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ABSTRACT

SERIOUS LEISURE, MOTIVATION, EXPERIENCE VALUE AND BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS IN CHARITY SPORT EVENT CONTEXT
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Supervisor: Prof. Dr. M. Settar KOÇAK

March 2020, 123 pages

Charity sport events are valuable in terms of both actively enjoying leisure time, obtaining amazing experiences, and fundraising for a nonprofit organization, thus serving a meaningful purpose. Charity sporting events need a specific research focus apart from other sporting events because “cause” and “activity” at hand have a direct and mutual effect on the interest and commitment of individuals to the event (Filo et al., 2009). A model integrating key variables from the studies of serious leisure, charity sport event participation motivation, the perceived value of experience and behavioral intentions were proposed and tested on the participants of charity sport events. Thereby, the present study tried to employ the concept of serious leisure to better understand participants’ behavioral intentions for charity sport events. The sample of the study consisted of individuals who participate in charity running events held in Turkey in 2019. Data for the pilot study were collected from 214 Turkish Garmin Salt Lake Ultra Trail charity runners. Participants composed of 140 (65.4%) males and 74 females (34.6%). The main study sample was comprised of charity runners participating in 41. İstanbul Marathon in 2019. 316 participants, 201 (63.6%) male,
and 115 (36.4%) female were included in the main study for the proposed SEM model analysis. As a result of structural equation modeling, the model's fit indices were found between acceptable intervals ($\chi^2 = 427.696; df = 114; \chi^2 / df = 3.75; GFI = 0.89; CFI = 0.91; RMSEA = 0.073; TLI = 0.90$).
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ÖZ

SPORTİF YARDIMSEVERLİK ETKİNLİKLERİNDE CİDDİ BOŞ ZAMAN, MOTİVASYON, DENEYİM DEĞERİ VE DAVRANIŞSAL NİYETLER

Yazıcı, Tuba
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Danışman: Prof. Dr. M. Settar Koçak

Mart 2020, 123 sayfa

Sportif yardımseverlik etkinlikleri hem boş zamanları aktif olarak geçirmek, olumlu deneyimler kazanmak hem de bir amaç için bağış toplamak ve böylece faydalı bir amaca hizmet etmek açısından çok değerlidir. Sportif yardımseverlik etkinlikleri, diğer spor etkinliklerinden benzersiz bir araştırma odağı gerektirir, çünkü etkinliğe bir amaç için katılmak ve spor yapmak, katılımcıların etkinliğe bağlılığı üzerinde önemli ve kolektif bir etkiye sahiptir (Filo et al., 2009). Bu çalışmada ciddi boş zaman, sportif yardımseverlik etkinliği katılım motivasyonu, algılanan deneyim değeri ve davranışsal niyet değişkenlerini içeren bir model önerildi ve sportif yardımseverlik etkinliği katılımcıları üzerinde test edildi. Araştırmanın örneklemini, 2019 yılında Türkiye'de yapılan sportif yardımseverlik etkinliğine katılan bireyler oluşturmuştur. Pilot çalışma verileri 214 Garmin Tuz Gölü Ultra Trail yardımseverlik koşucularından toplanmıştır. Katılımcılar 140 (% 65.4) erkek ve 74 kızdan (% 34.6) oluşmaktadır. 41. İstanbul Maratonu'na katılan 201 (% 63.6) erkek ve 115 (% 36.4) kadın toplam 316 yardımseverlik koşucusu önerilen SEM modeli analizi için ana çalışmaya dahil edilmiştir. Yapısal eşitlik modellemesi sonucunda, modelin uyum indeksleri kabul
edilebilir aralıklarda bulunmuştur ($\chi^2 = 427,696; \text{df} = 114; \frac{\chi^2}{\text{df}} = 3,75; \text{GFI} = 0,89; \text{CFI} = 0,91; \text{RMSEA} = 0,073; \text{TLI} = 0,90$).

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Sportif Yardımcı Etkinlik, Ciddi Boş Zaman, Motivasyon, Deneyim Değeri, Davranışsal Niyetler
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes three sections. First, the background of the study is presented followed by a purpose of the study. Third, the significance of the study is explained.

1.1. Background of the Study

Sport provides a perfect platform to promote health and fitness as well as to communicate messages and foster a change in society (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). A remarkable way through which this change can be created is by participating in charity sport events to raise awareness and have a positive impact on the world (Mahoney, 2013). Such charity events using sports aim at creating a connectedness between altruistic organizations and sports. They combine charity and sports culture. Charity sport events stand for specially organized events with one or more kinds of sporting activities in which the participants collect money to help a charity with the help of the activity performed (Filo, Funk, & O’Brien, 2011). For Non-Governmental Organizations (henceforth NGOs), sporting events (such as biking running and/or swimming) are valuable sources that create an attractive atmosphere to raise money for a reason like helping people with serious diseases, scholarships for students, the health of children. Also, the causes can be things other than human beings like animals, the environment, and wildlife. Activities vary widely in intensity, to such an extent that some are showcased as endurance running, swimming (for example Tough Mudder, 2014), while others have a more reason related concentration and may be less physically demanding (for example Run for Green) (Hyde, Dunn, Wust, Bax, & Chambers, 2016). What is more, numerous people take part in large-scale events like the Boston Marathon, Istanbul Marathon, or Ironman Triathlon. Those people who
participate in such long-distance running events are not directly related to a cause, yet they also contribute to the fund-raising as a reference for the charitable organization of their choice (Mahoney, 2013). Charity sport events not only provide revenue from event participants; they also offer opportunities for various purposes at the same time. A leisure activity, social interaction with friends and a source of entertainment for people taking part in the event (Taylor & Shanka, 2008). Thus, Charity Sport Event activities are very valuable in terms of both actively spending leisure time, gaining positive experiences and raising funds for a charitable organization, thereby serving a useful purpose.

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) around the world are increasingly using sporting events to raise funds and raise awareness. For instance, Charity event participation is an essential source of funding for Non-Governmental Organizations in the Istanbul Marathon, which takes competitors through a route connecting the Asian and European continents. Runners announce their charity projects and calls to their family, friends, and acquaintances by e-mail or social media before and after participating in national or international races. In their announcements, they call for donations to the projects of the NGOs they support. Donations are made directly to the official bank account of the relevant NGO. 37,000 runners from 106 nations and different regions of Turkey participated in the 41st of the Istanbul Marathon in 2019. The Istanbul marathon also means to take the attention of the runners who aim at raising money for charity organizations. Charity organizations gathered a total of 12.1 million TL donations in a single marathon in Istanbul Marathon 2018 (Daily Sabah, 2019).

The New York City Marathon is the most crowded long-distance race on the planet. The New York Marathon in 2019 included more than 50,000 runners from the world’s best athletes to individuals of different ages and skills, coming from more than 125 nations, and around 9,000 of the runners were the ones who ran for charity organizations (Media Center Press Release, 2019). In 2018, runners (running for donations to charity organizations) who took part in the New York Marathon helped raise more than $40 million for more than 400 charitable organizations (Runners World, 2019).
The Peer-to-Peer Fundraising Thirty, which aims to list the biggest 30 U.S. charities or charity campaigns, indicated that charity campaigns including sport activities such as hiking, running, swimming, cycling, riding or challenges helped more than $1.39 billion to be raised in 2018. e.g. Heart Walk – $122,654,921; Light the Night Walk – $76,970,400; Bike MS – $65,519,000; Walk to End Alzheimer’s – $96,898,684) (Peer to Peer Forum, 2019). Total collective fundraising raised form the U.K.’s sports and challenge events helped the donations raise by over 10% in 2018 to a sum of more than £150 million. 92% of the people who participated in U.K.’s charity events said that they would contribute to a similar charity once more (Fundraising Challenge Events, 2019).

Adım Adım [a Turkish reduplication meaning step by step], established in 2008, was the first of its kind as a charity sport organization in Turkey. This sport event charity formation organizes events to unite non-governmental organizations and people who desire to make any contribution to the charity work. It provides financial and promotional support to social responsibility projects with the help of endurance sports that include cardio like running, cycling, swimming, and mountaineering. The amount of money collected by charity sport events has gone up to 70.662.438 TL in the year 2019 with the help of 79.614 volunteers, runners, and 655.864 contributors (Adım Adım, 2019).

As can be understood from the numbers, charity sport events keep on gaining more and more fame and have turned out to be extremely effective instruments for raising money for altruistic associations. As charity sport events become progressively well-known and integral, the focus must be given to deciding the variables that drive participation, support and lead to a meaningful event experience (Filo et al., 2011). It could be the case that individuals are eager to participate more and pay a considerably higher entrance fee to an event that clearly advertises its charity relations (Bennett, Mousley, Kitchin, & Ali-Choudhury, 2007). Stebbins (2001) claims that volunteers experience an extraordinary number of enriching experiences because of philanthropic activities.
Altruism, the intrinsic feeling of helping others, is likewise perceived as an award by volunteers (Misener, Doherty, & Hamm-Kerwin, 2010). Charity sport event participants conceive altruism as a reward as well. Besides, charity sport event attendees not only reaping the rewards for themselves, but they also feel that they are making a critical contribution to society like volunteers (Orr, 2006). This difference distinguishes charity sport event attendees from attendees in different types of serious leisure, for example, amateurism and hobbyist activities (Misener, Doherty, & Hamm-Kerwin, 2010).

The idea of serious leisure SL was first introduced by Stebbins during the 1970s to examine individuals who highly commit to recreation activities as amateurs who are a novice, hobbyists who do it as a hobby and volunteers (Lee, Bentley, & Hsu, 2017). Stebbins (1982) pointed out that leisure activities can be grouped into two kinds as serious leisure, which is more structured and casual leisure. Casual leisure is an “immediately, intrinsically rewarding, relatively short-lived pleasurable activity requiring little or no special training to enjoy it” (Stebbins, 1997, p. 17), such as watching television, napping, reading a newspaper, or taking a leisurely walk in the park (Stebbins, 2001). Serious leisure activity attendees, on the other hand, are engaged in an activity, they start to build up enthusiasm in the pursuit and effectively plan for it. Moreover, they demonstrate steady and consistent demands for the activity, strongly identify with it, and commit outstanding effort to it. With the support of the activity participation, they gain abilities, information, and experiences to achieve perceived benefits (Cheng & Tsaur, 2012).

SL has been used to research the dedication to leisure in a variety of sport and recreational contexts such as kayaking adventure tours (Kane & Zink, 2004), computer gaming (Bryce & Rutter, 2003), off-road driving (Rosenbaum, 2013), rock climbing (Dilley & Scranton, 2010; Lee, 2013), mountain sports (Stebbins, 2005), college football fandom (Gibson, Willming, & Holdnak, 2002), dancing (Brown, 2007), motorsport events (Harrington, Cuskelly, & Auld, 2000), ice skating (McQuarrie & Jackson, 1996), skydiving (Anderson & Taylor 2010), sport tourism (Green & Jones, 2005), volunteers for the elders in community sports organisations (Misener, et al., 2010), masters swimming (Hastings, Kurth, Schloder, & Cyr, 1995), bass fishing
participation in marathon (Shipway & Jones, 2008), in triathlon (Lamont, Kennelly, & Moyle 2014; McCarville, 2007). Despite the fact that past research has examined serious leisure in different leisure activities, no consideration has been paid to charity sport events. Charity runners commit a lot of their leisure for training and activities that help them to raise funds. This connotes that such activities can be considered as serious leisure activities. Therefore, serious leisure theory may help us to understand charity runners’ motivations and experiences.

Managing and delivering better experiences remains to be one of the essential objectives of marketing (Hernández-Ortega & Franco, 2019). Staging memorable experience in service is vital for retaining existing members and getting new ones (Yazıcı, Koçak, & Hürmeriç, 2017). Research on experience shows that staged experience at an event is likely to result in strong memories and fulfillment (Yazıcı et al., 2017). Furthermore, many researchers have connected well-designed experiences to positive behavioral intentions (e.g., Luo, Chen, Ching, & Liu, 2011; Pine & Gilmore, 1998). Scholars and experts have underlined the need for examining how experiences are changed into value for customers (Grönroos 2015; Hernández-Ortega & Franco, 2019). Customer value has become a critical idea in marketing and gained increased recognition as a reliable variable. As it clarifies customers’ behavioral intentions (Oriade & Schofield, 2019; Yrjölä, Rintamäki, Saarijärvi, Joensuu, & Kulkarni, 2019). Furthermore, it is revealed to influence satisfaction and future intentions (Gardiner, King, & Grace, 2012; Prebensen, Kim, & Uysal, 2016; Williams & Soutar 2009). In the research conducted by Lee, Jin, and Lee (2014), on the impact of customer perception of value on loyalty, find out that perceived value significantly affected behavioral intentions.

Leisure and Sport marketers have tried to understand the factors that influence individuals to attend events. Discovering participants' future intentions can be crucial data to improve the proficiency of marketing endeavors in the undeniably competitive environment (Cunningham & Kwon, 2003). Besides, Funk and James (2006) indicate that motives connect with the one's self-concept and values, contributing to attachment to a sport object. In keeping with these relationships, no previous research has examined charity sport experiences in a behavioral model. This study broadens the
literature by exploring these constructs in connection to charity sport event. Charity
sport events necessitate a unique study focus other than remaining sport events because
the cause and sport at hand have a substantial and collective effect on individuals' attachment to the event (Filo, Funk, & O'Brein, 2009).

It is of great importance to examine the behavioral intentions of participants regarding charity sport events that inspire social solidarity by enabling individuals to take action through sports. In any case, in spite of their significance for society, there is little research on consumer behavior issues identified with these charity sport events. Even though up-to-date research have investigated the motivation to attend charity sport events (for example, Bennett et al., 2007; Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2008, Filo et al., 2009; Scott & Solomon, 2003; Taylor & Shanka, 2008; Webber, 2004; Higgins & Hodgins, 2008; Wood, Snelgrove, & Danylchuk, 2010), many of these studies have been descriptive and exploratory (Snelgrove & Wood, 2010). Besides, the notions of serious leisure and experience value concepts have not been studied in charity sport events. So as to fill these research gap, a model incorporating key variables from the studies of serious leisure, charity sport events participation motivation, perceived value of experience and behavioral intentions were proposed and tested on the participants of charity sport events.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

The main aim of this study was to introduce an integrated approach to understand conceptual associations among the constructs of serious leisure, charity sport event participation motivation, the perceived value of experience, and behavioral intentions as well as to construct the structural relationship model. In other words, the aim was to provide updated knowledge of the study constructs and also how they relate to each other to drive participant loyalty behavior. To this end, a model containing key variables from the studies of serious leisure, charity sport event participation motivation, the perceived value of experience, and behavioral intentions were proposed and tested on the participants of charity sport events. In a conceptual model, the researcher identified serious leisure as independent variable, charity sport event participation motivation and participants’ perceived value of experience as mediator
variables and behavioral intentions as the dependent variable. Finally, this study also examined demographic variables of the charity sport event participants.

1.3. Significance of the Study

Charity sport events are very valuable in terms of both actively enjoying leisure time, obtaining amazing experiences, and fundraising for a charitable organization, thereby serving a useful purpose. Furthermore, not only charity sport event participants are getting rewards for themselves, but they are also making a significant contribution to society (Misener et al., 2010; Orr, 2006). Non-governmental organizations around the world are increasingly using sporting events to raise funds and raise awareness. Charity sport events keep growing in popularity and have become remarkably successful charity fundraising mechanisms (Bennett et al., 2007). Since charity sport events become popular in recent years, increased focus should be put on identifying the factors influencing attendance and leading to a meaningful experience. It could be the case that people are willing to participate more and pay a substantially higher entrance fee to an event that highlights its charity links (Bennett et al., 2007).

Charity sporting events need a specific research focus apart from other sporting events because the cause and activity at hand have a direct and mutual effect on the interest and commitment of individuals to the event (Filo et al., 2009). Nevertheless, little research has been carried out on behavioral issues associated with charity sport events. While recent studies have explored the motivation behind participation in charity sports events (for example, Bennett et al., 2007; Filo et al., 2008; Filo et al., 2009; Scott & Solomon, 2003; Taylor & Shanka, 2008; Webber, 2004; Higgins & Hodgins, 2008; Wood et al., 2010), many of these studies have been descriptive and exploratory (Snelgrove & Wood, 2010). No study examined charity sport experiences in a behavioral model. Therefore, the aim of this study is the development and testing of a model to clarify the multi-dimensional concept of serious leisure experience in charity sport events and to examine charity sport experiences in a behavioral model. Though past research has investigated serious leisure in various recreation activities (e.g., off-road driving, Rosenbaum, 2013; skydiving, Anderson & Taylor 2010; rock climbing Lee, 2013), no attention has been paid to charity sport events in serious leisure concept.
Besides, the experience value concept has not been studied in charity sport events. In order to fill these research gaps, a model integrating key variables from the studies of serious leisure, charity sport event participation motivation, perceived value of experience, and behavioral intentions were proposed and empirically tested on the participants of charity sport events. Thereby, present study tried to employ the concept of serious leisure to better understand participants' behavioral intentions for charity sport events.

