

Running Head: ONLINE PEER-TO-PEER FUNDRAISING AND CHARITY SPORT

An exploration of charity sport event donor perceptions of online peer-to-peer fundraising
mechanisms

Abstract

The employment of online peer-to-peer fundraising has become a critical aspect of the charity sport event experience. Charity sport event participants are encouraged, and often required, to fundraise as part of their involvement. Within this fundraising, participants increasingly use online peer-to-peer fundraising to solicit donations. The current research examines online peer-to-peer fundraising from the perspective of charity sport event donors. Guided by diffusion of innovation theory and sociological approaches to technology, semi-structured interviews were conducted with individuals who had made an online donation in support of a charity sport event participant in the previous 12 months ($N=24$). Four themes developed from the interviews: technological detachment, technology eases pressure, saturated market, and cause integrity. These themes highlight concerns with the relative advantage inherent to online peer-to-peer fundraising, as well as the importance of addressing technological adoption as a social process between users and technologies. The findings provide implications for event managers and charity managers to empower fundraisers to engage further with prospective donors through both online and in-person communication.

Keywords: donors, fundraisers, fitness philanthropy, technology, charitable causes

An exploration of charity sport event donor perceptions of online peer-to-peer fundraising mechanisms

1.0 Introduction

Charity sport events are participatory sport events where individuals register to complete a physical activity in an organised environment and raise money for a specific charitable cause, or a collection of charitable causes (Filo et al., 2008). Examples of successful charity sport events include the Multiple Sclerosis (MS) Brissie to the Bay bike ride, which has been in existence for 30 years and raises over \$1 million for MS Queensland each year, and the Ride to Conquer Cancer, a team cycling event that has taken place in Canada, Australia and New Zealand, raising money for a collection of cancer-based charities. The Ride to Conquer Cancer is considered Canada's largest peer-to-peer fundraising program (Alberta Cancer Foundation, 2019).

A distinguishing characteristic of charity sport events is the reliance upon, or encouragement of, participants to raise funds on behalf of the designated charitable partner(s). Charity sport event participants enlist their friends, family and colleagues for financial support as part of their peer-to-peer fundraising efforts (Filo et al., 2020a). Peer-to-peer fundraising refers to fundraising efforts reliant upon individuals soliciting charitable donations from others within their social network (Wu, 2019). Moreover, individuals who donate on behalf of charity sport event participants (i.e., charity sport event donors) commonly cite their connection with the participant as a factor driving their decision to donate (Filo et al., 2020b).

Increasingly, the fundraising required or encouraged within charity sport event participation is being conducted online, powered by new digital platforms and social networking sites (i Naudí et al., 2019). We can locate peer-to-peer fundraising as part of the growth of what sociologists and digital media scholars have dubbed the rise of the 'prosumer'

or ‘produser’, where participants are both producers and users of digital content (Bruns & Schmidt, 2011).

Examples of online peer-to-peer fundraising platforms currently utilised within charity sport events include GoFundMe, Everyday Hero, and CauseVox (Smith, 2017). A study of 17,416 cycling, endurance, walking, and running events taking place in the United States and Canada from 2016 to 2018 revealed that nearly 80% of event revenues were generated via online peer-to-peer fundraising (Walter et al., 2019). The employment of online peer-to-peer fundraising has become increasingly timely and important as charity sport event managers and fundraisers have had to innovate through virtual fundraisers as a way to navigate the crowded marketplace and respond to restrictions related to COVID-19 (Joyce, 2020). Furthermore, COVID-19 has had a pronounced impact on the more traditional funding sources for charitable organisations, suggesting that more innovative, peer-to-peer approaches are necessary (McLeod, 2020). Accordingly, coming to an understanding of donor attitudes and perceptions towards the use of online peer-to-peer fundraising within charity sport events can be important in effectively leveraging these digital tools and optimising event outcomes.

Research on charity sport events has been primarily undertaken from the participant perspective. While there is a broader body of research examining the social and cultural dimensions of charity sport endeavours (Palmer, 2020), research investigating charity sport event *donors* – those individuals who donate on behalf of charity sport event participants – is limited (Filo et al., 2020b). Of the research that has been done, the focus has typically been on the donor’s affective relationship, or empathy path (Ruiz-Junco, 2017), to the event participant, and less the ways in which donors perceive being (virtually) approached to fundraise, despite online peer-to-peer technologies changing solicitation practices and how donations are made to charity sport event participants.

Research on donor perceptions of online fundraising solicitations is necessary as digital tools have been advanced as critical mechanisms for charity sport event participants to engage with in an effort to bolster fundraising appeals (Filo et al., 2020a). Meanwhile, a lack of trust in nonprofit organisations has been cited as a barrier to making donations in the charity sport event context (Oreg et al., 2020), and the emergence of online fundraising, which can be perceived as less personal, could amplify this distrust. Accordingly, the purpose of the current research is to explore how charity sport event donors perceive solicitations via online peer-to-peer fundraising techniques. Online peer-to-peer fundraising is conceptualised as donation requests received by charity sport event donors via technologies such as email and social media.

