# Aerobics Instructors' Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support and Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise

**He Jin**

**Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Management, Major in Physical Education Emilio Aguinaldo College, Manila, Philippines**

**DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200493**

**Received: 28 February 2026; Accepted: 05 March 2026; Published: 17 March 2026**

## ABSTRACT

The respondents are predominantly male, adult, and highly experienced aerobics instructors, indicating a mature and skilled group well-equipped to handle the demands of their profession.

Aerobics instructors generally perceive themselves as effective in supporting participant autonomy across all dimensions, particularly by explaining activity rationale, providing effort-based feedback, and fostering self-paced learning and initiative, while areas such as shared decision-making and fully acknowledging participant feelings show slight room for improvement.

Male instructors perceive themselves as more autonomy-supportive than female instructors, while the number of years of teaching experience does not significantly influence instructors' self-assessed autonomy-supportive practices.

Participants are generally intrinsically motivated to exercise, with motivation driven mainly by a strong sense of accomplishment, persistence despite challenges, enjoyment of activities, personal progress, and self-directed engagement rather than external rewards.

Respondents' sex significantly influences perceptions of participants' intrinsic motivation, with male instructors consistently rating motivation higher than female instructors, while years of experience do not significantly affect these perceptions, indicating that participants are generally viewed as intrinsically motivated regardless of instructor tenure. Autonomy-supportive instruction has a strong and significant positive influence on participants' intrinsic motivation, leading to higher enjoyment, persistence, engagement, and sense of accomplishment in exercise activities.

**Keyword:** Aerobics instructors, Autonomy Support in Physical Activities (Aerobics)

## INTRODUCTION

Aerobics instructors play a pivotal role in shaping participants' exercise experiences, particularly through the support they provide for autonomy. Autonomy support refers to the instructor's ability to acknowledge and nurture participants' perspectives, choices, and volition during exercise sessions. This approach contrasts with controlling behaviors that may undermine intrinsic motivation. In the context of aerobics, where sustained engagement is essential for health benefits, understanding the dynamics between instructor autonomy support and participants' intrinsic motivation is crucial.

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) posits that fulfilling basic psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness— enhances intrinsic motivation. In aerobics settings, instructors who provide autonomy support are more likely to satisfy these needs, thereby fostering a deeper intrinsic motivation for exercise among participants (Wanwan & Khairani, 2025). This relationship underscores the importance of instructor behaviors in influencing participants' exercise motivations and adherence.

Recent studies have explored the impact of instructor autonomy support in various physical activity contexts. For instance, research indicates that autonomy-supportive teaching styles in physical education settings lead to increased intrinsic motivation and sustained engagement in physical activities (Behzadnia et al., 2025). These findings suggest that similar dynamics may be present in aerobics classes, where instructor behaviors can significantly influence participants' motivation levels

Studies have examined the role of perceived autonomy support in physical activity settings. A study involving high school students found that perceived autonomy support from instructors positively influenced students' intrinsic motivation for physical activity, mediated by the satisfaction of basic psychological needs (Wanwan & Khairani, 2025). This research highlights the relevance of autonomy-supportive behaviors in enhancing motivation within cultural contexts.

Moreover, the satisfaction of basic psychological needs has been identified as a critical factor in promoting intrinsic motivation for exercise. In a study focusing on adolescents, the fulfillment of autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs was associated with increased intrinsic motivation for physical activity, leading to higher participation rates (Deng et al., 2023). These findings emphasize the importance of instructors' roles in creating environments that satisfy these needs to enhance motivation.

The impact of instructor autonomy support extends beyond motivation to influence participants' exercise behaviors. Research indicates that when instructors adopt autonomy-supportive teaching styles, participants are more likely to engage in regular physical activity and demonstrate improved exercise adherence (Behzadnia et al., 2025). This underscores the potential of instructor behaviors to shape long-term exercise habits among participants.

In aerobics classes, where group dynamics and instructor participant interactions are central, the quality of instructor autonomy support can significantly affect participants' exercise experiences. Studies have shown that instructors who provide meaningful choices, acknowledge participants' perspectives, and minimize controlling behaviors foster a supportive environment that enhances intrinsic motivation (Behzadnia et al., 2025).

Understanding the mechanisms through which instructor autonomy support influences motivation is essential for developing effective training programs for aerobics instructors. Research suggests that training instructors to adopt autonomy-supportive behaviors can lead to increased intrinsic motivation among participants, thereby improving overall exercise outcomes (Behzadnia et al., 2025).

Furthermore, the cultural context plays a significant role in shaping the effectiveness of autonomy-supportive behaviors. In cultures with a strong emphasis on hierarchical relationships, such as in some Asian societies, instructors' behaviors may be perceived differently. Therefore, understanding cultural nuances is crucial when implementing autonomy-supportive strategies to ensure their effectiveness in enhancing intrinsic motivation (Wanwan & Khairani, 2025).

The interplay between instructor autonomy support and participants' intrinsic motivation has implications for the design of aerobics programs. Programs that incorporate elements of autonomy support, such as providing choices in exercises and fostering a sense of competence and relatedness, are more likely to engage participants and promote sustained participation (Behzadnia et al., 2025).

The relationship between aerobics instructors' perceived autonomy support and participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise is complex and multifaceted. Instructor behaviors that support autonomy can enhance intrinsic motivation, leading to increased engagement and adherence to exercise programs. However, the effectiveness of these behaviors may be influenced by cultural contexts and individual differences among participants.

Future research should continue to explore the dynamics between instructor autonomy support and intrinsic motivation in diverse cultural settings. Longitudinal studies examining the longterm effects of autonomy-supportive teaching styles on exercise behaviors would provide valuable insights into the sustainability of motivation and adherence to physical activity programs (Behzadnia et al., 2025).

Additionally, developing and implementing training programs for aerobics instructors that focus on enhancing autonomy-supportive behaviors could be beneficial. Such programs should include strategies for acknowledging participants' perspectives, providing meaningful choices, and minimizing controlling behaviors to foster an environment conducive to intrinsic motivation (Behzadnia et al., 2025).

Fostering intrinsic motivation through instructor autonomy support is a promising approach to enhancing participants' exercise experiences in aerobics classes. By understanding and implementing autonomy-supportive behaviors, instructors can create environments that promote sustained engagement and positive exercise outcomes among participants (Behzadnia et al., 2025).

**Statement of the Problem**

This study determined the relationship of aerobics instructors' participant-perceived instructor autonomy support and participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise in Anhui Industry Polytechnic in Anhui Province, China.

The results of the study were used as a basis for a participant centered coaching program.

Specifically, the study sought answers to the following questions:

What is the demographic profile of the aerobics instructor respondents in terms of:

1. sex;
2. age;
3. number of years as an aerobics instructor?

What is the self-assessment of instructor respondents of their participant-perceived instructor autonomy support in terms of:

a. offering exercise choices;
b. encouraging participant decisions;
c. explaining activity rationale;
d. acknowledging participant feelings;
e. supporting self-paced learning;
f. providing effort-based feedback; and
g. promoting participant initiative?

Is there a significant difference in the self-assessment of instructor respondents of their participant-perceived instructor autonomy support when they are grouped according to their profile?

What is the assessment of the instructor respondents of the participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise in terms of:

1. enjoyment of the activity;
2. interest in learning new exercises;
3. satisfaction from personal progress;
4. engagement in sessions without external rewards;

5. persistence despite challenges;
6. curiosity about improving technique; and
7. sense of accomplishment from participation?

Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the instructor respondents of the participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise when they are grouped according to their profile?

Is there is significant relationship between the self-assessment of instructor respondents of their participant-perceived instructor autonomy support and the assessment of the instructor respondents of the participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise?

Based on the results of the study, what participant-centered coaching program can be proposed?

**Hypothesis**

**The following hypotheses were tested:**

There is no significant difference in the self-assessment of instructor respondents of their participant-perceived instructor autonomy support when they are grouped according to their profile.

There is no significant difference in the assessment of the instructor respondents of the participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise when they are grouped according to their profile.

There is no significant relationship between the self assessment of instructor respondents of their participant perceived instructor autonomy support and the assessment of the instructor respondents of the participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise.

# METHODOLOGY

**Research Design**

This study employs a descriptive–comparative–correlational research design, distinguished by the precise delineation of variables, systematic organization of data, meticulous analysis, and careful consideration of contextual influences. According to Takahashi and Endo (2023), descriptive research is fundamental for capturing phenomena as they naturally occur, allowing scholars to systematically document behavioral tendencies, environmental contexts, and situational dynamics. Such an approach provides a solid empirical foundation for generating evidence-based insights into complex social and psychological processes.

**Sampling Technique**

The respondents of the study were the aerobics instructor from Anhui Industry Polytechnic in Anhui Province, China. In selecting the instructor respondents, purposive sampling technique was used among the instructor respondents.

Purposive sampling is the more appropriate technique because the researcher intends to get only those instructors who have been in the university for at least 3 years and who has taught the course in aerobics for at least 2 years. The school has more that 400 teachers. Out of the 400 were PE teachers.

**Research Instrument**

In gathering the data needed, the researcher used a researcher-made questionnaires on the self-assessment of instructor respondents of their participant-perceived instructor autonomy support and the assessment of the instructor respondents of the participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise.

The researcher used face to face or onsite in administering this questionnaire.

The questionnaire was composed of the following parts.

Part 1 – This section determines the demographic profile of the aerobics instructor respondents.

Part 2 – This section determines the self-assessment of instructor respondents of their participant-perceived instructor autonomy support.

Part 3 – This section identifies the assessment of the instructor respondents of the participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise.

The adapted questionnaire and the researcher-made questionnaire was subjected to content validation of the experts who are knowledgeable in the field of research. The suggestions of the experts were made integral in the instrument.

The same instrument was submitted for face validation with at least five experts. The questionnaire was pilot tested to measure reliability. The pilot testing was computed using Cronbach's Alpha through the Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS). The researcher welcomes the suggestions of the experts and made necessary revisions to construct the said instruments valid.

**Data Gathering Procedure**

The researcher obtained permission from the office of the president of Anhui Industry Polytechnic in Anhui Province, China. When permission was approved, the researcher asked permission from the aerobics instructors by distributing a letter of consent form to the instructors, which was signed by them and was returned to the researcher.

After, the purpose of the study and instructions on how the items on the survey should be answered were explained to the instructor respondents. Then, the survey was administered face to face and they were given enough time to answer the survey.

After completing the survey, the researcher collected the questionnaires from the instructor respondents.

The data was gathered, tallied, and processed with Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). The processed data was interpreted and analyzed, and the results were used to propose a participant-centered coaching program.

Finally, the interpretation and analysis of data was done. Summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations were formulated.

**Statistical Treatment of the Data**

The responses to the survey questionnaire was tallied using the SPSS, and then they were tabulated and organized accordingly. The data was presented, analyzed, and interpreted using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, independent samples t-test, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson's r correlation.

For research question no. 1, descriptive statistics such as frequency counts and percentages was used to treat responses in the demographic profile of the aerobics instructor respondents.

For research question nos. 2 and 4, weighted means was utilized to treat the self-assessment of instructor respondents of their participant-perceived instructor autonomy support .

For research question nos. 3 and 5, one way ANOVA with post-hoc analysis (Scheffe) were used .

