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Abstract

The objective of this master thesis was to determine the different motivations for Dutch runners to participate in traditional versus innovative running events. Traditional running events are running events that have been applied in the same way (in the Netherlands) for decades. Innovative running events are those that are ‘new’ and have a fun factor or are combined with other sports. The research question: ‘What motivates Dutch runners to participate in traditional versus innovative running events’ is answered through qualitative, explorative research. The Achievement Goal Theory and Self Determination Theory are used to generate insight in intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors of Dutch runners. The results have shown that the most important motivations to participate in traditional running events are the challenge, atmosphere, a satisfied feeling, a social aspect and recreation. On the other hand, participants of innovative running events are especially motivated to participate because they enjoy the event, want to participate with friends and they want to achieve the physical challenge. In the end, this means that the majority of participants of both events are intrinsically motivated to participate in running events. However, relating this to running as a sports activity, it could be concluded that participants of traditional running events are intrinsically motivated to go for a run and participants of innovative running events are more extrinsically motivated.
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1. Introduction
This section introduces the topic of this master thesis: runner’s motivation in traditional versus innovative running events. First, the topic will be introduced and the differences between traditional and innovative running events will be explained. Thereafter, the current running market in the Netherlands is described and the gap in literature is set up. Besides, a research question is prepared in this paragraph.

1.1 Introduction to the topic
There are several factors by which people can be motivated to work out. Some people are intrinsically motivated to participate in sports, whereas others are more extrinsically motivated. Why is this? And what is someone’s intrinsic or extrinsic motivation to participate in sports? The term “sport” is a broad concept, this research specifically focuses on running. The reason for this focus is because running is one of the most popular sports in the Netherlands (Scheerder, Breedveld, Borgers, 2015, p. 192). The popularity of running is defined by Scheerder et al (2015): ‘People see running as an activity that is easy to learn and is good for one’s health. This image contributes to the popularity of the sport’ (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 204). Besides, there are various running events organized in the Netherlands every year (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 204). One of them is the ‘traditional’ running event. In addition, a new type of running event has been upcoming the past few years. These running events are called ‘innovative’ running events within this research. To elaborate further on this, traditional running events could be defined as running events that have been applied in the same way (in the Netherlands) for decades. A traditional running event could be seen as an event with the same, particular distance(s) every year, and in which running is the only physical sport. Examples of traditional running events are ‘De Zevenheuvelenloop’, ‘Eindhovense Marathon’ and ‘Dam tot Dam loop’. Innovative running events are seen as running events that are ‘new’ and have a different approach than traditional running events. These could be seen as running events which are characterized with a fun factor or which are combined with other sports (e.g. swimming, climbing or adding obstacles) (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 201). Examples of innovative running events are ‘Mud Runs’, ‘Color Runs’ or ‘Obstacle Runs’. The last few years, traditional running events have lost market share, being possibly caused by the arrival of innovative running events (Zevenheuvelenloop, 2018).
1.2 The Dutch running market

The Dutch Running market is studied by various researchers (Scheerder et al., 2015) (Hover et al., 2014) (Hover, 2013) (Bottenburg & Hover, 2009). The current literature concerning running events are described first. Thereafter, the popularity of the sport is explained as ’waves of running’ in paragraph 1.2.2. Thereafter, the profile of the Dutch runner is showed in paragraph 1.2.3 and the current literature about runners’ motivation is described in paragraph 1.2.4.

1.2.1 Running events

Several studies investigated the current sports and runners market in the Netherlands (Hover et al., 2014) (Hover, 2013) (Scheerder et al., 2015) (Bottenburg & Hover, 2009). Hover et al. (2014) investigated sport events within the Netherlands. There are 10,000 large and small sport events held in the Netherlands every year. Sport events are important for several reasons: for the sport itself and the participants, but it could also lead to opportunities for businesses and politics. These opportunities are for example realized by the development of locations for network shorts, VIP arrangements and business meetings (Hover et al., 2014, p. 275). Therefore, the Dutch government invested about 4.7 million euro in sport events over the last few years. Next to that, several towns and provinces invested in sport events. In total, the investments of the governments are approximately 30 million euro per year (Hover et al., 2014, p. 276). As a result of these investments, sport events generate income. Visiting sport events is a popular leisure activity in the Netherlands. At least once a year, sport events are visited by four out of ten adults (either participant or spectating). Expressed in terms of numbers, events are visited by 5.2 million people yearly, resulting in 77 million visits and in total 1 milliard euro spent (Hover et al., 2014, p. 275).

There were about 2,000 running events held per year in The Netherlands. Scheerder et al. (2015) mentioned in his study that organizers of Dutch events developed new concepts and/or introduced these from abroad, in order to reach and create new market segments (Scheerder et al., 2015). In the Netherlands, these events grow exponentially the last few years. For example, the number of participants of the ‘Dutch Fisherman’s Friend Strongman Run’ has doubled within 3 years (Scheerder et al., 2015). These kind of events are called ‘innovative running events’ within this research. Therefore, Dutch running events are split up into traditional running events and innovative running events within this study.
1.2.2 Three waves of running

Running is one of the most popular sports in the Netherlands. Only fitness (22%), swimming (18%) and hiking (14%) are practiced by a larger group of the Dutch population (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 192). Scheerder et al. (2015) defined a runner as someone who runs at least twelve times a year. There have been two “waves of running” within the Netherlands, one in the ‘60s and the second one in the early ‘90s. A “wave of running” could be defined as: ‘a period of growth in participation in running after a period of decline or stabilization’ (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 192). The number of Dutch runners was quite stable (10%) between the years 2006 to 2011. However, since 2012, the number of running participants increased to 13%. Therefore, Hover (2013) stated that a third wave of running developed in 2012 (Hover, 2013). In 2012, there was a significant increase in running participation of 30% in comparison to 2011 (from 10% to 13%). The drivers for this third wave were: 1) An increased importance of being slim, muscular, fit and healthy. 2) A strong increase among women participating in running activities. 3) The development of various running opportunities: the number of running events increased and there are more different distances available. 4) The improved professionalism and increased commercialization of running events (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 193). Interestingly, the arrival of ‘innovative running events’ is not taken into account within the research of Scheerder et al. (2015). Scheerder et al. (2015), only stated that there is a development of various running events (referred to various distances). As far as they show in their research, they did not investigate whether the addition of innovative sport events had an influence on the increased number of runners. Although, according to Rodriguez (2015), the arrival of innovative running events could be a cause of the increase in the number of runners since 2012. This is based on the fact that only obstacle runs (one part of innovative running events) have been seen as the fastest growing sport in the United States. This concept grew in three years (2010-2013) from 40.000 to 3.5 million participants (Rodriguez, 2015, p. 8). Obstacle runs became also popular in the Netherlands. The number of participants in obstacle runs grew from 13.000 in 2012 to 260.000 in 2018 (Cijfers Obstacle Run, 2019). Information above gives an overview of the Dutch runners’ market and the increased motivation of participants in the Netherlands over years.

1.2.3 Profile of the Dutch runner

Scheerder et al. (2015) defined the group of runners as heterogeneous. This means that the group of runners is diverse, and that there is not one specific running segment (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 204). There is little knowledge about the Dutch runner. However, Scheerder et al.
(2015) found that more than half of them are men (60%) and less than half of them women (40%). It was stated that the number of runners under the age of 35 decreased and the number of runners between the age of 35 to 49 years old increased. Next to that, half of the total number of runners consisted of highly-educated people (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 198). The study of Scheerder et al. (2015) defined another profile for ‘event runners’, which are mostly men (70%) or women (30%) who have a paid job and are in the age of 30 to 55 years old (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 200). It is not clear whether this profile is valid for all types of running events within the research. In other words, Scheerder et al. (2015) did not make a distinction between participants of traditional versus innovative running events.

As mentioned before, running is one of the most popular sports in the Netherlands (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 192). A runner is defined as someone who runs at least 12 times a year, according to Scheerder et al. (2015). This means that, - in 2012, - 13% of the Dutch population was seen as a ‘runner’ and that there are approximately 2,000 running events held in the Netherlands every year (Scheerder et al., 2015, pp. 192-200). It is interesting to mention that a particular segment is attracted by specific (mostly innovative) running events. For example, although running was not a popular sport for women in the past, Hover et al., (2014) found that the so called ‘ladies runs’ have caused an increase in women participating in running events (Hover et al., 2014, p. 275), which could be related to the outcome of the third wave of running of Scheerder et al. (2015). He mentioned also that one of the reasons for this third wave of running was an increase in women’s participation.

1.3 Motivation theories in sports
The research of Spray, Wang, Biddle, Chatzisarantiset (2006), Ntoumanis (2001) , Sit & Koenraad (2004), Tsorbatzoudis, Alexandris, Zahariadis, Grouios (2006) and Vallerand & Losier (1999) is interesting to mention since various intrinsic and extrinsic motivation theories in sports are researched in these studies (Spray et al., 2006, p. 43), (Ntoumanis, 2001, p. 397), (Sit & Koenraad, 2004, p. 605), (Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006, p. 364), (Vallerand & Losier, 1999, p. 143). These studies used several motivation theories to clarify intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of athletes. According to these studies, there are two commonly used motivation theories in sports, namely the ‘Achievement Goal Theory’ and the ‘Self Determination Theory’. These theories have extensive applications in sports and are therefore useful for the understanding of motivated behavior and cognitive, affective and behavioral outcomes (Ntoumanis, 2001, p. 397). The Achievement Goal Theory is useful for determining how
individuals varying in motivational orientation in their participation to sports (Sit & Koenraad, 2004, p. 605). On the other hand, the Self Determination Theory could be used in a sport setting to study consequences of motivation, since different types of motivation lead to varying outcomes (Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006, p. 364). Spray et al. (2006) suggested that testing multiple motivation theories in sport activities can provide a more comprehensive understanding of performance (Spray et al., 2006, p. 48). The Achievement Goal Theory determined that ones’ success and competence is dependent on the achievement of goals. This study divides these goals into 1) task-goals and 2) ego-goals (Spray et al., 2006, p. 44). Another popular motivation theory in sports is the Self Determination theory. This theory takes extrinsic and intrinsic motivation into account and includes one’s psychological needs for competence, autonomy and relatedness, which are the drivers for motivated behavior (Spray et al., 2006, p. 44). The Self Determination theory determines that when motivation becomes intrinsic, there is more motivation to participate in sport activities over time. Both motivation theories will be explained further in paragraph 2.4.

1.4 Relevance
This master thesis is both academically and socially relevant. First, the academic relevance will be explained in paragraph 1.4.1. Thereafter, the social relevance will be described in paragraph 1.4.2.

1.4.1 Academic relevance
This master thesis is academically relevant since this study will contribute to the current literature by combining intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors of traditional versus innovative running events. Especially the combination of the motivation in these two events is not studied before. Next to that, there is a contradiction in literature whether participants of traditional and / or innovative running events are intrinsically or extrinsically motivated. This contradiction is described in the next paragraph.

Innovative running events have been becoming increasingly popular and traditional running events have to deal with a losing market share (Zevenheuvelenloop, 2018). Rodriguez (2015) investigated only innovative running events in the United States. However he did not make any link or combination to traditional running events. Research investigating the traditional market was not focused especially on runners’ motivation to participate in running events (Scheerder et al., 2015) (Hover et al., 2014) (Hover, 2013). Therefore, there is little
knowledge about the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of Dutch participants in (traditional) running events. Next to that, these studies do not take the recent problem (losing market share) of traditional running events into account. Relating this to innovative running events. Rodriguez (2015) mentioned that people are intrinsically motivated for the participation in innovative running events. However, he also mentioned that the majority of participants participate in innovative running events because friends also participate. This leads to extrinsic motivation and thus also is a contradiction in literature.

The most important gap in literature is a study into (intrinsic and/or extrinsic) motivation of runners with the combination of traditional and innovative running events. This is not studied before and therefore it is not clear what people from traditional running events motivate to participate in traditional events and whether this motivation differs from participants of innovative running events. When both motivations are clearly described, one will get insight into whether the losing market share of traditional running events is caused by innovative running events. It also will be clarified whether the participants of innovative running events have a completely different motivation than participants of traditional running events.

