-0.489	0.625
	Female	144	8.75	2.35		
<i>Recreation Experience Preference</i>	Male	96	82.01	11.67	0.106	0.916
	Female	144	81.84	11.74		
Nature	Male	96	13.17	2.34	-0.180	0.857
	Female	144	13.22	2.09		
Physical Fitness	Male	96	12.60	2.18	1.886	0.060
	Female	144	11.97	2.75		
Physical Rest	Male	96	8.40	1.53	-0.378	0.705
	Female	144	8.47	1.41		
Loneliness	Male	96	14.54	4.44	-0.959	0.339
	Female	144	15.05	3.79		
Escape Crowds	Male	96	16.87	3.13	-0.228	0.820
	Female	144	16.96	2.92		
Escape Physical Stressors	Male	96	7.73	2.06	-1.363	0.174
	Female	144	8.11	2.13		
Spending time with family	Male	96	8.66	1.64	2.526	0.012*
	Female	144	8.02	2.08		

*: p<0.05

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study, which determined the intrinsic leisure motivation and recreation experience preferences of individuals participating in recreational activities in family life centers, show that the participants' intrinsic leisure

motivation scores are high and their recreation experience preference scores are similarly high. There are statistically significant differences between the participants' gender, age, education level, daily leisure time duration, and effective use of leisure time and measurement tools.

Table 4. Independent sample t-test results between measurement tools and age variable

	N=(240)					
	Age	n	\bar{x}	sd	t	p
<i>Intrinsic Leisure Motivation</i>	20<	180	80.18	10.93	-1.326	0.186
	20>	60	82.26	9.22		
Challenge	20<	180	28.63	5.41	-0.883	0.378
	20>	60	29.31	4.22		
Self-Determination	20<	180	23.40	3.86	-0.259	0.796
	20>	60	23.55	3.37		
Commitment	20<	180	10.27	2.41	-2.765	0.006*
	20>	60	11.26	2.34		
Competence	20<	180	9.08	2.72	1.419	0.157
	20>	60	9.66	2.75		
Amotivation	20<	180	8.77	2.28	0.866	0.388
	20>	60	8.46	2.59		
<i>Recreation Experience Preference</i>	20<	180	83.17	10.91	2.936	0.004*
	20>	60	78.13	13.16		
Nature	20<	180	13.33	2.03	1.534	0.126
	20>	60	12.83	2.58		
Physical Fitness	20<	180	12.28	2.51	0.611	0.541
	20>	60	12.05	2.69		
Physical Rest	20<	180	8.50	1.38	0.919	0.359
	20>	60	8.30	1.67		
Loneliness	20<	180	15.12	4.04	1.842	0.067
	20>	60	14.01	4.06		
Escape Crowds	20<	180	17.27	2.70	3.122	0.002*
	20>	60	15.90	3.58		
Escape Physical Stressors	20<	180	8.14	1.93	2.279	0.024*
	20>	60	7.43	2.52		
Spending time with family	20<	180	8.51	1.85	3.209	0.002*
	20>	60	7.60	2.03		

*: p<0.05

While the participants' high intrinsic leisure motivation and the fact that they exhibited the highest sub-dimension score in the challenge sub-dimension describe their challenging side, it is observed that they have a high intrinsic motivation to participate in recreational activities in family life centers. At the same time, despite the preference for recreational experience for the participants revealed the priority of getting away from the crowd, in another study, outdoor recreation participants stated that the most important experiential benefits were nature experience, peace, and physical rest (13). Considering each society, culture, and individual differences, it is expected result that preferences for participation in recreational activities will differ. Therefore, participating in recreational activities in family life centers away from negative living conditions such as city crowds and workload may be important factors affecting preferences. It is accepted that some factors direct the factor of participation in recreation (14), and the share of family

participation should not be ignored (15). Therefore, as Iwasaki and Mannell (3) emphasize, intrinsic motivation in leisure activities and experience preference is influenced by both person and situation factors.

In another study based on recreation experience preferences, which also depend on individual differences, past and present experiences, it was found that recreation experience preferences influence visitors' motivation to visit natural resources (16). In another study, it was stated that recreation experiences are strongly related to satisfaction, with activity-specific experiences being more important than general experiences (17).

