



## Examination of Risk Taking and Motivation Levels of Individuals Participating in Outdoor Recreative Activities\*

Tunahan OĞUZ<sup>1</sup>, Meriç ÖDEMİŞ<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü. <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5742-1681>

<sup>2</sup>Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat Üniversitesi, Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2034-4295>

### To cite this article/ Atf için:

Oğuz, T., & Ödemiş, M. (2026). Examination of risk taking and motivation levels of individuals participating in outdoor recreative activities. *Uluslararası Bozok Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(1), 202-218.

### Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the reasons for participation, risk-taking tendencies, and motivation levels of individuals participating in outdoor recreational activities, particularly those involving elements of adventure, excitement, and risk. Data were collected from a total of 425 individuals (mean age  $30.73 \pm 5.59$  years), including 185 female participants (mean age =  $30.31 \pm 5.38$  years) and 240 male participants (mean age =  $31.05 \pm 5.74$  years), using a personal information form, the Short Form of the Area-Specific Risk-Taking Scale, and the Recreational Activities Participation Motivation Scale. Non-parametric tests (Mann-Whitney U, Kruskal-Wallis, Spearman Correlation) were used in data analysis. According to the research findings, men have significantly higher risk-taking and motivation levels than women. While it was observed that single individuals tend to take more risks than married individuals, it was found that the perception of health/safety risks increased with higher education levels. Variables such as type of recreational activity and region also showed significant differences in some sub-dimensions. A significant positive correlation was found between risk-taking and motivation; indicating that risk-taking behavior is a motivational factor. Instructors in recreational activities should receive regular risk management training and be prepared for potential hazards.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Motivation, Risk Taking, Recreational Activities

## Açık Alan Rekreatif Etkinliklere Katılan Bireylerin Risk Alma ve Motivasyon Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi

### Özet

Bu araştırmanın amacı, özellikle macera, heyecan ve risk unsurları içeren açık hava rekreasyon faaliyetlerine katılan bireylerin katılım nedenlerini, risk alma eğilimlerini ve motivasyon düzeylerini incelemektir. Veriler, kişisel bilgi formu, Alan Spesifik Risk Alma Ölçeği Kısa Formu ve Rekreasyon Faaliyetleri Katılım Motivasyon ölçeği kullanılarak, 185 kadın katılımcıdan (ortalama yaş =  $30,31 \pm 5,38$  yıl) ve 240 erkek katılımcı (ortalama yaş =  $31,05 \pm 5,74$  yıl) olmak üzere toplam 425 kişiden (ortalama yaş  $30,73 \pm 5,59$  yıl) toplanmıştır. Veri analizinde parametrik olmayan testler (Mann-Whitney U, Kruskal-Wallis, Spearman Korelasyonu) kullanılmıştır. Araştırma bulgularına göre, erkeklerin risk alma ve motivasyon düzeyleri kadınlardan anlamlı derecede daha yüksektir. Bekar bireylerin evli bireylere göre daha fazla risk alma eğiliminde olduğu gözlemlenirken, sağlık/güvenlik risk algısının eğitim seviyesi yükseldikçe arttığı tespit edildi. Eğlence aktivitesi türü ve bölge gibi değişkenler de bazı alt boyutlarda önemli farklılıklar gösterdi. Risk alma ile motivasyon arasında anlamlı bir pozitif korelasyon bulundu; bu da risk alma davranışının motivasyonel bir faktör olduğunu göstermektedir. Eğlence aktivitelerindeki eğitmenlere düzenli risk yönetimi eğitimi verilmeli ve olası tehlikelere karşı hazırlıklı olmaları sağlanmalıdır.

**Keywords:** Motivasyon, Risk Alma, Rekreatif Aktiviteler

\*This study was prepared by utilizing the master's thesis titled "Examination of risk taking and motivation levels of individuals participating in outdoor recreational activities" prepared by Tunahan OĞUZ under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meriç Ödemiş.

## INTRODUCTION

Recreation is an enjoyable and energizing activity that has positive effects on both our physical and mental health, in which we can actively or passively participate. These activities also allow us to better understand ourselves (Çelebi & Özbey, 2020). Participating in recreational activities enhances our ability to empathize and helps us establish more genuine relationships with others. It also enhances social skills such as planning, awareness, appreciation, cooperation, problem-solving, and emotional regulation (Szabo & Ábrahám, 2013; Umaç, 2021).

Recreation is divided into two types, namely outdoor and indoor recreation, based on location. Nature sports, which use nature as a resource, hold a significant place within outdoor activities. Nature sports are classified as activities performed on land, air, water, and snow. Hardiman & Burgin (2011) define outdoor recreation and adventure tourism together. Similarly, Weber (2001) provided a unifying definition of adventurous recreation activities, and outdoor recreation. Weber argues that outdoor recreation emerged following the trend of adventure recreation.

There are two fundamental approaches to understanding recreation. The objective approach considers recreation as the activities individuals prefer in their leisure time, while the subjective approach examines recreation in the context of participants' values, attitudes, and motivations (Raadik et al., 2010). In this context, individuals' motivation to meet their needs, gains meaning within the framework of the subjective approach to recreation. Motivation is a comprehensive concept that is influenced by various reasons and factors. It can arise from biological causes, such as hunger and thirst, or psychological causes, such as the desire for success and status. Motivation is divided into two categories: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation is related to an individual's level of interest and curiosity, while extrinsic motivation is more performance-based and involves social expectations. Both types of motivation can manifest themselves at different stages of life and in various ways (Kinczel et al., 2020). When recreational activities are examined, it is observed that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors are effective in participation (Müderrisoğlu et al., 2006).

