ISSN: 2618 – 5911
**Turkish Journal of Sports Science**
2025; 9(1);21-35
DOI: 10.32706/tusbid.1678322
**Research Article**

# Examination of Leisure Crafting and Intrinsic Leisure Motivation of Sports Science Students[1]

Halime DİNÇ[2] Yusuf Can ÖZDEMİR[3] Rıfat YAĞMUR[4]
Burak OLUR[5] Dürdane SİCİMLİ[6]

## Abstract

This study investigates the levels of leisure crafting and intrinsic leisure motivation among sports science students based on demographic variables and examines the relationship between these two concepts. The sample consists of 310 voluntary students (177 male, 133 female) from the Faculty of Sports Sciences at Afyon Kocatepe University. Data were collected using the Leisure Crafting Scale, the Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale, and a demographic questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, Independent Samples t-Test, One-Way ANOVA, and Pearson Correlation tests were employed in the analysis. Results showed that male students reported higher leisure crafting levels, while intrinsic leisure motivation did not differ significantly by gender. Although class level and department had no overall impact on leisure crafting, recreation students scored significantly higher than students from other departments. Significant differences were also observed in certain sub-dimensions regarding paternal education and income levels. Additionally, positive correlations were found between specific sub-dimensions of intrinsic leisure motivation and leisure crafting. Overall, the findings highlight a meaningful link between intrinsically motivated leisure and proactive engagement in leisure activities, suggesting that such involvement can support self-exploration and personal development during university years.

***Keywords:*** Intrinsic Leisure Motivation, Leisure, Leisure Crafting

# Spor Bilimleri Öğrencilerinin Boş Zaman Becerikliliği ve İçsel Boş Zaman Motivasyonlarının İncelenmesi

## Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, spor bilimleri öğrencilerinin bazı demografik değişkenlere göre boş zaman becerikliliği ve içsel boş zaman motivasyon düzeylerini incelemek ayrıca bu iki kavram arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmaktır. Bu bağlamda, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi'nde öğrenim gören 177 erkek ve 133 kadın olmak üzere toplam 310 birey gönüllü katılım sağlamıştır. Çalışmada veri toplama aracı olarak "boş zaman becerikliliği" ve "içsel boş zaman motivasyonu" ölçekleri ile demografik değişkenlerden oluşan bir anket formu kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde, betimsel istatistik yöntemleri, Independent Samples t-Testi, tek yönlü Varyans Analizi (ANOVA) ve Pearson Korelasyon testleri uygulanmıştır. Araştırma bulguları, erkek

[1] This study was presented as an oral presentation at the 6th International Recreation and Sports Management Congress

[2] Corresponding Author: Afyon Kocatepe University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Afyonkarahisar-Türkiye. halimedinc@yandex.com
[3] Afyon Kocatepe University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Afyonkarahisar-Türkiye. ozdemircanyusuf@hotmail.com
[4] Afyon Kocatepe University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Afyonkarahisar-Türkiye. ryagmur@hotmail.com
[5] Afyon Kocatepe University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Afyonkarahisar-Türkiye. burakolur@aku.edu.tr
[6] Afyon Kocatepe University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Afyonkarahisar-Türkiye. durdanesicimli@gmail.com

***Citation/Atıf:*** Dinç, H., Özdemir, Y.C., Yağmur, R., Olur, B., Sicimli, D. (2025). Examination of Leisure Crafting and Intrinsic Leisure Motivation of Sports Science Students. *Turkish Journal of Sports Science*, 9(1):21-35. DOI: 10.32706/tusbid.1678322

*Received:17.04.2025*
*Accepted: 24.06.2025*

öğrencilerin boş zaman becerikliliğinin daha yüksek olduğunu, ancak içsel boş zaman motivasyonu açısından cinsiyetler arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Sınıf düzeyi ve bölüm değişkenleri genel olarak boş zaman becerikliliği üzerinde anlamlı bir etki göstermemekle birlikte, rekreasyon bölümü öğrencilerinin bu alanda diğer bölümlere kıyasla istatistiksel olarak anlamlı düzeyde daha yüksek beceriklilik sergilediği belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca ölçekler ile baba eğitim durumu ve gelir düzeyi değişkenleri açısından da bazı alt boyutlara göre anlamlı farklılıklar tespit edilmiştir. Son olarak içsel boş zaman motivasyonu ölçeğine ait bazı alt boyutlar ile boş zaman becerikliliği arasında anlamlı ve pozitif yönlü ilişki ortaya çıkmıştır. Sonuç olarak, bu çalışma spor bilimleri öğrencilerinin boş zaman becerikliliği ile içsel boş zaman motivasyonu arasındaki ilişkiyi ortaya koyarak, bu sürecin üniversite yaşamı boyunca bireyin kendini keşfetmesine ve kişisel gelişimine nasıl katkı sağladığına dair değerli içgörüler sunmaktadır. Bulgular, içsel motivasyonla yürütülen boş zaman etkinliklerinin, genç bireylerin belirli alanlarda beceri geliştirmelerinde destekleyici bir rol oynayabileceğini göstermektedir.

***Anahtar Kelimeler***: İçsel Boş Zaman Motivasyonu, Boş Zaman, Boş Zaman Becerikliliği

## INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary world, leisure time has become an essential component of personal balance, offering not only rest but also opportunities for growth and self-expression. Individuals increasingly use their free time to support their mental well-being, develop new skills, and foster social connection.

Research shows that the dynamics of work pace, educational life, and social responsibilities significantly shape how people engage in leisure activities (Yayla & Çetiner, 2019). Effective use of leisure time has been linked to improved well-being and overall life satisfaction (Sirgy et al., 2017). In this context, two key concepts—leisure crafting and intrinsic leisure motivation—emerge as crucial for making leisure time both productive and meaningful.