In the current study, it was determined that gender did not significantly differentiate intrinsic leisure motivation. On the other hand, in another study, it was determined that the gender of university students differentiated intrinsic leisure motivation (16). Weissinger, Caldwell, and Bandalos (18) also stated that gender is not an important determinant for intrinsic leisure motivation and presented a

parallel result with the findings of the current study. On the other hand, recreation experience preference differs according to gender. The related difference results in the finding that male participants have a higher desire to spend time with family. Based on the findings

obtained, considering the gender factors, since it is evaluated that women are responsible for spending more time with the family, it is understandable that men's recreational experience preferences are evaluated through choosing activities to be with the family.

Table 5. Independent sample t-test results between measurement tools and education level variable

		N=(240)				
	Education level	n	\bar{x}	sd	t	p
<i>Intrinsic Leisure Motivation</i>	High School and Below	176	79.76	10.96	-2.302	0.022*
	Bachelor's Degree	64	83.28	8.91		
Challenge	High School and Below	176	28.55	5.46	-1.257	0.210
	Bachelor's Degree	64	29.50	4.11		
Self-Determination	High School and Below	176	23.18	3.88	-1.753	0.081
	Bachelor's Degree	64	24.14	3.22		
Commitment	High School and Below	176	10.21	2.44	-3.397	0.001*
	Bachelor's Degree	64	11.39	2.19		
Competence	High School and Below	176	9.09	2.75	-1.285	0.200
	Bachelor's Degree	64	9.60	2.68		
Amotivation	High School and Below	176	8.71	2.27	0.217	0.828
	Bachelor's Degree	64	8.64	2.61		
<i>Recreation Experience Preference</i>	High School and Below	176	82.50	11.84	1.305	0.193
	Bachelor's Degree	64	80.28	11.19		
Nature	High School and Below	176	13.27	2.20	0.820	0.413
	Bachelor's Degree	64	13.01	2.17		
Physical Fitness	High School and Below	176	12.16	2.63	0.604	0.546
	Bachelor's Degree	64	12.39	2.32		
Physical Rest	High School and Below	176	8.43	1.49	-0.319	0.750
	Bachelor's Degree	64	8.50	1.36		
Loneliness	High School and Below	176	15.03	4.07	1.164	0.246
	Bachelor's Degree	64	14.34	4.02		
Escape Crowds	High School and Below	176	17.15	2.83	1.930	0.055
	Bachelor's Degree	64	16.31	3.37		
Escape Physical Stressors	High School and Below	176	8.14	1.96	2.150	0.033*
	Bachelor's Degree	64	7.48	2.41		
Spending time with family	High School and Below	176	8.30	1.89	0.235	0.814
	Bachelor's Degree	64	8.23	2.06		

*: p<0.05

Table 6. One-way ANOVA results between measurement tools and efficient daily leisure time variable

		N=(240)				
	Daily leisure	n	\bar{x}	sd	F	p
<i>Intrinsic Leisure Motivation</i>	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	80.98	11.52	0.388	0.817
	1-2 hours	77	79.83	8.66		
	3-4 hours	70	81.64	11.70		
	5-6 hours	29	79.72	11.38		
	7 hours and more	10	82.20	8.27		
	Total	240	80.70	10.55		
Challenge	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	29.11	6.52	0.649	0.628
	1-2 hours	77	28.55	4.30		
	3-4 hours	70	28.71	5.03		
	5-6 hours	29	28.34	4.79		
	7 hours and more	10	31.10	4.77		
	Total	240	28.80	5.14		
Self-Determination	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	23.75	3.87	0.854	0.492
	1-2 hours	77	23.19	3.33		
	3-4 hours	70	23.80	3.93		