1.4.2 social relevance
This research will be highly relevant for the organizers of running events. Expected is that there is a difference in the motivation of different types of running events since Scheerder et al. (2015) and Rodriguez (2015) mentioned both different motivational aspects for a) traditional and b) innovative running events in their research. If organizers know the intrinsic and extrinsic motives of different groups of runners who participate in running events, they could create value that better fits the(se) specific segment(s). Subsequently, sports events are important for societal and political purposes. The Dutch Ministry for Public Health, Welfare and Sports focuses on sports events because of economical and societal developments. Sports events in the Netherlands are for example important to stimulate sports participation, improve the economy, create solidarity and for city marketing (Hover et al., 2014).

1.5 Research question
The purpose of this study is to generate more insight in the motives of Dutch runners to participate in running events. The research question could be stated as follows: “What motivates Dutch runners to participate in traditional versus innovative running events?”.
1.6 Outline of this thesis

This thesis will continue with a literature review in the next chapter. Chapter 3 gives a clear insight in the chosen methodology. Chapter 4 shows the results and these will be discussed in chapter 5. Chapter 5 does also include practical and managerial limitations and an indication for future research. Chapter 6 describes the conclusion. The references being used for conducting this master thesis are stated in chapter 7.

2. Literature review

The literature review demonstrates the current level of knowledge regarding the Dutch sport and running market. To generate a clear understanding about motivation, this subject is described first. There are several theories to describe motivation and these are represented within paragraph 2.2. Next to that, a distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation is made. These concepts are explained and also supported by motivation theories. The information so far is relatively non-specific and therefore there is focused on motivation in sports in paragraph 2.4. Thereafter, motivation in Dutch running events is determined in paragraph 2.5.

2.1 Motivation

Motivation is a widely used concept which could determine (a part of) consumer behavior. Consumer behavior is affected by various sources, also known as the psychological core. The psychological core covers motivation, ability, and opportunity; exposure, attending, perception and comprehension; memory and knowledge; and attitudes about an offering (Hoyer, MacInnis, Pieters, 2018, p. 43). Motivation could be defined as ‘an inner state of activation that provides energy needed to achieve a goal’ (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 45). Next to motivation, other important aspects to achieve goals are opportunities and abilities. An opportunity is defined as the possibility to participate in activities, influenced by (a lack of) time, distraction and the complexity, amount, repetition and control of information (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 63). On the other hand, ability is defined as ‘the extent to which consumers have the required resources to make an outcome happen’ (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 60). According to Hoyer et al. (2018), it is important to understand that, even when one’s motivation is high, a goal cannot be reached when someone has not the opportunity or ability to reach that goal (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 65). Outcomes of high Motivation, Opportunity and Ability include goal-relevant behavior, high-
effort information processing, decision-making and felt involvement. However, within this study, the focus is put on motivation because this is closely related to sports: one should first get motivated before one is participating in sports. Opportunity and ability are also closely related to sport participation, though these concepts are difficult to influence. When one has not the opportunity or ability to participate in running events, he or she cannot participate. In contrast, when one is not motivated, the person is still able to participate in running events. Therefore, a delineation is made to focus solely on (external and internal) motivation.

Hoyer et al. (2018), mentioned that when one is motivated, he/she is energized, ready and willing to engage in a goal-relevant activity (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 45). Goals are outcomes that we would like to achieve. ‘Goal Setting comprises what to pursue and at what level’ (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 52). After goalsetting, people are motivated to form a goal intention, plan to take action, implement and control the action and evaluate success or failure in attaining the goal (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 52). Consumers learn from their experience and use this for future goal setting (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 52). According to Hoyer et al. (2018), ‘consumers are more likely to actually achieve a goal when they have a fixed rather than a flexible plan for goal pursuit, because it provides a definite set of steps to take in reaching the goal’ (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 52). Goals need to be realistic since consumers who have a plan may feel demotivated in their pursuit if they believe they are far away from their goal. However, they feel motivated when a recent action toward goal attainment was successful (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 52). Next to that, Hoyer et al. (2018) stated that consumers are more likely to continue working toward a goal if they set a target range, rather than a single, very specific goal. The reason for this is that people see the lower number as attainable and the higher number as a challenge. Last, when consumers have made little progress toward a goal, they are more motivated when there is a wide variety of ways to achieve it (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 52). Another important aspect in motivation is the degree of effort one exerts to achieve a goal (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 52). Hoyer et al. (2018) stated that ‘the amount of effort people exert to achieve a goal depends not only on how important the goal is to them, but also on how well they are doing in achieving other, potentially unrelated goals’ (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 52).

The definition of consumers being motivated with respect to a product, service or activity is called ‘felt involvement’. Felt involvement is defined as: ‘consumer’s experience of being motivated with respect to products, services, decisions and actions about these’ (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 45). There are four types of felt involvement, namely 1) enduring involvement
which refers to a long-term interest in an activity. 2) Situational involvement, which means that one is temporarily interested in an activity, often caused by situational circumstances. 3) Cognitive involvement, referring to interest in a certain subject by thinking about, learning and processing information related to a certain activity. 4) Affective involvement, which is related to expending emotional energy and raising deep feelings about an activity (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 47). Important factors to increase felt involvement, and thus motivation, is when something is perceived as personally relevant, consistent with someone’s self-concept (mental view of oneself), values, needs, goals, emotions and self-control processes. Other influencers for motivation are when something is of great risk and/or when something is moderately inconsistent with someone’s prior attitudes (Hoyer et al., 2018, p. 47). Someone’s motivation could change over time since there are different types of involvement. Someone’s motivation could for example change, depending on their current situation.

2.2 Motivation theories
To determine someone’s motivation, several motivation theories could be used as a starting point. There are multiple academic studies which determine motivation theories from different angles and perspectives. One of the most well-known motivation theories is ‘Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs’. Maslow stated that there are hierarchical needs which could be categorized within the pyramid (Maslow, 1943, pp. 372-382). Lower-order needs are fulfilled before one begins to fulfill higher order needs. The categorized needs stated by Maslow are (from lower-order- to higher-order needs), 1) psychological needs, 2) safety needs, 3) social needs, 4) egoistic needs and 5) self-actualization needs (Maslow, 1943, pp. 372-383). This theory focusses on the fulfillment of needs, which is in line with Hoyer et al. (2018). It was mentioned that the fulfillments of needs is important to increase motivation (Hoyer et al., 2018, pp. 48-52).

Sport participation could belong to all types of needs. However, sport is mostly related to the three higher-order needs. Therefore McClelland focused in the Acquired Needs Theory only on higher order needs (Moore, Grabsch, Rotter, 2010, p. 25). This technique is related to Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs (Pardee, 1990, p. 18). However, this theory only is focused on higher order needs, namely 1) achievement, 2) power and 3) affiliation. The Acquired Needs Theory states that people are not born with certain needs, but that these needs are acquired during childhood (Moore et al., 2010, p. 25) (Pardee, 1990, p. 14).
Another theory related to the three higher order needs - mentioned in Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and McClelland Acquired Needs Theory - is the Expectancy Theory of Vroom. He mentioned that motivation is the multiplication of Expectation * Instrumentality * Valence (Parijat & Bagga, 2014, pp. 2-3). Therefore, the relationship between efforts and performance is known as ‘Expectation’. Instrumentality is defined by the relationship between performance and rewards/work outcomes. Last, valence is the outcome of the relationship between rewards/work outcomes and personal goals (Parijat & Bagga, 2014, pp. 2-3). The stronger the relationships and links are, the higher the motivation. The theory describes that someone is motivated to act when there is an expectancy that his or her behavior could result in the achievement of the desired outcomes (Parijat & Bagga, 2014, p. 3). This could be linked to Hoyer et al. (2018), who also state that the achievement of goals lead to higher motivation.

To elaborate further on this, a theory especially made to link motivation to goals is the Goal Setting Theory. The Goal Setting Theory relates high motivation to the achievements of goals (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 705). The Goal Setting Theory assumes that people are motivated by goals, provided that goals are clear, specific and challenging. Therefore, self-efficacy is an important factor, which could be linked again to the higher order needs of Maslow. Assuming that people set their goals by themselves, people with high self-efficacy set higher goals than people with lower self-efficacy (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 706). Highly self-efficacious individuals are also more willing to achieve their goals, determine and use better task strategies and respond more positively to negative feedback than people with lower self-efficacy (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 706). Locke & Latham (2002), argued that specific and challenging goals would lead to higher performance than when one is forced to do his or her best. They mentioned even that when people are asked to do their best, they do not (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 706).

Above mentioned motivation theories are useful to determine one’s motivation in several situations. However, these motivation theories do not fully fit with extrinsic and intrinsic motivation in sports. Next, there are some motivation theories, which could be perfectly used for the sport market. These theories will be explained in paragraph 2.4. Most theories take intrinsic and/or extrinsic motivation into account. Therefore, in the next paragraph, a clear definition and distinction between extrinsic motivation theories and intrinsic motivation theories is made.
2.3 Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation

Motivation could be both intrinsic and/or extrinsic. To determine extrinsic and intrinsic motivations in sports, general motivation theories could be used. Motivation theories are built on a set of assumptions about the nature of people and their driving forces resulting in action (Deci & Ryan, 1985, p. 3). Extrinsic motivation is defined as the participation in activities because of social pressure and external rewards. One is not motivated by the activity itself, but this person feels pressure from family and friends or wants to win something by participating the activity (Broeck, Vansteenkiste, de Witte, Lens, and Andriessen, 2009, p. 322). On the other hand, intrinsic motivation could be defined as the participation in activities because the activity itself is perceived as interesting or fun. One wants to participate in the activity without getting something back, the activity itself is enough to participate (Broeck et al., 2009, p. 322). Next to extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, Deci et al., (1985) makes a distinction between mechanic theories and organismic theories: ‘Mechanic theories tend to view the human organism as passive, that is, as being pushed around by the interaction of psychological drivers and environmental stimuli, whereas organismic theories tend to view the organism as active, that is, as being volitional and initiating behaviors’ (Deci & Ryan, 1985, p. 3). Mechanic theories could be linked to extrinsic motivation and organismic theories could be linked to intrinsic motivations.

A short overview about good examples of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation theories (which are also examined above/below) is made. Examples of good intrinsic motivation theories are Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and McClelland’s Acquired Needs Theory (Maslow, 1943) (Spray et al., 2006) (Moore et al., 2010)(Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996). On the other hand, examples of extrinsic motivation theories are Vroom’s Expectancy Theory and Latham’s Goal Setting Theory (Parijat & Bagga, 2014) (Locke & Latham, 2002). There also is a motivation theory which combined intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, namely Nicholls Achievement Goal Theory and Deci and Ryan’s Self Determination Theory (Sit & Koenraad, 2004) (Spray et al., 2006). However, not all mentioned motivation theories could be used within this research. There is chosen for the motivation theories which best fit with the sports market, namely the Achievement Goal Theory and the Self Determination Theory (Spray et al., 2006) (Ntoumanis, 2001) (Sit & Koenraad, 2004) (Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006). The Achievement Goal Theory matches sports since this theory is suitable for determining how individuals varying in motivational orientation differ in their participation motives int he sport context (Sit &
Koenraad, 2004, p. 605). Next, several sports psychologists embraced the Achievement Goal Theory to determine motivation in sports (Duda, 2001), (Duda & Hall, 2001), (Roberts, 2001). On the other hand, the Self-Determination Theory is also important in determining one’s motivation in sports, because this theory could be used in a sports setting to study consequences of motivation, since different types of motivation lead to varied outcomes (Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006, p. 364). Therefore, this research focused especially on these two motivation theories, which will be further explained in relation to motivation in sports in the next paragraph.

2.4 Motivation (theories) in sports

As mentioned in section 1.3 and 2.3, the Achievement Goal- and Self Determination Theory are frequently used theories to explain people’s motivation in sport. First, the Achievement Goal Theory is described in section 2.4.1. Thereafter, the Self Determination Theory is described in section 2.4.2.