Addressing this research purpose can provide charity sport event managers with insights on how to equip participants with online fundraising best practices and strategy. Diffusion of innovation theory guides this investigation. Applying diffusion of innovation theory to the perspectives of charity sport event donors responds to calls for further research exploring the dynamics and perceptions of end users within research on innovation in sport (Hyysalo, 2009). In addition, the findings derived from the current research can contribute to diffusion of innovation theory through its application of donors' social uses of technologies within the charity sport event context.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Peer-to-Peer Fundraising and Charity Sport Events

Peer-to-peer fundraising has become an important aspect of the charity sport event experience. Fundraising solicitations from friends have been found to expand the number of donors and donations (Meer, 2011). Friends asking other friends for donations via online technologies such as social media has also been highlighted as cost effective and allows charities to increase their number of donors (Castillo et al., 2015). The effectiveness of peer-

to-peer fundraising has led to its adoption across a range of fundraising contexts, including charity sport events.

Supporting the designated charity is one of the most influential factors driving individuals to participate in a charity sport event (Won et al., 2011), and a considerable portion of charity sport event participants are perceived as cause fundraisers (Wood et al., 2010). To this end, charity sport event participation can be leveraged by event managers to get individuals further involved in the charitable cause (Goodwin et al., 2017), and this can include fundraising through peer-to-peer networks.

Research on charity sport event donors has revealed that these individuals are motivated to donate based upon: good feelings experienced; their perceived efficacy of donations; inspiration derived from younger participants; and their affinity for the participant and the cause (Filo et al., 2020b). The feel-good factor refers to positive emotions experienced as a result of a donation on behalf of a charity sport event participant. Perceived efficacy of donations involves donor expectations of the impact their contribution will make. Meanwhile, affinity for the participant reveals that individuals view their donations to charity sport event participants as a reflection of their connection with that participant (Filo et al., 2020b). Each of these factors relate to online peer-to-peer fundraising techniques, and suggest that further investigation of the adoption of these techniques is warranted. The current research applies diffusion of innovation theory to this investigation.

2.2 Diffusion of Innovation Theory

The current research brings together diffusion of innovation theory with insights from the sociology of technology. Diffusion of innovation theory (DIT) positions diffusion as the process within which an innovation is communicated across a variety of platforms throughout a social system within a period of time (Rogers, 1995). The current research advances online peer-to-peer fundraising as an innovation to be adopted by charity sport event donors in that

previously donations were often solicited in person through pre-existing social relationships or via other mediating technologies (e.g., charity appeals). Now, online donations can extend beyond friends, families and colleagues to complete strangers, although donations are more usually secured through peer-to-peer connections. Online peer-to-peer fundraising may no longer be innovative per se as it has emerged as a standard and institutionalised practice across organisations, groups, and individuals seeking funds or support. However, its relative newness and impact on the charity sport event fundraising process position it as an innovation worthy of investigation.

Diffusion of innovation has been applied across a number of sport contexts. Notably, Funk (2019) positioned diffusion of innovation as a critical framework in understanding how ideas and knowledge can be advanced within sport management. Kellison and Hong (2015) applied the theory to the adoption of sustainable features within stadium design. Seifried et al. (2017) applied DIT within a historical research approach exploring the adoption of collegiate football bowl games delivered by the US armed forces from 1942 to 1967. Whilst stadium design and college football experiences can be viewed as quite distinct from charity sport events, a similarity is shared in that each context aspires to cultivate, concentrate, and harness a collective feeling among participants through innovative forms of infrastructural design. While this existing research emphasises the importance of social systems to the adoption of innovations in sport, what is missing from DIT models is an approach which underlines technological adoption as a relational and dynamic process that takes account of diverse social and technical contexts (Neves & Mead, 2020). Combining DIT with an appreciation of the social dimensions of giving, including the stoking and channelling of affective and moral responses to a cause, helps establish a more relational and less individualised approach to technological adoption in online peer-to-peer fundraising.

Adoption of an innovation is based upon five factors: relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability. In addition to these five factors, the social component of the system (i.e., people talking to other people about the innovation) has been highlighted as a critical aspect of the diffusion of innovation and acceptance of technology within that system (Sarker & Wells, 2003). While behaviour models like DIT do acknowledge social factors, they tend to adopt an individualised approach in predicting acceptance and use of digital technologies, overlooking different social and technical contexts (Neves & Mead, 2020). We suggest that to understand the adoption of digital donating in the charity sport event context, there is a need to understand the diffusion of technologies in a way that takes into account relations between technological artefacts and social actors. As Neves and Mead (2020) argue, technological artefacts do not exist in themselves but are defined in relation to its users, their capacities and various social contexts.

Returning to the key factors which drive adoption of an innovation, *relative advantage* reflects perceptions of whether an innovation will put an individual in a better position. Relative advantage is often based upon perceived improvements in efficiency, effectiveness, or economic returns (Lin & Chen, 2012). Relative advantage has been found to be positively related to the adoption of technologies such as Internet banking (Shih & Fang, 2004) and ride sharing applications (Min et al., 2019). In the context of charity sport event donors and online peer-to-peer fundraising, relative advantage can be derived from the ease and speed in which donations can be made.

Compatibility refers to an innovation's consistency with the existing experiences and expectations of potential adopters (Rogers, 2002). Alignment with the values of potential adopters and the capacity to address problems perceived by adopters further underscores compatibility (Sanson-Fisher, 2004). The more compatible an innovation is to the potential adopter, the more likely that person is to adopt (Seifried et al., 2017). Among charity sport

event donors, compatibility can encompass whether the online tools employed within peer-to-peer fundraising are consistent with previous tools employed in soliciting donations, along with the online tools that donors use in other areas of life, as well as how seamlessly they integrate with popular existing online platforms such as Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter.

