

LEVERAGING CHARITY SPORT EVENTS TO DEVELOP A CONNECTION TO A CAUSE

ADAM GOODWIN,* RYAN SNELGROVE,† LAURA WOOD,† AND MARIJKE TAKS‡

*Human Kinetics, University of Windsor, Windsor, ON, Canada

†Department of Recreation & Leisure Studies, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada

‡School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, Canada

Charity sport events can be strategically leveraged to provide benefits beyond the event itself. This study explores how charity sport events can be leveraged as an opportunity for nonprofit organizations to stimulate participants' interest in their other cause-related activities. Specifically, the relationships between motives for participation and future intentions to engage in additional cause-related activities are examined. Questionnaires were used to collect data at three separate and uniquely themed running events in support of charities tied to Alzheimer's disease, anaphylaxis, and mental health. Results from the multiple regression analysis highlight the predictive importance of cause, social, and event theme as predictors of future intentions. The physical aspect of the event was an important factor in attracting participants to the event but not predictive of future intentions to engage in additional charity-related activities.

Key words: Charity sport events; Leveraging; Motivation

Introduction

Increased attention is being given to the need to strategically leverage the hosting of sport events to produce desired benefits instead of assuming positive outcomes will be automatically achieved (Taks, Chalip, & Green, 2015). Potential benefits by leveraging sport events can include economic stimulation, facilitating current and future tourism, enhanced community pride, social capital and happiness, increased sport participation, and social change (Mackellar, 2015; Misener, 2015; Potwarka, Tepylo,

Fortune, & Mair, 2016; Taks, Green, Misener, & Chalip, 2014). Leveraging activities have typically been studied in the context of competitive sport; however, other types of events can also be leveraged. For example, Snelgrove and Wood (2010) argued that charity sport events (CSEs) can be leveraged to produce benefits for the local community through increased visitor spending and enhanced destination image.

The hosting of sporting events to solicit funds and generate public awareness for charitable organizations is now widespread across the US and

Address correspondence to Ryan Snelgrove, Assistant Professor, Department of Recreation & Leisure Studies, University of Waterloo, 200 University Ave W., Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada. Tel: (519) 888-4567; E-mail: Ryan.Snelgrove@uwaterloo.ca

Canada, making the leveraging opportunity significant (Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2009; Peloza & Hassay, 2007). A charity, a private organization, or individual seeking to affiliate with or help a charity can organize CSEs. CSEs can also be leveraged as an opportunity for nonprofit organizations to stimulate participants' interest in their other cause-related activities (Wood, Snelgrove, & Danylchuk, 2010; Woolf, Heere, & Walker, 2013); for example, volunteering with the nonprofit organization after the CSE. In order to do so, it is necessary to develop an understanding of which motives of the CSE event experience are predictive of future intentions to engage in other charitable activities (Snelgrove & Wood, 2010). Thus, the purpose of this study is to determine the relationships between motives for CSE participation and future intentions to engage in other charitable activities. The context of the study is three running events organized by private individuals seeking to benefit three different types of causes.

Literature Review

To date, much of the research on charity sporting events has focused on understanding the *motivations* that attract participants to those events (e.g., Beder & Fast, 2008; Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2008; Jeffery & Butryn, 2012; Taylor & Shanka, 2008; Webber, 2004; Wharf Higgins & Lauzon, 2003; Won, Park, Lee, & Chung, 2011). Specifically, research has identified that participants are motivated to provide financial support to the charity or cause, provide social support, generate public awareness, engage in physical activity, and socialize with others (e.g., Filo et al., 2008; Scott & Solomon, 2003; Snelgrove & Wood, 2010). Another potentially important element explaining attraction to a particular charity event, which has received minimal attention, is the uniqueness of the event. From the event organizer's perspective, creating distinct CSEs is important to ensure the host organization remains competitive and maintains its position in the CSE marketplace (e.g., Rundio, Heere, & Newland, 2014; Winand, Vos, Zintz, & Scheerder, 2013). Furthermore, CSE managers must continually produce distinct offerings to adapt to dynamic consumer expectations and needs (Winand et al., 2013).

