Indonesian Journal of Sustainability Accounting and Management
ISSN 2597–6214 | e–ISSN 2597–6222
DOI: 10.28992/ijsam.v5i2.210

Investigating the Effect of Customer Experience, Perceived Value, and Customer Satisfaction on Environment-Friendly Behavior

Üzeyir Kement[1] | Evren Güçer[2] | Sinan Çavuşoğlu[3] * | Bülent Demirağ[4]

[1]*Ordu University, Gastronomy and Culinary Arts, Ordu, Turkey*
[2]*Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Department of Recreation, Ankara, Turkey*
[3]*Bingol University, Vocational School of Social Science, Management and Organization Services, Bingol, Turkey*
[4]*Gaziantep University, Department of Property Protection and Security, Gaziantep, Turkey*

*Correspondence to: Sinan Çavuşoğlu, Bingol University, Vocational School of Social Science, Management and Organization Services, Bingol, Turkey.
E-mail: sinankys42@gmail.com

Abstract: In line with the model proposed within the scope of the research, this study seeks to achieve the following goals: 1) to examine the effect of experience on perceived value, 2) to determine the effect of the sub-dimensions of perceived value on customer satisfaction, and 3) to determine the effect of customer satisfaction on environment friendly behavior. The study was conducted on individuals who participated in the camping activities in the Black Sea region of Turkey. The results show that feel, relate, and act experiences have positive effects on functional value, while sense, feel, and act experiences have positive effects on social value. Additionally, sense, feel, relate, and act experiences show positive effects on emotional value, while sense, feel, and act experiences have positive effects on epistemic and conditional values. On the other hand, the think experience, located in the experience dimensions, does not affect any sub-dimension of perceived value. In conclusion, the sub-dimensions of the perceived value affect customer satisfaction, and customer satisfaction positively affects environmentally friendly behavior.

Keywords: camping, customer experience, customer satisfaction, environmental behavior, perceived value.

Article info: Received 12 May 2020 | revised 6 September 2020 | accepted 30 April 2021

Recommended citation: Kement, Ü., Güçer, E., Çavuşoğlu, S., & Demirağ, B. (2021). Investigating the Effect of Customer Experience, Perceived Value, and Customer Satisfaction on Environment-Friendly Behavior. *Indonesian Journal of Sustainability Accounting and Management*, 5(2), 175–186. https://doi.org/10.28992/ijsam.v5i2.210.

INTRODUCTION

People are inclined to take part in recreational activities for reasons such as severe working conditions, living in crowded environments because of urbanization, the desire to rest mentally and physically and seeking relaxation. Recreative activities let people recharge themselves and enable them to be more active in work life (Iso-Ahola et al., 1980). However, recreational activities may lead to negative consequences, such as environmental pollution in places where these activities are carried out (Han et al., 2010; Song et al., 2012). In order to avoid such damage, it is required that we primarily become attentive consumers and for environmentally friendly applications to be practiced while doing these activities. Therefore, individuals are expected to take environmental problems in consideration while performing recreational activities (Formica & Murrmann, 1998; Çavuşoğlu & Durmaz, 2019).

In the last few years, marketing activities for the development of environmentally friendly behaviors and attitudes have also gone up in the tourism sector. In line with these developments there has been a great increase in examination of environmentally friendly behavior of consumers in the tourism sector (Butler, 2008; Han et al., 2009; Han et al., 2010; Chan, 2013). In particular, it has become essential to determine the environmentally friendly behaviors of individuals visiting natural areas for tourism or recreation purposes (Kement & Güçer, 2015). This is because some issues have become more imperative in preventing the destruction of natural areas and minimizing the damage given to them (Clark et al., 1971). There are some factors that have led individuals to prefer camping activities more than before. These may include the search for alternative tourism types and trying to get away from urban environments by going to natural areas (Bultena & Klessig, 1969). Given the fact that the individuals who carry out these activities also make economic contributions to their destinations, camping has become one of the most popular recreational activities. However, because camping activities take place in natural areas, certain environmental measures should be taken. It is believed that by this means, the level of environmentally friendly behavior in individuals can be identified and the factors in the field of marketing directing the individuals to behave in an environmentally friendly manner can be discovered.