While motivation for recreational activities varies among individuals due to many contributing factors. Renewal and recovery, social interaction and communication, mental clarity, a sense of freedom, gaining internal awareness, and happiness are the primary factors contributing to personal well-being. Therefore, it is believed that the need for recreation should be addressed from both an individual and societal perspective (Jenkins & Pigram, 2006). In adventure recreation, "risk perception" is a personal characteristic, and risk-taking motivations vary among individuals (Dinç & Yavaş Tez, 2021). Risk can manifest at physical, social, and psychological levels and is one of the primary factors that attracts individuals to adventure recreation programs (Dinç, 2018). The concepts of risk-taking and risk management in adventure activities are among the most important topics of discussion, with some sources indicating that risk is a motivating factor (Buckley, 2012).

Individuals with a high level of adventure seeking have been observed to prefer activities that involve greater risk and derive greater satisfaction from such activities (Zuckerman, 2007). These individuals view risky situations not as threats but as opportunities to test and exceed

personal limits, thus demonstrating a more positive and challenging attitude toward such situations (Ewert, 1985).

The primary objective of this research is to examine the reasons for participation in outdoor recreational activities and the risk-taking tendencies and motivation levels of individuals involved, particularly in those activities that include elements of adventure, excitement, and risk. This research aims to identify the factors that influence individuals' risk-taking behaviors and motivations. This research makes a significant contribution to understanding the risk-taking and motivation levels of individuals participating in outdoor recreational activities. Identifying the relationship between risk-taking and motivation can provide valuable information for planning and managing such activities. Using this information is crucial, particularly for ensuring individuals' safety and maximizing their benefits from these activities. This study will contribute both to the academic literature and to practical applications by providing valuable information. This will help to organize outdoor recreational activities more safely and effectively.

## **METHOD**

### **Research model**

The research utilized a survey model. This involves conducting surveys with large groups, gathering and describing the opinions and attitudes of individuals within the group regarding a phenomenon or event (Karakaya, 2014).

### **Participants**

The population of the current study consisted of individuals participating in outdoor recreation activities in the Alanya, Kemer, Ölüdeniz, and Marmaris regions. The study group consisted of individuals who participated in outdoor recreation activities and volunteered for the study. A total of 425 individuals (mean age =  $30.73 \pm 5.59$  years) were selected, consisting of 185 females (mean age =  $30.31 \pm 5.38$  years) and 240 males (mean age =  $31.05 \pm 5.74$  years). The study sample was determined through convenience sampling.

### **Ethics committee permission**

The research was conducted with the permission of the Social Sciences and Humanities Scientific Research Ethics Committee at Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University (dated 06.11.2024 and numbered 2024/29).

### **Data Collection Tools**

A personal information form containing questions about demographic variables and recreation participation, the "Domain-Specific Risk-Taking Scale Short Form," and the "Recreational Activities Participation Motivation Scale" were used to collect data in the study.

### **Personal Information Form**

The researcher-developed personal information form includes demographic questions such as age, gender, activity participation preferences, and outdoor recreation preferences to gather information about the participants in the study.

## Domain-Specific Risk Taking Scale Short Form

The "DOSPERT (Domain-Specific Risk Taking)" scale, used to measure individuals' risk-taking behavior, was first developed by Weber and colleagues in 2002 and later shortened by Blais and Weber (2006). The scale was adapted into Turkish by Dinç & Tez (2019). The scale consists of five different subscales and contains a total of 25 items. These 5 subdimensions include ethical (5, 8, 25), financial (3, 4, 7, 10, 12), health/safety (13, 14, 16, 19, 22), recreation (2, 9, 11, 15, 20, 21), and social (1, 6, 17, 18, 23, 24).

The scale is a seven-point Likert-type measurement tool, with options ranging from "Definitely No," "Probably No," "Partially No," "Undecided," "Partially Yes," "Probably Yes," to "Definitely Yes. In addition to the total score, each subscale can be scored separately. High scores indicate a high risk-taking tendency. There are no reverse-scored items on the scale.

## Recreational Activities Participation Motivation Scale

Developed by Gözen (2020), the 36-item "Recreational Activities Participation Motivation Scale" comprises five subscales: "achievement orientation" (10 items), "difficulty" (9 items), "risk taking" (6 items), "individualism" (5 items), and "innovation" (6 items). The scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale. The scale scoring is graded on a five-point Likert type and has the options of 'Not Appropriate at All, Not Appropriate, Does Not Matter, Appropriate, Completely Appropriate'.

## Data Analysis

Data from 425 completed scales were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25. In the literature, the normality of the data distribution is evaluated using skewness and kurtosis coefficients, and values between -1.5 and +1.5 are considered indicative of a normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Since the data in this study did not meet the normality assumption, non-parametric statistical methods were used. Descriptive statistics were calculated using frequency distributions, arithmetic means, and standard deviations. Differences between two independent groups were examined using the Mann-Whitney U test, while comparisons between more than two groups were made using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Relationships between variables were analyzed using the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. The statistical significance level was set at  $p < 0.05$  for all analyses.