Motives to Participate in CSEs

Existing CSE literature shows that individuals are motivated to register for CSEs for:

1. The physical challenges (e.g., Filo et al., 2008; Wood et al., 2010);
2. To foster social connections (e.g., Filo et al., 2008; Scott & Solomon, 2003; Wharf Higgins & Hodgins, 2008); and
3. To help others (e.g., Filo et al., 2008; Snelgrove & Wood, 2010; Snelgrove, Wood, & Havitz, 2013), through raising money, raising awareness, and supporting others.

Furthermore, there is an increase in calls for the examination of uniqueness of sporting events and the role of uniqueness in attracting individuals to the event (e.g., Yoshida, James, & Cronin, 2013).

Physical. The physical component of CSEs is a strong draw for some event participants (Bennett, Mousley, Kitchin, & Ali-Choudhury, 2007; Rundio et al., 2014; Won et al., 2011; Wood et al., 2010). Both the sporting only and the combination of the physical and charitable event aspects are a draw for event participants (Filo et al., 2008; Wood et al., 2010). Those interested in sport are provided with the space to express this interest while also challenging or improving their physical abilities in the activity (Parris, Shapiro, Peachey, Bowers, & Boucet, 2015; Taylor & Shanka, 2008). As CSEs have a strong physical activity component, a strong motivator is the associated fitness and health benefits (Rundio et al., 2014).

Social. The strengthening of already existing relationships and developing new interpersonal bonds allows event participants to satisfy a basic human social need, attachment to others through their participation in CSEs (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). These events provide participants with the opportunity to socialize with friends, family, and other event attendees (Bennett et al., 2007; Coghlan & Filo, 2013; Rundio et al., 2014; Scott & Solomon, 2003; Won et al., 2011). There are opportunities to meet new and different people (Beard & Ragheb, 1983; Filo et al., 2008; Taylor & Shanka, 2008) and

build friendships with others (Snelgrove & Wood, 2010). Therefore, for event organizers wishing to coordinate an event that increases the likelihood of participants returning to subsequent events, the event managers should focus on developing events for participants to be social with existing friends, and to meet different people. Furthermore, in terms of leveraging CSEs to elicit participants' support for other charitable activities, individuals can be motivated to participate in charitable activities by friends and family (Peloza & Hassay, 2007).

Raising Money for the Cause. Raising funds for the cause can be an important registration motive (Rundio et al., 2014; Snelgrove & Wood, 2010; Wharf Higgins & Hodgins, 2008). Individuals raise money for the event to aid those affected by helping the cause organization fulfill its mission (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Hyde, Dunn, Bax, & Chambers, 2014). However, Jeffery and Butryn (2012) found that some individuals are demotivated to participate by having to raise funds, but will participate in the event for other reasons (e.g., helping others). For event organizers, it may be important to promote multiple ways in which the cause and charity benefit from people taking part in the CSE besides the purely financial assistance.

Raising Public Awareness. In addition to raising funds through the event, nonprofit organizations use CSEs to raise awareness about the charity and cause (Wharf Higgins & Lauzon, 2003). People can be motivated to participate in CSEs to support the cause by raising awareness about the charitable organization and acting as ambassadors (Filo, Groza, & Fairley, 2012). For example, Filo et al. (2012) found that a desire to raise public awareness was a strong motivator for participation in a Lance Armstrong cycling event in support of cancer research.

Supporting Others. Previous research has found that event participants are often empathetic toward a friend or family member's illness and want to provide support by showing compassion for these individuals through event participation. For instance, Snelgrove and Wood (2010) found that supporting

others through participating in the event was an important motivator for participation in a Multiple Sclerosis Bike Tour event. Similarly, other research has reported participants expressing a strong desire to show support to loved ones through participation in illness related walks and cycling events (e.g., Filo et al., 2008; Snelgrove et al. 2013).

