

PARTICIPATION VERSUS NONPARTICIPATION IN A CHARITY RUNNING EVENT

MONA MIREHIE,* RICHARD J. BUNING,†¹ AND HEATHER J. GIBSON*

*Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport Management, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

†Department of Tourism, Conventions, and Event Management, Indiana University–Purdue University
Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN, USA

Hosting sport events to raise money for charitable causes has become pervasive, yet we know little about why individuals choose to participate or not. This study examined the differences between participants and nonparticipants of a hallmark small-scale charity running event. Data were collected via an online survey containing measures of charity event participation frequency, enduring involvement, negotiation efficacy, family support, running participation patterns, and demographics. Nonparticipants were also asked about event-related participation constraints. The sample was comprised of $N = 322$ event participants and $N = 112$ nonparticipants (committed runners). A one-way ANOVA demonstrated no statistically significant differences between the two independent samples with respect to the variables of interest. Nonparticipants indicated relatively low constraints to event participation. The most commonly reported constraints solicited in an open-ended question format were injuries and participation in an alternative event. Findings revealed that event participants and nonparticipants are very similar in terms of their running participation patterns. However, definite nonnegotiable constraints or preplanned involvement with other events inhibited participation in the studied event. Over time, this can result in either the expansion or contraction of their involvement in the running event. By illuminating nonnegotiable constraints, this study may help event organizers improve planning and management towards event sustainability.

Key words: Enduring involvement; Constraints; Charity running events; Nonparticipation; Participant sport events; Negotiation efficacy

Introduction

With the growth in the number of participatory sports events, many of which are tied to charity fund-raising, concerns have been raised that the number

of events has surpassed demand and might cause charity fatigue and intense competition for the same participants in a community (Hendriks & Peelen, 2013). Therefore, to encourage event sustainability it is necessary to find out more about both the event

¹Current affiliation as of January 1, 2018: UQ Business School, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. Address correspondence to Mona Mirehie, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport Management, University of Florida, 300 Florida Gym, PO Box 118208, Gainesville, FL 32611-8208, USA. Tel: (352) 294-1678; Fax: (352) 392-7588; E-mail: monamirehie@hnp.ufl.edu

participants and those who, despite being committed participants in the various sports associated with these events, choose not to participate. The growing body of knowledge on these events has tended to focus on a range of issues including: individual benefits such as health and wellness outcomes (Funk, Jordan, Ridinger, & Kaplanidou, 2011), charity as a motivation for participating in these events (Bennett, Mousley, Kitchen, & Ali-Choundhury, 2007), satisfaction with various aspects of an event and intention to participate in future events (e.g., Kaplanidou & Gibson, 2010), the tourism effects (Snelgrove & Wood, 2010), and benefits sought and satisfied by participation (Gibson & Chang, 2012), among others. However, little to no previous research has focused on why some community members choose to participate in these events and others do not.

The current study focused on the eighth annual Five Points of Life Marathon Race Weekend (SPOL), 2013 in Gainesville, Florida. Gainesville has a tradition of being a runner-friendly city and has a well-developed sport event portfolio (Gibson, Kaplanidou, & Kang, 2012). Elite athletes from around the world use Gainesville as a training site, particularly in the winter. The town hosted its own marathon in the 1970s until 1983 when interest in it declined. In 2006 the marathon was revived in the form of the Five Points of Life Marathon. The primary purpose of hosting the event for the organizers is to raise awareness of the necessity for donating blood, apheresis, marrow, cord blood, and organ and tissue. Recently, the event has established goals related to encouraging community members to become more physically active. Training groups for this race are established in partnership with a local health and fitness club to provide motivation, knowledge, and support for those who have set their sights on participating in the race weekend. Gradually over the years this marathon has grown into a full weekend of events and has become the hallmark running event for Gainesville whereby local runners as well as nonresidents include the race weekend on their annual list of events. The race weekend now consists of five events: a children's marathon (1.2 miles), a 5k (3.1 miles), a half-marathon (13.1 miles), and a full marathon and/or marathon relay (26.2 miles).

The purpose of this study was to investigate why some members of the community participated in

this annual hallmark running event while others, despite being committed runners, chose not to participate. Specifically, a number of concepts known to be associated with leisure-sport participation including patterns of participation in charity sport events, involvement in running generally, constraints to event participation, the efficacy to negotiate constraints on running, and family support for running and event participation were examined.

Literature Review

Charity Event Participation

With an increasing interest in using sport events as a means for supporting charities, scholarly research on charity sport event participation has garnered significant attention. Charity sport events generally encompass any such event that dedicates a significant portion of its proceeds to a charitable cause (Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2009). As charity sport events have become more pervasive, a variety of behavioral and attitudinal constructs have been investigated within this context. Motivation is typically the primary focus of this work and as such provides a foundation to understand why people participate in these events both in terms of philanthropic-related motives and sport participation motives.

Bennett et al. (2007) investigated motivation for charity event participation among a British sample and found individuals were willing to pay a higher registration fee if the event was considered prestigious, if the participant was highly involved with the charitable cause, or if the individual was motivated by the pursuit of a healthy lifestyle. In a study of participants from events associated with the Lance Armstrong Foundation, Filo, Funk, and O'Brien (2008) found intellectual, social, and competency motives were the primary drivers for event participation. The authors contended participants were also altruistically motivated. They suggested that the charitable characteristics of the event influenced social and competency motives more readily. In a related study, Filo, Funk, and O'Brien (2011) compared recreation and charity-based motives from two separate events and found both types of motivation contribute to developing an attachment to charity sport events. Recently, Rundio, Heere, and Newland (2014) compared the motives of

triathlon participants for cause-related events and non-cause-related events. They found that participants of the cause-related event rated self-esteem motives, personal goal achievement, competition, and recognition/approval significantly higher than non-cause-related event participants.