The main contribution of this study is to develop and test a model to better explain the concept of serious leisure experience in charity sport events. Previous studies on charity sport event experiences have investigated participation motivations. Nevertheless, the relative combined impact of these variables is unclear. Quantitative results of this research is expected to help to comprehend the multi-dimensional aspects of participants' experiences in charitable sports. Therefore, this study investigated the reliability of this multi-dimensional model by collecting data from the Turkish charity sport event participants. This is the first study that investigates the relationship between serious leisure and charity sport event motivations. Also, this is the first study that measures experience values in a charity sport context. The interesting results of this research could be relevant both to leisure marketing research and fundraising practitioners. Researchers could better understand the causal relationships among factors of serious leisure, charity sport event participation motivation, perceived experience value, and behavioral intentions.

It is important for sports marketers and event managers responsible for sport funding programs to fully grasp how and why individuals choose to engage in donating activities in order to reach potential donors and participants (Won, Park, & Turner, 2010). Understanding the motivation for participation is a key point. Moreover, in the light of this study service organizers can develop viable marketing strategies and which could better meet leisure participants' needs and wants.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents an overview of the literature on the following constructs: serious leisure, charity sport event motivation, experience value, and behavioral intentions.

2.1. Serious Leisure

Stebbins (1982) claimed that leisure activities could be categorized into two types as Serious Leisure SL and Casual Leisure CL. Casual leisure is an “immediately, intrinsically rewarding, relatively short-lived pleasurable activity requiring little or no special training to enjoy it” (Stebbins, 1997, p. 17). Such as watching television, napping, reading a newspaper, or taking a leisurely walk in the park (Stebbins, 2001). On the other hand, serious leisure is a construct that Robert Stebbins (1982, 1992) has established through ethnographic studies of people from a variety of leisure activities, including music, arts, and sports. The concept of SL was defined as: The systematic pursuit of an amateur, a hobbyist, or a volunteer activity that individuals find so significant and interesting that they launch themselves on a career centered on acquiring and expressing its special skills, knowledge, and experience (Stebbins, 1992, p. 3). Serious leisure participants are engaged in an activity, and they start to build up an enthusiasm for the pursuit and effectively make plans for it. Moreover, they create steady and predictable demands for the activity, firmly identify with it, and put a considerable amount of effort into it. Through participation in the activity, they gain skills, information, and experience to be able to achieve perceived benefits (Cheng & Tsaur, 2012). To separate serious leisure from casual leisure, Stebbins (1982) distinguished six characteristics of serious leisure. So as to portray the different types of commitments that are done on leisure; perseverance, personal effort, career,
identification, unique ethos, and durable benefits are identified as the six attributes of serious leisure SL (Lee et al., 2017).

2.1.1. Perseverance

Perseverance means the ability to overcome the difficulty that occurs in recreation experiences and the capacity to stay positive (Lee et al., 2017). Stebbins (1981) reported that attendees sometimes needed to endure through constraints like injury, weariness, hot, anxiety, fatigue, cold, and embarrassment. In this regard, perseverance might be considered as determination in goal-directed conduct over time (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008). Serious attendees in sports recreation show resilience to distress and difficulties, for instance, enduring pain all through a long-distance race is viewed as a way to honor runners’ commitment to this sport (Lee & Ewert, 2013).

2.1.2 Leisure Career

Leisure career mirror a continuum of changing patterns identified with skills, information, and abilities. For instance, individuals may perceive their dynamic development in conditioning while they are preparing for the following event (Tsaur & Liang, 2008).

2.1.3. Significant Effort

Significant personal effort is related with developing special knowledge, skills, or abilities. One can devote significant effort to obtain all three attributes, based on the activity. Ultimately, the efforts and energies dedicated to the pursuit shape a serious career (Stebbins, 1982).

2.1.4. The Durable Benefits

The durable benefits represent a realization of a pleasing or wanted result (Gould et al., 2008). Durable benefits incorporate self-improvement, self-enrichment, self-expression, feeling of accomplishment, enhancement of self-image, and self-gratification (Orr, 2006). Stebbins (2001) state that volunteers experience an
outstanding number of enriching experiences as a result of altruistic actions. Altruism is likewise regarded as a prize by volunteers (Stebbins, 2001). Charity sport event participants conceive altruism as a reward. Besides, not only charity sport event participants get rewards for themselves, but also they make a noteworthy contribution to society (Misener et al., 2010; Orr, 2006). This additional aspect separates charity sport event attendees from attendees of different types of serious leisure like amateurism and hobbyist activities (Misener et al., 2010).

According to Stebbins (2005, p. 186), "the drive to find fulfillment in serious leisure is the drive to experience the rewards of given leisure activity," and studies on volunteering as serious leisure has uncovered that specific rewards or advantages can be acquired from the activity. Career volunteers appreciate the personal rewards (e.g., self-actualization, self-esteem, self-enrichment) and social rewards (e.g., social cooperation, group achievement) intrinsic in any serious leisure activity (Misener et al., 2010; Stebbins, 2001). An attendee can be motivated to proceed with the activity when they find rewards satisfying (Misener et al., 2010; Stebbins, 2005).

2.1.5. Identification

Individual and communal identities arise from an individual's commitment to recreation activities and internalization of the values in an activity (Green & Jones 2005; Lee & Ewert, 2019). Previous research has demonstrated that individuals build up a feeling of identity with the help of their engagement with these activities (Lee & Ewert, 2019), by wearing the costumes, t-shirts or uniforms for the specific activity (Shipway & Jones 2008), telling their exciting paddling stories (Kane & Zink 2004).

2.1.6. Unique Ethos

In spite of the fact that what is mentioned above concentrates on individual devotion to a recreational event, the framework of serious leisure SL additionally underlines the social network inside a recreational setting (unique ethos). Unique ethos clarifies sense of togetherness and companionships between volunteers and corresponding relations between people and their social environments. A social environment gives a chance for attendees to communicate with different volunteers, immerse themselves into the
culture and assess their advancement with norms and standards of a specific activity or event (Lee et al., 2017).

SL has been used to research the dedication to leisure in a variety of sport and recreational contexts such as kayaking adventure tours (Kane & Zink, 2004), computer gaming (Bryce & Rutter, 2003), off-road driving (Rosenbaum, 2013), rock climbing (Dilley & Scranton, 2010; Lee, 2013), mountain sports (Stebbins, 2005), college football fandom (Gibson, Willming, & Holdnak, 2002), dancing (Brown, 2007), motorsport events (Harrington, Cuskelly, & Auld, 2000), ice skating (McQuarrie & Jackson, 1996), skydiving (Anderson & Taylor 2010), sport tourism (Green & Jones, 2005), volunteers for the elders in community sports organizations (Misener et al., 2010), masters swimming (Hastings, Kurth, Schloder, & Cyr, 1995), bass fishing (Yoder, 1997), participation in marathon (Shipway & Jones, 2008), in triathlon (Lamont, Kennelly, & Moyle, 2014; McCarville, 2007). Though past research has investigated serious leisure in various recreation activities, no attention has been paid to charity sport events.

2.2. Attendance to Charity Sport Events

Charity sport events are a recent phenomenon in which sport and donation activities are combined (Hendriks & Peelen, 2013). Charity sport events stand for specially organized events with one or more kinds of sporting activities in which the participants collect money to help a charity with the help of that activity performed (Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2011). For Non-Governmental Organizations (henceforth NGOs), sporting events (such as biking running and swimming) are valuable sources that create an attractive atmosphere to raise money for a reason like helping people with serious diseases, scholarships for students, the health of children. Also, the causes can be things other than human beings like animals, the environment, and wildlife. Activities vary widely in intensity, to such an extent that some are showcased as endurance running, swimming (for example Tough Mudder, 2014), while others have a more reason related concentration and are less physically demanding (for example Relay for Life; American Cancer Society, 2014) (Hyde et al., 2016). What is more, numerous people take part in large-scale events like the Boston Marathon or Istanbul Marathon.
or Ironman Triathlon. Those people who participate in such long-distance running events are not directly related to a cause. However, they contribute to the fund-raising as a reference for the charitable organization of their choice (Mahoney, 2013).

Charity sport events not only provide revenue from event participants; they also offer opportunities for various purposes at the same time. A leisure activity, social interaction with friends and a source of entertainment for people taking part in the event (Taylor & Shank, 2008). Charity sport events are a successful way to raise money for a reason while promoting an active and healthy way of life through exercise (Filo et al., 2011). Hence, a CSE is a non-profit event that is a successful way of acquiring funds as well as raising awareness for a cause, typically concerning health or social issues. Because of the widespread usefulness of such CSEs, numerous non-profit organizations (NPOs) used them as a way to raise awareness and funds for a particular reason (Won et al., 2010).

Over the last couple of years, the fame of cause-related fitness events has expanded widely (Naudi et al., 2019). These charity events necessitate high attendee involvement and are profitable for the objectives of the non-profit organizations and similarly for the corporate sponsors (Scott & Solomon, 2003). For instance, Charity event participation is an important source of funding for non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the Istanbul Marathon, which takes competitors through a route connecting the Asian and European continents. Runners announce their charity projects and calls to their family, friends, and acquaintances by e-mail or social media before and after participating in national or international races. In their announcements, they call for donations to the projects of the NGOs they support. Donations are made directly to the official bank account of the relevant NGO. There were 37,000 runners from 106 countries and all around Turkey in the 41st edition of the Istanbul marathon race in 2019. The Istanbul Marathon also aims to attract runners who compete for charities. Charities collected a total of 12.1 million TL donations in a single marathon in 2018 (Daily Sabah, 2019).
Individuals may be eager to take part in such activities more and give considerable money to an event that obviously advertises and promotes its charity connections (Bennett et al., 2007). For instance, people donated $7.7 billion in Australia, and among this money, $2 billion comes from special events (Hyde et al., 2016). Similarly, $1.07 billion among the $10.6 billion was donated by charity events in Canada (Hyde et al., 2016). Helping other people has been connected with the altruistic feeling of satisfaction. Charity sport events, specifically, offer a meaningful experience, and the act of helping others shapes a significant part of that meaning (Filo et al., 2009).

Charity sport occasions enable individuals to fulfill different motives identified with both the sport and recreation aspects of the event like social, physical, etc., in combination with motives for charitable giving (Filo, Funk, & O’Brien, 2008; Taylor & Shanka, 2008). Such events enable attendees to fulfill several motives simultaneously, e.g., doing exercise, relaxation, and having fun while contributing to charity (Filo, Funk & O’Brien, 2008; Naudi et al., 2019). Therefore, charity sport events necessitate a unique study focus different from other sport events as the cause, and the sport have a remarkable and collective effect on attendee's adherence to the event (Filo et al., 2009). Nevertheless, up to date, there has been only a few research that aims to look for involvement in charity sport events. Most of the studies have tried to seek to gain an understanding of the motivations for participation in the charity event (e.g., Bennett et al. 2007; Chiu, Lee, & Won, 2016; Filo et al., 2008; Filo et al. 2011; Scott & Solomon, 2003; Snelgrove & Wood 2010; Taylor & Shanka 2008; Webber, 2004; Higgins & Hodgins, 2008; Higgins & Lauzon, 2003; Won & Park 2010; Wood et al., 2010).

2.2.1 Previous Literature on Charity Sport Event Motivations

Scott and Solomon's (2003) study was the first attempt to investigate motivations that individuals have in a cause-related fitness event (Race for the Cure®). The study identified several motivations depending on interviews with the participants in the Race for the Cure. Results about the motives that encourage the participation were exhibited like this: individual association with the disease, social advantages, supporting the reason/network commitment, fitness, and fundraising.
Bennett et al. (2007) inspected the drives that impact the attendance in mass sporting events with charity associations. Attendees reporting that they had joined in at least one charity-related event responded to a survey designed to examine participant's reasons for participation. The outcomes displayed ten drives that apparently affected the decision to participate or not. Among the ten, four were found to be dominated including; good cause(s) involvement supported by an event, chances to lead a healthy way of life supported by the occasion, a person's association with the sport, and desire to mix socially with different participants.

Filo et al. (2008) investigated the factors that draw individuals to a charity sport event while discussing the role of charity in promoting a commitment to the event. The researchers found that intellectual, competency, and social drives, help people and enhance charity, in combination with the motivations of reciprocity and self-esteem, lead to the attractiveness of the event. The findings also indicate that the charitable aspect affects the motivations of competency and social drives and helps to create an attachment to the event.

The motives, satisfaction, and intention of individuals when participating in a sports event coordinated by a non-profit organization have been studied by Taylor and Shanka (2008) as an important means of supporting causes and raising revenue. It was revealed that achievement, involvement, status, and socialization contributed to the motives of individuals.

Won et al. (2010) conducted a study to understand CSE participation motivation with a sample of Relay for Life events participants. The authors identified six motivations, including; philanthropy, social/entertainment, external/benefits, family needs, sports, and group collaboration. The findings showed that philanthropy was the most significant inspiration after which family needs, group collaboration, social/entertainment, sports, and external/benefits can be listed in order. The results also showed variations in motivational factors depending on the sex and age of the participants. In addition, the satisfaction of the individuals with the event and their desire to return to the event correlated significantly to the motivational attributes (Won, Park, & Lee, 2013; Won & Park, 2010)
The motivational variables that influence the involvement of college students in charity sport events have been investigated by Won, Park, and Lee (2013). The authors defined six motivational variables depending on the literature relating to sport participation and donor motivation. These motivational factors were: philanthropy, sport, supporting the cause, social interactions, reference group influence, and benefits. The most significant motivation was found as philanthropic, accompanied by motives linked to sport and to support the cause. The results also revealed demographic differences in motivational variables.

Filo et al. (2011) broadened the literature on charity sports by contrasting the impact of charitable motives and the role of recreational motivations in individuals' commitment in two separate charity sports contexts. The study observed donating and recreational drives similarities or differences in two different charity sport settings. In the charity importance case (i.e., LIVESTRONG Challenge), findings revealed the motive of social recreation and the charitable motivations of reciprocity, self-esteem, need to support others, and the willingness to promote charity were significant predictors of the event attachment. Results in the non-prominence of a charity event (i.e., 3 M Half Marathon) showed that cognitive, social, physical, and escape recreational motivations, and charitable motivations of reciprocity, self-esteem, and ability to promote charity significantly correlated to the attachment to events. The motivations for community donation were higher when the cause was prominent, but when the cause was less visible (i.e., 3 M Half Marathon and Relay), the motivations for recreation were higher. Furthermore, the social motive generated an attachment to events in both settings.

Chiu et al. (2016) investigated the effectiveness of current Charity Sport Events (CSEs) subscales encouraging participation in CSEs. Data collected from university students. Results showed that the five-factor charity sports event motivation significantly predict the participation intention to the charity sport events. Previous literature about charity sport event motivation presented in Table 2.1 below.
Earlier research has emphasized the importance of incorporating giving behavior and sports motivation in order to better comprehend the motivations of attendees in charity sport events (Filo et al., 2008). These results were verified by many quantitative analyses of the charity sport participants (i.e., Bennett et al., 2007; Chiu et al., 2016; Filo et al., 2010; Won & Park, 2010). Using the charity sport motives identified by literature related charity sport event motivations as a reference, six motives were utilized in the current study (1) Philanthropy, (2) Health and Fitness, (3) Cause, (4) Social Interaction, and (5) Reference Group.

2.2.1.1 Philanthropic Motive

To start with, the philanthropic motivation means a wish to help other people, and it is viewed as one of the critical motivations for attending to CSE. Numerous researchers have shown that the philanthropic motivation is a significant reason for a person to take part in a CSE (Bennett et al., 2007; Chiu et al., 2016; Filo et al., 2011).