Theme. As noted, charitable sporting events are unique from other charity- and sport-only events because they typically attract individuals motivated by the charitable and physical aspects (Filo et al., 2009). Given this quality, CSEs provide distinct opportunities for event organizers to develop unique events that differ from traditional charitable (e.g., a fundraiser dinner) or sport-only events (i.e., no charitable component). As Snelgrove et al. (2013) suggested, CSEs are inherently unique from sport- or charity-only events so they can allow event registrants to express their individuality. However, given the possibility that more than one event could be hosted to fulfill participants' cause and physical needs, it is important for CSEs to distinguish their events from others. Thus, charity sport event organizers' strategies to attract event participants (e.g., supporting the cause to make a difference) should be reflected in the unique elements of the event (e.g., themed event t-shirt that allows participants to express this motivation). Therefore, event organizers should develop event themes that build on the unique attributes of the event (e.g., hosting a CSE with a mental health focus at night and calling it a "Night Run"). Furthermore, Yoshida et al. (2013) suggested that event uniqueness could be achieved through an event's environment and location, and the relationships that develop between event participants. Ultimately, creating a uniquely themed event can strengthen the meaning of the event for participants and potentially deepen participants' connection to the cause (Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2014; Woolf et al., 2013). Thus, we consider "theme" as a way, within the context of CSEs, to reflect participants' quest for novelty.

Additional Cause-Related Involvement

A charitable organization may want to leverage a charity sport event by attracting event participants

to becoming involved in other aspects of the organization (Woolf et al., 2013). When individuals deepen their relationship with the charity in addition to participation in the event at hand, the charity assumes a more central role in their lives (Hassay & Pelozo, 2009). In a study of a sport event benefiting a charitable organization, Inoue and Havard (2014) described the relationship between perceptions of an event and intentions to consider sponsor-related products as a manifestation of *balance theory*. More specifically, if an event attendee develops an attraction to an event they may be more likely to identify with other organizations associated with the event (e.g., Inoue & Havard, 2014); in particular, a charitable cause may benefit from its association with the CSE. Thus, there is theoretical support for the notion that highly motivated event attendees may develop connections to a benefiting cause.

Despite this leveraging opportunity for charitable organizations, limited research has investigated this potential (Hassay & Pelozo, 2009; Wood et al., 2010; Woolf et al., 2013). Results from one study investigating a charity triathlon found that the event did not strengthen individuals' connection to the charity at hand (e.g., Woolf et al., 2013). However, the authors provide a number of cautions that justify further investigation in this area. First, their focus on a fairly physically demanding activity (i.e., triathlon) might narrow the type of event participants to individuals focused primarily on the activity and less so on the charity. Second, the event did very little to emphasize the benefiting charity and focused more on the physical component of the event. Last, the authors only focused on one event and charity, making it unclear if the findings are generalizable to other events or causes.

Thus, this study seeks to build upon extant CSE research by investigating the relationship between CSE motives and future intentions to engage in cause-related activities in the context of three running events geared towards recreational runners.

Method

This study collected data through questionnaires during three 1-day charity sport events that took place in Southern Ontario, Canada, between July and September 2015. The events were organized by private sport event companies who worked in

partnership with local nonprofit organizations as part of the CSEs' causes. Prior to and during the events, registrants were encouraged to fundraise and donate funds to the causes associated with each event.

Event One

Event One was a themed, intimate, charitable 5-km run and walk. This event is a recurring event, which was organized for the second time. Before, during, and after the event, a local nonprofit organization (partners with the event organizers) that provides programs and supports research for those living with allergies, anaphylaxis, and asthma had an information kiosk set up in the start/finish area. The event started with a 550-m and 1-km kids' dash (only those 16 years of age and older, and participating in the 5-km run/walk were eligible to participate in the study). The 2.5-km course started and ended at the same location; participants ran out and in to the start/end area to complete the full 5 km. Participants ran or walked along the course that was situated along a body of freshwater that provided views of the scenic downtown of the neighboring city. The event was uniquely themed compared to other similar events in the region. Before the event, all event participants received a rock and roll themed t-shirt from the event organizers (a privately-operated event company). Along the running/walking course were two live rock and roll performances to add to the event's rock and roll theme. After completing the course, each participant received a participant medal that was shaped as a guitar pick, along with snacks and water. All of the food and snack options offered during the event were clearly labeled with potential allergens in support of the event's charitable aspect (e.g., asthma education). Lastly, in the finish area, a live band performed rock and roll songs.