Although the need to protect natural areas has become paramount, the studies on the environmentally friendly behaviors of consumers are not carried out to a satisfactory level (Song et al., 2012). Therefore, thanks to this study it is intended to determine the environmentally friendly behaviors of individuals in camping activities, which are believed to be studied inadequately. In recent years, the experience economy has developed into significant in the marketing and development of an event (Tsaur et al., 2007). It is possible for individuals to gain experience in nature-based recreation activities. These experiences allow the individuals to repeat the same activity. The experiences of individuals in camping activities are one of the far-reaching factors (Kim & Perdue, 2013; Özer et al., 2015). It has been observed that when the experiences of individuals gained as a result of the performed activity turn out to be positive, they may repeat the activity (Xiang & Gretzel, 2010). For example, Chen & Lin (2015) found that the customer experience of individuals in sustainable social relationship positively affects the perceived value. It is advantageous for businesses and marketers in terms of competition to pay attention to the experience that individuals will gain through activities. Thus, it is of great importance to take customer experiences into account during the camping activities and, therefore, to create positive value perceptions in individuals. In addition to achieving economic contributions from camping activities, environmental applications should also be constantly developed and used. While camping activities are being marketed, taking environmentalist practices into account may help prevent the extinction of natural areas where these activities take place. In other words, it is important for entrepreneurs to use community-based and nature-based marketing activities to ensure sustainability.

Unlike other studies, this research aims to examine the effect of sub-dimensions of customer experience on the sub-dimensions of perceived value. In addition, the effect of perceived value of consumers on customer satisfaction, and the effect of customer satisfaction on environment-friendly behaviors have been examined. The model of the study is original in this aspect. The most important finding of this research is the discovery of the factors that are indicators of the environmentally friendly behaviors of individuals. In line with this finding, environmentalist behaviors in recreational and touristic activities taking place in natural areas can be made more prevalent.

METHODS

The questionnaire form consists of five parts. In the first part of the questionnaire, 22 questions were used to measure the customer experience (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Schmitt, 1999; Chang & Chieng, 2006; Nadiri & Günay, 2013), 14 questions were used to measure the perceived value in the second part (Sheth et al., 1991; Ledden et al., 2007; Chahal & Kumari, 2012; Chen & Lin, 2015). Next, in the third chapter, four questions were used to measure the behavior of environmentally friendly recreation (Perugini & Bagozzi, 2001; Kim & Han, 2010; Song et al., 2012). In the fourth section, 3 questions were used to measure customer satisfaction (Chen & Lin, 2015). The final part was used to measure the demographic characteristics. Scales were measured on a five-point Likert-type scale with anchors of (1) "strongly disagree" and (5) "strongly agree". To determine the demographic characteristics of the participants, gender, marital status, age, educational status and income status were asked. To determine the accuracy of the content of the questionnaire, the survey was conducted by both academicians and practitioners. First of all, the questions were translated into Turkish and then back translated into English, and it was checked whether there was a change in meaning. Finally, 30 people were interviewed and then the validity and reliability of the questionnaire were tested for a pre-test.

Individuals visiting the camps in the Black Sea Region were identified as the population of the research. According to the data of the National Camp Caravan Federation (2016) in the Black Sea Region, there are 15 camp sites. Most of these camp sites have bungalow type houses, tent areas, including some food and beverage areas. There is no numerical data about the population of the research. A table has been proposed by Krejcie & Morgan (1970) to determine how much the sample size should be to compare the size of the population. In the calculation of the sample size, 387 questionnaires are sufficient for the sample size at the 0.05 significance level and in the universe size greater than 10,000 specified in the 0.05 sample error (Altunışık et al., 2004; Yazıcıoğlu & Erdoğan, 2004; Ural & Kılıç, 2006). In this study, the sample was determined as 411 people considering that it could represent the population. In the study, the convenience sampling method was used in the selection of the guests to whom the questionnaires were applied, and lastly 420 questionnaires were applied. The surveys continued with 411 questionnaires because of the deficiencies in 9 surveys.

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the respondents. In the questionnaire, respondents were asked about their gender, age, education, income level and marital status. It is seen that 55.7% of the respondents were male and 44.3% were female. When the ages were examined, it was found that the maximum respondent was 35-44 with 25.1%. It was also noticed that more than half of the respondents (53.3%) are married and have children. According to the income level, 42.1% of the respondents have a high income. Conversely, 38.2% of the respondents were educated at undergraduate level.

In the research, SPPS and Amos statistic programs were used to perform descriptive statistical analyzes and path analyzes. Cronbach Alpha (CA) reliability coefficients were used to determine reliability. In order to determine validity, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), composite reliability (CR), average variance extracted (AVE), maximum shared variance square (MSV), average shared variance square (ASV) and AVE root square explained have been made use of. As a last step, path analysis was performed to test hypotheses.

Table 1 Demographic Profile of The Respondents

Variable	Classification	n	%
Gender	Male	229	55.7
	Female	182	44.3
Marital Status	Married with children	219	53.3
	Married and childless	90	21.9
	Single	102	24.8
Income Level	Very Low	34	8.3
	Low	33	8.0
	Medium	92	22.4
	High	173	42.1
	Very High	79	19.2
Education Level	Primary school	53	12.9
	High school	53	12.9
	Associate degree	79	19.2
	Undergraduate degree	157	38.2
	Master degree	69	16.8
Age	<18	10	2.4
	18-24	31	7.5
	25-34	71	17.3
	35-44	103	25.1
	45-54	94	22.9
	55-64	66	16.1
	65≤	36	8.8

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The mean, standard deviation and correlation values are shown in Table 2. The data were not collected by random sampling method. However, the data were collected by a non-random sampling method, but may be random. Runs test was used to determine the random of the data (Kavak, 2008). Scale items p <0.001 was found to be not significant. Therefore, the data shows randomness and the obtained results can be generalized. The Z and significance scores obtained as a result of the runs test are shown in detail in Table 3.

