Universidade Vigo

Revista de Investigación en Educación, 2026, 24(2), 438-461
DOI: https://doi.org/10.35869/reined.v24i2.6949
https://revistas.webs.uvigo.es/index.php/reined
ISSN 1697-5200 | e-ISSN 2172-3427

From Behavior to Identity in Recreational Life: Development and Validation of the Holistic Recreation Profile Scale (HRPS-20)

De la conducta a la identidad en la vida recreativa: desarrollo y validación de la Escala del Perfil Recreativo Holístico (HRPS-20)

Ali Selman Özdemir[1]

[1] İstanbul Topkapı University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, İstanbul, Türkiye *aliselmanozdemir@topkapi.edu.tr*

Received: 7/11/2025
Accepted: 22/4/2026

Contact address:
Ali Selman Özdemir
Faculty of Sports Sciences
İstanbul Topkapı University İstanbul,
Levent, Levent CD. No:51
34330 Beşiktaş/İstanbuL
Türkiye

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to develop the Holistic Recreation Profile Scale (HRPS-20) and examine its psychometric properties as a multidimensional measure of recreational life. The scale was designed to assess five theoretically grounded dimensions: Participation Intensity, Diversity and Portfolio Breadth, Psychological Restoration Well-Being and Flow Experience, Constraint Negotiation, and Identity Commitment and Sustainability. A mixed-method scale development approach was followed. An initial 30-item pool was generated and refined through semi-structured interviews with 23 participants, after which quantitative analyses were conducted with 584 Turkish-speaking adults. Item screening and preliminary exploratory analyses supported the reduction of the pool to a final 20-item form. Exploratory factor analysis yielded an interpretable five-factor structure explaining 61,58% of the total variance. The final form showed high internal consistency (Cronbach's α = ,939), with subscale alphas ranging from ,781 to ,900. Confirmatory factor analysis supported the retained structure and indicated acceptable model fit, $\chi^2(158) = 535{,}20$, $p < ,001$, CFI = ,947, TLI = ,936, IFI = ,947, RMSEA = ,064, 90% CI [,058, ,070], and SRMR = ,049. Qualitative findings further supported all five dimensions. Overall, the HRPS-20 appears to be a psychometrically sound and conceptually grounded multidimensional instrument for assessing recreational life.

Key Words

Recreation, Scale Development, Holistic Recreation Profile, Recreational Well-Being, Flow Experience, Constraint Negotiation, Recreational Identity

Resumen

El propósito de este estudio fue desarrollar la Escala de Perfil Holístico de la Recreación (HRPS-20) y examinar sus propiedades psicométricas como una medida multidimensional de la vida recreativa. La escala fue diseñada para evaluar cinco dimensiones teóricamente fundamentadas: Intensidad de Participación, Diversidad y Amplitud del Portafolio, Restauración Psicológica, Bienestar y Experiencia de Flujo, Negociación de Restricciones, e Identidad, Compromiso y Sostenibilidad. Se siguió

un enfoque mixto de desarrollo de escalas. Inicialmente, se generó un banco de 30 ítems, que posteriormente fue refinado mediante entrevistas semiestructuradas con 23 participantes; después de ello, se llevaron a cabo análisis cuantitativos con 584 adultos turcoparlantes. El cribado de ítems y los análisis exploratorios preliminares respaldaron la reducción del banco inicial a una forma final de 20 ítems. El análisis factorial exploratorio reveló una estructura interpretable de cinco factores que explicó el 61,58% de la varianza total. La forma final mostró una alta consistencia interna (alfa de Cronbach = ,939), con coeficientes alfa de las subescalas que oscilaron entre ,781 y ,900. El análisis factorial confirmatorio respaldó la estructura retenida e indicó un ajuste aceptable del modelo, $\chi^2(158) = 535{,}20$, $p < ,001$, CFI = ,947, TLI = ,936, IFI = ,947, RMSEA = ,064, IC del 90% [,058, ,070], y SRMR = ,049. Los hallazgos cualitativos también apoyaron las cinco dimensiones. En conjunto, la HRPS-20 parece ser un instrumento multidimensional psicométricamente sólido y conceptualmente fundamentado para evaluar la vida recreativa.

Palabras clave

Recreación, Desarrollo de Escalas, Perfil Holístico de la Recreación, Bienestar Recreativo, Experiencia de Flujo, Negociación de Restricciones, Identidad Recreativa

1. INTRODUCTION AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Recreation and leisure experiences have long been recognized as important life domains associated with quality of life, psychological well-being, and social functioning. Classical and contemporary work in leisure studies has shown that leisure is not merely discretionary time use, but a context through which individuals pursue enjoyment, restoration, competence, meaning, and social connection (Iso-Ahola, 1980; Kleiber et al., 2011; Newman et al., 2014; Kuykendall et al., 2018).

Despite this multidimensional nature, most measurement traditions in leisure and recreation have tended to focus on relatively specific domains rather than on recreational life as an integrated profile. Some instruments emphasize leisure satisfaction, others focus on leisure motivation, while still others foreground experiential outcomes, perceived constraints, negotiation processes, or identity-related commitment (Beard & Ragheb, 1980, 1983; Driver et al., 1991; Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Jackson et al., 1993; Godbey et al., 2010; Stebbins, 1982; Jun & Kyle, 2011). These approaches have made important contributions to the field, but they have generally remained specialized and segmented.

Among the most established approaches, the Leisure Satisfaction Scale conceptualizes leisure primarily through satisfaction outcomes (Beard & Ragheb, 1980), whereas the Leisure Motivation Scale focuses on the motivational bases of participation (Beard & Ragheb, 1983). Experience-oriented approaches, including benefit- and preference-based traditions, have emphasized the outcomes and experiences sought through recreation (Driver et al., 1991). Constraint-based models have shifted attention toward structural, interpersonal, and intrapersonal barriers, as well as the strategies individuals use to negotiate those barriers (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Jackson et al., 1993; Godbey et al., 2010). From a longer-term perspective, serious leisure research has shown that leisure can become deeply integrated into identity, commitment, and durable lifestyle patterns (Stebbins, 1982; Jun & Kyle, 2011).

Although these perspectives are theoretically robust, they do not fully capture recreational life as an integrated behavioral, experiential, and identity-related profile. Recreational life cannot be understood only by asking how often individuals participate

or how much time they allocate to activities. It also requires attention to how diverse their participation is, how recreation is experienced psychologically, how barriers are negotiated, and how deeply recreation is embedded in self-definition and long-term continuity (Newman et al., 2014; Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Jackson et al., 1993; Godbey et al., 2010; Stebbins, 1982; Jun & Kyle, 2011).

Recent literature further supports the need for such an integrated view. Work on flow has emphasized the importance of deep concentration, intrinsic absorption, and altered time perception in optimal experience (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990), while recovery research has highlighted psychological detachment and restoration as central outcomes of everyday nonwork activity (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). In parallel, studies on leisure participation suggest that activity breadth and variety may also matter for life satisfaction and broader well-being, not only frequency or duration (Kuykendall et al., 2018; Chang et al., 2013). At the same time, identity-based perspectives indicate that sustained recreational involvement often reflects more than repeated behavior; it may also represent an enduring aspect of who individuals are and how they organize their lives (Stebbins, 1982; Jun & Kyle, 2011).