Event Two

Event Two included a nighttime charitable run and walk to raise awareness and funds for youth mental health. It is organized annually, and this was the fourth edition. A locally owned and operated store for local runner enthusiasts organized the event in partnership with an 86-year-old organization that supports young peoples' mental health

and provides assistance and therapy for youth with emotional and psychological issues. The event was a 5-km run or walk along an urban park's waterway. Prior to the main event, children could participate in a 200-m or 1-km dash/run. The event was unique to other events in the region. Symbolic to the event's mental health focus, the CSE is the only event in the region to take place at night. As an incentive for attendees to fundraise for the partner organization, participants reaching certain fundraising targets received free event registration (\$75 raised), plus a gift basket (\$300), coffee brewer (\$500), and other prizes (\$1,000) from the title sponsor (a coffee shop franchise). In addition to all event registrants receiving a themed medal and t-shirt, participants received an LED running light to be placed around an arm while participating in outdoor activities at night.

Event Three

Event Three was a charitable run and walk organized in connection with World Alzheimer's Day. This event was organized for the fifth time. A 5-km, 10-km, and half-marathon (21-km) run and walk option were available for participants. The event took place in a community located approximately 30 min from the busiest land border crossing between Canada and the US. This location enabled individuals from both countries to participate, providing a unique international flavor to the community of participants. As the event took place on World Alzheimer's Day, all participants were encouraged to raise funds and donate to support programs for people who care for those living with Alzheimer's disease. The event was themed as a run for superheroes to support both those living with the disease, and caring for individuals with Alzheimer's disease. Themed t-shirts were provided by the event organizer (a family-owned sporting event company) to all registered runners and walkers. All event registrants completing the course received a medal that was associated with the event's theme and information from the Alzheimer Society (of Canada). Furthermore, to support the promotion and celebration of health associated with the event, the event's main registration, start, and finish areas were in the vicinity of the local community's annual health exposition event that took place on the same day as the CSE.

Data Collection

Data were collected on site at each of the three events using a paper questionnaire. A member of the research team approached as many participants as possible, explained the study, ensured the individual met inclusion criteria (16 years and older, and was an event participant), provided the questionnaire in an envelope with a pencil, and instructed the individual how to submit the questionnaire. The research team's information kiosk was located near the main entrance/exit of the registration area to make it convenient to submit questionnaires. After the study participant submitted the completed questionnaire, the researchers provided the participants with a small gift (i.e., logoed Frisbee).

Questionnaire

Close-ended questionnaires measuring motives and attachment to the CSE were developed using constructs based on earlier findings (e.g., Filo et al., 2008; Snelgrove & Wood, 2010; Wood et al., 2010). The questionnaire had three sections. Part A asked for the event registrant's hometown and event type (e.g., 5-km walk); Part B contained questions related to participants' motivations and intended behaviors; and Part C included descriptive and demographic questions (e.g., age, gender, and previous event participation). The questionnaires for each of the three events differed slightly in that the language of the items was adjusted to reflect each event's unique title and cause [e.g., "(Event Title) provides me with an opportunity to improve my ability in running/walking" or "To show compassion for people living with (cause) is important to me"].

Part B asked respondents to circle responses on a 5-point Likert scale. The scale was anchored at opposing ends by *strongly agree* (a rating of 5) and *strongly disagree* (a rating of 1). Three items per construct were developed based on extant literature or developed by the research team. The physical and social motivator constructs were derived from items used by Beard and Ragheb (1983). These measures have been used in previous studies investigating CSEs and have found both qualitative (Filo et al., 2008) and quantitative (e.g., Filo et al., 2012; Snelgrove & Wood, 2010) support as CSE

participation motives. The helping self and others motivational variables were based on previous work by Filo et al. (2008), Filo et al. (2009), Scott and Solomon (2003), Snelgrove and Wood (2010), and Wharf Higgins and Lauzon (2003). The thematic and uniqueness of the event constructs were developed by the research team based on the arguments put forth by Yoshida et al. (2013) on the need for innovativeness at sporting events. Future intentions to engage in additional cause-related activities were developed based on Woolf et al. (2013).