Leisure crafting refers to the individual's ability to plan their leisure time, choose meaningful activities, and sustain engagement in these activities (Petrou & Bakker, 2016). This skill is critical for making leisure time both efficient and fulfilling. On the other hand, intrinsic leisure motivation is a key element that shapes individuals' attitudes and behaviors toward leisure activities (Ryan & Deci, 2000). According to Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000), intrinsic motivation arises when individuals engage in an activity with a sense of volition and psychological freedom. This theory identifies autonomy, competence, and relatedness as the three basic psychological needs that foster intrinsic motivation. In this context, leisure crafting can be interpreted as a proactive behavior that satisfies these needs, particularly autonomy and competence, thus reinforcing intrinsic leisure motivation. In addition to Self-Determination Theory, other motivation theories such as the Expectancy-Value Theory (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002) emphasize individuals' expectations of success and the value they place on activities as determinants of motivation. Within leisure contexts, this aligns with how individuals assess the personal relevance and enjoyment of an activity before committing to it. The integration of psychological (e.g., Ryan & Deci, 2000) and sociological theories (e.g., Stebbins, 2001) provides a more comprehensive framework for understanding how individuals engage in leisure crafting. While psychological theories explain internal mechanisms such as need satisfaction and self-regulation, sociological frameworks contextualize these behaviors within broader social structures, educational backgrounds, and cultural expectations. In this regard, leisure crafting and intrinsic motivation form a synergistic partnership that focuses on individuals' potential to make their leisure time purposeful and rewarding.

Leisure crafting encompasses an active and deliberate effort toward achieving personal goals during one's leisure time (Petrou & Bakker, 2016). It includes seeking opportunities for self-development, forming new social relationships, and engaging with others (Fritz & Sonnentag, 2005). This concept suggests that leisure is not solely about passive rest or entertainment, but also involves participation in activities that foster

learning, social connection, and psychological renewal (Petrou & Bakker, 2016). Individuals who renew themselves through leisure crafting can manage their physical and mental energy more effectively, which in turn generates more positive outcomes (Ni et al., 2022).

Leisure crafting helps individuals offset resource losses—such as time, work-related stress, or burnout—by creating new resources, enhancing social support, and enriching existing ones (Hmieleski & Cole, 2021). This aligns closely with the concept of the "gain spiral of resources," a key component of the Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory. Developed by Hobfoll (1989), COR Theory posits that individuals strive to conserve, maintain, and increase their physical, cognitive, emotional, and social resources. This effort becomes particularly pronounced in situations where current resources are threatened or where there is potential to gain new ones. As a stress theory, COR focuses on how people protect and replenish their resources. Accordingly, leisure crafting can be seen as a comprehensive and effective strategy for preserving, gaining, and optimizing personal resources.

While individuals develop themselves through leisure crafting, their underlying motivation for engaging in such activities also plays a crucial role. This highlights the concept of intrinsic leisure motivation. According to Ryan and Deci (2000), motivation involves perceiving a situation as a personal challenge and striving to overcome it through self-initiated effort. This process is inherently self-directed and occurs in the absence of external rewards. Intrinsic motivation refers to the internal drivers of participation in leisure activities, encompassing both psychological mechanisms such as autonomy and competence, and sociological influences including social identity and cultural context (Chen & Pang, 2012). It is characterized by spontaneous interest, decision-making, and positive mood while pursuing personally meaningful goals (Orbegoso, 2016). How individuals spend their leisure time reflects not only their activities but also the significance those activities bring to their lives (Manfredo et al., 1996). Intrinsic motivation especially covers activities done for inner satisfaction and enjoyment (White, 1959). This form of motivation means engaging in an activity for the pleasure and fulfillment it provides (Deci & Ryan, 2013). From this perspective, intrinsic motivation illuminates how individuals explore their potential and add depth to their lives.

Leisure crafting and intrinsic leisure motivation stand out as two fundamental constructs that enhance quality of life, support psychological recovery, and optimize resource management. However, empirical research exploring the direction, strength, and contextual dynamics of the relationship between these two variables remains limited. In this regard, the present study aims to examine the relationship between leisure crafting and intrinsic leisure motivation, while also analyzing the role of relevant demographic variables, thereby contributing to the literature. Demographic factors such as age, gender, and education level are included in the study based on the assumption that these characteristics may influence individuals' leisure preferences, motivations, and capacities for leisure crafting. Understanding these effects will provide a more nuanced interpretation of how personal background shapes leisure-related behaviors. The findings are expected to inform the development of strategies that help individuals utilize their leisure time more effectively and meaningfully. Thus, the study offers both theoretical insights and practical implications for future applications. To provide a clearer analytical direction and align with the theoretical framework, the following hypotheses were developed to guide the study:

H1: There is a significant relationship between intrinsic leisure motivation and leisure crafting among sports science students.

H2: There are significant differences in intrinsic leisure motivation according to certain demographic variables (e.g., income level, academic department).

H3: There are significant differences in leisure crafting according to certain

demographic variables (e.g., gender, academic department, parental education).

These hypotheses aim to explore not only the interrelation between the main psychological constructs but also how individual characteristics might shape students' leisure-related behaviors.

## METHODS

This section presents the research model, details regarding the study group, data collection instruments, the data collection process, and the procedures for data analysis.

### *Research Model*

This study employed a quantitative research approach, utilizing both causal-comparative and correlational survey models (Karasar, 2007) to examine the intrinsic leisure motivation and leisure crafting skills of students in the field of sport sciences. Data were collected through a questionnaire technique.

### *Participants*

This study was conducted with students from the Faculty of Sport Sciences at Afyon Kocatepe University. The study group consisted of a total of 310 students who voluntarily agreed to participate. Participants were selected through convenience sampling due to its practicality and accessibility in educational settings; however, this non-probability method may limit the generalizability of the findings. Nevertheless, considering that student admission processes (e.g., special talent exams) and curricular structures across sport sciences faculties in Turkey are largely standardized, the findings may provide indicative insights at a national level.