Accordingly, there remains a clear need for a multidimensional instrument that conceptualizes recreational life as an integrated structure rather than as a single outcome, single motive, or single participation indicator. The present study addresses this gap through the development of the Holistic Recreation Profile Scale (HRPS), a multidimensional instrument intended to assess recreation across behavioral engagement, activity breadth, restoration and flow, negotiation of constraints, and identity-based sustainability.

1.1. Conceptual Model and Dimensions of the HRPS

The HRPS was developed around five theoretically grounded dimensions that together reflect a broader holistic recreation profile.

Recreational Participation Intensity refers not simply to participation frequency, but to the extent to which recreation is prioritized, regularly enacted, and embedded within everyday routines. In this sense, intensity reflects the sustainability and continuity of recreational behavior rather than isolated or episodic participation alone (Iso-Ahola, 1980; Kleiber et al., 2011; Newman et al., 2014).

Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth captures the extent to which individuals distribute their recreational engagement across different kinds of experiences and remain open to varied forms of participation. This dimension assumes that recreational life is shaped not only by how much participation occurs, but also by the breadth and balance of activity patterns. Prior work linking leisure participation patterns with life satisfaction and broader well-being supports the view that activity diversity may carry its own psychological value (Kuykendall et al., 2018; Chang et al., 2013).

Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience represents the experiential and affective core of recreational life. It includes the mentally restorative function of recreation, positive emotional consequences, and flow-like immersion characterized by deep focus and diminished awareness of time. This dimension draws conceptually on both flow theory and recovery-based approaches to well-being (Newman et al., 2014; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007).

Recreational Constraint Negotiation reflects individuals' capacity to sustain participation by generating alternatives, adapting conditions, and finding practical solutions in the face of time, financial, or situational barriers. This dimension is grounded in the literature that reconceptualized leisure constraints not only as inhibitors, but also as conditions that may be actively negotiated rather than passively accepted (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Jackson et al., 1993; Godbey et al., 2010).

Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability addresses the extent to which recreation becomes integrated into self-concept, long-term commitment, and enduring lifestyle continuity. This dimension is informed by serious leisure theory and related work showing that leisure can become identity-salient and sustained across time, rather than remaining a temporary or superficial activity pattern (Stebbins, 1982; Jun & Kyle, 2011).

Taken together, these five dimensions provide an integrative framework through which recreational life can be conceptualized as more than a behavioral count or a single psychological outcome. The HRPS was therefore designed to assess recreation as a multidimensional profile that incorporates behavioral regularity, experiential quality, adaptive negotiation, and identity-based continuity within a single measurement structure.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Study Design and Scale Development Approach

The development of the Holistic Recreation Profile Scale (HRPS) followed a mixed-method, scale engineering approach designed to integrate conceptual grounding, content adequacy, structural evidence, and practical usability within a single instrument (Boateng et al., 2018; DeVellis, 2017; Hinkin, 1998; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). In this framework, scale development is treated not merely as a statistical exercise but as a staged process in which theoretical coherence and psychometric evidence are considered together (DeVellis, 2017; Boateng et al., 2018).

The scale was conceptually developed around five theoretically grounded dimensions: Recreational Participation Intensity, Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth, Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience, Recreational Constraint Negotiation, and Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability. These dimensions were designed to capture recreational life as a multidimensional structure extending beyond simple participation frequency or duration. More specifically, the proposed framework integrates behavioral engagement, experiential and restorative outcomes, active negotiation of barriers, and identity-based sustainability of recreational life.

The overall development process proceeded in successive stages: (a) identification of a theory-based dimensional framework; (b) generation of an initial item pool; (c) refinement of item content and wording through qualitative interviews; (d) item screening and exploratory factor analytic evaluation of the initial item pool; (e) refinement into a shorter final form; (f) evaluation of internal consistency; and (g) confirmatory testing of the retained multidimensional structure (DeVellis, 2017; Boateng et al., 2018; Hinkin, 1998; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). This process was intentionally designed to

preserve theoretical interpretability while avoiding overreliance on purely data-driven restructuring (Boateng et al., 2018; Hinkin, 1998; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006).

2.2. Item Pool Development and Language of Item Construction

At the initial stage, an item pool consisting of 30 items was generated to represent the behavioral, affective, and cognitive components of recreational life across the five proposed dimensions. During item writing, particular attention was given to single-meaning wording, conceptual fit with the intended dimension, and linguistic clarity for adult respondents (DeVellis, 2017; Hinkin, 1998). The initial item pool was intentionally broader than the anticipated final form in order to allow item screening on both conceptual and empirical grounds (DeVellis, 2017; Boateng et al., 2018).

All items were originally developed in Turkish and refined through qualitative interviews conducted in the same language. For transparency and to support future cross-cultural research, the full English item pool is provided in Appendix A, and the original Turkish wording is presented in Appendix B. In this study, the manuscript language was English, whereas both item generation and qualitative refinement were conducted in Turkish. This distinction was preserved intentionally to ensure linguistic transparency in reporting.

2.3. Qualitative Support and Content Refinement

Before the quantitative psychometric analyses, semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted with 23 participants in order to evaluate the conceptual relevance, comprehensibility, and experiential resonance of the proposed item content. The interviews focused on how participants understood recreation in daily life, how they managed time and financial limitations, how they experienced psychological restoration and flow, and the extent to which recreation was integrated into identity and long-term lifestyle.

The qualitative material was used to support content refinement rather than to determine the final factor structure statistically. In other words, interview data informed conceptual clarification, wording refinement, and interpretive grounding, but factor retention decisions were based on the quantitative item screening and factor-analytic results. This distinction was important because the qualitative phase was intended to improve alignment between item wording and lived recreational experience, not to replace psychometric testing (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

In particular, the interview narratives were useful for strengthening items related to recreational constraint negotiation, identity, and restoration. Participants frequently described recreation as something they actively protected, adapted under limited time or finances, and incorporated into long-term life patterns. These themes provided conceptual support for keeping the five-dimensional framework intact while refining the item pool into a more interpretable final form (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

2.4. Participants

The quantitative sample consisted of 584 Turkish-speaking adults residing in Türkiye. Participants were recruited through convenience-based access routes, including online distribution and social networks. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 65 years. The mean age of the sample was 34,88 years (SD = 10.49), and the mean self-reported weekly recreation duration was 12,46 hours (SD = 12,77). The sample included 258 men (44,2%) and 326 women (55,8%). Additional demographic distributions for marital status, education, employment, perceived income, and age group are reported in Table 1.

The sample size was considered adequate for both exploratory and confirmatory analyses of the retained multidimensional structure (Boateng et al., 2018; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006; Brown, 2015; Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). However, because both the exploratory and confirmatory analyses were ultimately conducted within the same overall dataset, the confirmatory findings should be interpreted as supportive rather than equivalent to strict cross-validation in an independent sample. Future studies are therefore encouraged to test the structure again in separate samples and diverse populations (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006; Brown, 2015; Anderson & Gerbing, 1988).