Analysis

As a number of the motives were being combined in one study for the first time and one of the motives was newly created for this context (i.e., event theme), exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with varimax rotation was first used to explore the factor structure of the motivation constructs. Subsequently, confirmatory factor analysis was employed to confirm the derived structure from the EFA for the motives as well as future intentions. Last, multiple regression analysis was used to assess the relationships between the four motives and future intentions.

Results

Study Participants

During Event One ($n = 176$), researchers distributed 90 questionnaires (51.1% of event participants) and received 76 (84.4% response rate). Of those returned, 72 were deemed usable. During Event Two ($n = 305$), 87 event participants received a questionnaire (28.5% of attendees). Of the 79 returned (90.8% response rate), 76 were deemed usable during data analysis. From Event Three ($n = 632$), 174 surveys of the 176 distributed (27.5% of event registrants; 98.9% response rate) were returned, and 167 were deemed usable in the study. As the three events had 1,113 participants, this study represents 29.6% of all participants, and 89.2% of the distributed questionnaires. Based on the anecdotal experience of the field researchers, event participants typically did not complete a survey because they were too tired (e.g., "Sorry, I am too tired") from having just completed the run.

Approximately 65% of respondents were female, and 35% male, with an age range from 16 to 78 ($M = 41.8$, $SD = 11.4$). Of the respondents, 49% had previously attended the specific CSE they were participating in during data collection.

Constructs

The exploratory factor analysis results indicate that the three cause-related variables (i.e., helping others, raising funds, and raising public awareness) delineated into one construct labeled *cause*. The three other motives (physical, social, theme) delineated as separate factors (total variance explained = 71.7%). No cross-loadings were present. Prior to the confirmatory factor analysis, three items with loadings below 0.700 were removed from further analysis to improve the reliability of the measures (i.e., two cause items, one theme item). Next, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted for the items representing the four motives derived from the EFA (i.e., cause, physical, social, theme) and future intentions. Results presented in Table 1 indicate that all items loaded on their expected constructs (i.e., factor loadings greater than 0.700) except for one item. This item with a loading of 0.670 (i.e., "I am an active part of raising awareness about . . .") was removed from subsequent analyses.

Convergent validity was achieved as the average variances extracted for each construct were above the suggested cut-off point of 0.50. Furthermore, the composite reliability figures were all acceptable, with the lowest value being 0.834. Finally, discriminant validity was assessed by comparing the squared correlations between the constructs with the AVE for each construct. As seen in Table 2, all AVE values were greater than the squared correlations, indicating discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The means and standard deviations of the six constructs are also presented in Table 2.

Multiple Regression

A multiple regression was conducted to assess the relationships between motives and future intentions to engage in additional cause-related activities. As shown in Table 3, results indicate that the motives

Table 1
Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Construct Item	Factor Loadings	CR	AVE
Cause motive		0.908	0.585
To help people living with (. .) is important to me	0.80		
To show compassion for people living with (. .) is important to me	0.83		
Participating in (. .) to raise funds for the (. .) is important to me	0.74		
I want to raise funds for (. .)	0.78		
Raising awareness about (. .) is important to me	0.72		
I am an active part of raising awareness about (. .)	0.67		
Physical motive		0.874	0.698
(. .) provides me with an opportunity to improve my running ability	0.83		
(. .) provides me with an opportunity to keep in shape	0.87		
(. .) provides me with an opportunity to challenge my running abilities	0.80		
Social		0.834	0.627
(. .) will allow me to meet new and different people	0.73		
(. .) will allow me to interact with others	0.81		
(. .) will allow me to build friendships with others	0.84		
Theme		0.861	0.756
The event organizers created an event that is unique compared to other charity events	0.83		
The theme of the event is unique compared to other charity events	0.91		
Future intentions for additional activities		0.865	0.682
By participating in (. .), I feel involved in this cause	0.81		
By participating in (. .), I am more likely to support this cause in the future	0.85		
(. .) motivates me to participate in other activities related to this cause	0.82		

Note. ²(df) = 386.194 (164); ²/df = 2.35; comparative fit index = 0.953; normed fit index = 0.923; root mean square error of approximation = 0.066; CR = composite reliability; AVE = average variance extracted.

of cause, social, and theme were predictive of future intentions. The physical motive was not a statistically significant predictor of future intentions.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of which motives for participation in CSEs might be associated with future intentions to engage in additional cause-related activities. In evaluating this relationship, a previously unstudied motivation in CSE literature was also measured, namely the theme of the event. The theoretical and

practical contributions of this study are discussed in this section.