For research question no. 6, Pearson's r correlation analysis was utilized

# RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 Frequency Distribution of the Respondents' Demographic Profile

| **Profile** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
|---|---|---|
| **Sex**<br>Male | 40 | 66.7% |
| Female | 20 | 33.3% |
| **Total** | **60** | **100%** |
| **Age**<br>More than 20 years old | 60 | 100% |
| **Total** | **60** | **100%** |
| **Number of Years as Aerobics Instructor** 3-5 years | 12 | 20.0% |
| 6-10 years | 20 | 33.3% |
| More than 10 years | 28 | 46.7% |
| **Total** | **60** | **100%** |

**Sex.** Majority of the respondents are male comprising of forty (40) or 66.7%, while females account for 20 respondents or 33.3%. This indicates that male aerobics instructors are more represented in the study compared to their female counterparts.

**Age.** All respondents are more than 20 years old, indicating that the participants are adults who are likely to possess sufficient maturity and life experience relevant to their profession. This age distribution implies that the respondents are within an appropriate age range to engage in and sustain a physically demanding occupation such as aerobics instruction.

**Number of Years as Aerobics Instructor.** Nearly half (46.7%) have been working as aerobics instructors for more than 10 years, indicating a highly experienced group. Meanwhile, twenty (20) or 33.3% have been in the profession for 6-10 years, and twelve (12) or 20.0% have 3-5 years of experience. This distribution shows that the majority of the respondents have substantial years of practice, which may contribute to a higher level of expertise, skill development, and familiarity with aerobics instruction.

**Respondents' Self-Assessment of their Participant**-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support

**Offering Exercise Choices**

Table 2 presents the self-assessment of the aerobics instructor respondents of their participant-perceived instructor autonomy support in terms of offering exercise choices.

Table 2 Respondents' Self-Assessment of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support in Terms of Offering Exercise Choices

| **Offering Exercise Choices** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I provide participants with options for exercises during sessions. | 3.22 | 0.80 | True of Me | Effective | 1 |
| I allow participants to choose the type of activity they prefer. | 3.02 | 0.77 | True of Me | Effective | 5 |
| I offer alternatives for drills based on participant preference. | 3.05 | 0.77 | True of Me | Effective | 4 |
| I encourage participants to select exercises that match their skill level. | 3.07 | 0.78 | True of Me | Effective | 3 |
| I adjust activity options according to participant interests. | 3.17 | 0.85 | True of Me | Effective | 2 |
| I give multiple exercise variations to maintain engagement. | 2.92 | 0.72 | True of Me | Effective | 6 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.07** | **0.66** | **True of Me** | **Effective** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True Me/Very Effective; 2.51-3.50 True of Me /Effective;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of Me /Slightly Effective;1.00-1.1.50 Not True of Me/Not Effective

As shown in Table 2, among the individual indicators, the highest-ranked item is "I provide participants with options for exercises during sessions" with a mean score of 3.22, interpreted as effective. This implies that most instructors consistently offer varied exercise options, allowing participants to feel a sense of control over their workout. Similarly, "I adjust activity options according to participant interests" ranked second with mean score of 3.17, reflecting instructors' responsiveness to participants' preferences, which is essential for maintaining interest and longterm participation. Encouraging participants to select exercises that match their skill level with mean score of 3.07, and offering alternatives for drills based on participant preference with mean score of 3.05 further demonstrate instructors' efforts to accommodate individual differences and promote inclusivity in exercise sessions. On the other hand, the lowest-ranked item is "I give multiple exercise variations to maintain engagement" with a mean score of 2.92, although it is still interpreted as effective. This indicates that while instructors do provide variations, there may be slightly less emphasis on offering multiple alternatives simultaneously, indicating a potential area for enhancement. The composite mean score of 3.07 falls within the range of "True of Me" and is interpreted as "Effective," indicating that the respondents perceive themselves as effectively supporting participant autonomy by providing exercise choices during aerobics sessions. This indicates that instructors generally recognize the importance of involving participants in decision-making to enhance engagement, motivation, and satisfaction. Overall, the findings show that aerobics instructors perceive themselves as effective in offering exercise choices, thereby fostering an autonomy-supportive environment that can positively influence participants' motivation, confidence, and adherence to physical activity programs.

**Encouraging Participant Decisions**

Table 3 Respondents' Self-Assessment of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support in Terms of Encouraging Participant Decisions

| **Encouraging Participant Decisions** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I ask participants to make choices about their training approach. | 3.00 | 0.80 | True of Me | Effective | 4 |
| I allow participants to decide the sequence of exercises. | 3.05 | 0.79 | True of Me | Effective | 3 |
| I support participants in taking ownership of their practice decisions. | 3.07 | 0.78 | True of Me | Effective | 2 |
| I encourage participants to set personal goals for each session. | 3.15 | 0.78 | True of Me | Effective | 1 |
| I respect participant choices even if they differ from my recommendation. | 2.90 | 0.84 | True of Me | Effective | 5 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.05** | **0.68** | **True of Me** | **Effective** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True Me/Very Effective; 2.51-3.50 True of Me /Effective;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of Me /Slightly Effective;1.00-1.1.50 Not True of Me/Not Effective

As shown in Table 3, the highest-ranked item is "I encourage participants to set personal goals for each session" with a mean score of 3.15. This finding implies that instructors place strong emphasis on goal-setting as a means of enhancing participant motivation, focus, and sense of ownership over their progress. Closely following this is "I support participants in taking ownership of their practice decisions" with mean score of 3.07, which reflects instructors' efforts to build participant confidence and independence in managing their training choices. Allowing participants to decide the sequence of exercises with mean score of 3.05, further demonstrates instructors' willingness to share control and promote active involvement in session structure. In contrast, the lowestranked item is "I respect participant choices even if they differ from my recommendation" with a mean score of 2.90, although it still falls within the "True of Me" and "Effective" range. This indicates that while instructors generally respect participant decisions, there may be occasional challenges in fully accepting choices that deviate from professional guidance, possibly due to concerns about safety or effectiveness. The composite mean score of 3.05 is described as "True of Me" and interpreted as "Effective," indicating that, overall, the respondents perceive themselves as effectively encouraging participants to take an active role in decision-making during aerobics sessions. This indicates that instructors generally foster an environment where participants are empowered to contribute to and influence their own exercise experiences.

**Explaining Activity Rationale**

Table 4 Respondents' Self-Assessment of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support in Terms of Explaining Activity Rationale

| **Explaining Activity Rationale** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I explain why each exercise is important for skill development. | 3.25 | 0.73 | True of Me | Effective | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I describe how drills contribute to participants' overall performance. | 3.00 | 0.84 | True of Me | Effective | 5 |
| I clarify the purpose of specific techniques or activities. | 3.05 | 0.77 | True of Me | Effective | 4 |
| I provide reasoning for session structures and practice progressions. | 3.15 | 0.76 | True of Me | Effective | 2 |
| I help participants understand the benefits of each activity choice. | 3.08 | 0.82 | True of Me | Effective | 3 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.11** | **0.67** | **True of Me** | **Effective** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True Me/Very Effective; 2.51-3.50 True of Me /Effective;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of Me /Slightly Effective;1.00-1.1.50 Not True of Me/Not Effective

As shown in Table 4, the highest-ranked item is "I explain why each exercise is important for skill development" with a mean score of 3.25. This implies that instructors consistently emphasize the developmental value of exercises, enabling participants to see the connection between activities and their skill improvement. The second-highest item, "I provide reasoning for session structures and practice progressions" with mean score of 3.15, further reflects instructors' efforts to clarify how sessions are organized and how activities progress, which may help participants better appreciate the logic behind training plans. Helping participants understand the benefits of each activity choice with mean score of 3.08, and clarifying the purpose of specific techniques or activities with mean score of 3.05 also indicate a consistent practice of providing meaningful explanations. The lowest-ranked item, "I describe how drills contribute to participants' overall performance" with mean score of 3.00, remains within the "True of Me" and "Effective" range, indicating that although explanations are generally provided, there may be slightly less emphasis on explicitly linking drills to overall performance outcomes. The composite mean of 3.11 falls within the "True of Me" category and is interpreted as "Effective," indicating that, overall, the respondents perceive themselves as effective in explaining the purpose and importance of activities during aerobics sessions. This indicates that instructors generally recognize the value of helping participants understand why specific exercises and session structures are included, which can enhance motivation, compliance, and meaningful engagement.

**Acknowledging Participant Feelings**

Table 5 Respondents' Self-Assessment of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support in Terms of Acknowledging Participant Feelings

| **Acknowledging Participant Feelings** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I recognize and validate participant emotions during sessions. | 2.95 | 0.79 | True of Me | Effective | 5 |
| 2. I listen attentively to participant concerns about exercises. | 3.27 | 0.73 | True of Me | Effective | 1 |
| 3. I adapt instruction based on participant emotional feedback. | 2.97 | 0.78 | True of Me | Effective | 4 |
| 4. I show understanding when participants feel frustrated or challenged. | 3.05 | 0.81 | True of Me | Effective | 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. I encourage participants to express how they feel about training. | 3.12 | 0.78 | True of Me | Effective | 2 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.07** | **0.66** | **True of Me** | **Effective** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True Me/Very Effective; 2.51-3.50 True of Me /Effective;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of Me /Slightly Effective;1.00-1.1.50 Not True of Me/Not Effective

As shown in Table 5, the highest-ranked item is "I listen attentively to participant concerns about exercises," with a mean score of 3.27. This finding implies that instructors place strong emphasis on active listening, allowing participants to voice concerns related to difficulty, safety, or comfort. The secondranked item, "I encourage participants to express how they feel about training" with mean score of 3.12, further reflects an open and communicative atmosphere where participants feel comfortable sharing their emotional responses to training. Showing understanding when participants feel frustrated or challenged with mean score of 3.05 also indicates that instructors acknowledge emotional struggles and provide reassurance when needed. On the other hand, the lowest-ranked item is "I recognize and validate participant emotions during sessions" with a mean score of 2.95, though it still falls within the "True of Me" and "Effective" range. Similarly, adapting instruction based on participant emotional feedback with mean score of 2.97 indicates that while instructors are generally aware of participants' feelings, translating emotional cues into instructional adjustments may be slightly less consistent. The composite mean score of 3.07 falls within the "True of Me" category and is interpreted as "Effective," indicating that, overall, the respondents perceive themselves as effective in recognizing and responding to participants' emotional experiences during aerobics sessions. This suggests that instructors generally demonstrate sensitivity to participants' feelings, which is essential for creating a supportive and motivating exercise environment. Overall, the results indicate that aerobics instructors perceive themselves as effective in acknowledging participant feelings, thereby supporting autonomy and fostering a positive, empathetic, and engaging training environment that can enhance participant motivation and persistence in physical activity.