2.5. Procedure and Ethical Approval

Data were collected through a self-report survey format. Participants responded to the scale items using a 5-point Likert-type response structure ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), and instructed to consider their general experiences over the past three months when responding to the scale items. The items were written to reflect respondents' ongoing recreational life patterns rather than isolated or highly exceptional experiences.

Ethical approval for the study was granted by the Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee of İstanbul Topkapı University (Decision No. 2025/23; approval letter dated 09 December 2025, No. E-49846378-050.04-2500022287). Participation was voluntary, and all respondents completed the survey anonymously.

2.6. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, reliability analyses, and exploratory factor analyses were conducted in IBM SPSS Statistics, whereas confirmatory factor analysis was conducted in JASP using the SEM module.

The quantitative analysis proceeded in three main stages. First, the initial 30-item form was examined through item analysis and exploratory factor analysis in order to identify problematic items and evaluate whether the theoretically proposed structure could be meaningfully retained. At this stage, corrected item–total correlations, alpha-if-item-deleted values, communalities, and exploratory loading patterns were considered together. Particular attention was given to reverse-coded items and to items showing weak or ambiguous performance. The distinction between items that were clearly removed because of psychometric weakness and items that were simply not retained in the shorter final form was preserved analytically (DeVellis, 2017; Boateng et al., 2018; Hinkin, 1998; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006).

Second, after screening the initial item pool, a final 20-item form was retained. Exploratory factor analysis of this final form was conducted using Principal Axis Factoring with Direct Oblimin/Oblimin rotation, consistent with the expectation that the latent dimensions of recreational life would be related rather than independent (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006; Brown, 2015). The adequacy of the data for factor analysis was evaluated using the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin statistic and Bartlett's test of sphericity. Factor retention decisions were based on empirical interpretability together with the original five-dimensional conceptual framework (DeVellis, 2017; Boateng et al., 2018; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006).

Third, the internal consistency of the final total scale and each subscale was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha coefficients. In addition, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted for the retained 20-item, five-factor structure. The CFA was first tested as a correlated five-factor measurement model and then revised by allowing two theoretically justifiable residual covariances between highly similar item pairs. Model fit was evaluated using multiple indices, including the chi-square statistic, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI), Incremental Fit Index (IFI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) (Brown, 2015; Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Hu & Bentler, 1999). Standardized factor loadings, R^2 values, factor covariances, and residual covariances were also examined.

Throughout the analytic process, the primary aim was not to chase the statistically most convenient alternative solution but to retain and refine the theoretically grounded five-dimensional structure as far as the evidence reasonably allowed. Thus, the final retained model reflects a combination of conceptual consistency, item screening, exploratory evidence, internal consistency, and confirmatory support (DeVellis, 2017; Boateng et al., 2018; Hinkin, 1998; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006; Brown, 2015; Anderson & Gerbing, 1988).

2.7. Reporting Strategy

Because the initial 30-item form represents a screening and refinement stage rather than the final instrument, it is reported in the manuscript primarily to document how the final 20-item form was reached (Boateng et al., 2018; Hinkin, 1998; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). The final retained HRPS-20 is therefore treated as the main psychometric outcome of the study. Item wording in the main tables is presented through item codes for clarity and economy, whereas the complete English and Turkish wording is provided in the appendices. This reporting strategy was adopted to maintain readability in the main text while preserving full transparency of the development process (DeVellis, 2017; Boateng et al., 2018).

3. RESULTS

The sample characteristics are presented first to contextualize the psychometric findings, followed by the item screening, exploratory, reliability, confirmatory, and qualitative results.

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	258	44,2
	Female	326	55,8
Marital status	Married	242	41,4
	Single	342	58,6
Education group	High school or below	110	18,8
	Undergraduate and above	474	81,2
Employment group	Employed (public/private/self-employed)	402	68,8
	Student	77	13,2
	Unemployed/Retired	105	18,0
Perceived income	Income less than expenses	199	34,1
	Income equal to expenses	232	39,7
	Income greater than expenses	153	26,2
Age group	18–30	226	38,7
	31–45	266	45,5
	46+	92	15,8

Continuous variables

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age	34,88	10,49	18	65
Weekly recreation duration (hours)	12,46	12,77	0	72

Note. N = 584. Percentages are based on valid cases. Continuous variables are reported as mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum values

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Quantitative Sample

The sample included 584 adults, with women comprising 55,8% and men 44,2% of the participants. The mean age was 34,88 years (SD = 10,49), and the mean weekly recreation duration was 12.46 hours (SD = 12,77). Most participants were employed, had undergraduate education or above, and were concentrated in the 31–45 age range.

3.1. Refinement of the Initial Item Pool

The initial 30-item pool functioned as a coherent starting framework and demonstrated high overall internal consistency (Cronbach's α = ,943). However, item-level screening showed that the broader pool was not equally strong across all items. Several reverse-coded items performed weakly, most notably m15r, m9r, and m4r, which showed low corrected item–total correlations and contributed less clearly to the developing structure. Other items were not retained not because they were uniformly poor, but because they contributed less efficiently to the conceptual balance and interpretability of the shorter final form. Together, these findings supported the transition from the initial 30-item pool to a more parsimonious retained structure.

Dimension	Item	Mean	SD	Corrected Item–Total Correlation	Cronbach's α if Item Deleted	Screening Decision
Recreational Participation Intensity	m1	3,29	1,25	,731	,939	Retained
	m2	3,26	1,33	,714	,940	Retained
	m3	3,01	1,29	,699	,940	Not retained in final form
	m4r	2,97	1,32	,343	,944	Removed
	m5	3,40	1,21	,701	,940	Retained
	m6	3,23	1,28	,735	,939	Retained
Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth	m7	3,53	1,23	,617	,941	Retained
	m8	3,55	1,20	,569	,941	Retained
	m9r	3,15	1,26	,215	,945	Removed
	m10	3,17	1,19	,656	,940	Retained
	m11	3,74	1,12	,632	,941	Not retained in final form
	m12	3,31	1,22	,576	,941	Retained
Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience	m13	4,15	1,02	,528	,942	Retained
	m14	4,12	1,00	,447	,942	Retained
	m15r	3,40	1,29	,090	,946	Removed
	m16	4,02	1,10	,410	,943	Retained
	m17	4,10	1,01	,521	,942	Retained
	m18	4,14	1,01	,485	,942	Not retained in final form
Recreational Constraint Negotiation	m19	3,20	1,25	,725	,940	Not retained in final form
	m20r	3,14	1,32	,460	,942	Removed
	m21	3,60	1,24	,682	,940	Retained
	m22	3,36	1,27	,699	,940	Retained
	m23	3,28	1,17	,658	,940	Retained
	m24	3,29	1,23	,746	,939	Retained
Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability	m25	3,68	1,23	,682	,940	Retained
	m26r	3,01	1,34	,491	,942	Removed
	m27	3,21	1,34	,701	,940	Retained
	m28	3,19	1,23	,556	,941	Retained
	m29	3,59	1,17	,732	,940	Retained
	m30	3,59	1,18	,618	,941	Not retained in final form

Note. Item wording corresponding to each item code is provided in Appendix A (English) and Appendix B (original Turkish version). The initial 30-item form yielded Cronbach's α = ,943

Table 2. Initial 30-Item Form: Item Analysis and Screening Indicators

The initial 30-item form showed high overall internal consistency (α = ,943), but the item-level results indicated that several items contributed less clearly to the emerging structure. In particular, reverse-coded items such as m15r, m9r, and m4r displayed weak corrected item–total correlations and were excluded. Other items were not retained in the final form because they offered less conceptual clarity or structural efficiency within the shortened multidimensional solution.