Although many researchers have examined different cause-related constructs (e.g., Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2011; Parris et al., 2015; Snelgrove & Wood, 2010; Taylor & Shanka, 2008; Wharf Higgins & Hodgins, 2008), to our knowledge they have yet to examine these three cause-related motives at the same time. Therefore, this study was the first to quantitatively examine these three cause related motives in a single study. However, that the three cause-related motivations loaded on one factor was not entirely surprising.

Table 2
Means and Squared Correlations of Constructs

Construct	Means	1	2	3	4	5
Cause	4.11 (0.69)	–	0.135**	0.235**	0.317**	0.544**
Physical	4.25 (0.69)		–	0.211**	0.166**	0.148**
Social	3.79 (0.74)			–	0.289**	0.327**
Theme	3.92 (0.75)				–	0.377**
Future intentions	4.03 (0.77)					–

Note. **p < 0.01.

Table 3
Multiple Regressions for Future Intentions Towards
Additional Charity Involvement

Future Intentions for Additional Activities	
Cause	0.741***
Physical	0.048
Social	0.211***
Event theme	0.111**
Adjusted R^2	0.780
F	241.17

Note. ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Importantly, those motivated by helping the *cause* and *social* aspects of the event had the strongest relationship with future intentions. The relationship between *cause* motives and future interest for participating in other cause-related activities supports the notion of centrality (i.e., the cause assumes a central role in the lives of the participants). The fact that social motives strengthen interest for participating in other cause-related activities aligns with previous findings by Woolf et al. (2013). We suggest a two-step process. Using the results reported here, event organizers can leverage social connectedness and interest in a cause to encourage participation in their respective events (e.g., Pelozo & Hassay, 2007). In doing so, they will ensure success at the events. As a second step, these individuals are also natural prospects for recruitment to other cause related activities. Therefore, by developing intentional leveraging strategies, event organizers can benefit both themselves through a well-attended event, as well as the charitable cause associated with the event, by stimulating event participants' interest in becoming involved with the charity post-CSE.

Therefore, if a goal of an event is to develop participants who get involved in the charity outside of the event, nonprofit organizations may wish to highlight both the social and cause-related aspects of the event. Two examples of highlighting the cause from the study's CSEs include: 1) Having children, or parents of the children, who have benefited from the charity's programs provide each event participant with a participation medal when the individual crosses the finish line; and 2) during the CSE for anaphylaxis, the local asthma and anaphylaxis education center had a kiosk with allergen-free food that participants could sample.

Thus, charitable organizations can leverage these events to stimulate future involvement in its other activities. Although the mean score for the physical motive was in the "agree" range in this study, this construct did not predict future intentions. Therefore, it can be suggested that the physical motive is instrumental in attracting event participants, but may not be instrumental in getting them interested in other cause related activities. Thus, preevent, CSE managers should highlight the opportunity to be physically active to the target market, but then focus on the social and cause aspects of the event to increase the likelihood that participants will return to subsequent events.

Researchers have also suggested there is a need for more research examining the uniqueness of sport events, as much of the extant research is conceptual (Yoshida et al., 2013). Furthermore, the concept of a *unique event theme* has yet to be examined in a CSE context. Results from the present study suggest that when individuals are motivated to attend a CSE because of the event's unique theme, they are more likely to deepen their connection to the charity through additional activities. These findings are consistent with research that found an organization's innovativeness was related to customer loyalty (Jin, Goh, Huffman, & Yuan, 2015). Therefore, event managers may focus on developing a unique CSE event experience by hosting the event in a unique location, by providing entertainment before, during, and after the sporting aspect of the event, and tying the cause and sport event together well (Woolf et al., 2013). For the participant, unique event elements (e.g., a themed participant t-shirt and medal) may also allow the individuals to differentiate themselves from others as an attempt to be unique (Tian, Bearden, & Hunter, 2001). Being unique or participating in unique experiences may strengthen the meaning of the event for participants, and this may increase the likelihood the individual will participate in future activities as he/she becomes more connected to the cause (Filo et al., 2014).