Employing a unique perspective on charity sport events, Coghlan (2012) studied cycling event tourists through an autoethnography at a 3-day cycling charity event in Australia. Coghlan's work discovered two previously unidentified themes in the literature, fear and anxiety related to event safety that could act as a potential constraint to charity event participation, and the potential for creative expression through fundraising for participants. In a follow-up study, Coghlan and Filo (2013) concluded that social connection among participants was paramount to charity sport events as it is central to individuals' social and emotional well-being. Also, the authors found escapism was an important motive for multiday events. Similarly, Filo, Spence, and Sparvero (2013) found a sense of community among charity event participants. The authors argued that such sense of community ultimately inspired them to train for and compete in these events.

Recent research by Hendriks and Peelen (2013) segmented charity sport event participants on the basis of their motivation, involvement, experience, and connection with the charity. The authors also found participants with the least cycling experience and event participation history raised the most money for the charity, while more experienced participants raised less funds for the charity. Accordingly, there seemed to be a negative relationship between charity event participation frequency and willingness to raise funds for a charity. Perhaps as individuals become more involved in a sport or sport event careers, motives related to fundraising for a charity diminishes. Certainly, Buning and Gibson (2015) found some indication of this among the group of cyclists they studied.

As this brief review indicated, there is a plethora of research on charity sport events that primarily focused on motivation whereas the differences between participants and nonparticipants of such events has received very little attention. Particularly, as the number of events has increased in recent years and local charities often rely on the funds raised it is important, both for the work of a charity and the

sustainability of an event, to understand why some community members do not participate.

Enduring Involvement

The concept of involvement stems from seminal work by Sherif and Cantril (1947) and Allport (1943). Sherif and Cantril's conceptualization of ego involvement is grounded in social judgment theory, which argues individuals subconsciously perceive and evaluate ideas by comparing them with their current attitudes or position towards a particular idea (Sherif, Sherif, & Nebergall, 1965). Ego involvement is typically regarded as the importance or centrality of an issue to an individual's life. Allport (1943) argues ego involvement cannot occur through participation in an activity alone as it consists of the total participation of the self with the activity. Following adoption and operationalization of the involvement concept in consumer behavior research (Arora, 1982; Bloch & Bruce, 1984; Laurent & Kapferer, 1985), various conceptualizations of involvement have been applied by leisure researchers to understand participation patterns in a range of leisure activities.

Adapting Laurant and Kapferer's (1985) multi-dimensional approach to psychological involvement, McIntyre (1989) introduced the concept of enduring involvement (EI) that represents the meaning and role of leisure activities in individuals' lives and conceptualized it as three dimensions: attraction, self-expression, and centrality. Attraction refers to an individual's attachment to an activity. Self-expression includes personal and social identity associated with the activity, and centrality refers to the extent to which individuals' lives are organized around the activity and if their friends are involved in the activity. Various scales have been used to measure different aspects of involvement in leisure (e.g., Havitz & Dimanche, 1999; Kyle, Absher, Norman, Hammitt, & Jodice, 2007; McIntyre, 1989). The presumption of these studies is that individuals' involvement in leisure activities yields understanding of different aspects of their behavior. McIntyre (1989) found that centrality to lifestyle, social bonds, and enjoyment were the most important reasons for involvement in an activity.

Within research on adult sport participation and involvement, McIntyre, Coleman, Boag, and

Cuskelly (1992) were the first to measure involvement in relation to master's sport participation. In terms of behavioral involvement, they found that the participants averaged 17 years of master's participation in their chosen sport, and had high levels of EI in master's sport. More recently, Beaton, Funk, Ridinger, and Jordan (2011) examined three facets of involvement among marathon runners and found that those who have stronger psychological connections to running get engaged in various types of running events, more frequently, and with more depth for instance they try to find out more about the event's sponsor. Thus, if higher psychological involvement in a sport seems to be linked to event participation, it makes sense to examine potential differences among those who take part and those who do not in an event focused on their particular interest—in this case running.

Family Support

Previous research has demonstrated that a supportive social environment increases the intrinsic motivations and personal choices for participation in an activity (e.g., Goodsell, Harris, & Baily, 2013). Thus, studying long-term engagement in any activity family as a social institution that highly influences individuals' decisions should be taken into consideration (Goodsell et al., 2013). Indeed, serious leisure participation can impose a cost on family well-being when affective attachment and behavioral consistency overloads the family unit (Goff, Fick, & Oppliger, 1997). For instance, highly committed runners run some 40–60 miles per week for training (Barrell, Chamberlain, Evans, Holt, & Mackean, 1989), which necessitates the dedication of a great amount of time; thus, the opportunity to set aside non-work time for running is greatly affected by a runner's marital status, number of children and their ages, and the nature of the relationships within the family. Barrell et al. (1989) found that for some runners the acquisition of running time depended on the support and cooperation of the individual's spouse as a runners' family life is mostly organized around training and event schedules. They found that partners and children supported a runner in different ways such as setting meal times to fit in with running schedules, washing the runner's kit, providing moral support by attending events, and

supporting the runner via the club's committee or social events. Indeed, Goff et al. (1997) found that such spousal support of participation can minimize family–leisure conflict.

Goodsell and Harris (2011), in a study of amateur marathon runners, also found that families of marathon runners tend to be very cooperative and supportive. The authors argued families might support marathon running more than other sports because finishing a marathon is a meaningful goal for distance runners and is viewed as a great accomplishment (Goodsell & Harris, 2011). Also, constraints were found to be more easily overcome with spousal support. In a similar study, Goodsell et al. (2013) found that an invitation from family or friends was a common motivation for beginning to run as well as running a marathon. Runners who lacked this social support had inconsistent training patterns or favored other activities. Thus, in a study trying to understand participation or nonparticipation in an event that necessitates intense prior preparation, it makes sense to examine a runner's wider familial context as a potential source of support or constraint.