The preliminary exploratory analysis of the initial pool further supported this decision. The dataset was clearly suitable for factor analysis, as indicated by excellent sampling adequacy and a significant Bartlett's test of sphericity. The imposed five-factor solution explained 57,17% of the total variance, suggesting that the overall conceptual framework was already visible at the initial stage. At the same time, the 30-item solution also showed that several reverse-coded and borderline items weakened the structure and reduced interpretive clarity. For this reason, the initial form was treated as a screening stage rather than as the final measurement model.

Indicator	Value
Sample size (N)	584
Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO)	,949
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, χ^2	10974,167
df	435
p	< ,001
Extraction method	Principal Axis Factoring
Rotation method	Oblimin with Kaiser normalization
Fixed number of factors	5
Total variance explained (%)	57,17
Initial eigenvalue, Factor 1	12,113
Initial eigenvalue, Factor 2	3,035
Initial eigenvalue, Factor 3	1,919
Initial eigenvalue, Factor 4	1,239
Initial eigenvalue, Factor 5	1,043

Problematic items identified in the initial solution

Item	Key issue observed
m4r	Low corrected item–total correlation and weak communality
m9r	Very low corrected item–total correlation and weak communality
m15r	Extremely low corrected item–total correlation and weak communality
m20r	Borderline item functioning in relation to the broader factor solution
m26r	Borderline item functioning in relation to the broader factor solution

Note. The initial 30-item solution was evaluated as a screening stage rather than the final retained structure

Table 3. Preliminary Exploratory Factor Analytic Indicators for the Initial 30-Item Form

The preliminary exploratory analysis of the initial 30-item pool supported the suitability of the data for factor analysis, with excellent sampling adequacy and a significant Bartlett's test. At the same time, the initial five-factor solution revealed that several reverse-coded and borderline items weakened the structure, supporting the transition to a more interpretable 20-item form.

3.2. Exploratory Structure of the Final HRPS-20

After refinement, the retained 20-item form yielded a clearer and more interpretable five-factor exploratory structure. The final exploratory model showed excellent adequacy for factor analysis, with KMO = ,947 and a significant Bartlett's test, $\chi^2(190) = 7180{,}947$, $p < ,001$. The five-factor solution explained 61.58% of the total variance, indicating a more efficient and conceptually cleaner structure than the broader initial pool.

Assigned Dimension	Item	Factor Loading	Communality
Recreational Participation Intensity	m1	,775	,745
	m2	,902	,737
	m5	,716	,633
	m6	,712	,709
Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth	m7	,560	,554
	m8	,728	,595
	m10	,432	,497
	m12	,488	,464
Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience	m13	,782	,683
	m14	,776	,648
	m16	,694	,483
	m17	,758	,632
Recreational Constraint Negotiation	m21	-,226	,492
	m22	-,767	,679
	m23	-,656	,582
	m24	-,837	,791
Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability	m25	-,302	,486
	m27	,391	,646
	m28	,676	,580
	m29	,521	,680

EFA summary indicators

Indicator	Value
Sample size (N)	584
KMO	,947
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $\chi^2(190)$	7180,947
p	< ,001
Extraction method	Principal Axis Factoring
Rotation	Oblimin with Kaiser normalization
Number of factors retained	5
Total variance explained (%)	61,58

Note. Loadings are pattern coefficients from the rotated five-factor solution. Because oblique rotation was used, negative loadings indicate factor direction rather than poor item functioning. For interpretive clarity, items are grouped according to the retained theoretical structure of the HRPS-20 rather than being reordered solely by loading magnitude. Item wording corresponding to each item code is provided in Appendix A (English) and Appendix B (original Turkish version)

Table 4. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for the Final 20-Item Form

The final 20-item form produced a clearer and more interpretable five-factor exploratory structure. The solution explained 61,58% of the total variance and showed especially strong loadings for the dimensions of Recreational Participation Intensity and Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience. Although a few items displayed weaker or mixed loading tendencies, the overall structure was sufficiently coherent to justify confirmatory testing.

Inspection of the pattern coefficients showed that the dimensions of Recreational Participation Intensity and Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience were especially clear and stable. Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth and Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability were also interpretable, although some items showed relatively weaker or mixed loading tendencies. Within Recreational Constraint Negotiation, negative loadings reflected factor direction under oblique rotation rather than poor item functioning. Overall, the final 20-item solution supported the

theoretical five-dimensional framework and provided a sufficiently coherent basis for further reliability and confirmatory analyses.

Although the exploratory structure was interpretable and practically usable, it was not treated as flawless. A limited number of items displayed borderline or mixed loading patterns, which made confirmatory testing necessary. Thus, the retained HRPS-20 was carried forward not as a purely exploratory endpoint, but as a psychometrically promising structure requiring confirmatory evaluation. For this reason, the exploratory solution was interpreted in conjunction with conceptual coverage rather than as a purely item-by-item mechanical loading exercise.

3.3. Internal Consistency of the HRPS-20

The retained HRPS-20 demonstrated high internal consistency at the total-scale level (α = ,939). The five subscales also showed acceptable to strong reliability coefficients, ranging from ,781 to ,900. The strongest coefficient was observed for Recreational Participation Intensity, whereas Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth yielded the lowest, though still acceptable, alpha value. These results indicate that the final 20-item structure is internally coherent both as a total measure and across its retained dimensions.

Scale / Subscale	Items	Cronbach's α
HRPS-20 total scale	20	,939
Recreational Participation Intensity	4	,900
Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth	4	,781
Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience	4	,854
Recreational Constraint Negotiation	4	,854
Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability	4	,830

Note. Cronbach's alpha coefficients are reported for the total scale and each retained subscale of the HRPS-20

Table 5. Internal Consistency Coefficients for the HRPS-20 Total Scale and Subscales

The HRPS-20 demonstrated high internal consistency overall, and all five subscales yielded acceptable to strong reliability coefficients. These findings indicate that the final 20-item structure is internally coherent both as a total measure and across its retained dimensions.

Taken together with the exploratory findings, the reliability results suggest that the HRPS-20 is not merely a statistically reduced short form, but a stable multidimensional instrument in which each retained dimension contributes meaningfully to the broader recreation profile construct.

3.4. Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The retained five-factor structure was subsequently examined through confirmatory factor analysis. The initial confirmatory model provided acceptable fit, but a revised model allowing two theory-consistent residual covariances produced a better and more defensible solution. The final revised model showed acceptable and improved fit to the data: $\chi^2(158) = 535{,}20$, $p < ,001$, CFI = ,947, TLI = ,936, IFI = ,947, RMSEA = ,064, 90% CI [,058, ,070], and SRMR = ,049.