Validity and reliability calculations were performed before the measurement model was tested. The validity and reliability results are shown in Table 3. The AVE (Fornell & Larcker, 1981) and CR (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988) were exploited to determine convergent validity. It was obtained that AVE values were higher than 0.50 and CR values were higher than AVE values. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was also analyzed to determine the construct validity (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Standardized factor loadings of the measurement items of each construct were found to be over 0.50. It was achieved that measurement model has convergent and construct validity. By dividing the chi square by the degree of freedom (X^2/df) the goodness of fit of the model has been determined. If the value of X^2/df is less than 5, the model is acceptable. Also, if it is below 2, it can be said that

the model has a good fit (Şimşek, 2007). When the results were examined, it was remarked that the value of X^2/df was 1.981. Therefore, it can be commented that the measurement model has a good fit. The fact that when the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) value is less than 0.05i it is "good" while it is between 0.05 and 0.08, it reveals the "acceptable" goodness of fit (Stevens, 2001; Schermelleh-Engel & Moosbrugger, 2003). The RMSEA value is 0.048, so the measurement model has a good fit. The goodness of fit index (GFI), the comparative fit index (CFI), and the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) show acceptable compatibility at values of 0.90 or higher (Kline, 1998; Bryne, 2001; Hair et al., 2006; Şimsek, 2007). In this study, the scores of GFI=0.957, CFI=0.983 were found as indicated along with TLI=0.978. Thus, the index results were found to be acceptable. In conclusion, the measurement model has a good fit (X^2/df=1,981, CMIN: 118,872, RMSEA: 0.048, NFI: 0.966, CFI: 0.983, GFI: 0,957; IFI: 0.983, TLI: 0,978, p<0,001). The results are also shown in Table 2.

Maximum shared variance square (MSV), average shared variance square (ASV) and square root values of AVE (Hair et al., 2010) were estimated to determine the discriminant validity. It was found out that MSV values of the variables are lower than AVE values, and ASV values are lower than MSV values (See Table 3). In addition, the square root of the AVE values of each variable is higher than the correlation between the variables (See Table 2). The measurement model has discriminant validity.

Cronbach Alpha (CA) values were analyzed to estimate the reliability of variables. It was learnt that the reliability values of the variables are higher than 0.70, so the reliability coefficients (Hair et al., 2006) are good. Kurtosis (K) and Skewness (S) values were also estimated to determine the normality distribution of variables. All variables provide normal distribution (Hair et al., 2013) (see Table 2).

The hypotheses were tested with structural equation model (see Table 4). The goodness of fit of the model was good (CMIN: 992,685, DF: 700, X^2/df: 1,418, RMSEA: 0.032, NFI: 0.882, GFI: 893, CFI: 0.962, IFI: 0.962, AGFI: 0,875, TLI: 0,957). The estimated R^2 values were functional value (0.31), social value (0.31), emotional value (0.35), epistemic value (0.30), situational value (0.38), customer satisfaction (0.50) and environmentally friendly behavior (0.13), respectively.

Table 2 Mean, Standard Deviation and Discriminant Validity

Constructs		Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	SENSE	3.71	0.83	0.714											
2	FEEL	3.51	1.00	0.516	0.755										
3	THİNK	3.33	0.98	0.347	0.475	0.748									
4	ACT	3.75	0.92	0.384	0.332	0.254	0.775								
5	RELATE	3.65	1.01	0.334	0.314	0.269	0.352	0.806							
6	FNV	3.64	1.03	0.367	0.398	0.353	0.343	0.377	0.755						
7	SCV	3.57	1.03	0.436	0.427	0.275	0.352	0.267	0.332	0.762					
8	EMV	3.53	0.99	0.461	0.427	0.273	0.377	0.343	0.400	0.400	0.787				
9	EPV	3.76	1.11	0.408	0.388	0.243	0.328	0.266	0.464	0.467	0.508	0.812			
10	CDV	3.72	1.09	0.458	0.449	0.313	0.404	0.231	0.493	0.406	0.465	0.638	0.849		
11	CS	3.56	0.97	0.372	0.371	0.293	0.390	0.261	0.505	0.456	0.553	0.580	0.613	0.755	
12	EFB	3.51	1.02	0.233	0.241	0.195	0.250	0.223	0.257	0.356	0.246	0.262	0.253	0.334	0.794