**Supporting Self-Paced Learning**

Table 6 Respondents' Self-Assessment of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support in Terms of Supporting Self-Paced Learning

| **Supporting Self-Paced Learning** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I allow participants to progress at their own pace. | 3.12 | 0.80 | True of Me | Effective | 2 |
| I give opportunities for participants to repeat skills as needed. | 2.95 | 0.79 | True of Me | Effective | 5 |
| I respect individual learning speeds during practice. | 3.22 | 0.76 | True of Me | Effective | 1 |
| I provide guidance without rushing participant development. | 3.00 | 0.76 | True of Me | Effective | 4 |
| I encourage participants to set their own pace for exercises. | 3.10 | 0.86 | True of Me | Effective | 3 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.08** | **0.69** | **True of Me** | **Effective** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True Me/Very Effective; 2.51-3.50 True of Me /Effective;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of Me /Slightly Effective;1.00-1.1.50 Not True of Me/Not Effective

As shown in Table 6, the highest-ranked item is "I respect individual learning speeds during practice" with a mean score of 3.22. This implies that instructors are particularly attentive to differences in participant capability and readiness, avoiding pressure to conform to a single pace. Closely following is "I allow participants to progress at their own pace" with mean score of 3.12, which reinforces the notion that instructors give participants autonomy over the speed of their development. Encouraging participants to set their own pace for exercises with mean score of 3.10, also reflects instructors' support for self-regulation and personal comfort during training. In contrast, the lowest-ranked item is "I give opportunities for participants to repeat skills as needed" with a mean score of 2.95, although it remains within the "True of Me" and "Effective" range. This suggests that while repetition is generally allowed, it may be less consistently emphasized compared to other self-paced strategies. Similarly, providing guidance without rushing participant development with mean score of 3.00, indicates that instructors are mindful of pacing but may face practical constraints such as time limitations or group dynamics. The composite mean of 3.08 falls within the "True of Me" category and is interpreted as "Effective," indicating that, overall, the respondents perceive themselves as effective in allowing participants to learn and perform exercises at a pace that suits their individual abilities. This indicates that instructors generally promote a learner-centered environment that values personal progress rather than uniform performance.

**Providing Effort-Based Feedback**

Table 7 Respondents' Self-Assessment of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support in Terms of Providing Effort-Based Feedback

| **Indicators** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Interpretation** | **Description** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I give feedback focused on participant effort rather than only results. | 3.15 | 0.76 | True of Me | Effective | 2 |
| 2. I acknowledge improvements based on consistent practice. | 3.13 | 0.81 | True of Me | Effective | 3 |
| 3. I encourage participants to value persistence and dedication. | 2.98 | 0.79 | True of Me | Effective | 4 |
| 4. I provide constructive feedback that motivates continued effort. | 3.28 | 0.76 | True of Me | Effective | 1 |
| 5. I recognize participant hard work even when performance is imperfect. | 2.95 | 0.72 | True of Me | Effective | 5 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.10** | **0.67** | **True of Me** | **Effective** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True Me/Very Effective; 2.51-3.50 True of Me /Effective;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of Me /Slightly Effective;1.00-1.1.50 Not True of Me/Not Effective

As shown in Table 7, the highest-ranked item is "I provide constructive feedback that motivates continued effort," with a mean score of 3.28. This implies that instructors prioritize feedback that not only corrects performance but also inspires participants to keep trying and improving. Closely following is "I give feedback focused on participant effort rather than only results" with mean score of 3.15, highlighting instructors' recognition of the value of hard work and engagement in the learning process. Acknowledging improvements based on consistent practice with mean score of 3.13 further reflects instructors' attention to gradual progress and sustained commitment. On the other hand, the lowestranked items are "I encourage participants to value persistence and dedication" with mean score of 2.98 and "I recognize participant hard work even when

performance is imperfect" with mean score of 2.95, though both remain within the "True of Me" and "Effective" range. This indicates that while instructors generally recognize effort, explicit reinforcement of persistence during moments of imperfection may occur slightly less frequently. The composite mean of 3.10 falls within the "True of Me" category and is interpreted as "Effective," indicating that, overall, the respondents perceive themselves as effective in emphasizing effort, persistence, and improvement rather than focusing solely on performance outcomes. This suggests that instructors generally adopt feedback practices that support intrinsic motivation and encourage continued participation.

**Promoting Participant Initiative**

Table 8 Respondents' Self-Assessment of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support in Terms of Promoting Participant Initiative

| **Promoting Participant Initiative** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretation** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I encourage participants to try new techniques independently. | 3.08 | 0.77 | True of Me | Effective | 4 |
| I invite participants to suggest drills or variations. | 3.10 | 0.75 | True of Me | Effective | 3 |
| I support participants in experimenting with skill applications. | 3.12 | 0.72 | True of Me | Effective | 2 |
| I foster an environment where participants take initiative in learning. | 2.93 | 0.78 | True of Me | Effective | 6 |
| I reward proactive behavior and independent problem-solving. | 3.23 | 0.72 | True of Me | Effective | 1 |
| I encourage participants to explore beyond the standard exercises. | 3.00 | 0.80 | True of Me | Effective | 5 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.08** | **0.64** | **True of Me** | **Effective** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True Me/Very Effective; 2.51-3.50 True of Me /Effective;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of Me /Slightly Effective;1.00-1.1.50 Not True of Me/Not Effective

As shown in Table 8, the highest-ranked item is "I reward proactive behavior and independent problem-solving" with a mean score of 3.23. This implies that instructors strongly reinforce initiative by recognizing participants who take responsibility for their own learning and problem-solving. Supporting participants in experimenting with skill applications with mean score of 3.12 and inviting participants to suggest drills or variations with mean score of 3.10, further indicate that instructors encourage creativity and active involvement in shaping the training process. Encouraging participants to try new techniques independently with mean score of 3.08 also reflects instructors' openness to participant-led exploration. In contrast, the lowest-ranked item is "I foster an environment where participants take initiative in learning" with a mean score of 2.93 (, although it remains within the "True of Me" and "Effective" range. This indicates that while specific autonomysupportive behaviors are practiced, creating a consistently initiativedriven learning climate may still present challenges. Encouraging participants to explore beyond the standard exercises with mean score of 3.00also received a comparatively lower rank, indicating room for further enhancement. Overall, the findings show that aerobics instructors perceive themselves as effective in promoting participant initiative, which is essential for developing confidence, independence, and sustained motivation in physical activity participation.

**Summary of the Respondents' Self-Assessment of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy**

Table 9 Summary of the Respondents' Self-Assessment of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support

| **Promoting Participant Initiative** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Offering Exercise Choices | 3.07 | 0.66 | True of Me | Effective | 5 |
| 2. Encouraging Participant Decisions | 3.05 | 0.68 | True of Me | Effective | 7 |
| 3. Explaining Activity Rationale | 3.11 | 0.67 | True of Me | Effective | 1 |
| 4. Acknowledging Participant Feelings | 3.07 | 0.66 | True of Me | Effective | 6 |
| 5. Supporting Self-Paced Learning | 3.08 | 0.69 | True of Me | Effective | 3.5 |
| 6. Providing Effort-Based Feedback | 3.10 | 0.67 | True of Me | Effective | 2 |
| 7. Promoting Participant Initiative | 3.08 | 0.64 | True of Me | Effective | 3.5 |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.08** | **0.66** | **True of Me** | **Effective** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True Me/Very Effective; 2.51-3.50 True of Me /Effective;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of Me /Slightly Effective;1.00-1.1.50 Not True of Me/Not Effective

As shown in Table 9, among the seven dimensions, explaining activity rationale ranked highest, with a mean score of 3.11. This indicates that instructors most strongly support autonomy by helping participants understand the purpose and benefits of exercises and session structures, which can enhance participants' sense of meaning and commitment to training. Closely following is providing effort-based feedback with mean score of 3.10, ranked second, indicating that instructors frequently emphasize effort, persistence, and improvement rather than outcomes alone, thereby fostering intrinsic motivation and resilience. Supporting self-paced learning and promoting participant initiative both share the third-and-a-half rank with mean score of 3.08, reflecting instructors' balanced efforts in respecting individual learning speeds while encouraging independent exploration and proactive engagement. In contrast, offering exercise choices with mean score of 3.07 and acknowledging participant feelings with mean score of 3.07 ranked lower, though they remain within the "Effective" range. This suggests that while instructors do provide choices and show emotional awareness, these practices may be less emphasized compared to other autonomy-supportive behaviors. The lowestranked dimension is encouraging participant decisions with mean score of 3.05, indicating a relatively lesser, though still effective, level of shared decision-making during sessions. Overall, the findings demonstrate that aerobics instructors perceive themselves as effective in supporting participant autonomy across multiple dimensions, with particular strength in explaining activity rationale and reinforcing effort, while also highlighting areas that may benefit from further enhancement to achieve a more holistic autonomysupportive instructional approach.

**Differences in the Self-Assessment of Respondents of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support When Grouped According to Profile**

**On Sex**

Table 10 Differences in the Self-Assessment of Respondents of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy when Grouped According to Sex

| **Indicators** | **Sex** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Computed t-value** | **Sig** | **Decision on Ho** | **Interpreta tion** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | 3.26 | 0.43 | 2.78 | 0.01 | Rejected | Significant |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Offering Exercise choices | Female | 2.69 | 0.87 | | | | |
| Encouraging participant decisions | Male | 3.25 | 0.45 | 2.91 | 0.01 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.64 | 0.88 | | | | |
| Explaining activity rationale | Male | 3.32 | 0.47 | 3.13 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.69 | 0.83 | | | | |
| Acknowledging participant feelings | Male | 3.26 | 0.43 | 2.77 | 0.01 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.69 | 0.87 | | | | |
| Supporting selfpaced learning | Male | 3.28 | 0.45 | 2.80 | 0.01 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.68 | 0.90 | | | | |
| Providing effortbased feedback | Male | 3.30 | 0.46 | 2.98 | 0.01 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.70 | 0.84 | | | | |
| Promoting participant initiative | Male | 3.27 | 0.44 | 3.07 | 0.01 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.69 | 0.79 | | | | |
| Over-all | Male | 3.28 | 0.44 | 2.95 | 0.01 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.68 | 0.85 | | | | |

As shown in Table 10, across seven indicators, male respondents consistently obtained higher mean scores than female respondents. For the indicator offering exercise choices, males reported a higher mean score compared to females with a computed t-value of 2.78 and a significance value of 0.01. This indicates a statistically significant difference, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis and indicating that male respondents perceived themselves as offering more exercise choices than their female counterparts.

Similar patterns were observed in encouraging participant decisions and explaining activity rationale. Male respondents reported higher self-assessments compared to female respondents. The computed t-values of 2.91 and 3.13, both with significance levels at or below 0.01, indicate significant differences between the two groups. These findings imply that male respondents perceived themselves as more likely to encourage decision-making and explain the rationale behind activities than female respondents.

The indicators acknowledging participant feelings, supporting self-paced learning, and providing effort-based feedback also revealed statistically significant differences in favor of male respondents. The mean scores for males ranged from 3.26 to 3.30, while females' mean scores ranged from 2.68 to 2.70. All

corresponding t-values (2.77 to 2.98) and significance levels (0.01) support the rejection of the null hypothesis. These results indicate that male respondents rated themselves higher in recognizing participant emotions, allowing learners to progress at their own pace, and giving feedback based on effort.

Likewise, in promoting participant initiative, male respondents again reported a higher mean than female respondents, with a computed t-value of 3.07 and a significance level of 0.01. This indicates a significant difference, implying that male respondents perceived themselves as more supportive of participant initiative.

Overall, the aggregated results further confirm these findings. Male respondents obtained a higher overall mean score of 3.28 compared to female respondents with mean score of 2.68. The computed t-value of 2.95 and significance value of 0.01 indicate a statistically significant difference between the two groups, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. In general, the findings indicate that sex significantly influences respondents'

self-assessment of participant-perceived instructor autonomy, with male respondents consistently perceiving themselves as more autonomy-supportive across all measured indicators than female respondents.