Constraints

In any study of participation or nonparticipation, understanding the barriers or what is more commonly referred to in leisure studies as constraints is an important consideration (Jackson, 1999). Initially, constraints were considered immovable barriers that limited or blocked participation in a leisure activity (Jackson, 2005). However, Crawford and Godbey (1987) suggested that constraints not only limit participation, but also affect activity preference. Accordingly, they identified three categories of constraints: intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural. Later on, Crawford, Jackson, and Godbey (1991) extended this conceptualization of constraints into a hierarchical model that suggests intrapersonal constraints are faced when the individual is deciding upon the type of leisure activity. If these constraints are overcome then interpersonal constraints emerge in the next stage, particularly in activities requiring partners, and finally when interpersonal constraints are overcome individuals may face structural constraints. The absence of structural constraints or the ability of individuals to negotiate them leads to participation or nonparticipation in an activity

(Crawford et. al, 1991). Indeed, Scott's (1991) study supported this contention that constraints are not insurmountable in nature and can be overcome by various strategies employed by individuals. Similarly, Jackson, Crawford, and Godbey (1993) argued that individuals tend more towards negotiating constraints rather than not participating in an activity.

Following this line of research, scholars have also investigated constraints related to physical activity and sport participation. Alexandris and Carroll (1997) considered the demographic differences in the perception of recreational sports constraints. The authors found that females were more constrained than males, especially by intrapersonal constraints. Married individuals were more constrained than singles by time, and perception of constraints was higher among less-educated individuals. Indeed, Palen et al. (2010) found that the presence of children at home and the amount of time those children spend participating in sport constrains parents' participation in sport. In a study comparing participants and nonparticipants in the context of snow skiing, Gilbert and Hudson (2000) found that nonparticipants reported more intrapersonal constraints such as perceiving skiing as being harder to learn than other sports, feeling self-conscious or embarrassed to learn skiing. On the other hand, participants (i.e., skiers) reported feeling more constrained by family, time, or economic factors, but were still able to take part in the sport.

More recently, the idea of conceptualizing constraints as competing priorities has been introduced to the literature by Lamont and Kennelly (2011). In their study of Australian triathletes, the authors proposed that individuals have limited resources such as time and money within their control that can be allocated either to their day-to-day priorities or can choose to allocate these resources to the pursuit of leisure goals. Following the traditional categorization of intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural leisure constraints, Lamont and Kennelly identified competing priorities such as personal preferences, personal relationships, and external factors that act as constraints for participation in triathlons. In a related study that refined this initial analysis, Lamont, Kennelly, and Wilson (2012) identified seven domains of competing priorities for amateur triathletes including relationships, sociability,

domestic, financial, leisure, well-being, and work. Thus, conceptually in a study seeking to find out why individuals did not take the opportunity to take part in the hallmark event for their sport, constraints on participation in the event was felt to be a relevant concept.

Negotiation Efficacy

As noted above, following the growing debate about the ability of individuals to negotiate various constraints on their leisure, Jackson et al. (1993) revised their hierarchical constraints model to include propositions about the negotiation process. Accordingly, the authors suggested that participation in leisure "is dependent not on the absences of constraints (although this may be true for some people), but on negotiation through them. Such negotiations may modify rather than foreclose participation" (p. 4) as it seems to be the case for the skiers in Gilbert and Hudson's (2000) study. Henderson, Bedini, Hecht, and Schuler (1995) postulated that an individual's willingness or ability to negotiate constraints might be linked to self-efficacy, and in turn might be explained by part of Bandura's (1977) social learning theory, notably the concept of self-efficacy, which helps to explain differences in the degree to which people believe they can overcome challenges or cope.

Developing empirical exploration into the constraint negotiation process further, Hubbard and Mannell (2001), in a study of participation among employees in a corporate recreation program, examined four competing models of the constraint negotiation process. They found strong support for their constraints-effect-mitigation model, which proposed not only that participants who perceived the most constraints were likely to participate less in the recreation programs, but also that these constraints initiated either an inhibitory or a facilitatory negotiation process. Individuals who enacted a facilitatory approach were found to use more negotiation strategies and resources to enable their participation than those with an inhibitory approach. Hubbard and Mannell postulated that the size of an individual's negotiation strategies repertoire and their self-confidence to enact these strategies might further explain why some individuals are able to negotiate leisure constraints. They suggested the term

negotiation efficacy to describe this confidence to enact negotiation strategies.

Negotiation efficacy, “people’s confidence in their ability to successfully use negotiation strategies to overcome constraints they encounter” (p. 22) was examined further by Loucks-Atkinson and Mannell (2007). Working with a sample of participants with Fibromyalgia Syndrome, the authors explored individuals’ propensity to take part in exercise. Negotiation efficacy was found to directly and positively influence negotiation efforts; however, it did not directly influence participation. The authors suggest that there appears to be an interdependent effect on participation based on a combination of motivation, constraints, and negotiation, and they suggest the addition of another proposition to Jackson et al.’s (1993) work: “the greater people’s confidence in the successful use of negotiation resources to cope with constraints, the greater the motivation and effort to negotiate and the higher the level of participation” (Loucks-Atkinson & Mannell, 2007, p. 34).

White (2008) continued the empirical study of negotiation efficacy in an outdoor recreation context. In operationalizing negotiation efficacy, White incorporated Bandura’s (1997) theoretical developments by incorporating four sources of self-efficacy: (1) mastery experience, (2) vicarious experience, (3) social persuasion, and (4) psychological or emotional experiences. White found support for Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) constraints–effect–mitigation model, in that negotiation efficacy was found to positively affect negotiation efforts, but negatively affected constraints. However, in contrast to Loucks-Atkinson and Mannell (2007), White found only limited support for the indirect influence of negotiation efficacy on participation with motivation as a mediator. White’s findings advocate for the role of negotiation efficacy in understanding the inhibitory and facilitatory nature of constraint negotiation.

Most recently and of particular relevance for this study, negotiation efficacy has been examined in relation to participation in marathon running (Ridinger, Funk, Jordan, & Kaplanidou, 2012). As noted throughout this article, participation in marathons is a leisure activity that involves a regular training regime by the runner and may involve the negotiation of a range of constraints as individuals

navigate the various domains of their lives. Ridinger et al. investigated the role of involvement and negotiation efficacy on running commitment. The authors found that two dimensions of involvement, pleasure and centrality combined with negotiation efficacy, explained almost three fourths of the variance in running commitment, indeed individuals with higher levels of negotiation efficacy were found to be more committed to running.