2.2.1.2 Health and Fitness Motive

The health and fitness motive relates to the willingness to participate in physical activity in order to stay fit and healthy; these recreational motivations may also be an essential reason for taking part in CSEs (Chiu et al., 2016). Sport and fitness-related practices are the key components of CSEs; thus, exercise or physical activity motivations can also be a critical factor underlying individuals' participation in CSEs (Chiu et al., 2016).
Table 2.1.

*Previous Literature About Charity Sport Event Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal connection to the cause</td>
<td>Mix socially</td>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Social/entertainment</td>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>Philanthropic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to raise funds</td>
<td>Experience fun and enjoyment</td>
<td>Social implications</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Family needs</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>Sport/event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>Pursue a healthy lifestyle</td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Sport incentives</td>
<td>Supporting the cause</td>
<td>Need to help others</td>
<td>Cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits</td>
<td>Experience helper’s high</td>
<td>Intellectual engagement</td>
<td>Socialisation</td>
<td>Group collaboration</td>
<td>Social interactions</td>
<td>Desire to improve the charity</td>
<td>Social interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the cause/community</td>
<td>Feels a duty to participate</td>
<td>Desire to improve the charity</td>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>Reference group influence</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Reference group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and mental stimulation</td>
<td>Need to help others</td>
<td>External factors/benefits</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement/improve performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of the event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with a good cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to help the charity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.1.3 The Cause Motive

Cause has been described as a way for people to increase awareness and make a positive impact on the world by promoting a charity organization (Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2009). For instance, certain attendees may be inspired to take an active part in the İstanbul marathon as they choose to help a particular charity (children's education) like 'Söz konusu eğitimse siz de yardımcı koşar mısınız?' [If it is for education, would you run for help?] project, while others may be motivated to take part because of a more common sense of altruism and a desire to contribute to society. All of the CSE's are designed to enhance public awareness and promote a specific cause, irrespective of the form, scope or intensity of sports events (Chiu et al., 2016; Bennett et al., 2007; Scott & Solomon 2003).

2.2.1.4 Social Interaction Motive

Social interaction refers to an intimate association with other people. Individuals are inspired to take part in charity sporting activities to make new friends, to connect with others and to exchange their experience with someone (Bennett et al., 2007). The primary motivation in this respect was the need for social interaction with someone (Filo et al., 2010; 2011; Won & Park, 2010; Scott & Solomon, 2003). Offering participants opportunities to share their achievements and socialize with others will potentially create a group atmosphere and possibly increase loyalty and identification (Chalip, 2006). Creating an entertaining environment in which the attendees can develop relations and feel as if they are part of something more than themselves helps organizations to develop economic and social value regarding their events (Chalip, 2006).

2.2.1.5 Reference Group Motive

Lastly, as an external and environmental component, the reference group motive shows the impact of reference groups, such as friends or family members. This motivation has often been seen to play an essential part in CSE attendance (Chiu et al., 2016).
It is crucial for event marketers who are planning for sport fundraising projects to consider how and why audiences want to participate in donation practices in order to attract prospective donors and supporters (Won et al., 2010). Knowing the motivation behind involvement is a starting point to aid social marketers to determine the efficacy of these activities (Scott & Solomon, 2003), and for efficient handling of such kinds of events.

2.3. Experience Value

Managing and providing excellent experiences remains one of the key marketing objectives (Lemon & Verhoef, 2016). Scholars and professionals highlighted the need to research how these experiences convert to value for consumers (Grönroos 2015; Hernandez-Ortega & Franco, 2019). In marketing, consumer value has become a vital element and received a considerable reputation as an accurate measure because it demonstrates the behavioral intentions of the customers (Al-Sabbahy, Ekinci, & Riley 2004; Bolton & Drew 1991; Lee et al., 2014; Oriade & Schofield, 2019; Prebensen, Kim, & Uysal, 2016; Pura, 2005; Rintamäki & Kirves, 2017; Sweeney, Soutar, & Johnson, 1999).

Traditionally, the value was described as the overall evaluation of an offering according to what is received and what is given (Zeithaml, 1988). The traditional approach indicates that value is the consequence of an evaluation of cost and benefit. Value is usually seen from this conventional viewpoint as an economic value, which is the result of an assessment between "get" and "give" elements (Zeithaml, 1988). Recently, however, the concept of value moved towards the experiential approach. In this perspective, value is regarded as the product of consumption experience (Ahn & Back, 2019). The exact nature of value creation can not be grasped in traditional models of value creation of sports management because they only concentrate on the amounts or quality of products (Parks, Quarterman, & Thibault, 2011). The drawback of that approach is that it ignores the condition of the consumption process. For instance, in the mind of a customer, the perceived value of new skis could be significantly different, due to a number of circumstances including weather, and whether the person is skiing alone or with friends (Woratschek, Horbel, & Popp,
Obviously, the value of a new ski relies on the particular context in which it is used. The resources which may be incorporated in the value creation process rely, therefore, on the particular setting. As a consequence, value proposals may be more desirable in a context, but in another, it may be less precious (Woratschek, Horbel, & Popp, 2014).

There is an increasing trend that highlights the participation of individuals in service operations, and interactions will contribute to desirable service experiences (Sandström, Edvardsson, Kristensson, & Magnusson, 2008). People are exchanging valued resources (e.g., money, time, physical, and psychological security) for emotional and motivational experiences arranged by organizations (Ellis & Rossman, 2008). In this perspective of value, the competition center on personal co-creation experiences that leads to a value which is unique for every person (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Experience can be seen as a link between the inner and outer worlds of the person (Hernandez-Ortega & Franco, 2019). Every person lives their own experience from his or her viewpoint in one single event (Hernandez-Ortega & Franco, 2019). The interpretation of experience value will always be different, even if its root is objectively similar for each individual (Hernandez-Ortega & Franco, 2019; Pine & Gilmore 1998; Tung & Ritchie, 2011).

Customer experience is not developed, according to Vargo and Lusch (2004). Instead, it is co-created by customer interactions with the various service features. Service planners should organize a cohesive collection of elements or hints along the customer experience journey to activate the desired experience (Berry et al., 2002; Teixeira, Patricio, Nunes, Nobrega, Fisk, & Constantine, 2012). Such service elements are the setting in which experience occurs and, in addition to service activities, compose of the requirements that service planners put forth to allow the desired experiences (Teixeira et al., 2012). Context involves the features of each point of contact, while the activities create the experience (Teixeira et al., 2012). In addition, the value creation locus is no longer restricted to the 'producer.' Instead, value is co-created collectively by businesses, consumers, and other interested parties in a collaborative process (Woratschek et al., 2014). Both participants, e.g., businesses, clients, non-profit
organizations, actively engage in the value-creation process by combining their personal (e.g., expertise, competencies, and skills) and other sources (Woratschek et al., 2014). For instance, value is often co-created by multiple actors (e.g., club, teams, event organizers, catering suppliers, security personnel, voluntary employees, media, spectators, etc.) in the case of team sports activities (Woratschek et al., 2014). A further example is skiing tourism, which combines the resources of ski lifts, sport manufacturers, hotels, restaurants, ski schools, etc. (Woratschek et al., 2014).

Many theories have discussed the association between experience and value creation. Initially, Experience Economy clarified the progression of the idea of value from a product orientation to an experiential one (Pine & Gilmore, 1999). Secondly, the Service-Dominant Logic (SDL) approach has recognized the phenomenological aspect of value (Vargo & Lusch 2008). Lastly, the Service Logic (SL) approach describes the value of the beneficiary as unique, experiential, and contextual (Grönroos 2011; Hernandez-Ortega & Franco, 2019). Value is evaluated by the recipient according to SDL, which means that suppliers can only provide value offerings as sources for potential value creation. Co-creation of value enables the customer to incorporate the value proposition of the company with his or her competencies, as well as with community and other tools (Woratschek et al., 2014). We can not presume, accordingly, to develop experiences that exactly match expected results. Instead, we develop circumstances that help customers better co-create their ideal experiences (Teixeira et al., 2012). For instance, individuals can use the mountain bike in very varying ways and establish a very personal value, based on their personal (e.g., riding skills), public (e.g., quality and accessibility of mountain biking trails) as well as other components (e.g., location of the region) (Woratschek et al., 2014). In the scope of sporting events, the value proposition of the organizer is a platform that can be used to co-create value among different actors (organizations and individuals) (Woratschek et al., 2014). Value is perceived in a unique way and contextually interpreted by each individual (Vargo & Lusch, 2008). Therefore, creating value is a challenging task because consumer interest always tends to be a moving target (Rintamäki & Kirves, 2017).
Perceived value differs among customers in different circumstances, scenarios, and over time (Holbrook, 1999). It is important for all organizations to develop an understanding of how the creation of value can have a positive impact on behavioral intentions (Rintamäki & Kirves, 2017). Fans, for example, contribute significantly to sporting events. Just before the event, this engagement starts with songs, choreographies that are displayed in the stadium, or producing fan banners and posters (Woratschek et al., 2014). During the game, spectators help to create a particular atmosphere by music, singing, interacting emotionally (Woratschek et al., 2014). Fans from both the home and the away teams may make a positive and a negative contribution to the event atmosphere (Woratschek et al., 2014). They continue to participate in the value creation cycle after the sports event as they cherish wins or cope with defeats together (Woratschek et al., 2014). In addition, sport customers contribute to the prestige of a sporting event, for example, by involving members in communities or advising the event to other customers (Woratschek et al., 2014). Additionally, the involvement of other individuals in the consumption process may affect the perceived quality of service and, thus, the perception of value proposals (Uhrich & Benkenstein, 2010). Watching a football game in a small stadium with very few spectators will be an entirely different experience than watching it in a big stadium with many spectators (Woratschek et al., 2014).

Earlier research employed unidimensional and multidimensional scales to evaluate the perceived value. In the unidimensional measure of value, individuals evaluate value by contrasting what they receive with what they give, taking into account only functional or economic aspects. Nevertheless, scholars have criticized the one-dimensional model as too limited to reflect the nature of consumer values, since the value is a dynamic and complex construct (Babin, Darden, & Griffin, 1994; Holbrook, 1999; Lee & Min, 2013; Sweeney & Soutar, 2001). Opponents of one-dimensional value measurements have argued that value includes various dimensions, such as utilitarian, hedonic, social, and epistemological dimensions (Lee & Min, 2013; Sweeney & Soutar, 2001).
Multidimensional scales of perceived value, such as social, emotional, functional, and epistemic responses, have recently been recommended. The value interpretation of the customers can be divided into functional and non-functional values (Ahn & Back, 2019). The functional value is attributed to tangible expectations such as comfort, cost, and quality (Sheth, 1981). Intangible needs, including social, emotional, etc. experiences are linked to the non-functional value (Ahn & Back, 2019). The value of customer experience has been separated into three dimensions: functional value, emotive value, and social value by Sweeney and Soutar (2001). The functional experience value is the personal awareness of the customer regarding the functional features of complete services or products in the consumption process. On the other hand, the subjective interpretation of the individual regarding the mood and emotional alterations is the emotional experience value (Williams & Soutar, 2000). Individual’s sense of satisfaction with social requirements is about social experience value (Bao, 2017).

In this study, first of all, physical value is seen as an important construct for charity sport events to assess the quality and to evaluate whether the experience setting was well organized. Next, emotional value is critical in rating charity sport events because participants experience emotional and psychological feelings. They are excited and be happy to contribute to a good cause. Third, social value is included since participants are inspired to develop social networks. Finally, economic value is critical since participation fees and travel expenses are an essential component of the participation decisions.

2.4. Behavioral Intentions

Marketers in recreation and sport have long been seeking to better understand the factors affecting participants' attendance behavior. In order to increase the effectiveness of marketing efforts in an increasingly competitive environment, identifying the future intentions of the individuals may be key information (Cunningham & Kwon, 2003). Indeed, one of the most important goals of social sciences and marketing is to develop information to affect behavior (Bigné et al., 2005).
Intention can be defined as the predicted or planned future conduct of an individual (Lam & Hsu, 2004). This reflects the expectations of a person regarding a specific behavior in a specific context, and it can be defined as a possibility to act (Lam & Hsu, 2004). Behavioral intentions indicate the effort that a person is willing to make to execute the behavior (Filo, Chen, King, & Funk, 2013). The planned behavior theory suggests that behavioral intention contributes to explicit actions, and an individuals’ intention to participate in forecasts individuals’ actual behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Additionally, loyal individuals are much more inclined to advise service to friends, family, or other people by serving as effective word-of-mouth advertisers (Yazıcı et al., 2017). In previous research, behavioral intentions were assessed based on positive word of mouth (Boulding, Kalra, Staelin, & Zeithaml, 1993; Lee & Min, 2013; Yazıcı et al., 2017), intention to repurchase (Cronin & Taylor, 1992), and eagerness to pay a premium price (Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1996). In this research, future participation intention and positive word of mouth were included as two dimensions of behavioral intentions. Participation intention in an event is the probability of charity sport participants continue to participate in a charity sporting event in the future (Filo et al., 2010). Charity sports promoters should strive to establish long-term relations with attendees and should strive to maintain them in their fundraising efforts. Positive word of mouth is the probability that the event will be suggested to relatives and/or friends or not (Mahoney, 2013). Word-of-mouth is among the most important ways to communicate in the service industry. Customers search for knowledge, and individuals often consider word-of-mouth knowledge as more credible during the knowledge-seeking phase, since it is the experience-based view of a third party (Ha & Jang, 2010). Word of mouth is an outcome of the emotional reactions of individuals to consumption experiences (Ha & Jang, 2010).
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter explains the methodology used for this study. This research was intended to introduce a holistic approach to understand conceptual relations among the constructs of serious leisure, charity sport event participation motivation, the perceived value of experience, and behavioral intentions as well as proposing the structural relationship model. In other words, the aim was to gain a better comprehension not only of the concepts themselves but also how the constructs associated with each other to influence individuals’ loyalty behavior. With this aim, a model combining key variables from the studies of serious leisure, charity sport event participation motivation, the perceived value of experience, and behavioral intentions were hypothesized and tested on the participants of charity sport events. Finally, this research also analyzed the demographic characteristics of the charity sport event participants. The hypothesized model was shown in Figure 3.2. In this regard, this chapter outlines the research methodology, the research design, the research hypothesis, the demographic characteristics of the respondents and the instruments used to collect data.

3.1. Research Design

The purpose of this research was to examine relationships among charity sport event participants’ perceived value of experience, serious leisure characteristics, charity sport event participation motivation, and behavioral intentions; thus, this research is a correlational study. Associations between two or more variables are examined without any manipulation of variables in correlational research, and numerical representations can demonstrate the relations between variables (Fraenkel & Norman, 1993). Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is preferred as a correlational technique as it is
proposed as an efficient approach to work concurrently on the associations between
the antecedents and outcomes of the concepts (Oreg, 2006).

The data for this study were obtained in two stages, the former data collection was for
the pilot study, and the following data collection was for the main study analysis. Data
were collected quantitatively through adopted surveys both for the pilot study and the
main study. The quantitative method collects huge amounts of numerical data by the
use of surveys with close-ended questions, offering scholars with comprehensive
information that can reflect the population being examined, thus generalizing results
(Punch, 2005). To evaluate charity sport event participants’ perceived value of
experience, serious leisure characteristics, participation motivation, and behavioral
intentions, all scales were translated into Turkish. Required permissions to apply the
instruments were obtained from the authors of the scales. Permissions were also taken
from the Middle East Technical University, Applied Ethics Research Centre, Ethics
Committee on Human Researches (see Appendix A). Data for the pilot study were
collected from 214 charity sport event participants; while 316 subjects were
participated in the main study analysis. Research design of the study is presented in
Figure 3.1.

3.1.1. Research Model and Hypothesis

The aim of this study is threefold, including: (1) Hypothesizing a model depending on
related theories of charity sport event (2) Adopting selected scales into Turkish, which
are reported to be valid and reliable. The selected scales developed to explore (a)
charity sport event participants’ serious leisure characteristics on six dimensions:
identification, unique ethos, durable benefits, personal effort, leisure career, and
perseverance. (b) charity sport event participation motivations on five dimensions:
health and fitness, philanthropic, cause, social interaction, and reference group (c)
perceived value of experience on four dimensions: physical value, emotional value,
social value, economic value (d) behavioral intentions. (3) Finally, testing the
hypothesized model.
Figure 3.1 Research Design

Thereby, a research model has been hypothesized (Figure 3.2), and the following research hypotheses are aimed to be tested:

H1. Charity runners’ serious leisure characteristics will be significantly and positively related to their participation motivations, which indicate that individuals who have higher levels of serious leisure traits will have higher participation motivation.
Figure 3.2 Proposed Model

H2. Charity runners’ serious leisure characteristics will be significantly and positively related to their perceived experience value, which indicate that individuals who have higher levels of serious leisure traits will have higher levels of experience value.