To evaluate the adequacy of the sample size for the statistical analyses conducted, a post-hoc power analysis was performed using G*Power 3.1.9.7 software. Based on the tests applied in the study—including independent samples t-tests, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson correlation analysis—a power calculation was conducted using an alpha level of .05, a medium effect size (f = 0.25), and a sample size of 310 participants. The resulting statistical power (1 – β) was calculated to be above 99.9%. This result confirms that the sample size was sufficient for the analyses performed and supports the reliability of the study's results.

The study was conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval was granted by the Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee of Afyon Kocatepe University (Decision No: 2024/385, dated 20.11.2024). The questionnaire, which served as the data collection tool, was administered face-to-face. The survey took approximately 6 minutes to complete, and the data obtained were analyzed in accordance with the principle of anonymity.

Basic demographic characteristics of the participants, including gender, class level, academic department, and parental education, are presented in Table 1 to provide a clearer profile of the sample.

### *Data Collection*

In this research, the "Personal Information Form," the "Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale," and the "Leisure Crafting Scale" were used as data collection instruments. The personal information form included questions related to gender, grade level, department, income status, and parental education levels. The data were collected between November 25, 2024, and December 13, 2024.

### *Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale*

To assess participants' intrinsic leisure motivation, the "Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale," originally developed by Weissinger and Bandalos (1995) and adapted into Turkish by Özdemir, Durhan, and Karaküçük (2020), was utilized. The scale consists of five subdimensions and 23 items. Özdemir et al. (2020) stated that the scale is valid and effective in explaining the psychological and sociological factors underlying participation in leisure activities.

The scale is structured using a 5-point Likert-type rating system, with response options ranging from "1 = Strongly Disagree" to "5 = Strongly Agree." The subdimensions of the scale are as follows: Challenge (items 1–8), Self-Determination (items 9–14),

Commitment (items 15–17), Identification (items 18–20), and Amotivation (items 21–23). The items in the Amotivation subdimension were reverse coded and carefully recoded prior to analysis. All data entries were double-checked to ensure scoring accuracy and internal consistency.

In the Turkish adaptation study, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the subdimensions were reported as .85 for Challenge, .85 for Self-Determination, .75 for Commitment, .71 for Identification, and .70 for Amotivation. The overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale was .91. In the current study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the subdimensions were calculated as .825, .741, .735, .748, and .685 respectively, with an overall reliability coefficient of .891.

### *Leisure Crafting Scale*

This scale, which reflects a proactive effort to achieve personal goals during leisure time, was developed by Petrou and Bakker (2016) and adapted into Turkish by Sürücü and Ertan (2022). The scale is unidimensional and consists of 9 items. In the adaptation study, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was reported as .845. The scale is based on a 5-point Likert-type system with response options ranging from "1 = Strongly Disagree" to "5 = Strongly Agree." In the current study, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the scale was calculated as .855.

Both scales had previously undergone comprehensive psychometric evaluations, including confirmatory factor analyses during their Turkish adaptation processes, which supported their structural validity. Therefore, the present study did not reassess the factor structures but relied on these well-established and validated frameworks.

### *Data Analysis*

The collected data were entered into SPSS software for statistical analysis. During data entry, percentage and frequency distributions were examined to identify potential coding errors; any inaccuracies were reviewed and corrected when necessary. To assess the normality of the data distribution, skewness and kurtosis values were evaluated. According to George and Mallery (2003), values between -2 and +2 are considered acceptable indicators of a normal distribution. In this study, all variables were found to fall within this range, supporting the assumption of normality.

Descriptive statistics, including percentages, frequencies, and means, were calculated to summarize participants' demographic characteristics and average scale scores. Independent samples t-tests were used to examine differences in intrinsic leisure motivation and leisure crafting scores by gender. One-way ANOVA was conducted for variables with more than two groups (e.g., grade level, academic department, income level, and parental education). When ANOVA results indicated significant differences, Tukey's HSD post hoc test was employed to identify the source of the group differences. Finally, Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to assess the relationships between intrinsic leisure motivation and leisure crafting.

## RESULTS

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Sport Sciences Faculty Students' Demographic Characteristics, Leisure Crafting, and Intrinsic Leisure Motivation

| Variables | Groups | Frequency | % | ILMS | LCS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | x̄±ss | x̄±ss |
| Gender | Male | 177 | 57,1 | 3,816±0,891 | 4,234±0,719 |
| | Female | 133 | 42,9 | 3,684±0,789 | 4,045±0,655 |
| Grade Level | 1 | 89 | 28,7 | 3,724±0,866 | 4,134±0,718 |
| | 2 | 86 | 27,7 | 3,616±0,938 | 4,168±0,709 |
| | 3 | 41 | 13,2 | 3,865±0,698 | 4,073±0,712 |
| | 4 | 94 | 30,3 | 3,877±0,798 | 4,191±0,068 |
| Department | Physical Education and Sports Teaching | 82 | 26,5 | 3,774±0,096 | 4,109±0,689 |
| | Coaching Education | 126 | 40,6 | 3,678±0,075 | 4,063±0,721 |
| | Recreation | 102 | 32,9 | 3,848±0,830 | 4,299±0,657 |
| İncome | Low | 51 | 16,5 | 3,745±0,902 | 4,176±0,712 |
| | Medium | 155 | 50,0 | 3,677±0,834 | 4,077±0,707 |
| | High | 104 | 33,5 | 3,889±0,838 | 4,254±0,668 |
| Father's Education Level | Primary School | 88 | 28,4 | 3,812±0,868 | 4,090±0,748 |
| | Middle School | 64 | 20,6 | 3,671±0,724 | 3,984±0,684 |
| | High School | 119 | 38,4 | 3,760±0,927 | 4,176±0,656 |
| | University | 39 | 12,6 | 3,782±0,767 | 4,500±0,617 |
| Mother's Education Level | Primary School | 139 | 44,8 | 3,643±0,870 | 4,039±0,766 |
| | Middle School | 61 | 19,7 | 3,811±0,817 | 4,147±0,614 |
| | High School | 85 | 27,4 | 3,847±0,845 | 4,282±0,599 |
| | University | 25 | 8,1 | 3,980±0,850 | 4,360±0,714 |