## FINDINGS

**Table 1.** Frequency distribution of participants according to demographic information

VARIABLES	GROUP	N	%
Gender	Female	185	43.5
	Male	240	56.5
Marital status	Married	175	41.2
	Single	250	58.8
Educational status	Elementary School	7	1.6
	Middle School	11	2.6
	High School	92	21.6
	Bachelor	242	56.9
	Post Graduate	73	17.2
Income level	17.000 TL and below	26	6.1
	Between 17.001-30.000 TL	92	21.6
	Between 30.001- 50.000 TL	136	32.0

	50.000 TL and more	171	40.2
<b>Activity</b>	Paragliding	233	54.8
	Rafting	62	14.6
	Jeep Safari	34	8.0
	Atv Safari	44	10.4
	Diving	48	11.3
<b>Participating region</b>	Alanya	327	76.9
	Ölüdeniz	68	16.0
	Marmaris	9	2.1
	Kemer	21	4.9
<b>Events during the holiday period</b>	Yes	226	53.2
	No	199	46.8
<b>Purchasing style</b>	Adventurer	194	45.6
	Social	90	21.2
	Relaxing	72	16.9
	Utilitarian	12	2.8
	Unplanned	57	13.4

Table 1 shows that of the individuals who participated in the research, 185 were female, which constitutes 43.5% of the participants, and 240 were male, comprising 56.5% of the participants. It was observed that 41.2% of the participants were married and 58.8% were single. When the distribution of educational backgrounds was examined, the rate of primary school graduates was 1.6%, secondary school graduates 2.6%, high school graduates 21.6%, bachelor's degree graduates 56.9%, and individuals with postgraduate education 17.2%. The income level of the participants was as follows: 6.1% had 17,000 TL and below, 21.6% between 17,001-30,000 TL, 32.0% between 30,001-50,000 TL, and 40.2% had 50,000 TL and above. Of those who participate in recreational activities, 54.8% go paragliding, 14.6% go rafting, 8.0% go on a jeep safari, 10.4% go on an ATV safari, and 11.3% go diving. Examining participation in recreational activities by region, 76.6% participate in the Alanya region, 16.0% in the Ölüdeniz region, 2.1% in the Marmaris region, and 4.9% in the Kemer region. The responses to the question, "Do you only do recreational activities on holiday?" were 53.2% yes and 46.8% no. Among the responses to the question, "What is your style of purchasing recreational activities?", 45.6% identified as adventurous, 21.2% social, 16.9% relaxing, 2.8% utilitarian, and 13.4% unplanned.

**Table 2.** Comparison of risk taking and motivation scores according to gender variable

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Z	p
Etical sub-dimension	Woman	185	191.60	35446.50	-3.230	<b>0.001</b>
	Men	240	229.49	55078.50		
Financial sub-dimension	Woman	185	174.21	32228.50	-5.729	<b>0.000</b>
	Men	240	242.90	58296.50		
Health/safety sub-dimension	Woman	185	178.53	33027.50	-5.084	<b>0.000</b>
	Men	240	239.57	57497.50		
Recreational sub-dimension	Woman	185	190.99	35332.50	-3.246	<b>0.001</b>
	Men	240	229.97	55192.50		
Social sub-dimension	Woman	185	209.81	38815.50	-.470	0.638
	Men	240	215.46	51709.50		
<b>RISK TOTAL</b>	Woman	185	175.13	32399.00	-5.581	<b>0.000</b>
	Men	240	242.19	58126.00		
Achievement orientation	Woman	185	193.14	35731.00	-2.931	<b>0.003</b>
	Men	240	228.31	54794.00		

Difficulty sub-dimension	Woman	185	183.31	33912.00	-4.381	<b>0.000</b>
	Men	240	235.89	56613.00		
Risk taking sub-dimension	Woman	185	175.27	32425.50	-5.568	<b>0.000</b>
	Men	240	242.08	58099.50		
Individuality sub-dimension	Woman	185	211.14	39060.00	-.276	0.783
	Men	240	214.44	51465.00		
Innovation sub-dimension	Woman	185	198.59	36740.00	-2.130	<b>0.033</b>
	Men	240	224.10	53785.00		
<b>MOTIVATION TOTAL</b>	Woman	185	182.10	33688.00	-4.554	<b>0.000</b>
	Men	240	236.82	56837.00		

When the risk-taking scores in Table 2 were examined according to the gender variable, no statistically significant difference was found in the social sub-dimension only ( $p>0.05$ ), while significant differences were found in favor of male individuals in all other sub-dimensions (finance, health/finance, and recreation) and in total scores ( $p<0.05$ ). When the motivation scores were evaluated, only no statistically significant difference was found in the individualism sub-dimension ( $p>0.05$ ), but significant differences were found in favor of male individuals in all other sub-dimensions (success, challenge, risk-taking, and innovation), and in total scores ( $p<0.05$ ).

**Table 3.** Comparison of risk taking and motivation scores according to marital status variable

	Marital statu	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Z	p
Etical sub-dimension	Married	175	208.36	36463.00	-.667	0.505
	Single	250	216.25	54062.00		
Financial sub-dimension	Married	175	209.14	36599.00	-.544	0.587
	Single	250	215.70	53926.00		
Health/safety sub-dimension	Married	175	211.07	36937.00	-.271	0.786
	Single	250	214.35	53588.00		
Recreational sub-dimension	Married	175	190.92	33411.50	-3.102	<b>0.002</b>
	Single	250	228.45	57113.50		
Social sub-dimension	Married	175	201.61	35281.50	-1.602	0.109
	Single	250	220.97	55243.50		
<b>RISK TOTAL</b>	Married	175	198.93	34813.00	-1.976	<b>0.048</b>
	Single	250	222.85	55712.00		
Achievement orientation	Married	175	220.44	38577.50	-1.047	0.295
	Single	250	207.79	51947.50		
Difficulty sub-dimension	Married	175	213.63	37385.50	-.089	0.929
	Single	250	212.56	53139.50		
Risk taking sub-dimension	Married	175	214.15	37477.00	-.162	0.871
	Single	250	212.19	53048.00		
Individuality sub-dimension	Married	175	205.48	35959.50	-1.059	0.289
	Single	250	218.26	54565.50		
Innovation sub-dimension	Married	175	216.13	37822.50	-.441	0.659
	Single	250	210.81	52702.50		
<b>MOTIVATION TOTAL</b>	Married	175	216.01	37801.00	-.422	0.673
	Single	250	210.90	52724.00		