H3. Charity runners’ motivation will be significantly and positively related to their perceived experience value, which indicate that individuals who have higher levels of participation motivation will have higher levels of experience value.

H4. Charity runners’ motivation will be significantly and positively related to their behavioral intentions, which indicate that individuals who have higher levels of participation motivation will have higher levels of behavioral intentions.

H5. Charity runners’ perceived experience value will be significantly and positively related to their behavioral intentions, which indicate that individuals who have higher levels of experience value will have higher levels of behavioral intentions.

The exogenous variable (independent variable) for this research model is: serious leisure characteristics (identification, unique ethos, durable benefits, personal effort, leisure career, and perseverance). Mediator variables are charity sport event
participation motivation (philanthropic, sport event, cause, social interaction, and reference group) and perceived value of experience (physical value, emotional value, social value, economic value). The endogenous variable (dependent variable) is: behavioral intentions. In conclusion, this research aims to analyze the relationships among independent variable (serious leisure characteristics), mediator variable (charity sport event participation motivation and perceived value of experience) and dependent variable (behavioral intentions).

3.2. Research Sample and Procedures

The sample setting of this study was charity sport events. Charity sport events offer meaningful experience for attendees (Filo, Funk, & O’Brien, 2009; Filo, Funk, & O’Brien, 2008). Factors such as the possibility to physically challenge oneself, socialize with other attendees, help people in need and promote the mission of a charity are the perceived benefits which can be gained through the charity event experience (Filo et al., 2008). Therefore, participation of community to this kind of events increasing day by day. In Turkey charity sport event is a new phenomenon. The purposeful technique was used in this research in terms of sampling strategy. The aim of the study was to evaluate the correlations among the constructs, including the concept of serious leisure, participants' perceived experience value, charity sport event participation motivation, and behavioral intentions of charity runners. Hence, data were collected from charity runners by purposive sampling. On the other hand, the degree to which the findings of the study can be generalized regulates the external validity of the study (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). In respect of this research, the sample chosen from the population should be represented in the best possible way to generalize results from sample to population. Thus, charity runners in İstanbul Marathon and charity runners in Garmin Salt Lake Ultra Trail was selected for this study. After deciding the sample setting of the study and completing the questionnaire draft, required approvals were received by e-mail from the developers of the scales and from the Middle East Technical University, Applied Ethics Research Centre, Human Research Ethics Committee. In a two-phase process, the data were obtained,
firstly to test the validity and reliability of the scales a pilot study was performed. Then
data were gathered for the main study analysis.

Pilot study data were gathered from 214 Turkish Garmin Salt Lake Ultra Trail charity
runners. Participants composed of 140 (65.4%) males and 74 females (34.6%). Data
were collected from runners who come to the sport event (Garmin Salt Lake Ultra
Trail) to run for a charitable organization. There were a total of 450 questionnaires
distributed and 214 usable questionnaires collected after excluding those with
excessive missing data or excluding participants who do not run for a charitable cause.
Data were collected by five researchers. Researchers were informed how
questionnaires could be distributed and how scales could be clarified. In the presence
of the researchers, the questionnaires were answered by participants. The researchers
assisted in filling out the questionnaire for respondents who needed more clarification
while completing the questionnaire. Collected data were solely utilized for the
adaptation of the scales into the Turkish culture and to test the reliability and validity
of the scales.

The main study sample was comprised of charity runners participating in 41. İstanbul
Marathon in 2019. Appropriate sample size is critical to evaluate and decide the
significance of the SEM analysis. The criterion of Kline (2011) for a sample size of
more than 200 was regarded to be sufficient for both data collections. With this aim, a
different sample of 316 participants, 201 (63.6%) males, and 115 (36.4%) females
were included in the main study for the proposed SEM model analysis. The main study
participants were recruited from the 41. İstanbul Marathon, Turkey, in 2019. In terms
of previous charity sport event attendance, 111 (35.1%) of them were first or second-
time participants, 92 (29.1%) of them were third or fourth-time participants, 55
(17.4%) of them were fifth or sixth-time participants, and 58 (18.4%) of them were
seventh or more time participants. Data were collected by online questionnaires that
were distributed after the marathon among charity runner's groups by social media.
Data were collected after the marathon face to face by researchers as well. Participants
were informed about the purpose of the study. They were told that all the responses
would remain anonymous and confidential. The researchers observed the participants
during the data collection process to see whether they responded independently to the questionnaire, and the researchers answered the attendees’ questions to eliminate missing data. The time for explaining the primary purpose of the study and completing the questionnaire was around 15 minutes. The respondents’ demographic characteristics were provided in Table 3.1 below for the main study.

Table 3.1

*Main Study Demographic Profile of the Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 and above</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Attendance</td>
<td>1-2 time</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-4 time</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-6 time</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seventh or more</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Data Collection Instruments

To evaluate the hypothesized relationships, data were collected with an instrument including five sections: The first part was the demographic information form, and the other four scales were adopted to Turkish. The questionnaires developed to explore (1) charity runners' serious leisure characteristics on six dimensions: identification, unique ethos, durable benefits, personal effort, leisure career, and perseverance. (2) charity sport event participation motivations on five dimensions: health and fitness, philanthropic, cause, social interaction, and reference group (3) perceived value of experience on four dimensions: physical value, emotional value, social value, economic value (4) behavioral intentions.

The data collection instruments which can be related to the charity sport events were chosen from the literature based on study purpose. The scales translated and adapted by the researcher to assess participants' perceptions on the selected dimensions. The first part of the questionnaire was the demographics part, comprising of age, gender, participants' level of education, and the frequency of previous involvement at charity sport events. The rest of the questionnaire was consisting of Likert-scales ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." In sum, four scales included in this study for the data collection; namely, Serious Leisure Scale, Charity Sport Event Participation Motivation Scale, Value of Experience Scale and Behavioral Intentions Scale. Source of selected subscales and the corresponding Cronbach's alpha values presented in Table 3.2 below.

3.3.1. Translation and Adaptation Process of the Scales

For the adaptation study, the Serious Leisure Scale, Charity Sport Event Participation Motivation Scale, Value of Experience Scale, and Behavioral Intentions Scale were translated by a standard protocol into Turkish. First of all, the survey was translated into Turkish by two linguists. Upon reviewing these translations and finding the variations, a final Turkish version was produced with agreement between the linguists.
Table 3.2  
*Reference of Subscales and Number of Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serious Leisure Scale</strong></td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tsaur &amp; Liang (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unique Ethos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tsaur &amp; Liang (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Durable Benefit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tsaur &amp; Liang (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Effort</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tsaur &amp; Liang (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure Career</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tsaur &amp; Liang (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tsaur &amp; Liang (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charity Sport</strong></td>
<td>Philanthropic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chiu, Lee &amp; Won (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chiu, Lee &amp; Won (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health/Fitness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mahoney (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chiu, Lee &amp; Won (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chiu, Lee &amp; Won (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of Experience Scale</strong></td>
<td>Physical Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prebensen, Kim &amp; Uysal (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prebensen, Kim &amp; Uysal (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sweeney &amp; Soutar (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prebensen, Kim &amp; Uysal (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ha and Jang (2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, another linguist translated the Turkish version back into English. The back-translated items and the original English items were seen reflecting one another. Then the Turkish version was slightly modified for the charity sport event context by a physical education expert.
Serious Leisure Scale (Tsaur & Liang, 2008) was developed to uncover birding experiences. With the author's permission, slight modifications were added where necessary to fit our study context. Some words were modified, such as, instead of "birding" "charity sport event" was utilized where necessary. For the Value of Experience Scale, slight modifications were conducted with the permission of the author; instead of "this winter activity" "this charity running experience" was used where necessary. To determine face validity, if the modified survey was measuring what it was intended to measure, the scale was tested by administering the survey to 10 students. The participant's feedback demonstrated that the surveys were suitable for use in Turkish sample. In line with the recommendations, the questionnaire was finalized.

3.4. Data Analysis Plan

Data were evaluated by the Statistical Package for Social Science SPSS 25.0 and Analysis of Moment Structures AMOS 25.0. Firstly, descriptive statistics were performed by SPSS 25.0 which revealed information regarding the sample characteristics. The next step analysis was performed utilizing structural equation modeling to assess the theoretical model with the data. The method of structural equation modeling is an efficient technique for assessing causal relationships between several concepts and is one in which distinct multiple regression equations are concurrently calculated (Hair et al., 2014). Such parameters were tested in relation to the structural model; a) the overall goodness-of-model fit, b) individual casual paths in terms of standardized path coefficients.

3.5. Pilot Study

Prior to the SEM analyses, validity and reliability studies performed for all the scales used in this study as a pilot study. Data for the pilot study were collected from 214 Turkish Garmin Salt Lake Ultra Trail charity runners. Participants composed of 140 (65.4%) males and 74 females (34.6%).
3.5.1. Data Screening for Factor Analysis

The suggested assumptions of missing value analysis, univariate normality, univariate outliers, multivariate outliers, and multivariate normality were inspected sequentially for each scale prior to the validation and reliability analysis. (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

3.5.1.1. Missing Data

The Data Set review showed that 18 participants omitted some items. Missing values were replaced by the mean score of the respondent’s scores on the remaining items.

3.5.1.2. Outliers

Univariate and multivariate outliers were inspected before running factor analysis.

3.5.1.2.1. Univariate Outliers

Univariate outliers were identified by scanning standardized z-scores. As suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), cases with z-scores exceeding 3.29 were considered as possible outliers. The results showed that some cases with z-scores were surpassing the suggested score on the participation motivation and experience value. Univariate outliers have not been eliminated before the multivariate outliers were checked.

3.5.1.2.2. Multivariate Outliers

Multivariate outliers were detected for each variable by evaluating the Mahalanobis distance (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), and the values surpassing the critical chi-square was considered as potential multivariate outliers ($p < .001$). The findings indicated that several multivariate outliers were present in some of the data sets. The data that were deleted from all univariate and multivariate outliers showed better fits for the factor analysis results for each construct. Thus factor analysis were carried out for each variable with data removed by all univariate and multivariate outliers.
3.5.2. Assumptions of Factor Analysis

With respect to the sample size criteria, the data were sufficiently high to carry out Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) on the Kline (2011) guideline, for the sample size to be approximately 200.

3.5.2.1. Univariate Normality Assumption

The assumption of normality was tested by observations of skewness and kurtosis values, normality checks (Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk), histograms, box plots and Q-Q plots (Kline, 2011). When box plots were checked, 38th, 112th, 110th, 138th 143th, 166th, 198th and 203th cases emerged as outliers. Therefore, these cases were excluded from the data set. Furthermore, the findings revealed that some items in each variable deviate little from normality, although other items had a relatively normal distribution. The test of Mardia was conducted as a multivariable normality predictor, and Mardia tests were not found to be significant so the multivariable normality was not violated (p>.05). The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), therefore, proceeded with the maximum likelihood extraction method. Because Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum and Strahan (1999) have suggested that the best option is maximum likelihood (ML), if data are distributed normally. Since “it allows for the computation of a wide range of indexes of the goodness of fit of the model [and] permits statistical significance testing of factor loadings and correlations among factors and the computation of confidence intervals.” (p. 277). In addition, Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimation was used to run CFAs for each scale. Thus findings were provided in the pilot study with the estimate of ML.

3.5.2.2. Multicollinearity

Finally, the assumption of multicollinearity was examined for each scale. The appearance of bivariate correlations surpassing .90 is the sign of multicollinearity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Correlation matrix inspection of each variable demonstrated that some of the items were highly correlated, but no correlation exceeded .90 and therefore the assumption of multicollinearity was verified.
3.5.3. Charity Sport Participation Motivation Scale

In the scale selection phase, the related literature was investigated to portray how the concept of motivation for attendance in charity sport events was conceptualised in previous research. The existing scales, as proposed by Clark and Watson (1995), were analyzed to understand the construct's nature and detect any concerns with present scales. Upon the review of the relevant literature Charity Sport Motivation Scale was identified as a convenient measure for our sample setting. Chiu et al. (2016) have tested and validated it quantitatively by using both a bifactor modeling and second-order modeling methods.

The CSE motivation scale was built on previous research (Billing et al. 1985; Filo et al. 2011; Gladden et al. 2005; Snelgrove and Wood 2010; Taylor and Shanka 2008; Won and Park 2010). There are 16 items in the scale, which represent five CSE motivating factors, i.e., philanthropic, sport event, cause, social interaction, and reference group. Chiu et al. (2016) recorded that the reliability scores for all subscales surpassed 0.70, with a range of 0.70 to 0.85, except for one subscale, ‘sport and event’ (0.67). Therefore, this subscale was not included in our study. Instead, a different subscale “health and fitness” (Mahoney, 2013) which is not included in Charity Sport Participation Motivation Scale of Chiu et al. (2016) was included for factor analysis since the subscale items are relevant with charity sport event literature and health and fitness items are related with our context as well. (e.g. I participate in charity runs to stay active, I participate in charity runs to stay in shape physically, participating in charity runs helps me maintain a healthy lifestyle, participating in charity runs aids in developing my physical fitness). Each dimension was measured with multiple items operationalized on a 5-point scale. Respondents were asked to indicate their levels of agreement with each item of charity sport participation motivation on a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree where 1 = extremely disagree and 5 = extremely agree.
3.5.3.1. Validity and Reliability of the Charity Sport Participation Motivation Scale

First of all, EFA was run to decide the factor structure of Charity Sport Participation Motivation Scale by IBM SPSS Statistics 25. Since motivation subscales were taken from different authors. Afterwards, CFA was run to ensure the factor structure of the scale by AMOS 25 Software.

3.5.3.1.1. Exploratory Factor Analysis Procedure

Initially, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed to determine the dimensional structure of the items, selected to evaluate the dimensions of motivation. The goal of the EFA is to assess the factor structure according to the correlations between the variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Philanthropic, cause, social interaction, and reference group subscales were taken from the work of Chiu et al. (2016). On the other hand, health and fitness subscale was taken from Mahoney (2013). Different subscales were taken from different scales. Therefore, to test the factor structure of the scale an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted. A series of preliminary analyses were undertaken before conducting factor analysis.

Before carrying out the exploratory factor analysis, necessary assumptions including histograms, Q-Q Plots and Skewness-Kurtosis values were controlled. The Skewness and Kurtosis values were ranged between +3.29 and -3.29 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As regards the descriptive statistics of items, the mean scores of items were found between 2.38 and 4.50 as shown on the Table 3.3.

Barlett test of sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin values were evaluated before conducting factor analysis. Bartlett test of sphericity was statistically significant, \( \chi^2(\text{df}=190) = 1288.856, (p<.05) \), promoting the factorability of the correlation matrix as in Table 3.4. The sampling adequacy issue of Kaiser-Meyer- Olkin (KMO) test score (.82) found to be exceeding the suggested score of .60 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).
Table 3.3
*Descriptive Statistics and Skewness-Kurtosis Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philantropic_1</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philantropic_2</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philantropic_3</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause_1</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause_2</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause_3</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness_1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness_2</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness_3</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness_4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>-.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction_1</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction_2</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction_3</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction_4</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group_1</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group_2</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group_3</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4
*KMO and Bartlett’s Test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</th>
<th>.820</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx.Chi-Square</td>
<td>1288,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mardia’s test was not significant (p > .05) as a predictor of multivariate normality, which illustrate that multivariate normality assumption was verified, thus maximum likelihood was preferred as an extraction method. When evaluating the factors, following the criteria provided by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), the variables with the loadings of .32 and higher loadings were regarded as significant.

After running exploratory factor analysis with Maximum Likelihood and Promax with Kaiser Normalization method one item in Social Interaction Factor “I participate in this event because I can share the experience with others.” was excluded from the scale because of crossloading. One item about Philantropic Factor “Giving/Helping is a religious act.” was also omitted from the scale because of loading lower than .32 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). On the other hand, two items with regard to “Philantropic factor” loaded together with “Cause factor”. Therefore, these two factors which have common meanings were decided to combine within the same factor. Thereby, a new factor constituted with five items. The new constituted factor was called as “Philanthropic & cause factor.” Exploratory factor analysis factor loadings of the charity sport participation motivation scale were presented on the Table 3.5.