Index	Value
χ^2	535,20
df	158
p	< ,001
CFI	,947
TLI	,936
IFI	,947
RMSEA	,064
RMSEA 90% CI	[,058, ,070]
SRMR	,049
GFI	,909

Model fit índices

Dimension	Item	Std. Loading
Recreational Participation Intensity	m1	,805
	m2	,785
	m5	,808
	m6	,870
Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth	m7	,667
	m8	,614
	m10	,707
	m12	,660
Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience	m13	,828
	m14	,795
	m16	,679
	m17	,791
Recreational Constraint Negotiation	m21	,675
	m22	,821
	m23	,753
	m24	,863
Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability	m25	,713
	m27	,779
	m28	,675
	m29	,799

Standardized factor loadings

Residual covariance	Std. Estimate
m1 ~~ m2	,440
m7 ~~ m8	,306

Residual covariances added in the revised model

Note. The revised CFA model retained the same 20 items and the same five-factor structure as the exploratory solution. Only two theory-consistent residual covariances, m1 ~~ m2 and m7 ~~ m8, were added to improve model fit. All standardized loadings were statistically significant. Item wording corresponding to each item code is provided in Appendix A (English) and Appendix B (original Turkish version)

Table 6. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for the Revised Five-Factor HRPS-20 Model

The revised five-factor confirmatory model showed acceptable and improved fit to the data. All standardized factor loadings were significant, and the retained 20-item, five-factor structure remained unchanged at the confirmatory stage. Model fit improved after allowing two theory-consistent residual covariances between m1–m2 and m7–m8.

Importantly, the confirmatory stage did not require changes to the retained 20 items or to the five-factor conceptual structure itself. Instead, fit improved after allowing correlated residuals between m1 and m2, and between m7 and m8. In both cases, the paired items belonged to the same dimensions and reflected closely related

wording/content, making these revisions theoretically interpretable rather than arbitrary data-driven modifications.

All standardized factor loadings in the revised model were statistically significant and ranged from ,614 to ,870, indicating that the retained items functioned as meaningful indicators of their intended latent factors. The highest loadings were observed in Recreational Participation Intensity and Recreational Constraint Negotiation, whereas the lowest, though still acceptable, loading was observed within Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth. The R^2 values likewise indicated that the latent dimensions explained a meaningful proportion of variance across the retained indicators.

The factor covariances further showed that the five dimensions were positively and significantly related, consistent with the view that recreational life is multidimensional yet internally connected. Some correlations were relatively high, particularly between Recreational Constraint Negotiation and Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability, suggesting conceptual proximity among some retained dimensions. Nevertheless, the overall pattern supported a related-factor solution rather than a fully undifferentiated single-factor structure.

3.5. Qualitative Support for the Retained Dimensions

The qualitative findings provided clear experiential support for all five retained dimensions of the HRPS-20. Participants frequently described recreation as something they actively tried to maintain in everyday life, even when time, motivation, or financial resources were limited. This was closely aligned with the dimensions of Recreational Participation Intensity and Recreational Constraint Negotiation. They also described trying new activities, varying their recreational routines, and combining different kinds of experiences, which supported the meaning of Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth.

HRPS-20 Dimension	Qualitative Theme	Interpretation	Illustrative translated quote
Recreational Participation Intensity	Making time whenever possible	Participants described recreation as something they actively tried to fit into everyday life, even under busy conditions.	"I try to make use of every free opportunity I have"
	Protecting recreation time	Some participants framed recreation as time that should be protected rather than easily sacrificed.	"I try to keep that time protected in my life"
Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth	Openness to trying new activities	Participants frequently referred to experimenting with new activities and moving beyond routine preferences.	"I really enjoy trying new things and stepping outside my comfort zone"
	Varied activity patterns	Recreation was often described as spread across different forms such as walking, reading, music, socializing, or outdoor pursuits.	"One day I like reading, another day I like walking"
Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience	Mental renewal and emotional uplift	Participants repeatedly described recreation as mentally refreshing and emotionally energizing.	"After the activity, I feel completely energized"
	Flow-like absorption	Participants reported losing track of time or becoming deeply immersed in activities they valued.	"When I start a book, I can finish it the same day"
Recreational Constraint Negotiation	Generating alternatives under constraints	Many participants described flexible adjustment strategies when time or money was limited.	"If I cannot afford it, I look for a free version or another way to do it"
	Refusing complete cancellation	Rather than abandoning recreation, participants often reported modifying duration, setting, or cost.	"I do not completely cancel it; I reduce it, but I still make room for it"
Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability	Recreation as part of identity	Participants often described recreation as part of who they are, not just something they occasionally do.	"These activities reflect my personality and identity"
	Long-term lifestyle continuity	Many participants projected their recreation patterns into the future as an enduring way of life.	"I can definitely see myself continuing this 5–10 years from now"

Note. The illustrative quotations were translated from Turkish to English for reporting purposes. The original interview material was collected and analyzed in Turkish. Quotations are presented as representative examples of recurring themes rather than as exhaustive excerpts

Table 7. Representative examples of recurring themes

The qualitative findings supported all five dimensions of the HRPS-20. Participants described recreation as something they actively maintained, diversified, adapted under constraints, and incorporated into their identities and longer-term lifestyles. In this respect, the interview material closely paralleled the psychometric structure obtained in the quantitative analyses.

The interview material also strongly reflected the restorative and affective dimension of recreation. Participants described recreation as mentally refreshing, emotionally uplifting, and, at times, immersive enough to alter their perception of time. These themes aligned closely with Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience. In addition, many participants referred to recreation not as a temporary or superficial pastime but as something linked to identity, self-description, and future lifestyle continuity, thereby supporting Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability.

In this respect, the qualitative phase did more than merely confirm that the items were understandable. It also demonstrated that the final retained dimensions were grounded in

recurring lived patterns of recreational experience. Thus, the qualitative findings reinforced the interpretation that the HRPS-20 captures recreation as an integrated behavioral, experiential, and identity-related life profile rather than as a simple participation count.

3.6. Overall Interpretation of the Findings

Across the analytic stages, the findings consistently supported the refinement of the HRPS from an initial 30-item pool to a retained 20-item, five-dimensional form. The screening phase identified several problematic reverse-coded and borderline items, while the refined 20-item structure yielded stronger interpretability, better explained variance, and high internal consistency. The confirmatory analysis then supported the same five-factor configuration, with improved fit after the addition of two theory-consistent residual covariances. Finally, the qualitative findings reinforced the conceptual relevance of the retained dimensions and demonstrated that the scale is supported not only statistically but also experientially. Taken together, these results suggest that the HRPS-20 constitutes a psychometrically promising and conceptually grounded multidimensional measure of recreational life.