**On Number of Years as an Aerobics Instructor**

Table 11 Differences in the Self-Assessment of Respondents of their Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy when Grouped According to Number of Years as Aerobics Instructor

| Indicators | Years as Aerobics Instructor | Mean | SD | Computed F-value | Sig | Decision on Ho | Interpreta tion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Offering Exercise choices | 3-5 years | 3.03 | 0.44 | 0.56 | 0.57 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.97 | 0.77 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.17 | 0.67 | | | | |
| Encouraging participant decisions | 3-5 years | 2.97 | 0.45 | 0.89 | 0.42 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.92 | 0.77 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.17 | 0.69 | | | | |
| Explaining activity rationale | 3-5 years | 3.05 | 0.50 | 1.04 | 0.36 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.96 | 0.79 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.24 | 0.65 | | | | |
| Acknowledging participant feelings | 3-5 years | 3.00 | 0.43 | 0.81 | 0.45 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.95 | 0.78 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.19 | 0.66 | | | | |
| Supporting selfpaced learning | 3-5 years | 3.00 | 0.51 | 0.86 | 0.43 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.95 | 0.80 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.20 | 0.67 | | | | |
| Providing effortbased feedback | 3-5 years | 3.03 | 0.45 | 1.28 | 0.29 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.94 | 0.74 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.24 | 0.68 | | | | |
| Promoting participant initiative | 3-5 years | 3.01 | 0.45 | 0.59 | 0.56 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.98 | 0.72 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.17 | 0.65 | | | | |
| Over-all | 3-5 years | 3.01 | 0.46 | 0.87 | 0.43 | Accepted | Not Significant |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 6-10 years | 2.95 | 0.76 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.20 | 0.66 | | | | |

As shown in Table 11, there are no statistically significant differences across all seven indicators and the overall measure of instructor autonomy based on years as aerobics instructor. This is evidenced by the computed F-values, which range from 0.56 to 1.28, and the corresponding significance levels, all of which are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Consequently, the null hypothesis was accepted for all indicators, indicating that the length of experience as an aerobics instructor does not significantly influence respondents' self-assessment of their autonomy-supportive practices.

In terms of descriptive statistics, instructors with more than 10 years of experience as an aerobics instructors consistently obtained slightly higher mean scores across all indicators compared to those with 3–5 years and 6–10 years of experience. For instance, in offering exercise choices, instructors with more than 10 years of experience recorded the highest mean, while those with 6–10 years had the lowest mean. Similar trends were observed in encouraging participant decisions, explaining activity rationale, and providing effort-based feedback, where the most experienced group reported marginally higher self-assessments. However, these differences were minimal and insufficient to reach statistical significance.

Likewise, for indicators such as acknowledging participant feelings, supporting self-paced learning, and promoting participant initiative, the mean scores across the three experience groups were closely clustered, with only slight variations. This indicates a relatively consistent perception of autonomy-supportive instructional behaviors regardless of the number of years spent teaching aerobics.

The standard deviation values also indicate moderate variability within each group, particularly among instructors with 6–10 years of experience, but not enough to produce meaningful differences between groups.

Overall, the aggregated results reinforce the conclusion that years of experience as an aerobics instructor do not significantly affect respondents' self-assessment of participant-perceived instructor autonomy. While instructors with more than 10 years of experience tend to rate themselves marginally higher, autonomy supportive practices appear to be consistently perceived across varying lengths of teaching experience. This implies that such practices may be influenced more by individual teaching style, training, or personal beliefs rather than by the duration of professional experience alone.

**Respondents' Assessment of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise Enjoyment of the Activity**

Table 12 presents the assessment of the aerobics instructor respondents of the participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise in terms of enjoyment of the activity.

Table 12 Respondents' Assessment of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise in Terms of Enjoyment of the Activity

| Enjoyment of the Activity | Mean | SD | Qualitative Description | Interpretati on | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Participants seem to genuinely enjoy the exercises during sessions. | 3.22 | 0.80 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 1 |
| 2. They smile or show positive expressions while performing routines. | 2.92 | 0.89 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 5 |
| 3. They participate eagerly without being prompted. | 3.00 | 0.74 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 3.5 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Participants demonstrate enthusiasm for repeating exercises. | 3.00 | 0.76 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 3.5 |
| 5. They appear happy when engaging in group or solo activities. | 3.05 | 0.93 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 2 |
| 6. Participants show excitement when new routines are introduced. | 2.82 | 0.70 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 6 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.00** | **0.68** | **True of the Participants** | **Motivated** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True of the Participants/Very Motivated; 2.51-3.50 True of the Participants/Motivated;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of the Participants/Slightly Motivateed;1.00-1.1.50 Not True of the Participants/Not Motivated

As shown in Table 12, the highest mean was recorded for the statement "Participants seem to genuinely enjoy the exercises during sessions" with mean score of 3.22 ranking first. This indicates that respondents strongly observed authentic enjoyment among participants, highlighting enjoyment as a key component of their intrinsic motivation. The second highest-ranked indicator, "They appear happy when engaging in group or solo activities" with mean score of 3.05, further supports the notion that participants experience positive emotions regardless of the activity format, whether collaborative or individual. The indicators *"*They participate eagerly without being prompted" and "Participants demonstrate enthusiasm for repeating exercises" both obtained a mean score of 3.00 sharing the rank of 3.5. These results indicate that participants are willing to engage voluntarily and show readiness to repeat activities, reflecting sustained interest and enjoyment rather than mere compliance. Such behaviors are indicative of intrinsic motivation, where participation is driven by internal satisfaction rather than external pressure. Meanwhile, "They smile or show positive expressions while performing routines*"* obtained a mean score of 2.92, ranking fifth, while "Participants show excitement when new routines are introduced*"* recorded the lowest mean score of 2.82, ranking sixth. Although these indicators ranked lower relative to others, both still fall within the True of the Participants category and are interpreted as Motivated. This indicates that while visible expressions of enjoyment and excitement toward novelty may vary among participants, these behaviors are still generally present and contribute to overall intrinsic motivation. The overall composite mean score of 3.00 falls within the range of 2.51–3.50, which is qualitatively described as True of the Participants and interpreted as Motivated.

This indicates that, in general, participants are perceived to be intrinsically motivated to engage in exercise activities and derive enjoyment from their participation during aerobics sessions.

Overall, the findings indicate that participants are perceived to enjoy exercise activities and display behaviors associated with intrinsic motivation. The consistency of mean scores across all indicators within the Motivated range indicates a generally positive and enjoyable exercise environment, where participants willingly engage, express satisfaction, and maintain enthusiasm for continued participation.

**Interest in Learning New Exercises**

Table 13 Respondents' Assessment of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise in Terms of Interest in Learning New Exercises

| **Interest in Learning New Exercises** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Participants are eager to try new movements or routines. | 2.80 | 0.88 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 5 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. They ask questions about proper execution of exercises. | 3.20 | 0.75 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 1 |
| 3. Participants show curiosity about unfamiliar exercises. | 2.95 | 0.89 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 4 |
| 4. They willingly attempt advanced or modified routines. | 3.03 | 0.76 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 2 |
| 5. Participants seek opportunities to expand their skill set. | 2.97 | 0.94 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 3 |
| **Composite Mean** | **2.99** | **0.74** | **True of the Participants** | **Motivated** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True of the Participants/Very Motivated; 2.51 -3.50 True of the Participants/Motivated;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of the Participants/Slightly Motivateed;1.00 -1.1.50 Not True of the Participants/Not Motivated

As shown in Table 13, among the indicators, the statement "They ask questions about proper execution of exercises" obtained the highest mean score of 3.20, ranking first. This indicates that participants show a strong interest in understanding and correctly performing exercises, reflecting an active learning orientation rather than passive participation. Such behavior indicates intrinsic motivation driven by a desire for mastery and competence. The second highest-ranked indicator, "They willingly attempt advanced or modified routines" with mean score of 3.03, further supports this interpretation, as participants appear open to challenges and variations that can enhance their skills. The indicators "Participants seek opportunities to expand their skill set" with mean score of 2.97 and "Participants show curiosity about unfamiliar exercises" with mean score of 2.95 ranked third and fourth, respectively. Both indicators fall within the *True of the Participants* category, suggesting that participants generally exhibit curiosity and initiative in skill development, although these behaviors may vary among individuals. The relatively higher standard deviation values for these items indicate some variability in how strongly participants display these traits. The lowest-ranked indicator, "Participants are eager to try new movements or routines" with mean score of 2.80, still falls within the *Motivated* range. This implies that while participants are generally open to new exercises, eagerness may be slightly less pronounced compared to other expressions of interest, such as asking questions or attempting modified routines. This may indicate that participants prefer gaining understanding and confidence before fully embracing unfamiliar movements. The composite mean score of 2.99 falls within the range of 2.51–3.50, which is qualitatively described as True of the Participants and interpreted as Motivated. This overall result indicates that participants generally demonstrate intrinsic motivation manifested through curiosity, willingness, and engagement in learning new movements and routines during exercise sessions.

Overall, the findings indicate that participants are intrinsically motivated to learn new exercises, as reflected in their curiosity, willingness to ask questions, and readiness to attempt more challenging routines. The consistency of mean scores within the *Motivated* range highlights a positive learning environment that supports skill development and sustained engagement in exercise activities.

Satisfaction from Personal Progress

Table 14 Respondents' Assessment of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise in Terms of Satisfaction from Personal Progress

| **Satisfaction from Personal Progress** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Participants show pride when mastering a new technique. | 3.20 | 0.71 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. They express contentment after improving performance. | 2.80 | 0.94 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 5 |
| 3. Participants track or note their progress during sessions. | 3.05 | 0.72 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 2 |
| 4. They appear motivated by achieving personal goals. | 3.03 | 0.86 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 3 |
| 5. Participants celebrate small improvements or milestones. | 2.97 | 0.78 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 4 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.01** | **0.69** | **True of the Participants** | **Motivated** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True of the Participants/Very Motivated; 2.51 -3.50 True of the Participants/Motivated;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of the Participants/Slightly Motivateed;1.00 -1.1.50 Not True of the Participants/Not Motivated

As shown in Table 14, Among the indicators, "Participants show pride when mastering a new technique" obtained the highest mean score of 3.20, ranking first. This indicates that mastery experiences play a significant role in motivating participants, as feelings of pride and accomplishment are clearly observed when new skills are successfully learned. The second highest-ranked indicator, "Participants track or note their progress during sessions" with mean score of 3.05, indicates that participants are mindful of their development and actively monitor their improvements, reflecting a goal-oriented and self-reflective approach to exercise. The indicators "They appear motivated by achieving personal goals" with mean score of 3.03, and "Participants celebrate small improvements or milestones" with mean score of 2.97 ranked third and fourth, respectively. These findings indicate that participants derive motivation from setting and attaining personal goals, as well as from recognizing incremental progress. Although the mean scores are slightly lower than the top-ranked items, they still fall within the Motivated category, indicating that these behaviors are generally present among participants. The lowest-ranked indicator, "They express contentment after improving performance" with mean score of 2.80, nevertheless remains within the True of the Participants and Motivated range. This indicates that while expressions of contentment may not always be overt or consistently observed, participants still experience satisfaction following improvements in performance. The relatively higher standard deviation for this item also indicates variability in how participants outwardly express satisfaction. The composite mean score of 3.01 falls within the range of 2.51–3.50, which is qualitatively described as True of the Participants and interpreted as Motivated. This overall result indicates that participants are generally intrinsically motivated by their own improvements and progress, finding satisfaction in personal growth and achievement during exercise sessions.