2.4.1 Achievement Goal Theory

The Achievement Goal Theory is important in this research since this theory best fits with sport participation. There are several types of the Achievement Goal Theory. The theory used in this research is developed by Nicholls (1989), as this Achievement Goal Theory fits best with motivation in sports according to several studies (Sit & Koenraad, 2004) (Spray et al., 2006). Nicholls suggested that people define success in different ways (Nicholls, 1989, p. 5). He stated that individuals have two different ‘goal orientations’, namely ‘task-orientation’ and ‘ego-orientation’ (Sit & Koenraad, 2004, p. 608). The Achievement Goal Theory determines that one’s success and competence depends on its achievement of goals (Spray et al., 2006, p. 44). The task-goal is described as goals of individuals who are able to underscore task mastery, self-improvement and effort. However, individuals could also primarily want to win and set the best performance, referring to an ‘ego-goal’. According to Sit and Koenraad (2004) ‘an ego-involved individual experiences subjective success when he/she has a better performance than others in the social comparison process’ (Sit & Koenraad, 2004, p. 606). These task- and ego-goals reflect individual differences between people. However, this motivation theory is not only about ‘task- and ego-goals’, situational factors are also taken into account. Examples of these situational factors are pressure from coaches, parents or friends (Sit & Koenraad, 2004, p. 611). According to the Achievement Goal Theory, a distinction between situational factors could be made. These factors refer to one’s perceived motivational climate: the climate created by a
teacher or coach can reflect task and ego qualities (Spray et al., 2006, p. 44). According to Sit and Koenraad (2004), task-orientation is associated with desirable or adaptive achievement behaviors (high effort, choosing challenging tasks and high persistence) (Sit & Koenraad, 2004, p. 606). Sit and Koenraad (2004) mentioned that ‘task orientation was found to correspond with intrinsic motives for sport involvement such as skill development and fitness’ (Sit & Koenraad, 2004, p. 607). In contrast, ego-orientation ‘lead to maladaptive patterns such as exerting less effort and demonstrating a lack of persistence, particularly at low perceived competence and in the face of adverse outcomes’ (Sit & Koenraad, 2004, pp. 606-607). Ego-orientation is related to extrinsic sport participation motives, like social recognition (Sit & Koenraad, 2004, p. 607).

2.4.2 Self Determination Theory

Another frequently used motivation theory in sport is the Self Determination Theory. The Self Determination Theory takes extrinsic and intrinsic motivation into account and includes one’s psychological needs for competence, autonomy and relatedness, being drivers for motivated behavior (Spray et al., 2006, p. 44). These could be linked to the (intrinsic) ‘psychological needs’ of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. According to the given data, motivation in sports is commonly seen as the so called ‘higher-order needs’. However, the Self Determination Theory shows that the ‘lower order needs’ should be taken into account by researching intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in sport participation.

According to the Self Determination Theory, intrinsic motivation refers to enjoyment, interest/fun and satisfaction and comes from the inner side (Spray et al., 2006, p. 44) (Vallerand & Losier, 1999, p. 153). On the other hand, extrinsic motivation depends on materialistic benefits (like trophies) or social pressure to participate in sports (Vallerand & Losier, 1999, p. 143). Extrinsic motivation could be subdivided into four types, called: 1) external regulations – behavior associated with external pressure, 2) introjected regulations – ‘internal pressures to avoid guilt’, 3) identified regulations – ‘self-determined motivations related to personal values and goals’ and 4) integrated regulations – motivation becomes more intrinsic and one’s values become similar to other’s (Spray et al., 2006, p. 44). It seems that some of these regulations are more intrinsic. However, intrinsic motivation refers to enjoyment, interest, inherent satisfaction and this is not the case for both introjected regulations and integrated regulations. Therefore these regulations are still defined as extrinsic since ‘introjected regulation’ is an internal pressure to avoid guilt and ‘integrated regulation’ is on an abstract level and reflects only
behavior (Spray et al., 2006, p. 44). The motivation of an individual increased when one moved from external regulations to integrated regulations (Spray et al., 2006, p. 44).

Someone’s motivation could change over time: when one first feels some external pressure to (for example) sport, one may overtime get motivated because sport becomes one of the own values. This is confirmed by Hoyer et al. (2018), since he mentioned that felt involvement and also motivation increased when something becomes a ‘value’. When someone thereafter starts sports participation, motivation is changed in actual behavior.

2.4.2.1 Self Determination Theory and Behavior
As mentioned in the first section of this chapter, motivation is part of someone’s behavior. The Self Determination Theory could be also linked to behavior. This is done by Tsorbatzoudis et al. (2006) and Vallerand and Losier (1999), examining the relationship between recreational sport participation and intrinsic-, extrinsic- and a-motivation (which are defined later in this paragraph). This study assumed that someone’s motivation could be directly linked to one’s individual sports behavior and this study is (partly) based on the Self Determination Theory (Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006, pp. 363-364). However, it is important to note that they describe extrinsic- and intrinsic motivation differently and added ‘a-motivation’ within their research.

To elaborate further on this, the studies of Vallerand and Losier (1999) and Tsorbatzoudis et al. (2006) divide extrinsic motivation into three (instead of four) different regulations: 1) external regulation – individuals participate in sport because of external rewards or pressure, 2) introjected regulation – behaviors that are ‘initiated and coordinated by internally controlling imperative’: external source of control is replaced by internal sources (feelings of guilt or fear, usually occurs at sport addicts) and 3) identified regulation – ‘individual perceives the behavior of highly valued, and therefore, performs it out of choice, even if it is not pleasurable’ (Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006, p. 365). According to this data, it could be concluded that these studies do not use the last sub-dimension (integrated regulation) mentioned with the Self Determination Theory. On the other hand, intrinsic motivation consists of three sub-dimensions, namely intrinsic motivation 1) to know – ‘satisfaction derived from learning, exploring or trying to understand new concepts’, 2) towards performance – ‘engaging in an activity for the pleasure and satisfaction experienced when one attempts to feel competent and to experience accomplishment’ and 3) to stimulate experience – ‘a sensation seeking, peak experience, fun and excitement’, mostly fulfilled in extreme sports (Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006, p. 365). At last, a-motivation could be defined as: individuals who ‘have no purpose or
expectation for their participation and, therefore, it is very likely that they will eventually drop out of sports’ (Vallerand & Losier, 1999, p. 154). Different types of motivation (e.g. extrinsic-, intrinsic- or a-motivation) lead to several consequences. Vallerand and Losier (1999), suggested in their research that motivational consequences could be split up into cognitive, affective and behavioral consequences (Vallerand & Losier, 1999, p. 157). Cognitive consequences are consequences in memory and conceptual learning. Affective consequences are defined with the terms: interest, satisfaction, positive emotions, mood and anxiety. Examples of behavioral consequences are continue/persistence of sports, behavioral intentions, intensity and performance (Vallerand & Losier, 1999, p. 157). According to Vallerand et al. (1999), motivation generates important outcomes on cognitive and affective as well as behavioral consequences. In accordance with the Self Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), Tsorbatzoudis et al. (2006) and Vallerand and Losier (1999) suggest that their outcomes are also decreasingly positive from intrinsic motivation to a-motivation (Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006, pp. 365-366) (Vallerand & Losier, 1999, p. 157). This means that one’s motivation to participate in sports becomes higher for intrinsic motivated people than for extrinsic- or a-motivated people. Tsorbatzoudis et al. (2006) assumed in their study that the increase in motivation leads to an increase in sports participation. They distinct extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, in which extrinsic motivation could lead to an increase of someone’s intention to continue the sport. Intrinsic motivation increased knowledge and stimulated someone to achieve performance. A-motivation shows a significant decrease in participation (Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006, p. 366) (Vallerand & Losier, 1999, p. 154).

2.5 Motivation in running events

Runners are motivated by several factors according to the current literature. Runners’ motivation is described in paragraph 2.5.1. Thereafter, runners’ motivation is split up in motivation for participants of traditional running events and motivations for runners of innovative running events. These are described in paragraph 2.5.2 and 2.5.3. Thereafter, the contradiction in literature is described in the last paragraph of this chapter.

2.5.1 Runners’ motivation

According to Scheerder et al. (2015), people start running because it is easy to learn and it is good for one’s health (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 204). The most important aspects for runners
to take place on an event are investigated by Scheerder et al. (2015). They mentioned that runners’ motivation to participate in traditional running events differs significantly per event (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 202). However, atmosphere is of most importance when considering to register for a traditional event (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 203). This is in line with the outcome of Bottenburg & Hover (2009), since they found that 60% of the runners participate in traditional running events because of the atmosphere and entourage (Bottenburg & Hover, 2009, p. 44). Next, 40% of the runners participate in running events because their acquaintances also participate (Bottenburg & Hover, 2009, p. 44). On the other hand, sanitary facilities and the number of runners (running jams) are the two most important points of improvement for the most running events.

Consequently, within the last few years, a certain group of runners is participating more through the organization of other innovative running events (like Mudruns) (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 202). Scheerder et al. (2015), stated that the majority of the participants of these innovative running events, are focused on the activity itself, the social setting, the atmosphere or the physical challenge (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 204). On the other hand, Rodriguez (2015) found that the most important motivations to participate in obstacle runs are 1) friends participating, 2) connecting and socializing with others, 3) having fun and 4) physical challenge (Rodriguez, 2015, p. 4).

2.5.2 Motivation in traditional running events
There has been little knowledge about Dutch participants in running events. However, Scheerder et al. (2015), investigated the Dutch running market and concluded that 80% of the runners participated in running events frequently. They also mentioned that 60% are loyal to running events in which they participated before (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 202). They assume that the participation in running events gives people positive energy through focus and training. Another important factor in participation at running events are family and friends. In addition, the most important factor for selecting an event are ‘atmosphere’ and ‘environment’ (Scheerder et al., 2015, pp. 202-203). The study of Scheerder et al., (2015) mentioned that the motivation of people to participate in traditional running events is mostly that they want to ‘win’ or ‘set the best performance/record’ (whether or not for themselves). Since extrinsic motivation is defined as the participation in activities because of social pressure and external rewards, participants of traditional running events are seen as extrinsically motivated, according to Scheerder et al. (2015).
2.5.3 Motivation in innovative running events
Participants of innovative running events are motivated by the activity itself, the social setting (a short distance, feasible for the whole family), the atmosphere (entertainment) and/or the physical challenge (e.g. the extension by mud-obstacle or color-runs) (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 204). This is largely in line with the results of Rodriguez (2015). He investigated intrinsic and extrinsic motivations of people to participate in obstacle runs in the United States. Rodriguez (2015) found that people in the United States participate in obstacle runs because of the social setting (with current friends and socializing with others), having fun and because of the physical challenge. Therefore, in his study, Rodriguez (2015) mentioned that ‘individuals were guided more by intrinsic motives than extrinsic motives’ (Rodriguez, 2015, p. 4). Although this statement could be criticized since Rodriguez (2015) also mentioned that 81 percent of the participants agreed that friends encouraged them to participate, followed by 71 percent of encouragement by acquaintances and 53 percent is encouraged by family (Rodriguez, 2015, p. 41). Since social pressure is one of the key elements of extrinsic motivation, it could be concluded that participants of innovative running events could also be extrinsically motivated.

2.5.4 Motivation according theories: contradiction in literature
An important motivation theory to use in this research is the Achievement Goal Theory. Since an ego-goal (Achievement Goal Theory) is defined by individuals who want to win and set the best performance, there is a similarity between ego-goals and the motivation of participants of traditional running events. On the other hand, motivations of participants in innovative running events could be better linked to task-goals since these participants are motivated by the physical challenge. Therefore, one could assume that participants are mostly driven by ‘ego-goals’ when participating in traditional running events, although participants could also be driven by ‘task-goals’, which mostly occurs with participants of innovative running events.

