

Copyright
by
Amy Susan Rundio
2011

**The Thesis Committee for Amy Susan Rudio
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:**

**The Motives of Endurance Athletes to
Participate in Cause-Related or Non-Cause-Related Sport Events**

**APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

Supervisor:

Bob Heere

Brianna Newland-Smith

**The Motives of Endurance Athletes to
Participate in Cause-Related or Non-Cause-Related Sport Events**

by

Amy Susan Rundio, B.S.

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Science in Kinesiology

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2011

Dedication

In memory of Richard White, and to all those dedicated to helping others in need.

Acknowledgements

There are many people who I would like to thank for their support, patience, and knowledge, without which I would not have been able to undertake this project. I would like to thank everyone from the bottom of my heart. First, I am very grateful for the opportunities and experiences that the faculty and staff of the Department of Sport Management at the University of Texas at Austin have allowed me to take part in. A special thanks to my advisor and supervisor Dr. Bob Heere for pushing me to do my best and explore my passion for cause-related sport. Also, to Dr. Brianna Newland, who as a reader of my thesis provided valuable insight, feedback, and encouragement. To my family and friends, who provided much needed support and guidance throughout the process, I cannot say thank you enough.

Friday, August 12, 2011

Abstract

The Motives of Endurance Athletes to Participate in Cause-Related or Non-Cause-Related Sport Events

Amy Susan Rundio, M.S. Kin.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2011

Supervisor: Bob Heere

Many non-profit organizations in need of funding have turned to using endurance athletic events as fundraisers. These events, also known as cause-related sport events, can fulfill the many needs and desires of athletes. This study was designed to compare the motives of athletes in cause-related and non-cause-related sport events. Using the Motives of Marathoners Scales (MOMS), participants were asked to rate their motivations for attending either a cause-related sport event or non-cause-related sport event. Multiple motivations were found for attending both cause-related and non-cause-related sport events. Being associated with a cause provided cause-related sport events with an attribute that attracted participants for self-esteem, recognition/approval, personal goal achievement, and competition reasons. Non-cause-related events attracted participants motivated by general health motives. Overall, motives to attend events can be affected by the event's attributes, such as affiliation with a cause, and these event attributes can fulfill more than one motive.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	ix
Introduction.....	1
Rationale	3
Review of Related Literature	5
Motivations for Participating in Sport	7
Understanding Motivations of Endurance Athletes	10
Event-Specific Motivations	13
Motives for Participating in Cause-Related Sport	15
Motivations for Donating to a Cause	18
Purpose of Study	20
Research Objective	20
Methodology	22
Instrumentation	22
Procedures.....	23
Participants.....	26
Data Analysis	29

Results.....	31
Descriptive Statistics.....	31
Cause-Related Event Participants.....	31
Non-Cause-Related Event Participants.....	32
Comparison of Cause-Related and Non-Cause-Related Event Participants	32
Reliability Analysis	34
Motivations to Participate.....	37
Differences in Motives between Cause-Related and Non-Cause-Related Event Participants.....	38
Training Habits of Endurance Events Participants	40
Gender of Endurance Events Participants.....	42
Participation in Endurance Events	43
Discussion.....	47
Appendix A Survey.....	54
Appendix B MOMS Subscales	59
References.....	61

List of Tables

Table 4.1:	Description of Events.....	25
Table 4.2:	Demographics of Participants	28
Table 5.1:	Comparison of Cause-Related and Non-Cause-Related Participants	33
Table 5.2:	Reliability Analysis.....	35
Table 5.3:	Overall Order of Motives from Most Important to Least Important	37
Table 5.4:	Motives of Cause-Related vs. Non-Cause-Related Event Participants	39
Table 5.5:	Mean Comparisons by Training Habits per Week.....	42
Table 5.6:	Mean Comparisons by Gender.....	43
Table 5.7:	Mean Comparisons by Events per Year.....	46

INTRODUCTION

In America, over 1.5 million charitable organizations serve more than 300 million people (National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2009). Funding for these organizations has become an issue as the government financial support of non-profits has been scaled back and private support has decreased as a share of total nonprofit income. Thus, charities compete for dollars and donations from Americans in a very competitive environment. Despite these challenges, there has been record growth in the number of non-profit organizations. This is due mainly to the commercialization of the industry (i.e., increased fees and charges, commercial ventures, partnerships with for-profit organizations, and the marketing of products) and professionalization of practices and infrastructure within the industry (Herman, 2004).

In response to this growth and competitiveness, many nonprofits have sought to become more creative in their fundraising efforts. Take, for example, St. Baldrick's Events, in which participants shave their heads to raise money for childhood cancer research. This innovative fundraiser has raised more than \$113 million (St. Baldricks.org, n.d.). Other unique events include Save Lids to Save Lives (Susan G. Komen for the Cure Foundation), Movember (LiveStrong), and the PCF Home Run Challenge (Prostate Cancer Foundation) which raise money for the respective organization. These methods are used in an effort to gain awareness and funds for the organization.

The participatory sport event is one fundraising technique that non-profits use. Events such as the LiveStrong Challenge, the Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure, and the

Heart Walk have become popular and effective fundraisers for nonprofit organizers. These events offer participants a chance to complete a physical challenge (e.g., 5K run/walk or a bike ride) while raising funds and awareness for the charity. Yet, these cause-related events have to compete with non-cause-related events for participants, and thus funds for their cause. To better compete in the marketplace, nonprofit organizations need to understand the types of consumers participating in their events and what motivates these consumers to participate in these charity events versus others. Having this knowledge, the organizations can craft their marketing messages to reach target markets such as experienced athletes or first-time participants.

Endurance athletes are one target market for marketers of cause-related and non-cause-related events to examine. Endurance athletes are those athletes who participate in endurance sports, or sports distinguished through recurring movements throughout the activity, and actively participate in such events with these characteristics (Kerr, 1997). Endurance athletes tend to be more plan-oriented than other athletes and actively tailor their race calendar to include events that meet their needs (Svebak & Kerr, 1989). Understanding why endurance athletes select certain events can help cause-related event marketers include specific messages and/or event elements to attract more endurance athletes. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the motivations of endurance athletes at various types of events to understand why endurance athletes choose to participate in cause-related or non-cause related sport events.

Rationale

Endurance event participation has rapidly increased over the past several years. According to USA Triathlon, membership has grown from 21,000 in 2000 to 135,000 in June 2010 (USA Triathlon Membership Breakdown, 2010). The number of USA Cycling license holders was over 55,000 in 2010 (USA Cycling-Active Demographics, 2010). In addition to these yearly memberships, USA Triathlon has reported over 300,000 one-day memberships (which are required to participate in sanctioned events) (“USA Triathlon membership breakdown”, 2010). These numbers don’t include the number of non-members who also participate in events such as marathons, trail races, triathlons, bicycling rides and more or the number of participants in non-sanctioned races (races that are not governed by the national governing body and therefore do not require membership or license with the national governing body to participate). For example, Running USA reported that over 10.2 million people finished a road race in 2009, up from 7.5 million in 2000 (“Running USA”, 2010). This increase in participation can partially be attributed to an increase in the number of events, a more diverse range of events offered, an increase of media attention, and an increasing awareness of the benefits of physical activity (“Demographics”, 2011). The diverse range of events offered includes the type of activity for participants (run, bike, etc.), the focus of the event (fun, social, competitive, etc.), the location of the event, the type of event (cause-related or non-cause-related), and more.

Charities often use participatory sport events to raise awareness and funds for their cause (Wood, Snelgrove & Danylchuk, 2010). As the number of charitable

organizations has risen to over 1.5 million in 2008, overcrowding of the philanthropic sector has occurred (National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2009). Participatory sport events have helped some charities overcome this overcrowding by providing a new and creative avenue to raise funds. Combined with the increase in participation of events, these events have allowed charitable organizations to reach donors in a unique way. These events can range from triathlons to bicycle rides to walks, and have benefited many non-profit organizations such as the Lance Armstrong Foundation, Susan G Komen for the Cure, and the National Multiple Sclerosis Society.

People participate in these events for many reasons, but especially because it allows them to do something good for others and for themselves simultaneously. Motives for participating in cause-related sport events include motives of reciprocity, self-esteem, and the need to help others (Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2008). Understanding specific motives beyond those related to the cause can help non-profit organizations tailor event elements and marketing messages to better reach participants.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Previously, researchers have examined motives for participating in leisure activities (Beard & Ragheb, 1983; Roberts, 1992; Ryan, Frederick, Lepes, Rubio & Sheldon, 1997), motives for giving to a cause (Guy & Patton, 1988; Sargeant, 1999; Sundel, Zelman, Weaver & Pasternak, 1978), motives of participating in sport events (Funk, Toohey & Bruun, 2007, Hritz & Ramos, 2008; LaChausse, 2006; Ogles & Masters, 2000) and motives for participating in cause-related sport events (Bennett, Mousley, Kitchin & Ali-Choudhury, 2007; Filo, Funk & O'Brien, 2008; Taylor & Shanka 2008). Motives of endurance athletes have also been examined for participating in their respective sport and for participating in particular events (cf. Egloff & Gruh, 1996; Ogles & Masters, 2000; Hritz & Ramos, 2008; Gat & McWhirter, 1998). However, there has been a lack of research that focuses on endurance athletes participating in cause-related sport events.

Motivation can be defined as an internal drive that guides a person's behavior. (Roberts, 1992; Iso-Ahola, 1982). Motivation itself has been examined in many contexts—work, travel, and sport, for example. Major approaches in motivational research include Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs, the escape-seeking model (Iso-Ahola, 1982), and push-pull factors (Crompton, 1979). Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs identified five basic needs for every person. The five needs identified had to be satisfied in order (i.e. lower needs must be satisfied before higher needs can be satisfied). The needs, from lowest order to highest order, are physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization (Maslow, 1954). Those still trying to achieve

physiological and safety needs are not likely to participate in sports, as it is difficult for sports to fulfill these needs. However, sports could help those trying to achieve social and esteem needs, and could potentially be a path to self-actualization. There have been examples of athletes ignoring physiological needs (i.e. sustaining chronic injuries) in pursuit of esteem needs (i.e. winning), and thus the assumption that needs are fulfilled in order could be suspect (Jarvis, 2006, p. 140).