Accordingly, based on the relevance of these concepts for understanding participation/nonparticipation in a hallmark running event, the following research questions were posed:

- **Research Question 1:** Do participants and non-participants of the 2013 Five Points of Life Race Weekend differ with respect to running experience, enduring involvement, negotiation efficacy, charity event participation, and family support?
- **Research Question 2:** What constraints prevented nonparticipants from participating in the 2013 Five Points of Life Race Weekend?

Method

Data Collection

For the event participants, data collection began 2 days after the completion of the event weekend. Event participants were recruited to participate in the study through e-mail contact from the event organizers. Data were collected from the event participants via an online questionnaire linked to the invitation message. For the nonparticipants, purposive sampling was used to recruit respondents through e-mails to running groups, flyers posted around the community (e.g., library, local fitness clubs), and on local social media. The nonparticipants were then invited to complete an online questionnaire through these messages. The online questionnaires contained six to seven sections and included: measures of enduring involvement (Chang, 2009), negotiation efficacy (Ridinger et al., 2012, adapted from White, 2008); other items were self-constructed measuring family support, regular charity event participation frequency, running participation patterns, and demographics. The nonparticipant questionnaire contained an additional section measuring constraints

both as an opened-ended item and a 7-factor scale (Alexandris & Carroll, 1997).

The enduring involvement in running scale adapted from Chang (2009) contained five factors: hedonic involvement (4 items), centrality (5 items), social (3 items), self-identity (3 items), and social identity (3 items) measured on a 7-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Negotiation efficacy was measured by adopting a 3-item scale from Ridinger et al. (2012), asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with each of the items on a 7-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Family support was measured by a fixed-choice question "How supportive do you feel your family members are of your running?" Five choices were provided from 1 (*very unsupportive*), 2 (*unsupportive*), 3 (*neutral*), 4 (*supportive*), 5 (*very supportive*). Frequency of charity event participation was measured by a fixed-choice question asking respondents to indicate their level of agreement from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) with the statement: "I regularly take part in events supporting a charity."

Running participation patterns were measured by two open-ended questions. The first question asked respondents to report the average number of hours they spend running every week. The second question measured running experience by asking about the number of years and months they have been running. For the nonparticipants questionnaire, leisure constraints were measured using a multifaceted scale adapted from Alexandris and Carroll (1997) that assessed three categories of constraints across seven factors: intrapersonal constraints [individual and psychological (6 items), lack of knowledge (4 items), lack of interest (3 items)], interpersonal constraints [lack of partner (3 items)], and structural constraints [facilities and services (4 items), accessibility and financial (4 items), time (3 items)]. Lastly, to capture any additional constraints an open-ended item asking the nonparticipants to explain their reasoning for non-participation was included.

Sample

The total sample consisted of $N = 434$ runners ($n = 322$ event participants; $n = 112$ nonparticipants).

Forty-four percent of race participants indicated they were male ($n = 127$) and 56% ($n = 159$) were female. For the nonparticipants, 42% were male ($n = 41$) while 58% ($n = 57$) were female. The mean age of the event participants was $M = 41$ years old ($SD = 12.94$) and nonparticipants $M = 37$ years ($SD = 13.17$). The majority of the sample reported being Caucasian (87%, $n = 243$ event participants, $n = 83$ nonparticipants), college educated (66%, $n = 93$ event participants; 30%, $n = 29$ nonparticipants), and had an annual income of \$100,000 or more (41%, $n = 109$ event participants; 39%, $n = 37$ nonparticipants). Almost half of the event participants (48%, $n = 137$) had children and were married or living with a partner and a further 16.6% ($n = 47$) were married without children. The majority of nonparticipants (42%, $n = 39$) were single, followed by 29.3% married with children ($n = 27$), and 25% married without children ($n = 23$). The event participants' running experience ranged from 1 month to 50 years ($M = 11.44$, $SD = 1.00$), while nonparticipants ranged from 1 month to 36 years of running experience ($M = 10.80$, $SD = 8.93$). Average time spent running per week for the event participants ranged from 1 to 30 hr ($M = 5.53$, $SD = 4.37$), and for the nonevent participants it ranged from 1 to 15 hr ($M = 4.71$, $SD = 2.74$).

Data Analysis

Analysis of the data included several steps utilizing Mplus 7.2 statistical modeling software and SPSS Statistics 22.0. First, to test the previously established concept structures and ensure the measurement model was adequate for further analysis in the context of the current study a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted with the enduring involvement and negotiation efficacy scales. Kyle et al. (2007) suggested that enduring involvement had been sufficiently used over the years to warrant the use of CFA to test validity (instead of EFA). Average variance extracted (AVE) scores were calculated for each latent variable to assess the convergent validity of the latent variables (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). In order to test overall model fit, chi-square goodness-of-fit, root mean square of approximation (RMSEA), comparative fit index (CFI), and the nonnormed fit index (NNFI) were calculated.

Second, to evaluate the internal consistency of enduring involvement and negotiation efficacy Cronbach's alpha, item-total correlations, and composite reliability were calculated. Third, to assess the differences between participants and nonparticipants in regards to enduring involvement, negotiation efficacy, family support, regular charity event participation frequency, and running participation a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Lastly, to examine the constraints encountered by the nonparticipants descriptive statistics were calculated for the each of the constraints factors and the open-ended responses were categorized utilizing thematic analysis.