*ILMS=Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale, LCS=Leisure Crafting Scale*

As shown in Table 1, 57.1% (n=177) of the students participating in the study were male, while 42.9% (n=133) were female. Regarding class distribution, 30.3% (n=94) of the students were in their fourth year. In terms of academic department, 40.6% (n=126) were enrolled in the Coaching Education program. Additionally, 50.0% (n=155) of the students reported having a medium income level. Concerning parental education levels, 38.4% (n=119) of the fathers had completed high school, while 44.8% (n=139) of the mothers had completed primary school. The table also presents the mean scale scores for each demographic variable.

Table 2. Differences in Leisure Crafting and Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Total Scores and Subdimensions According to Gender among Sport Sciences Faculty Students

| Variables | Gender | n | x̄ | Sd | *t* | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Leisure Crafting | Male | 177 | 4,23 | 0,71 | 2,38 | 0,018* |
| | Female | 133 | 4,04 | 0,65 | | |
| Intrinsic Leisure Motivation | Male | 177 | 3,81 | 0,89 | 1,35 | 0,176 |
| | Female | 133 | 3,68 | 0,78 | | |
| Challenge/ Competence | Male | 177 | 3,49 | 1,14 | 1,37 | 0,171 |
| | Female | 133 | 3,31 | 1,06 | | |
| Self-Determination | Male | 177 | 3,93 | 0,76 | 0,93 | 0,350 |
| | Female | 133 | 3,85 | 0,72 | | |
| Commitment | Male | 177 | 3,96 | 0,80 | 1,47 | 0,142 |
| | Female | 133 | 3,83 | 0,70 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Identification | Male | 177 | 3,84 | 0,84 | 2,44 | 0,015* |
| | Female | 133 | 3,60 | 0,83 | | |
| Amotivation | Male | 177 | 3,49 | 1,14 | 1,37 | 0,171 |
| | Female | 133 | 3,31 | 1,06 | | |

**p<0,05*

As shown in Table 2, a statistically significant difference was found in the Leisure Crafting mean scores and the Identification subdimension of Intrinsic Leisure Motivation according to gender among students of the Faculty of Sport Sciences (p<.05).

Table 3. Differences in Leisure Crafting and Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Total Scores and Subdimensions According to Grade Level among Sport Sciences Faculty Students

| Variables | Grade Level | n | x̄ | Sd | F | *p* | *Difference* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Leisure Crafting | 1 | 89 | 4,13 | 0,71 | 0,307 | 0,821 | - |
| | 2 | 86 | 4,16 | 0,70 | | | |
| | 3 | 41 | 4,07 | 0,71 | | | |
| | 4 | 94 | 4,19 | 0,66 | | | |
| Intrinsic Leisure Motivation | 1 | 89 | 3,72 | 0,86 | 1,691 | 0,168 | - |
| | 2 | 86 | 3,61 | 0,93 | | | |
| | 3 | 41 | 3,86 | 0,69 | | | |
| | 4 | 94 | 3,87 | 0,79 | | | |
| Challenge/ Competence | 1 | 89 | 4,02 | 0,81 | 1,512 | 0,210 | - |
| | 2 | 86 | 3,80 | 0,72 | | | |
| | 3 | 41 | 4,01 | 0,58 | | | |
| | 4 | 94 | 3,96 | 0,68 | | | |
| Self-Determination | 1 | 89 | 3,91 | 0,81 | 0,048 | 0,986 | - |
| | 2 | 86 | 3,87 | 0,76 | | | |
| | 3 | 41 | 3,90 | 0,67 | | | |
| | 4 | 94 | 3,91 | 0,71 | | | |
| Commitment | 1 | 89 | 3,98 | 0,85 | 1,807 | 0,146 | - |
| | 2 | 86 | 3,78 | 0,78 | | | |
| | 3 | 41 | 3,79 | 0,65 | | | |
| | 4 | 94 | 3,99 | 0,67 | | | |
| Identification | 1 | 89 | 3,84 | 0,88 | 2,925 | 0,034* | 4 < 2 |
| | 2 | 86 | 3,54 | 0,79 | | | |
| | 3 | 41 | 3,64 | 0,88 | | | |
| | 4 | 94 | 3,86 | 0,82 | | | |
| Amotivation | 1 | 89 | 3,29 | 1,19 | 3,465 | 0,017* | 4 < 2 |
| | 2 | 86 | 3,19 | 1,12 | | | |
| | 3 | 41 | 3,65 | 0,90 | | | |
| | 4 | 94 | 3,63 | 1,04 | | | |

**p<0,05*

As shown in Table 3, no statistically significant differences were found in the total scores of Leisure Crafting and Intrinsic Leisure Motivation according to students' grade level. However, significant differences were observed among grade levels in the Identification subdimension (p = .034) and the Amotivation subdimension (p = .017). Post hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test indicated that students in the fourth year scored significantly higher in Identification and lower in Amotivation compared to second-year students (4>2). No significant differences were found in the remaining subdimension (p<.05).