Iso-Ahola proposed two sets of motivational forces: the desire to escape and the search for intrinsic rewards (1982). This challenged Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs, as Iso-Ahola believes that for some, satisfying social needs is more important and that there is more than one need influencing leisure behavior. For example, participating in an event can provide an opportunity to escape work or daily life and can allow for a sense of competency, social interaction, and relaxation. The push-pull concept is another two-dimensional approach that complements Iso-Ahola's model (Crompton, 1979). Crompton and McKay (1997) present push motives as escaping and pull motives as seeking. In recreation, for example, people are motivated by internal motives (push factor) and by external elements related to the destination and its attributes (pull factor) (Zhang & Lam, 1999).

As shown through these theories, there are many possible motives for athletes' leisure choices such as sport, and a variety of ways to classify these reasons. Participation in charity sport events, for example, might help one fulfill social and esteem needs through the social nature of an event or allowing one to feel as though they have helped someone in need. Participation in such events could also be explained by Iso-

Ahola's escape-seeking model (1982) and Crompton's push-pull factors (1979).

Examining the needs and desires of participants more specifically provides a better understanding of why people choose to participate in particular sports and events and why they choose to support the charities that they do.

Motivations for Participating in Sport

From the many motivational theories presented, it has been shown that sport participants have many reasons for how their leisure time is spent, and these reasons can range from fulfilling social needs to stimulating one's mind to wanting to relax. Sport participation can be explained by each theory, and researchers have investigated sport participation to develop specific motivational theories for leisure, recreation, and sport.

Beard and Ragheb (1983) developed a scale for measuring leisure motivation for all types of leisure activities and participants. Leisure activities are defined as non-work activities that are voluntary in nature, and can be active or inactive, and include sporting activities (Beard & Ragheb, 1983). Motivations for participating in these types of activities can be grouped into four subscales: intellectual, social, competency-mastery, and stimulus avoidance. Intellectual motives arise from the desire to learn and explore, social motives arise from the need for friendship, competency-mastery motives are the desire to achieve and master something (usually physical in nature), and stimulus-avoidance motives arise from the need to escape over-stimulating life situations (Beard & Ragheb, 1983). For sport participants, these motives can definitely be relevant and seen through the planning and analysis of workouts, participating in training groups, practicing

of skills, and traveling to escape the stresses of daily life. However, these motives are quite broad and can apply to many leisure activities. There are many reasons for participating in sport that can be grouped into Beard and Ragheb's four categories (1983), but should be expanded upon to truly understand the different reasons athletes choose to participate in sport.

Ryan et al., (1997) identified five motive categories relevant to motivation for adherence to participation in different types of physical activity: interest/enjoyment, competence, appearance, fitness, and social motives. Enjoyment motives include the desire to have fun, pursue interests, or be stimulated. Competence motives include the desire to be challenged and develop skills. Enjoyment and competence motives are primarily intrinsic, or motives for participation that arise from the satisfaction of participating in the activity itself (Ryan et al., 1997). Social motives included wanting to be with friends or meet new people. Appearance motives are related to the appearance of the individual and fitness motives include improving cardiovascular fitness and maintaining strength, and are considered extrinsic because they relate to outcomes separate from the actual activity. Ryan et al., (1997) also found that there were differences in motives among participants of different types of physical activity. For example, in the sport class, enjoyment and competence motives were higher and lower in body-related motives than those participants in the fitness class. The sport class participants also showed more adherence to exercise participation than those in the fitness class.

Other researchers have found differences in motivations between gender (Recours, Souville & Griffet, 2004; Koivula, 1999) as well as level of participation and culture (Curry & Weiss, 1989). Researchers have also examined types of motivations for participating in sport in formal and informal settings (Recours, Souville & Griffet, 2004). They found that females were more likely to be motivated by sociability and less motivated by extrinsic motives than males. The more informal the setting, the more irrelevant are the extrinsic motives to participants of both genders (Recours, Souville & Griffet, 2004). In another study, differences in competition, fitness, and social motivations were also found between gender and country. Fitness motives were more important and competitive motives less important to Austrian students than to American student-athletes. American females also expressed social motivation as more important motive than American males (Curry & Weiss, 1989).

Koivula (1999) found that of the nine motives for participating in sport that she examined (appearance, physical health, competition/challenge, fun/enjoyment, socializing, mood and stress coping, weight management, competence/skill, and muscle improvement), several differed between genders. Consistent with previous studies, Koivula found that appearance was more important to women than men, competition was more important to men. Women also scored higher than men regarding mood enhancement, stress coping, and weight management. Inconsistent with previous findings, Koivula found that men gave higher ratings for socializing. This however may have been due to the sample population as men participated in team sports more than women did (Koivula, 1999).

Deci and Ryan (1993) found that motivations varied between involvement in sport versus involvement in exercise, as well as by gender. Individual sport participants (i.e. skiing, canoeing, and tennis) were found to be more motivated by interest/enjoyment and competence motivation than fitness activity participants (i.e. running and weightlifting). Fitness activity participants, however, had higher levels of body-related motivation. In other words, individual sport participants were more intrinsically motivated. However, fitness group participants had a more instrumental motivation focus. Women showed more body-related motivation than men, as expected; however, gender did not predict competence or interest/enjoyment motivations. However, due to the focus on individual sports and fitness activities social motives were not examined, and could certainly influence participation in sport.

Overall, there are many different reasons for participating in sport, and researchers have found that some motives are more important to one group of participants than to another. This underscores the importance of market research for an event in order to better tailor the event to meet the needs of the target market.

Understanding Motivations of Endurance Athletes

As motivations for sport participation vary amongst many variables, such as age, type of activity, and gender, it is important to more closely examine the motivations of endurance athletes as they approach their respective sports differently than other athletes (Svebak & Kerr, 1989). According to reversal theory, there are four meta-motivational states, or frames of mind, that guide how a person interprets his or her motives (Kerr,

1997, p. 9-10). The motivational states are telic-paratelic, negativistic-conformist, mastery-sympathy, and autic-alloic. Most research has focused on telic-paratelic dominance in athletes. The telic state elicits serious and goal-oriented behavior, while the paratelic-state elicits more spontaneous and impulsive behavior. Svebak and Kerr (1989) found that endurance athletes tend to be more telic-dominant than athletes who prefer other sports. Sell (1991) observed that regardless of the level of an athlete's participation the athlete still displays a telic-orientation. The unique traits of endurance athletes, especially those whose sports activity occupies a central role in their lifestyle, can affect their motivations.

Indeed, the super-adherence of these athletes to training regimens, the centrality of the sport in the lives of these athletes, and the centrality of motivation in general and sport psychology are reasons for examining the motives of endurance athletes. For these reasons, Masters, Ogles, and Jolton (1993) set about developing an instrument to measure the motivations of marathon runners pertaining to training for and competing in a marathon. The Motivations of Marathoners Scales (MOMS) has four categories of motivations: psychological, physical, social, and achievement. These overlap some with Beard and Ragheb's (1983) motives (intellectual, social, competence-mastery, and stimulus-avoidance). The social components both examine the need for esteem of others and affiliation with others. The psychological category of the MOMS includes some of the stimulus-avoidance component found in Beard and Ragheb's scale, and the achievement category is similar to the competence-mastery component in that both examine achieving and competing physically. However, the two scales differ regarding

the intellectual component and the physical category. Both the similarities and differences of the scales exemplify how different motives can be. The MOMS, however, was specifically designed with regards to endurance athletes' motives.

The four categories of the MOMS are based on nine specific motivations examined previously. Psychological motives include running for life meaning, self-esteem, and psychological coping; achievement motives include running for personal goal achievement and competition; social motives include recognition/approval of others and affiliation with others; and physical motivation include running for one's health and weight concern. After developing and testing the MOMS, the researchers showed that the instrument was internally consistent (Chronbach's α range .80 to .93) and has factorial validity. Masters, Ogles, and Jolton also suggested that the MOMS be used to develop motivational theories and compare differences in motives among ages, genders, and experiences to further understand the motives of marathoners.

Masters, Ogles, and Jolton (1993) also intended for the MOMS to be adapted for other similar activities. Ogles and Masters (2000) used the MOMS has been used to measure differences in motives among older and younger male marathoners. Older runners reported being more motivated by general health reasons, weight concerns, life meaning, and affiliation with other runners, while younger runners were more motivated by personal goal achievement. Havenar and Lochbaum (2007) explored differences in first-time marathon finishers and pre-race dropouts and found differences in motives of finishers of a marathon and dropouts of training; dropouts were more motivated by social motives and weight concerns than finishers. The MOMS has also been adapted to

cycling to measure the differences in motives of competitive and non-competitive cyclists (LaChausse 2006). LaChausse found that cyclists overall endorsed goal achievement and health concerns as motives for cycling (2006). However, differences were found between males and females, competitive and non-competitive cyclists, and road and off-road cyclists.

The MOMS cannot possibly examine all motives of all participants, but it allows one to explore the motives that are important to endurance athletes participating in a sport. While we know that motivations may vary based on sport, gender, competitiveness, or experience (LaChausse, 2006; Havenar & Lochbaum, 2007), motivations beyond sport may also come into play, such as wanting to see new places and explore (Funk, Toohey & Bruun, 2007).

Event-Specific Motivations

Motives for selecting events must also be considered when examining participants' selection of events. The motives for participating in specific events can be no less varied than the motives for participating in a sport. Often, the motives for participating in sport can lead to participating in specific events or vice versa. In addition to motives for participating in sport, attractiveness of the event and event-specific attributes can lead to selection of the events.