Note: The results written in bold numbers in the sections of each scale refer to the square root of the AVE values, p=<0,001

Table 3 Z-Values, P-Values, Kurtosis, Skewness, Composite Reliability, Averaged Variance Extracted, Cronbach Alpha, Maximum Shared Variance Square, Average Shared Variance Square, Factor Loading

Constructs		Z	p	K. S.	CR	CA	AVE	MSV	ASV	λ
Sense Experience (SENCE)	SENSE1	-3.458	0.001	-0.830 0.260	0.87	0.87	0.51	0.31	0.17	0.668
	SENSE2	-0.746	0.456							0.712
	SENSE3	-3.121	0.002							0.649
	SENSE4	-2.202	0.028							0.618
	SENSE5	-3.368	0.001							0.678
	SENSE6	-0.812	0.417							0.678
	SENSE7	-0.882	0.378							0.762
	SENSE8	-3.272	0.001							0.737
Feel Experience (FEEL)	FEEL1	-2.075	0.038	0.975 -0.258	0.80	0.80	0.57	0.27	0.16	0.748
	FEEL2	-3.479	0.001							0.805
	FEEL3	-2.488	0.013							0.727
Think Experience (THİNK)	THINK1	-2.183	0.029	0.977 -0.662	0.83	0.83	0.56	0.23	0.10	0.719
	THINK2	-3.194	0.001							0.793
	THINK3	-2.979	0.003							0.820
	THINK4	-3.264	0.001							0.666
Act Experience (ACT)	ACT1	-1.061	0.289	0.921 -0.039	0.82	0.82	0.60	0.16	0.11	0.789
	ACT2	-2.122	0.034							0.726
	ACT3	-0.511	0.609							0.819
Relate Experience (RELATE)	RLT1	-2.320	0.020	-0.703 -0.140	0.88	0.87	0.65	0.14	0.08	0.675
	RLT2	-1.174	0.240							0.849
	RLT3	-1.282	0.200							0.879
	RLT4	-1.628	0.104							0.813
Environmentally Friendly Behavior (EFB)	EFB1	-0.805	0.421	-0.493 -0.532	0.87	0.86	0.63	0.13	0.07	0.760
	EFB2	-2.440	0.015							0.867
	EFB3	-1.676	0.094							0.851
	EFB4	-1.837	0.066							0.705
Functional Value (FNV)	FNV1	-2.426	0.015	-0.597 -0.365	0.80	0.84	0.57	0.26	0.15	0.691
	FNV2	-3.479	0.001							0.771
	FNV3	-2.828	0.005							0.808
Social Value (SCV)	SCV1	-3.000	0.003	-0.378 -0.470	0.80	0.81	0.58	0.22	0.14	0.728
	SCV2	-1.333	0.182							0.757
	SCV3	-2.367	0.018							0.806
Emotional Value (EMV)	EMV1	-2.481	0.013	-0.483 -0.516	0.86	0.83	0.62	0.27	0.16	0.831
	EMV2	-2.383	0.017							0.744
	EMV3	-1.933	0.053							0.807
	EMV4	-0.897	0.370							0.765
Epistemic Value (EPV)	EPV1	-3.211	0.001	-0.770 -0.267	0.80	0.80	0.66	0.41	0.18	0.817
	EPV2	-2.315	0.021							0.816
Conditional Value (CDV)	CDV1	-2.651	0.008	-0.798 -0.043	0.84	0.84	0.72	0.41	0.19	0.860
	CDV2	-1.498	0.134							0.848
Customer Satisfaction (CS)	CS1	-3.363	0.001	-0.453 -0.439	0.80	0.80	0.57	0.38	0.19	0.783
	CS2	-0.744	0.457							0.770
	CS3	0.419	0.675							0.728
Model Goodness Fit: CMIN: 1427,900, DF: 1106, χ^2/df: 1,291, RMSEA: 0.027, GFI: 0,881, CFI: 0,968, NFI: 0.872, TLI: 0.964, IFI: 0.968, AGFI: 0,863										

K.S.: Kurtosis, Skewness, CR: Composite Reliability, CA: Cronbach Alpha, AVE: Average variance extracted, λ: confirmatory factor analysis, MSV: Maximum shared variance square, ASV: average shared variance square, p=<0,001