Generally, the findings demonstrate that satisfaction from personal progress is an important source of intrinsic motivation for participants. The consistency of mean scores across all indicators within the Motivated range highlights that participants value mastery, goal attainment, and gradual improvement, which collectively contribute to sustained engagement and positive exercise experiences.

**Engagement in Sessions without External Rewards**

Table 15 Respondents' Assessment of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise in Terms of Engagement in Sessions Without External Rewards

| **Engagement in Sessions Without External Rewards** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Participants remain focused even without praise or incentives. | 2.97 | 0.96 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 3.5 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. They engage fully in routines regardless of recognition. | 3.12 | 0.69 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 1 |
| 3. Participants practice diligently without expecting material rewards. | 2.95 | 0.96 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 5 |
| 4. They attend sessions for the joy of activity rather than rewards. | 2.97 | 0.71 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 3.5 |
| 5. Participants sustain attention throughout exercises without prompting. | 3.05 | 0.91 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 2 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.01** | **0.74** | **True of the Participants** | **Motivated** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True of the Participants/Very Motivated; 2.51 -3.50 True of the Participants/Motivated;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of the Participants/Slightly Motivateed;1.00 -1.1.50 Not True of the Participants/Not Motivated

As shown in Table 15, Among the indicators, “They engage fully in routines regardless of recognition” obtained the highest mean score of 3.12, ranking first. This indicates that participants are intrinsically driven to participate actively even in the absence of acknowledgment or praise. The second highest-ranked indicator, “Participants sustain attention throughout exercises without prompting” with mean score of 3.05, further supports this interpretation, indicating that participants are able to maintain focus and involvement independently during sessions. The indicators “Participants remain focused even without praise or incentives” and “They attend sessions for the joy of activity rather than rewards” both recorded a mean score of 2.97 sharing a rank of 3.5. These results indicate that participants are generally capable of maintaining focus and attendance based on intrinsic enjoyment, although the relatively higher standard deviations imply variability in the degree to which individuals exhibit these behaviors. This may reflect differences in personal motivation levels or situational factors affecting engagement. The lowest-ranked indicator, “Participants practice diligently without expecting material rewards” with mean score of 2.95, nonetheless remains within the True of the Participants and Motivated category. This indicates that while material rewards are not the primary driver of participation, some participants may still vary in their consistency of effort when no tangible incentives are present. The composite mean score of 3.01 falls within the range of 2.51–3.50, which is qualitatively described as True of the Participants and interpreted as Motivated. This overall finding indicates that participants generally engage in exercise sessions for internal reasons, such as enjoyment and personal satisfaction, rather than relying on external incentives or rewards.

**Persistence Despite Challenges**

Table 16 Respondents’ Assessment of the Participants’ Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise in Terms of Persistence Despite Challenges

| **Persistence Despite Challenges** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Participants continue exercising even when movements are difficult. | 3.02 | 0.77 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 4 |
| 2. They attempt challenging routines multiple times until successful. | 3.03 | 0.96 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Participants do not give up easily during complex exercises. | 3.08 | 0.65 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 2 |
| 4. They demonstrate resilience when facing fatigue or mistakes. | 2.85 | 0.92 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 5 |
| 5. Participants maintain effort despite discomfort or difficulty. | 3.13 | 0.79 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 1 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.02** | **0.72** | **True of the Participants** | **Motivated** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True of the Participants/Very Motivated; 2.51 -3.50 True of the Participants/Motivated;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of the Participants/Slightly Motivateed;1.00 -1.1.50 Not True of the Participants/Not Motivated

As shown in Table 16, among the indicators, "Participants maintain effort despite discomfort or difficulty" obtained the highest mean score of 3.13, ranking first. This indicates that participants are willing to endure physical challenges and continue exerting effort even when exercises become uncomfortable, highlighting strong perseverance. The second highest-ranked indicator, "Participants do not give up easily during complex exercises" with mean score of 3.08, further reinforces this finding, indicating that participants show determination and sustained engagement when confronted with complex movements. The indicators "They attempt challenging routines multiple times until successful" with mean score of 3.03 and "Participants continue exercising even when movements are difficult" with mean score of 3.02 ranked third and fourth, respectively. These results indicate that participants are generally willing to repeat challenging routines and persist through difficulty in order to achieve success. However, the relatively higher standard deviation for repeated attempts indicates variability in how consistently participants demonstrate this behavior. The lowest-ranked indicator, "They demonstrate resilience when facing fatigue or mistakes" with mean score of 2.85, still falls within the True of the Participants and Motivated category. This indicates that while resilience in the face of fatigue or errors is present, it may be less consistently or less visibly demonstrated compared to other forms of persistence. Individual differences in physical conditioning, confidence, or energy levels may influence this outcome. The composite mean score of 3.02 falls within the range of 2.51–3.50, which is qualitatively described as True of the Participants and interpreted as Motivated. This overall result indicates that participants generally demonstrate persistence and determination when faced with difficult or demanding exercise tasks, reflecting a healthy level of intrinsic motivation.

Generally, the findings indicate that participants possess a generally strong level of intrinsic motivation characterized by persistence despite challenges. The consistent mean scores within the Motivated range across all indicators highlight that participants are willing to exert sustained effort, cope with difficulty, and continue engaging in exercise activities even when faced with physical or technical challenges.

**Curiosity About Improving Technique**

Table 17 Respondents' Assessment of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise in Terms of Curiosity About Improving Technique

| **Curiosity About Improving Technique** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Participants actively seek feedback on their form. | 2.95 | 0.89 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 4 |
| 2. They ask for tips to refine movements or improve posture. | 3.05 | 0.75 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 2 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Participants attempt variations to enhance skill execution. | 2.98 | 0.95 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 3 |
| 4. They show interest in understanding the mechanics behind exercises. | 3.13 | 0.70 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 1 |
| 5. Participants experiment with adjustments to improve technique. | 2.90 | 0.93 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 5 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.00** | **0.73** | **True of the Participants** | **Motivated** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True of the Participants/Very Motivated; 2.51 -3.50 True of the Participants/Motivated;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of the Participants/Slightly Motivateed;1.00 -1.1.50 Not True of the Participants/Not Motivated

As shown in Table 17, among the indicators, "They show interest in understanding the mechanics behind exercises" obtained the highest mean score of 3.13 ranking first. This indicates that participants are not only focused on performing movements but are also interested in understanding how and why exercises work, which is indicative of deep engagement and a mastery-oriented mindset. The second highest-ranked indicator, "They ask for tips to refine movements or improve posture" with mean score of 3.05, further supports this interpretation, showing that participants actively seek guidance to enhance the quality and effectiveness of their performance. The indicators "Participants attempt variations to enhance skill execution" with mean score of 2.98, and "Participants actively seek feedback on their form" with mean score of 2.95ranked third and fourth, respectively. These findings indicate that participants are generally open to experimenting with different approaches and receiving feedback to improve technique, although the relatively higher standard deviations suggest variability in how consistently these behaviors are exhibited among participants. The lowest-ranked indicator, "Participants experiment with adjustments to improve technique" with mean score of 2.90, nevertheless remains within the True of the Participants and Motivated category. This indicates that while experimentation and self-initiated adjustments are present, they may occur less frequently or more cautiously compared to seeking explanations or instructor-provided tips. The composite mean score of 3.00 falls within the range of 2.51–3.50, which is qualitatively described as True of the Participants and interpreted as Motivated. This overall result indicates that participants generally demonstrate curiosity and interest in refining their exercise techniques, reflecting intrinsic motivation oriented toward learning, mastery, and self-improvement.

Generally, the findings demonstrate that participants are intrinsically motivated by curiosity about improving their exercise techniques. The consistent placement of all indicators within the Motivated range highlights an exercise environment that encourages understanding, refinement, and mastery of movements, supporting sustained engagement and continuous skill development.

**Sense of Accomplishment from Participation**

Table 18 Respondents' Assessment of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise in Terms of Sense of Accomplishment from Participation

| **Sense of Accomplishment from Participation** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Participants feel proud after completing a session. | 3.07 | 0.73 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 3 |
| 2. They demonstrate confidence when performing learned routines. | 3.10 | 0.95 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 2 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Participants express satisfaction in meeting personal exercise goals. | 2.90 | 0.73 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 6 |
| 4. They appear fulfilled when mastering challenging sequences. | 3.05 | 0.95 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 4 |
| 5. Participants celebrate personal achievements during or after sessions. | 3.18 | 0.70 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 1 |
| 6. They show motivation to continue after recognizing their progress. | 2.95 | 0.98 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 5 |
| **Composite Mean** | **3.04** | **0.73** | **True of the Participants** | **Motivated** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True of the Participants/Very Motivated; 2.51 -3.50 True of the Participants/Motivated;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of the Participants/Slightly Motivateed;1.00 -1.1.50 Not True of the Participants/Not Motivated

As shown in Table 18, among the indicators, "Participants celebrate personal achievements during or after sessions" obtained the highest mean score of 3.18, ranking first. This indicates that participants recognize and value their accomplishments, whether big or small, and that these self-acknowledged successes serve as an important source of motivation. The second highest-ranked indicator, "They demonstrate confidence when performing learned routines" with mean score of 3.10, indicates that repeated participation and learning contribute to increased self-confidence, reinforcing participants' motivation to continue engaging in exercise activities. The indicator "Participants feel proud after completing a session" with mean score of 3.07ranked third, showing that session completion itself is associated with feelings of pride and achievement. This is followed by *"*They appear fulfilled when mastering challenging sequences" with mean score of 3.05, which highlights the motivational impact of overcoming difficulty and achieving mastery. Both indicators underscore the role of successful participation and skill acquisition in fostering a sense of accomplishment. The lowerranked indicators, "They show motivation to continue after recognizing their progress" with mean score of 2.95, and *"*Participants express satisfaction in meeting personal exercise goals" with mean score of 2.90 still fall within the True of the Participants and Motivated category. These results indicate that while recognition of progress and goal attainment contributes to motivation, the expression of these experiences may vary among participants, as reflected by the relatively higher variability in responses. The composite mean score of 3.04 falls within the range of 2.51–3.50, which is qualitatively described as True of the Participants and interpreted as Motivated. This overall finding indicates that participants generally experience a sense of fulfillment, pride, and accomplishment as a result of their participation in exercise sessions, reflecting a strong intrinsic motivational orientation.