Motives to travel to events, for example, can fulfill all four motive categories identified by Beard and Ragheb (1983). Hritz and Ramos (2008) found that those who travel often have a desire to seek new and different experiences, escape from routines, or

meet new people; these desires can fulfill intellectual, social, and stimulus-avoidance motives. Using surveys distributed at a masters swimming event, the researchers found that the most important motivations were fitness-related (i.e. staying in shape or being physically fit). They also found that while travel motives were least important for participants, the participants who were motivated by stimulus-avoidance were more likely to travel to compete (Hritz & Ramos, 2008). The nature of the event (a championship meet) may have impacted some of the findings of the study, however, this further underscores the idea that different events attract different people, therefore motives for attending the event must be considered.

Other factors for attending a specific event examined have included socialization, event attractiveness, personal motivation, escape and relaxation, and event attributes (Streicher & Saayman, 2010). Socialization motives included items like family can participate and for family recreation; personal motivation included items such as participated to discover and evaluate myself or event presented a major challenge. Other motives to attend included escape and relaxation. For example, to visit a new area or to get away were reasons under this category. Most importantly, reasons were given for participating based upon the event attractiveness and event attributes. Event attractiveness included the atmosphere of the event, the type of event, and the event's sport. Event attributes included items such as living nearby, the prestige of the event, and the amenities of the event. These two categories are particularly relevant as they highlight that endurance athletes do choose events based on characteristics of the event.

It makes sense then that event organizers should consider event attributes and attractiveness when planning and organizing their events.

Other researchers looked specifically at tourism motives for attending sport events, and found that prior sport motives, destination image, and travel motives all contributed to participation in the event (Funk, Toohey, & Bruun, 2007). Their findings suggest an integrated approach to recruit participants should include targeting running-related organizations to reach those motivated by prior involvement with running and working with tourism organizations to reach those motivated by tourism. Again, understanding motives for participation in events are important because it can help organizers design events to attract participants.

Motives for Participating in Cause-Related Sport

An event attribute that might also enhance attractiveness to some participants is the cause that the event is supporting. People can strongly identify with charities and may be more likely to participate in events that support a cause they are passionate about or can relate to. A factor that could affect an athlete's decision to participate in a race could be the visibility of the charity. For instance, events can have no affiliation with a non-profit, can benefit a non-profit (but the non-profit does little to no organizing for the event), or can be conducted by the non-profit (in which the non-profit organizes the event). Events organized by the non-profit are likely to attract more athletes who strongly identify with the cause than those non-profit organizations who have little say in how the non-profit is publicized through the event. However, the non-profit organization

needs to analyze its goals, needs, and resources when deciding how to partake in such an event. One of the analyses needs to consider if targeting endurance athletes will help the organization raise money and awareness for their cause, and if so, what motivates them to participate in events so that they can effectively tailor the event to maximize the benefits.

Cause-related sport events certainly provide an added benefit to some participants, and various researchers have categorized the motives for participating in many ways. For example, Filo, Funk, and O'Brien (2008) examined four dimensions of leisure motivations as defined by Beard and Ragheb (1983)—intellectual, social, escape, and competency—as well as four factors related to donations—reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others, and desire to improve the charity. Using several focus groups, the researchers found that all of the motives contributed to attraction to the event except for the escape motives because the events had become a part of their yearly and daily routines and was no longer an escape from the pressures of daily life.

Researchers from England also attempted to discover how important altruistic motives, sport-related motives, and social motives are in cause-related sport events (Bennett et al., 2007). A survey was developed by adapting items from existing instruments, and the results indicated that two motives were dominant among participants: involvement with the cause and the desire to pursue a healthy lifestyle. Other important motives included an individual's previous involvement and the desire for social interaction. The researchers from England also found that motivations differed among males and females (Bennett et al. 2007). These studies demonstrate that both

motives related to the sport and motives related to the cause are important to consider when targeting consumers.

Other studies support these findings, such as Won, Park, and Turner's (2010) study examined the motivations of participants in health-related charity sport events. After distributing and analyzing a survey developed for the study, the researchers found six major factors of motivation: philanthropy, social/entertainment, external/benefit, family needs, sports, and group collaboration motives. The philanthropic motives and family needs motives were found to be most important for participants in this event. Taylor and Shanka (2008) also used surveys to examine the motivations to attend and satisfaction with the event. They developed four motivational components specific to cause-related participatory sport events. They found that eleven motivational items could be grouped into achievement, involvement, status, and socialization components, and that these components motivated participants differently. For example, repeat participants were more motivated by achievement, and participants under 34 years of age were more motivated by socialization and status. The findings of this study suggest that participants can be segmented based on motivations, and that the event can provide for all segments. Along with the results from the other studies, it seems worthwhile to include motivational elements for the different segments the event organizers can target.

In a study performed at a museum, Thyne examined motivation-based values for museum patrons (2001). Thyne argues that by understanding visitor motivations, museums can “ensure that the right experiences and atmospheres are being created and marketed towards the appropriate segmented markets” (Thyne, 2001, p. 119). Through a

ladder analysis of eighteen interviews with museum patrons, Thyne (2001) found that patrons were motivated by several different values and therefore cannot all be grouped together when segmenting the market. The implications for cause-related sport events are that participants cannot be segmented into a single group either and that targeting specific segments could prove beneficial to the nonprofit organization.

Motivations for Donating to a Cause

Motives for donating to a cause are important to understand for cause-related sport event organizers because of the charitable component of the event and the competition among non-profits. Guy and Patton (1988) explored basic motives for giving to charities and helping others. They found that the basic need to help others without expectation of extrinsic rewards is perhaps the strongest, but that other individuals may be motivated to help because of personal gain, self-esteem, or social rewards. Understanding these motives and how they affect the decision-making process can help non-profit marketers create awareness of the non-profit's need and donating can fulfill the needs of donors. The differences in motivations also suggest a need for segmentation. For example, researchers surveyed managers and non-managers regarding their donation motives found that these two groups are motivated to donate to different types of organizations because they have different expectations of the nonprofits (Sundel et al., 1978). They, too, suggest that donors can and should be viewed as heterogeneous groups and therefore segmented in marketing efforts.

Participants in participatory sport events select these events for a variety of reasons. Cause-related events add a new set of motives for selecting events. Because there are so many motivations behind choosing events, cause-related sport event organizers must consider including many elements in events in an attempt to appease a variety of participants. They should also consider segmenting the market in order to better understand how the event can fulfill the needs and desires of participants. One group that can be segmented and targeted is endurance athletes because they already have motives to participate in similar events.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

Research Objective

The overall objective of this research is to compare participants of cause-related and non-cause-related sport events. To date, relevant literature has examined why consumers are participating in charity sport events. By examining what motivates endurance athletes to participate in charity and non-charity events, this study will begin to fill the gap in the literature. It will also help event organizers understand what motivates participants to attend endurance events so they can tailor their marketing messages and event elements. Using a quantitative approach, this study is designed to examine what motives are important to endurance athletes when selecting their events and whether there are differences in motives for endurance athletes who participate in cause-related sport events from endurance athletes participate in non-cause-related sport events.

Previously, the focus for participant motivation research has been solely on participants already attending events. This research examined consumers of endurance events and compared motives of participants of cause-related events with motives of those participating in non-cause-related events. Understanding the differences in these motivational profiles of participants will address the gap in the current literature of why some consumers choose not to participate in cause-related events.

For the practitioner, this study will provide a clearer picture of why endurance athletes select events in which to participate. This knowledge can then be used to tailor marketing and recruiting techniques for these constituents. For example, emphasizing the

competitiveness of the event or providing connections to training programs could help those motivated by competitiveness, weight loss, or social reasons. Through implementing the results of this study within an organization, non-profits can better reach more consumers which in turn can help the non-profit realize its goals of increased awareness, participation, donations, and commitment from a specific group of consumers—endurance athletes.

METHODOLOGY

The study was designed to be non-experimental. Endurance athletes' motives were compared based on their participation in cause-related and non-cause related endurance events. The survey was distributed to athletes at several endurance events, and results were analyzed using descriptive statistics, reliability measures, and analyses of variance (ANOVA).

Instrumentation

Survey participants were asked about their training habits (typical number of hours per week and day, training with others or self), their perceived level of ability or skill (i.e. did they consider themselves to be novice, intermediate, advanced, or elite athletes?), their likelihood to participate in future endurance events and previous event participation (number of events within the last year and the number of events that benefitted a charity), and who they came to the race with. A demographic section was also included to gather information on gender, race, education, age, and income. Participants who completed the survey at their training group practice instead of an event were also asked to list the name and type of the last endurance event they participated in, whether or not it benefitted a charity and the name of that charity, and how long ago the event was in order to help determine whether or not they participate in charity events.

After completing the above sections of the survey, participants completed the Motivations of Marathoners Scales (MOMS) as developed by Masters, Ogles, and Jolton

(1993). The MOMS survey includes 56 items designed to examine nine motivations: life meaning (7 items), self-esteem (8 items), psychological coping (9 items), personal goal achievement (6 items), competition (4 items), recognition/approval of others (6 items), affiliation with others (6 items), general health concerns (6 items), and weight concern (4 items). The survey was modified slightly so that instead of asking participants about their possible reasons for running, they were asked about their possible reasons for participating in this event. The word running was removed from specific motives and those items were altered to be generic for event participation (i.e. to improve my running speed became to improve my speed and to socialize with other runners became to socialize with other athletes). Overall, the survey, including the demographic portion and the MOMS, took anywhere from five to ten minutes to complete. The survey in its entirety can be found in Appendix A.