Limitations and Future Research

This study has some limitations that should be considered. First, a social desirability bias may have influenced some participants to express positive impressions of the event (e.g., the unique

theme) or cause (e.g., support for the cause). This study only focused on the future intentions of event participants because of its cross-sectional design. The benefit of this approach is that it is possible to assess interest in engaging in additional cause-related activities. A focus on behaviors directly introduces the need to study a number of constraints and enabling factors that explain the gap between interest and action, making it unreasonable to correlate motives with actual behaviors. However, a study design that collects data about the participants' subsequent actual involvement in additional activities for the charity would also be beneficial. In doing so, it would be important to investigate the tactics and strategies that lead to successful activation of this expressed future intention. Furthermore, this study only measured the general intentions of participants to become involved in charitable activities outside of the event. Therefore, future studies could explore specific intentions of CSE participants (e.g., to volunteer, become a regular donor).

Conclusion

The findings from this study provide insights for both researchers and practitioners. The results add to the growing body of literature examining charity sport events with specific identification of the motivations that predict future intentions to become involved in other cause-related activities. Therefore, a nonprofit organization may leverage a CSE by managing its own event, or partnering with a mass-sporting event that does not currently have a cause component, as a strategy to recruit volunteers and elicit new donors and supporters.

Prior to the start of the event, practitioners should highlight the event's physical component in marketing materials to attract participants to the CSE. For the charity's postevent benefit, during the event, to increase the likelihood that participants become involved with the charity after the event, event managers should highlight the events social and cause components. CSEs can provide a unique opportunity for charities to recruit future volunteers, engage donors, or other activities that may be of benefit to the charity; however, to fully benefit from these opportunities, charities must develop strategies to take advantage of these opportunities. For example, the charitable component may

be incorporated into various components of the CSE's theme, branding, and participation medals and t-shirts.

References

- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497–529.
- Beard, J. G., & Ragheb, M. G. (1983). Measuring leisure motivation. *Journal of Leisure Research, 15*, 219–228.
- Beder, J., & Fast, J. (2008). Episodic volunteering: Why people walk/run for charity. *The International Journal of Voluntary Administration, 25*(3), 3–13.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 40*(5), 924–973.
- Bennett, R., Mousley, W., Kitchin, P., & Ali-Choudhury, R. (2007). Motivations for participating in charity-affiliated sporting events. *Journal of Consumer Behavior, 6*(2), 155–178.
- Coghlan, A., & Filo, K. R. (2013). Using constant comparison method and qualitative data to understand participants' experiences at the nexus of tourism, sport and charity events. *Tourism Management, 35*, 122–131.
- Filo, K. R., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien, D. (2008). It's really not about the bike: Exploring attraction and attachment to the events of the Lance Armstrong Foundation. *Journal of Sport Management, 22*, 501–525.
- Filo, K. R., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien, D. (2009). The meaning behind attachment: Exploring camaraderie, cause, and competency at a charity sport event. *Journal of Sport Management, 23*, 361–387.
- Filo, K. R., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien, D. (2011). Examining motivation for charity sport event participation: A comparison of recreation-based and charity-based motives. *Journal of Leisure Research, 43*, 491–518.
- Filo, K. R., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien, D. (2014). An empirical investigation of the role of camaraderie, cause, competency, and participation motives in the development of attachment to a charity sport event. *Managing Leisure, 19*, 245–262.
- Filo, K., Groza, M. D., & Fairley, S. (2012). The role of belief in making a difference in enhancing attachment to a charity sport event. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 24*(2), 123–140.
- Fornell, C., Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research 18*(1), 39–50.
- Hassay, D. N., & Pelozo, J. (2009). Building the charity brand community. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 21*, 24–55.
- Hyde, M. K., Dunn, J., Bax, C., & Chambers, S. K. (2014). Episodic volunteering and retention: An integrated