Construct Reliability and Validity

The CFA results (Table 1) indicated the enduring involvement and negotiation efficacy measurement model fit the data well according to recommended criterion (Hu & Bentler, 1998; MacCallum, Browne,

& Sugawara, 1996). The associated model fit indices are as follows: $\chi^2 = 365.673$, RMSEA = 0.052, CFI = 0.954, and NNFI = 0.944. Regarding convergent validity four of the six factors demonstrated acceptable levels of AVE according to the recommended threshold of 0.5 or above (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). However, social involvement and negotiation efficacy AVE scores were slightly below this criterion, but as both factors have previously been validated by other scholars in similar contexts the factors were deemed acceptable for further analysis. In regards to reliability, all of the enduring involvement factors and negotiation efficacy demonstrated adequate internal consistency as Cronbach's alphas were above acceptable criterion according to Nunnally (1978): hedonic ($\alpha = 0.892$), centrality ($\alpha = 0.901$), social ($\alpha = 0.750$), self-identity ($\alpha = 0.879$), social identity ($\alpha = 0.804$), and negotiation efficacy ($\alpha = 0.706$). Further, these factors demonstrated acceptable composite reliability scores ranging from 0.709 to 0.894

Table 1
Enduring Involvement and Negotiation Efficacy Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Factors and Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		AVE	CR	
Hedonic				0.636	0.874	0.892
I really enjoy running	6.04	1.14	0.791			
Participating in running is one of the most satisfying things that I do	5.74	1.28	0.793			
Running is pleasurable for me	6.04	1.11	0.723			
Running interests me a lot	5.99	1.11	0.875			
Central				0.629	0.894	0.901
I attach great importance to running	5.78	1.26	0.808			
I find a lot of my life is organized around running	4.99	1.47	0.768			
Running has a central role in my life	5.42	1.42	0.810			
I would rather run than do most anything else	4.50	1.59	0.745			
Running reflects my lifestyle	5.67	1.26	0.831			
Social				0.452	0.701	0.750
Most of my friends or family members are in some way connected to running	3.86	1.65	0.511			
I enjoy discussing running with my friends and family	5.39	1.29	0.867			
Running provides the chance to socialize with my friends or family	4.61	1.67	0.586			
Self-identity				0.718	0.884	0.879
Participation in running says something about me	5.52	1.12	0.752			
Running reflects who I am	5.08	1.39	0.882			
Running is an important part of who I am	5.36	1.36	0.901			
Social identity				0.587	0.808	0.804
Other people see an important side of me when I participate in running	5.05	1.30	0.854			
I can tell things about other people by seeing them participating in running	4.80	1.32	0.644			
When I run, others see me the way I want them to see me	4.84	1.37	0.786			
Negotiation efficacy				0.448	0.709	0.706
In the past, I have been successful getting around barriers to running	5.55	1.12	0.662			
People I admire find ways to get around challenges they face when trying to run	5.21	1.28	0.660			
I enjoy overcoming obstacles to running	5.60	1.17	0.685			

Note. Standardized estimates are presented.

all greater than the recommended criterion of 0.700 (Hair et al., 2010).

Results

Differences Between Participants and Nonparticipants

The ANOVA results (Table 2) revealed no statistically significant differences between the two independent samples (event participants and nonparticipants) and the variables of interest. In regards to enduring involvement, both samples were quite homogenous as they both reported relatively high levels of enduring involvement for each of the five factors: hedonic (participants, $M = 5.94$, $SD = 1.05$; nonparticipants, $M = 5.99$, $SD = 0.89$), centrality (participants, $M = 5.26$, $SD = 1.22$; nonparticipants, $M = 5.27$, $SD = 1.12$), social (participants, $M = 4.59$, $SD = 1.25$; nonparticipants, $M = 4.70$, $SD = 1.32$), self-identity (participants, $M = 5.27$, $SD = 1.17$; nonparticipants, $M = 5.47$, $SD = 1.14$), social identity (participants, $M = 4.87$, $SD = 1.13$; nonparticipants, $M = 4.99$, $SD = 1.11$). Further, no statistically significant differences were found between the event participants and nonparticipants across the five factors of enduring involvement: hedonic [$F(1, 429) = 0.261$, $p = 0.609$], centrality [$F(1, 428) = 0.001$, $p = 0.980$], social [$F(1, 430) = 0.635$, $p = 0.426$], self-identity [$F(1, 427) = 2.378$, $p = 0.124$], and social identity [$F(1, 430) = 0.886$, $p = 0.347$]. Similarly, both groups of runners reported relatively high levels of negotiation efficacy (event participants, $M = 5.45$, $SD = 0.95$; nonparticipants, $M = 5.45$, $SD = 0.93$) as no statistically significant difference was found [$F(1, 427) = 0.001$, $p = 0.982$].

In regards to running participation behavior, both samples reported relatively similar patterns of running experience (participants, $M = 11.54$, $SD = 11.06$; nonparticipants, $M = 10.57$, $SD = 8.69$) and average hours spent running per week (participants, $M = 5.53$, $SD = 4.37$; nonparticipants, $M = 4.71$, $SD = 2.74$). Thus, neither running experience [$F(1, 421) = 0.688$, $p = 0.407$] or average hours spent running per week [$F(1, 415) = 3.310$, $p = 0.070$] revealed statistically significant between group differences. Additionally, both independent samples indicated that they receive relatively high levels of support from their family for their participation in running

Table 2
Event Participants and Nonparticipants ANOVA

Measure	Event Participant ($n = 322$)		Nonparticipant ($n = 112$)		Between Groups df	Within Groups df	F	p
	$[M (SD)]$	$[M (SD)]$	$[M (SD)]$	$[M (SD)]$				
Running experience (years)	11.54 (11.06)	10.57 (8.69)	1	421	0.688	0.407		
Hours run per week	5.53 (4.37)	4.71 (2.74)	1	415	3.310	0.070		
Involvement: Hedonic	5.94 (1.05)	5.99 (0.89)	1	429	0.261	0.609		
Involvement: Central	5.26 (1.22)	5.27 (1.12)	1	428	0.001	0.980		
Involvement: Social	4.59 (1.25)	4.70 (1.32)	1	430	0.635	0.426		
Involvement: Self-identity	5.27 (1.17)	5.47 (1.14)	1	427	2.378	0.124		
Involvement: Social identity	4.87 (1.13)	4.99 (1.11)	1	430	0.886	0.347		
Negotiation efficacy	5.45 (0.95)	5.45 (0.93)	1	427	0.001	0.982		
Regular charity event participation	3.84 (0.89)	3.78 (1.17)	1	386	0.188	0.665		
Family support	4.34 (0.89)	4.22 (1.09)	1	428	1.001	0.318		

Note. Involvement and negotiation efficacy measured from (1) not at all important to (7) very important. Regular charity event participation measured from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Family and friends support measured from (1) very unsupportive to (5) very supportive.