A factor with fewer than three items is generally weak and unstable (Preacher & Maccallum, 2003). In this analysis, the number of items for a factor can be regarded as acceptable since a factor has at least 4 items and each of the factor loadings of the items are greater than .32 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Therefore, this factor model decided as final factor model of EFA (Table 3.5).

The best way to understand the number of factors in the scale is to examine more than one technique. In order to identify the precise number of factors, eigenvalues (Table 3.6) were also evaluated. Identifiable factors were required have eigenvalues greater than 1 (Shevlin & Lewis, 1999).
Table 3. 5

*Exploratory Factor Analysis Factor Loadings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health&amp;Fitness_4</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health&amp;Fitness_3</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health&amp;Fitness_2</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health&amp;Fitness_1</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference_Group_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference_Group_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference_Group_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social_Interaction_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social_Interaction_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social_Interaction_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social_Interaction_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When inspecting Table 3.6 below, it can be seen that four factors were greater than 1. The first factor (health and fitness) explains 28.35% of the total variance of the scale; the second factor (cause) explains 24.08% of the total variance; the third factor (reference group) explains 15.54% of the total variance, and the fourth factor (social interaction) explains 7.6% of the total variance. The four-factor structure totally explains 75.57% of the total variance.
Table 3.6

*Eigenvalue Percentages of Variance and Cumulative Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>28.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>24.08</td>
<td>52.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>67.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>75.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, the scree plot revealed four possible factors on the slope of the plot. When looking the Figure 3.3, it can be that the inflection point is 5. Hence, according to the eigenvalues and scree plot, this scale was regarded to have four factors.

![Scree Plot](image)

*Figure 3.3 Scree Plot*

Overall, the four-factor structure of the scale was determined as the final model, depending on all statistically acceptable values.

### 3.5.3.1.2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) Results

Following an exploratory factor analysis and having a decision on the scale's factor structure, Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was undertaken. CFA has been performed to confirm the scales’ factor structure which is established by EFA. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is a statistical technique that indicates whether the hypothesized structure fits with the data correctly, that is, whether there is an
association between the observed variables and their underlying non-observed variables (Child, 1990). CFA is a validity procedure particularly used in the adaptation of measurement instruments developed in different cultures and settings. In the current study, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to examine whether or not the four-factor structure of the scale would be confirmed in the Turkish sample. The confirmatory factor analysis was carried out with the maximum likelihood method by AMOS 25 program. The proficiency of the model was evaluated based on six distinct fit indices including: (a) the model $\chi^2$, which is a measure of overall fit, with non-significant $\chi^2$ suggesting advisable fit; (b) the $\chi^2 / \text{sd}$, with a rate of between 2 and 3 indicating a good fit (Kline, 1998); (c) Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) with scores above .90 suggesting a good fit (Schumacker & Lomax, 1996) (d) the comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), with scores above .90 suggesting a good fit; (e) the root mean square of approximation (RMSEA; Browne & Cudeck, 1993), with scores over 0.10 resulting to reject of the model; (f) the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI; Tucker & Lewis, 1973) with scores above 0.90 considered as a good fit.

A factor loading cutoff .40 has been employed for CFA (Matsunaga, 2010). After running first CFA two items related with “Philanthropic” subscale found to have loadings lower than .40. Thus, the related items were excluded from the scale to boost the index fit values. According to the confirmatory factor analysis results of the scale, the model has acceptable fit values ($\chi^2 = 82.066; \text{df} = 59; \chi^2 / \text{df} = 1.39; \text{GFI} = 0.92; \text{CFI} = 0.97; \text{RMSEA} = .055; \text{TLI} = 0.96$). Therefore, this model has been maintained as the final model (Figure 3.4). Loadings of the confirmatory factor analysis for the retained items was presented in the Figure 3.4 below;
Figure 3.4 Model specification of Turkish version of Charity Sport Event Participation Motivation Scale

Cronbach’s alpha values and the loadings of the confirmatory factor analysis for the retained items were presented in the Table 3.7 below;
Table 3.7  
*Confirmatory Factor Analysis Factor Loadings and Subscale Cronbach's Alpha Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Fitness Cronbach’s alpha = .89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) I participate in charity runs to stay active.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) I participate in charity runs to stay in shape physically.</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Participating in charity runs helps me maintain a healthy lifestyle.</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Participating in charity runs aids in developing my physical fitness.</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause Cronbach’s alpha = .83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) I am proud to be a contributor to the cause or the organization.</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) I am a worthy member of the charity (cause) I support.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) I believe in the cause I support.</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Cronbach’s alpha = .83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Someone asks/asked me to participate in this charity run.</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Peer influence is an important reason why I participate in this charity run.</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) My friends or family encourage me to join this charity run.</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction Cronbach’s alpha = .78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Charity runs makes me feel like I belong to a group or community.</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) I participate in this event to work with others as a team.</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Charity runs gives me a chance to spend time with my friends/family.</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To evaluate the concurrent validity of the Charity Sport Event Participation Motivation Scale, validities were determined by a Pearson correlation coefficient between the participants’ motivation values and Behavioral Intention Scale scores. In this research there was a positive correlation between behavioral intentions and cause motive ($r = .59, p < .001$); health and fitness motive ($r = .55, p < .001$); social interaction motive ($r = .30, p < .001$); reference group motive ($r = .16, p < .001$). Revealing that
individuals with a high motivation score tended to get high scores on the behavioral intentions.

3.5.3.1.3. **Internal Consistency of the Scale**

Cronbach alpha values were computed to illustrate the reliability of the scale. The findings of the reliability tests revealed that the subscales had also sufficient internal consistency and scale can be confidently utilized to measure individuals’ charity sport motivation. Additionally, all of the “Cronbach alpha if item deleted” values were lower than the existing Cronbach alpha values. Hence, the deletion of the related item was not considered. Internal consistency values of the factors were shown in the Table 3.8 below.

Table 3.8

*Internal Consistency Levels of the Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Health_Fitness</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Cause</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Reference_Group</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Social_Interaction</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internal consistency score of the Health_Fitness factor was revealed as $\alpha = .89$, the alpha level of the Cause factor was found as $\alpha = .83$. Reliability score of the Reference Group factor was computed as $\alpha = .83$ and reliability score of the Social Interaction factor was found as $\alpha = .78$. Total reliability score of the scale was .85. Results of the reliability analysis revealed that both of the factors exceeded the .70 cut-off point representing that the factors are reliable to measure the intended factors (Fraenkel &
Wallen; 2012). Alternatively, the factor plot in rotator factor space was also inspected to check the factor structure better. The plot offered that the factors fit with the four-factor model.

![Factor Plot in Rotator Factor Space](image)

*Figure 3.5 Factor Plot in Rotator Factor Space*

### 3.5.4. Serious Leisure Scale

The serious leisure concept was evaluated by Tsaur and Liang (2008) Serious Leisure Scale that was built on framework of Stebbins (1992) serious leisure. The scale comprised of six dimensions: identification, unique ethos, durable benefits, personal effort, leisure career and perseverance. Those six characteristics have been utilized to differentiate between serious leisure and casual leisure. These were also used to research the essence of leisure activities (Tsaur & Liang, 2008). Five of the six dimensions from Stebbins (1992) serious leisure framework were examined with three items, durable individual benefits assessed using six items. Totally there are 21 items in the scale which measure serious leisure. The scale was reported to be valid and reliable. According to Tsaur and Liang's (2008) work, the subscales reliability ranged from .86 to.94. The participants were requested to state their level of agreement in 5-point Likert scale from strongly disagreeing (1-point score) to strongly agreeing (5-point score) for each serious leisure item.
3.5.4.1. Validity and reliability of the Serious Leisure Scale

Before carrying out reliability and validity studies of a Serious Leisure Scale a number of preliminary tests were undertaken. Data were screened by taking into account the analysis considering the normality of each variable (skewness and kurtosis values), outlier and missing data analysis. As shown in Table 3.9, the mean values of the items ranged from 3.42 to 4.52. The Skewness and Kurtosis values were found between +3.29 and -3.29 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Table 3.9

Descriptive Statistics and Skewness-Kurtosis Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance_1</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance_2</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance_3</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure_Career_1</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure_Career_2</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure_Career_3</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal_Effort_1</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal_Effort_2</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal_Effort_3</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable_Benefits_1</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable_Benefits_2</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable_Benefits_3</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable_Benefits_4</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable_Benefits_5</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable_Benefits_6</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique_Ethos_1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique_Ethos_2</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique_Ethos_3</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification_1</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification_2</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification_3</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.4.1.1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) Results

CFA has been subjected to the Serious Leisure Scale for testing if the original factor structure fits with the data. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was preferred over exploratory factor analysis (EFA) whenever the primary objective was to measure a particular hypothesis depending on a priori theory (Henson & Roberts, 2007). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is a method of validity used particularly to adapt measurement tools developed in various cultures and settings. CFA was performed to examine whether or not the six factor structure of the scale would be validated in a Turkish sample. According to the confirmatory factor analysis results of the scale used in this study, the model has acceptable fit index values ($\chi^2 = 343.402; \text{df} = 171; \chi^2 / \text{df} = 2.00; \text{GFI} = 0.89; \text{CFI} = 0.92; \text{RMSEA} = .072; \text{TLI} = 0.90$). Thus, this model was retained as the final model (Figure 3.6).

To demonstrate the concurrent validity of the Serious Leisure Scale, validities were demonstrated by checking the Pearson correlation coefficient between the participants’ behavioral intention values and Serious Leisure Scale scores. A positive correlation between behavioral intentions and personal effort ($r = .26, p < .001$); identification ($r = .25, p < .001$); durable benefits ($r = .23, p < .001$); unique ethos ($r = .22, p < .001$); leisure career ($r = .19, p < .001$); perseverance ($r = .17, p < .001$) were found. Suggesting participants with a higher serious leisure characteristics tended to get higher values on the behavioral intentions.
Figure 3.6 Model specification of the Turkish version of Serious Leisure Scale

Cronbach’s alpha values and the loadings of the confirmatory factor analysis was presented in the Table 3.10 below
Table 3.10

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis Factor Loadings and Subscale Cronbach’s Alpha Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perseverance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) I participate in charity running activities even though I am busy.</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) I participate in charity running activities even though I feel tired.</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) I participate in charity running activities even though I feel depressed.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leisure Career</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Charity running is an important part of my lifestyle.</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) If there is no running in my life, I will feel bored.</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) I will take part in charity running on a long-term basis.</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) I devote considerable effort and time to taking part in charity running events.</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) In order to enhance my expertise in running, I would like to put money and time into training related to running.</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) In order to enhance the expertise in running, I would like to spend money purchasing books related to running.</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Durable Benefit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Charity running allows me to achieve self-actualization.</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Charity running allows me to achieve self-expression.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Charity running allows me to achieve feelings of accomplishment.</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Charity running allows me to achieve self-enrichment.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) Charity running allows me to make friends with other charity runners.
(f) Charity running can increase my physical strength

**Unique Ethos**

Cronbach’s alpha = .84

(a) For getting along with other members of the charity running fraternity on a long-term basis, we develop common beliefs, values, and norms.
(b) I will get together with members of the charity running fraternity privately for running or other activities.
(c) When I get together with members of the charity running fraternity privately, I can speak out freely.

**Identification**

Cronbach’s alpha = .72

(a) In my opinion, few other leisure activities can replace charity running.
(b) I like to watch television programs related to running in daily lives.
(c) I like to share interesting events about charity running with other people.

### 3.5.4.1.2. Internal Consistency of the Scale

Following the confirmatory factor analyses, internal consistency scores in terms of Cronbach’s alpha values were calculated. Cronbach’s alpha is an indicator of the consistency of the replies throughout the items (Kline, 2011). There is an improvement in the score with the rise on the number of items and in general Cronbach’s alpha values of greater than 0.70 is considered sufficient, near 0.80 is regarded very good values and near 0. 90 is rated as outstanding (Field, 2009; Kline, 2011). Cronbach alpha values were measured for internal consistency in order to demonstrate the reliability of the scale. The findings of the reliability analysis suggest that the subscales have also sufficient internal consistency and can be utilized with success to assess the serious leisure characteristics of the participants. Furthermore, there was no need to remove any items since the “cronbach alpha if item deleted” values were lower than the cronbach alpha values. Reliability score of the “Perseverance Factor” was found as
α = .77, the alpha level of the second factor was found as α = .79. The alpha level of the “Personal Effort Factor” was found as α = .76. Internal consistency score of the “Durable Benefits Factor” was found as α = .83. reliability score of the “Unique Ethos Factor” was found as α = .84 and the cronbach alpha values of the last factor was .72. Total reliability score of the scale was α = .91. Results of the internal consistency analysis revealed that both of the factors exceeded the .70 cut-off point indicating that the factors are reliable to measure the intended factors (Fraenkel & Wallen; 2012).

Table 3.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1:</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perseverance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2:</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3:</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4:</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5:</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Ethos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6:</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen in the Table 3.11 in the “Personal Effort” factor deletion of the last item slightly increases the cronbach alpha level of the Personal Effort subscale (.76 to .80). However, according to Preacher & Maccallum (2003), a factor with fewer than three items is generally weak and unstable. In this analysis, the “Personal Effort” factor has three items and had adequate cronbach alpha level (.76). Therefore, the deletion of the related item was not considered.
3.5.5. Value of Experience Scale

A scale adapted by Prebensen, Kim & Uysal (2016) was used to measure the perceived value of charity sport event experience. This scale has been adapted by researchers to uncover tourism experiences. Items of the scale developed by Williams and Soutar (2009), and Sweeney and Soutar (2001). Examples of items are; “This winter activity had consistent quality” and “This winter activity was exciting.” The scale was composing of four subscales: physical value, emotional value, social value, economic value. Four of the three subscales were measured with four items, social value evaluated with three items for a total of 15 items evaluating perceived value of experience. Prebensen, Kim & Uysal (2016) reported the scale as valid and reliable.

3.5.5.1. Validity and Reliability of the Value of Experience Scale

Prior to reliability and validity tests on the value of experience scale, a number of preliminary observations like and Q-Q Plots, Skewness-Kurtosis values and histograms were inspected. The Skewness and Kurtosis values were found between +3.29 and -3.29 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As regards the descriptive statistics of items, the mean scores of items were found between 3.39 and 4.43 (Table 3.12).

Table 3.12
Descriptive Statistics and Skewness-Kurtosis Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical_Value_1</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical_Value_2</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical_Value_3</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical_Value_4</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional_Value_1</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional_Value_2</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional_Value_3</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional_Value_4</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social_Value_1</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social_Value_2</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social_Value_3</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic_Value_1</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic_Value_2</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic_Value_3</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic_Value_4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was found from the analysis of the mean values that emotional experience value was the most highly rated value and economic value was the least rated experience value perceived by charity sport event participants. Among the emotional experience value items “This running experience makes me happy” ($M=4.43$, $SD=.66$) item has the highest mean score. “This running experience is exciting” ($M=4.42$, $SD=.61$) item has the second highest mean score. Among the economic experience value items “The prices for additional services are acceptable” ($M=3.39$, $SD=1.02$) item has the lowest mean score (Figure 3.7).
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*Figure 3.7 Mean Scores of Experience Value Scale*
3.5.5.1.1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) Results

CFA was performed for the experience value scale to test whether the original factor structure is in compliance with the current data. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was preferred over exploratory factor analysis (EFA) whenever the primary objective was to measure a particular hypothesis depending on a priori theory (Hurley et al., 1997; Henson & Roberts, 2007). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is a method of validity used particularly to adapt measurement tools developed in various cultures and settings. CFA was performed to examine whether or not the four factor structure of the scale would be validated in a Turkish sample. According to the confirmatory factor analysis results of the scale used in this study, the model has acceptable fit index values ($\chi^2 = 167.45; df=83; \chi^2 / df = 2.02; GFI = 0.91; CFI = 0.96; RMSEA = 0.073; TLI = 0.94$). Therefore, this model was retained as the final model (Figure 3.8).