	5-6 hours	29	22.48	4.34		
	7 hours and more	10	23.90	2.51		
	Total	240	23.44	3.74		
Commitment	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	10.74	2.64	31.074	0.370
	1-2 hours	77	10.41	2.10		
	3-4 hours	70	10.82	2.50		
	5-6 hours	29	9.93	2.82		
	7 hours and more	10	9.80	1.68		
	Total	240	10.52	2.43		
Competence	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	8.85	3.03	1.601	0.175
	1-2 hours	77	8.96	2.47		
	3-4 hours	70	9.51	2.69		
	5-6 hours	29	10.17	2.80		
	7 hours and more	10	8.70	2.79		
	Total	240	9.23	2.73		
Amotivation	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	8.51	2.58	0.112	0.978
	1-2 hours	77	8.70	2.20		
	3-4 hours	70	8.78	2.46		
	5-6 hours	29	8.79	2.36		
	7 hours and more	10	8.70	2.00		
	Total	240	8.69	2.36		
Recreation Experience Preference	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	83.81	11.38	1.990	0.097
	1-2 hours	77	81.57	10.71		
	3-4 hours	70	83.08	12.02		
	5-6 hours	29	76.79	13.69		
	7 hours and more	10	80.90	9.37		
	Total	240	81.91	11.69		
Nature	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	13.53	2.23	1.803	0.129
	1-2 hours	77	13.22	1.97		
	3-4 hours	70	13.34	2.07		
	5-6 hours	29	12.24	2.70		
	7 hours and more	10	13.20	2.39		
	Total	240	13.20	2.19		
Physical Fitness	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	12.57	2.92	0.832	0.506
	1-2 hours	77	12.07	2.21		
	3-4 hours	70	12.41	2.68		
	5-6 hours	29	11.68	2.30		
	7 hours and more	10	11.70	2.75		
	Total	240	12.22	2.55		
Physical Rest	Lower than 1-2 hour ^{sa}	54	8.68	1.32	3.383	0.010*
	1-2 hours	77	8.36	1.39		
	3-4 hours ^b	70	8.65	1.21		
	5-6 hours ^c	29	7.62	2.09		
	7 hours and more	10	8.80	1.31		
	Total	240	8.45	1.45		
Loneliness	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	14.90	4.58	0.422	0.793
	1-2 hours	77	15.07	3.75		
	3-4 hours	70	14.97	4.05		
	5-6 hours	29	14.00	4.37		
	7 hours and more	10	14.40	2.79		
	Total	240	14.85	4.06		
Escape Crowds	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	17.59	2.86	1.546	0.190
	1-2 hours	77	16.71	2.73		
	3-4 hours	70	17.04	3.23		
	5-6 hours	29	15.96	3.17		
	7 hours and more	10	17.00	3.16		
	Total	240	16.92	3.00		
Escape Physical Stressors	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	8.05	1.87	1.443	0.220
	1-2 hours	77	7.87	2.22		
	3-4 hours	70	8.28	2.09		
	5-6 hours	29	7.20	2.22		

	7 hours and more	10	8.20	1.98		
	Total	240	7.96	2.11		
Spending time with family	Lower than 1-2 hour	54	8.46	2.02	0.552	0.697
	1-2 hours	77	8.24	1.84		
	3-4 hours	70	8.37	1.81		
	5-6 hours	29	8.06	2.23		
	7 hours and more	10	7.60	2.31		
	Total	240	8.28	1.94		

*: p<0.05

Table 7. Independent sample t-test results between measurement tools and efficient leisure time variable

N=(240)						
	Efficient leisure	n	\bar{x}	ss	t	p
<i>Intrinsic Leisure Motivation</i>	Yes	114	83.36	10.11	3.825	0.000*
	No	126	78.29	10.39		
Challenge	Yes	114	29.77	5.09	2.799	0.006*
	No	126	27.93	5.05		
Self-Determination	Yes	114	24.36	3.62	3.750	0.000*
	No	126	22.60	3.65		
Commitment	Yes	114	11.11	2.39	3.660	0.000*
	No	126	9.99	2.35		
Competence	Yes	114	9.49	2.86	1.391	0.166
	No	126	9.00	2.60		
Amotivation	Yes	114	8.62	2.47	-0.454	0.650
	No	126	8.76	2.26		
<i>Recreation Experience Preference</i>	Yes	114	80.94	13.05	-1.217	0.225
	No	126	82.78	10.28		
Nature	Yes	114	13.11	2.46	-0.633	0.527
	No	126	13.29	1.92		
Physical Fitness	Yes	114	12.03	2.83	-1.095	0.275
	No	126	12.39	2.27		
Physical Rest	Yes	114	8.35	1.59	-0.912	0.363
	No	126	8.53	1.32		
Loneliness	Yes	114	14.52	4.36	-1.174	0.242
	No	126	15.14	3.77		
Escape Crowds	Yes	114	16.68	3.31	-1.204	0.230
	No	126	17.15	2.67		
Escape Physical Stressors	Yes	114	7.75	2.29	-1.485	0.139
	No	126	8.15	1.92		
Spending time with family	Yes	114	8.47	1.87	1.448	0.149
	No	126	8.11	1.98		