- theoretical approach. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 1–19.
- Inoue, Y., & Havard, C. T. (2014). Determinants and consequences of the perceived social impact of a sport event. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28, 295–310.
- Jeffery, K. A., & Butryn, T. K. (2012). The motivations of runners in a cause-based marathon-training program. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 35(3), 300–319.
- Jin, N., Goh, B., Huffman, L., & Yuan, J. J. (2015). Predictors and outcomes of perceived image of restaurant innovativeness in fine-dining restaurants. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 24(5), 457–485.
- Mackellar, J. (2015). Determinants of business engagement with regional sport events. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 15, 7–26.
- Misener, L. (2015). Leveraging parasport events for community participation: Development of a theoretical framework. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 15, 132–153.
- Parris, D. L., Shapiro, S. L., Peachey, J. W., Bowers, J., & Boucet, A. (2015). More than competition: Exploring stakeholder identities at a grassroots cause-related sporting event. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 12(2), 115–140.
- Pelozo, J., & Hassay, D. N. (2007). A typology of charity support behaviors: Towards a holistic view of helping. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 17(1), 135–151.
- Potwarka, L. R., Tepylo, H., Fortune, D., & Mair, H. L. (2016). Launching off but falling fast: Experiences of becoming more physically active in response to the Vancouver 2010 Olympic Winter Games. *Event Management*, 3, 297–312.
- Rundio, A., Heere, B., & Newland, B. (2014). Cause-related versus non-cause-related sport events. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 23(1), 17–26.
- Scott, A., & Solomon, P. J. (2003). The marketing of cause-related events: A study of participants as consumers. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 11(2), 43–66.
- Snelgrove, R., & Wood, L. (2010). Attracting and leveraging visitors at a charity cycling event. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 15, 269–285.
- Snelgrove, R., Wood, L., & Havitz, M. E. (2013). Developing personal attachment to a physically active charity event. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 18(2), 13–140.
- Taks, M., Chalip, L., & Green, B. C. (2015). Impacts and strategic outcomes from non-mega sport events for local communities. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 15, 1–6.
- Taks, M., Green, B. C., Misener, L., & Chalip, L. (2014). Evaluating sport development outcomes: The case of a medium-sized international sport event. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 14, 213–237.
- Taylor, R., & Shanka, T. (2008). Cause for event: Not-for-profit marketing through participant sport events. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 24(9–10), 945–958.
- Tian, K. T., Bearden, W. O., & Hunter, G. L. (2001). Consumers' need for uniqueness: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28, 50–66.
- Webber, D. (2004). Understanding charity fundraising events. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 9(2), 122–134.
- Wharf Higgins, J., & Hodgins, A. (2008). The great escape—a FUNdraising bike tour for the Multiple Sclerosis Society. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 19(2), 49–67.
- Wharf Higgins, J., & Lauzon, L. (2003). Finding the funds in fun runs: Exploring physical activity events as fundraising tools in the nonprofit sector. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8, 363–377.
- Winand, M., Vos, S., Zintz, T., & Scheerder, J. (2013). Determinants of service innovation: A typology of sports federations. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 13(1–2), 55–73.
- Won, D., Park, M., Lee, K. Y., & Chung, J. (2011). Factors affecting participation in charity sport events involving low intensive physical activity. *International Journal of Leisure and Tourism Marketing*, 2(3), 248–257.
- Woolf, J., Heere, B., & Walker, M. (2013). Do charity sport events function as “brandfests” in the development of brand community? *Journal of Sport Management*, 27, 95–107.
- Wood, L., Snelgrove, R., & Danylchuk, K. (2010). Segmenting volunteer fundraisers at a charity sport event. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 22(1), 38–54.
- Yoshida, M., James, J. D., & Cronin, J. J. (2013). Sport event innovativeness: Conceptualization, measurement, and its impact on consumer behavior. *Sport Management Review*, 16, 68–84.