Procedures

The surveys were distributed at four participatory sport events and one training group's practice session. Of the four events, two were affiliated with a charity and two were not. Also, two of the four events were aqua runs (a swim and run event) and two of the four were bike rides. As seen in Table 4.1, each category of event (cause-related and non-cause-related) survey consisted of one aqua-run and one bike ride.

The aqua run not affiliated with any charity was a competitive event with awards handed out for the event and results posted online for the 750 meter swim and 3 km run. Participants had to register ahead of time and check in prior to the event to receive their

timing devices, had to register through USA Triathlon (the sanctioning body) as an annual or one-day member, and after the event food was provided and wards were handed out. The bike ride not affiliated with a charity was held on a weekend by a local cycling association. The ride offered seven distances for participants (14 miles to 105 miles) that were fully supported with food, drinks, rest stops, and vehicles to assist with mechanical failure and first aid. Participants were able to pick up their packets the day before the event at an expo or on the day of the ride. There was a pre-ride expo the day of the event, and a post ride party available to all participants. Riders were not timed and no awards were handed out.

The cause-related aqua run was a 500m swim and 5km run that benefitted Big Brothers, Big Sisters and American Youthworks—both organizations dedicated to helping youth in the community. Racers had to pre-register and check-in to receive their timing equipment. Post race there was no food, but awards were handed out; points could also be accumulated at the event towards a series award for participating in all seven events put on by organizing company. Only a portion of the proceeds of the event went to the charities, as the event was not organized by the charities. The cause-related bike ride was organized by a local cancer center and 100% of the proceeds benefitted one of their surgery programs. The ride offered three options from 16 to 64 miles, but was not timed and no awards were handed out. Participants had to register prior to the event, but could pick-up their registration packets the day before or at the event. Prior to the event there was an expo and there was a post-event party with food, music, and various booths. In addition to a registration fee, participants could participate on a team to

fundraise for the event. These teams competed against each other to raise the most funds and the winning team received a private tent at the event with food and a catered party at a local festival.

At each of the events, participants were asked by the researcher to complete the surveys either before or after the event (such as during registration/check-in or while waiting for an awards ceremony). The surveys took five to ten minutes to complete, and when the participants finished, they returned the survey to the researcher.

Table 4.1
Description of Events

Cause-Related Events		Non-Cause-Related Events	
Aqua Run	Bike Ride	Aqua Run	Bike Ride
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 750 meter swim • 3 kilometer run 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 distances • 14 miles to 105 miles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 500 meter swim • 5 kilometer run 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 distances • 16 to 64 miles
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Youthworks • Big Brothers, Big Sisters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Cancer Center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Charity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Charity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards • Timing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Awards • No Timing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards • Timing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Awards • No Timing

The training group was a local triathlon training group that has 13 coached practices a week. Members do not have to attend all workouts, but are encouraged to attend several each week. The members often are training for specific races, and participate in several events a year-both charity and non-charity events. Participants were asked at the beginning of a weekday workout to fill out the survey upon completion of the workout and return the surveys to the researcher.

Participants

Endurance athletes are individuals who participate in sports that require a prolonged athletic output over an extended distance or period of time. They spend many of their hours training and preparing to compete in events. Their motivations to train for and participate in endurance athletic events have been well documented (Beard & Ragheb 1983; Filo, Funk & O'Brien 2008; Ogles & Masters 2000; Won, Park & Turner, 2010). Because these athletes have experience training for and participating in endurance events, they are excellent targets for non-profit organizations seeking participants for their cause-related sport events. For the purposes of this survey, endurance athletes were defined as participants in an endurance sport event—defined as an event that required sustained activity and training for the event, such as an aqua run or bike ride. The athletes considered competed in an endurance event at least once over the previous three months.

Surveys were provided to 400 adult multi-sport athletes (i.e. triathletes) and cyclists who had competed in an endurance event. A total of 182 surveys were returned (response rate = 45.5%), of which 180 were useable (45%). Of the surveys gathered, 74 participants participated in a cause-related event and 106 athletes competed in a non-cause-related event. Ninety-eight males and 80 females participated, ranging in age from 20 to 75 years, with a mean age of 42.4 years. Consistent with previous work on these athletes, participants overwhelmingly listed their ethnicity as Caucasian (88.6%), and were between the ages of 32 and 55 (73.5%). Most had earned a bachelor's degree or higher (86.3%), and over half had an individual income of \$75,000 or more (56%).

Over half identified themselves as intermediate endurance athletes (58.8%), when asked what term best described them as an athlete (novice, intermediate, advanced, or elite). Almost a quarter of the respondents identified themselves as advanced endurance athletes, 15.8% as novices, and only 2 respondents identified themselves as elite endurance athletes. Most (84.7%) said that they would be very likely to participate in another endurance event within the next year, and 78.5% said they would be very likely to participate in another event within the next three months.

Participants were most likely to participate in another endurance event within one year (84.7%), but still highly likely to participate in another event within the next six months (80.2%) and three months (78.5%). Most trained three to nine hours a week on average (57.6%) and participants spread their training out over four to seven days (84.9%). Athletes also reported spending more time training by themselves than with others. A majority of athletes reported that in the past year they had participated in one to five events (60.1%). Most reported that at least half of the events they had participated in during the last year did benefit a charity (58.9%). Complete details of the participants profile can be found in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Demographics of Participants

Type of Event	N	Gender	N	Athlete Level	N
Cause-Related	74	Male	98	Novice	28
Non-Cause-Related	106	Female	80	Intermediate	104
Total:	180	Total:	178	Advanced/Elite	45
				Total:	177

Age	N	Education	N	Attended Race With	N
18-30	22	High School	3	Friends	52
31-40	34	Some College	21	Sport Clubs	10
41-50	34	Bachelor's Degree	84	Work Colleagues	2
51-60	24	Graduate Degree	68	Family	29
61+	7	Total:	176	By Myself	44
Total:	121			Total:	137

# of Events	N	Income	N	Ethnicity	N
0-2 Events	36	\$0-24,999	4	Caucasian	156
3-5 Events	68	\$25,000-49,999	18	African-American	4
6-8 Events	22	\$50,000-74,999	27	Asian American	6
9-11 Events	14	\$75,000-99,999	29	Hispanic	9
12-14 Events	8	\$100,000-124,999	23	Other	1
15+ Events	10	\$125,000-149,999	12	Total:	176
Total:	158	\$150,000 or above	34		
		Total:	147		

Data Analysis

All completed questionnaires were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 18.0 for analysis. First, descriptive statistics (frequencies and means) were calculated for each of the demographic variables and the individual items on the MOMS. Some of the demographic variables were grouped into categories for simpler analysis (i.e. age, training habits, event participation). A variable for each of the nine subscales was created by taking the mean of the items for that subscale (i.e. the four items on the Competition subscale were averaged to create a variable for the Competition subscale). These created variables were later used when analyzing differences among groups.

Next, reliability measures were calculated for each of the nine subscale variables that had been created (life meaning, self-esteem, psychological coping, personal goal achievement, competition, recognition/approval of others, affiliation with others, general health orientation, and weight concern). A reliability analysis was run using each of the scale variables and Chronbach's alpha, the inter-item correlations, and the corrected item-total correlation were analyzed for acceptable ranges in accordance with previous research. Items with inter-item correlations outside the range of .3 to .8 were eliminated if the corrected item-total correlation was also below .5 (Bearden, Netemeyer, & Teel, 1989). These items were removed from their respective subscales and the variables for those subscales were recalculated and retested for reliability.

Mean comparisons were then performed using univariate analysis of variances (ANOVAs) to compare the means of each of the nine subscales amongst the following

independent variables: event type, gender, training habits per week, and number of events participated in per year.

RESULTS

This chapter presents the overall results of this research study. First, the descriptive statistics are presented. Second, the reliability analysis regarding the MOMS is described, followed by a description of the findings. Then, comparisons of the means for each of the subscales are presented for the different types of events, athlete levels, and training habits.

Descriptive Statistics

Using the demographic portion of the questionnaire, the sample of event participants was examined to determine what types of people were participating in the events. The demographics were also used to compare the two event types, these differences were later used to see if the different demographics had different motivations.

CAUSE-RELATED EVENT PARTICIPANTS

Participants in the cause-related events included more females than males (57.5% to 42.5%), with the majority of participants aged between 18 and 50 years, with no participants over 60 years of age. Most cause-related event participants had at least a bachelor's degree and earned at least \$50,000 in income. Most cause-related event participants considered themselves to be intermediate endurance athletes, and trained 4-7 days a week.

NON-CAUSE-RELATED EVENT PARTICIPANTS

Non-cause-related event athletes were more predominantly male than female (63.5% to 36.5%), with most being between 31 and 60 years of age. Most non-cause-related event participants also had at least a bachelor's degree, and an income of at least \$75,000. Most also considered themselves to be intermediate athletes and trained 4-7 days per week.

COMPARISON OF CAUSE-RELATED AND NON-CAUSE-RELATED EVENTS

For the most part, the cause-related and non-cause-related event athletes have similar profiles. However, cause-related events had more female athletes than male athletes, while non-cause-related events had more male athletes than female athletes. Non-cause-related event athletes also tended to be slightly older than cause-related event athletes; the average age for non-cause-related event participants was 45.41 years compared to the cause-related event participant average age of 37.77 years. A higher percentage of non-cause-related event athletes (76.3%) than cause-related event athletes (48.9%) reported that at least half of the events they had participated in over the past year were cause-related. This demonstrates that many athletes participate in both types of events throughout the year. See table 5.1 for a detailed profile of the cause-related event participants and the non-cause-related event participants.