Table 4. Differences in Leisure Crafting and Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Total Scores and Subdimensions According to Academic Department among Sport Sciences Faculty Students.

| Variables | Department | n | x̄ | Sd | F | *p* | *Difference* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Leisure Crafting | Physical Education and Sports Teaching$_1$ | 82 | 4,10 | 0,68 | 3,486 | 0,032* | 2<1,3 |
| | Coaching Education$_2$ | 126 | 4,06 | 0,72 | | | |
| | Recreation $_3$ | 102 | 4,29 | 0,65 | | | |
| Intrinsic Leisure Motivation | Physical Education and Sports Teachin $_1$ | 82 | 3,77 | 0,87 | 1,138 | 0,322 | - |
| | Coaching Education$_2$ | 126 | 3,67 | 0,84 | | | |
| | Recreation $_3$ | 102 | 3,84 | 0,84 | | | |
| Challenge/ Competence | Physical Education and Sports Teachin $_1$ | 82 | 3,77 | 0,87 | 1,138 | 0,322 | - |
| | Coaching Education$_2$ | 126 | 3,67 | 0,84 | | | |
| | Recreation $_3$ | 102 | 3,84 | 0,84 | | | |
| Self-Determination | Physical Education and Sports Teaching$_1$ | 82 | 3,89 | 0,73 | 1,789 | 0,169 | - |
| | Coaching Education$_2$ | 126 | 3,82 | 0,77 | | | |
| | Recreation $_3$ | 102 | 4,00 | 0,72 | | | |
| Commitment | Physical Education and Sports Teaching$_1$ | 82 | 3,93 | 0,72 | 0,483 | 0,617 | - |
| | Coaching Education$_2$ | 126 | 3,85 | 0,81 | | | |
| | Recreation $_3$ | 102 | 3,95 | 0,73 | | | |
| Identification | Physical Education and Sports Teaching$_1$ | 82 | 3,70 | 0,78 | 4,692 | 0,010* | 2<1<3 |
| | Coaching Education$_2$ | 126 | 3,60 | 0,94 | | | |
| | Recreation $_3$ | 102 | 3,94 | 0,72 | | | |
| Amotivation | Physical Education and Sports Teaching$_1$ | 82 | 3,39 | 1,12 | 3,691 | 0,026* | 2<1<3 |
| | Coaching Education$_2$ | 126 | 3,25 | 1,14 | | | |
| | Recreation $_3$ | 102 | 3,64 | 1,01 | | | |

**p<0,05*

As shown in Table 4, statistically significant differences were found among departments in students' total Leisure Crafting scores, as well as in the Identification and Amotivation subdimensions (p = .01). However, no significant differences were observed in the total Intrinsic Leisure Motivation scores or in the other subdimensions (p>.05).

Table 5. Differences in Leisure Crafting and Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Total Scores and Subdimensions According to Income Level among Sport Sciences Faculty Students

| Variables | Income | n | x̄ | Sd | F | *p* | *Difference* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Leisure Crafting | Low | 51 | 4,17 | 0,71 | 2,059 | 0,129 | - |
| | Medium | 155 | 4,07 | 0,70 | | | |
| | High | 104 | 4,25 | 0,66 | | | |
| Intrinsic Leisure Motivation | Low | 51 | 3,74 | 0,90 | 1,956 | 0,143 | - |
| | Medium | 155 | 3,67 | 0,83 | | | |
| | High | 104 | 3,88 | 0,83 | | | |
| Challenge/ Competence | Low | 51 | 3,94 | 0,82 | 2,456 | 0,087 | - |
| | Medium | 155 | 3,86 | 0,71 | | | |
| | High | 104 | 4,06 | 0,67 | | | |
| Self- | Low | 51 | 3,55 | 0,82 | 10,21 | 0,000* | 1 < 2 < 3 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Determination | Medium | 155 | 3,87 | 0,73 | | | |
| | High | 104 | 4,11 | 0,66 | | | |
| Commitment | Low | 51 | 3,68 | 0,86 | 4,504 | 0,012* | 1 < 2 < 3 |
| | Medium | 155 | 3,87 | 0,72 | | | |
| | High | 104 | 4,06 | 0,74 | | | |
| Identification | Low | 51 | 3,60 | 0,90 | 2,054 | 0,130 | - |
| | Medium | 155 | 3,69 | 0,78 | | | |
| | High | 104 | 3,87 | 0,90 | | | |
| Amotivation | Low | 51 | 3,46 | 1,01 | 0,294 | 0,745 | - |
| | Medium | 155 | 3,37 | 1,02 | | | |
| | High | 104 | 3,47 | 1,27 | | | |

**p<0,05*

As shown in Table 5, no statistically significant differences were found in the total scores of Leisure Crafting and Intrinsic Leisure Motivation according to students' income levels (p<.05). However, in the Self-Determination subdimension of the Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale, students with higher income levels scored significantly higher (p=.000). Additionally, a statistically significant difference was found in the Commitment subdimension based on income level (p=.012). No significant differences were observed in the remaining subdimensions of the Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale (p<.05).

Table 6. Differences in Leisure Crafting and Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Total Scores and Subdimensions According to Father's Educational Background among Sport Sciences Faculty Students

| Variables | Father's Education Level | n | x̄ | Sd | F | *p* | *Difference* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Leisure Crafting | Primary School$_1$ | 88 | 4,09 | 0,74 | 4,91 | 0,002* | 1<2 <3<4 |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 64 | 3,98 | 0,68 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 119 | 4,17 | 0,65 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 39 | 4,50 | 0,61 | | | |
| Intrinsic Leisure Motivation | Primary School$_1$ | 88 | 3,81 | 0,09 | 0,791 | 0,791 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 64 | 3,67 | 0,09 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 119 | 3,76 | 0,08 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 39 | 3,78 | 0,12 | | | |
| Challenge/ Competence | Primary School$_1$ | 88 | 3,92 | 0,80 | 1,178 | 0,318 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 64 | 3,81 | 0,72 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 119 | 4,00 | 0,67 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 39 | 4,03 | 0,71 | | | |
| Self-Determination | Primary School$_1$ | 88 | 3,74 | 0,75 | 1,962 | 0,120 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 64 | 3,92 | 0,72 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 119 | 3,98 | 0,70 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 39 | 3,97 | 0,88 | | | |
| Commitment | Primary School$_1$ | 88 | 3,83 | 0,81 | 2,755 | 0,43 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 64 | 3,87 | 0,67 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 119 | 3,87 | 0,76 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 39 | 4,23 | 0,73 | | | |
| Identification | Primary School$_1$ | 88 | 3,69 | 0,87 | 0,383 | 0,766 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 64 | 3,69 | 0,81 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 119 | 3,76 | 0,79 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 39 | 3,84 | 1,00 | | | |
| Amotivation | Primary School$_1$ | 88 | 3,61 | 1,01 | 1,564 | 0,198 | - |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Middle School$_2$ | 64 | 3,35 | 1,05 |
| | High School$_3$ | 119 | 3,38 | 1,13 |
| | University$_4$ | 39 | 3,19 | 1,29 |