4. DISCUSSION

The primary aim of this study was to develop a multidimensional instrument capable of assessing recreational life not merely in terms of participation frequency or duration, but as a broader profile integrating behavioral regularity, activity breadth, restorative and flow-related experience, negotiation of constraints, and identity-based sustainability. Overall, the findings supported the refinement of the HRPS from an initial 30-item pool to a retained 20-item, five-dimensional form. The final HRPS-20 demonstrated high total-scale internal consistency, acceptable to strong subscale reliability, an interpretable exploratory structure, and acceptable confirmatory fit after a limited and theoretically defensible model revision. Taken together, these findings suggest that the HRPS-20 can be regarded as a psychometrically promising multidimensional measure of recreational life.

A central contribution of the present study is that it moves beyond narrowly segmented leisure measurement traditions and instead brings together behavioral, experiential, adaptive, and identity-related aspects of recreation within a single framework. Existing traditions in the literature have understandably focused on specific components, such as leisure satisfaction, motivation, experiential outcomes, constraints, or commitment (Beard & Ragheb, 1980, 1983; Driver et al., 1991; Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Jackson et al., 1993; Godbey et al., 2010; Stebbins, 1982; Jun & Kyle, 2011). However, the present findings support the view that recreational life can also be meaningfully conceptualized as a broader integrated profile, in which regular participation, activity variety, psychological restoration, active coping with constraints, and identity-based continuity are interrelated rather than isolated processes.

4.1. From Initial Item Pool to Retained Multidimensional Structure

One of the clearest findings of the study is that the initial 30-item pool was psychometrically workable but conceptually and structurally less efficient than the retained 20-item form. The item screening and exploratory analyses indicated that several reverse-coded items weakened the structure, and some additional items, although not necessarily poor in isolation, contributed less clearly to the interpretability and efficiency of the final multidimensional solution. This pattern is broadly consistent with the scale development literature, which emphasizes that item retention should be guided not only by local psychometric performance but also by conceptual coherence, structural clarity, and practical usability (DeVellis, 2017; Boateng et al., 2018; Hinkin, 1998; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006).

The retained 20-item form produced a stronger and more interpretable structure than the broader initial pool. Importantly, the final solution did not emerge from unrestricted data-driven restructuring; rather, it reflected the refinement of a theoretically grounded five-dimensional model. This was a deliberate methodological choice. Because the scale was conceptually designed around five dimensions, the analytic strategy prioritized the retention and refinement of this framework rather than immediate collapse into a simpler but theoretically thinner structure. In this respect, the present findings align with recommendations in the psychometric literature that scale development should balance empirical adequacy with conceptual defensibility (DeVellis, 2017; Boateng et al., 2018; Hinkin, 1998; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006).

4.2. Recreational Participation Intensity as Structured and Sustainable Engagement

The Recreational Participation Intensity dimension reflects an important distinction between mere occurrence of participation and more structured, sustainable recreational engagement. Rather than treating recreation as occasional involvement, this dimension captures the extent to which recreation is deliberately maintained within everyday life. This perspective is compatible with broader leisure theory, which has long suggested that leisure should be understood not only as free time activity, but also as a meaningful and organized component of lived experience (Iso-Ahola, 1980; Kleiber et al., 2011; Newman et al., 2014).

In the present study, this dimension performed strongly in both the exploratory and confirmatory phases, suggesting that regularity, routinization, and continuity of participation can be measured as a distinct aspect of recreational life. The qualitative material also supported this interpretation by showing that participants often framed recreation as something to be protected, maintained, or deliberately incorporated into everyday routines. This suggests that intensity, in the present framework, is better understood as sustainable engagement than as simple behavioral frequency alone.

4.3. Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth

The findings also support the inclusion of Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth as a meaningful dimension of recreational life. This dimension recognizes that recreational quality may depend not only on how much participation occurs, but also on

how varied and balanced that participation is. Previous work has suggested that leisure participation patterns and breadth of experience may be linked to life satisfaction and broader well-being (Kuykendall et al., 2018; Chang et al., 2013). The present results extend this line of thinking by suggesting that diversity can be measured as a distinct component of a broader recreation profile.

At the same time, this dimension showed the relatively lowest reliability coefficient among the retained subscales, although it remained within acceptable limits. This may indicate that diversity is, by nature, a somewhat broader and less internally homogeneous construct than some of the other dimensions. Still, both the quantitative and qualitative findings suggest that breadth of recreational engagement represents a meaningful and distinguishable component of recreational life rather than a peripheral or secondary feature.

4.4. Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience

The Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience dimension represents the experiential core of the HRPS-20. Its strong performance in the factor analyses supports the view that recreation should not be reduced to participation behavior alone; how recreation is experienced psychologically is equally central. This interpretation is consistent with both flow theory and recovery-based approaches to well-being, which emphasize that optimal and restorative experiences arise through immersion, detachment, enjoyment, and recovery from everyday demands (Newman et al., 2014; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007).

The qualitative findings were especially valuable in this regard. Participants frequently described recreation as emotionally uplifting, mentally refreshing, and immersive enough to alter awareness of time. These accounts closely parallel the conceptual logic of flow and psychological restoration and reinforce the interpretation that this dimension captures an experientially meaningful component of recreation. In practical terms, this suggests that a person may participate in recreation without necessarily deriving the same level of restorative or flow-related benefit, making this dimension particularly important for differentiating recreational profiles beyond simple activity counts.

4.5. Recreational Constraint Negotiation: Beyond the Presence of Barriers

One of the most distinctive strengths of the HRPS-20 lies in its explicit attention to Recreatio nal Constraint Negotiation. Rather than merely documenting whether barriers exist, this dimension captures whether individuals can actively respond to those barriers by generating alternatives, adapting conditions, and preserving participation. This is highly consistent with the shift in leisure constraints research from viewing constraints solely as inhibitors toward understanding negotiation as an active coping process (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Jackson et al., 1993; Godbey et al., 2010).

The present findings support that conceptualization in both quantitative and qualitative terms. Quantitatively, the dimension performed strongly across exploratory, reliability, and confirmatory stages. Qualitatively, participants described numerous flexible strategies related to time, money, and everyday obligations. These narratives suggest that recreational life cannot be adequately understood only by asking whether people

experience limitations; it is equally important to examine whether they possess or mobilize negotiation resources and strategies. This point is also consistent with previous work showing that self-efficacy and adaptive coping play an important role in the negotiation of leisure constraints (Loucks-Atkinson & Mannell, 2007).

From an applied perspective, this dimension may be particularly useful because it differentiates between people who face similar structural barriers but respond to them in meaningfully different ways. Thus, the HRPS-20 may help identify not only recreational limitations, but also adaptive capacities relevant to intervention design.

4.6. Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability

The Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability dimension reflects another important conceptual contribution of the scale. In line with serious leisure theory, the present findings suggest that recreational life is not only about participation frequency or even immediate enjoyment; it may also become integrated into self-concept, long-term commitment, and durable life organization (Stebbins, 1982; Jun & Kyle, 2011). This dimension therefore moves the construct beyond "doing recreation" toward "being a person for whom recreation matters in an enduring way."

The quantitative results supported this dimension as a stable component of the final scale, and the qualitative findings reinforced the interpretation that many participants understood recreation as part of who they were, how they described themselves, and how they imagined their future lives. In this sense, the scale appears sensitive not only to recreational behavior, but also to the degree to which recreation becomes identity-relevant and sustainable across time.