(participants, $M = 4.34$, $SD = 0.89$; nonparticipants, $M = 4.22$, $SD = 1.09$) and no significant between groups difference was present [$F(1, 428) = 1.001$, $p = 0.318$]. Lastly, both groups of runners indicated that they participate in charity-based events quite frequently (participants, $M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.89$; nonparticipants, $M = 3.78$, $SD = 1.17$) and at similar levels as no significant between groups difference was discerned [$F(1, 386) = 0.188$, $p = 0.665$].

Nonparticipant Constraints

The nonparticipant sample reported relatively low constraints to their participation in the race weekend across three constraint categories (Table 3): Intrapersonal constraints: individual and psychological ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 1.19$), lack of knowledge ($M = 1.81$, $SD = 1.20$), and lack of interest ($M = 1.97$, $SD = 1.32$); Interpersonal constraints: lack of partners ($M = 1.64$, $SD = 1.18$); and Structural constraints: facilities and services ($M = 2.48$, $SD = 1.32$), accessibility and financial ($M = 1.80$, $SD = 1.19$), and time ($M = 2.61$, $SD = 1.84$). In response to the open-ended question asking for further information about why the nonparticipants did not take part in the event a total of 132 comments were reported. The reported constraints were categorized into six themes by the research team (Table 4). The most common constraints reported were having physical limitations such as injury or pregnancy ($f = 30$) and participating in an alternative running event ($f = 23$). The least common reasons for nonparticipation were lack of interest in

Table 3
Nonparticipant Constraints

Measure	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Intrapersonal constraints		
Individual and psychological	2.20	1.19
Lack of knowledge	1.81	1.20
Lack of interest	1.97	1.32
Interpersonal constraints		
Lack of partners	1.64	1.18
Structural constraints		
Facilities and services	2.48	1.32
Accessibility and financial	1.80	1.19
Time	2.61	1.84

Note. Constraints measured from (1) *not at all important* to (7) *extremely important*.

Table 4
Nonparticipant Open-Ended Constraints

Theme	<i>f</i>
Physical limitation (e.g., injury, pregnancy)	30
Alternative event (e.g., another marathon on the same day)	23
Money/time	18
Lack of knowledge	16
Lack of training	10
Miscellaneous	14
Not interested in Five Points of Life event (e.g., the course was boring)	6

Note. Respondents reported were asked to explain their reasoning for nonparticipation; these responses were coded using thematic analysis.

the Five Points of Life Event such as the course was considered boring ($f = 6$) and lack of training ($f = 10$). Moderately reported constraints included money/time ($f = 18$), lack of knowledge ($f = 16$), other ($f = 14$).

Discussion

The overall purpose of the study was to compare event participants and nonparticipants of a charity sport event. With respect to the first research question, results revealed that event participants and nonparticipants did not differ in regards to enduring involvement, negotiation efficacy, regular charity event participation, family support, and general running behavior. Both groups of respondents were experienced runners and highly involved in running. This supports previous research findings that showed participants with high level of experience in an activity have high levels of psychological and behavioral involvement (Beaton et al., 2011; McIntyre et al., 1992), and devote much of their leisure time to participating in a favorite activity. Similar to Goodsell and Harris's (2011) findings, families of the runners were found to be very supportive of their running participation. Certainly, this high level of family support and their high level of involvement supports Barrell et al.'s (1989) findings regarding the strong dependence of running participation on family support. Runners with these predispositions have also been identified as regular running event participants with a high likelihood of traveling to take part in such events outside of their

home towns (McGehee, Yoon, & Cárdenas, 2003). With respect to the current study, interestingly, while both groups reported a high level of family support for their running, the event participants were more likely to be married and have children. This might suggest that the event participants by virtue of being in the midst of the primary child-rearing stages of the family life cycle (Kelly, 1986) might be more anchored to their communities through their children, which may in turn encourage them to take part in community events such as this marathon weekend. So, although the nonparticipants are also experienced runners, highly involved in running, with high family support, many of them are at a different family life-cycle stage, either single or married without children, stages that may not be as connected to community by virtue of their children (Kelly, 1986), and so may not feel the impetus to take part in their community's hallmark running event.

One issue that might have had an influence on nonparticipation in the marathon weekend was the idea of involvement pulsation suggested by Lamont, Kennelly, and Wilson (2011). Lamont et al. argued an individual's event participation expands and contracts over time. More specifically, event participants go through cycles of training and preparation focused on priorities surrounding their sport involvement then they experience periods of recovery after an event when more importance is attached to other priorities. Thus, the nonparticipants in this study might have been experiencing a period of recovery from participating in another event held before the event under investigation and as such for future studies we recommend inquiring more about details of participation in other events as the nonparticipants did indicate that they took part in other types of events and some reported that they had chosen to participate in an alternative running event.

Regarding the second research question, surprisingly, although nonparticipants of the event under investigation reported relatively low levels of constraints to participation in the 5POL race weekend and high levels of efficacy to negotiate these constraints still they did not participate in the event. Based on the conception of constraints provided by Crawford et al. (1991), for some participants definite insurmountable constraints (e.g., injury or pregnancy) prevented event participation. However, for

others, constraints in the forms of competing priorities such as work and school also likely contributed to nonparticipation (Lamont et al., 2012) as some of the respondents mentioned time constraints.

The decision for nonparticipation in 5POL might have also been made on the basis of other factors. According to Beaton et al. (2011), marathon runners with high levels of psychological connection tend to participate in various types of events. In fact, some of the nonparticipants mentioned that their participation in another event on the same day as the Five Points of Life Marathon prohibited their 5POL participation. Thus, perhaps previous participation in 5POL and desire to experience alternative events were reasons for preferring other events over 5POL. Additionally, nonparticipants of the 5POL were frequent charity-event participants and Hendriks and Peelen (2013) found that those who often take part in charity events seem to develop a reticence towards the demands of constantly raising money for charity the more they take part in such events, a tendency that was also noted in a study of cyclists by Buning and Gibson (2015). So perhaps a "sense of charity fatigue" develops in regular event participants. Indeed, in this study some of the nonparticipants mentioned that money was the reason for their nonparticipation, although they did not specify if fundraising was an issue.