**Summary of the Respondents' Assessment of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise**

Table 19 Summary of the Respondents' Assessment of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise

| **Indicators** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Qualitative Description** | **Interpretati on** | **Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Enjoyment of the Activity | 3.00 | 0.68 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 5.5 |
| 2. Interest in Learning New Exercises | 2.99 | 0.74 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 7 |
| 3. Satisfaction from Personal Progress | 3.01 | 0.69 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 3.5 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Engagement in Sessions without External Rewards | 3.01 | 0.74 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 3.5 |
| 5. Persistence Despite Challenges | 3.02 | 0.72 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 2 |
| 6. Curiosity About Improving Technique | 3.00 | 0.73 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 5.5 |
| 7. Sense of Accomplishment from Participation | 3.04 | 0.73 | True of the Participants | Motivated | 1 |
| **Overall Mean** | **3.01** | **0.71** | **True of the Participants** | **Motivated** | |

Legend: 3.51-4.00 Very True of the Participants/Very Motivated; 2.51 -3.50 True of the Participants/Motivated;1.51-2.50 Slightly True of the Participants/Slightly Motivateed;1.00 -1.1.50 Not True of the Participants/Not Motivated As shown in Table 19, among the indicators, sense of accomplishment from participation obtained the highest mean score of 3.04, ranking first. This indicates that feelings of pride, fulfillment, and recognition of personal achievements are the strongest sources of intrinsic motivation for participants. Closely following this, persistence despite challenges ranked second with mean score of 3.02, indicating that participants are willing to sustain effort and continue exercising even when faced with difficulty or discomfort, reflecting resilience and determination. The indicators satisfaction from personal progress and engagement in sessions without external rewards both recorded a mean score of 3.01, sharing a rank of 3.5. These findings suggest that participants are motivated by personal improvement and are able to remain engaged in exercise activities without reliance on praise, incentives, or material rewards. Such results highlight the presence of self-driven motivation rooted in growth and internal satisfaction rather than external reinforcement. Meanwhile, enjoyment of the activity, and curiosity about improving technique both obtained a mean of 3.00, sharing a rank of 5.5.

Although ranked slightly lower, these indicators still fall within the Motivated category, indicating that participants generally enjoy the exercise sessions and show interest in understanding and refining their techniques. The relatively similar mean values across indicators suggest a balanced motivational profile rather than a strong dominance of one single factor. The lowest-ranked indicator, interest in learning new exercises with mean score of 2.99, nevertheless remains within the True of the Participants and Motivated range. This implies that while participants are generally open to learning new routines, their motivation may be more strongly anchored in mastery, accomplishment, and persistence rather than novelty alone. The overall mean score of 3.01 falls within the range of 2.51–3.50, which is qualitatively described as True of the Participants and interpreted as Motivated. This overall result indicates that participants are generally intrinsically motivated to engage in exercise activities, demonstrating positive internal drivers such as enjoyment, persistence, curiosity, and a sense of accomplishment.

Generally, the summary indicates that participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise is consistently present across all dimensions assessed. The close clustering of mean scores around the overall mean suggests that intrinsic motivation is multifaceted and evenly distributed, with a slightly stronger emphasis on accomplishment, perseverance, and self-driven engagement.

**Differences in the Assessment of Respondents of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise When Grouped According to Profile**

**On Sex**

Table 20 presents the differences in the assessment of respondents of the participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise when grouped according to sex.

Table 20 Differences in the Assessment of Respondents of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise when Grouped According to Sex

| Indicators | Sex | Mean | SD | Computed t-value | Sig | Decision on Ho | Interpreta tion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Enjoyment of the Activity | Male | 3.26 | 0.43 | 4.12 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.48 | 0.80 | | | | |
| 2. Interest in Learning New Exercises | Male | 3.27 | 0.46 | 3.90 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.44 | 0.89 | | | | |
| 3. Satisfaction from Personal Progress | Male | 3.26 | 0.44 | 3.77 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.51 | 0.83 | | | | |
| 4. Engagement in Sessions without External Rewards | Male | 3.27 | 0.49 | 3.58 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.50 | 0.89 | | | | |
| 5. Persistence despite Challenges | Male | 3.30 | 0.46 | 4.06 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.48 | 0.84 | | | | |
| 6. Curiosity about Improving Technique | Male | 3.27 | 0.46 | 3.69 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.48 | 0.89 | | | | |
| 7. Sense of Accomplishment from Participation | Male | 3.31 | 0.46 | 3.95 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.50 | 0.86 | | | | |
| Over-all | Male | 3.27 | 0.44 | 3.90 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Female | 2.48 | 0.85 | | | | |

As shown in Table 20, the result indicates a consistent pattern: male respondents rated participants' intrinsic motivation higher across all seven indicators compared to female respondents. For example, in enjoyment of the activity, males reported a mean of 3.26 while females reported 2.48, with a computed t-value of 4.12 and a significance level of 0.00. This indicates a statistically significant difference, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating that male respondents perceived participants as more motivated to enjoy exercise activities than female respondents. Similar significant differences were observed in interest in learning new exercises with computed t-value of 3.90 and a significance value of 0.00, satisfaction from personal progress with computed t-value of 3.77 and significance value of 0.00, and engagement in sessions without external rewards with computed t-value of 3.58 and a significance value of 0.00. These results indicate that male respondents perceived participants as more intrinsically motivated to learn, improve, and engage in exercise regardless of external incentives, while female respondents assessed these behaviors as less pronounced. The pattern continues for persistence despite challenges with computed t-value of 4.06 and a significance value of 0.00, curiosity about improving technique with computed t-value of 3.69 and a significance value of 0.0, and sense of accomplishment from participation with computed t-value of 3.95, with significance value of 0.00, all of which show statistically

significant differences. These findings indicates that male respondents consistently perceived participants as more resilient, curious, and motivated by personal achievement compared to female respondents. The overall mean also reflects this trend, with males reporting a higher mean than females, with a computed t-value of 3.90 and significance level of 0.00. This indicates a significant difference in overall assessment, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. In general, the data suggest that sex significantly influences respondents' perceptions of participants' intrinsic motivation for exercise, with male respondents perceiving participants as more motivated across all dimensions, while female respondents rated motivation consistently lower. This may reflect differences in perception, interaction, or observation between male and female respondents.

**On Number of Years as Aerobics Instructor**

Table 21 Differences in the Assessment of Respondents of the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise when Grouped According to Aerobics Instructor

| Indicators | Years as Aerobics Instructor | Mean | SD | Computed F-value | Sig | Decision on Ho | Interpreta tion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Enjoyment of the Activity | 3-5 years | 2.89 | 0.60 | 1.38 | 0.26 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.85 | 0.80 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.16 | 0.61 | | | | |
| 2. Interest in Learning New Exercises | 3-5 years | 2.83 | 0.65 | 1.61 | 0.21 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.83 | 0.87 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.17 | 0.65 | | | | |
| 3. Satisfaction from Personal Progress | 3-5 years | 2.93 | 0.60 | 1.00 | 0.37 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.87 | 0.80 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.14 | 0.65 | | | | |
| 4. Engagement in Sessions without External Rewards | 3-5 years | 2.88 | 0.70 | 1.15 | 0.33 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.87 | 0.88 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.16 | 0.64 | | | | |
| 5. Persistence despite Challenges | 3-5 years | 2.90 | 0.61 | 1.51 | 0.23 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.86 | 0.81 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.19 | 0.67 | | | | |
| 6. Curiosity about Improving Technique | 3-5 years | 2.85 | 0.67 | 1.40 | 0.26 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.86 | 0.88 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.17 | 0.63 | | | | |
| 7. Sense of Accomplishment | 3-5 years | 2.92 | 0.65 | 1.11 | 0.34 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.91 | 0.84 | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | >10 years | 3.19 | 0.66 | | | | |
| from Participation | | | | | | | |
| Over-all | 3-5 years | 2.89 | 0.63 | 1.33 | 0.27 | Accepted | Not Significant |
| | 6-10 years | 2.86 | 0.83 | | | | |
| | >10 years | 3.17 | 0.64 | | | | |

As shown in Table 21, the results show that across all seven indicators, instructors with more than 10 years of experience consistently reported slightly higher mean scores compared to instructors with 3–5 years or 6–10 years of experience. For example, in enjoyment of the activity, instructors with over 10 years of experience reported a mean of 3.16, compared to 2.89 for 3–5 years and 2.85 for 6–10 years. Despite these differences, the computed Fvalues across all indicators ranged from 1.00 to 1.61, with significance levels ranging from 0.21 to 0.37, all above the 0.05 threshold. Consequently, the null hypothesis was accepted for all indicators, indicating that differences in years of experience as an aerobics instructor do not significantly affect respondents' assessment of participants' intrinsic motivation. The descriptive statistics show a consistent trend: instructors with over 10 years of experience tend to perceive participants as slightly more motivated across all dimensions, including interest in learning new exercises, satisfaction from personal progress, engagement without external rewards, persistence despite challenges, curiosity about improving technique, and sense of accomplishment from participation.

However, the lack of statistical significance suggests that these variations are minor and could be due to individual perceptions or sampling variability rather than a true effect of instructor experience. The overall mean across all groups—2.89 for 3–5 years, 2.86 for 6– 10 years, and 3.17 for >10 years—further supports this interpretation. While instructors with more than 10 years of experience perceive participants as slightly more intrinsically motivated, the differences are not statistically meaningful. This implies that participants' intrinsic motivation is generally consistent and independent of the instructors' years of experience, suggesting that motivation is likely influenced more by participant characteristics, program design, or class environment rather than the length of the instructor's teaching tenure.

Generally, the findings indicate that while instructor experience may slightly influence perceptions, it does not significantly impact the overall assessment of participants' intrinsic motivation. Participants are generally perceived as motivated across all indicators, regardless of whether the instructor has few or many years of teaching experience.

**Relationship Between the Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support and the Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise**

Table 22 Relationship Between the Participant-Perceived Instructor Autonomy Support and the Participant's Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise.

| **Participantperceived Instructor Autonomy Support** | **Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise** | **Computed r** | **Sig** | **Decision on Ho** | **Interpretation** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Offering exercise choices | Enjoyment of the activity | 0.88 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Interest in learning new exercises | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Satisfaction from personal progress | 0.89 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Engagement in sessions without external rewards | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Persistence despite challenges | 0.87 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Curiosity about improving technique | 0.87 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Sense of accomplishment from participation | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | **Average** | **0.88** | **0.00** | **Rejected** | **Significant** |
| 2. Encouraging participant decisions | Enjoyment of the activity | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Interest in learning new exercises | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Satisfaction from personal progress | 0.87 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Engagement in sessions without external rewards | 0.84 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Persistence despite challenges | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Curiosity about improving technique | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Sense of accomplishment from participation | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | **Average** | **0.86** | **0.00** | **Rejected** | **Significant** |
| 3. Explaining activity rationale | Enjoyment of the activity | 0.87 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Interest in learning new exercises | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Satisfaction from personal progress | 0.88 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Engagement in sessions without external rewards | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Persistence despite challenges | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Curiosity about improving technique | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Sense of accomplishment from participation | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Average** | **0.87** | **0.00** | **Rejected** | **Significant** |
| 4. Acknowledging participant feelings | Enjoyment of the activity | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Interest in learning new exercises | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Satisfaction from personal progress | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Engagement in sessions without external rewards | 0.84 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Persistence despite challenges | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Curiosity about improving technique | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Sense of accomplishment from participation | 0.84 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | **Average** | **0.86** | **0.00** | **Rejected** | **Significant** |
| 5. Supporting self-paced learning | Enjoyment of the activity | 0.87 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Interest in learning new exercises | 0.87 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Satisfaction from personal progress | 0.89 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Engagement in sessions without external rewards | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Persistence despite challenges | 0.87 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Curiosity about improving technique | 0087 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Sense of accomplishment from participation | 0086 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | **Average** | 0.88 | **0.00** | **Rejected** | **Significant** |
| 6. Providing effort-based feedback | Enjoyment of the activity | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Interest in learning new exercises | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Satisfaction from personal progress | 0.87 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Engagement in sessions without external rewards | 0.84 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Persistence despite challenges | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Curiosity about improving technique | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Sense of accomplishment from participation | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | **Average** | 0.86 | **0.00** | **Rejected** | **Significant** |
| 7. Promoting participant initiative | Enjoyment of the activity | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Interest in learning new exercises | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Satisfaction from personal progress | 0.89 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Engagement in sessions without external rewards | 0.85 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Persistence despite challenges | 0.87 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Curiosity about improving technique | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | Sense of accomplishment from participation | 0.86 | 0.00 | Rejected | Significant |
| | **Average** | 0.87 | **0.00** | **Rejected** | **Significant** |
| **Over-all Instructor Autonomy Support** | **Over-all Participants' Intrinsic Motivation for Exercise** | **0.88** | **0.00** | **Rejected** | **Significant** |

As shown in Table 22, the data show consistently strong positive correlations across all dimensions of autonomy support and all indicators of intrinsic motivation, with computed r-values ranging from 0.84 to 0.89, all significant at significance value of 0.00. As a result, the null hypothesis of no relationship is rejected in every instance, indicating that instructor autonomy support is significantly associated with higher levels of intrinsic motivation among participants.