Complexity is the degree to which an innovation is believed to be challenging to understand and apply (Rogers, 2002). It is generally believed that innovations with increased complexity involving greater skill and more effort are less likely to be adopted (Lin & Chen, 2012). To this end, complexity has a negative relationship with the adoption of technologies (Min et al., 2019). Complexity can be particularly impactful given the degree of difficulty and potential to look foolish inherent to using technologies (Swasy, 2016).

Trialability speaks to whether an innovation can be tried and tested on a limited basis prior to its application (Rogers, 2002). This is closely related to complexity in that the more complex an innovation is perceived to be, the more important the capacity to trial the innovation becomes (Teo et al., 1995). Trialability can thus prove important in removing doubt among potential adopters (Seifried et al., 2017). Charity sport event donors may want to experiment with online peer-to-peer fundraising tools as a means to become more comfortable with the technologies used. However, this opportunity is often not available as donors are prompted with requests. In the context of the current research, interviews were only conducted with individuals who had made a donation after a request via online peer-to-peer technologies. Hence, the influence of trialability is not assessed within the current research.

Finally, *observability* refers to how visible the results of adopting an innovation can be to others (Rogers, 2002). This visibility is important as the easier it is for others to see the results of the innovation, the more inclined they will be to adopt (Seifried et al., 2017). Observability has contributed to the widespread adoption of technologies such as

smartphones (Park & Chen, 2007). Observability relates to charity sport event donors and peer-to-peer fundraising technologies in that these technologies often involve online and public displays of other donors, donation amounts, and total donations within campaigns. These displays can have mixed results in fundraising campaigns (Vesterlund, 2003), while nonetheless allowing donors to see the potential impact through total donation figures.

Observability closely aligns with the notion that when products and ideas are readily visible in public, they are more likely to spread and be adopted widely (Berger, 2016). Social influence encapsulates the impact that others can have on an innovation. This factor is important as interaction with others about an innovation can reduce uncertainty and allow individuals to gather information and insights (Min et al., 2019). Interaction with individuals in your social network is inherent to online peer-to-peer fundraising in that fundraisers appeal directly to prospective donors. Face-to-face interactions are challenged by the COVID-19 context, hence the need for research on novel ways of interacting afforded to donors by online peer-to-peer fundraising, and alternative virtual means of converting interactions into material support.

The application of DIT to end users or donors highlights the intersections between technological change, social interaction and innovation. The current research adds to the broader scholarship in innovation studies (Dahlin, 2014) that examines the influence of social practices in the diffusion of innovations. By considering donor perceptions of peer-to-peer fundraising mechanisms, the research shows how digital tools and technologies shape the innovation profile of the sports-charity sector. Moreover, the research illustrates how innovation can be diffused through the network of peer-to-peer fundraising that is both technological and social at one and the same time. Bringing a social shaping of technology approach (Mackenzie & Wajcman, 1999) to diffusion of innovation theory helps avoid technological determinism (i.e., that technology drives all human activity solely on its own

terms). Rather, it highlights technological adoption as an ongoing relational process between users and technologies, often resulting in unanticipated practices and innovations.

DIT can be located within broader sociological studies of technology that draw attention to the social nature of our interactions with technology, in this case the digital tools and platforms that sustain peer-to-peer fundraising (Mackenzie & Wajcman, 1999). New digital technologies enable fundraising appeals to be distributed rapidly and widely amongst peers, with networked affordances fostering a scale and accessibility of peer-to-peer fundraising not possible with prior traditional methods. However, rather than simply offering greater efficiencies, these technological innovations inevitably impact on what are ultimately *social, ethical, and emotional appeals* driven by advocates and their respective charitable causes. The current research therefore extends DIT by considering the social dimensions of technology through peer-to-peer fundraising and the new networks and digital platforms that enable its uptake and spread. We suggest that to understand the adoption of new technologies of giving we require a combined model that addresses individual factors such as perceived use and ease of use, but also the relations between technologies and social actors and the cultural and moral beliefs that mediate these relations (Neves & Mead, 2020).

As noted above, research on charity sport event donors has been limited to date and there has been little attention on how technologies such as social media and personal fundraising websites are reshaping donor behaviours and how donors experience the adoption of these technologies. With social media proliferating as tools for charity sport event fundraising, and these technologies implicated in heightened awareness of fitness philanthropy initiatives, it is important to understand how these technologies are understood and perceived by donors (Palmer et al., 2021). This article deploys diffusion of innovation theory with a sociological approach to technology to investigate how charity sport event donors use, understand and experience online peer-to-peer fundraising technologies. The

paper focuses on technological adoption as a process whereby users incorporate technology into their lives in different and unanticipated ways. Specifically, the following research question is advanced:

How do charity sport event donors perceive online peer-to-peer fundraising solicitations?

To address this research question, qualitative data were collected based upon interviews with charity sport event donors.

3.0 Method

3.1 Materials

An interview guide was developed by the research team in advance of the interviews. This development involved multiple iterations and revisions conducted by researchers with extensive experience in the charity sport event context. The interview guide was divided into four sections. First, the research purpose was stated and an overview of the interview structure was included. This overview provided definitions of key terms that would be used within the interview (e.g., charity sport events). Second, a battery of demographic questions was included (i.e., age, gender, education level). This section also incorporated content from the online recruitment questionnaire requiring interviewees to indicate the event and charity for which their donation occurred, their relationship with the charity sport event participant, and the amount of their donation. Next, eleven questions were included assessing the factors that contribute to the interviewee's decision to donate on behalf of a charity sport event participant (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). Fourth, a collection of questions investigating how the process of soliciting a donation from a charity sport event participant has evolved as a result of online peer-to-peer technologies. Notably, the third section of the interview guide was employed for a separate research project, while the responses and insights derived from the third and fourth sections are the basis for the current research. A collection of example

interview questions, and the corresponding adoption of innovation factor for each example question is provided in Table 1.