*: p<0.05

The age factor significantly differentiates both intrinsic leisure motivation and recreation experience preference. While individuals over the age of 20 are motivated at a higher level in intrinsic leisure motivation, this situation is in favor of participants under the age of 20 in recreation experience preference. Therefore, it can be said that age differentiates intrinsic leisure motivation and recreational experience preference. Similarly, Arnberger and Eder (19) stated that age differentiates recreational experience preference. Education was found to differentiate intrinsic leisure motivation, and

Özdemir (20) similarly found that educational status significantly changed intrinsic leisure motivation. Education is an important tool in motivating individuals. Opening the horizons of individuals towards knowledge is an important step to keep them motivated. In this direction, it is considered an expected result that the education factor differentiates intrinsic leisure motivation.

CONCLUSION

As a conclusion of the study; intrinsic leisure motivation scores are high and their recreation experience preference scores are similarly high.

There are statistically significant differences between the participants' gender, age, education level, daily leisure duration and efficient use of leisure and measurement tools. It is suggested that various variables of the participants participating in recreational activities in family centers differentiate their intrinsic leisure motivation and recreational experience preferences, so it is recommended that programs that will make their motivation and preference factors sustainable should be continued in the centers.

In many countries and in Türkiye, individuals prefer recreational activities such as visiting friends and surfing the internet, which they characterize as spending their leisure productively, but face limitations due to leisure time, money and pollution. Therefore, using leisure time effectively can also deeply affect leisure motivation and preferences. In the current research group, individuals developed higher intrinsic leisure motivation if they thought that they used their leisure time effectively, but it is very important to plan effective leisure in the form of spending quality time in centers such as family life centers. This situation fundamentally affects the recreational preferences.

Increasing individuals' awareness of leisure time spent with the family and perhaps providing trainings in this direction can help families make better use of their leisure time, promote family health and improve intra-family and interpersonal interactions. Productive leisure time spent with the family is a valuable parameter that can significantly improve the health of individuals and societies. In this direction, it is recommended that the activities in family life centers should be organized with activities that will trigger the intrinsic leisure motivation of individuals, and accordingly, recreational experience preferences should be planned in favor of activities spent in family life centers.

REFERENCES

1. Sansone C, Harackiewicz, J. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation, The Search for Optimal Motivation and Performance (Educational Psychology) (Edts Carol Sansone and Judith M. Harackiewicz) 1st ed, 2000; 1-10. [doi:10.1016/B978-012619070-0/50023-4]
2. Weissinger E, Iso-ahola, S. Intrinsic Leisure Motivation, Personality And Physical Health, *Loisir et Société/Society and Leisure*. 2013;7(1), 217-228. [doi:10.1080/07053436.1984.10715179]
3. Iwasaki, Y, Mannell, R. Situational and Personality Influences on Intrinsically Motivated Leisure Behavior: Interaction Effects and Cognitive Processes. *Leisure Sciences*. 1999; 21, 287-306. [doi:10.1080/014904099273011]

APPLICABLE REMARKS

- It should be taken into consideration that intrinsic motivation is an important variable in recreational participation, and at the same time, recreation experience preference is also a significant factor. Therefore, it can be ensured that recreation programs can be organized in this direction by evaluating the relevant variables in different recreational field participation.
- In addition, the effects of recreation experience preference and intrinsic motivation on each other and the relationship between them can be investigated with different sample groups.
- Studies can be expanded by conducting similar research in different geographical locations.
- At the same time, in addition to the quantitative research method, qualitative data can be obtained and the perspectives of the participants can be included by obtaining their opinions in the study.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Study concept and design: Tebessüm Ayyıldız Durhan. Acquisition of data: Tebessüm Ayyıldız Durhan, Ceren Suveren. Analysis and interpretation of data: Tebessüm Ayyıldız Durhan. Drafting the manuscript: Tebessüm Ayyıldız Durhan, Yasin Arslan. Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Yasin Arslan. Statistical analysis: Tebessüm Ayyıldız Durhan. Administrative, technical, and material support: Ceren Suveren. Study supervision: Yasin Arslan.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declared that there is no conflict of interest.