3.5.5.1.2. Internal Consistency of the Scale

To demonstrate the reliability of the scale, the Cronbach Alpha values of the scale and subscales were calculated. Cronbach’s alpha value of “Physical Value” was .91. Cronbach’s alpha value of the “Emotional Value Subscale” was .92. Cronbach’s alpha value of “Social Value” was .83 and Cronbach’s alpha value of the “Economic Value Subscale” was .92. Total reliability score of the scale was .89. All reliabilities surpassed .70. Thus, scale found to have adequate internal consistency. Hence, scale can be used successfully to measure participants’ perceived experience value. Cronbach’s alpha values and the loadings of the confirmatory factor analysis were presented in the Table 3.13 below.
Figure 3. 8 Model Specification of Turkish Version of Experience Value Scale
Table 3.13

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Factor Loadings and Subscale Cronbach’s Alpha Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) This charity running experience has a consistent level of quality</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) This charity running experience is well formed</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) This charity running experience has an acceptable standard of quality</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) This charity running experience is well organized</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) This charity running experience gives me a feeling of well-being</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) This charity running experience is exciting</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) This charity running experience is stimulating</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) This charity running experience makes me happy</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Participating in this charity running experience enables me to create a good impression</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Participating in this charity running experience enhances the way I am perceived</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Participating in this charity running experience makes me feel more socially accepted</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The price paid for this running experience is reasonable</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The prices for additional services are acceptable</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) This experience represents “value” for money</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) This running experience is correctly priced</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, in the “Physical Value Subscale” deletion of the one item slightly increased the cronbach alpha level of the “Physical Value Subscale” (.91 to .94). However, because of the high cronbach alpha level of the factor (.91), the deletion of the item was not decided. Internal consistency values of the factors and items were presented in the Table 3.14 below.
Table 3.14
Internal Consistency Levels of the Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Physical Value</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Emotional Value</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Social Value</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Economic Value</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.6. Behavioral Intentions Scale

In order to evaluate charity sport event attendees’ behavioral intentions including re-participation intention, eagerness to recommend and positive word-of-mouth, behavioral intention scale was used which is adopted by Ha and Jang (2010). Scale items were derived from Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman’s (1996). Ha and Jang (2010) used the scale to evaluate potential behavioral intentions in Korean restaurants concerning the dining experiences. Authors found Cronbach's alpha as .97 of the 3-item version scale. It is a Likert-type scale, where 1 = extremely disagree and 5 = extremely agree.

3.5.6.1. Turkish Version of the Behavioral Intention Scale

Since the three item scale is not appropriate for performing confirmatory factor analysis the three items of the Behavioral Intention Scale was evaluated with explanatory factor analysis. In this sense, factor analysis with the principal component
analysis was carried out with direct oblimin rotation for the 3 items of the Behavioral Intention Scale. The results of the analysis provided single factor with Eigen values greater than 1.00 and explained 85.4% of the total variance. Factor loadings of the scale were shown in the Table 3.15.

Table 3.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WR1</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR2</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVP</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cronbach alpha value of the Behavioral Intention Scale was measured to evaluate the reliability of the scale. The analysis revealed a good internal consistency (α = .91) for the three item version of the scale.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In the present chapter, initially, the findings regarding the necessary assumptions of SEM were presented. Afterwards, descriptive statistics findings in terms of means, standard deviations were presented. Then, findings were presented regarding the structural model. Lastly, a summary concerning the major results of SEM was reported.

4.1. Assumptions of SEM

Before proceeding with the main study analysis suggested assumptions which were recommended by Tabachnick & Fidell (2007) were tested and verified.

4.1.1. Sample Size Criterion

Kline (2011) suggested the use of a sample of more than 200 cases for SEM. In the present research, a sample of 316 cases was evaluated and regarded adequate to perform SEM analysis.

4.1.2. Missing Value Analysis

First of all, the data were inspected for extreme and incorrectly entered cases before the SEM was carried out (e.g. instead of 4 some data entered as 40). Such kind of cases were corrected by contrasting with the values in the hard-copy questionnaires. The complete data set was essential to the accurate results, therefore each researcher advised the respondents to fill all the questions at the process of collection of data. However, some questionnaires have been obtained with unusable data. In particular, 355 questionnaires provided meaningful data in spite of the fact that approximately 380 questionnaires were received from respondents. Several respondents did not
answer the large proportion of questions, and some of them scored all questions with the same ranking. Therefore, those questionnaires were omitted. Subsequently, cases with over 50% missing score on each variable were excluded from the data set with suggestions of Hair et al. (2014), since those cases were deemed to be useless. The exclusion of cases with 50% or above missing values resulted in a data set consisting of 316 cases.

4.1.3. Normality and Linearity

Univariate normality assumption was tested by checking the criterias which are suggested by Kline (2011) including tests of normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk), Skewness and Kurtosis scores, Q-Q plots, histograms, and box-plots. The screening of histograms, Q-Q plots, and box-plots demonstrated that items have fairly normal distribution. As shown in Table 4.1, the mean scores for items ranged from 3.87 to 4.43. The Skewness and Kurtosis scores were between the range of -3.29 and +3.29 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Besides, histograms and normal p-p plots were scanned. It was seen that nearly all them were in line with random fashion in the data. Subsequently, scatter plots were visually examined to evaluate homoscedasticity assumption, and dispersed dots revealed no pattern. Lastly, partial plots of residuals were examined to test the linearity assumption and it was seen that bivariate correlations not departed much from linearity. Assumptions were, therefore, presumed to be confirmed for this study.

4.1.4. Multicollinearity

Multicollinearity was evaluated by checking bivariate correlations and calculating variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance scores for the research variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The existence of bivariate correlations above .90 indicated as the sign of multicollinearity by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Inspection of the matrix of correlation showed that most of the variables were significantly correlated, but no correlation reached .90. Values were found within the acceptable limits; therefore, multicollinearity assumption was verified for this study.
Table 4.1

Means, Standard Deviations, Skewness, and Kurtosis Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.8</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.Career</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Effort</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.6</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.Benefit</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.Ethos</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.Fitness</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.Group</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Interaction</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Vaule</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM.Vaule</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Vaule</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC.Vaule</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.Participation</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Refer1</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Refer2</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Structural Equation Modeling Results

To study the proposed relationships in this study, the causal model was evaluated utilizing the maximum-likelihood estimation procedure of Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) version 25. The proficiency of the model was evaluated based on six distinct fit indices including: (a) the model $\chi^2$, which is a measure of overall fit, with non-significant $\chi^2$ suggesting advisable fit; (b) the $\chi^2 /sd$, with a rate of between 2 and 3 indicating a good fit (Kline, 1998); (c) Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) with scores above .90 suggesting a good fit (Schumacker & Lomax, 1996) (d) the comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), with scores above .90 suggesting a good fit; (e) the root mean square of approximation (RMSEA; Browne & Cudeck, 1993), with scores over
0.10 resulting to reject of the model; (f) the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI; Tucker & Lewis, 1973) with scores above 0.90 considered as a good fit.

The model was tested by structural equation modeling analysis. Results for this analysis provided acceptable values. The multiple indices verified the adequacy of the model fit. Hence, depending on the acceptable interval of goodness of fit statistics, this model cannot be rejected. Goodness of fit statistics for the model values were shown in Table 4.2 below. See Figure 4.1 for the illustration of the final model specification.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Model</td>
<td>427.696</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RMSEA: Root mean Square Error of Approximation; GFI: Goodness of Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index
Figure 4.1 Proposed Model with Standardized Direct Effects
When the standardized regression weights were inspected, all of the p values were significant (p<0.05) except standardized regression weights between behavioral intention and experience value. Standardized regression weights ranged between .13 and .94. Standardized regression weights were presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSE_Motivation</td>
<td>Serious Lêisure</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience_Value</td>
<td>Serious Lêisure</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience_Value</td>
<td>CSE_Motivation</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Intention</td>
<td>CSE_Motivation</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Intention</td>
<td>Experience_Value</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.Fitness</td>
<td>CSE_Motivation</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>CSE_Motivation</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>8.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.Group</td>
<td>CSE_Motivation</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Interaction</td>
<td>CSE_Motivation</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Serious Lêisure</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.Ethos</td>
<td>Serious Lêisure</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>8.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.Benefit</td>
<td>Serious Lêisure</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>10.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Effort</td>
<td>Serious Lêisure</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.Career</td>
<td>Serious Lêisure</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>Serious Lêisure</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.Participation</td>
<td>B.Intention</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Refer1</td>
<td>B.Intention</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>14.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Refer2</td>
<td>B.Intention</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC.Vaule</td>
<td>Experience_Value</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Vaule</td>
<td>Experience_Value</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM.Vaule</td>
<td>Experience_Value</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Vaule</td>
<td>Experience_Value</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1. Hypothesis Testing

The hypotheses were evaluated by structural equation modeling analysis. The strengths of path relationships were shown with standardized path coefficients. The standardized path coefficients between the study variables were revealed in Figure 4.1.

**Hypothesis 1**: Charity runners’ serious leisure characteristics will be significantly and positively related to their participation motivations; which indicate that individuals who have higher levels of serious leisure traits will have higher participation motivation. Hypothesis 1 was accepted as serious leisure has a positive direct effect on the participation motivations ($\beta = 0.58, p < .05$).

**Hypothesis 2**: Charity runners’ serious leisure characteristics will be significantly and positively related to their perceived experience value; which indicate that individuals who have higher levels of serious leisure traits will have higher levels of experience value. Hypothesis 2 was accepted as serious leisure has a positive direct effect on the experience value ($\beta = 0.51, p < .05$).

**Hypothesis 3**: Charity runners’ motivation will be significantly and positively related to their perceived experience value; which indicate that individuals who have higher levels of participation motivation will have higher levels of experience value. Hypothesis 3 was verified as motivation has a positive direct effect on the experience value ($\beta = 0.38, p < .05$).

**Hypothesis 4**: Charity runners’ motivation will be significantly and positively related to their behavioral intentions; which indicate that individuals who have higher levels of participation motivation will have higher levels of behavioral intentions. Hypothesis 4 was verified as motivation has a positive direct effect on the behavioral intentions ($\beta = 0.81, p < .05$).

**Hypothesis 5**: Charity runners’ perceived experience value will be significantly and positively related to their behavioral intentions; which indicate that individuals who
have higher levels of experience value will have higher levels of behavioral intentions. Hypothesis 5 was rejected as experience value has not significant positive affect on behavioral intentions ($\beta = 0.13, p < .05$). Path co-efficient for the hypothesized relationships were presented in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4
Path Co-Efficient and T-Values for Structural Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Causality</th>
<th>Path coefficients</th>
<th>t values</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Serious leisure has a positive direct effect on the participation motivations.</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>5.886</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Serious leisure has a positive direct effect on the experience value.</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.349</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Motivation has a positive direct effect on the experience value.</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.858</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Motivation has a positive direct effect on the behavioral intentions.</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>5.545</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Experience value has not significant positive affect on behavioral intentions.</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05

The serious leisure characteristics accounted for 34% variances in charity sport event participation motivation and 62% variances in perceived experience value explained by serious leisure characteristics and participation motivation. All of the variables
within the structural model, together explained the 52% variances in behavioral intentions.

Besides, Among the six dimensions of serious leisure, durable benefits ($\lambda_4 = 0.81$), identifying strongly with the activity ($\lambda_6 = 0.72$), and having careers in their endeavors ($\lambda_2 = 0.70$) were stronger indicators. On the other hand, unique ethos ($\lambda_5 = 0.66$) and perseverance ($\lambda_1 = 0.53$), had smaller explanatory power. Among the four dimensions of charity sport event participation motivation, cause ($\lambda_2 = 0.80$), health and fitness ($\lambda_1 = 0.68$) were stronger indicators. Reference group ($\lambda_3 = 0.43$) had smaller explanatory power. Among the four dimensions of perceived experience value, emotional value ($\lambda_2 = 0.80$) was the strongest indicators. Economic value ($\lambda_4 = 0.33$) had smaller value.

In order to see relationship between serious leisure characteristics and behavioral intentions a separate multiple regression conducted. correlation matrix, represented that all predictors were correlated with behavioral intentions ($p<.05$). The strongest variable correlated with the behavioral intentions was personal effort ($r = .26, p<.001$). Second powerful predictor correlated with the behavioral intentions was identification ($r=.25, p<.001$), and the lowest correlation with the outcome variable was perseverance ($r =.17, p<.001$). In addition, to reveal relationship charity sport event participation motivation and behavioral intentions a multiple regression conducted. According to regression analysis results, the strongest predictor correlated with the behavioral intentions was cause ($r=.59, p<.001$). Second powerful predictor correlated with the behavioral intentions was health and fitness ($r=.55, p<.001$). and the lowest correlation with the behavioral intention was reference group ($r =.16, p<.001$).
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This work helps to promote research in charity events and the growing field of involvement in charity sports events. The findings may be useful for the organizers of the charity sport events. This research also helps to make several theoretically and statistically useful contributions to literature. Two key goals were included in the present study. Firstly, selected instruments adapted to the context of a charity sport event in Turkish culture. Next, using a serious leisure theory, a behavioral model was hypothesized and evaluated in which serious leisure characteristics, participation motivations, and perceived experience value were correlated to predict behavioral intentions of charity sport event participants.

Charity sport events offer a meaningful experience to participants (Filo, Funk, & O’Brien, 2009; Filo, Funk, & O’Brien, 2008). Ability to challenge oneself physically, to socialize with other attendees, assist disadvantaged people and promote the mission of a charity have been described as benefits gained by charity sport event experience (Filo et al., 2008). Therefore, the sustainability of the charity sport events is essential. The participation of the community to this kind of events increasing day by day. In Turkey, charity sport event is a new phenomenon. It has great importance to examine the experiences, motivation, and behavioral intentions of the charity sport event participants. This study contributes to the literature in considering the utility of both perceived value of experience and serious leisure in a charity sport event context, and this study empirically verified the value of incorporating experience value and serious leisure approach into charity sport event modeling. Previously conducted studies in literature did not investigate serious leisure characteristics (identification, unique ethos, durable benefits, personal effort, leisure career, and perseverance) and perceived
value of experience in a charity sport event context which is an important contribution of this research to the literature.

5.1. Relationship between Serious Leisure and Participation Motivations

Findings of the present model showed that "durable benefits," which provide self-enrichment, a sense of achievement, self-image improvement, and self-gratification features, is the strongest indicator of charity runners' serious leisure characteristics. The desire to attain fulfillment in serious leisure is about experiencing the enjoyment of the rewards in a specific leisure activity, according to Stebbins (2005, p. 186). Studies on volunteering as a serious leisure activity has shown that leisure activity can provide distinctive incentives or benefits. According to Stebbins (2001), volunteers benefit from the personal rewards that they are integral in any serious leisure activity such as self-recovery, personal enrichment, and social rewards such as interaction with other people, group achievement. Such incentives will inspire a participant to pursue the practice, as they are pleased with the rewards, and they probably want to repeat the experience (Stebbins, 2005). In general, the incentives of serious leisure are primarily personal rewards, but Stebbins (2001) states that altruism (attitude of caring for others and acting to help them) is also perceived as a reward by volunteers. What is more, volunteer research has revealed that volunteers view themselves not only as receiving personal rewards but also as contributing to diverse communities (Misener et al., 2010; Orr, 2006; Stebbins, 1998). This further feature separates volunteers from other types of serious leisure activities, including hobbyist activities and amateurism (Misener et al., 2010).

Results of the SEM analysis revealed that charity runners' serious leisure characteristics is significantly and positively related to their participation motivations, which indicates that participants who have higher levels of serious leisure traits will have higher participation motivation. Similarly, the relationship between serious leisure and volunteer motivation was investigated by (Beard & Ragheb 1983; Misener et al. 2010; Pi, Lin, Chen, Chiu, & Chen, 2014). Authors found that serious leisure positively related to volunteer motivation. In another research conducted by Lee and Ewert (2013), the correlations between Serious Leisure activities (SL) and
motivational quality were explored. The SL viewpoint was employed in the study to explain the dedication of rock climbers, their identities, and serious pursuits. The theory of self-determination (SDT) was applied to investigate whether SL was encouraged or prevented by motives of different levels of self-determination. Identified motivation (e.g., 'I value the benefits of climbing') is found to correlate with commitment, identity development, and personal rewards, additionally intrinsic motivation (e.g., 'I enjoy my climbing trips/sessions') is found to correlate with personal and social rewards. However, introjected motivation (e.g. 'I feel guilty when I don't climb') is found to negatively correlated with financial return, whereas external motivation (e.g. 'I climb because other people say I should') and amotivation (e.g. 'I cannot see why I should bother climbing') are not found to correlate with SL constructs significantly. Consistent with the literature, this research found that charity runners who have higher levels of serious leisure traits have higher participation motivations.