Table 5.1

Comparison of Cause-Related and Non-Cause-Related Event Participants

	Cause-Related		Non-Cause Related	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Gender				
Male	31	42.5%	66	63.5%
Female	42	57.5%	38	36.5%
Total	73		104	
Age				
18-30 yrs	10	21.3%	12	16.2%
31-40 yrs	22	46.8%	12	16.2%
41-50 yrs	11	23.4%	23	31.1%
51-60 yrs	4	8.5%	20	27.0%
61+ yrs	0	0%	7	9.5%
Total	47		74	
Education				
High School	1	1.4%	2	1.9%
Some College	6	8.5%	14	13.5%
Bachelor's Degree	36	50.7%	48	46.2%
Graduate Degree	28	39.4%	40	38.5%
Total	71		104	
Income				
\$0-24,999	4	6.3%	0	0.0%
\$25,000-49,999	11	17.5%	7	8.3%
\$50,000-74,999	13	20.6%	14	16.7%
\$75,000-99,999	6	9.5%	23	27.4%
\$100,000-\$124,999	12	19.0%	11	13.1%
\$125,000-\$149,999	6	9.5%	6	7.1%
\$150,000+	11	17.5%	23	27.4%
Total	63		84	
Training Habits				
0-1 day per week	1	1.5%	4	4.0%
2-3 days per week	3	4.5%	17	17.2%
4-5 days per week	28	41.8%	58	58.6%
6-7 days per week	35	52.2%	20	20.2%
Total	67		99	

Reliability Analysis

After the descriptive statistics were analyzed, a reliability analysis was performed for each of the subscales in order to determine internal consistency using Chronbach's alpha coefficient (Chronbach, 1951). Scales with a score higher than .8 are believed to possess internal consistency (Lance, Butts & Michels, 2006). Originally, the coefficients ranged from .809 to .899 in value. However, upon analysis of the inter-item correlation's and corrected item-total correlation, several items were deleted. Items with inter-item correlations outside the range of .3 to .8 were eliminated if the corrected item-total correlation was below .5 (Bearden, Netemeyer, & Teel, 1989). This resulted in one item from the life meaning subscale ("To make my life more complete"), two items from the self esteem subscale ("To improve my self-esteem" and "To feel mentally in control of my body"), and one item from the psychological coping subscale ("To become less anxious") being deleted.

The three subscales were then reassessed for reliability using Chronbach's alpha. The Chronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from .809 to .899 in value, and the item-to-total correlations and range of inter-item correlations fit the previously discussed guidelines. The Chronbach's alpha coefficient, item-to-total correlations, and range of inter-item correlations can be found in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2
Reliability Analysis of Subscales

	Means	SD	Cronbach's Alpha	Item-to- total correlations	Range of Inter- item correlations
Life meaning			.863		
Item 1	3.82	1.93		.64	.27 - .77
Item 2	3.68	1.91		.71	.38 - .77
Item 3	3.47	1.95		.59	.39 - .52
Item 5	3.30	1.96		.66	.42 - .64
Item 6	3.04	1.87		.59	.27 - .71
Item 7	3.12	1.89		.76	.48 - .71
Self-esteem			.826		
Item 2	4.30	1.83		.63	.39 - .56
Item 3	3.36	1.78		.58	.32 - .56
Item 4	5.28	1.56		.54	.26 - .58
Item 5	4.84	1.79		.73	.45 - .58
Item 6	5.46	1.48		.58	.35 - .57
Item 8	3.89	2.10		.50	.26 - .45
Psychological coping			.882		
Item 2	2.96	1.94		.50	.29 - .56
Item 3	4.03	1.90		.63	.40 - .54
Item 4	4.25	1.79		.57	.31 - .56
Item 5	3.78	1.89		.69	.30 - .76
Item 6	3.73	1.81		.72	.29 - .76
Item 7	3.14	1.71		.74	.37 - .74
Item 8	3.89	1.92		.65	.30 - .63
Item 9	3.49	1.97		.69	.33 - .64
Personal goal achievement			.809		
Item 1	4.55	1.90		.58	.23 - .73
Item 2	5.70	1.60		.51	.28 - .47
Item 3	4.82	1.83		.59	.28 - .73
Item 4	5.78	1.42		.52	.23 - .50
Item 5	4.15	2.09		.63	.40 - .52
Item 6	5.21	1.60		.58	.35 - .52

Table 5.2 Continued

	Means	SD	Cronbach's Alpha	Item-to- total correlations	Range of Inter- item correlations
Competition			.876		
Item 1	4.11	2.00		.65	.51 - .66
Item 2	3.51	2.15		.80	.66 - .73
Item 3	3.24	1.92		.71	.51 - .70
Item 4	2.95	2.04		.78	.58 - .73
Recognition/approval			.899		
Item 1	3.01	1.78		.71	.47 - .78
Item 2	2.98	1.72		.71	.44 - .78
Item 3	3.13	1.81		.77	.57 - .68
Item 4	2.89	1.73		.67	.44 - .65
Item 5	2.68	1.72		.72	.50 - .73
Item 6	2.82	1.78		.77	.52 - .73
Affiliation			.833		
Item 1	4.67	1.76		.55	.30 - .48
Item 2	3.92	1.78		.65	.38 - .58
Item 3	3.87	1.95		.62	.35 - .58
Item 4	4.44	1.99		.52	.30 - .55
Item 5	3.81	1.84		.64	.40 - .57
Item 6	4.51	1.89		.67	.43 - .55
General health orientation			.833		
Item 1	6.01	1.18		.60	.38 - .50
Item 2	5.02	1.84		.64	.30 - .59
Item 3	5.96	1.27		.54	.28 - .50
Item 4	4.28	1.97		.59	.28 - .61
Item 5	5.85	1.25		.54	.30 - .55
Item 6	4.66	1.95		.75	.44 - .61
Weight concerns			.841		
Item 1	4.99	1.98		.74	.40 - .81
Item 2	4.13	2.10		.72	.37 - .81
Item 3	4.81	1.82		.74	.60 - .63
Item 4	4.56	1.91		.52	.37 - .63

*Items deleted are not included in table. All items (both included and deleted) can be found in Appendix B.

Motivations to Participate in Endurance Events

On the nine subscales, participants said the most important reason for attending endurance events was because of general health motivations such as staying in physical condition and preventing illness ($M=5.29$). Self esteem ($M=4.52$), personal goal achievement ($M=5.04$), affiliation ($M=4.21$), and weight concern ($M=4.62$) motivations were all above the midpoint of the scale, indicating that they were important reasons to participate. Less important reasons to attend included life meaning ($M=3.41$), psychological coping ($M=3.66$), and competition ($M=3.45$) motivations. The least important reason for attending was for recognition or approval of others ($M=2.92$). Subscale ranking in terms of importance and a complete list of item means can be found in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3
Overall Order of Motives from Most Important to Least Important

Motives	Mean	Standard Deviation
General health orientation	5.29	1.18
Personal goal achievement	5.04	1.25
Weight concern	4.62	1.61
Self-esteem	4.52	1.29
Affiliation	4.21	1.38
Psychological coping	3.66	1.38
Competition	3.45	1.73
Life meaning	3.41	1.48
Recognition/approval	2.92	1.43

Differences in Motives between Cause-Related and Non-Cause-Related Events

A one-way univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate mean differences on each of the subscales by event type, as well as by training habits, gender, and event participation.

Cause-related event participants rated personal goal achievement motives ($M=5.53$) and general health orientation motives ($M=5.08$) as the most important reason to participate. Other important reasons to participate included self-esteem motives ($M=4.78$), affiliation motives ($M=4.41$), and weight concern motives ($M=4.47$). They scored lowest on recognition/approval motives ($M=3.28$), life meaning motives ($M=3.55$), psychological coping motives ($M=3.69$), and competition motives ($M=3.96$).

Non-cause related event participants also general health orientation motives ($M=5.44$) and personal goal achievement ($M=4.70$) motives as most important reasons to participate. Other important motives included weight concern motives ($M=4.72$), self-esteem motives ($M=4.33$) and affiliation motives ($M=4.07$). The least important reasons to participate for non-cause related event athletes were recognition/approval motives ($M=2.67$), competition motives ($M=3.09$), life meaning motives ($M=3.31$), and psychological coping motives ($M=3.64$).

Table 5.4

Motives of Cause-Related vs. Non-Cause-Related Event Participants

Cause-Related Event			Non-Cause-Related Event		
Motives	Mean	Std. Deviation	Motives	Mean	Std. Deviation
<i>Personal goal achievement*</i>	5.53	1.14	<i>General health orientation*</i>	5.44	1.14
<i>General health orientation*</i>	5.08	1.21	Weight concern	4.72	1.58
<i>Self-esteem*</i>	4.78	1.23	<i>Personal goal achievement*</i>	4.70	1.22
Weight concern	4.47	1.65	<i>Self-esteem*</i>	4.33	1.29
Affiliation	4.41	1.46	Affiliation	4.07	1.31
<i>Competition*</i>	3.96	1.75	Psychological coping	3.64	1.33
Psychological coping	3.69	1.46	Life meaning	3.31	1.47
Life meaning	3.55	1.49	<i>Competition*</i>	3.09	1.64
<i>Recognition/approval*</i>	3.28	1.45	<i>Recognition/approval*</i>	2.67	1.38

* $p < .05$ *Italics indicate significant differences between motives.*

Significant differences between cause-related and non-cause-related events were found for several of the subscales. Cause-related event participants were significantly more motivated by Self-Esteem motives ($p=.024$), Personal Goal Achievement motives ($p<.001$), Competition motives ($p=.001$), and Recognition/Approval of Others motives ($p=.006$) than non-cause-related event participants. Non-cause-related event athletes were significantly more motivated by General Health Orientation motives ($p=.044$) than cause-related event athletes. There were no significant differences found between the two groups for Life Meaning motives ($p=.311$), Psychological Coping motives ($p=.836$), Affiliation motives ($p=.123$), or Weight Concern motives ($p=.325$).