At the same time, the relatively high correlations between this dimension and Recreational Constraint Negotiation suggest that these two constructs may be conceptually close in practice. Individuals who see recreation as part of who the y are may also be more willing or able to negotiate barriers in order to preserve it. This does not collapse the two constructs into one, but it does suggest that identity-based commitment and adaptive persistence may operate in close conjunction within recreational life.

4.7. Confirmatory Support and Interpretation of Model Fit

The confirmatory findings are particularly important because they extend the evidence beyond exploratory interpretability. The final revised CFA model supported the same five-factor structure retained from the exploratory stage, and the confirmatory phase did not require any changes to the item composition or conceptual organization of the scale. Instead, model fit improved through the addition of two theory-consistent residual covariances between closely related item pairs. This kind of limited revision is widely accepted in structural equation modeling when it is theoretically interpretable rather than purely opportunistic (Brown, 2015; Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Hu & Bentler, 1999).

The CFA results should nevertheless be interpreted with appropriate caution. Because the exploratory and confirmatory analyses were conducted within the same overall sample rather than in fully independent samples, the confirmatory evidence is best understood as supportive rather than definitive cross-validation. For this reason, the present study does not claim that the five-factor model has been finalistically settled.

Rather, the findings suggest that the retained HRPS-20 is psychometrically coherent, conceptually grounded, and sufficiently supported to justify use and further testing in new samples.

4.8. Practical and Research Implications

The HRPS-20 may offer practical value for both research and applied recreation contexts. Because it captures multiple dimensions of recreational life within a single instrument, it may help researchers move beyond simple participation indices and examine how different aspects of recreation co-occur within broader life patterns. In applied settings, the scale may help identify whether a person's recreational profile is strong in regularity, breadth, restoration, adaptation, or identity-based continuity—or whether some of these areas remain underdeveloped.

This multidimensional perspective may be particularly useful in interventions designed to enhance recreational well-being. For example, some individuals may require support in diversifying their recreational portfolio, whereas others may benefit more from developing negotiation strategies under time or cost constraints. Still others may participate regularly but derive limited restoration or may fail to integrate recreation into a stable and self-relevant lifestyle. In this sense, the HRPS-20 may support more targeted and evidence-informed approaches to recreation programming.

The scale may also be relevant to lines of work concerned with sustained or serious forms of recreational engagement, including cases in which recreation becomes organized, identity-relevant, and lifestyle-embedded over time (Lamont et al., 2014). Although the HRPS-20 is not a serious leisure scale in a narrow sense, some of its dimensions—especially identity, commitment, and sustainability—can help illuminate how ordinary recreational life may begin to acquire longer-term structure and meaning.

4.9. Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study relied on self-report data, which may introduce response-related biases common to psychometric survey research. Second, the sample consisted of Turkish-speaking adults and was obtained through convenience-based recruitment, which limits the extent to which the findings can be generalized to other populations. Third, although the confirmatory findings were supportive, they were not derived from a truly independent cross-validation sample. Accordingly, future studies should test the HRPS-20 in separate samples and examine whether the retained structure remains stable across different groups and contexts.

Future research may also investigate measurement invariance across gender, age, education, or socioeconomic groups, and may further explore the relationship of the HRPS-20 with constructs such as subjective well-being, life satisfaction, physical activity, or broader leisure-related adjustment. In addition, the relatively high covariance observed between some retained dimensions suggests that second-order or alternative higher-level structural models may also be worth testing in future studies. Such work would not replace the present five-dimensional solution, but could clarify the broader architecture of recreational life as measured by the HRPS-20.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the present study supports the HRPS-20 as a psychometrically promising and conceptually grounded multidimensional measure of recreational life. By integrating regular participation, activity breadth, restoration and flow, negotiation of constraints, and identity-based continuity, the scale offers a broader representation of recreational life than instruments focused on only one of these components. The combined exploratory, reliability, confirmatory, and qualitative findings suggest that recreational life can be meaningfully understood as a holistic profile rather than as a single behavioral index or isolated experiential outcome. Accordingly, the HRPS-20 may provide a useful basis for future recreation research and for applied efforts aimed at understanding and improving recreational well-being.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J.C. & Gerbing, D.W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(3), 411-423. *https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411*

Beard, J.G. & Ragheb, M.G. (1980). Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research, 12*(1), 20-33. *https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1980.11969416*

Beard, J.G. & Ragheb, M.G. (1983). Measuring leisure motivation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *15*(3), 219-228. *https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1983.11969557*

Boateng, G.O., Neilands, T.B., Frongillo, E.., Melgar-Quiñonez, H.R. & Young, S.L. (2018). Best practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and behavioral research: A primer. *Frontiers in Public Health, 6*, Article 149. *https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149*

Brown, T.A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Chang, P.-J., Yeh, C.-H., Pai, F.-Y. & Huang, T.-P. (2013). Leisure activity participation and life satisfaction. *International Journal of Sport Management, Recreation and Tourism, 12*, 1-18. *https://doi.org/10.5199/ijsmart-1791-874X-12a*

Crawford, D.W. & Godbey, G. (1987). Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure. *Leisure Sciences, 9*(2), 119-127. *https://doi.org/10.1080/01490408709512151*

Creswell, J.W. & Plano Clark, V.L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper & Row.

DeVellis, R.F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). Sage.

Driver, B.L., Brown, P.J. & Peterson, G.L. (Eds.). (1991). *Benefits of leisure*. Venture Publishing.

Elo, S. & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62*(1), 107-115. *https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x*

Godbey, G., Crawford, D.W. & Shen, X.S. (2010). Assessing hierarchical leisure constraints theory after two decades. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *42*(1), 111-134. *https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2010.11950197*

Hinkin, T.R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, *1*(1), 104-121. *https://doi.org/10.1177/109442819800100106*

Hsieh, H.-F. & Shannon, S.E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*(9), 1.277-1.288. *https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687*

Hu, L.-T. & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*(1), 1-55. *https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118*

Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1980). *The social psychology of leisure and recreation*. Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.

Jackson, E.L., Crawford, D.W. & Godbey, G. (1993). Negotiation of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences, 15*(1), 1-11. *https://doi.org/10.1080/01490409309513182*

Jun, J. & Kyle, G.T. (2011). The effect of identity salience on the development of commitment. *Journal of Leisure Research, 43*(4), 513-531. *https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2011.11950247*

Kleiber, D.A., Walker, G.J. & Mannell, R.C. (2011). *A social psychology of leisure* (2nd ed.). Venture Publishing.

Kuykendall, L., Boemerman, L. & Zhu, Z. (2018). The importance of leisure for subjective well-being. In E. Diener, S. Oishi & L. Tay (Eds.). *Handbook of well-being*. DEF Publishers.