Specifically, indicators such as offering exercise choices and supporting self-paced learning showed the strongest relationships with intrinsic motivation, with average computed r-values of 0.88. This indicates that when instructors provide participants with options, allow them to progress at their own pace, and foster self-directed engagement, participants are more likely to experience enjoyment, curiosity, persistence, engagement without external rewards, and a sense of accomplishment. Other autonomy-supportive behaviors, including encouraging participant decisions, explaining activity rationale, acknowledging participant feelings, providing effort-based feedback, and promoting participant initiative, also show strong and significant correlations (average r-values from 0.86 to 0.87), indicating that all forms of autonomy support positively influence participants' intrinsic motivation.

The overall correlation between instructor autonomy support and participants' intrinsic motivation is 0.88 with significance value of 0.00, which is very strong and statistically significant. This demonstrates that the degree to which participants perceive their instructors as supportive of autonomy is closely linked to their internal motivation to engage in exercise. In practical terms, autonomy-supportive instruction appears to foster motivation by enhancing enjoyment, encouraging curiosity and mastery, promoting persistence in the face of challenges, and facilitating a sense of achievement and engagement without reliance on external rewards. In summary, the findings highlight a robust and meaningful relationship: participant-perceived autonomy support from instructors is a critical factor in enhancing intrinsic motivation for exercise. This underscores the importance of employing autonomy-supportive teaching strategies, as these behaviors consistently strengthen participants' motivation, engagement, and overall positive exercise experiences.

# CONCLUSIONS

**Summary of Findings**

1. The respondents are predominantly male, adult, and highly experienced aerobics instructors, indicating a mature and skilled group well-equipped to handle the demands of their profession.

2. Aerobics instructors generally perceive themselves as effective in supporting participant autonomy across all dimensions, particularly by explaining activity rationale, providing effort-based feedback, and fostering self-paced learning and initiative, while areas such as shared decision-making and fully acknowledging participant feelings show slight room for improvement.

3. Male instructors perceive themselves as more autonomy-supportive than female instructors, while the number of years of teaching experience does not significantly influence instructors' self-assessed autonomy-supportive practices.

4. Participants are generally intrinsically motivated to exercise, with motivation driven mainly by a strong sense of accomplishment, persistence despite challenges, enjoyment of activities, personal progress, and self-directed engagement rather than external rewards.

5. Respondents' sex significantly influences perceptions of participants' intrinsic motivation, with male instructors consistently rating motivation higher than female instructors, while years of experience do not significantly affect these perceptions, indicating that participants are generally viewed as intrinsically motivated regardless of instructor tenure.

6. Autonomy-supportive instruction has a strong and significant positive influence on participants' intrinsic motivation, leading to higher enjoyment, persistence, engagement, and sense of accomplishment in exercise activities.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the summary of findings and the conclusions, the researcher highly /recommends the following:

Training institutions and fitness organizations should continue to invest in professional development programs that sustain and update the skills of experienced.

Involving participants in planning activities and actively responding to their feelings, alongside maintaining effective practices such as explaining activity rationale and providing effort-based feedback.

Professional development workshops should be designed to promote reflective teaching practices.

Instructors should continue to emphasize mastery, personal progress.

Fitness organizations should encourage standardized observation and reflection tools to help instructors develop a more balanced and objective assessment of participant motivation

Teaching strategies—such as offering choices, supporting self-paced learning, encouraging initiative, and providing meaningful feedback—into instructor training and practice.

## REFERENCES

1. Aelterman, N., Vansteenkiste, M., Soenens, B., & Haerens, L. (2021). A dimensional and person-centered perspective on controlled reasons for non-participation in physical education. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 23, 142–154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.12.001
2. Akdemir, E. (2025). The determination of teachers' motivation based on Herzberg's motivation theory. Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET, 19(4), 89–101. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1272850
3. Amorose, A. J., & Horn, D. S. (2025). Intrinsic motivation: Relationships with collegiate athletes' gender, scholarship status, and perceptions of their coaches' behavior. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 22, 63–84.
4. Andrew, D. (2024). The impact of leadership behavior on satisfaction of college tennis players: A test of the leadership behavior congruency hypothesis of the multidimensional model of leadership. Journal of Sport Behavior, 32, 261–277.
5. Assor, A., Kaplan, H., & Roth, G. (2022). Choice is good, but relevance is excellent: Autonomy-enhancing and suppressing teacher behaviours predicting students' engagement in schoolwork. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72(2), 261–278. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709902158883
6. Baard, P. P., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2024). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34(10), 2045–2068. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02690.x
7. Behzadnia, B., Adachi, P. J. C., & Deci, E. L. (2025). Are physical education teachers' autonomy-supportive behaviors related to high-school students' actual game-play performance? Journal of Educational Psychology, 117(2), 123–135.
8. Benson, P. (2025). Teacher education and teacher autonomy: Creating spaces for experimentation in secondary school English language teaching. Language Teaching Research, 14(3), 259–275. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810365236
9. Blömeke, S., & Klein, P. (2023). When is a school environment perceived as supportive by beginning mathematics teachers?
10. Effects of leadership, trust, autonomy and appraisal on teaching quality. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11(4), 1029–1048. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763013-9424-x
11. Bray, S. R., Millen, J. A., Eidsness, J., & Leuzinger, C. (2025). The effects of leadership style and exercise program choreography on enjoyment and intentions to exercise. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 6, 415–425.
12. Carlson, M. D., & Morrison, R. S. (2024). Study design, precision, and validity in observational studies. Journal of Palliative Medicine, 12(1), 77–82. https://doi.org/10.1089/jpm.2008.9690
13. Chelladurai, P. (1978). A contingency model of leadership in athletics (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Department of Management Sciences, University of Waterloo, Canada.
14. Chelladurai, P. (1990). Leadership in sports: A review. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 21, 328–354.
15. Chelladurai, P. (1993). Leadership. In R. N. Singer, M. Murphy, & L.
16. K. Tennant (Eds.), Handbook on research on sport psychology (pp. 647–671). New York, NY: McMillan.
17. Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (2025). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 3, 85–92.
18. Cross, S. E., & Markus, H. R. (2024). The cultural constitution of personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp. 378–396). Guilford Press. https://bit.ly/3dj1KUF

19. Daşdan, A. E. N., Aşçı, F. H., Kazak, Z. Ç. F., & Altıparmak, M. E. (2022). The validity and reliability of the Situational Motivation Scale (SIS) for the physical education classroom environment. Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 10(1), 7–12. https://doi.org/10.1501/Sporm_0000000214
20. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and selfdetermination in human behavior. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
21. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. Journal of Research in Personality, 19(2), 109–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/00926566(85)90023-6
22. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. A. Dienstbier (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1990: Perspectives on motivation (pp. 237–288). University of Nebraska Press. https://bit.ly/3xoCaEB
23. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11, 227–268.
24. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
25. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). Handbook of self-determination research. University of Rochester Press. https://bit.ly/3DpnCsf
26. Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. Educational Psychologist, 26(3–4), 325–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.1991.9653137
27. Deng, A., Zhang, J., & Li, X. (2023). Changing trajectory of daily physical activity levels among adolescents: The role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. BMC Public Health, 23(1), 16949. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16949-1
28. Diseth, Å., Breidablik, H. J., & Meland, E. (2023). Longitudinal relations between perceived autonomy support and basic need satisfaction in two student cohorts. Educational Psychology, 38(1), 99–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2017.1356448
29. Engin, G. (2025). An examination of primary school students' academic achievements and motivation in terms of parents' attitudes, teacher motivation, teacher self-efficacy and leadership approach. International Journal of Progressive Education, 16(1), 257–276. https://bit.ly/3S0E06G
30. Ergür, D. O. (2025, November). The role of the teacher in gaining learner autonomy. In International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications (Vol. 354, p. 359). https://bit.ly/3QBvYzW
31. Escriva-Boulley, G., Tessier, D., Ntoumanis, N., & Sarrazin, P. (2023). Need-supportive professional development in elementary school physical education: Effects of a cluster-randomized control trial on teachers' motivating style and student physical activity. Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology, 7(2), 218–234. https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000119
32. Fin, G., Moreno-Murcia, J. A., León, J., Baretta, E., & Júnior, R. J. N. (2024). Interpersonal autonomy support style and its consequences in physical education classes. PLoS ONE, 14(5), e0216609. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216609
33. Flunger, B., Hollmann, L., Hornstra, L., & Murayama, K. (2022). It's more about a lesson than a domain: Lesson-specific autonomy support, motivation, and engagement in math and a second language. Learning and Instruction, 77, 101500. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2021.101500
34. Frederick, C. J., & Shaw, S. M. (2025). Body image as a leisure constraint: Examining the experience of aerobic exercise classes for young women. Leisure Sciences, 17, 57–73.
35. Gil-Arias, A., Harvey, S., García-Herreros, F., González-Víllora, S., Práxedes, A., & Moreno, A. (2021). Effect of a hybrid teaching games for understanding/sport education unit on elementary students' self-determined motivation in physical education. European Physical Education Review, 27(2), 366–383.
36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2021.101500
37. Gillison, F. B., Standage, M., & Skevington, S. M. (2021). Relationships among adolescents' weight perceptions, exercise goals, exercise motivation, quality of life, and leisure-time exercise behaviour: A self-determination theory approach. Health Education Research, 21, 836–847.