When risk taking and motivation are compared according to the marital status variable in Table 3, a significant difference is observed only in the recreation sub-dimension, as well as a slight but significant difference in the total risk taking score ( $p<0.05$ ). No significant difference is

found in any other sub-dimension ( $p>0.05$ ), indicating that there is no significant effect on motivation levels in the success sub-dimension and individuality sub-dimension ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 4.** Comparison of risk taking and motivation scores according to the educational status variable

	<b>Educational statu</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean Rank</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
Etical sub-dimension	Elementary School	7	218.93	4	0.798
	Middle School	11	170.91		
	High School	92	214.09		
	Bachelor	242	212.14		
	Post Graduate	73	220.25		
Financial sub-dimension	Elementary School	7	257.29	4	0.110
	Middle School	11	175.18		
	High School	92	208.22		
	Bachelor	242	205.94		
	Post Graduate	73	243.90		
Health/safety sub-dimension	Elementary School	7	304.21	4	<b>0.003</b>
	Middle School	11	138.82		
	High School	92	245.38		
	Bachelor	242	203.13		
	Post Graduate	73	207.35		
Recreational sub-dimension	Elementary School	7	207.29	4	0.142
	Middle School	11	161.36		
	High School	92	225.80		
	Bachelor	242	203.73		
	Post Graduate	73	235.94		
Social sub-dimension	Elementary School	7	236.00	4	0.407
	Middle School	11	142.27		
	High School	92	213.79		
	Bachelor	242	214.13		
	Post Graduate	73	216.71		
<b>RISK TOTAL</b>	Elementary School	7	233.29	4	<b>0.022</b>
	Middle School	11	127.86		
	High School	92	228.36		
	Bachelor	242	203.00		
	Post Graduate	73	237.67		
Achievement orientation	Elementary School	7	216.36	4	0.947
	Middle School	11	190.27		
	High School	92	212.95		
	Bachelor	242	215.95		
	Post Graduate	73	206.37		
Difficulty sub-dimension	Elementary School	7	224.79	4	0.973
	Middle School	11	208.50		
	High School	92	215.47		
	Bachelor	242	214.51		
	Post Graduate	73	204.45		
Risk taking sub-dimension	Elementary School	7	227.93	4	0.944
	Middle School	11	196.64		
	High School	92	216.53		
	Bachelor	242	209.90		
	Post Graduate	73	219.88		
Individuality sub-dimension	Elementary School	7	219.43	4	0.561
	Middle School	11	160.68		
	High School	92	218.29		
	Bachelor	242	216.48		
	Post Graduate	73	202.06		
	Elementary School	7	144.00		
	Middle School	11	200.45		

Innovation sub-dimension	High School	92	206.32	4	0.556
	Bachelor	242	217.96		
	Post Graduate	73	213.49		
<b>MOTIVATION TOTAL</b>	Elementary School	7	215.00	4	0.996
	Middle School	11	200.36		
	High School	92	214.16		
	Bachelor	242	213.90		
	Post Graduate	73	210.27		

In Table 4, when risk taking and motivation are compared according to the education status variable, a significant difference was found only in the health/safety sub-dimension of the risk taking scale and the total risk taking score ( $p < 0.05$ ), but no significant difference was found in the other dimensions the total motivation score ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 5.** Comparison of risk taking and motivation scores according to the recreational activity variable

	Activity	N	Mean Rank	df	p
Etical sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	202.13	4	0.070
	Rafting	62	219.05		
	Jeep Safari	34	187.87		
	Atv Safari	44	252.64		
	Diving	48	221.89		
Financial sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	203.22	4	0.399
	Rafting	62	211.81		
	Jeep Safari	34	203.88		
	Atv Safari	44	233.99		
	Diving	48	231.69		
Health/safety sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	195.90	4	<b>0.018</b>
	Rafting	62	209.21		
	Jeep Safari	34	222.24		
	Atv Safari	44	253.47		
	Diving	48	239.72		
Recreational sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	218.33	4	0.147
	Rafting	62	179.19		
	Jeep Safari	34	201.09		
	Atv Safari	44	202.97		
	Diving	48	230.89		
Social sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	212.03	4	0.615
	Rafting	62	220.15		
	Jeep Safari	34	183.21		
	Atv Safari	44	203.07		
	Diving	48	221.11		
<b>RISK TOTAL</b>	Paragliding	233	206.05	4	0.193
	Rafting	62	196.08		
	Jeep Safari	34	201.44		
	Atv Safari	44	229.70		
	Diving	48	243.95		
Achievement orientation	Paragliding	233	224.16	4	<b>0.013</b>
	Rafting	62	204.90		
	Jeep Safari	34	230.76		
	Atv Safari	44	163.74		
	Diving	48	184.34		
Difficulty sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	216.92	4	0.410
	Rafting	62	196.46		
	Jeep Safari	34	227.51		
	Atv Safari	44	185.78		
	Diving	48	212.45		
	Paragliding	233	218.20		