5.2. Relationship between Serious Leisure, Experience Value and Behavioral Intentions

A novel contribution of this research is that charity runners' serious leisure characteristics were found to be significantly and positively related to their perceived experience value, suggesting that participants who have higher levels of serious leisure traits get more value from their experiences. Besides, in order to see the relationship between serious leisure characteristics and behavioral intentions, a multiple regression conducted. The correlation matrix represented that all predictors were correlated with the behavioral intentions ($p<.05$). The strongest predictor correlated with the behavioral intentions was "personal effort." The second powerful predictor correlated with the behavioral intentions was "Identification," and the lowest correlation with the the behavioral intentions variable was "perseverance." These findings suggested that if a person devotes considerable effort and time into running and training, then the person's possibility of joining the charity event and recommending it to others is higher. Charity runners with SL characteristics inclined to allocate more time and effort for the charity events. In a similar vein, Cheng and Tsaur (2012) study investigated the correlation between surfers' serious leisure SL characteristics and
recreation involvement RI. Their findings suggest that a higher degree of serious leisure features enables higher level of recreational involvement. Authors stated that unique ethos, identification with the activity, significant personal efforts, and career pursuits in their efforts are strong indicators of surfers' SL characteristics. Similar with the Stebbin's's point of view, these results suggested that charity runners with SL attributes demonstrate dedication and involvement in the activity.

5.3. Relationship between Participation Motivation and Behavioral Intentions

Studies concerning charity sports events has mainly focused on the possible causes that contribute to the participation of individuals in charity sport events (Bennett, Hyde, et al., 2016; Mousley, Kitchin, & Ali-Choudhury, 2007; Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2008), and the contributing factors to the meaning of individuals' experience arise from their involvement in charity sports events (Cornwell & Smith, 2001; Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2009; Higgins & Hodgins, 2008). Although the earlier research has contributed significantly to the development of charity sport event CSE studies, current literature needs to be expanded to better explain behavioral intentions related to charity sport events. The present study expands current work by examining possible intentions of involvement in charity sports events. Results of the SEM analysis revealed that charity runners' motivation was found to be significantly and positively related to their behavioral intentions, which indicate that participants who have higher levels of participation motivation have higher levels of behavioral intentions. Findings showed that "cause" is the strongest indicator of charity runners' participation motivation. Moreover, according to regression analysis results, the strongest predictor correlated with the behavioral intentions was "cause". The second powerful predictor correlated with the behavioral intentions was "health and fitness" and the lowest correlation with the behavioral intentions was "reference group." Attendees in a charity sport event not only motivated for the leisure event but also they are motivated to contribute to a good cause. Adding a cause to an event may also add meaning that enables participants to satisfy their needs, especially altruistic ones, thereby enhance their self-esteem (Rundió, Heere, & Newland, 2014). Likewise, in a study with Multiple Skleroz MS
Walk participants, Won et al. (2011) found that promoting the MS Society's goal was the most important reason to take part in the CSEs charity sport events, accompanied by social interaction with others, enjoying sport. According to the authors, the importance of this incentive to help a good cause can be attributed to the significant rise of CSEs organized by various NPOs and their successful advertising campaigns to improve public awareness. In like manner, Won et al. (2013) examined the relative significance of the chosen charity sport event (CSE) characteristics, which have an influence on the probability of college students attending a CSE. The study results showed that university students were most interested in sports activities when choosing a CSE, accompanied by the cause or host organization, the participating cost, participation gift, and reference source. Researchers have shown that helping a cause is the second most important characteristic that the young generation takes into account when choosing CSE. Filo et al., 2009 claimed that it is crucial for most of people to be able to do something for others and tell someone about the event and thus enhances the motives of individuals to participate.

The ability to assist other people have a positive effect on the person by enhancing one's sense of self-worth (Stebbins, 2005). Charity sport events are a setting where people can express their hope that a difference can be made. Thereby, charity sport events can reflect a meaningful experience (Filo, Groza, & Fairley, 2012). For instance, if a person feels that his or her attendance in a charity sport event will really make a difference, then that person is likely to be more motivated to attend in the event and eventually become attached to it (Filo, Groza, & Fairley, 2012). In the same vein, Won and Park (2010) explored the factors for the younger age group's engagement in CSEs and reported that the most important reason was a philanthropy-related motivation for the participation of university students with CSEs and the second most important reason was a willingness to enjoy sports and/or special events, accompanied by enthusiasm to help a cause and willingness for social interactions. Furthermore, these motivational aspects were reported to be positively related to the satisfaction of participants and their desire to come back to the event.
Higgins and Hodgins (2008) analyzed the Multiple Sclerosis Society's cycling fundraising event to understand individuals' experiences. Volunteer work for social or altruistic reasons was considered to be more essential than personal reasons. On the other hand, Rundio et al. 2014 contrasted the reasons for engaging in cause-related and non-cause-related sporting events in order to explain how charities can discriminate in an endurance race. The findings revealed distinct motivational variations. For participants in cause-related events; self-esteem, the achievement of personal goals, competitiveness, and recognition were significantly higher valued motives. The authors concluded that incorporating a charity aspect into an event can contribute to the organization's differentiation strategy. In like manner, with a sample of individuals who engaged in at least one CSE, Bennett et al. (2007) reported that the key motivations were involvement with a good cause, incentives for a healthy lifestyle, sports participation, and social interaction. The willingness to maintain a healthy lifestyle was the second important factor behind attendance decisions, which means that the recognition of the health attributes of an event should be an essential component of the marketing plan of the event organizer. Additionally, the research found that if the CSE is considered credible and the individual is engaged with the good cause, participant's willingness to pay a higher entry fee increases. It shows that charity sport event attendees are motivated much more by the willingness to help a good cause than by personal benefits. It is, therefore essential to remember that altruistic motivations most of the time outweigh the exercise-related gains obtained by engaging in a CSE setting (Bennett et al., 2007; Won & Park, 2010; Won et al., 2010). Adding a cause adds value to events. Therefore, underlining the opportunity to give as well as the chance for leisure activity, maybe helpful from an event marketing perspective.

Filo et al. (2008) conducted a qualitative method to analyze individuals' motives in both a recreational and cause-related cycling event. The research found two motives for recreational activities (social and physical) and three motivations for charitable donations (reciprocity, need to support others and willingness to enhance charity), make a contribution to the attachment of the events. Filo, Funk, and O'Brien (2009) have noted that participants can derive significant meaning from a CSE experience,
contributing to a situation in which charity sports events have become effective fundraising vehicles for non-governmental organizations. In addition to fundraising, these events also serve to increase awareness about a specific cause, promote community involvement, develop sponsor partnerships and to generate charity advertising (Filo, Groza, & Fairley, 2012).

5.4. Relationship between Participation Motivation and Experience Value

As a novel contribution of this study to the literature, the motivation was found to have a positive direct effect on the experience value. These findings of this study suggest that the participants who have higher levels of participation motivation get more value from their experiences. In a similar vein, Filo et al. (2011) claim that the more the participant stated that he or she was motivated to participate by reciprocity, self-esteem, and the willingness to promote charity motivations, the more personal, symbolic, and functional meaning a participant attributed to the event. Furthermore, the act of donating and helping a good cause has been associated with feelings of happiness (McGowan, 2006). Charity sport events offer a meaningful experience to individuals, donating and supporting other people is a key element of that meaning (Filo et al., 2009).

5.5. Relationship between Experience Value and Behavioral Intentions

In predicting behavioral intentions, perceived value has acquired growing acceptance as a reliable predictor (Oriade & Schofield, 2019). However, in this study, Hypothesis 5, which indicate that participants who have higher levels of experience value will have higher levels of behavioral intentions, was rejected as experience value was not found to have a significant positive effect on behavioral intentions. In previous studies, consumer value was found to be a significant antecedent of behavioral intentions. For instance, in a research performed by Oriade and Schofield (2019) showed that value from multiple aspects (emotional value, financial social and personal value) has a significant effect on the satisfaction and behavioral intentions of visitors. Ahn and Back (2019) investigated whether or not cruise experience affects the attitude and behavior of the cruise customers by perceived value in the cruise environment. Authors
found that perceived functional and health values of consumers have a significant
direct positive influence on behavioral intentions. In a similar vein, Pura (2005) and
Lee et al. (2014) reported that customer-perceived value had a significant influence on
behavioral intentions. This result is consistent with previous research findings (e.g.
Bolton & Drew 1991; Cronin, Brady, & Hult, 2000; Chen & Chen, 2010; Patterson &
Spreng, 1997; Petrick, 2004; Rust & Oliver, 1994; Yang & Chang, 2015; Wang, Tsai,
Lee & Liu, 2017). Most of the research reported a significant positive relationship on
the association between perceived values and behavioral intentions. Nonetheless, these
results contradict the findings of this study and some other studies. For instance,
Gallarza and Saura (2006) did not find direct effects on loyalty in social, play,
aesthetics, and time and effort value dimensions. Besides, Chen and Chen (2010) did
not find a significant relationship between experience quality and behavioral
intentions. In the study of Yrjölä et al. (2019), economic value is found to be related
only to the intentions of loyalty and not to other outcome variables (satisfaction, word
of mouth). Moreover, in Gallarza and Saura's (2006) study, a significant relationship
between value and behavioral intentions was not found. In this respect, value
dimensions have been shown to be highly sensitive to the context of
research. Especially, multidimensional value perceptions can be recognized as
context-specific like economic value (Gallarza & Saura, 2006).

5.6. Managerial Implications

Charity sport events are an effective way of raising funds for a cause at the same time,
inspiring an active and healthy lifestyle through activities (Filo et al., 2011).
Strengthening the perception of contributing to a good cause through participation is a
primary goal that can be accomplished via charity sporting events. Strengthening the
belief in trying to make a real difference may contribute further to the meaning that
attendees gain from the event, leading to the improved attachment to the event and
related charity organization. Improved sense of attachment may reinforce the
constructive feelings and helpful behaviors of the attendees towards the event,
including increased likelihood of participation, positive attitude (Filo et al., 2010), and
positive word-of-mouth (Funk & James, 2006).
There are several implications for those who plan and promote charitable sport events from the results of this study. To strengthen individuals' commitment to the event, marketers should strive to strengthen the idea that these people are making a real contribution to society by engaging in the event. The contribution of a good cause in the event gives the attendees added value and allows them to satisfy a multitude variety of motives. It was thereby adding extra meaning to the event experience. Such knowledge may be used by organizers to differentiate their events. Organizations should include claims regarding creating a real change in their media messages and try to communicate to participants that their objectives have been met with post-campaign practices (Filo, Groza, & Fairley, 2012). Event organizers should convey the implications of the event's social change. T-shirts, caps, and posters with messages that reflect creating a real change by attendance can be offered to attendees before, during, and after the event (Filo, Groza, & Fairley, 2012).

When the event has charity connections, marketing efforts should highlight how involvement in the event and supporting the cause is successful and contribute to the social change to help future attendees understand it (Rundió, Heere, & Newland, 2014). The incorporation of a wide range of features in the event can help to satisfy various desires and thus appeal to a broader range of individuals who have varying motivations. For instance, organizers can attract individuals into the event by conveying that events can offer opportunities for participants to socialize with other people. In addition, the event can be represented as encouraging an active and healthy lifestyle to reinforce the inherent social responsibility of the event. Green (2001) discovered that running identification differed among separate participant groups. Additionally, the author reported that identification was associated with length and form of course choice because the strongly identified runners favored a full or half marathon, while moderate and low-identified runners favored 10 km and walking routes, respectively. When it comes to event planning, charitable organizations can benefit from the inclusion of sporting events that match varying skill levels by providing duration and difficulty ranging paths (Wood et al., 2010).
Social media can be used before and after the event to enhance the social side of charity sport events, at the same time increasing the confidence of participants in making a difference. Organizations can appeal to individuals through the delivery of relevant social media content (Bennett, 2007). Social media tools can express needs prior to the event, at the same time providing a platform to thank participants after the event and sharing the accomplished outcomes. Besides, viral internet videos showcasing charitable organization's supporters explaining the charity's and the event's significance could be a successful way of building a narrative in the event marketing communication (Filo et al., 2012). On the event site, a social area may be formed where attendees can have a drink or a meal and speak about their fundraising campaigns. During that time, individuals could be honored for their fundraising works in front of other attendees. This can be done by giving fundraisers special awards (Wood et al., 2010). To persuade donors and attendees that their contributions really made a contribution to society.
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GİRİŞ


Sportif yardımseverlik etkinlikleri katılımcılarından sadece gelir elde etmekle kalmaz, aynı zamanda etkinliğe katılan insanlar için rekreatif boş zaman etkinliği, sosyal etkileşim ve bir eğlence kaynağı olarak anıltılı amaçlar için fırsatları sunar. Bu nedenle, sportif yardımseverlik etkinlikleri boş zamanları aktif olarak değerlendirir, olumlu deneyimler kazanmak ve yardımseverlik organizasyonları için bağış toplayarak faydalı bir amaca hizmet etmek açısından çok değerlidir. Dünyadaki sivil toplum kuruluşları bağış toplamak ve farkındalığı artırmak için giderek artan oranda spor etkinliklerini kullanmaktadır. Örneğin, yardımseverlik etkinliği koşulları Asya ve Avrupa kıtalarını birbirine bağlayan İstanbul maratonunda sivil toplum kuruluşları (STK'lar) için önemli bir finansman kaynağıdır. Koşucular, ulusal veya uluslararası


ABD'nin en büyük 30 bağış toplama kampanyası sıralayan Peer-to-Peer Fundraising Thirty, sportif yardımseverlik kampanyalarının 2018 yılında yürüyüş, koşma, bisiklete binme ya da dayanıklılık yarışmaları gibi sportif yardımseverlik etkinlikleri ile 1,39 milyar dolardan fazla bağış toplandığını tespit etmiştir (Peer to Peer Fundraising Forum, 2019). Birleşik Krallık’ta spor etkinliklerinden elde edilen toplam bağış 2018 yılında % 10'dan fazla artarak 150 milyon £ 'dan fazlalığa yükselmiştir. Birleşik Krallık’ta yapılan anket çalışmasına göre yardımseverlik etkinliğinde katılanların % 92'si yine aynı yardım kuruluşunu desteklemeyi düşünmektedir (Fundraising Challenge Events, 2019).


çaba gösterirler. Etkinliğe katılım yoluyla beceri, bilgi ve deneyim kazanırlar (Stebbins, 1982). Stebbins (1982) ciddi boş zamanı kayıtsız boş zamandan ayıraran altı ayrı edici özellik belirlemiştir. Bu özellikler; boş zamanda gerçekleştirilen faaliyet konusunda azim etmek, kayda değer bir çaba harcamak, boş zaman kariyeri elde etmek, uzun süren faydalar sağlamak, inançlar ve değerler sisteminden oluşan sosyal bir dünya yaratmak ve bu sosyal topluluğun üyesi haline gelmek, seçilen aktiviteyle katılımcı arasında güçlü bir bağ oluşturmakta.

Ciddi boş zaman, çok çeşitli spor ve rekreatif alanlarda boş zaman bağlılığını incelemek için kullanılmıştır; kano macera turları (Kane ve Zink, 2004), arazi sürüşü (Rosenbaum, 2013), kaya tırmanışı (Dilley ve Scranton, 2010; Lee, 2013), dağ sporları (Stebbins, 2005), yüzme ustaları (Hastings, Kurth, Schloder ve Cyr, 1995), balkıçılık (Yoder, 1997), buz pateni (McQuarrie ve Jackson, 1996), motor sporları etkinlikleri (Harrington, Cuskelley ve Auld, 2000), futbol hayranlığı (Jones, 2000), bilgisayar oyunları (Bryce ve Rutter, 2003), spor turizmi (Green & Jones, 2005), dans (Brown, 2007), spor organizasyonlarındaki yaşlılar için gönüllülük (Misener, Doherty, ve Hamm-Kerwin 2010), triatlon (Lamont, Kennelly ve Moyle, 2014; McCarville, 2007), maraton (Shipway ve Jones 2008), serbest düşüş (skydiving)’e katılım (Anderson ve Taylor, 2010). Geçmişte yapılan araştırmalar çok çeşitli rekreasyon faaliyetlerinde ciddi boş zaman kavramını araştırma olmuştur olsa da, sportif yardımseverlik etkinlikleri ciddi boş zaman kavramını dahilinde bu güne kadar incelenmemiştir.
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Bireylerin spor yoluyla harekete geçmesini sağlayarak sosyal dayanışmaya ilham veren bu tür faaliyetlere katılımı artırmak amacıyla bu faaliyetlerdeki davranışsal niyetleri incelemek büyük önem taşımaktadır. Toplum için önemine rağmen, bu etkinlikler konusunda çok az araştırma bulunmaktadır. Son zamanlarda yapılan çalışmalar, sportif yardımseverlik etkinliği katılımcıda motivasyonu incelemiş olsa da (örn. Filo ve diğerleri, 2008, 2009; Scott ve Solomon, 2003; Webber, 2004; Higgins ve Hodgins, 2008; Higgins ve Lauzon, 2003; Wood ve diğerleri, 2010). Sportif...
yardımsızdırlar etkinliklerinde ciddi boş zaman ve deneyim değeri kavramları daha önce araştırılmamıştır. Ayrıca ulusal literatürde sportif yardımseverlik etkinlikleri daha önce hiç çalışılmamıştır. Bu araştırma boşluğunu doldurmak için, ciddi boş zaman, sportif yardım etkinliğine katılım motivasyonu, algılanan deneyim değeri ve davranışsal niyetler, önerilen modeldeki ilişkiler kapsamında yardımseverlik koşucuları üzerinde test edilmiştir.