As mentioned before, participants of traditional running events want to set the best performance. Relating this behavior to the Self Determination Theory, this is derived from an ‘intrinsic motivation towards performance’ (Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006). On the other hand, participants of innovative running events are, according to Scheerder et al. (2015) and Rodriguez (2015), motivated by the physical challenge. This could be related to ‘intrinsic motivation to stimulate experience’. Therefore, it could be concluded that participants of both
traditional and innovative running events are intrinsically motivated (on different levels) according to the Self Determination Theory. However, looking at the outcomes of Rodriguez (2015), there is found another contradiction in literature. Rodriguez (2015) stated that participants are more intrinsically motivated to participate in innovative running events. However, he also mentioned that the majority of participants is influenced by friends or acquaintance. This leads to an extrinsic motivation according to the Self Determination Theory and thus is a contradiction in literature. Therefore, it is unclear whether participants of traditional and innovative running events are intrinsically or extrinsically motivated.

As mentioned before, there is little knowledge about this research topic. After analyzing the available literature, it could be concluded that the literature is contradicted when relating them to several motivation theories. The scope and nature of the research context is not clearly described yet. Therefore, this study is intended to clarify the differences in motivation of participants in traditional versus innovative running events and intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is taken into account. This is done by generating an answer on the research question “What motivates Dutch runners to participate in traditional versus innovative running events?”. 
3. Methodology

To answer the research question and to generate hypotheses, a research methodology has been set up. First, the research strategy is introduced in this chapter. Second, the research design is showed in paragraph 3.2. The operationalization of this master thesis is described in paragraph 3.3. In this master thesis, validity and reliability are taken into account and these topics are discussed in paragraph 3.4. Last, the research ethics are described in paragraph 3.5.

3.1 Research strategy

As mentioned before, a contradiction in literature about motivation of Dutch runners to participate in traditional versus innovative running events exists. Only a few studies are focusing on this aspect. However, these studies only are focused on one of the two types of events and a combination of both is not taken into account. The contradiction in literature and the scarce number of studies about this topic ensure that there is little knowledge about motivation of participants of traditional versus innovative running events. Therefore, the aim of this research was to contribute to the current literature by combining intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors of traditional versus innovative running events.

To generate an answer on the research question, explorative, qualitative research is conducted. According to Morse (2003) and Klopper (2008), qualitative research is the best approach when little is known about a topic (Klopper, 2008, p. 62) (Morse, 2003, p. 833). Qualitative research is described as all forms of research on collecting and interpreting linguistic material resulting in statements of a social phenomenon (Bleijenbergh, 2016, p. 12). There is chosen for qualitative research because qualitative research provides rich empirical material by interviewing a relatively small group of respondents (Bleijenbergh, 2016, p. 12). Interviewing a small group of respondents generally provides detailed and complete information about the motivations of participants of traditional versus innovative running events. Qualitative research was the best approach for this thesis since it was important to firstly collect empirical data, which in the end most likely would lead to possible explanations or hypotheses for the subject.

Exploratory research is done with the intention to explore a research question rather than offering a final and conclusive solution for the research question. Exploratory research is conducted for this study because the motives for Dutch runners to participate in traditional versus innovative running events had not been researched before and was therefore unclear. In
other words, there was a lack of knowledge about this topic. Because of this, an exploratory research setup was chosen to deep dive into this topic and to set up hypotheses for further research.

3.2 Research Design
As mentioned before, a small group of respondents is interviewed in order to answer the research question. Therefore the need of 10-20 respondents was important (Bleijenbergh, 2016, p. 12). Because of this, 10-20 interviews needed to be done to reach the objective of the study. The number of necessary interviews was depended on the quality of the information obtained from interviews in this investigation. Along the way, the researcher will determine whether it is necessary to obtain extra interviews in order to achieve more valid information if necessary.

Data has been collected from Dutch runners. The group of Dutch runners is considered to be heterogeneous and therefore, there is not a specific target group representing runners. However, Scheerder et al. (2015) described a more specific profile for the event runner. Most event runners are men (70%). At least 30% of the event runners are women (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 200). Therefore, the group of interviewees should represent 70% male respondents and 30% female respondents. Taking age into account, most event runners are between 30 and 55 years old (72%). 13% of Dutch event runners are younger than 30 and 13% of these runners are older than 55 (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 200). The intention was to roughly maintain these numbers when selecting respondents.

Respondents are recruited by social media (e.g. Facebook and Instagram). The researcher provided an announcement including a striking poster and the question whether one is or knows someone who has participated in running events and is willing to help the researcher (appendix 1.1). The post provided some information about this research, namely the master program of the researcher, the objective of the study and how much time the interview would last. Next, a so called ‘poll’ was provided at ‘my story’ on Facebook and Instagram in which people were asked whether they had participated in running events and whether they are open for an interview (appendix 1.2).

3.3 Operationalization
Data is collected by the use of interviews with participants of traditional- and innovative running events. There are various interview strategies. For this study, the methodology of semi-structured interviews was chosen. Therefore, some questions/subjects were set up before the
interviews took place. First of all, respondents were asked to tell something about what kind of runners they are. Thereafter, it was asked on which running events respondents participated in the past year and how they prepared for the running events. These are the more general questions about running. Thereafter, questions to know who represented the Self Determination Theory were asked, like the added value, support, whether he or she participated alone or with others and whether winning is important for the respondent. Next, the Achievement Goal Theory is tested by the subjects: setting goals, influence of others, task-goals and ego-goals and when an event has been considered successful for the respondent. The interview ended with general questions about the best events, most important aspects of events, events that one would never participate in, the physical challenge, the use of social media after an event and the influence of sport watches.

An advantage of a semi-structured interview is that all respondents are asked the same questions. In the end, this leads to higher reliability of the analysis (in comparison to open interviews). On the other side, a disadvantage of semi-structured interviews is a higher chance to exclude important, relevant unforeseen information (Bleijenbergh, 2016). Although reliability is mostly used in quantitative research, it could also be important in qualitative research. Since quality is seen as the most important aspect of information elicitation, a good qualitative study can help to understand an unclear situation (Golafshani, 2003, p. 601) (Stenbacka, 2001, p. 551). Reliability is seen as an important topic within this thesis, which is why there is opted for semi-structured interviews. This means that the disadvantages are taken for granted in this thesis. In this case, a narrative analyses approach was chosen. This approach focuses on the understanding of a social phenomenon from the knowledge of directly involved people (Bleijenbergh, 2016).

After conducting the interviews, the audio files of each interview were transcribed. This means that every word of both the respondent and the researcher were written down. This was done to find an underlying structure in the interviews by coding them.

To generate a valid master thesis, there are set up theoretical- and stipulative definitions to clarify some concepts. These definitions are described in paragraph 3.3.1 and paragraph 3.3.2.

### 3.3.1 Theoretical definitions

**Motivation:** “an inner state of activation that provides energy needed to achieve a goal” (Hoyer et al., 2018).
Intrinsic motivation: the participation in activities because the activity itself is perceived as interesting or fun. One wants to participate in the activity without getting something back, the activity itself is enough to participate (Broeck et al., 2009).

Extrinsic motivation: the participation in activities because of social pressure and external rewards. One is not motivated by the activity itself, but because he or she feels pressure from family and friends or wants to win something by participating in the activity (Broeck et al., 2009).

Runners: someone who runs at least 12 times a year (Scheerder et al., 2015).

Ego-goal: an individual’s purpose to win or achieve the best performance in a running event (Sit & Koenraad, 2004).

Task-goal: an individual’s purpose referred to task mastery, self-improvement and effort (Sit & Koenraad, 2004).

3.3.2 Stipulative definitions

Running events: Organized event focusing on running activities during a planned (part of a) day.

Traditional running events: running events that have been applied in the same way (in the Netherlands) for decades.

Innovative running events: running events that are ‘new’ and have a different approach than traditional running events. These could be seen as running events which are characterized by a fun factor or which are combined with other sports (e.g. swimming, climbing or adding obstacles).

3.4 Validity and reliability

Validity and reliability are important in qualitative research. Validity is guaranteed by defining the right questions in the interviews, which lead in the end to the answer of the research question. Operationalized definitions, as described in section 3.3, are explained in the same way to respondents. Since a semi-structured interview is done, the interview questions were fixed and the researcher was prepared prior to the interviews.

To increase reliability, the researcher took care of a silence and quiet room/place to hold the interview. This is done so the respondent was not distracted during the interview. Next to that, the researcher has adopted an open attitude, in order to do not influence the respondents. Due to the fact that the researcher did not want to influence respondents, all questions asked
were also open in nature. Besides, the researcher asked the respondents whether the interview may be recorded. When interviews are recorded, interviews could be transcribed easily and potential misunderstandings could be corrected. Besides, the interviews are semi-structured. As mentioned before, semi-structured interviews increase reliability. After the interviews were done, the reliability was guaranteed by coding the received information from interviews.

### 3.5 Ethics

There are several ethical principles that should be taken into account in a master’s level research. First of all, it is important to minimalize the risk of harm: this research should not harm participants (examples: psychological harm of participants, or to generate a social disadvantage for participants). Minimalizing the risk of harm is done through obtaining explicit permission for the interview and audio recordings and protection of the anonymity of participants.

A second research ethic is known as obtaining informed consent, which means that respondents should understand that they are taking part in research and what the research requires of them. The researcher took this research ethic into account by informing the respondents about this master thesis, telling them what the purpose of this research is and by thanking them to participate in an interview. Next, participants were asked whether they liked it to get/read the results after finishing this master thesis.

The third research ethic is protecting anonymity and confidentiality. This is done through telling the respondents that their participation and answers will be anonymous and that, except the participant and researcher, nobody will be able to get access to their personal information. Another research ethic is asking permission to record the interview. This was needed to transcribe the interviews and generate a reliable analysis. The researcher has asked permission to each respondent and told them that the audio recordings will be deleted after this master thesis.

The next research ethic is providing the right to withdraw. This means that the respondents were able to stop with the interview when they were not willing to participate anymore. Participants were also able to skip questions if they did not want to answer it. This research ethic is fulfilled since the researcher told this to the participants before starting the interview.

The last research ethic is a possible implication of how the findings may be applied for the organizers of events. Expected is that this research generates insight in the different motives
of participants of traditional and innovative running events. On the basis of that information, hypotheses are set up to test in future, quantitative research. In the end, this information could be used by event organizers to fit the aspects of the event with runners motives to participate.

4. Results

In this chapter, the results of the interviews are described. First, the selection of respondents is described. Thereafter, the process of data analysis is described. Next, the results from the interview are shown in line with the topics 1) runners’ profile, 2) the (number of) events on which participants assign, 3) Runners preparation for an event, 4) the reason why participants start running 5) the Achievement Goal Theory, 6) the Self Determination Theory and 7) the needs and wants of runners, and what influences them. The topics used in the semi-structured interview were also maintained for the description of the results.

4.1 Participants

As described in Chapter 3, participants are recruited through a post on social media. The Social Media actions resulted in 21 positive reactions in the end. 14 of these responses were from participants of traditional running events. 4 responses were from participants of innovative running events and 3 of them did both traditional and innovative running events. 9 of the respondents were male and 12 respondents were female. Depending on the available respondents, the researcher tried to select more men than women. This is done because Dutch event runners are represented by men (70%) and women (30%). However, these numbers are not reached for both traditional and innovative running events (see figure 1). The reason for this is that women have agreed to participate in a greater extent for the interview. Next, Scheerder et al. (2015) mentioned in their study that the majority of event runners are between the age of 30-55. This is in accordance with the sample, in which most people are between that age. However, especially the younger group is more presented in this research. A possible explanation for this is that the study of Scheerder et al. (2015) takes only traditional running events into account, and younger people may be attracted more by innovative running events (or run both events).

The researcher started to schedule some interviews and after 9 interviews with participants of traditional running events, the researcher did not find new information about the topics. Therefore 9 interviews were held with participants of traditional running events.

Figure 1: Interview respondents
In total, there are 7 interviews done with participants of innovative running events. It was more difficult to reach these respondents. However, in the end, they generated enough information for this master thesis. Important to mention is that 13 interviews were done, but three of the respondents participated in both events, so they generate information for both traditional and innovative running events in one interview.