Risk taking sub-dimension	Rafting	62	213.30	4	0.446
	Jeep Safari	34	206.21		
	Atv Safari	44	181.18		
	Diving	48	203.80		
Individuality sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	204.97	4	0.676
	Rafting	62	215.76		
	Jeep Safari	34	213.78		
	Atv Safari	44	234.39		
	Diving	48	210.74		
Innovation sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	209.69	4	0.084
	Rafting	62	217.65		
	Jeep Safari	34	234.63		
	Atv Safari	44	168.49		
	Diving	48	231.02		
<b>MOTIVATION TOTAL</b>	Paragliding	233	217.78	4	0.237
	Rafting	62	205.56		
	Jeep Safari	34	229.32		
	Atv Safari	44	175.31		
	Diving	48	204.84		

In Table 5, when risk taking and motivation are compared according to the recreational activity variable, a significant difference was found only in the health/safety sub-dimension of risk taking ( $p < 0.05$ ) and a significant difference in the success sub-dimension of motivation ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 6.** Comparison of risk-taking and motivation scores by recreational activity area

	Region	N	Mean Rank	df	p
Etical sub-dimension	Alanya	327	224.24	3	<b>0.000</b>
	Ölüdeniz	68	153.76		
	Marmaris	9	177.39		
	Kemer	21	245.10		
Financial sub-dimension	Alanya	327	217.67	3	0.176
	Ölüdeniz	68	194.32		
	Marmaris	9	147.83		
	Kemer	21	228.74		
Health/safety sub-dimension	Alanya	327	228.46	3	<b>0.000</b>
	Ölüdeniz	68	161.88		
	Marmaris	9	151.89		
	Kemer	21	164.05		
Recreational sub-dimension	Alanya	327	206.60	3	0.170
	Ölüdeniz	68	241.59		
	Marmaris	9	196.39		
	Kemer	21	227.24		
Social sub-dimension	Alanya	327	216.06	3	0.625
	Ölüdeniz	68	197.93		
	Marmaris	9	189.11		
	Kemer	21	224.43		
<b>RISK TOTAL</b>	Alanya	327	219.50	3	0.159
	Ölüdeniz	68	191.56		
	Marmaris	9	153.11		
	Kemer	21	206.93		
Achievement orientation	Alanya	327	205.58	3	0.112
	Ölüdeniz	68	242.02		
	Marmaris	9	202.94		
	Kemer	21	238.88		
	Alanya	327	207.88		

Difficulty sub-dimension	Ölüdeniz	68	235.22	3	0.284
	Marmaris	9	185.33		
	Kemer	21	232.64		
Risk taking sub-dimension	Alanya	327	209.55	3	0.493
	Ölüdeniz	68	229.10		
	Marmaris	9	180.50		
Individuality sub-dimension	Kemer	21	228.55	3	0.059
	Alanya	327	220.17		
	Ölüdeniz	68	181.25		
Innovation sub-dimension	Marmaris	9	162.56	3	0.342
	Kemer	21	225.79		
	Alanya	327	207.34		
<b>MOTIVATION TOTAL</b>	Ölüdeniz	68	236.43	3	0.392
	Marmaris	9	223.17		
	Kemer	21	220.98		
	Alanya	327	208.34	3	0.392
	Ölüdeniz	68	232.79		
	Marmaris	9	190.33		
	Kemer	21	231.14		

In Table 6, when risk taking and motivation are compared according to the recreational activity region variable, a significant difference was found only in the ethical and health/safety sub-dimensions of risk taking ( $p < 0.05$ ), while no significant difference was found in other sub-dimensions and total scores ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 7.** Comparison of risk-taking and motivation scores by recreational activity area

	<b>Region</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean Rank</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
Etical sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	202.13	4	0.070
	Rafting	62	219.05		
	Jeep Safari	34	187.87		
	Atv Safari	44	252.64		
	Diving	48	221.89		
Financial sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	203.22	4	0.399
	Rafting	62	211.81		
	Jeep Safari	34	203.88		
	Atv Safari	44	233.99		
	Diving	48	231.69		
Health/safety sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	195.90	4	<b>0.018</b>
	Rafting	62	209.21		
	Jeep Safari	34	222.24		
	Atv Safari	44	253.47		
	Diving	48	239.72		
Recreational sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	218.33	4	0.147
	Rafting	62	179.19		
	Jeep Safari	34	201.09		
	Atv Safari	44	202.97		
	Diving	48	230.89		
Social sub-dimension	Paragliding	233	212.03	4	0.615
	Rafting	62	220.15		
	Jeep Safari	34	183.21		
	Atv Safari	44	203.07		
	Diving	48	221.11		
<b>RISK TOTAL</b>	Paragliding	233	206.05	4	0.193
	Rafting	62	196.08		
	Jeep Safari	34	201.44		
	Atv Safari	44	229.70		