Interviewees were asked about benefits received and perceived as a result of their donation as a means to explore relative advantage. The evolution of donor solicitations and best practices within donation requests were probed to assess compatibility. Questions concerning the fundraiser's ask and perceived costs associated with the donation were developed around complexity. And, observability was examined through questions about the impact of recognition – or a lack thereof – of donations. Collectively, the questions were framed around the sociology of technology through their focus on how donors experience and understand the use of online peer-to-peer fundraising mechanisms.

Insert Table 1

3.2 Procedures

Interviewees were recruited via a Qualtrics Panel survey administered online to invite participants. A panel allows researchers to distribute a survey to a targeted population based upon criteria determined by the research team. The selection criteria employed in the panel required that an individual had to have: donated online on behalf of a charity sport event participant in the past year, been age 18 or older, and lived in Australia at the time of the interview. This final requirement was included to ensure that Qualtrics could access these individuals from their database, as well as to ease the scheduling of interviews for time zone reasons. The Qualtrics Panel was used to administer an online questionnaire that consisted of: a five-sentence explanation of the purpose of the research; open-ended questions concerning the individual's donation to the charity sport event participant (e.g., for what charity did you donate?; how much did you donate?); and a final question asking if the respondent would be interested in and available to participate in a follow-up semi-structured interview. Individuals who indicated that they were willing and able to participate in the interview were taken to a

landing page wherein they could provide their email address for further follow-up and the scheduling of the interview. Within the process of scheduling the interviews, informed consent documentation was sent via email to obtain consent from all interviewees. Those individuals who did not agree to participate in the follow-up interviews were thanked for their time in completing the online questionnaire. Qualtrics provided a small monetary incentive to all questionnaire respondents to increase the response rate.

All interviews were conducted over the phone and video conference, and were audio recorded with the interviewee's permission. A single researcher conducted all interviews. The interviews lasted between 15 and 50 minutes in length. After conducting 23 interviews, the interviewer felt that new themes were no longer developing. A 24th interview was conducted to determine whether this was the case, and this interview confirmed this, indicating that data saturation was in place. The interview recordings were transcribed by a third-party upon completion of this 24th interview.

3.3 Participants

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with charity sport event donors ($N=24$). The sample was comprised of individuals who had donated on behalf of a charity sport event participant in the preceding 12 months. In the context of charity sport events, event participants are often donors themselves. However, within the current research, the charity sport event donors were speaking of their experience donating for an event in which they did not participate. Most of the interviewees had made multiple donations to charity in the previous 12 months, but for the purposes of the current research, interviewees were asked to focus on their most recent donation on behalf of a charity sport event participant. This specific donation is noted in the 'Charity Sport Event Donated To' column within Table 2. The sample was 37.5% male and 62.5% female, and interviewees ranged in age between 28-

78, and the average age was 44. A majority of interviewees (58.3%) had completed at least a Bachelor's Degree.

With regard to the most recent donation on behalf of a charity sport event participant, the interviewees had contributed between \$10 and \$2,500 with the majority (62.5%) having donated between \$11-\$50. All interviewees lived in Australia at the time of the donation and interview. Table 2 provides the demographic profile of the sample.

Insert Table 2

3.4 Data Analysis

The data analysis process consisted of six steps: getting familiar with the data, determining initial codes, identifying themes, consultation and establishing intercoder agreement, creating conceptual definitions, and reporting the results (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In getting familiar with the data, the lead researcher reviewed each transcript a number of times to evaluate preliminary impressions. These impressions led to initial codes being identified. Next, based upon these initial codes, themes were created: technological detachment, technology eases pressure, saturated market, and cause integrity. Given the exploratory, qualitative nature of the current research, these initial codes were generated via an inductive approach wherein participants' views were used to build themes (Creswell & Clark, 2017).

From there, the lead researcher developed theme labels and representative quotations within each theme, and provided these to the research team. Collectively, the research team discussed the themes, representative quotations and working definitions. This discussion led to intercoder agreement (Carey et al., 1996). Next, finalised operational definitions were created by the lead researcher based upon the discussion among the research team, and additional representative quotations were drawn from the transcripts. The themes, operational

definitions and representative quotations are included below. Pseudonyms are used in place of interviewee names to ensure anonymity.

Data trustworthiness was established through multiple mechanisms involving consultation among the research team and interactions with the interviewees (e.g., Lietz, et al., 2006; Miles & Huberman, 1994). First, after reading through the transcripts (Step 1 above), and after generating the initial themes and representative quotations (Step 4 above), the lead researcher drafted a document featuring themes, working operational definitions, and all quotations within each theme for distribution to the research team. From there, the research team met via videoconference to discuss this document. Within this discussion, the idea of combining the third and fourth themes, saturated market and cause integrity, into a single theme was talked through. Based upon differences within the operational definitions of each theme, along with the density of each theme, it was decided to keep these two themes separate. Hence, agreement was in place regarding the themes, definitions, and representative quotations. Second, a summary of key points was collated during each interview by the interviewer, and these summary points were provided to interviewees at the conclusion of each interview. This member checking afforded the opportunity for interviewees to provide feedback on the topics and points discussed within each interview (Creswell, 2009). Agreement was in place between each interviewee and the interview.