**p<0,05*

As shown in Table 6, a statistically significant difference was found in the total scores of the Leisure Crafting Scale according to father's educational background, with students whose fathers held a university degree scoring higher (p=002). No statistically significant differences were observed in the total Intrinsic Leisure Motivation scores or in any of its subdimensions (p<.05).

Table 7. Differences in Leisure Crafting and Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Total Scores and Subdimensions According to Mother's Educational Background among Sport Sciences Faculty Students

| Variables | Mother's Education Level | n | x̄ | Sd | F | *p* | *Difference* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Leisure Crafting | Primary School$_1$ | 139 | 4,03 | 0,76 | 2,989 | 0,031 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 61 | 4,14 | 0,61 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 85 | 4,28 | 0,59 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 25 | 4,36 | 0,71 | | | |
| Intrinsic Leisure Motivation | Primary School$_1$ | 139 | 3,64 | 0,87 | 1,297 | 0,146 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 61 | 3,81 | 0,81 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 85 | 3,84 | 0,84 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 25 | 3,98 | 0,78 | | | |
| Challenge/ Competence | Primary School$_1$ | 139 | 3,88 | 0,80 | 1,362 | 0,255 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 61 | 3,87 | 0,66 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 85 | 4,07 | 0,60 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 25 | 4,00 | 0,72 | | | |
| Self-Determination | Primary School$_1$ | 139 | 3,80 | 0,76 | 1,578 | 0,195 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 61 | 3,95 | 0,64 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 85 | 3,96 | 0,76 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 25 | 4,10 | 0,82 | | | |
| Commitment | Primary School$_1$ | 139 | 3,86 | 0,80 | 0,899 | 0,442 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 61 | 3,84 | 0,71 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 85 | 3,98 | 0,72 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 25 | 4,06 | 0,75 | | | |
| Identification | Primary School$_1$ | 139 | 3,67 | 0,90 | 0,540 | 0,655 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 61 | 3,79 | 0,76 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 85 | 3,78 | 0,85 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 25 | 3,82 | 0,67 | | | |
| Amotivation | Primary School$_1$ | 139 | 3,41 | 1,06 | 3,670 | 0,571 | - |
| | Middle School$_2$ | 61 | 3,53 | 1,08 | | | |
| | High School$_3$ | 85 | 3,42 | 1,17 | | | |
| | University$_4$ | 25 | 3,16 | 1,18 | | | |

****p<0,05***

As shown in Table 7, no statistically significant differences were found in students' total Leisure Crafting scores, total Intrinsic Leisure Motivation scores, or any of its subdimensions according to mother's educational background (p<.05).

Table 8. Correlation Between Intrinsic Leisure Motivation and Leisure Crafting

| Intrinsic Leisure Motivation | Pearson's r | Leisure Crafting |
|---|---|---|
| Challenge/ Competence | r | .530** |
| Self-Determination | r | .443** |
| Commitment | r | .400** |
| Identification | r | .363** |
| Amotivation | r | .096 |

As shown in Table 8, significant positive correlations were observed between Leisure Crafting and the subdimensions of the Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Scale, including Challenge/Competence (r=.530**), Self-Determination (r=.443**), Commitment (r=.400**), and Identification (r=.363**). These results suggest that students with higher levels of intrinsic motivation tend to engage more proactively in leisure crafting activities. Notably, no significant relationship was found between Amotivation and Leisure Crafting (r=.096, non-significant), indicating that the absence of motivation does not contribute meaningfully to the structuring of leisure time. Overall, the coefficients reflect moderate to strong relationships, supporting the theoretical assumption that intrinsic motivation plays a key role in shaping how individuals structure and invest in their leisure experiences.

## DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

This study examined the intrinsic leisure motivation and leisure crafting of sport sciences students in relation to various demographic variables, while also exploring the relationship between these two constructs.

In terms of gender, a statistically significant difference was found between male and female students in total leisure crafting scores (Table 2). The higher scores among male students may suggest that they are more effective in utilizing their leisure time and managing leisure-related activities. In contrast, no significant difference was found in the total intrinsic leisure motivation scores. This suggests that gender does not have a distinct effect on intrinsic motivation. Although not directly in the context of intrinsic leisure motivation, a meta-analysis conducted by Yarım and Ada (2021) also concluded that gender does not significantly influence general motivation. Similarly, in a study by Dinç et al. (2019) examining university students' meanings of leisure, no significant findings were reported regarding the intrinsic leisure motivation variable, despite significant results in other subdimensions. These findings support the notion that intrinsic leisure motivation is independent of gender, aligning with previous research.

Regarding the grade level variable, no statistically significant differences were observed in total leisure crafting or intrinsic leisure motivation scores (Table 3). However, differences were found in the Identification and Amotivation subdimensions. Notably, fourth-year students scored higher, which may reflect the influence of accumulated academic knowledge and experience on motivation. Nevertheless, the absence of consistent differences suggests that grade level may have a limited effect on these constructs. It is possible that leisure crafting and intrinsic motivation develop at earlier stages and remain relatively stable throughout university years. According to Sivan and Siu (2021), university students have opportunities to explore various domains, participate in extracurricular activities, and engage with diverse peer groups throughout their academic journey. This process helps them better understand themselves and discover genuine interests and passions, enabling them to structure their leisure time more consciously and meaningfully. Hill (2013) also found that higher identification scores among fourth-year students may align with the identity development process during university. As students approach graduation, they may increasingly feel the need to define

themselves beyond academic roles, which in turn encourages engagement in leisure activities aligned with their evolving self-concept.