TRAINING HABITS OF ENDURANCE EVENT PARTICIPANTS

Various training habits of the athletes participating in the events were assessed to determine if various training habits affected motivations for participating in events. The survey contained questions about the number of days per week participants spent training, number of hours per week participants spent training, number of hours per week participants spent training with others, and number of hours per week participants spent training alone. When assessed for significant differences, only the number of days spent training per week variable showed significant differences for six of the motivation subscales. Self esteem ($p=.01$) motives, personal goal achievement motives ($p<.001$), competition motives ($p=.02$), recognition/approval motives ($p=.03$), affiliation motives ($p=.03$), and weight concern motives ($p=.049$) were found to have significant differences between number of days trained per week. No significant differences were found for life meaning motives ($p=.46$), psychological coping motives ($p=.78$), and general health orientation motives ($p=.08$). Means and standard deviations for each training habit group can be found in Table 5.5.

Self-esteem motives ranged in importance from $M=2.73$ for those who trained for zero or one day a week to $M=4.64$ for those who trained four to five days a week. Personal goal achievement motives ranged in importance from $M=3.07$ for zero to one day a week to $M=5.55$ for those who trained six to seven days a week. Competition motives ranged from $M=1.40$ for those who trained zero to one day a week to $M=3.82$ for those who trained six to seven days a week. Recognition/approval motives ranged from $M=1.40$ for those who trained zero to one day a week to $M=3.21$ for those who trained six to seven days a week. Affiliation motives ranged from $M=2.63$ for those who trained zero to one day a week to $M=4.47$ for those who trained six to seven days a week.

Weight concern motives ranged from $M=3.50$ for those who trained zero to one day a week to $M=5.26$ for those who trained two to three days a week.

Those who spend six or seven days per week training were generally more motivated than those who trained less. They were most motivated by personal goal achievement motives ($M=5.55$) and general health orientation motives ($M=5.18$), but were also strongly motivated by self-esteem motives ($M=4.63$), affiliation motives ($M=4.47$), and weight concern motives ($M=4.30$). Those who trained four or five days a week were most motivated by general health orientation motives ($M=5.45$), and were more motivated by these motives than any other category. Other important motives for this group were personal goal achievement motives ($M=4.97$), weight concern motives ($M=4.69$), self-esteem motives ($M=4.64$), and affiliation motives ($M=4.19$).

Those who trained two to three days per week were generally less motivated by each group of motives, except for weight concern motives. They were more motivated by weight concern motives ($M=5.26$) than any other group. Other important motives for this group were personal goal achievement motives ($M=4.53$), self-esteem motives ($M=4.33$), and affiliation motives ($M=4.01$). Those who trained for one day a week or no days a week were less motivated by each motive than any other group. The only motives that this group scored above the midpoint of the scale were general health orientation motives ($M=4.13$).

Table 5.5

Mean Comparisons by Training Habits per Week

Motives	0-1 Days		2-3 Days		4-5 Days		6-7 Days	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
<i>Personal goal achievement*</i>	3.07	1.43	4.53	1.16	4.97	1.19	5.55	1.08
General health orientation	4.13	1.69	5.18	1.26	5.45	1.10	5.18	1.23
<i>Weight concern*</i>	3.50	1.69	5.26	1.02	4.69	1.55	4.30	1.71
<i>Self-esteem*</i>	2.73	1.29	4.33	0.86	4.64	1.33	4.63	1.26
<i>Affiliation*</i>	2.63	1.82	4.01	1.35	4.19	1.32	4.47	1.41
Psychological coping	3.00	1.19	3.71	1.17	3.61	1.49	3.66	1.34
Life meaning	2.43	1.15	3.21	1.04	3.36	1.60	3.50	1.42
<i>Competition*</i>	1.40	0.52	3.10	1.43	3.37	1.75	3.82	1.74
<i>Recognition/approval*</i>	1.40	0.38	2.89	1.15	2.76	1.38	3.21	1.52

* $p < .05$ *Italics indicate significant differences between motives.*

GENDER OF ENDURANCE EVENT PARTICIPANTS

Significant differences between males and females were found for three of the motive subscales: life meaning ($p=.047$), self esteem ($p=.00$), and affiliation ($p=.00$). For these three motive subscales, females reported being more motivated than males. Females were most motivated by general health orientation ($M=5.22$), personal goal achievement ($M=5.12$), self-esteem ($M=4.95$), weight concern ($M=4.82$), and affiliation ($M=4.74$). The most important motives for males were general health orientation ($M=5.36$), personal goal achievement ($M=4.99$), weight concern ($M=4.47$), and self-esteem ($M=4.20$).

Both males and females reported being least motivated by recognition approval ($M=2.83$ and $M=3.08$, respectively). Most important for both genders were general health orientation motives. Means and standard deviations for both genders can be found in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6
Mean Comparisons by Gender

Motives	Male		Female	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
General health orientation	5.36	1.18	5.22	1.18
Personal goal achievement	4.99	1.26	5.12	1.26
<i>Self-esteem*</i>	<i>4.20</i>	<i>1.32</i>	<i>4.95</i>	<i>1.11</i>
Weight concern	4.47	1.66	4.82	1.53
<i>Affiliation*</i>	<i>3.84</i>	<i>1.30</i>	<i>4.74</i>	<i>1.30</i>
Psychological coping	3.56	1.41	3.84	1.31
<i>Life meaning*</i>	<i>3.23</i>	<i>1.48</i>	<i>3.69</i>	<i>1.43</i>
Competition	3.49	1.76	3.45	1.72
Recognition/approval	2.83	1.47	3.08	1.38

* $p < .05$ *Italics indicate significant differences between motives.*

PARTICIPATION IN ENDURANCE EVENTS

Participants were also asked how many endurance events they had participated in over the past year to ascertain if their participation in events affected their motivations for participating in a type of event (cause-related or non-cause-related). Life meaning ($p=.01$), personal goal achievement ($p<.001$), competition($p=.02$), recognition/approval ($p=.03$), and affiliation motives ($p=.03$) were all found to have significant differences between the categories of number of events (0-2 events, 3-5 events, 6-8 events, 9-11 events, 12-14 events, and 15+ events). Means and standard deviations for all categories can be found in Table 5.7.

Those who participated in zero to two events in the past year were most motivated by general health orientation ($M=5.25$), weight concern ($M=4.81$), personal goal

achievement ($M=4.28$), and self-esteem ($M=4.25$) motives. They were least motivated by competition ($M=2.69$) and recognition/approval motives ($M=2.65$). They were less motivated by personal goal achievement, competition, recognition/approval, and affiliation motives than any other category of events.

Those who participated in three to five events in the past year were most motivated by general health orientation ($M=5.29$), personal goal achievement ($M=4.90$), weight concern ($M=4.47$), self-esteem ($M=4.43$), and affiliation motives ($M=4.18$). They were least motivated by recognition/approval motives ($M=2.59$). They were less motivated by life meaning, psychological coping, and weight concern motives than any other category of events.

Those who participated in six to eight events over the past year were most motivated by personal goal achievement ($M=5.38$), general health orientation ($M=5.28$), self-esteem ($M=4.82$), weight concern ($M=4.66$), affiliation ($M=4.42$), and competition motives ($M=4.05$). They were least motivated by recognition/approval ($M=3.67$).

Those who participated in nine to eleven events in the past year were most motivated by general health orientation ($M=5.64$), personal goal achievement ($M=5.38$), weight concern ($M=5.12$), affiliation ($M=4.96$), and self-esteem motives ($M=4.92$). They were least motivated by recognition/approval motives ($M=3.85$). They were more motivated by life meaning, competition, recognition/approval, and general health orientation motives than any other category of events.

Those who participated in twelve to fourteen events were most motivated by personal goal achievement ($M=5.64$), affiliation ($M=5.21$), self-esteem ($M=5.14$), weight concern ($M=5.07$), and general health orientation motives ($M=5.06$). They were least motivated by recognition/approval motives ($M=3.27$). They were more motivated by

self-esteem, personal goal achievement, and affiliation motives than any other category of events. They were less motivated by general health orientation motives than any other category of events.

Those who participated in fifteen or more events in the past year were most motivated by general health orientation ($M=5.48$), personal goal achievement ($M=5.45$), weight concern ($M=5.18$), self-esteem ($M=4.17$), and affiliation motives ($M=4.13$). They were least motivated by recognition/approval motives ($M=2.88$). They were motivated by weight concern motives more than any other category of events.

Table 5.7

Mean Comparisons by Endurance Event Participation

Construct	0-2 Events		3-5 Events		6-8 Events		9-11 Events		12-14 Events		15+ Events	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
<i>Life meaning*</i>	3.22	1.50	3.10	1.50	3.91	1.18	4.36	1.18	3.62	1.11	3.42	1.78
Self-esteem	4.25	1.54	4.43	1.28	4.82	1.08	4.92	1.01	5.14	0.82	4.17	1.37
Psychological coping	3.50	1.34	3.29	1.48	3.93	1.07	4.28	0.99	4.05	1.32	4.00	1.33
<i>Personal goal achievement*</i>	4.28	1.27	4.9	1.17	5.38	1.21	5.38	1.38	5.64	0.86	5.45	1.09
<i>Competition*</i>	2.69	1.26	3.22	1.77	4.05	1.71	4.11	1.78	4.00	1.08	3.83	2.07
<i>Recognition/approval*</i>	2.65	1.45	2.59	1.31	3.67	1.11	3.85	1.73	3.27	1.06	2.88	1.69
<i>Affiliation*</i>	3.61	1.40	4.18	1.3	4.42	1.33	4.96	1.09	5.21	1.46	4.13	1.26
General health orientation	5.25	1.36	5.29	1.09	5.28	1.10	5.64	1.00	5.06	1.13	5.48	1.64
Weight concern	4.81	1.78	4.47	1.57	4.66	1.71	5.12	1.16	5.07	1.05	5.18	1.75

* $p < .05$ *Italics indicate significant differences between motives.*

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the findings of the study are discussed. The differences in motives between event populations are explored, and implications from these findings, both theoretical and practical, are also described. Limitations of this study are acknowledged, and future research directions are considered.