4.2 Data analysis
To conduct a qualitative data analysis based on interviews, the process of coding is used: applying concepts in the margin of the different interviews. This helps to unravel, combine and interpret the material obtained. The coding of different texts could be done manually and computer supported (Bleijenbergh, 2016). In this master thesis, there is chosen for manual coding. Computer supported coding is a tool for analysis, however this will never replace the thinking process of the researcher. Therefore there is chosen for coding manually.

In the coding process, there is chosen for an inductive approach. The starting point for this form of coding is that the researcher starts coding close to the empirical material. This is done through open codes. Thereafter the concepts were further abstracted with axial- and selective codes. A summary table is shown in appendix 2. The total coding file is available if desired.

4.3 Interview results
The results will be discussed based on the semi-structured interviews. First, some general information about both types of runners is discussed. Thereafter, more specific information about runners’ motivation is provided based on the Achievement Goal Theory and the Self Determination Theory. Last, other questions about runners’ motivation is discussed.
4.3.1 Runners’ profile

The results have shown that the frequency someone runs varies greatly for runners of both traditional and innovative running events. For traditional running events, the frequency of running varies from one to four times a week. Respondents who also participate in other sports, run less a week than participants who practice running as the only sport. A reason for this could be that respondents who participate in other sports have less time to run than respondents who went for a run as the only physical sport. The distance per run depends on both the person and type of training. For example regarding type of training, the distance varies between an interval training and an endurance run. Additionally, the distance someone runs also varies between the runners and what they train for. Some runners indicated that they normally run between 7 to 10 kilometers a time. However, there are also runners who run 18 to 25 kilometers a time. The distance and how often someone runs also depends on whether he/she has registered for an event. All respondents mention that they build up the distance slowly, depending on the number of kilometers of the event. See figure 2 for a visual representation of this type of runner.

Runners of innovative running events vary also in the frequency they run a week: some runners run once a week, others run three times a week. Interesting to mention is that for all respondents (except one), running is not the only physical sport. Respondents mentioned: “I also go to the gym”, “I also CrossFit every week” or “I also do strength training”. This differs from participants of traditional running events, for who running is the only physical sport or they also do a team sport (except for the participants who did both traditional and innovative running events, they also do fitness/CrossFit). Looking at the distance, runners of innovative running events run considerably shorter distances than runners of traditional running events. One of the runners mentioned: “I run 5 to 10 kilometer, the reason for this is that I also do strength training. I want to keep combining that and I cannot combine long endurance training with explosiveness”. Another respondent mentioned: “I usually do not run longer than 10 kilometer, as my hockey training alone is enough for obstacle runs”. There is one runner who normally runs between 7 and 10 kilometer. However, nowadays he/she runs 10 to 20 kilometer once in two weeks. He/she mentioned that the main driver is not pleasure, but he/she accepted a challenge to run a Strong Viking Irish Edition of 42 kilometer for which he/she needs training. On the other hand, there is one respondent who normally don’t run as a leisure/sports activity.
However, before the event he/she did prepare him-/herself by running. Please see figure 3 for a visual representation of this type of runner.

4.3.2 The number of running events per year

Both respondents of traditional and innovative running events were asked which events they attended at last year. The results have shown that most participants for both events participated in 1 to 3 events per year. Two participants of traditional running events and two participants of innovative running events run 3 to 5 events per year. Both kind of events have one respondent who runs 5 to 10 events per year. Last, one participant of traditional running events runs one event per month, which means he/she runs 12 events a year. Another important aspect is that 7 out of 9 respondents of traditional running events have ran at least half a marathon once. Therefore, the distances of participants in traditional running events are fairly close together. On the other hand, the distances of participants of innovative running events are much more scattered, from 13 to 60 kilometer. As shown in figure 4, participants of traditional running events participate more frequently than participants of innovative running events.
4.3.3 Preparation for a running event
Five out of nine participants of traditional running events prepare themselves for an event based on strict schedules. They buy, download or provide themselves schedules in preparation for the events. Most of them train more times a week, after they have registered for an event. Other respondents state that they do not train more frequently, but they train larger distances. Looking at the eating pattern, it could be concluded that almost none has changed their eating pattern in favor of the traditional running event.

Participants of innovative running events seem to prepare themselves very diversely. One respondent does not train extra for an innovative running event. The respondent mentioned that he/she is also a participant of traditional running events, so he/she runs frequently and his/her weekly fitness training is enough for the obstacles. On the other hand, there are two respondents who only train for running and not for the obstacles. There are also two respondents who only train (in addition) for the obstacles, but not for running. This could be explained by the fact that these two respondents are also participants of traditional running events. This means that they run every week already, so they mentioned this is not an additional training moment for obstacle runs because they know they can run the distance. Last, there are two respondents for innovative running events who train for both, running and obstacles. Looking to their eating pattern, there could be concluded that they don’t change that in order to run an innovative obstacle run. However, participants mentioned that they eat more carbohydrates the day before and the day of the event.

It makes sense that participants of traditional running events show a pattern in their preparation. It is usually necessary to purchase, download or create training schedules because most of them run a (half) marathon. Therefore, one has to train more frequently and larger
distances than for an innovative event. Most people of innovative events namely run 13 to 19 kilometer, with a lot of obstacles, which reduces the distance to run. The distance could also be the most important reason for participants of innovative running events for training diversely. When one is already fit and has a good condition, it is maybe more important to train for the obstacles. However, when one goes weekly to the gym and does not run frequently it may be more important to train for the running part of innovative running events. Next to that, some participants also run 42 or 60 kilometer obstacle runs. This group mentioned that they should train for both running and obstacles.

4.3.4 Why participants start running
Respondents were asked why they start running. Most people answer this question with an extrinsic motivational factor. Interesting quotes from respondents of traditional running events were: “I think I started for field hockey, to improve my condition. And thereafter I actually thought it was super nice, so then I decided to continue running”. Two other respondents mentioned: “For me it all started as an obligation and I did not like it at all, now I really like it and it gives me satisfaction”. These quotes show a change in motivation over time. Where their motivation was first extrinsic, the motivation became intrinsic over time. Other reasons for participants of traditional running events to start running is “Because I needed – for medical reasons – an alternative for another sport”, “for my health and to get fit” and “because it is easy and accessible to start running”.

Participants of innovative running events also mentioned mostly extrinsic motivational factors when they start running. Only one of the respondents argued that he/she really liked running. The other respondents started running because of extrinsic motivation factors. Four respondents mentioned that they do not like running as a physical activity. They run because they “want to get fit”, “as an alternative for another sport” or they “run only in the preparation for innovative running events”. These reasons were the answers from respondents who only participate in innovative running events (and not in both events).

4.3.5 Achievement Goal Theory

| Characteristics of task-goals | Characteristics of ego-goals |
The Achievement Goal Theory distinguishes task-goals and ego-goals. Table 1 summarizes the most important characteristics of both kind of goals according to Sit and Koenraad (2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Mastery, self-improvement and high effort</th>
<th>Willingness to win or set the best performance</th>
<th>Social recognition is also important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set challenging tasks</td>
<td>One is successful when one achieves better results than the social environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the development of skills and fitness</td>
<td>Less effort and a lack of persistency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also known as intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Also known as extrinsic motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: characteristics of task- and ego-goals

Results show that people who participate in traditional running events set task-goals instead of ego-goals. This is apparent from the following arguments. All respondents of traditional running events choose their own performance above winning (materialistic benefits). They mentioned that they want to improve their own abilities or personal records. Some respondents of traditional running events set time goals. Other respondents of traditional running events mentioned that reaching the finish is the most important goal for them. Interesting to mention is that younger runners with less experience set the goal ‘reaching the finish’ more often instead of a specific time goal. However, when one participates more often in running events, this goal changes often in time goals. This is in congruence with Hoyer et al. (2018), who mentioned that people evaluate the success or failing in attaining the goal and that they learn from these experiences. This is used for future goalsetting according to Hoyer et al. (2018). There is one respondent who mentioned that the success of a running event depends on whether he/she had a nice day with the people he/she went with. He/she stated that the participation in running events is also a social aspect for him/her because running is an individual sport: it became social for him/her when he/she started participating in running events with others. Next to that, participants of traditional running events state that others have little influence on setting goals. However, according to two respondents, others have influenced his/her goals when they stimulate an extra challenge or when they bet that they can or cannot reach a specific distance or time goal. One of the respondents said: “someone told me I would never finish in 1 hour and 57 minutes. Then I said, I certainly will and set this as a goal for myself”. Someone else mentioned: “in the future, I might be influenced by others, but now there was no one I know with a better time that I would like to beat”. This last quote can be considered an ego-goal, since one of the characteristics of ego-goals is that one thinks he/she is successful when he/she
achieves better results than one’s social environment. However, this respondent also tends to have more task-goals since he/she set the goal to run a marathon of 42 kilometers (without any experience), which leads to self-improvement, high effort and focus, especially on the development of his/her skills and fitness. In the end, the answers from participants of traditional running events show that they set task-goals. As mentioned in section 2.4.1, task-goals correspond with intrinsic motives for sport involvement (Sit & Koenraad, 2004, p. 607). Therefore, the following hypothesis is set up:

**H1: Participants of traditional running events set task-goals and are thus intrinsically motivated because they want to improve their own records and set up challenging goals.**

Participants of innovative running events set both task- and/or ego-goals, respondents who participate in these events do not show a clear pattern in their answers (see figure 5). This is apparent from the following information from the interviews. An interesting difference between participants of traditional and innovative running events is that participants of innovative running events attach fewer value to time goals. Respondents of innovative running events stated that they consider it to be more important to reach the finish. Some respondents argued that “sometimes you experience long queues at obstacles, and you have no influence on that yourself”. Since improving time is mostly not the most important challenge, two out of seven respondents look for a greater challenge in an extremely long distance, e.g. an obstacle run of 42 kilometers or an obstacle run of 60 kilometers. This leads to task-goals since they choose extremely challenging events. However, both respondents always run together with others and would not participate on their own. Therefore, it seems that participants set up ego-goals more often because the social recognition is important for them. One of the
respondents stated: I did not consciously opt for that 42 kilometer run, but more because I was challenged by a friend”. However, he/she also mentioned that “I registered for this event because I was challenged by a friend. However, once I started, it turned into intrinsic motivation”. Interesting to mention is that people who participate in innovative running events always run together with others, meaning that they are not allowed to run on their own pace. This leads to an ego-goal: social recognition. Participants of innovative running events also mentioned that their own performance (reaching the finish) is more important than winning (materialistic) benefits. This leads to task-goals because runners want to challenge and improve themselves. However, two out of seven respondents for innovative running events mentioned that winning medals at the Strong Viking Run became very important for them. They mentioned that winning medals gives them the confirmation that they are able to achieve their goals. Both respondents also stated that they would participate more frequently in Strong Viking Runs in order to earn (one of) these medals. This leads to an ego-goal since they could win materialistic benefits. Social recognition could also become important when winning medals through posting their results on social media. An agreement between traditional and innovative running events is that participants of both events allow to be influenced for goalsetting when they are challenged. Lastly, the answers from participants of innovative running events show that some of them set task-goals and others ego-goals, with the exception of a few respondents who set both task- and ego-goals. Based on this information, the second hypotheses is set up:

H2: Challenging/improving themselves and social recognition are the most important motives for people to participate in innovative running events.

4.3.6 Self Determination Theory

As mentioned in paragraph 2.4.2, the Self Determination Theory described intrinsic motivation as the enjoyment, interest, fun and satisfaction from the inner side. Extrinsic motivation is, according to this theory, described as sports participation depending on materialistic benefits (like trophies) or social pressure. Respondents were asked whether they feel more comfortable with the characteristics of intrinsic motivation (enjoyment, interest, fun and satisfaction) or with the characteristics of extrinsic motivation (materialistic benefits and social pressure) after participating in a running event. All respondents, for both types of events, mentioned that they feel more related to the characteristics of intrinsic motivation, such as enjoyment, interest, fun and satisfaction. This could be explained by the fact that winning is impossible or not feasible
at traditional running events. Respondents of innovative running events mentioned that: “At the obstacle runs that I participate in, there is a time registration, but there is no winner. It is all about reaching the finish”. However, there are two respondents who have indicated that winning medals is important for them, because that is a confirmation for them that they can do it. Next to that, respondents mentioned that social pressure is not relevant for them. However, some respondents stated in other answers that they will never run or participate an event on their own. This is especially true for innovative running events.