4.0 Results and Discussion

4.1 Technological Detachment

The first theme to be developed from the semi-structured interviews was technological detachment. This theme is defined as online peer-to-peer fundraising removing the personal touch from donation requests, contributing to a far more automated and impersonal process. In describing this impersonalisation, Kirstin stated:

I think that it's a lot less personal. Like for me, if I saw a post on social media even if it was from a close friend, I'd probably wouldn't donate just because I feel that it's quite impersonal and it sort of you don't know where it's going or how it's going or anything like that.

The role of social media in creating a less personal environment was also referenced by Carla: "I think everything happens through social media now, so it's more like a general call out rather than a personal, 'Hey, can you help me?'"

Leslie alluded to a lack of human interaction in the donation process as a result of technological development, saying "It's all quite automated and online, a little less direct human interaction." The lack of interaction was also commented upon by Charlotte, "Now it's more everything's online and you don't have that interaction with people like you used to." And Charlotte reinforced this point by adding, "I'm just old-fashioned this way, I like talking to a person face to face." Interviewees revealed that social media and the capacity to make donation requests online have led to a far less personal and interactive donation experience. The quotes shared within this theme speak to a diminished relative advantage in DIT, as well as a perceived lack of compatibility with donor expectations for requests (i.e., an expectation for more personal, face-to-face requests).

Technological detachment depicts online peer-to-peer fundraising within charity sport events as lacking a personal touch. This sentiment reflects a lack of consistency with how charity sport event donors expect a fundraising solicitation to go (Rogers, 2002). Interviewees highlighted a need for more personal, human interaction when approached to make a donation. This theme suggests that online peer-to-peer fundraising techniques do not provide a relative advantage as charity sport event donors did not position these techniques as an improvement in the context of human interaction. From a sociology of technology perspective this theme highlights how user-relations with technologies are not inscribed or

fixed but emerge in relation to the technology, their users and specific beliefs and assumptions. Here online peer-to-peer fundraising is understood as part of wider popular discourses which position technology as something that is decreasing face-to-face contact and instead creating more impersonal and distanced social relations.

This finding also distinguishes online peer-to-peer fundraising techniques in the charity sport event context from other peer-to-peer fundraising efforts that are viewed as more personal. For example, Gao (2016) revealed that inclusion of a video in a peer-to-peer crowdfunding pitch more than doubled the likelihood of receiving contributions. Similarly, Mollick (2014) found that pitches that did not include a video experienced a significant decrease in likelihood of funds received. These existing findings concerning the impact of more personal touches in peer-to-peer fundraising – alongside the perception derived from the current findings that technology may remove the human element – underscore a need for charity sport event managers to emphasise the importance of the human touch and empower participants to leverage their empathy path and be more personal in their online appeals.

4.2 Technology Eases Pressure

Understandings of peer-to-peer technologies as impersonalising were balanced with more positive assessments which focus on the affordances of technology to ease giving pressure. Technology eases pressure is defined as online peer-to-peer fundraising facilitating less confronting donation requests and allowing potential donors to feel less stress when approached. Melissa described the freedom she felt when coming across a donation request online:

I guess that's the good thing about digital, is you can just scroll by and think, 'Oh I'm not willing to do that at the moment'. There's not that pressure to actually, look if it's on your feed, if you don't feel like looking at it, you just scroll by.

Carla shared a similar sentiment about being able to decide without feeling too pressured: “It doesn't feel like the other person is begging for assistance. It's more like everyone has the option. The option's open if you want to support. And if you don't, it's okay.” Madeline described how online requests can lead to a more comfortable interaction between donor and fundraiser: “Asking, you know, ‘can you make this donation in that portal online?’ takes away that kind of weirdness when you're trying to get someone to help you with a good cause.”

Beyond the freedom and comfort afforded by technology within donation requests, interviewees commented on how technology allows fundraisers to reach a wider audience with relative ease. For instance, Kirstin noted:

It has changed because there's a lot more ways to get the fundraising out there.

Obviously, with social media and everything like that, you can reach a lot more people. So you don't just need to go to work and go, ‘Hey, can anyone donate?’ Or go to your friends and say, ‘Can anyone donate?’ I think that a lot more people are putting [fundraising appeals] on social media when they're doing things for specific charities, whether it is a sporting event or something like that, people can reach a lot more people to get the donations.

Furthermore, Khloe indicated that technology has made things easier for the donor as well:

It gets out a lot more now and easier than back in the days like when I was growing up. It's just a click of a button and you're able to just donate straight away and it's relatively easy. Click this, put this amount in, and it's done.

Interviewees detailed how technology is understood as creating a less pressured donation environment that makes things easier for both the fundraiser and the donor. Technology eases pressure highlights the importance of understanding relations with technology and aligns with relative advantage as well as reduced complexity. Further, the experience of technology

easing pressure shows how the adoption of technology is shaped by both technical and social affordances, with peer-to-peer fundraising providing pre-existing networks to engage with end users fostering collective sentiment among these networks to promote the cause.