Events were selected for their similarities, but inevitably there would be differences between the events. An attempt was made to ensure that the most prominent difference was affiliation with a cause. Between these two event types, significant differences were found between five of the motives: self-esteem, recognition/approval, personal goal achievement, competition, and general health orientation.

Affiliation with a cause could help explain why cause-related events attract athletes more motivated by self-esteem and recognition/approval reasons than non-cause-related athletes. Guy and Patton (1988) found that self-esteem motives were important reasons for donating to a cause, and the findings in this study of self-esteem motives importance to participants align with those findings. The cause may have added meaning to the endurance events that allowed participants to fulfill their needs to improve their self-esteem through helping others. Filo, Funk, and O'Brien (2008) suggested that self-esteem motives helped drive participation in cause-related events and develop attraction to the events. The results from this study support these findings, and suggest that in addition to self-esteem motives increasing participation, a cause can have an effect on other motivations.

. The affiliation with a cause could have also attracted participants motivated by recognition and approval. Reasons such as earning the respect of people, making family and friends proud, earning recognition, or getting compliments from others were important reasons for participating were designated as recognition and approval motives examined. Affiliation with a cause can also add meaning to the event by helping participants support a cause important to their friends and family or earning recognition from those around for both their athletic achievement and helping out those in need. These findings are in line with previous results. For example, Guy and Patton (1988), found that social rewards were one motivation to help others. While other researchers found that other social motives such as the desire for social interaction were important (Bennett et al., 2007). This finding was not supported in this study, but cause definitely provided participants with an avenue to gain recognition and approval from others that could not be found as much in non-cause-related events.

Personal goal achievement motives were more important for cause-related event participants than participants of non-cause-related events. To improve my speed, push myself beyond my current limits and beat a certain time were some items that measured personal goal achievement. Personal goal achievement motives could be fulfilled either through timing provided by event organizers or individually through one's own watch and equipment. For this reason, personal goal achievement could be achieved at all events. Taylor and Shanka (2008) found that achievement motives are important to participants of cause-related events, and the findings in this study are similar.

Competitive motives, surprisingly, were more important to participants of cause-related events than to non-cause-related events. Motives such as the desire to compete with others and place high in a race were used to measure overall competitive motives. In other words, competitive motives encouraged race against others. Previously, competition had not been reported as an important motive for participants of cause-related sport events. The event types were similar in that one cause-related and one-non-cause-related event provided opportunities to assess one's performance against others and each type had one event that did not provide these opportunities. Many cause-related events attract groups of participants through the cause. These groups train and fundraise together, and would make it easy to compare performances among friends. However, as this study did not assess whether or not groups were participating, this assumption cannot be made without further investigation. Also, without knowing how participants evaluated competition, it is impossible to determine why participants believed that cause-related events would fulfill their competitive motives more than participants believed that non-cause-related events would.

Non-cause-related participants did cite general health orientation motives as a more important reason for participating in their event than cause-related event participants. To improve health, prolong life, become more physically fit, stay in physical condition, and prevent illness were all reasons for participating used to assess the overall general health orientation subscale. The general health orientation motives were the most important reasons for participating in the event for non-cause-related event endurance athletes. These athletes, surprisingly, had a higher percentage of athletes who

trained fewer days per week than cause-related event participants, although the majority of non-cause-related event athletes trained four days a week or more. The importance of general health orientation motives to non-cause-related event athletes could reflect an increased awareness of the importance of exercise to overall health, reflect more experience participating in events, or a focus on the sport instead of the cause at events. Also, cause-related events could attract people that are less worried about themselves, and more about others. Filo, Funk, and O'Brien (2008) had found that the need to help others was important to participants in cause-related events. Non-cause-related events would then be more concerned about their personal health.

The results of this study support the importance of event attributes to event attractiveness. Streicher and Saayman (2010) found that event attributes and elements can have an effect on motivations for attending certain events. In addition to the attributes identified by Streicher and Saayman (2010), affiliation with a cause is one event attribute can affect motivations to attend events. Cause-related event participants in this study were more motivated by personal goal achievement, self-esteem, recognition/achievement, and competition reasons, suggesting that cause may add meaning to event that cannot be found elsewhere. Participants may be able to fulfill their needs and desires better through cause-related events because of the added meaning.

Other event elements may also have impacted the motives measured, but cannot be accurately identified through this study. For example, being a championship event may attract more participants who will travel in order to compete (Hritz & Ramos, 2008). Timing and awards make it easier to assess whether or not one has beat other people,

place high in a race, improve their speed, or compete with themselves. In other words, both competitive and personal goal achievement motives could easily be fulfilled by events that provide these amenities.

It is also important to note that there were many reasons to attend each endurance event, and each event fulfilled several needs for each participant. Indeed, there were five major motivations to attend endurance events, cause-related or not, supporting Iso-Ahola's belief that leisure can fulfill more than one need at once (Iso-Ahola, 1982). In addition, this study's results support previous researchers' findings that there are many reasons for participating in endurance events (Masters, Ogles & Jolton, 1993; Ryan et al., 1997). Events of all types can fulfill these motives if the correct attributes and elements are provided to athletes, but this study demonstrates that some attributes can fulfill multiple motives. These attributes can also fulfill different motives.

Sample differences could also have affected motivations. Cause-related events attracted more females and a younger group of athletes. In line with previous research, female athletes in this study are more motivated by social reasons than males (Recours, Souville & Griffet, 2004; Curry & Weiss, 1989). Cause-related event attendees also reported being more motivated by social reasons than non-cause-related participants. The sample differences may help explain some of the differences in motives between event type participants, but further research will be needed determine the effects of these differences on motives.

The size of the event sample, though, was a limitation. A larger event sample could have provided a clearer picture of why people participate in events and whether

differences in the event participant samples affected the motivations for participating in the event. Also, different event elements and attributes, such as date, time, and location, could have affected the results of the study. The study did not ask participants about other event attributes, as its focus was on cause. However, as the results of this study show, event attributes can have an effect on motives. Another limitation was the studies inability to address why motives were important to participants. Understanding why different motives were important to participants would be beneficial to practitioners and provide a deeper understanding as to why athletes choose to participate in cause-related events. As this was the first exploratory study to examine the differences in motivations to participate cause-related and non-cause-related events, future research will have to overcome these limitations.

In addition to addressing these limitations, future research will need to further explore if there are other motives that are important to athletes participating in cause-related events, why motives are important to athletes, and how event elements fulfill these motives. More in-depth analysis of event attributes and their effects on motivations will also need to be undertaken. Qualitative research, such as interviews or focus groups with participants, will be integral in understanding how and which event attributes affect the motivations of participants. Also, future studies should examine why cause-related events attracted participants more motivated by competition than non-cause-related events did.

This study does provide an initial understanding of why people participate for practitioners. Event attributes must be considered as they fulfill different and multiple motives. Choosing which attributes and elements to include in an event can affect who will choose to participate. Also, practitioners should consider the population likely to attend their event when marketing. For example, cause-related event organizers should consider the attendees at their event by examining past events they have hosted and attendees at other similar events nearby. Marketers should try to emphasize that how the events can fulfill the motives of likely attendees, realizing that these motives will also likely attract other segments of endurance athletes to their events. For example, marketing and emphasizing how the participating in the event will support the cause will help potential participants realize how the event can fulfill their self-esteem motives. Including different elements at the event can help fulfill different motives as well, and organizers should realize that they can attract more than the likely attendees because some elements are attractive to all endurance athletes.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY

Selection of Events by Endurance Athletes

Dear participant,

I am graduate student at the University of Texas at Austin, and I would like to ask you to fill out this short survey, which I am conducting as part of my master's thesis. The focus of the study is to identify what motives are important to endurance athletes when selecting their events.

Filling out this survey will take about 10 minutes, and is completely voluntarily. At any point you can stop your cooperation and return the questionnaire to the survey taker. The survey does not contain any questions in regards to your personal information that could identify you, and your participation will remain anonymous. The risks of participating in the study are no more than can be found in daily life.

If you have any questions or concerns, please ask the survey taker, or contact Amy Rundio either by phone (352) 697-0742 or by e-mail rundioa@gmail.com

If you have any problems with this data collection and/or the researcher, please contact the University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board (IRB) office at (512) 471-8871.

Thank you for your cooperation!

Amy Rundio

In a typical week, on how many days do you participate in sports, fitness or recreational activities? _____ Days a Week

How much time do you spend doing participating in sports, fitness or recreational activities on a typical day? _____ Hours _____ Minutes

How many hours a week do you train by yourself? _____

How many hours a week do you train with others? _____

Which term best describes you as an endurance athlete? Novice Intermediate Advanced Elite

Please skip to the next section if you are completing this survey at an event.

What is the name of the last endurance event you participated in? _____

What type of event was it (e.g. 10k, sprint triathlon, century ride)? _____

Did the endurance event have a charity sponsor? If so, which charity did it benefit? _____

How long ago was this endurance event? _____

Please circle the number that best reflects your thoughts.

	Not Likely						Very Likely
How likely are you to compete in another endurance event (run, bike, swim, duathlon, triathlon) in the next 3 months?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

How likely are you to compete in another endurance event (run, bike, swim, duathlon, triathlon) in the next 6 months?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

How likely are you to compete in another endurance event (run, bike, swim, duathlon, triathlon) in the next year?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

How likely are you to compete in this event next year?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

How many endurance events have you participated in the last year? _____

How many of these events benefitted a charity? _____

Gender: Male Female

Age: _____

Ethnicity: Caucasian African-American Asian
 Hispanic Native American American
 Other _____

Individual Income Before Taxes:

\$0-24,999 \$25,000-49,999 \$50,000-74,999 \$75,000-99,999
 \$100,000-124,999 \$125,000-149,999 \$150,000 or above Prefer not to Answer

Education: High School Some College Bachelor's Degree Graduate Degree

Who did you come to the race with?