	Diving	48	243.95		
	Paragliding	233	224.16		
	Rafting	62	204.90		
Achievement orientation	Jeep Safari	34	230.76	4	<b>0.013</b>
	Atv Safari	44	163.74		
	Diving	48	184.34		
	Paragliding	233	216.92		
	Rafting	62	196.46		
Difficulty sub-dimension	Jeep Safari	34	227.51	4	0.410
	Atv Safari	44	185.78		
	Diving	48	212.45		
	Paragliding	233	218.20		
	Rafting	62	213.30		
Risk taking sub-dimension	Jeep Safari	34	206.21	4	0.446
	Atv Safari	44	181.18		
	Diving	48	203.80		
	Paragliding	233	204.97		
	Rafting	62	215.76		
Individuality sub-dimension	Jeep Safari	34	213.78	4	0.676
	Atv Safari	44	234.39		
	Diving	48	210.74		
	Paragliding	233	209.69		
	Rafting	62	217.65		
Innovation sub-dimension	Jeep Safari	34	234.63	4	0.084
	Atv Safari	44	168.49		
	Diving	48	231.02		
	Paragliding	233	217.78		
	Rafting	62	205.56		
<b>MOTIVATION TOTAL</b>	Jeep Safari	34	229.32	4	0.237
	Atv Safari	44	175.31		
	Diving	48	204.84		

In Table 7, when risk taking and motivation are compared according to the recreational activity region variable, a significant difference was found only in the ethical and health/safety sub-dimensions of risk taking ( $p < 0.05$ ), while no significant difference was found in other sub-dimensions and total scores ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 8.** Comparison of risk-taking and motivation scores according to the variable of whether the activity is held on holiday

	Activity	N	Mean Rank	df	p
Etical sub-dimension	Yes	226	214.26	1	0.817
	No	199	211.57		
Financial sub-dimension	Yes	226	208.09	1	0.379
	No	199	218.58		
Health/safety sub-dimension	Yes	226	217.47	1	0.424
	No	199	207.92		
Recreational sub-dimension	Yes	226	196.31	1	<b>0.003</b>
	No	199	231.95		
Social sub-dimension	Yes	226	202.36	1	0.057
	No	199	225.08		
<b>RISK TOTAL</b>	Yes	226	201.39	1	0.038
	No	199	226.18		
Achievement orientation	Yes	226	204.40	1	0.123
	No	199	222.77		
Difficulty sub-dimension	Yes	226	204.66	1	0.135
	No	199	222.47		

Risk taking sub-dimension	Yes	226	203.40	1	0.085
	No	199	223.91		
Individuality sub-dimension	Yes	226	212.40	1	0.915
	No	199	213.68		
Innovation sub-dimension	Yes	226	205.01	1	0.152
	No	199	222.07		
<b>MOTIVATION TOTAL</b>	Yes	226	202.99	1	0.073
	No	199	224.37		

In Table 8, when risk taking and motivation are compared according to the variable of whether recreational activities are done on holiday, a significant difference was found only in the recreation sub-dimension of risk taking ( $p < 0.05$ ), but no significant difference was found in other sub-dimensions and total scores ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 9.** Comparison of risk taking and motivation scores according to the purchasing style variable

	<b>Region</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean Rank</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
Etical sub-dimension	Adventurer	194	213.22	4	0.148
	Social	90	187.66		
	Relaxing	72	225.92		
	Utilitarian	12	246.00		
	Unplanned	57	229.02		
Financial sub-dimension	Adventurer	194	207.36	4	<b>0.010</b>
	Social	90	187.44		
	Relaxing	72	224.15		
	Utilitarian	12	205.79		
	Unplanned	57	260.00		
Health/safety sub-dimension	Adventurer	194	219.18	4	<b>0.000</b>
	Social	90	170.49		
	Relaxing	72	214.88		
	Utilitarian	12	173.25		
	Unplanned	57	265.09		
Recreational sub-dimension	Adventurer	194	223.88	4	0.052
	Social	90	196.36		
	Relaxing	72	228.99		
	Utilitarian	12	232.75		
	Unplanned	57	177.88		
Social sub-dimension	Adventurer	194	209.56	4	<b>0.046</b>
	Social	90	187.62		
	Relaxing	72	221.33		
	Utilitarian	12	243.17		
	Unplanned	57	247.89		
<b>RISK TOTAL</b>	Adventurer	194	215.83	4	<b>0.015</b>
	Social	90	176.56		
	Relaxing	72	227.56		
	Utilitarian	12	214.33		
	Unplanned	57	242.25		
Achievement orientation	Adventurer	194	207.46	4	0.482
	Social	90	222.08		
	Relaxing	72	224.31		
	Utilitarian	12	246.58		
	Unplanned	57	196.17		
Difficulty sub-dimension	Adventurer	194	225.04	4	0.330
	Social	90	208.78		
	Relaxing	72	203.63		
	Utilitarian	12	220.13		
	Unplanned	57	189.04		
	Adventurer	194	235.62		

Risk taking sub-dimension	Social	90	194.23	4	<b>0.007</b>
	Relaxing	72	195.92		
	Utilitarian	12	235.21		
	Unplanned	57	182.55		
Individuality sub-dimension	Adventurer	194	202.65	4	0.298
	Social	90	218.19		
	Relaxing	72	231.34		
	Utilitarian	12	257.88		
Innovation sub-dimension	Unplanned	57	207.43	4	0.379
	Adventurer	194	215.47		
	Social	90	213.35		
	Relaxing	72	214.26		
<b>MOTIVATION TOTAL</b>	Utilitarian	12	266.67	4	0.263
	Unplanned	57	191.16		
	Adventurer	194	222.22		
	Social	90	208.47		
	Relaxing	72	208.49	4	0.263
	Utilitarian	12	252.25		
	Unplanned	57	186.21		

When risk taking and motivation are compared according to the purchasing styles variable in Table 9, a statistically significant difference was found in the total score of risk taking across the finance, health/safety, and social dimensions ( $p < 0.05$ ). In addition, a significant difference was found in the risk section, a sub-dimension of motivation, while no statistically significant difference was found in the other sub-dimensions and the total score of motivation ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 10.** The relationship between risk taking and motivation