Table 4 Path Analysis

Construct	Hypothesis		Beta (β)	S.D.	t	p	R^2	Result
Functional Value (FNV)	H_{1a}	SENSE»FNV	0.099	0.072	1.372	0.170	0.31	Not Supported
	H_{1b}	FEL»FNV	0.460	0.149	3.092	0.002***		Supported
	H_{1c}	THİNK»FNV	0.078	0.069	1.135	0.257		Not Supported
	H_{1d}	RELATE»FNV	0.202	0.063	3.194	0.001***		Supported
	H_{1e}	ACT»FNV	0.165	0.061	2.690	0.007***		Supported
Social Value (SCV)	H_{2a}	SENSE»SCV	0.245	0.081	3.017	0.003***	0.31	Supported
	H_{2b}	FEEL»SCV	0.568	0.167	3.400	0.000***		Supported
	H_{2c}	THİNK»SCV	-0.028	0.076	-0.364	0.716		Not Supported
	H_{2d}	RELATE»SCV	0.052	0.068	0.763	0.445		Not Supported
	H_{2e}	ACT»SCV	0.193	0.067	2.862	0.004***		Supported
Emotional Value (EMV)	H_{3a}	SENSEEMV	0.242	0.073	3.309	0.000***	0.35	Supported
	H_{3b}	FEEL»EMV	0.480	0.148	3.233	0.001***		Supported
	H_{3c}	THİNK»EMV	-0.032	0.068	-0.464	0.643		Not Supported
	H_{3d}	RELATE»EMV	0.135	0.062	2.191	0.028*		Supported
	H_{3e}	ACT»EMV	0.192	0.061	3.159	0.002***		Supported
Epistemic Value (EPV)	H_{4a}	SENSE»EPV	0.251	0.091	2.759	0.006**	0.30	Supported
	H_{4b}	FEL»EPV	0.655	0.189	3.473	0.000***		Supported
	H_{4c}	THİNK»EPV	-0.057	0.086	-0.659	0.510		Not Supported
	H_{4d}	RELATE»EPV	0.069	0.077	0.900	0.368		Not Supported
	H_{4e}	ACT»EPV	0.228	0.076	3.003	0.003***		Supported
Conditional Value (CDV)	H_{5a}	SENSE»CDV	0.259	0.081	3.190	0.001***	0.38	Supported
	H_{5b}	FEEL»CDV	0.627	0.170	3.694	0.000***		Supported
	H_{5c}	THİNK»CDV	0.018	0.076	0.239	0.811		Not Supported
	H_{5d}	RELATE»CDV	-0.036	0.068	-0.528	0.598		Not Supported
	H_{5e}	ACT»CDV	0.291	0.069	4.247	0.000***		Supported
Customer Satisfaction (CS)	H_6	FNV»CS	0.192	0.058	3.307	0.000***	0.50	Supported
	H_7	SCV» CS	0.142	0.056	2.554	0.011*		Supported
	H_8	EMV» CS	0.249	0.061	4.116	0.000***		Supported
	H_9	EPV»CS	0.168	0.050	3.367	0.000***		Supported
	H_{10}	CDV» CS	0.268	0.055	4.895	0.000***		Supported
Environmentally Friendly Behavior (EFB)	H_{11}	CS»EFB	0.332	0.055	6.021	0.000***	0.13	Supported

When the results of the path analysis are estimated, it was observed that sense was (ß=0.099, p = <0.001) and think was (ß=0.078, p=<0.001) so that they did not have a significant positive effect on the functional value. Therefore, H_{1a} and H_{1c} hypotheses were not supported. On the other hand, feel (ß=0.460, p=<0.001), relate (ß=0.202, p=<0.001) and act (ß=0.165, p=<0.001) have a significant positive effect on functional value. Hence, H_{1b}, H_{1d} and H_{1e} hypotheses were supported. Think (ß= -0.028, p=<0.001) and relate (ß=0.052, p=<0.001) did not have a significant positive effect on social value. For that reason, H_{2c} and H_{2d} hypotheses were not supported.

Conversely, sense (ß=0.245, p=<0.001), feel (ß=0.568, p=<0.001) and act (ß=0.193, p=<0.001) have a significant positive effect on social value. Accordingly, H_{2a}, H_{2b} and H_{2e} hypotheses were supported. Think (ß=-0.032, p=<0.001) did not have a significant positive effect on emotional value. Consequently, H_{3c} hypothesis was not supported. Still, sense (ß=0.242, p=<0.001), feel (ß=0.480, p=<0.001), relate (ß=0.135, p=<0.05) and act (ß=0.192, p=<0.001) have a significant positive effect on emotional value. Therefore, H_{3a}, $H_{3b,}$ H_{3d} and H_{3e} hypotheses were supported. Contrarily, think (ß= -0.057, p=<0.001) and relate (ß=0.069, p=<0.001) did not have a significant positive effect on epistemic value. Hence, H_{4c} and H_{4d} hypotheses were not supported. Conversely, sense (ß=0.251, p=<0.01), feel (ß=0.655, p=<0.001) and act (ß=0.228, p=<0.001) have a significant positive effect on epistemic value. Thus, H_{4a}, H_{4b} and H_{4e} hypotheses were supported. Think (ß= -0.018, p=<0.001) and relate (ß= -0.036, p=<0.001) did not have a significant positive effect on conditional value, meaning that H_{5c} and H_{5d} hypotheses were not supported. Sense (ß=0.259, p=<0.01), feel (ß=0.627, p=<0.001) and act (ß=0.291, p=<0.001) have a significant positive effect on conditional value. For that reason, H_{5a}, H_{5b} and H_{5e} hypotheses were supported. Further, functional (ß=0.192, p=<0.001), social (ß=0.142, p=<0.05), emotional (ß=0.249, p=<0.001), epistemic (ß=0.168, p=<0.001) and conditional (ß=0.268, p=<0.001) have a significant positive effect on customer satisfaction. So, H_{6}, H_{7}, H_{8}, H_{9} and H_{10} hypotheses were supported. In conclusion, customer satisfaction (ß=0.332, p=<0.001) has a significant positive effect on environmentally friendly behavior. Therefore, H_{11} hypothesis was supported.