Çalışmanın Amacı

Bu araştırmanın başlıca üç amacı bulunmaktadır; (1) sportif yardımseverlik etkinlikleri ile ilgili olabilecek teoriler temelinde bir model üretmek (2) Seçilen ölçüm araçlarının Türkçeye uyarlanması. (3) Varsayılan modeli test etmek. Bu amaçla, ciddi boş zaman yaklaşımları kullanılarak, sportif yardımseverlik etkinliği katılımcılarının davranışsal niyetlerini tahmin etmek için ciddi boş zaman özellikleri, katılım motivasyonları ve algılanan deneyim değerinin dahil edildiği bir davranış modeli önerildi ve yardımseverlik koşucuları üzerinde test edildi. Önerilen model aşağıda sunulmuştur.
Çalışmanın Önemi


Bu araştırma, ciddi boş zaman, motivasyon, deneyim değeri ve davranışsal niyetler değişkenlerini sportif yardımseverlik etkinliği kapsamında araştırarak literatürü genişletmektedir. Sportif yardımseverlik etkinlikleri, diğer spor etkinliklerinden benzersiz bir araştırma alanı gerektirir, çünkü güzel bir amaca hizmet etmek ve spor, katılımcıların etkinliğe ilgisi ve etkinliğe bağlılığı üzerinde önemli ve kolektif bir etkiye sahiptir (Filo ve diğerleri, 2009; Wood ve diğerleri, 2010). Şöyle ki insanlar yardımseverlikle ilişkilerini açığa alan spor bir etkinliğe daha yüksek bir katılım ücreti ödeme ya da daha çok katılmaya istekli olabilirler (Bennett ve diğerleri, 2007). Bu bağlamda bu çalışma sportif yardımseverlik etkinliklerinde ciddi boş zaman, deneyim değeri değişkenlerini araştıran ilk çalışmadır. Araştırmaın bulguları ışığında hem boş zaman pazarlamacıları hem de bağış toplama organizatörleri, boş
zaman katılımcılarının ihtiyaç ve isteklerini daha iyi karşılayabilecek, uygulanabilir pazarlama stratejileri geliştirebilirler.

**METOD**

**Araştırma Örneklemi**


Veriler iki aşamalı bir süreçte toplanmış olup, öncelikle kullanılan ölçeklerin geçerlilik ve güvenirliklerini test etmek amacıyla pilot çalışma yapılmıştır. Daha sonra önerilen *yapsal eşitlik* modeli analizi için veriler toplanmıştır. Pilot çalışma için veriler Garmin Runfire Salt Lake Ultra Trail organizasyonuna katılan 214 Türk yardımseverlik koşucusundan alınmıştır. Katılımcılardan 140’ı (% 65.4) erkek ve 74’ü (% 34.6) kadınlardır. Veriler, bir yardımseverlik organizasyonuna destek vermek üzere etkinliğe (Garmin Runfire Salt Lake Ultra Trail) gelen koşuculardan toplanmıştır. Toplamda 450 anket dağıtılmış olup çok fazla eksik veri bulunan ya da yardım amaçlı koşmayan katılımcılar çıkarılduktan sonra 214 kullanılabılır anket elde edilmiştir. Veriler beş araştırmacı tarafından toplanmıştır. Özdeşlik sağlamak için


Veri Toplama Araçları

Varsaylan ilişkileri değerlendirme için, veriler beş bölümden oluşan bir anketle toplanmıştır Birinci bölüm demografik bilgilerden oluşmaktadır ve diğer dört ölçek Türkçe'ye uyarlanmıştır. Belirlenen ölçekler (1) sportif yardımseverlik etkinliği katılımcılarının ciddi boş zaman kalmaktan sağladığı altı boyuta araştırmayı amaçlamıştır: özdeşleşme, benzersiz değerler, kişisel çaba, boş zaman
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kariyeri ve azim. (2) sportif yardımseverlik etkinliği katılım motivasyonları beş boyutta: sağlık ve fitness, yardımseverlik, amaç, sosyal etkileşim ve referans grupu (3) algılanan deneyim değeri dört boyutta: fiziysel değer, duygusal değer, sosyal değer ve ekonomik değer (4) davranışsal niyetleri ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Sportif yardımseverlik etkinliği ile ilgili literatür incelenerek, araştırmanın veri toplama araçları araştırmacı tarafından belirlenmiş, tercüme edilmiş ve katılımcıların seçilen boyutlar hakkındaki görüşlerini değerlendirmek üzere uyarlanmıştır. Anketin ilk bölümü, yaş, cinsiyet, katılımcıların eğitim düzeyi ve daha önce sportif yardımseverlik etkinliklerine katılım sıklığını sorgulayan maddeleri içeren demografik bilgi bölümündür. Anketin diğer bölümleri “kesinlikle katılıyorum” dan “kesinlikle katılmıyorum” a kadar değişen Likert ölçeklerinden oluşmaktadır. Özetle, veri toplama için bu çalışmaya dört ölçek dahil edilmiştir; Ciddi Boş Zaman Ölçeği, Sportif Yardımsızverlik Etkinliğine Katılım Motivasyon Ölçeği, Deneyim Değişiklik Ölçeği ve Davranışısal Niyet Ölçeği.

SONUÇLAR

çalışmada, seçilen ölçeklerin Türk örnekleminde doğrulanıp doğrulanmayacağını araştırmak için doğrulayıcı faktör analizi (DFA) yapılmıştır. Faktör analizlerinin ardından tüm ölçeklerin her bir faktörü için Cronbach alfa değerile iç tutarlılık puanları hesaplanmıştır. Güvenirlik ve geçerlik çalışmalarıyla ölçeklerin faktör yapısının sonuçlandırılması sona model, yapısal eşitlik modellemesi YEM analizi kullanılarak test edilmiştir. Bu analiz ile kabul edilebilir sınırlarda şu değerlere ulaşılmıştır; ($\chi^2 = 427,696; df = 114; \chi^2/df = 3.75; \text{GFI} = 0.89; \text{CFI} = 0.91; \text{RMSEA} = 0.073; \text{TLI} = 0.90$). Bu endeksler model uyumunun yeterliliğini doğrulamıştır. Böylece, uyum istatistiklerinin kabul edilebilir aralığına dayanarak, mevcut model doğrulanmıştır.

**Hipotezlerin Test Edilmesi**

**Hipotez 1:** Ciddi boş zaman özelliklerinin katılım motivasyonları üzerinde doğrudan bir etkisi olduğu kabul edilmiştir ($\beta = 0.58$, $p < .05$). Yardımcı veren koşucuların ciddi boş zaman özellikleri ile katılım motivasyonları arasındaki anlamlı ve pozitif yöndeki ilişki; daha yüksek düzeyde ciddi boş zaman özelliklerine sahip katılımcıların katılım motivasyonunun daha yüksek olacağını göstermektedir.

**Hipotez 2:** Ciddi boş zaman özelliklerinin deneyim değeri üzerinde doğrudan bir etkisi olduğu kabul edilmiştir ($\beta = 0.51$, $p < .05$). Yardımcı veren koşucuların ciddi boş zaman özellikleri ile algılanan deneyim değerleri arasındaki anlamlı ve pozitif yöndeki ilişki; daha yüksek ciddi boş zaman özelliklerine sahip katılımcıların daha yüksek deneyim değerine sahip olacağını göstermektedir.

**Hipotez 3:** Motivasyonun deneyim değeri üzerinde doğrudan bir etkisi olduğu doğrulanmıştır ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < .05$). Yardımcı veren koşucuların motivasyonları ile algılanan deneyim değerleri arasındaki anlamlı ve pozitif yöndeki ilişki; katılım motivasyonu daha yüksek olan koşucuların daha yüksek deneyim değerine sahip olacağını ifade etmektedir.

**Hipotez 4:** Motivasyonun davranışsal niyetler üzerinde doğrudan bir etkisi olduğu doğrulanmıştır ($\beta = 0.81$, $p < .05$). Yardımcı veren koşucuların motivasyonları ile davranışsal niyetler arasındaki anlamlı ve pozitif yöndeki ilişki; katılım motivasyonu daha yüksek olan koşucuların daha yüksek davranışsal niyetlere (tekrar katılma, tavsiye etme) sahip olacağını belirtmektedir.

**Hipotez 5:** YEM sonuçlarına göre deneyim değerinin davranışsal niyetler üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi bulunmadığı için hipotez 5 reddedildi ($\beta = 0.13$, $p < .05$). Yardımcı veren koşucuların algılanan deneyim değeri ile davranışsal niyetleri arasında anlamlı olamayan pozitif yönde bir ilişkişisi vardır.

Ciddi boş zaman özellikleri, sportif yardımseverlik etkinlikleri katılım motivasyonundaki % 34'lük varyansı açıklamaktadır. Ciddi boş zaman özellikleri ve katılım motivasyonlarıyla birlikte algılanan deneyim değerindeki % 62 lik varyansı
açıklamaktadır. Yapısal model içindeki tüm faktörlere birlikte davranışsal niyetlerdeki %52’lik varyansı açıklanmıştır. Ayrıca, ciddi boş zaman özellikleri altı alt boyut arasında, “kalıcı faydalar sağlama” (λ4 = 0.81), “etkinlikle yüzdeleşme” (λ6 = 0.72) ve “boş zaman kariyeri” (λ2 = 0.70) daha güçlü göstergelerdir. “Benzersiz değerler” (λ5 = 0.66) ve “azim” (λ1 = 0.53) daha az açıklayıcı güce sahiptir. Sportif yardımseverlik etkinliği katılımcı davranış modelinin dört alt boyut arasında “amaç” (λ2 = 0.80), “sağlık ve fitness” (λ1 = 0.68) daha güçlü göstergelerdir. Motivasyonlar arasında “referans grubu” (λ3 = 0.43) en az açıklayıcı güce sahiptir. Algılanan deneyim değişkeninin dört boyutu arasında, “duygusal değer” (λ2 = 0.80) en güçlü değere sahiptir. “Benzersiz değer” ise (λ4 = 0.33) en az değere sahiptir.

Ciddi boş zaman özellikleri ile davranışsal niyetler arasındaki ilişkiye değerlendirilmek için ayrı bir çoklu regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Analiz sonuçlarına göre davranışsal niyetlerle ilişkili en güçlü yordayıcı “kişisel çaba”dır (r = .26, p <.001). Davranışsal niyetlerle ilişkili ikinci güçlü yordayıcı “özdeleşme” (r = .25, p <.001). ve sonuç değişkeni ile en düşük korelasyon “azim”dir (r=.17, p<.001). Buna ek olarak, sportif yardımseverlik etkinlik katılımcı motivasyonu ve davranışsal niyetleri ilişkisini ortaya çıkarmak için gerçekleştirdilen regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre, davranışsal niyetlerle ilişkili en güçlü yordayıcı “amaç”tır (r = .59, p <.001). Davranışsal niyetlerle ilişkili ikinci güçlü yordayıcı “sağlık ve zindelik” (r = .55, p <.001) ve sonuç değişkeni ile en düşük korelasyon “referans grubu” (r = .16, p <.001) arasında bulunmuştur.

**TARTIŞMA**


**Ciddi Boş Zaman ve Katılım Motivasyonları Arasındaki İlişki**


**Ciddi Boş Zaman Özellikleri, Deneyim Değeri ve Davranışsal Niyetler Arasındaki İlişki**

Bu araştırmının literature özgün bir katkısı, yardımsverlik koşucularının ciddi boş zaman özelliklerinin algılanan deneyim değerleri ile anlamlı ve pozitif yöndeki ilişkisini doğrulamasıdır. Çalışma sonuçlarında daha yüksek düzeyde ciddi boş zaman özelliklerine sahip katılımcıların daha yüksek düzeyde deneyim değerine sahip olduğu görülmuştur. Ayrıca, ciddi boş zaman özellikleri ile davranışsal niyetler arasındaki ilişiği değerlendirmek için çoklu bir regresyon gerçekleştirilmiştir. Korelasyon matrisi, tüm prediktorların sonuç değişkeni ile korele olduğunu göstermektedir (p < .05). Davranışsal niyetlerle ilişkili en güçlü yordayıcı "kişisel çaba", ikincisi güçlü ilişki "özdeşleşme" ve en düşük korelasyon "sebat/azim” arasında bulunmuştur. Bu bulgular, koşmaya ve eğitime büyük çaba ve zaman ayıran kişilerin,

**Katılım Motivasyonu ve Davranışsal Niyetler Arasındaki İlişki**
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Bennett ve diğerleri (2007) en az bir yardımseverlik etkinliğine katılmış bir grupla yaptığı araştırmda temel motivasyon faktörlerinin bir amacı destekleme, sağlıklı bir yaşam tarzına öncülük etme fırsatlarını, spor katılmımı ve sosyal etkileşimi içerdğini bulmuştur. Çalışma sonuçlarına göre sağlıklı bir yaşam tarzı sürdürüme arzusu, katılım kararlarının altında yatan önemli ikinci faktörü oluşturmaktadır ve yazarlara göre bir etkinliğin sağlık referanslarının oluşturulması etkinlik düzenleme stratejisinde belirgin bir şekilde yer almasını gerektirmektedir. Buna ek olarak, araştırma, yardımseverlik etkinliği güvencilirse ve iyi bir amaca sahipse, kişilerin daha yüksekte bir katılım ücreti ödeyecekleri ortaya koymustur. Bu, yardım etkinliklerine katılanların kişisel kazançtan ziyade başka bakımlarına yardım etme arzuyla daha fazla motive olduklarını göstermektedir. Bu bulgular yardımseverlik motivasyonlarının egzersize bağlı motivasyonları da gölgede biraktığını göstermektedir (Bennett ve diğerleri, 2007, Won ve Park, 2010; Won ve diğerleri, 2010). Dolayısıyla, etkinlik pazarlaması yönünde, sağlıklı ve zindelik için etkinliklere katılma fırsatı birlikte güzel bir amaç hizmet etme fırsatını da vurgulamak oldukça önemlidir. Çeşitli kâr amacı gütmeyen kuruluşlar ve yardımseverlik organizasyonları, pazarlama iletişimlerinde fark yaratmaya ilişkin ifadelerinde, çoğu zaman katılımcılara kampanya sonrasında amaç ve hedeflerin karşılandığını bildirmeye çalışırlar. Ayrıca,
bu iletişimler, bağış yapanların ve katılımcıların çabalarının fark yarattığım göstermek amacıyla, bağış toplayarak yardımcı olan kişilerin profillerini vurgulamaktadır.


Katılım Motivasyonu ve Deneyim Değeri Arasındaki İlişki

Bu çalışma sonuncunda motivasyonun deneyim değeri üzerinde doğrudan olumlu bir etkisi olduğu bulunmuştur. Bu çalışmanın bulguları, katılım motivasyonu daha yüksek

**Deneyim Değeri ve Davranışsal Niyetler Arasındaki İlişki**

ilişkili olmadığı sonucunu bulmuştur. Bu bağlamda, algılanan değerin araştırma içeriğine ve ortamına göre oldukça farklılık gösterebilmektedir. Özellikle ekonomik değer gibi çok boyutlu değer değerlendirmeleri, bağlama özgü olarak değişiklik gösterebilmektedir (Oh, 2003)
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