The emergence of the theme technology eases pressure illustrates that charity sport event donors feel that online peer-to-peer fundraising creates a less stressful donation environment. This theme suggests that online peer-to-peer fundraising can be less challenging and complex, and that innovation diffuses because of convenience (Rogers, 2002). Contrary to some of the misgivings noted within the previous theme, technology eases pressure represents a stronger relative advantage as interviewees discussed how online requests were easier for the donor, while also noting that the increased capacity to be more discerning in deciding to whom they donate was welcome (Lin & Chen, 2012). The easing of the process further underscores the reduced complexity afforded (Lin & Chen, 2012). Charity sport event donors noting that they felt less burdensome obligation suggests that online technologies can address some of the peer pressure effects previously reported (Meer, 2011), and could be used to reinforce the more egalitarian aspects of peer-to-peer fundraising.

User relationships to technology experienced as a tension between technology being impersonal but easing pressure underscores how technology offsets issues related to participants soliciting donations directly, while at the same time risking being impersonal and overlooked. More positively framed, Younkin and Kashkooli (2016) found that online peer-to-peer fundraising allows fundraisers to make the ask without losing face, an important consideration given the aforementioned psychological burdens of soliciting support. Moreover, the creative affordances of online tools can better enable engaging and affecting appeals, even if their necessary scale and efficiency (i.e., crafting one-to-many, rather than one-to-one appeals) can render the call to action slightly more impersonal. The online environment can therefore facilitate a balance between maintaining distance and proximity

through more engaging pitches. This suggests a need for education on how to achieve this balance.

Meanwhile, charity sport event donors' appreciation of the ease of making donations via online peer-to-peer fundraising mechanisms aligns with Clark's (1997) argument that moral action does not necessarily need to be prompted by a deep sense of sympathy, as online donors may be sufficiently inclined to give, in part, simply because it is easy and accessible. However, in embracing the relative ease afforded by technology in peer-to-peer online fundraising, charity sport event donors must be cognisant of avoiding donations turning into 'clicktivism', wherein donations are made with limited investment and engagement (Halupka, 2014). To this end, a challenge exists in embracing how online peer-to-peer fundraising mechanisms enable charity sport event participants to reach a wider audience, whilst ensuring that the sustainable potency and support of these appeals is not weakened in the eyes of donors. In other words, ensuring maximum ease and efficiency in taking action must not come at the cost of potential long-term enrolment in a cause.

4.3 Saturated Market

The third theme is saturated market, and this theme is defined as donor perceptions that online peer-to-peer fundraising mechanisms have contributed to an increase in the number of charitable organisations, charity sport events and charitable requests. Gordon spoke to the increase in the number of charities, "I have had that feeling at times [that there are too many charities], yes. So, I think from my perspective, I pull back from them a little bit and be more selective of who I donate for." Meanwhile, Davis described this increase in comparative terms with years past, "There seems to be so many more charities."

The perception of an increased number of charities was linked directly with the number of charity sport events that align with these causes. Madeline stated,

There's just way too many [charity sport events]. I suppose in a way, it's good. In terms of all the participants who want to participate...but for someone who's making the donation, for instance, it's way too many options...It's also impossible for me to help every, every time, you know.

Kathleen described how the influence of charity on sport events had impacted the sport experience:

You do notice that there is definitely more of those [charity sport initiatives]. I think there was a joke I heard on the radio, in the last couple of weeks. Someone wrote in the paper saying 'can we actually just have a football round, where it's not anything else?'.... feels like every time they went to the football, they'll be asked to support something.

Carla described how the increased number of charities relying on peer-to-peer methods translated to more donation requests appearing in the online environment:

It's becoming more and more wherever you turn somebody else wants money for something else and yeah, it's just becoming too much. You can only deal with so many so you've got to make your choice who you really want to support.

Palmer has described this as the "misery hierarchy", where 'donors are compelled to make a choice to support one person's misery or struggle over another's' (Palmer, 2020, p. 151).

Gordon speculated that technological developments such as peer-to-peer online fundraising led to an increased number of charities and requests, "I think charities have used technology to reach out more, so I think there's more [charities and donation requests]." Mary described the proliferation of charities and donation requests in the context of the ease with which technology facilitates promoting a cause: "There's mobile phones and people can be reaching to a lot of social media and people can be persuaded into some cause by writing something up in the internet and sharing with everyone. It's easy to share."

The saturated market theme indicates that charity sport event donors feel that online peer-to-peer fundraising has created an environment wherein there has been an increase in the number of charities and charity sport events for which donations can be made but also that new technological affordances, such as social media and smartphones, make donation requests feel more ubiquitous. Technological artefacts are understood as shifting cultures of giving as new technologies make it easier for charity participants to request funds.

Commentary surrounding the sheer volume of charity sport events and the corresponding online peer-to-peer fundraising requests echoes Spelman's (1998) sentiment that hypermediated citizens today are constantly confronted with, and evaluating, human suffering. The burden that comes from this constant evaluation can even lead to charity sport event donors yearning for sport events *not* aligned with a charitable cause, as evidenced by the allusion to a football round explicitly not aligned with a charity endeavour within the current research. To this end, charity sport event managers must be conscious of potentially exacerbating compassion fatigue through the delivery and promotion of their events (Moeller, 2002).

4.4 Cause Integrity

The fourth and final theme to emerge from the interview data was cause integrity. Cause integrity can be defined as online peer-to-peer fundraising allowing donors to assess the legitimacy of the charity and how funds raised will be used to address the stated cause. Carla revealed that the current crowding of charities places the onus on the donor to, "Make sure it's a legitimate event...something where people can put the money into and know that it's specifically for that purpose."