Furthermore, although no statistically significant difference was found between departments in terms of intrinsic leisure motivation and leisure crafting (Table 4), an evaluation of the mean scores revealed that students in the recreation department had higher leisure crafting scores compared to other departments. This finding may suggest that students in the recreation department possess stronger leisure management skills due to their professional orientation. The absence of significant differences in intrinsic leisure motivation scores between departments indicates that department-based differences may influence leisure crafting more directly. According to Silverman (1995), the curriculum of recreation departments covers topics such as time management, planning, and resource allocation for leisure activities. This specialized education may help students acquire practical skills that enhance leisure crafting, independent of their intrinsic motivation levels. In another study, Sessoms (2000) examined whether students in recreation departments were provided with greater opportunities to participate in diverse leisure activities. Exposure to a broader range of activities, along with guidance from faculty members and experienced peers, can contribute to students' abilities to effectively identify, plan, and sustain leisure engagements. Additionally, a study by Gou et al. (2022) found that higher income levels may provide more flexibility in work arrangements, allowing individuals to better integrate leisure into their lives. This leads to a greater sense of perceived control over leisure, which can influence their self-determination.

Regarding income level, no significant differences were found in leisure crafting or intrinsic leisure motivation (Table 5). However, students with higher income levels scored significantly higher in the Self-Determination subdimension, suggesting that socioeconomic status may influence personal awareness and self-regulatory capacities. The study by Okun and Morris (2003) emphasizes that socioeconomic status may intersect with social support networks. Individuals with higher income may have access to broader social environments and resources that facilitate leisure participation, which in turn positively affects their leisure crafting skills.

Father's educational background was found to significantly influence leisure crafting (Tables 6 and 7). Students whose fathers had attained a university degree reported higher leisure crafting scores. Although no statistically significant difference was found in relation to mother's education level, students with more highly educated mothers tended to have relatively higher scores. These findings highlight the influence of parental education levels on leisure behavior. According to Chesley and Flood (2017), the availability of leisure time that can be used for continued education is highly valuable. Higher parental education may be associated with an emphasis on lifelong learning and intellectual curiosity. These values may be transmitted to children, encouraging them to seek out new experiences and pursue knowledge beyond formal educational settings.

Finally, the study revealed important findings regarding the influence of different dimensions of intrinsic motivation on leisure crafting. Specifically, the dimensions of Challenge, Self-Determination, and Commitment were found to enhance individuals' capacity to make effective and meaningful use of their leisure time. These results suggest that the ability to cope with challenges, act autonomously, and feel committed is a significant determinant of leisure crafting. This aligns with previous findings showing that leisure crafting behaviors are strengthened when individuals perceive a clear structure of time and engage in goal-directed leisure activities (Tsaur, Yen, & Chen, 2021). In contrast, the Identification dimension appeared to have a more limited effect on leisure crafting. This may indicate that identification with activities contributes more to the motivational foundation rather than directly enhancing crafting behaviors. These findings underscore the importance of developing specific dimensions of intrinsic leisure motivation in order to improve how individuals engage with their leisure.

Supporting this, Xue et al. (2022) demonstrated that when college students engaged in leisure crafting regularly, especially in forms aligned with personal motivation, their well-being improved significantly over time. Particularly, supporting autonomy and the ability to cope with challenges may have a positive impact on leisure crafting. This aligns with the broader understanding that leisure crafting not only enhances individual well-being but also contributes to deeper forms of personal and professional integration, such as job embeddedness, as demonstrated by Teng and Chen (2025). Their study revealed that leisure crafting can play a significant mediating role in strengthening individuals' psychological connection to their work and life environments.

Overall, the results of the study highlight a strong and meaningful relationship between intrinsic leisure motivation and leisure crafting. The findings provided valuable insights in line with the purpose of the study and contributed to expanding the existing body of literature. Whereas previous studies often focused on variables associated with intrinsic motivation and leisure crafting separately, this study has brought their direct relationship into focus. Additionally, the analysis of these variables in comparison to demographic factors addresses a gap in the current literature. In conclusion, this study reveals the relationship between leisure crafting and intrinsic leisure motivation among sports science students, offering valuable insights into how this process contributes to self-discovery and personal development during university life. As a result of this study, engaging in intrinsically motivated leisure activities can play a supportive role in helping young individuals develop skills in specific areas.

This study has several limitations. Firstly, the research was conducted exclusively with students from a single university's Faculty of Sport Sciences, which limits the generalizability of the findings. The demographic and socioeconomic diversity of the participants was limited, potentially affecting the external validity of the study. In addition, the study relied solely on self-report measurement instruments, which may introduce response biases and limit the objectivity of the findings. The exclusive use of quantitative methods also restricted the depth of contextual and experiential insights that could have been captured through qualitative approaches.

Future research should consider collecting data from multiple universities and more diverse populations to enhance generalizability. Moreover, longitudinal research designs could be employed to explore the long-term effects of leisure crafting and intrinsic motivation. Qualitative approaches and in-depth interviews could provide more detailed insights into individuals' leisure experiences. Lastly, the influence of environmental and societal factors on these relationships should be examined in greater depth.

Beyond future research, the findings offer practical implications for university settings. For instance, campus-based leisure programs may be designed to enhance students' intrinsic motivation and leisure crafting abilities. Student support services and counseling units could also incorporate leisure planning and motivational skill-building into personal development workshops.