38. Guay, F., Vallerand, R. J., & Blanchard, C. (2025). On the assessment of situational intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The Situational Motivation Scale (SIMS). Motivation and Emotion, 24(3), 175–213. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005614228250
39. Haerens, L., Aelterman, N., Vansteenkiste, M., Soenens, B., & Van Petegem, S. (2025). Do perceived autonomy-supportive and controlling teaching relate to physical education students' motivational experiences through unique pathways? Distinguishing between the bright and dark side of motivation. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 16, 26–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.08.013
40. Haerens, L., Vansteenkiste, M., De Meester, A., Delrue, J., Tallir, I., Vande Broek, G., … & Aelterman, N. (2023). Different combinations of perceived autonomy support and control: Identifying the most optimal motivating style. Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 23(1), 16–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2017.1346070
41. Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L., Hein, V., Pihu, M., Soos, I., & Karsai, I. (2022). The perceived autonomy support scale for exercise settings (PASSES): Development, validity, and crosscultural invariance in young people. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 8(5), 632–653. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2006.09.001
42. Han, J., & Yin, H. (2021). Teacher motivation: Definition, research development and implications for teachers. Cogent Education, 3(1), 1217819. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1217819
43. Hinkin, T. R. (2025). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. Journal of Management, 21(5), 967–988. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639502100509
44. Huang, S., Zhang, J., & Wang, L. (2025). The dynamic impact of physical education teacher support on college students' exercise adherence: A longitudinal study. Journal of Physical Activity and Health, 22(4), 456–467.
45. Ingledew, D. K., & Markland, D. (2023). The role of motives in exercise participation. Psychology & Health, 23, 807–828.
46. Ingledew, D., Markland, D., & Medley, A. (2023). Exercise motives and stages of change. Journal of Health Psychology, 3, 477–489.
47. Kauffman, D. F., Soylu, M. Y., & Bryan, D. U. K. E. (2021). Validation of the motivation to teach scale. Hacettepe University Journal of Education Faculty, 40(40), 279–290.
48. Kılınç, A. Ç., Bozkurt, E., & İlhan, H. (2023). Examination of teachers' views on teacher autonomy. Journal of Education and Humanities: Theory and Practice, 9(18), 77–98. https://bit.ly/3xj1M5O
49. Kim, S., & Choi, S. (2023). Effects of instructor autonomy support on intrinsic motivation in aerobics classes: A longitudinal study.
50. Journal of Physical Education and Sports Science, 34(2), 45-58.
51. Kızıltepe, Z. (2023). Motivation and demotivation of university teachers. Teachers and Teaching, 14(5–6), 515–530. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600802571361
52. Klaos, H. (2022). Motivation, self-presentation and psychological needs of an amateur athlete. Faculty of Sport and Exercise Sciences, University of Tartu, Estonia.
53. Knowles, A., Wallhead, T., & Readdy, T. (2023). Exploring the synergy between Sport Education and in-school sport participation. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 37(2), 113–122. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2017-0123
54. Laverie, D. (2023). Motivation for ongoing participation in a fitness activity. Leisure Sciences, 20, 277–303.
55. Lee, H., Park, J., & Kim, Y. (2024). Cultural influences on autonomy support and intrinsic motivation in East Asian aerobics participants. Asian Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 29(1), 12-24.
56. Lim, B. C., & Wang, C. J. (2024). Perceived autonomy support, behavioural regulations in physical education and physical activity intention. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 10(1), 52–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2008.06.003
57. Liu, X., Zhang, Y., & Wang, L. (2024). The impact of autonomysupportive teaching on intrinsic motivation in Chinese aerobics classes. Journal of Asian Physical Education Research, 18(3), 6779.
58. Lloyd, K. M., & Little, D. E. (2025). Keeping women active: An examination of the impacts of self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and leadership on women's persistence in physical activity. Women & Health, 50, 652–669.

59. Lozano-Jiménez, J. E., Huéscar, E., & Moreno-Murcia, J. A. (2021). Effects of an autonomy support intervention on the involvement of higher education students. Sustainability, 13(9), 5006. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13095006
60. Lukner, K. (2022). Aerobics enthusiasts' training motivation and assessment of the trainer's behaviour. Faculty of Sport and Exercise Sciences, University of Tartu, Estonia.
61. Matsi, J. (2024). Self-reported motivation and obstacles to leisuretime physical activity among Estonian women aged 18–50. Institute of Psychology, University of Tartu, Estonia.
62. Maulana, R., Opdenakker, M. C., & Bosker, R. (2021). Teachers' instructional behaviors as important predictors of academic motivation: Changes and links across the school year. Learning and Individual Differences, 50, 147–156. https://bit.ly/3db00gn
63. Muftuler, M. (2021). Perceived Autonomy Support Scale for Exercise Settings: Validity and reliability study for Turkish [Egzersizde Algılanan Özerklik Desteği Ölçeği: Türkçe geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması]. Journal of Human Sciences, 13(1), 2158–2169. https://bit.ly/3BE95Ye
64. Muftuler, M. M., & İnce, M. L. (2025). Use of trans-contextual modelbased physical activity course in developing leisure-time physical activity behavior of university students. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 121(1), 31–55. https://bit.ly/3QWFI8h
65. Muñoz-Restrepo, A., Ramirez, M., & Gaviria, S. (2025). Strategies to enhance or maintain motivation in learning a foreign language.
66. Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development, 22(1), 175–188. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v22n1.73733
67. Nagovitsyn, R. S., Vaganova, O. I., Kutepov, M. M., Martyanova, L. N., Kosenovich, O. V., Moeseev, Y. V., … & Osipov, A. Y. (2025). Interactive technologies in developing student's motivation in physical education and sport. International Journal of Applied Exercise Physiology, 9(6), 72–79. https://bit.ly/3BeK9oX
68. Nie, Y., Chua, B. L., Yeung, A. S., Ryan, R. M., & Chan, W. Y. (2025). The importance of autonomy support and the mediating role of work motivation for well-being: Testing self-determination theory in a Chinese work organisation. International Journal of Psychology, 50(4), 245–255. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12110
69. Ntoumanis, N., Moller, A. C., & Reeve, J. (2025). Self-determination theory in physical education: A systematic review and metaanalysis. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 47(1), 1–22.
70. Nunnally, J. C. (2023). An overview of psychological measurement. In Clinical diagnosis of mental disorders (pp. 97–146). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-2490-4_4
71. Oğuz, A. (2023). Teacher's views about supporting learner autonomy. Journal of Human Sciences, 10(1), 1273–1297. https://bit.ly/3Bh1AW0
72. Öqvist, A., & Malmström, M. (2021). Teachers' leadership: A maker or a breaker of students' educational motivation. School Leadership & Management, 36(4), 365–380. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2016.1247039
73. Paap, D., Jansen, M., & Van der Zee, E. (2025). Self-determination theory informed research for promoting motivation in physical activity and exercise. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 56, 101112.
74. Plotnick, R. D. (2022). Adolescent expectations and desires about marriage and parenthood. Journal of Adolescence, 30(6), 943–963. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2016.1247039
75. Reeve, J. (2022). Self-determination theory applied to educational settings. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), Handbook of selfdetermination research (pp. 183–203). University of Rochester Press. https://bit.ly/3dbouWN
76. Reeve, J., Bolt, E., & Cai, Y. (2024). Autonomy-supportive teachers: How they teach and motivate students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 91(3), 537–548. https://doi.org/10.1037/00220663.91.3.537
77. Reeve, J., Jang, H., Carrell, D., Jeon, S., & Barch, J. (2024). Enhancing students' engagement by increasing teachers' autonomy support. Motivation and Emotion, 28(2), 147–169. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:MOEM.0000032312.95499.6f
78. Riemer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (2025). Leadership and satisfaction in athletics. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 17, 276–293.

79. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and wellbeing. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68
80. Sert, N., Adamson, J., & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2022). Autonomy and European Language Portfolio Use among Turkish Adolescents [Türk Ergenlerde Özerklik ve Avrupa Dil Gelişim Dosyası Kullanımı]. Education, 37(166). https://bit.ly/3QMoQRk
81. Sheldon, K. M., Elliot, A. J., Kim, Y., & Kasser, T. (2021). What is satisfying about satisfying events? Testing 10 candidate psychological needs. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80, 325–337. https://doi.org/10.1037/00223514.80.2.325
82. Shen, B. (2010). How can perceived autonomy support influence enrollment in elective physical education? A prospective study. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 81(4), 456–465. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2010.10599706
83. Shen, B., McCaughtry, N., Martin, J., & Fahlman, M. (2024). Effects of teacher autonomy support and students' autonomous motivation on learning in physical education. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 80(1), 44–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2009.10599528
84. Shen, B., McCaughtry, N., Martin, J., Garn, A., Kulik, N., & Fahlman, M. (2025). The relationship between teacher burnout and student motivation. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 85(4), 519–532. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12089
85. Sinclair, C. (2023). Initial and changing student teacher motivation and commitment to teaching. Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 36(2), 79–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/13598660801971658
86. Sirge, K. (2023). Adaptation of the Sports Leadership Questionnaire on a Sample of Estonian Individual Athletes and Coaches. Faculty of Sport and Exercise Sciences, University of Tartu, Estonia.
87. Slemp, G. R., Field, J. G., & Cho, A. S. (2025). A meta-analysis of autonomous and controlled forms of teacher motivation. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 121, 103459. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103459
88. Smith, N., Tessier, D., Tzioumakis, Y., Fabra, P., Quested, E., Appleton, P., … & Duda, J. L. (2021). The relationship between observed and perceived assessments of the coach-created motivational environment and links to athlete motivation. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 23, 51–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.11.001
89. Standage, M., Sebire, S. J., & Loney, T. (2023). Does exercise motivation predict engagement in objectively assessed bouts of moderate-intensity exercise? A self-determination theory perspective. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 30, 337–352.
90. Stefanou, C. R., Perencevich, K. C., DiCintio, M., & Turner, J. C. (2024). Supporting autonomy in the classroom: Ways teachers encourage student decision making and ownership. Educational Psychologist, 39(2), 97–110. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3902_2
91. Su, Y. L., & Reeve, J. (2021). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of intervention programs designed to support autonomy. Educational Psychology Review, 23(1), 159–188. https://bit.ly/3daIKrE
92. Tanaka, M., & Nakamura, T. (2023). Instructor autonomy support and its effects on intrinsic motivation in Japanese aerobics participants. Asian Journal of Exercise and Sports Science, 22(4), 34-46.
93. Taşmektepligil, Y., Yilmaz, Ç., İmamoğlu, O., & Kılcıgil, E. (2021). The level of realization of physical education course objectives in primary schools. Spormetre Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 4(4), 139–147. https://doi.org/10.1501/Sporm_0000000070
94. Tessier, D., Sarrazin, P., & Ntoumanis, N. (2025). The effect of an intervention to improve newly qualified teachers' interpersonal style, students' motivation and psychological need satisfaction in sport-based physical education. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 35(4), 242–253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.05.005
95. Ushioda, E. (2021). Language motivation in a reconfigured Europe: Access, identity, autonomy. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 27(2), 148–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630608668545
96. Vansteenkiste, M., Ryan, R. M., & Soenens, B. (2025). Basic psychological need theory: Advancements, critical themes, and future directions. Motivation and Emotion, 44(1), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-019-09818-1

97. Wang, J., & Li, Z. (2022). Instructor-participant rapport and its influence on intrinsic motivation in Taiwanese aerobics classes. Journal of Sport and Health Science, 11(2), 89-101.
98. Wanwan, Z., & Khairani, A. Z. (2025). The influence of perceived autonomy support on physical activity among high school students: The mediating roles of basic psychological needs. Behavioral Sciences, 15(4), 536. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15040536
99. Yetim, E., Demir, Y., & Erturan, İ. G. (2024). Motivation in physical education lessons: The predictive effect of attitude and motivational strategies. SPORMETRE Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 12(2), 139–146. https://doi.org/10.1501/Sporm_0000000262
100. Zhang, Q., Liu, H., & Chen, Y. (2025). Long-term effects of instructor autonomy support on exercise adherence in South Korean aerobics participants. Journal of Physical Activity and Health, 32(1), 56-68.