In elaborating on cause integrity and its importance, interviewees mentioned examples of fundraising initiatives that lacked integrity or did not distribute the funds raised properly in their eyes. For instance, Donna provided the following:

Well I've heard stories that some people aren't very ethical when it comes to those kind of things. Who knows how much of a percentage is actually going to the charity that they've got. They've got their things that they have to pay, they have to pay people within the organisation, yeah, so I'm just very weary.

Davis indicated that the emergence of technology and requests for donations online has enhanced the importance of cause integrity. He explained, "I find they are easy to look dodgy. I don't trust them so much so that's, I like to check who it is, and then find out what's happening...Make sure it is a real donation." While Davis highlights that online requests for charitable donations can be untrustworthy, other participants indicated that digital spaces provide a mechanism to determine the veracity of fundraising requests. Melissa states that charitable donations facilitated online are more trustworthy than those conducted by older technologies, like direct calls to donors. Melissa's comments illustrate how the adoption of technological innovations in sports charity are shaped by social-technical contexts. In this example, direct calls are understood as being part of a less trustworthy process of funding solicitation:

At least with if you donate online, then you've got their official website, you're actually more likely to have your money actually counted. I've never given money over the phone [on a direct call] because I don't trust it. If someone will just ring up and just take your details.

Participants also reflected on how online peer-to-peer fundraising has become normalised and more sophisticated as charities make use of multi-platform campaigns to reinforce cause integrity:

I think now it's more efforts are being sort of advertised online and it's just that's become the norm I think and people, I don't know, are more likely to donate to a charity that has like Cancer Council, RSPCA on their website. (Melissa)

I mean most of it's done online and there's certainly regular emails encouraging people to get involved and offering prizes in competitions and things for people when they're involved, so there's a lot more of that as opposed to just standing somewhere with a bucket and requesting a donation. It's a lot better coordinated, a lot more organised, it's a real marketing activity these days, it's not just a money collection activity (Peter).

Beyond the coordinated efforts that accompany online peer-to-peer fundraising requests and perceptions that established charities can increase donations through 'brand' legitimacy, digital technologies also afford prospective donors with time to assess cause integrity. Hugh, for instance, contrasts digital charity information to earlier donations requests through technological artefacts such as envelopes and pamphlets:

Look, I think in the past it was forms that people walked up to you with, and a little envelope and say, 'Would you like to donate for this event that I'm involved with?' I was never too keen on those sorts of things because it didn't give you enough information. They would walk up with a pamphlet and sort of stand and look at you while you want to go through it. Being able to access the information [online] at your own time, your own leisure, do your read up, do your research, and then at your own time, your own discretion make those donations or not, without that pressure of someone standing in front of you, is certainly a much better way of doing it.

Hugh captures how digital technologies give participants more time and information in making donation decisions compared to the 'pressure' of face-to-face requests and their reliance on older 'technologies' such as pamphlets and envelopes. While digital scholars emphasise the speed and instant nature of digital communications, in this example online

technologies paradoxically enable a slowing down, giving participant time to make deliberate and informed giving decisions.

Overall, while interviewees highlighted concerns about the legitimacy of fundraising requests and increased caution in the donation process, most noted how online peer-to-peer fundraising eased these concerns and cautions. Older donation technologies – direct calls, envelopes and pamphlets – are contrasted to current digital technologies, which are understood as more trustworthy in that they enable slower and deliberative donating decision-making. These different experiences of adoption of peer-to-peer fundraising highlights how the social context of giving shapes the meaning and use of technologies.

The theme of cause integrity represents further evidence of perceived complexity, as interviewees suggested it was increasingly important to carefully determine a charity's legitimacy in the context of online donation requests (Lin & Chen, 2012). This theme also highlights expectations around observability, as interviewees conveyed expectations around social proof to demonstrate a charity's legitimacy and stature (Park & Chen, 2007). Moreover, donor relations with technology are mediated by the charity sport event participants themselves, who act as sympathy entrepreneurs (Clark, 1997) in attempting to engender and direct people's altruistic impulses, and thus charity sport event managers should collaborate with charity sport event participants to better craft these calls.

4.5 Summary of Findings

The current research advanced the following research question: how do charity sport event donors understand and experience online peer-to-peer fundraising solicitations?

Drawing upon DIT and sociological approaches to technology, four themes were developed: technological detachment, technology eases pressure, saturated market, and cause integrity.

These four themes demonstrate that the social system within which charity sport event donors

and participants interact is critical in determining how online peer-to-peer fundraising is received and understood (Sarker & Wells, 2003).

Collectively, the four themes constructed within the current research reflect concerns about online peer-to-peer fundraising among charity sport event donors. Interviewees did note increased ease with some commentary around increased effectiveness. However, the lack of the more personalised, human touch within online peer-to-peer donation requests was highlighted as a disconnect with donor expectations. Meanwhile, interviewees described perceptions of online peer-to-peer fundraising mechanisms contributing to an increase in charities, charity sport events, and donation requests. Within this perceived increase, the online environment was positioned as a means to better assess the legitimacy and impact of the charitable causes for which these peer-to-peer request emerged. The contributions of the current findings to theory and practice are described next.