According to the Self Determination Theory, someone’s motivation could change over time. The theory stated that when one first feels some external pressure to sports, one become motivated over time because sport becomes one of their own values. As described in paragraph 2.4.2, the Self Determination theory subdivided extrinsic motivation into four types. Based on the interviews, it became clear that most respondents of traditional running events start running because of extrinsic motivation, based on introjected regulations. However, when they run more frequently and see progress, their motivation changed into intrinsic motivation to run. This means that people start running because of an internal pressure to avoid guilt. This is apparent from the following statements: “I started running because I wanted to work out and lose weight, but I actually thought running was terrible”. Thereafter the respondent said: “When I started to run more kilometers, I thought it would be really nice at some point, especially if you participate in an event and you achieve your ultimate goal”. Other respondents said that running became an addiction: where they first had to motivate themselves to run several times a week, thereafter they can no longer live without it. This means that one’s motivation changed from extrinsic motivation, based on introjected regulations, to intrinsic motivation towards performance (engaging in an activity for the pleasure and satisfaction experienced). Based on the Self Determination Theory, the third hypotheses is stated as follows:

**H3: The motivation of participants of traditional running events changed over time from extrinsic motivation to intrinsic motivation.**

Respondents were asked why they participated in running events. All respondents of traditional running events have indicated that they registered for running events so that they have a goal to work towards. From the previous questions it appears that the majority has difficulty keeping up with running frequently when they had not registered for an event. Some
respondents mentioned: “As soon as I register myself for an event, I have to run”. These answers show that respondents have extrinsic motivation based on identified regulation: self-determined motivations related to personal values and goals. According to the literature, identified regulation is an extrinsic motivation, but it becomes more intrinsic. Next to that, respondents mentioned some other important aspects to participate in traditional running events, namely challenge, atmosphere, feeling satisfied, social aspect and recreation. The majority of these concepts belong to intrinsic motivation defined by the Self Determination Theory. Combining these two outcomes, it could be concluded that runners of traditional running events are more intrinsically motivated according to the Self Determination Theory. The most important motivations for participants of traditional running events are described in hypotheses 4.

**H4: The most important motivations to participate in traditional running events are the challenge, atmosphere, feeling satisfied, social aspect and recreation.**

Respondents of innovative running events were also asked why they participate in running events. Where respondents of traditional running events show a clear pattern in their answers, the answers from respondents of innovative running events vary more. One respondent mentioned for example: “I participate in innovative running events so that I have a goal to train for, if I do not, the motivation for running decreases. I also participate innovative running events for fun and a bit of challenge”. There is also one respondent who participates in innovative running events to relax and have a moment for him- or herself. Another respondent participates in innovative running events because he/she is challenged by a friend. Respondents who participate in both traditional and innovative running events stated that “Running is more of a performance thing for myself, and an obstacle run is more social for me”. This fits well with the question whether other people motivated/supported the respondents to participate in innovative running events. They mentioned that they were not motivated by others to participate in innovative running events. However, they also stated that they make each other aware of innovative running events, that they consult on which events they participate in and that they will never run an innovative running event on their own.

**Based on the answers from respondents, it became clear** that participants of innovative running events participate in the events based on intrinsic motivation: they mentioned that they
enjoy events and have fun with others. Others mentioned that they were satisfied when they achieved a challenge. However, when specifying this to the running activity, participants were not intrinsically motivated. There were four respondents who only participate innovative running events (not combined with traditional running events). These respondents mentioned all that they do not like the running activity itself. This appears from the statements: “An endurance run does not appeal to me, there is nothing of explosiveness or challenge in it”, “I am participating because of the obstacles, that you have to run I do not mind. But I would never participate in a normal running event” and “The running activity on its own is actually not fun at all”. Therefore, participants of innovative running events are intrinsically motivated to participate in the events. However, they were extrinsically motivated to participate in running as sport activity because they do not like the sport and only run as preparation for the event or for their condition. Based on the information above, the fifth and last hypotheses is set up as follows:

\[ H5: \text{Participants of innovative running events enjoy events, having fun with others and want to achieve the physical challenge. These are determinants of intrinsic motivation. However, they are extrinsically motivated to run as a sport.} \]

**4.3.7 The needs and wants of runners, and what influences them**

Participants of traditional and innovative running events were asked what they find most important about running events. To minimalize variations in answers, the researcher gave some examples, such as physical challenge, atmosphere, distance or enjoyment. Participants of traditional running events stated that atmosphere and enjoyment are the most important determinants to participate in traditional running events. A challenging distance is also an important factor for participants of traditional running events. These outcomes confirm the outcomes of both motivation theories, stating that participants of traditional running events are intrinsically motivated. Also interesting to mention is that participants of traditional running events say that a good organization is also very important. The reason for this is that they had unpleasant experiences with running events that were poorly organized. Participants of innovative running events mentioned also that atmosphere and enjoyment are most important in events. Next, a good organization and a physical challenge are also very important for participants of innovative running events. It seems logical that participants of traditional
running events rank an challenging distance as important and the participants of innovative running events think that a physical challenge is important. Participants of traditional running events are long distance runners and participants of innovative running events may value the obstacles more as a physical challenge than only running.

Respondents were asked whether they were influenced by social media or information generated by sport watches. The younger generation mentioned that they post their participation on social media. In contrast, the older generation did not post pictures on social media. Respondents mentioned that they post pictures on social media because “I am proud that I made it and I want to show that to everyone” or “because reaching the finish feels like a win”. Other people mentioned that they post pictures in order to tell everyone at once that they did it, and reach the finish. This is the same for both traditional and innovative running events. However, participants of innovative running events more often post pictures on social media because they get their photo taken directly at the finish. In contrast, participants of traditional running events have to wait several days or weeks on their pictures, according to some respondents. Whether respondents were influenced by pictures of other runners on social media depends on the person itself. The answers varied from, “no, pictures of others do not influence me because I have made my own plan for that year” to “yes, I think social media will always have an influence, even when you say that it does not influence you”.

Almost all respondents wore a sports watch. Respondents mentioned in the interviews that they, especially in the beginning, were influenced by these watches. One respondent mentioned that “you can monitor thoughts and feelings, depending on what your watch says. You are going to believe the statistics of your sports watch, beyond your own feelings”. Next, almost every runner look at his/her sports watch during and after running. One of the respondents mentioned that the sports watch helps him/her to achieve their goals. He/she mentioned that they would not have achieved that time goal, if he/she would not wear the sports watch. In conclusion, runners are influenced by their sports watches.

5. Conclusion

The research question: ‘what motivates Dutch runners to participate in traditional versus innovative running events’ is answered within this research. There could be conclude that participants of traditional running events are intrinsically motivated. Respondents of innovative
running events are also intrinsically motivated to participate in the events. However they are extrinsically motivated to go for a run. This conclusion is based on the information stated below.

Based on the interviews, the results have shown that the frequency someone runs, greatly varies for runners of both traditional and innovative running events. Runners of traditional runners events run between the 7 and 25 kilometer per training. However, the majority of participants mentioned that they run at least once half a marathon. Therefore, the distances of traditional running events are fairly close together. In contrast, participants of innovative running events combine short distances more often with fitness, CrossFit or strength training. Looking at running events, the distances from participants of innovative running events do not vary a lot. Almost all respondents run at least half a marathon. On the other hand, distances of participants of innovative running events are scattered more (from 13 to 60 kilometers). Next, participants of traditional running events participate more frequently in events than participants of innovative running events. Results from interviews show a difference in the way both types of participants prepare themselves for events. Participants of traditional running events buy, download or provide themselves with schedules in preparation of the events. Most of them generally train more times a week or run for larger distances than before they have registered. Participants of innovative running events prepare themselves diversely. This could be explained by the fact that one has to do more diverse activities in innovative running events. These events are not only about running, but strength also is important here. Respondents were also asked why they started running. A similarity between participants of both types of events is that they both started running because of extrinsic motivation factors. However, the difference is that the motivation of participants of traditional running events changed over time and became intrinsic. On the other hand, the motivation of participants (who did only participate in traditional running events) is considered to be extrinsic. Running as a physical activity is not appreciated by participants of innovative running events.

Based on the Achievement Goal Theory, it could be concluded that participants of traditional events are intrinsically motivated because they all want to improve themselves in different ways. They adjust their goal to keep challenging themselves. The outcomes of the interviews stated also that self-improvement or the achievement of goals was highly valued by the respondents. They mentioned for example that an event was successful for them when the finish or the personal time goal is reached. This could refer to task-goals and task-goals lead to intrinsic motivation. Participants of innovative running events, on the other hand, do not show
a clear pattern in their motivations (see figure 5). Participants of innovative running events set both task- and/or ego-goals. They set fewer time goals but they consider it to be more important to reach the finish. Some participants mentioned that they participate especially because of the social setting, fun and pleasure with friends. This is an example of social recognition, which leads to ego-goals and thus to extrinsic motivation. However, other respondents mentioned that they want to improve and challenge themselves. This tends more to task-goals, and thus leads to intrinsic motivation. Lastly, interesting to mention is that the ego-goals for respondents of innovative running events are only characterized by the social aspect. Want to win or set the best performance is not the most important for them. A reason for this could be that there is usually no winner at this type of events. In the end, the motivation from participants of innovative running events differs per person. Some are intrinsically motivated according to the Achievement Goal Theory, others are extrinsically motivated according to this theory. With the exception of some participants who are both intrinsic and extrinsic motivated.

Based on the Self Determination Theory, a similarity between participants of both type of events is found. The interviewees all mentioned that they highly value the characteristics of enjoyment, interest, fun and satisfaction. This means that all respondents stated that they are intrinsically motivated according to the Self Determination Theory. As stated before, respondents of traditional running events generally start running because of extrinsic motivation, based on introjected regulations. However, as soon as they run more frequently and see progress in their running activity, their motivation becomes intrinsic. Participants of traditional running events start running so that they have a goal to work towards. The majority mentioned that they feel difficulty keeping up with running frequently when not registered for an event. In the end, participants of traditional running events are motivated by the challenge, atmosphere, satisfaction, the social aspect and recreation. On the other hand, participants of innovative running events mentioned that they enjoy events, have fun with others and they are satisfied when they achieved the challenge. These factors lead to intrinsic motivation to participate in innovative running events. However, it is important to mention that these respondents generally do not like the running activity itself. Therefore, it could be concluded that participants of innovative running events are extrinsically motivated to go for a run.

In the end, the research question: ‘what motivates Dutch runners to participate in traditional versus innovative running events?’ is answered. Participants of traditional running events value their own performance more than winning materialistic benefits. They mentioned
that they would improve their own abilities or personal records. Respondents register for
traditional running events so that they have a goal to work towards. The majority of participants
mentioned it is a goal to reach the finish and/or set time goals. Next, the most important
motivations to participate in traditional running events are the challenge, atmosphere, a satisfied
feeling, the social aspect and recreation. Runners participating in both events mentioned that
running traditional events is more of a performance thing for themselves, although innovative
running events are more socially respected. This is also confirmed by other respondents. All
respondents of innovative running events mentioned that they will always run with friends.
Therefore, social recognition became important in innovative running events. The most
important motivations for them are therefore enjoyment, having fun with friends and
achievement of the physical challenge.

6. Discussion, practical and managerial implications and future
research
The interviews provided several overwhelming topics, of which the main findings of runners’
motivation in traditional versus innovative running events were derived from. The six most
important topics, related to runners’ motivation, will be elaborated in relation to the theory
described in chapter 2. Thereafter, the practical and managerial implication are described. In
paragraph 5.3, the limitations are reflected. Next, the direction for further research is stated in
paragraph 5.4.