The research initially reveals the results of the relationships among some factors. It is believed that for more precise results, it is necessary to work in depth on the behavior of individuals participating in nature-based activities. Furthermore, the research was carried out in Turkey and the cultural differences experienced in Turkey (Gömeç, 2006; Kafesoğlu, 2015) can vary compared to other countries. Several variables have been used in the study to determine the environmentally friendly behavior of individuals. Previous studies show that there are other different variables that affect environmentally friendly behaviors (Stern, 2000; Lee, 2011; Song et al., 2012; Kil et al., 2014). For this reason, it can be advised for future research to be carried out on different variables that affect or are expected to affect environmentally friendly behavior.

Another aspect of the study is it investigates the effect of customer experience factors on perceived value. It has been determined that emotional, relational, and behavioral experience dimensions have an effect on functional value while the sensory, emotional and behavioral experience dimensions have an effect on social value. In addition, it was found that sensory, emotional, relational, and behavioral experience dimensions have an impact on the emotional value, whereas sensory, emotional and behavioral experience dimensions affect the epistemic and conditional values. However, it was found that intellectual experience did not affect any value dimensions among experience dimensions. Chen & Lin (2015) found that customer experience positively affects perceived value. In this study, it was determined that think and sense do not have a significant effect on functional value, think and relate do not have a significant effect on social value and epistemic value, and think does not have a significant effect on emotional value. Among all these results, the most remarkable is the think experience. The campers are lowly influenced by think experience dimension. Besides, it does not create a perception of value. However, think is an important factor in the research conducted by Chen & Lin (2015) on social networks. Campers care more about the sense and emotional experience during the camping experience. Therefore, the two studies have different results.

This study also concluded that the perceived value dimensions had a positive effect on customer satisfaction. From this point of view, it can be said that the value perceptions of the individuals who go camping, affect their satisfaction levels. Onaran et al. (2013) investigated the effect of perceived value dimensions in determining the satisfaction levels of thermal hotel customers in their study and found that emotional value is the most

effective value factor. Similarly, this study shows that emotional value was found to be one of the dimensions that affected satisfaction most. On the other hand, Chen & Lin (2015) obtained similar results with their study. Finally, Chen & Chen (2010) concluded that perceived value has a positive effect on customer satisfaction. This result shows that camping tourists feel valuable in nature, and this increases their satisfaction.

Besides, it was deduced that satisfaction affects environmentally friendly behaviors. Thus, the individuals exhibit environment-friendly behaviors when they are satisfied with the circumstances like the services at the camp site and the physical facilities etc. on the condition that camping service providers are qualified in presenting their service and technical equipment to ensure the satisfaction of their customers. This shows that the customers exhibit environmentally friendly behaviors throughout the period in which they purchase service. He et al. (2018) concluded that the satisfaction of tourists visiting the central China positively affect their environmentally friendly behavior. Moreover, Han & Kim (2010) found that satisfaction levels of green hotel customers positively affect their environmentally friendly behavior. All these results are in line with this research results. Finally, it can be said that one of the conditions for leaving a better natural environment to the future generations is that the camping businesses should provide a satisfactory service and reasonable opportunities to their customers.