Lamont, M., Kennelly, M. & Wilson, E. (2014). Competing priorities or distinct ambitions? Recreational and serious sport tourists. *Annals of Leisure Research, 17*(4), 457-477. *https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2014.947046*

Loucks-Atkinson, A. & Mannell, R.C. (2007). Role of self-efficacy in the constraints negotiation process: The case of individuals with fibromyalgia syndrome. *Leisure Sciences, 29*(1), 19-36. *https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400600983344*

Newman, D.B., Tay, L. & Diener, E. (2014). Leisure and subjective well-being: A model of psychological mechanisms as mediating factors. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 15*(3), 555-578. *https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9435-x*

Sonnentag, S. & Fritz, C. (2007). The recovery experience questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(3), 204-221. *https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.204*

Stebbins, R.A. (1982). Serious leisure: A conceptual statement. *Pacific Sociological Review, 25*(2), 251-272. *https://doi.org/10.2307/1388726*

Worthington, R.L. & Whittaker, T.A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*(6), 806-838. *https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006288127*

APPENDIX A

English Item Pool of the Holistic Recreation Profile Scale (HRPS)

Response format: 5-point Likert scale
(1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

Instruction: Please consider your general experiences over the past three months when responding to the following items.

Recreational Participation Intensity

1. (*) I allocate time regularly for recreational activities.
2. (*) I have specific time periods in my weekly routine reserved for recreation.
3. Recreational activities occupy a priority place in my weekly schedule.
4. I often have difficulty creating time for recreation.
5. (*) The time I plan for recreation usually takes place as intended.
6. (*) My recreational participation is stable and sustainable.

Recreational Diversity and Portfolio Breadth

7. (*) I am interested in different types of recreational activities.
8. (*) My recreational preferences extend across different areas (e.g., physical, social, cultural).
9. My leisure activities mostly remain limited to a single area.
10. (*) Individual and social activities are balanced in my recreational life.
11. I enjoy learning different recreational skills over time.
12. (*) Rather than always doing the same things, I make time to try different types of activities.

Psychological Restoration, Well-Being, and Flow Experience

13. (*) Recreational activities mentally refresh me.
14. (*) During recreation, I lose track of time.
15. I still feel unable to shake off my tiredness after recreational activities.
16. (*) Recreation helps me mentally detach from daily life.
17. (*) My positive emotions increase noticeably after recreation.
18. Recreation is a strong source of stress relief for me.

Recreational Constraint Negotiation

19. Even when my work or family responsibilities intensify, I find ways to protect my recreation time.
20. I often cancel my recreation plans because I have difficulty overcoming the barriers I encounter.
21. (*) Even when my budget is limited, I can create low-cost or no-cost recreational alternatives.
22. (*) Even when my motivation drops, I can still activate myself for recreation.
23. (*) I can behave flexibly in creating opportunities for recreation.
24. (*) Even when my time is limited, I can generate solutions that allow me to engage in recreation.

Recreational Identity, Commitment, and Sustainability

25. (*) Recreation is an important and defining part of my life.
26. My recreational participation is generally temporary and irregular.
27. (*) My recreational habits follow a long-term pattern.
28. (*) When I introduce or describe myself, I often mention my recreational interests.
29. (*) I try to improve my recreational skills over time.
30. It is important for me to master or improve my competence in the recreational activities I participate in.

Note. Items marked with an asterisk (*) constitute the final HRPS-20.

APPENDIX B

Original Turkish Item Pool of the Holistic Recreation Profile Scale (HRPS)

Bütüncül Rekreasyon Profili Ölçeği (BRPÖ) Madde Havuzu

Yanıt Formatı: 5'li Likert tipi derecelendirme
(1 = Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum, 2 = Katılmıyorum, 3 = Kararsızım, 4 = Katılıyorum, 5 = Kesinlikle Katılıyorum)

Yönerge: Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadelere yanıt verirken son üç aydaki genel yaşantınızı göz önünde bulundurunuz.

Rekreasyonel Katılım Yoğunluğu

1. (*) Rekreasyonel aktivitelere düzenli olarak zaman ayırıyorum.
2. (*) Haftalık rutinimde rekreasyon için ayırdığım belirli zaman dilimleri vardır.
3. Haftalık programımda rekreasyonel etkinlikler öncelikli bir yer tutar.
4. Rekreasyon için zaman yaratmakta sıklıkla zorlanırım.
5. (*) Rekreasyon için planladığım zaman çoğunlukla gerçekleşir.
6. (*) Rekreasyonel katılımım istikrarlı ve sürdürülebilirdir.

Rekreasyon Çeşitliliği ve Portföy Genişliği

7. (*) Farklı türlerde rekreasyonel aktivitelere ilgi duyarım.
8. (*) Rekreasyon tercihlerim farklı alanlara yayılır (ör. fiziksel, sosyal, kültürel).
9. Boş zaman etkinliklerim çoğunlukla tek bir alanda kısıtlı kalır.
10. (*) Rekreasyon yaşamımda bireysel ve sosyal etkinlikler dengeli bir şekilde yer alır.
11. Zaman içinde farklı rekreasyon becerileri öğrenmekten keyif alırım.
12. (*) Sürekli aynı şeyleri yapmak yerine, farklı aktivite türlerini denemeye zaman ayırırım.

Yenilenme, İyilik Hâli ve Akış Deneyimi

13. (*) Rekreasyonel aktiviteler beni zihinsel olarak yeniler.
14. (*) Rekreasyon sırasında zamanın nasıl geçtiğini fark etmem.
15. Rekreasyonel etkinlikler sonrasında yorgunluğumu atamamış hissederim.
16. (*) Rekreasyon, günlük hayatımdan zihinsel olarak uzaklaşmamı sağlar.
17. (*) Rekreasyon sonrası pozitif duygularım belirgin şekilde artar.
18. Rekreasyon benim için güçlü bir stres azaltma kaynağıdır.

Rekreasyonel Engelleri Yönetme

19. İş veya aile sorumluluklarım yoğunlaşsa bile rekreasyon zamanımı korumak için çözüm bulurum.
20. Karşılaştığım engelleri aşmakta zorlandığım için rekreasyon planlarımı sıkça iptal ederim.
21. (*) Bütçem kısıtlı olsa bile, maliyetsiz veya düşük maliyetli rekreasyon alternatifleri üretebilirim.
22. (*) Motivasyonum düşse bile rekreasyon için kendimi harekete geçirebilirim.
23. (*) Rekreasyon için fırsat yaratma konusunda esnek davranabilirim.
24. (*) Zamanım sınırlı olsa bile rekreasyon için çözüm üretebilirim.

Rekreasyonel Kimlik, Bağlılık ve Sürdürülebilirlik

25. (*) Rekreasyon yaşamımın önemli ve tanımlayıcı bir parçasıdır.
26. Rekreasyon katılımım genellikle geçici ve düzensizdir.
27. (*) Rekreasyon alışkanlıklarım uzun vadeli bir düzen içindedir.
28. (*) Kendimi tanıtırken veya anlatırken rekreasyonel ilgi alanlarımdan sıkça bahsederim.
29. (*) Rekreasyon becerilerimi zaman içinde geliştirmeye çalışırım.
30. Katıldığım rekreasyonel faaliyetlerde ustalaşmak veya yetkinliğimi artırmak benim için önemlidir.

Not. Yıldız (*) ile işaretlenen maddeler final HRPS-20 formunu oluşturmaktadır.