6.1 Discussion
6.1.1 Runners’ profile
The group of runners is defined as heterogeneous, which means that the group of runners is
diverse and that there is not a specific running segment (Scheerder et al., 2015). According to
Scheerder et al. (2015), event runners are 70% male and 30% female and the number of event
runners between the age of 30 to 55 years old increases. During the interviews it became clear
that this increase could be explained because most runners start running because they need –
whether or not for medical reasons – an alternative for another (team) sport. Respondents who
mentioned this were all between the age of 30 to 55 years when they started running. This could
be explained by the fact that most younger people participate in team sports. Therefore, it is
possible that people younger than 30 have less time to participate running frequently. On the
other hand, it is not odd that people above 30 like having fewer obligations and therefore start running instead of participating sports with more obligations. It is also possible that people above 30 need or want fewer new social contacts and therefore choose an individual sport like running. However, the respondents showed also that the running market is diverse and that different people participate in running. Especially participants of innovative running events were younger than Scheerder et al. (2015) stated. This could be explained by the image of innovative running events and that younger people are more attracted by the obstacles.

A runner is defined as someone who runs at least 12 times a year. Therefore, all respondents of traditional running events could be seen as a runner. In contrast, one participant of innovative running events does only run in preparation for events. He/she will not run 12 times a year. During the interviews it became clear that participants of traditional running events run more often as a leisure activity than participants of innovative running events. This could be explained by the fact that participants of innovative running events do not like it to go for a run. They do not run for pleasure, but because they want to get fit or as a preparation for an event. Next to that, participants of traditional running events run further distances than participants of innovative running events. This could be explained by the fact that participants of traditional running events are endurance runners and participants of innovative running events in general like short distances and explosiveness. The fact that participants of innovative running events liked explosiveness is based by the answers of respondents that they combine running usually with fitness, strength training or CrossFit. These types of training are more explosive in comparison with an endurance run. In the end, this means that participants of traditional running events are more motivated to went for a run, although participants of innovative running events are also motivated to combine short distances with the gym.

6.1.2 The number of running events per year
According to the current literature, there was nothing known about the number of events in which both types of runners participated. Based on the interviews, it could be concluded that the number of running events participated differs per person. This is not dependent on the type of running event. Some participants run only one event per year, although other participants run 12 events per year. Especially respondents of traditional running events mentioned that registering for an event helps them to go for a run more often in their spare time. When one registered for an event, he/she generated a goal to work towards. Since motivation is defined as ‘an inner state of activation that provides energy needed to achieve a goal’ (Hoyer et al., 2018),
it is not odd that participants of traditional running events mentioned that they are more motivated to go for a run when they registered for an event. Therefore, the outcomes of the interviews are in accordance with the literature of Hoyer et al. (2018) that one becomes more motivated when he/she wants to achieve a goal.

6.1.3 Preparation for running events

Based on the current, described literature in this research, there is nothing known about the preparation of participants of both running events. Therefore, there is searched to new literature. Bottenburg and Hover (2009) mentioned in their study how participants prepare themselves for running events. Therefore, Bottenburg and Hover (2009) makes a distinction between people who does running as main sport and people who has another main sport (than running). This could be compared to participants of traditional running events, of which the majority run as main sport and participants of innovative running events, of which the majority fitness or CrossFit as main sport. Bottenburg and Hover (2009) mentioned that 57% of participants, who run as a main sport, prepare themselves 12 or more weeks before the start of the event. 21% of these participants prepare themselves 6 to 11 weeks and 14% 1 week to 5 weeks before the start of the event. Last 5% of the participants who run as main sport does not or almost not prepare themselves for running events (Bottenburg & Hover, 2009, p. 19). Related this to the interviews, it is not confirmed whether these figures match exactly. However, for larger distances (at least half a marathon), the majority of respondents did also mention that they train more than 12 weeks before the start of the event.

The above mentioned percentages lies different for people who has another main sport than running. This could be linked to participants of innovative running events because they mentioned that they especially do fitness, CrossFit or strength training. Next to that, they participate running to get fit or as preparation for an event. The numbers for this group, according to Bottenburg and Hover (2009) are as follows, 40% of the people prepare themselves at least 12 weeks before the start of the event. Next, 24% of the people prepare themselves between the 6 and 11 weeks and 18% between the 1 week and 5 weeks before the start of the event (Bottenburg & Hover, 2009, p. 19). Last, 17% did not prepare themselves at all before they participate in running events. It seems logical that there are more respondents who does not prepare themselves for events when they does not running as main sport. Especially when people participate sports like soccer or field hockey. Within these sports people also need to have a good condition and people who participate innovative running events does mostly not
have to run very long distances because of the obstacles. However, above mentioned numbers are difficult to link to the respondents for innovative running events because the respondents did not mention how many weeks they start running in order to prepare themselves for the events.

On the other hand, there seems to be a difference in the frequency of running between people who run as main sport and people who have another main sport. According to Bottenburg and Hover (2009), 2% of the runners trains less than 1 times a week. However, for participants of innovative running events this percentage changed considerably – to 20% – for participants who has another main sport. This is the same for people who train once a week, 12% of participants who run as main sports train once a week. In contrast, 31% of participants with another main sport train once a week. Last, 86% of participants with running as main sport trains more than one time a week. On the other hand, 48% of participants with another main sport trains also more than ones a week. Relating this to the information generating by interviews, the majority of respondents of traditional running events (which has running as main sport) agreed that they run mostly 2, 3 or 4 times a week when prepare themselves for an event. When relating the people with other main sports to participants of innovative running events, the numbers seems also close to the outcomes of the interviews. There is 1 respondent who train only in preparation of the event, which is on average less than 1 times a week. Next, half of the remaining respondents run 1 time a week and the other half went 2 or 3 times a week for a run. The fact that participants of innovative running events train less frequent than participants of traditional running events could be explained by the fact that these participants do other sports and therefore have less time to run. Next, the majority of respondents of innovative running events has stated that they don’t like the running activity at all, which could be an important determinant for respondents to go less often for a run.

6.1.4 Why participants start running
According to the current literature, people start running because it is easy to learn and it is good for one’s health (Scheerder et al., 2015, p. 204). This is also partly experienced by asking the question why people start running. Therefore, it is not odd that Scheerder et al. (2015) mentioned this in their study. However, Scheerder et al. (2015) did not explain what they exactly meant with ‘good for one’s health’. During the interviews it became clear that this could be related to 1) improvement of one’s condition, 2) losing weight or 3) for medical reasons.
6.1.5 Runners’ motivation to participate in both running events

Based on the current literature, atmosphere is most important when one is considering to register for a traditional running event. It is not odd that Scheerder et al. (2015) and Bottenburg & Hover (2009) mentioned this in their study because this also matches the results of the interviews. Bottenburg & Hover (2009) stated also that another important factor to register for an event is because acquaintances also participate. However, this outcome could be doubted since the majority of participants of traditional running events runs the event on their own. Some respondents mentioned that they liked to do the peripheral activities with others, in order to make running more a social sport instead of individual sport. However, all participants run the event itself in their own. On the other hand, this outcome of Bottenburg & Hover (2009) seems to be, in larger numbers, true for participants of innovative running events. All participants of innovative running events mentioned in the interviews that they participate together with family, friends or acquaintances.

The current literature describes that running jams at traditional running events is one of the most important points for running events to improve. This is confirmed by respondents of the interviews. They mentioned for example: “so many people participate that you can hardly walk your own tempo for the first four/five kilometers, that is how crowded it is”. Therefore, most respondents mentioned that they think a good organization is important. One respondent explained this further as follows: “at the ‘Zevenheuvelenloop’ you start in groups, classified by speed. This means the fastest participant went first and the slowest went last. Then it is not necessary to run past everyone all the time. At the ‘Dam tot Dam loop’ for example, you were also classified in groups. However, these groups were made from start-number to start-number. Then you had to run through the grass when passing someone and were really bothered by each other”. Therefore, a well-organized event is an important determinant for runners to register for the event or not. This seems logical since running jams could prevent someone from achieving goals and the running activity itself.

The current literature also described some motivational factors for participants of innovative running events to participate. Scheerder et al. (2015) mentioned in their study that the majority of participants focused on the activity itself, the social setting, the atmosphere or the physical challenge. However, according to the study of Rodriguez (2015), motivations to participate in innovative running events are described as friends participating, connecting and socializing with others, having fun and the physical challenge. The outcomes of Scheerder et al. (2015) and Rodriguez (2015) look similar, although Rodriguez (2015) did not mention the
importance of the activity itself. Based on the current literature and the interview results, it
could be concluded that the most important reasons to participate in innovative running events
are: 1) the physical challenge, 2) having fun and 3) socializing with others.

6.1.5.1 Achievement Goal Theory
The current literature in paragraph 2.5.3 stated participants of traditional running events want
to win or set the best performance. It is striking that the current literature stated that participants
of traditional running events want to win. The reason for this is that all respondents have
explained that one is not able to win in these events. This appears from the following quotes:
“Winning? That is impossible.”, “What do you mean with winning? When do you win with
running?”, “Winning is not important, I think it is important to reach the finish”, “Winning is
not possible, so that is not important. In addition, then the pressure becomes too high, which is
not necessary for me”. Next, according to the interview results, winning or setting the best
performance do not seem to be the motivational factors for runners. As stated in hypothesis 1,
participants of traditional running events set task-goals and are thus intrinsically motivated.
They want to improve their own records and set up challenging goals. Based on the
Achievement Goal Theory of Nicholls (1989), self-improvement and choosing challenging
tasks are part of task-goals (see table 1).

Participants of innovative running events were, according to the current literature,
motivated by the physical challenge. This leads, according to the literature, to task-goals.
However, after analyzing the interviews it became clear that participants of innovative running
events have diverse motivations to participate. As stated in hypothesis 2, the majority of
participants have indicated that they want to challenge and improve themselves. This leads to
task-goals and intrinsic motivation. On the other hand, all respondents mentioned that social
recognition is important for them, which leads to ego-goals and to extrinsic motivation (see
table 1). Therefore, it could be concluded that participants of innovative running events set both
task- and/or ego-goals. Respondents of innovative running events are intrinsically motivated to
participate. However, the social recognition could become important because of the atmosphere
and vision of these events. Nobody runs on their own at innovative running events and all
participants help each other reaching the finish. Even when one wants to run in their own, this
seems to be almost impossible at this kind of events because all participants help each other
during the event. Even when they don’t know each other. Therefore, challenge and self-
improvements became the most important determinants to participate in innovative running events, which are related to task-goals.

6.1.5.2 Self Determination Theory

The Self Determination Theory stated that one’s motivation could change over time. Where one first was extrinsically motivated to participate in sports, after a while sports became their own interest and the motivation changed into intrinsic motivation (Spray et al., 2006). Hoyer et al. (2018) stated also that someone’s motivation could change over time since there are different types of involvement. This was confirmed by interviews. Respondents of traditional running events have literally said that they did not like running at the beginning. After a while, when they continued running more frequently and after showing some progress, they started to like running. Thereafter, they wanted to run more times a week. The motivational change from introjected regulations (extrinsic motivation) to intrinsic motivation could be explained by the fact that it is easy and accessible to start running. Participants generally do not like running in the first place but they participate in the running activity because of extrinsic motivational factors.

Respondents mentioned that the most important reasons to participate in traditional running events were the challenge, atmosphere, feeling satisfied, the social aspect and recreations (see hypothesis 4). Respondents imagine that they indeed want to achieve their goals and that they are disappointed when they cannot reach them. However, they also mentioned that they are still amateurs wanting to enjoy the event. This is where the concepts ‘atmosphere’, ‘feeling satisfied’, ‘social aspect’ and ‘recreation’ become important. On the other hand, it is possible to interpret and link ‘challenge’ to the results of Scheerder et al. (2015) about ‘the willingness to set the best performance’. However, respondents mentioned that the challenge is not always about setting the best performance. It depends on one’s situation. There are several factors that influence the challenge, for example the weather or how much one has trained for the event.