CONCLUSION

With this research, it was intended to determine the factors that may affect the environmentally friendly behaviors of the individuals participating in camping activities. However, the research, in general terms, has some limitations. Based on the results obtained in the research, a series of conclusions have been developed for the relevant local governments and marketers. With these recommendations, the basic points in the development of sustainable attitude and behavior in camping activities are specified. Thanks to this research, the perception levels of value and experience before the behaviors of the campers were explained. In the research, the effect of customer experience on perceived value was primarily examined. This review was made for those who participated in the camping activity. As a result of the examination, the camp experience has a positive and significant effect on the perceived value of the campers in general. Secondly, the effect of the campers' perceived value on their satisfaction levels was examined. As a result of the examination, it was concluded that the perceived value significantly affected satisfaction positively. Finally, in the research, the effect of customer satisfaction on environmentally friendly behavior was examined. It has been determined that the satisfaction levels of the campers have a positive effect on their environmentally friendly behavior. The experiences of camping tourists affect the perceived value. Therefore, diversification of tourist experiences in camping areas will be advantageous. Also, in the research, it was determined that the thought experience dimension of camper tourists was poor. The main reason for this may be the lack of advertising and promotional activities of the camp, which was taken as a sample. Camp sites need to increase their promotion and advertising activities. On the other hand, perceived value is one of the most important factors underlying the satisfaction of camping tourists. Camp sites should keep the benefit perception of tourists high. Satisfaction of camping tourists ensures that they exhibit behaviors that protect the environment and prevent environmental pollution. The tourism sector and public institutions should take actions to keep value perception and satisfaction of tourists high. This is important for tourists to respect the campsites they visit. This research was limited to Niksar camping. The next research by including other campgrounds located in Turkey can be obtained new findings. Also, different variables can be used to determine the behavior of the campers.

ORCHID

Sinan Çavuşoğlu https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9365-8677

REFERENCES

Altunışık, R., C., R., Bayraktaroğlu, S. K., & Yıldırım, E. (2004). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri. SPSS Uygulamalı*, Sakarya Publishing, Sakarya.

Anderson, J. C. & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: a review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(3), 411-423.

Bagozzi, R. P. & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16*(1), 74-94. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02723327

Bryne, B. M. (2001). Structural equation modeling with AMOS, EQS, and LISREL: Comparative approaches to testing for the factorial validity of a measuring instrument. *International journal of testing, 1*(1), 55-86. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327574IJT0101_4

Bultena, G. L. & Klessig, L. L. (1969). Satisfaction in camping: A conceptualization and guide to social research. *Journal of Leisure Research, 1*(4), 348-354. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1969.11969749

Butler, J. (2008). The compelling "hard case" for "green" hotel development. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 49*(3), 234-244. https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965508322174

Chahal, H. & Kumari, N. (2012). Consumer perceived value: the development of a multiple item scale in hospitals in the Indian context. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Healthcare Marketing, 6*(2), 167-190. https://doi.org/10.1108/17506121211243086

Chan, E. (2013). Gap analysis of green hotel marketing. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 25*(7), 1017-1048. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-09-2012-0156

Chang, P. L. & Chieng, M. H. (2006). Building consumer-brand relationship: a cross-cultural experiential view. *Psychology & Marketing, 23*(11), 927-959. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20140

Chen, C. F. & Chen, F. S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism management, 31*(1), 29-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.02.008

Chen, S. C. & Lin, C. P. (2015). The impact of customer experience and perceived value on sustainable social relationship in blogs: An empirical study. *Technological forecasting and social change, 96*, 40-50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2014.11.011

Clark, R. N., Hendee, J. C., & Campbell, F. L. (1971). Values, behavior, and conflict in modern camping culture. *Journal of Leisure Research, 3*(3), 143-159. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1971.11970026

Çavuşoğlu, S. & Durmaz, Y. (2019). Yeşil Davranışlara Karşı Tutumun Ziyaret Niyetine Etkisinde Yeşil İmajın Düzenleyicilik Rolü: Yeşil Oteller Örneği. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 29*(2), 303-315.

Fornell, C. & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. *Journal of marketing research*, 382-388. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800313

Formica, S. & Murrmann, S. (1998). The effects of group membership and motivation on attendance: an international festival case. *Tourism Analysis, 3*(3/4), 197-207.

Gömeç, S. (2006). *Türk kültürünün ana hatları*. Akçağ Publishig, Turkey.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Pearson Prentice Hall. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.

Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2013). *Multivariate Data Analysis*: Pearson Education Limited.

Han, H., Hsu, L. T. J., & Lee, J. S. (2009). Empirical investigation of the roles of attitudes toward green behaviors, overall image, gender, and age in hotel customers' eco-friendly decision-making process. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 28*(4), 519-528. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.02.004

Han, H., Hsu, L. T. J., & Sheu, C. (2010). Application of the theory of planned behavior to green hotel choice: Testing the effect of environmental friendly activities. *Tourism Management, 31*(3), 325-334. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.03.013

Han, H. & Kim, Y. (2010). An investigation of green hotel customers' decision formation: Developing an extended model of the theory of planned behavior. *International journal of hospitality management, 29*(4), 659-668. https://doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.01.001

He, X., Hu, D., Swanson, S. R., Su, L., & Chen, X. (2018). Destination perceptions, relationship quality, and tourist environmentally responsible behavior. *Tourism management perspectives, 28*(July), 93-104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp. 2018.08.001

Iso-Ahola, S. E., Allen, J. R., & Buttimer, K. J. (1980). Experience-related factors as determinants of leisure satisfaction. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 23*(1), 141-146. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.1982.tb00424.x

Kafesoğlu, İ. (2015). *Türk milli kültürü*. Ötüken Neşriyat A. S.