Considering negotiation effort is driven by preference in addition to motivation (Jackson et al., 1993), market saturation also likely contributed to event nonparticipation as runners in the community were able to compare the Five Points of Life event against other similar events in the area. Individuals choose endurance events in regards to many different event-specific characteristics such as location, weather, distance, course characteristics, size, pre/post activities, race goals, budget, location, time of the year, prestige, difficulty (Cespedes, n.d.; Paul, 2014). Further convoluting the running event market, nontraditional running events (e.g., obstacle races, themed runs) currently outnumber traditional half marathon and marathon running events as they attract 4 million participants and 2.5 million participants in the US, respectively (Running USA, 2014). If runners in the community were faced with negotiating a constraint, but lacked motivation or preference to participate in the Five Points of Life event either based on a lack of prior experience

or an attractive alternative event, they likely did not participate.

Typically, research on participatory sport events is focused on understanding the behavior and attitudes of a particular event's participants. However, the current study provided an innovative opening look into the behaviors and attitudes of individuals that chose not to participate in a community sport event. Thus, several notable implications for improved event management can be derived from the results. For instance, some nonnegotiable constraints (e.g., lack of knowledge or financial problems) reported by the nonparticipants can likely be alleviated by event organizers by reducing registration costs or increasing marketing efforts. Reported constraints that affect negotiation effort (e.g., alternative events, lack of interest, being out of town) can likely be addressed through event management by assessing competing event schedules and improving event characteristics such as course quality. Moving forward, understanding nonparticipation in events in addition to traditional participant studies is crucial to the continued success of promoting and organizing participatory sport events as event offerings continue to flourish.

Although the current study provides several contributions to the existing work in this area, it is not without limitations that necessitate acknowledgement to improve future research. Despite every effort to include a wide range of runners from the community in the nonevent participant sample the research team had difficulty in finding "lone-wolf runners" or in other words runners that prefer to run in isolation and outside of organized events. Although training for endurance events often occurs in isolation, an organized running event provides access to an environment with similar people (Shipway & Jones, 2007) and individuals can immerse themselves into the social world of running through training and participation (Robinson, Patterson, & Axelsen, 2014). Thus, capturing individuals that choose to not to participate in running events is a novel idea as some individuals may prefer running alone (Robinson et al., 2014), but they are harder to locate than event participants. Future research investigating nonparticipation should focus on capturing the perspective of lone-wolf runners perhaps through the use of qualitative inquiry and a mall-intercept method at popular running locations.

References

- Alexandris, K., & Carroll, B. (1997). Demographic differences in the perception of constraints on recreational sport participation: Results from a study in Greece. *Leisure Studies, 16*(2), 107–125.
- Allport, G. W. (1943). The ego in contemporary psychology. *Psychological Review, 50*, 451–478.
- Arora, R. (1982). Validation of an SOR model for situation, enduring, and response components of involvement. *Journal of Marketing Research, 19*, 505–516.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191–215.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.
- Barrell, G., Chamberlain, A., Evans, J., Holt, T., & Mackean, J. (1989). Ideology and commitment in family life: A case study of runners. *Leisure Studies, 8*(3), 249–262.
- Beaton, A. A., Funk, D. C., Ridinger, L., & Jordan, J. (2011). Sport involvement: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Sport Management Review, 14*(2), 126–140.
- Bennett, R., Mousley, W., Kitchin, P., & Ali-Choudhury, R. (2007). Motivations for participating in charity-affiliated sporting events. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 6*(2), 155–178.
- Bloch, P. H., & Bruce, G. D. (1984). Product involvement as leisure behavior. *Advances in Consumer Research, 11*(1), 197–202.
- Buning, R. J., & Gibson, H. (2015). The evolution of active-sport-event travel careers. *Journal of Sport Management, 29*, 555–569.
- Cespedes, A. (n.d.). *How to choose a half marathon race for the first time runner*. Retrieved from <http://livehealthy.chron.com/choose-half-marathon-race-first-time-runner-1649.html>
- Chang, S. (2009). *Relationship between active leisure and active vacations*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL. Retrieved from <http://ufdc.ufl.edu/UFE0024249/00001>
- Coghlan, A. (2012). An autoethnographic account of a cycling charity challenge event: Exploring manifest and latent aspects of the experience. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 17*(2), 105–124.
- Coghlan, A., & Filo, K. (2013). Using constant comparison method and qualitative data to understand participants' experiences at the nexus of tourism, sport and charity events. *Tourism Management, 35*, 122–131.
- Crawford, D., & Godbey, G. (1987). Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure. *Leisure Sciences, 9*(2), 119–127.
- Crawford, D. W., Jackson, E. L., & Godbey, G. (1991). A hierarchical model of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences, 13*(4), 309–320.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39–50.
- Filo, K., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien (2008). It's not really about the bike: Exploring attraction and attachment to the