Based on the current literature, participants of innovative running events were intrinsically motivated to stimulate experience. This was based on the fact that Scheerder et al. (2015) and Rodriguez (2015) mentioned that participants of innovative running events were motivated by the physical challenge. It is conceivable that the researchers mentioned this, since this is confirmed in the interviews. Hypothesis 5 stated that participants of innovative running events enjoy events, have fun with others and want to achieve the physical challenge. These are
determinants of intrinsic motivation. As stated before, this applies only the participation to the event and not for the running activity itself. Respondents are definitely extrinsically motivated to went for a run because they do not like the running activity itself (if only looking at the four respondents who participated in innovative running events solely). This could be explained by the fact that these respondents only run because they want to get fit or they are not considered to be endurance runners. They like short distances and explosiveness instead of running a long distance. This seems logical since innovative running events mostly consist of short distances with obstacles in between. The explosiveness could be found in the obstacles and one doesn’t have to run long distances.

According to Vallerand et al. (1999), one’s motivation to participate in sports becomes higher for intrinsically motivated people than for extrinsically motivated people. Next, Tsorbatzoudi et al. (2006) mentioned that an increase in motivation leads to an increase in sports participation. Extrinsic motivation could lead to an increased intention to continue sport. Intrinsic motivation could increase knowledge and stimulate someone to achieve performance. Relating this to the outcomes of the interviews, it could be concluded that participants of traditional running events have a higher motivation to run than participants of innovative running events. However, respondents of both traditional and innovative running events are intrinsically motivated to participate in the events.

6.1.6 The needs and wants of runners, and what influences them
It is stated in current literature that people are motivated to participate in running events because of the physical challenge, atmosphere, distance and enjoyment (Rodriguez, 2015) (Scheerder et al., 2015). Therefore, respondents were asked which of these four elements they consider to be important. However, respondents were also free to name something else. As mentioned in paragraph 4.3.7, respondents of both events mentioned almost the same, namely enjoyment and atmosphere. However, participants of traditional running events mentioned also that a challenging distance is an important factor for them. This seems logical, because most participants of traditional running events want 1) to improve themselves and to challenge themselves for longer distances or 2) to run a (half) marathon frequently so they do not consider a 5 or 10 kilometer run to be a challenge anymore. On the other hand, participants of innovative running events mentioned that the physical challenge is also important for them. This is also not odd, since most participants participated in, for example, a Strong Viking Run. Looking at the mission of this type of event they stated: “Strong Vikings’ mission is to make one stronger,
both physically and mentally. We challenge one to push his/her limits and meet challenges”. This mission indicates that the events are made to challenge yourself and therefore it is not odd that participants of innovative running events say that the physical challenge is important to them.

Respondents mentioned that they are influenced by some external factors, like social media or sports watches. It is not surprising that especially the younger generation perceives pictures on social media to be influencing for themselves or others. However, the answers varied frequently. Some respondents mentioned that they post pictures on social media because they are proud to have made it. However they do not think that it influenced someone else. This difference can probably be explained by whether a respondent him- or herself is sensitive for the influence of social media.

All respondents with a sports watch mentioned that they were influenced by the information generated by the sports watch. They were particularly influenced by this at the beginning. Therefore, people had to come up with their own way of filtering the information obtained. Sometimes, people think they are informed too much by the sports watch. However, all the respondents stated that a sports watch is a useful gadget to help during training or the achievement of goals.

6.2 Practical and managerial implications

The findings seem to consist of managerial implications for organizers of traditional and innovative running events. The first logical implication for event organizers is the knowledge and awareness of the motivational factors of participants. Event organizers should be aware of the factors that motivate participants to register for that event. There is a difference in motivation for participants of traditional versus innovative running events. This research determined the most important motivational factors for both events and is therefore important for organizers of both events.

The second implication is based on an improvement related to traditional running events. As mentioned by Bottenburg & Hover (2009), it is important to improve running jams at traditional running events. This could be done by selecting participants based on expected speed. Thereafter, the fastest people should start first and the slowest people last. This is an irritation of participants which is easily solvable.

Zevenheuvelenloop questioned whether innovative running events have an influence on the losing market share of traditional events. This is where the third implication comes in. Based
on the interviews, it could be concluded that innovative running events do not have an influence on the participation in traditional running events. This information is based on the fact that participants of innovative running events are not intrinsically motivated to go for a run. Next, they mentioned to run rather short distances and explosively instead of an endurance run.

6.3 Limitations
This research is conducted using semi-structured interviews. This means that this study generates a higher reliability. However, a limitation of semi-structured interviews is that important and relevant unforeseen topics - which are not being mentioned in the structure of the interviews - could be excluded.

The second limitation is about the distraction of participants during the interviews. Most interviews were held in a silent and quiet place. However, some participants were only accessible by phone. Two of the respondents were travelling during the interviews. Therefore, they could have been more distracted during the interviews than expected and the (phone) reception on was not always that good. However, the respondents did answer all questions properly.

The reader should bear in mind that the respondents for innovative running events mainly participate in Strong Viking Runs. There was little variation in the type of innovative running events. This means that participants had only participated in obstacle runs and/or mud runs and had not participated in ladies or color runs for example. Therefore, the outcomes are possibly not generalizable for all types of innovative running events, but only for obstacle runs and mud runs.

The fourth limitation is also about the interviews with participants of innovative running events. Enough information was found to write this master thesis. However, it is important to note that 3 out of 13 respondents participated in both traditional and innovative running events. It could be concluded that participants only participating in innovative running events generally do not enjoy running. However, respondents who participate in both events like running as well. Therefore, it would have been better when there were more respondents interviewed who solely participate in innovative running events.

The profiles of event runners described by Scheerder et al. (2015) were taken into account for the selection of respondents. However, it is not clear whether the profile of the event runner is only based on participants of traditional running events, or also on participants of innovative running events. The exact target group profile for participants of innovative running
events is unclear, which is why it is unclear whether the right target group is reached within this research.

6.4 Future research
This research indicated five hypotheses based on the outcomes of the interviews. Nine interviews with participants of traditional running events and seven interviews with participants of innovative running events were done. The large amount of information obtained from interviews with a small number of respondents should be tested with quantitative research in the future.

Next, quantitative research could not only test the hypotheses. It is also useful to determine the specific target groups for both type of events. Quantitative research is for example useful in determining the gender, age and educational level of the respondents. When this became clear, it should be easier to understand the different motivations for people who participate in traditional versus innovative running events.

The five hypotheses stated in this research are consciously only about the Achievement Goal Theory and Self Determination Theory. This is done because these theories are useful in determining one’s motivation in sports. However, it could be also interesting to test other factors in future research, like the event runners’ profile, why people participate in running events, how they prepare themselves and what exactly runners’ needs and wants are and what influences them.

As mentioned in section 5.3, respondents of innovative running events participated only obstacle and/or mud runs. To test whether these outcomes are generalizable for all types of innovative running events, the hypotheses could be tested by quantitative research. Therefore it will be important to generate respondents from various types of running events.

The reader should realize that this study only is focused on the Dutch running market. Future research could be done to check whether the outcomes also apply to other countries. Rodriguez (2015) investigated runners’ motivation of innovative running events in the United States. Therefore, it could especially be interesting to conduct this research again in non-western countries.

This research showed that people were influenced by their sports watches. Respondents mentioned that they, especially in the beginning, were influenced by the information generated by these watches. Interesting was that all respondents filtered the information and tried not to be influenced too much by the watches. Future research could be done to generate insight in the
The influence of diseases on one’s running participation is also an interesting topic for future research. One of the respondents mentioned that he/she had to deal with diabetes, which is an obstacle for him/her. On the other hand, this leads to extra motivation to achieve the finish/goals.
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Appendix 1: Data collection

1.1 Facebook post

1.2 Facebook and Instagram ‘poll’
## Appendix 2: Summary of the coding process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Traditioneel</th>
<th>Innovatief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soort hardloper</td>
<td>5 = 1 / 2 keer per week 2 = 2 / 3 keer per week 2 = 3 / 4 keer per week 5 = 0-10 km 2 = 10-15 km 2 = 15-20 km</td>
<td>1 = ik hardloop niet 4 = 1 / 2 keer per week 1 = 2 / 3 keer per week 1 = 3 / 4 keer per week 5 = 0-10 km 1 = 0-20 km 1 = 10-15 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waarom begonnen?</td>
<td>6 = extrinsieke factoren 3 = intrinsieke factoren</td>
<td>6 = extrinsieke factoren 1 = intrinsieke factoren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welke evenementen?</td>
<td>5 = 1-3 evenementen 2 = 3-5 evenementen 1 = 5-10 evenementen 1 = 10+ evenementen 7 = min. halve marathon 2 = max. ten miles</td>
<td>4 = 1-3 evenementen 2 = 3-5 evenementen 1 = 5-10 evenementen Varieert van 13 tot 60 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voorbereiding</td>
<td>5 = met schema 2 = zonder schema 2 = schema marathon 4 = extra trainen 3 = traint het hele jaar door 2 = extra trainen marathon 1 = eetpatroon aangepast 8 = eetpatroon niet aangepast</td>
<td>4 = extra getraind hardlopen 3 = niet extra getraind hardlopen 4 = extra getraind obstakels 3 = niet extra getraind obst 1 = eetpatroon aangepast 6 = eetpatroon niet aangepast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self determination theory</td>
<td>8 = om een doel te hebben: extra motivatie Overige antwoorden: uitdaging, goede sfeervol/voldaan gevoel bij finish, sociaal aspect en ontspanning</td>
<td>2 = gewoon leuk 2 = sociaal &amp; sportief 1 = ontspanning 3 = uitdaging 1 = stok achter de deur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waarom doe je mee?</td>
<td>4 = ja 5 = nee</td>
<td>6 = ja 1 = nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aangemoedigd door andere: inschrijven</td>
<td>4 = ja 5 = nee</td>
<td>6 = ja 1 = nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alleen of samen?</td>
<td>6 = alleen 3 = samen met andere</td>
<td>0 = alleen 7 = samen met andere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is winnen belangrijk?</td>
<td>0 = ja 9 = nee</td>
<td>1 = ja (medailles winnen) 6 = nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 = intrinsieke</td>
<td>7 = intrinsieke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intrinsieke/extrinsieke motivatie</td>
<td>0 = extrinsieke</td>
<td>0 = extrinsieke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement Goal Theory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Belangrijkste doel</td>
<td>4 = uitlopen</td>
<td>6 = uitlopen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = tijdsdoel</td>
<td>1 = jezelf extreem uitdagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Invloed andere?</td>
<td>3 = ja</td>
<td>2 = ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = nee</td>
<td>3 = nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Eigen prestatie / winnen?</td>
<td>9 = eigen prestatie</td>
<td>7 = eigen prestatie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = winnen</td>
<td>0 = winnen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wanneer succesvol?</td>
<td>6 = tijdsdoel behaald</td>
<td>5 = finish gehaald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = finish behaald</td>
<td>2 = goed gevoel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = goed gevoel</td>
<td>1 = social aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = altijd succesvol</td>
<td>1 = geen antwoord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = sociaal aspect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belangrijkste aan hardloopevenement</strong></td>
<td>1 = Groot evenement</td>
<td>3 = Goed georganiseerd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Goed georganiseerd</td>
<td>4 = sfeer en plezier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Sfeer en plezier</td>
<td>3 = Fysieke uitdaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Uitdagende afstand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aan welk hardloopevenement zou je nooit meedoen?</strong></td>
<td>1 = klein/niet goed georganiseerd</td>
<td>2 = klein/niet goed georganiseerd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = innovatieve evenementen</td>
<td>4 = traditionele evenementen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = fysiek te makkelijk of moeilijk</td>
<td>1 = nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = nee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Media</strong></td>
<td>6 = deelt foto’s</td>
<td>5 = deelt foto’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = deelt niks</td>
<td>2 = deelt niks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beïnvloed door sporthorloges</strong></td>
<td>6 = ja</td>
<td>4 = ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = niet gevraagd</td>
<td>2 = heb geen sporthorloge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = niet gevraagd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>