4. Maltsev, D, Andrieieva, O, Kashuba, V, Yarmak, O, Dobrodub, E, Grygus, I, Prusik, K. Assessment of the Quality of Active Family Leisure. *Physical Education Theory and Methodology*. 2022; 22(3). [doi:10.17309/tmfv.2022.3.13]
5. Warren-Adamson, C. What's happening in France? the settlement and social action centre. Exchange as empowerment, In, Warren-Adamson, Chris (ed.) *Family Centres and their International Role in Social Action*. Aldershot, UK. Ashgate Publishing. 2001; 29-44. [doi:10.4324/9781315209531-3]
6. Alexandris, K, Tsorbatzoudis, C, Grouios, G. Perceived constraints on recreational sport participation: Investigating their relationship with intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and amotivation. *Journal of leisure research*. 2002; 34(3), 233-252. [doi:10.1080/00222216.2002.11949970]
7. Bardak, F, Mamatoğlu, N. Intrinsic Motivation Scale for Employees: The Study of Validity and Reliability. *Humanistic Perspective*. 2023; 5(3), 1072-1097. [doi:10.47793/hp.1264714]
8. Erdoğan, S, Yazıcıoğlu, Y. *SPSS uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık. 2004.
9. Weissinger E, Bandalos, D. Development, reliability and validity of a scale to measure intrinsic motivation in leisure". *Journal of Leisure Research*. 1995; 27, 379-400. [doi:10.1080/00222216.1995.11949756]
10. Özdemir, A, S, Ayyıldız Durhan, T, Karaküçük, S. Validity And Reliability Analysis of Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale. *OPUS Journal of Society Research*. 2020; 15 (24), 2838-2855.
11. Manfredi, MJ, Driver, BL, Tarrant, MA. Measuring leisure motivation: A meta-analysis of the recreation experience preference scales. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 1999; 28(3), 188–213. [doi:10.1080/00222216.1996.11949770]
12. Ayar, H, Ayyıldız Durhan, T, Karaküçük, S. Recreation experience preference scale validity and reliability study. *Research in Sport Education and Sciences*. 2023; 25(2), 30-34. [doi:10.5152/JPESS.2023.22009]
13. Stewart, W, Harada, M, Fujimoto, J, Nagazumi, J. Experiential Benefits of Japanese Outdoor Recreationists. *Loisir et Société/Society and Leisure*. 1996; 19(2), 589-601. [doi:10.1080/07053436.1996.10715533]
14. Kurar, I. Research On The Determination Of Recreational Experience Preferences, Expectations, And Satisfaction Levels Of Local People. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge*. 2021. [doi:10.37335/ijek.v9i1.122]
15. Rancourt, A. Leisure education and the family. *Visions of Leisure and Business*. 1988; 7, 23-33.
16. Budruk, M, Stanis, S. Place attachment and recreation experience preference: A further exploration of the relationship. *Journal of outdoor recreation and tourism*. 2013; 1, 51-61. [doi:10.1016/j.jort.2013.04.001]
17. Schroeder, S, Cornicelli, L, Fulton, D, Merchant, S. The influence of motivation versus experience on recreation satisfaction: How appreciative- versus achievement-oriented recreation experience preferences relate to hunter satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 2019; 50, 107-131. [doi:10.1080/00222216.2018.1557502]
18. Weissinger, E, Caldwell, LL, Bandalos, DL. Relation between intrinsic motivation and boredom in leisure time. *Leisure Sciences*. 1992; 14(4), 317–325. [doi:10.1080/01490409209513177]
19. Arnberger, A, Eder, R. The influence of age on recreational trail preferences of urban green-space visitors: a discrete choice experiment with digitally calibrated images. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*. 2011; 54, 891 -908. [doi:10.1080/09640568.2010.539875]
20. Özdemir, A. Exploring Intrinsic Leisure Motivations Of University Students. *European Journal of Education Studies*. 2020; 7, 52-65.