- events of the Lance Armstrong Foundation. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 501–525.
- Filo, K., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien, D. C. (2009). The meaning behind attachment: Exploring camaraderie, cause, and competency at a charity sport-event. *Journal of Sport Management*, 23, 361–387.
- Filo, K., Funk, D. C., O'Brien, D. (2011). Examining motivation for charity sport participation: A comparison of recreation-based and charity-based motives. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 43(4), 491–518.
- Filo, K., Spence, K., & Sparvero, E. (2013). Exploring the properties of community among charity sport event participants. *Managing Leisure*, 18(3), 194–212.
- Funk, D., Jordan, J., Ridinger, L., & Kaplanidou, K. (2011). Capacity of mass participant sport events for the development of activity commitment and future exercise intention. *Leisure Sciences*, 33(3), 250–268.
- Gibson, H. J., & Chang, S. (2012). Cycling in mid and later life: Involvement and benefits sought from a bicycle tour. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 44(1), 23–51.
- Gibson, H. J., Kaplanidou, K., & Kang, S. J. (2012). Small-scale event sport tourism: A case study in sustainable tourism. *Sport Management Review*, 15(2), 160–170.
- Gilbert, D., & Hudson, S. (2000). Tourism demand constraints: A skiing participation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(4), 906–925.
- Goff, S. J., Fick, D. S., & Oppliger, R. A. (1997). The moderating effect of spouse support on the relation between serious leisure and spouses' perceived leisure–family conflict. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29(1), 47–60.
- Goodsell, T. L., & Harris, B. D. (2011). Family life and marathon running: Constraint, cooperation, and gender in a leisure activity. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 43(1), 80–109.
- Goodsell, T. L., Harris, B. D., & Bailey, B. W. (2013). Family status and motivations to run: A qualitative study of marathon runners. *Leisure Sciences*, 35(4), 337–352.
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Havitz, M. E., & Dimanche, F. (1999). Leisure involvement revisited: Drive properties and paradoxes. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 31(2), 122–149.
- Henderson, K. A., Bedini, L. A., Hecht, L., & Schuler, R. (1995). Women with physical disabilities and the negotiation of leisure constraints. *Leisure Studies*, 14(1), 17–31.
- Hendriks, M., & Peelen, E. (2013). Personas in action: Linking event participation motivation to charitable giving and sports. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 18(1), 60–72.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to under parameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*, 3, 424–453.
- Hubbard, J., & Mannell, R. C. (2001). Testing competing models of the leisure constraint negotiation process in a corporate employee recreation setting. *Leisure Sciences*, 23(3), 145–163.
- Jackson, E. L. (1999). Comment on Hawkins et al., "Leisure constraints: A replication and extension of construct development." *Leisure Sciences*, 21(3), 195–199.
- Jackson, E. L. (2005). *Constraints to leisure*. State College, PA: Venture Pub.
- Jackson, E. L., Crawford, D. W., & Godbey, G. (1993). Negotiation of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 15(1), 1–11.
- Kaplanidou, K., & Gibson, H. (2010). Predicting behavioral intentions of active event sport tourists: The case of a small scale recurring sports event. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 15, 163–179.
- Kelly, J. (1986). *Leisure*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kyle, G., Absher, J., Norman, W., Hammitt, W., & Jodice, L. (2007). A modified involvement scale. *Leisure Studies*, 26(4), 399–427.
- Lamont, M. J., & Kennelly, M. (2011). I can't do everything! Competing priorities as constraints in triathlon event travel careers. *Tourism Review International*, 14(2–3), 85–97.
- Lamont, M., Kennelly, M., & Wilson, E. (2011). Selfish leisure? Competing priorities and constraints in triathlon event travel careers. In M. Gross (Ed.), *Tourism: Creating a brilliant blend*. Proceedings of the Council for Australian Tourism and Hospitality Education Conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia.
- Lamont, M. J., Kennelly, M., & Wilson, E. (2012). Competing priorities as constraints in event travel careers. *Tourism Management*, 33(5), 1068–1079.
- Laurent, G., & Kapferer, J. N. (1985). Measuring consumer involvement profiles. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 22, 41–53.
- Loucks-Atkinson, A., & Mannell, R. C. (2007). Role of self-efficacy in the constraints negotiation process: The case of individuals with fibromyalgia syndrome. *Leisure Sciences*, 29(1), 19–36.
- MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 130–149.
- McGehee, N. G., Yoon, Y., & Cárdenas, D. (2003). Involvement and travel for recreational runners in North Carolina. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17(3), 305–324.
- McIntyre, N. (1989). The personal meaning of participation: Enduring involvement. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 21(2), 167–179.
- McIntyre, N., Coleman, D., Boag, A., & Cuskelly, G. (1992). Understanding masters sports participation: Involvement, motives and benefits. *ACHPER National Journal*, 138, 4–8.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Palen, L. A., Patrick, M. E., Gleeson, S. L., Caldwell, L. L., Smith, E. A., Wegner, L., & Flisher, A. J. (2010). Leisure constraints for adolescents in Cape Town, South Africa: A qualitative study. *Leisure Sciences*, 32(5), 434–452.

- Paul, S. (2014, July 31). How to pick the right marathon. *Runner's World*. Retrieved from <http://www.runnersworld.com/race-training/how-to-pick-the-right-marathon>
- Ridinger, L. L., Funk, D. C., Jordan, J. S., & Kaplanidou, K. (2012). Marathons for the masses: Exploring the role of negotiation-efficacy and involvement on running commitment. *Journal of Leisure Research, 44*(2), 155–178.
- Robinson, R., Patterson, I., & Axelsen, M. (2014). The “loneliness of the long distance runner” no more. *Journal of Leisure Research, 46*(4), 374–394.
- Rundio, A., Heere, B., & Newland, B. (2014). Cause-related versus non-cause-related sport events: Differentiating endurance events through a comparison of athletes' motives. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 23*, 17–26.
- Running USA. (2014). *2014 state of the sport—Part II: Non-traditional running events*. Retrieved from <http://www.runningusa.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=news.details&ArticleId=3128>
- Scott, D. (1991). The problematic nature of participation in contract bridge: A qualitative study of group-related constraints. *Leisure Sciences, 13*(4), 321–336.
- Sherif, M., & Cantril, H. (1947). *The psychology of ego involvement: Social attitudes and identifications*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Sherif, M., Sherif, C., & Nebergall, R. (1965). *Attitude and attitude change: The social judgment-involvement approach*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.
- Shipway, R., & Jones, I. (2007). Running away from home: Understanding visitor experiences in sport tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 9*, 373–383.
- Snelgrove, R., & Wood, L. (2010). Attracting and leveraging visitors at a charity cycling event. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 15*(4), 269–285.
- White, D. D. (2008). A structural model of leisure constraints negotiation in outdoor recreation. *Leisure Sciences, 30*(4), 342–359.