	1	2	3	4	5	<b>RISK TOTAL</b>	6	7	8	9	10	<b>MOT. TOTAL</b>
Etical (1)	r 1.000											
Financial (2)	r .454**	1.000										
Health/safety (3)	r .459**	.450**	1.000									
Recreational (4)	r .173**	.284**	.188**	1.000								
Social (5)	r .286**	.307**	.440**	.324**	1.000							
<b>RISK TOTAL</b>	r .560**	.688**	.721**	.670**	.661**	1.000						
Achievement (6)	r -.126**	-0.086	-.138**	.221**	.107*	0.041	1.000					
Difficulty (7)	r 0.012	.138**	0.045	.407**	.167**	.274**	.670**	1.000				
Risk taking (8)	r .161**	.241**	.220**	.367**	.243**	.396**	.431**	.725**	1.000			
Individuality (9)	r .200**	0.090	.116*	0.056	0.086	.121*	.239**	.355**	.318**	1.000		
Innovation (10)	r 0.006	0.025	0.054	.262**	.214**	.192**	.564**	.608**	.514**	.244**	1.000	
<b>MOTIVATION TOTAL</b>	r 0.062	.117*	0.077	.374**	.213**	.287**	.770**	.916**	.810**	.486**	.743**	1.000

In Table 10, a positive significant relationship was observed between the total risk taking score and the total motivation score ( $r = .287$   $p < 0.05$ ), while a positive significant relationship was also observed between the risk taking sub-dimensions and the motivation sub-dimensions ( $p < 0.05$ ).

## DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationship between risk-taking tendencies and motivation levels among individuals participating in outdoor recreational activities and assessed significant differences across various demographic variables. The findings are discussed and compared with similar studies in the literature.

According to the research findings, male participants were found to have higher risk-taking and motivation levels compared to female participants. This result shows significant differences,

particularly in the financial, health/safety, and recreation sub-dimensions. This finding is consistent with the results of Gözen's (2020) study, which found that males exhibit a higher risk-taking tendency. Similarly, Beşikçi (2023) also revealed that male participants' risk-taking behaviors were more pronounced than those of female participants. Akyüz et al. (2023) also found that male participants had higher risk-taking scores compared to female participants in their study. On the other hand, some studies argue that gender does not have a decisive effect on risk-taking behavior. For example, Yıldız et al. (2021) stated that gender did not make a significant difference in risk-taking tendency. Furthermore, Demirtaş and Kılıç (2022) stated that motivation levels did not vary by gender.

A significant difference was found in the recreation subscale and the total risk-taking score only. Single individuals appear to have a higher tendency to take risks than married individuals. This may be associated with individuals' lifestyle and responsibility levels. Beşikçi (2023) similarly stated that single individuals tend to take higher risks. Furthermore, a study conducted at Erbakan University emphasized that marital status can influence risk-taking behavior (Yolcu, 2024). However, some studies indicate that marital status does not have a significant effect on risk-taking or motivation. For example, Karaca and Demir (2020) stated that marital status is not a determining factor in recreational motivation. Similarly, Gözen (2020) reported that marital status did not create a significant difference in motivation levels.

A significant difference was found only in the health/safety subscale and the total risk-taking score, based on education level. This finding suggests that individuals make more conscious choices regarding risk-taking behaviors as their level of education increases. Gözen (2020) stated that individuals with higher education levels make decisions by better analyzing risks. Furthermore, an Erbakan University study similarly emphasized that education level affects risk perception (Yolcu, 2024). In contrast, Beşikçi (2023) found that education level had no significant effect on risk-taking behavior. Similarly, Yıldız et al. (2021) argued that education level is not a determining factor in motivation.

A significant difference based on activity type was found only in the health/safety subscale and the success subscale. Individuals participating in higher-risk activities, such as ATV safaris and diving, had higher risk-taking scores. This finding is consistent with Gözen's (2020) study, which found that risky activities increase individuals' motivation. Furthermore, Beşikçi (2023) stated that high-risk activities provide higher motivation and satisfaction, in individuals. However, some researchers, such as Karaca and Demir (2020), argue that activity type is not a determinant of risk-taking behavior. Similarly, Demirtaş and Kılıç (2022) stated that activity type did not make a significant difference in motivation levels.

The study found that risk-taking scores of those who did not participate in recreational activities during their vacation differed significantly only in the recreation dimension compared to those who did participate. When comparing risk-taking in recreational activity areas, Kemer region stood out in terms of ethical dimensions, while Alanya region stood out in terms of health/safety dimensions. When risk-taking and motivation were compared according to the purchasing style variable, it was observed that the unplanned style was preferred more in the total risk-taking score in the financial, health/safety, and social dimensions.

One of the key findings of the study is a significant positive relationship between risk taking and motivation. This suggests that individuals' risk-taking tendencies increase their motivation. Studies by Gözen (2020) and Beşikçi (2023) similarly indicate that risk-taking behaviors

increase individuals' intrinsic motivation. However, some studies argue that this relationship is weak or insignificant. For example, Yıldız et al. (2021) found no significant relationship between risk taking and motivation. Similarly, Yolcu's (2024) research also showed that this relationship may vary depending on individual differences.