### *Author's Statement of Contribution to the Article*

Idea/Concept: Halime Dinç, Yusuf Can Özdemir; Article design: Halime Dinç, Yusuf Can Özdemir; Consulting: Rıfat Yağmur; Data Collection and Processing: Halime Dinç, Burak Olur, Dürdane Sicimli; Analysis/Comment: Halime Dinç; Literature review: Halime Dinç, Yusuf Can Özdemir; Article writing: Halime Dinç; Critical Analysis: Rıfat Yağmur; Source/Material: Burak Olur, Dürdane Sicimli; Article Submission Corresponding Author: Halime Dinç

### *Conflict of Interest*

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

***Financial support***

No financial support was received for the completion of this study**.**

***Ethics Committee Approval***

The study was conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval was granted by the Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee of Afyon Kocatepe University (Decision No: 2024/385, dated 20.11.2024).

***Peer Review***

After the blind review process, it was found suitable for publication and accepted.

## REFERENCES

Chen, M., and Pang, X. (2012). Leisure motivation: An integrative review. *Social Behavior and Personality: an International Journal*, 40(7), 1075-1081.

Chesley, N., and Flood, S. (2017). Signs of change? At-home and breadwinner parents' housework and child-care time. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *79*(2), 511-534.

Deci, E. L., and Ryan, R. M. (2013). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Dinç, H., Koca, B, H., Poyraz, A., ve Aydemir, K. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin boş zaman anlamlarının incelenmesi. *Türkiye Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, *3*(1), 1-9.

Eccles, J. S., and Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual review of psychology*, *53*(1), 109-132.

Fritz, C., and Sonnentag, S. (2005). Recovery, health, and job performance: effects of weekend experiences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(3), 187.

George, D., and Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide Andreference*, 105-153.

Guo, H., Zhou, R., Li, M., Zhang, S., Yi, H., Wang, L., ... and Lu, H. (2022). The use of Kumpfer's resilience framework in understanding the breastfeeding experience of employed mothers after returning to work: a qualitative study in China. *International Breastfeeding Journal*, *17*(1), 13.

Hamrick, A. B., Paterson, T. A., Michaelis, T. L., Murnieks, C. Y., and Petrou, P. (2023). Work hard or play hard: the effect of leisure crafting on opportunity recognition and venture performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *38*(5), 106327.

Hill, A. P. (2013). Motivation and university experience in first-year university students: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, *13*, 244-254.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: a new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513.

Joseph Sirgy, M., Uysal, M., and Kruger, S. (2018). *A benefits theory of leisure well-being*. Handbook of leisure, physical activity, sports, recreation and quality of life, 3-18.

Karasar, N. (2007). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi: Kavramlar, İlkeler, Teknikler* Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Manfredo, M. J., Driver, B. L., and Tarrant, M. A. (1996). Measuring leisure motivation: A meta-analysis of the recreation experience preference scales. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28(3), 188-213.

Miller, K. A., Deci, E. L., and Ryan, R. M. (1988). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. *Contemporary Sociology*, *17*(2), 253.

Ni, Y. L., Kuo, C. C., Wu, C. H., Chang, W. H., and Chen, L. H. (2022). How can we cope with self-control demands and enhance proactive vitality management? The role of leisure crafting and supervisor recreational sports support. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 23(8), 3961-3980.

Okun, M. A., Ruehlman, L., Karoly, P., Lutz, R., Fairholme, C., and Schaub, R. (2003). Social support and social norms: Do both contribute to predicting leisure-time

exercise?. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, *27*(5), 493-507.

Orbegoso, A. (2016). La motivación intrínseca según Ryan & Deci y algunas recomendaciones para maestros. *Educare, Revista Científica de Educação*, *2*(1), 75-93.

Özdemir, A. S., Durhan, T. A., ve Karaküçük, S. (2020). İçsel boş zaman motivasyon ölçeği geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, *15*(24), 2838-2855.

Petrou, P., and Bakker, A. B. (2016). Crafting one's leisure time in response to high job strain. *Human relations*, *69*(2), 507-529.

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.

Sessoms, H. D. (2000). The 1960s: A pivotal decade for recreation research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(1), 143-146.

Silverman, L. H. (1995). Training theory-builders: Coursework in visitor behavior. Schole. *A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education*,, 10(1), 67-77.

Sivan, A., and Siu, G. P. K. (2021). A longitudinal study on leisure of Hong Kong adolescents. *Leisure Studies*, *40*(3), 306-320.

Stebbins, R. A. (2001). Serious leisure. *Society*, 38(4), 53–57.

Sürücü, L., ve Ertan, Ş. S. (2022). Boş zaman becerikliliği ölçeğinin türkçeye uyarlanması: geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *9*(1), 79-92.

Teng, H. Y., and Chen, C. Y. (2025). Do job crafting and leisure crafting enhance job embeddedness: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, *8*(3), 1030-1048.

Tsaur, S. H., Yen, C. H., and Chen, Y. T. (2021). Can leisure crafting enhance leisure engagement? The role of time structure and leisure type. *Leisure Studies*, 40(6), 747-763.

Weissinger, E., and Bandalos, D. L. (1995). Development, reliability and validity of a scale to measure intrinsic motivation in leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *27*(4), 379-400.

White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence. *Psychological Review*, 66(5), 297.

Xue, Q., Yang, J., Wang, H., and Zhang, D. (2022). How and when leisure crafting enhances college students' well-being: a (quantitative) weekly diary study. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 273-290.

Yarım, M. A., ve Ada, Ş. (2021). Cinsiyetin öğretmen motivasyonu üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi: Bir meta-analiz çalışması. *Bilim Eğitim Sanat ve Teknoloji Dergisi*, *5*(2), 103-116.

Yayla, Ö., ve Çetiner, H. (2019). Boş zamanların değerlendirilmesinde etkili olan faktörlerin boş zaman tatminine etkisi. *Turizm Akademik Dergisi*, *6*(1), 219-228.