Friends Sport Club Work Colleagues
 Family By Myself Other _____

Please read each item and then circle the appropriate score to indicate how important the specific item is as a reason for participating in this event.

Possible Reasons for Participating	Not a Reason							A very Important Reason
To help control my weight.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To compete with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To earn respect of peers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To reduce my weight.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To improve my speed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To earn the respect of people in general.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To socialize with other athletes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To improve my health.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To compete with myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To become less anxious.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To improve my self-esteem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To have something in common with other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To add a sense of meaning to life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To prolong my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To become less depressed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To meet people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To become more physically fit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To distract myself from daily worries.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To make my family or friends proud of me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To make my life more purposeful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To look leaner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To try to be faster.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To feel more confident about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To participate with my family and friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To make myself feel whole.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To reduce my chance of having a heart attack.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To make my life more complete.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To improve my mood.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To improve my sense of self-worth.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To share a group identity with other athletes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
It is a positive emotional experience.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To feel proud of myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To visit with friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To feel a sense of achievement.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
To push myself beyond my current limits.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

To have time alone to sort things out.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To stay in physical condition.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To concentrate on my thoughts.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To solve problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To see how high I can place in races.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To feel a sense of belonging in nature.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To stay physically attractive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To get a faster time than my friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To prevent illness.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
People look up to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To see if I can beat a certain time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To blow off steam	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Brings me recognition.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To have time alone with the world.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To get away from it all.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To make my body perform better than before.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To beat someone I've never beaten before.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To feel mentally in control of my body.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To get compliments from others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To feel at peace with the world.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To feel like a winner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX B: MOMS SUBSCALES

Items on the MOMS organized by subscale. Items italicized were deleted from analysis.

Life Meaning (LM)

1. To add a sense of meaning to life.
2. To make my life more purposeful.
3. To make myself feel whole.
4. *To make my life more complete.*
5. To feel a sense of belonging in nature.
6. To have time alone with the world.
7. To feel at peace with the world.

Self-Esteem (SE)

1. *To improve my self-esteem.*
2. To feel more confident about myself.
3. To improve my sense of self worth.
4. It is a positive emotional experience.
5. To feel proud of myself.
6. To feel a sense of achievement.
7. *To feel mentally in control of my body.*
8. To feel like a winner.

Psychological Coping (PC)

1. *To become less anxious.*
2. To become less depressed.
3. To distract myself from daily worries.
4. To improve my mood.
5. To have time alone to sort things out.
6. To concentrate on my thoughts.
7. To solve problems.
8. To blow off steam.
9. To get away from it all.

Personal Goal Achievement (PGA)

1. To improve my speed.
2. To compete with myself.
3. To try to be faster.
4. To push myself beyond my current limits.
5. To see if I can beat a certain time.
6. To make my body perform better than before.

Competition (C)

1. To compete with others.
2. To see how high I can place in races.
3. To get a faster time than my friends.
4. To beat someone I've never beaten before.

Recognition/Approval (RA)

1. To earn respect of peers.
2. To earn the respect of people in general.
3. To make my family or friends proud of me.
4. People look up to me.
5. Brings me recognition.
6. To get compliments from others.

Affiliation (A)

1. To socialize with other athletes.
2. To have something in common with other people.
3. To meet people.
4. To participate with my family and friends.
5. To share a group identity with other athletes.
6. To visit with friends.

General Health Orientation (GHO)

1. To improve my health.
2. To prolong my life.
3. To become more physically fit.
4. To reduce my chance of having a heart attack.
5. To stay in physical condition.
6. To prevent illness.

Weight Concerns (WC)

1. To help control my weight.
2. To reduce my weight.
3. To look leaner.
4. To stay physically attractive.

REFERENCES

- Beard, J. G., & Ragheb, M. G. (1983). Measuring leisure motivation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 15, 219-228.
- Bearden, W. O., Netemeyer, R. G., & Teel, J. E. (1989). Measurement of consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(4), 473-481.
- Bennett, R., Mousley, W., Kitchin, P., & Ali-Choudhury, R. (2007). Motivations for participating in charity-affiliated sport events. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, 6 (2), 155-178.
- Biddle, S. J. H., & Bailey, C. I. A. (1985). Motives for participation and attitudes toward physical activity of adult participants in fitness programs. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 61, 831-834.
- Chronbach, L. J. (1951). *Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests*. New York: Springer.
- Crompton, J.L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24, 408-424.
- Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24, 425-349.
- Demographics*. (2011, June). Retrieved August 1, 2011 from <http://www.usatriathlon.org/about-usat/demographics>
- Egloff, B., & Gruhn, A. J. (1996). Personality and Endurance Sports. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 21(2), 223-229.

- 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.
- Flood, S. E., & Hellstedt, J. C. (1991). Gender differences in motivation for intercollegiate athletic participation. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 14, 159-167.
- Frederick, C. M., & Ryan, R. M. (1993). Differences in motivation for sport and exercise and their relationships with participation and mental health. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 16, 125-145.
- Funk, D. C., Toohey, T., & Bruun T. (2007). International sport event participation: Prior sport involvement; destination image; and travel motives. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 7, 227-248.
- Gat, I., & McWhirter, B. (1998). Personality characteristics of competitive and recreational cyclists. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 21, 408-421
- Guy, B. S. & Patton, W. E. (1988). The marketing of altruistic causes: Understanding why people help. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 2 (1). 5-16.
- Havenar, J. & Lochbaum, M. (2001). Differences in participation motives of first-time marathon finishers and pre-race dropouts. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 30(3), 270-279.
- Herman, R. D. (Ed.). (2004). *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hritz, M. N., & Ramos, W. D. (2008). To travel or to compete: Motivations of Masters swimmers. *International Journal of Aquatic Research and Education*, 2, 298-312.

- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: A rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9, 256-262.
- Jarvis, M. (2006). Motivation and sport. *Sport psychology: A student's handbook* (pp. 135-154). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kerr, J. H. (1997). *Motivation and emotion in sport reversal theory*. United Kingdom: Psychology Press.
- LaChausse, R. G. (2006). Motives of competitive and non-competitive cyclists. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 29(4). 304-314.
- Lance, C. E., Butts, M. M., & Michels, L. C. (2006). The sources of four commonly reported cutoff criteria: What did they really say? *Organizational Research Methods*, 9, 202-220.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Massarky, C. W. (2004). Enterprise strategies for generating revenues. In R. Herman (Ed.), *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management* (pp. 436-465). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Masters, K. S., Ogles, B. M., & Jolton, J. A. (1993). The development of an instrument to measure motivation for marathon running: the motivations of marathoners scales (MOMS). *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 64 (2). 134-143.
- Number of Nonprofit Organizations in the United States, 1998-2008*. (2009). Retrieved on August 1, 2011 from <http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/PubApps/profile1.php>

- Ogles, B. M., & Masters, K. S. (2000). Older vs. younger adult male marathon runners: Participative motives and training habits. *Journal of Sport Behavior* 23(2), 130-143.
- Roberts, G. C. (Ed.). (1992). *Motivation in sport and exercise*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books.
- Running USA. (2010, August 4). Running USA's state of the sport 2010-Part III: U.S. road race trends. In *2010 Marathon, half-marathon, and state of the sport reports*. Retrieved June 8, 2011, from Running USA website:
<http://runningusa.org/node/57770>
- Ryan, R. M., Frederick, C. M., Lepes, D., Rubio, N., & Sheldon, K. M. (1997). Intrinsic motivation and exercise adherence. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 28, 335-354.
- Sargeant, A. (1999). Charitable giving: Towards a model of donor behavior. *Journal of Marketing*, 15, 215-238.
- Sell, L. (1991). *Motivational characteristics of elite triathletes*. Master of Science Thesis, Department of Physical Education, West Chester University, USA.
- Spiggle, S. (1994). Analysis and interpretation of qualitative data in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29, 128-142.
- St. Baldrick's-about us-history*. (n.d.). Retrieved August 1, 2011 from
<http://www.stbaldricks.org/about-us/history/>
- Strauss, A. L. (1990). *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Streicher, H. & Saayman, M. (2010). Travel motives of participants in the Cape Argus Pick N Pay Cycle Tour. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education, and Recreation*, 32(1), 121-131.
- Sundel, H. H., Zelman, W. N., Weaver, C. N., & Pasternak, R. E. (1978). Understanding Donor Motivation. *Social Work*. 23 (3), 233-236.
- Svebak, S. & Kerr, J. H. (1989). The role of impulsivity in preference for sports. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 10(1), 51-58.
- 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.
- Thyne, M. (2001), The importance of values research for nonprofit organisations: The motivation-based values of museum visitors. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 6, 116–130.
- USA Cycling active demographics. (2010). Retrieved August 1, 2011 from <http://www.usacycling.org/corp/demographics.php>
- USA Triathlon membership breakdown. (2010, June 30). Retrieved August 1, 2011 from http://assets.teamusa.org/assets/documents/attached_file/filename/29891/June30_2010_Demographics.pdf
- Watson, T. (2006, December 13). *Special Report: Consumer Philanthropy*. Retrieved from <http://onphilanthropy.com/2006/special-report-consumer-philanthropy/>
- Won D., Park M., & Turner B. A. (2010). Motivations for participating in health related charity sport events. *Journal of Venue and Event Management* 1(1), 17-44.

- Wood, L., Snelgrove, R., & Danylchuk, K. (2010) Segmenting volunteer fundraisers at a charity sport event. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing* 22(1), 38-54.
- Zhang, Q. H., & Lam, T. (1999). An analysis of mainland Chinese visitors' motivations to visit Hong Kong. *Tourism Management*, 20, 587-594.