Kavak, B. (2008). *Pazarlama Araştırmaları Tasarım ve Analiz*. Ankara: Hacettepe University Publishing.

Kement, Ü. & Güçer, E. (2015). Kamping Yapan Bireylerin Çevre Dostu Rekreasyon Davranışlarına Ekolojik Tutum ve Rekreasyonel Motivasyon Değişkenlerinin Etkisinin İncelenmesi. *Journal of Recreation & Tourism Research, 2*(3), 16-27.

Kil, N., Holland, S. M., & Stein, T. V. (2014). Structural relationships between environmental attitudes, recreation motivations, and environmentally responsible behaviors. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism, 7*, 16-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2014.09.010

Kim, Y. H. & Han, H. S. (2010). Intention to pay conventional hotel prices at a green hotel: a modification of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 18*(8), 997-1014. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2010.490300

Kim, D. & Perdue, R. R. (2013). The effects of cognitive, affective, and sensory attributes on hotel choice. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 35*, 246-257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.05.012

Kline, R. B. (1998). Software review: Software programs for structural equation modeling: Amos, EQS, and LISREL. *Journal of psychoeducational assessment, 16*(4), 343-364. DOI: 10.1177/073428299801600407

Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607-610. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308

Lee, T. H. (2011). How recreation involvement, place attachment and conservation commitment affect environmentally responsible behavior. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 19*(7), 895-915. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.570345

Ledden, L., Kalafatis, S. P., & Samouel, P. (2007). The relationship between personal values and perceived value of education. *Journal of Business Research, 60*, 965-974. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.01.021

Nadiri H. & Günay, G. N. (2013). An Empirical Study To Diagnose The Outcomes Of Customers Experiences In Trendy Coffee Shops, *Journal of Business Economics and Management, 14*(1), 22-53. https://doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2011.631742

Onaran, B., Atıl-Bulut, Z., & Özmen, A. (2013). Müşteri Değerinin, Müşteri Tatmini, Marka Sadakati ve Müşteri İlişkileri Yönetimi Performansı Üzerindeki Etkilerinin İncelenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Business & Economics Research Journal, 4*(2), 37-53.

Özer, L., Kement, Ü., & Gültekin, B. (2015). Genişletilmiş planlanmış davranış teorisi kapsamında yeşil yıldızlı otelleri tekrar ziyaret etme niyeti. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 33*(4), 72-85. https://doi.org/10.17065/huiibf.08815

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: a multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing, 64*(1), 12-40.

Perugini, M. & Bagozzi, R. P. (2001). The role of desires and anticipated emotions in goal-directed behaviours: broadening and deepening the theory of planned behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 40*(1), 79-98. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164704

Schermelleh-Engel, K. & Moosbrugger, H. (2003). Evaluating the Fit of Sructural Equation Models: Tests of Significance and Descriptive Goodness of Fit Measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online, 12*(2), 23-74.

Schmitt, B. H. (1999). *Experiential marketing: how to get customers to sense, feel, think, act and relate to your company and brand*, New York, USA.

Sheth, J. N., Newman, B. I., & Gross, B. L. (1991). Why we buy what we buy: a theory of consumption values. *Journal of Business Research, 22*, 159-170. https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(91)90050-8

Song, H. J., Lee, C. K., Kang, S. K., & Boo, S. J. (2012). The effect of environmentally friendly perceptions on festival visitors' decision-making process using an extended model of goal-directed behavior. *Tourism Management, 33*(6), 1417-1428. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.01.004

Stern, P. C. (2000). New environmental theories: toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. *Journal of social issues, 56*(3), 407-424. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00175

Stevens, J. P. (2001). *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences*. Taylor & Francis.

Şimşek, Ö. F. (2007). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesine giriş; temel ilkeler ve LISREL uygulamaları*, Ekinoks Publishing, Ankara.

Tsaur, S. H., Chiu, Y. T., & Wang, C. H. (2007). The Visitors Behavioral Consequences of Experiential Marketing: An empirical study on Taipei Zoo. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 21*(1), 47-64. https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v21n01_04

Ural, A. & Kılıç, İ. (2006). *Bilimsel Araştırma Süreci ve SPSS ile Veri Analizi: SPSS 10.0-12.0 for Windows*. Detay Publishing, Ankara.

Yazıcıoğlu, Y. & Erdoğan, S. (2004). *SPSS Uygulamalı Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*, Detay Publishing, Ankara.

Xiang, Z. & Gretzel, U. (2010). Role of social media in online travel information search. *Tourism Management, 31*, 179-188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.02.016