The fact that the majority of participants were from the Alanya region and that more than half were individuals solely engaged in paragliding is among the limitations of the study. The study found that men have higher risk-taking and motivation levels than women. Single individuals tend to take more risks than married individuals. As education level increases, health/safety risk perception increases, but motivation levels do not change significantly. It was observed that participants, especially those involved in the ATV safari recreational activity, paid attention to the health/safety aspect of risk-taking, and were also success-oriented in terms of motivation. The type of recreational activity affects individuals' risk perception and motivation levels in certain sub-dimensions. When comparing risk-taking in recreational activity areas, Kemer region stood out in terms of ethical dimensions, while Alanya region stood out in terms of health/safety dimensions. When risk-taking and motivation were compared according to the purchasing style variable, it was observed that the unplanned style was preferred more in the total risk-taking score in the financial, health/safety, and social dimensions.

There is a positive and significant correlation between risk-taking and motivation; as individuals take more risks, their motivation levels also increase. In this context, regular risk management training should be provided for instructors. They should be prepared for potential hazards. Separate risk plans should be prepared for each activity type. For example, special safety measures should be provided for riskier activities such as ATV riding or diving.

## REFERENCES

- Akyüz, O., Alper, R., & Bayazıt, B. (2023). Üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreasyon aktivitelerine katılım motivasyonu üzerine karşılaştırmalı bir çalışma. *CBÜ Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 18(2), 439-454.
- Beşikçi, T. (2023). Macera rekreasyonu katılımcılarının risk alma davranışları ve mutluluk düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Akdeniz Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1-Cumhuriyet'in 100. Yılı Özel Sayısı), 1083-1099.
- Blais, A. R., & Weber, E. U. (2006). A domain-specific risk-taking (dospert) scale for adult populations. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 1, 33-47.
- Buckley, R. (2012). Rush as a key motivation in skilled adventure tourism: resolving the risk paradox. *Tourism*, 33(4), 961-970 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.Tourman.2011.10.002>.
- Çelebi, A., & Özbey, B. (2020). Rekreasyon. Mirzeoğlu, N. (Ed.) *Spor bilimlerine giriş* içinde (265-294). Spor Yayınevi ve Kitabevi.
- Demirtaş, M., & Kılıç, S. (2022). Etkinlik türünün motivasyon düzeyleri üzerindeki etkisi. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(2), 123-137.
- Dinç, S. C. (2018). *Doğa sporları etkinliklerine ilişkin liderlik ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi*. Spor Yayınevi ve Kitabevi.
- Dinç, S. C., & Tez, Ö. Y. (2019). Alana özgü risk alma ölçeği-kısa formu'nun (dospert) türkçeye uyarlama çalışması. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 30(3), 107-120.
- Dinç, S. C., & Yavaş Tez, Ö. (2021). Macera rekreasyonu katılımcılarının risk alma davranışlarında farklılık yaratan değişkenlerin incelenmesi. *International Journal of Sport Exercise and Training Sciences-Ijsets*, 7(4), 203-219. <https://doi.org/10.18826/Useeabd.1002314>
- Ewert, A. (1985). Why people climb: The relationship of participant motives and experience level to mountaineering. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 17(3), 241-250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1985.11969619>
- Gözen, E. (2020). Açık alan rekreasyon aktivitelerine katılmayı motive eden faktörlere yönelik ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(3), 2197-2209. <https://doi.org/10.26677/TR1010.2020.475>
- Hardiman, N., & Burgin, S. (2011). Canyoning adventure recreation in the blue mountains world heritage area (Australia): The canyoning trends over the last decade. *Tourism Management*, 32, 1324-1331.
- Jenkins, J., & Pigram, J. (2006). *Outdoor recreation management* (Second Edt.). Routledge.
- Karaca, H., & Demir, E. (2020). Medeni durumun rekreatif motivasyon üzerindeki etkisi. *Spor ve Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(1), 33-47.
- Karakaya, İ. (2014). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. Tanrıoğen A. (Ed). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Anı Yayıncılık.
- Kinczel, A., Maklári, G., & Müller, A. (2020). Recreational activities and motivation among young people. *Geosport For Society*, 12(1), 53-65. <https://doi.org/10.30892/gss.1206-059>
- Müderrişoğlu, H., Aşikkutlu, H. S., Kalaycı, A., & Salantur, B. (2006). Rekreasyonel motivasyonların belirlenmesi: Spor tesisi örneği. *Düzce Üniversitesi Orman Fakültesi Ormanlık Dergisi*, 2(2), 15-23.
- Umaç, E. (2021). Rekreasyon ve sosyal beceriler. *CBÜ Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(2), 67-78.
- Raadik, J., Cottrell, S. P., Fredman, P., Ritter, P., & Newman, P. (2010). Understanding recreational experience preferences: Application at fulufjället national park, sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 10(3), 231-247.

- Szabo, A., & Ábrahám, J. (2013). Rekreasyonun sosyal becerilere etkisi. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 45(3), 123-135.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6. Edt.). Pearson.
- Yolcu, A. F. (2024). *Sportif rekreasyon faaliyeti olarak doğa ve macera sporları yapan bireylerin akış deneyimleri ve risk alma eğilimlerinin incelenmesi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi.
- Yıldız, A., Demirtaş, M., & Kılıç, S. (2021). Cinsiyetin risk alma eğilimi üzerindeki etkisi. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(2), 45-59.
- Weber, K. (2001). Outdoor adventure tourism a review of research approaches. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 360-377.
- Weber, E. U., Blais, A. R., & Betz, N. (2002). A Domain specific risk attitude scale: Measuring risk perceptions and risk behaviors. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 15, 263-290.
- Zuckerman, M. (2007). *Sensation seeking and risky behavior*. American Psychological Association.