4.6 Theoretical Implications

The current research contributes to DIT in a number of ways. First, contextually, the application of this theory to charity sports events responds to calls for allowing diffusion of innovation to guide sport management research (Funk, 2019). The finding that technology facilitates a less personal environment and eases pressure, in particular, underscores issues with complexity and compatibility experienced by charity sport event donors. In addition, the positive and negative aspects inherent to each theme reinforce the subjective nature of assessing relative advantage of an innovation.

The themes underlying relative advantage reflect a unique aspect of innovation in the charity sport event context. Charity sport event donors communicated that online peer-to-peer technologies provided some relative advantage (i.e., through a less stressful donation experience) while also involving a degree of relative disadvantage (i.e., through a less personal donation experience). Beyond these opposing perceptions, this finding also

underscores the importance of the dynamic between the fundraiser and the donor (Filo et al., 2020b) and the challenges that charity sport event participants must confront in attempting to solicit donations and raise funds in the online peer-to-peer environment. Charity sport event donors desire a personal touch, but do not want this personal touch to translate into pressure or stress. Further investigation of what this balance entails within online peer-to-peer fundraising is warranted.

Next, in the context of charity sport events, the current research responds to calls for investigation beyond the participant perspective (Daigo & Filo, 2019). An exploration of charity sport event donor perceptions of an ongoing shift in how fundraising is delivered adds to the existing, limited work on charity sport event donors (e.g., Filo et al., 2020b). The findings of the current research can complement the existing body of knowledge on charity sport event participants, as well as the emerging body of research on charity sport event managers, sponsors and donors, to provide a more holistic understanding of the charity sport event experience.

Finally, the current research adds to the burgeoning research on the social aspects of innovation and technology. The exploration of charity sport event donor perceptions of online peer-to-peer fundraising mechanisms adds to thinking about innovation in sport and shows how innovation is a diffuse social phenomenon. It is a process of interactions between participants, organisations, and here, donors, that variously illustrate the social values of donations. In this process, technological and social innovations play a double role. This research helps extend DIT, suggesting that to understand technological adoption we need to understand the relationships between users and technology. This relational approach helps move away from the individualising tendencies of DIT, which neglect the impacts of different social and technical contexts (Mackenzie & Wajcman, 1999; Neves & Mead, 2020).

4.7 Managerial Implications

A number of implications for charity sport event managers and charity managers emerge from the current findings. First, to bolster cause integrity and address the saturated market of charity sport events and causes, charity sport event managers can work to promote the legitimacy and impact of their partnering charity(s) among participants, fundraisers and donors. The emergence of cause integrity in the current research aligns with suggestions that trust and accountability are increasingly important in the charity sector (Hyndman, 2017), and the presence of online donations has reinforced this importance (Blouin et al., 2018). Charity sport event managers can direct online peer-to-peer fundraisers to third party charity evaluators such as Charity Navigator and Charity Watch. This direction can include education on what a specific charity's score or rating from these entities means, and how the charity's reputation was earned and is evidenced. This direction and education can create more informed fundraisers who are then able to reinforce the charity's legitimacy and integrity, while empowering online fundraisers – such as charity sport event participants – can provide a point of differentiation and competitive advantage for the cause and event amidst the crowded marketplace.

Second, promoting cause integrity can also involve establishing and reinforcing the legitimacy of the individual fundraiser. Tanaka and Volda (2016) highlighted legitimacy of the individual fundraiser as critical to grassroots fundraising such as crowdfunding, and identified four mechanisms for establishing fundraiser legitimacy: personal connection, donor interaction, donor reciprocity, and updates. Personal connection relates to a fundraiser's selection of a cause and the story behind their connection with that cause, and online peer-to-peer technologies such as social media allow fundraisers to broadcast their efforts and the narratives behind their campaign (Hookway, 2019). Donor interaction involves ongoing dialogue and community building among donors, and relates to the collaborative relations that are facilitated by online peer-to-peer fundraising platforms (Clarke & Tooker, 2018).

Donor reciprocity reflects fundraisers openly offering to donate to other fundraisers in exchange for donations to their cause and efforts. Updates require fundraisers to communicate progress and outcomes to donors, demonstrating their judicious use of funds, and enrolling donors in an ongoing cause and shared narrative through which potential further appeals may be made. Again, online platforms and social media can be critical in conveying these updates and narratives (Palmer et al., 2021).

In the context of charity sport events and the current findings, donor interaction and updates are particularly relevant. In describing donor interaction, Tanaka and Volda (2016) underscore the importance of communication taking place both online and offline, and the need to overcome limitations of technology in fostering deeper interactions. This aligns with the theme of technological detachment wherein donors described how the use of technology to solicit donations has created less intimate and meaningful transactions. The employment of handwritten thank you notes to donors, organising in-person events to thank donors, and personal phone calls to donors immediately after the event to describe the scene and experience can work to overcome the often times impersonal nature of online donation requests while improving donor interaction.

Increased interactions can bolster the transparency of the charity sport event donor transaction and address concerns that peer-to-peer fundraising is now usually mediated via a digital platform, one that may either be for-profit or a non-profit, and may or may not take a cut of each donation transacted. The activation of donor interaction and updates can represent efforts to continually innovate in ways to personalise the automated online donation experience. Sharing photos of participants training and crafting stories of friends and family directly impacted by the cause can foster an ongoing and interactive narrative wherein the donor can feel engaged beyond the one-off transaction of the donation. A donor's personal connection to a charity sport event participant has been revealed as a driving force behind the

decision to donate, and it is speculated that displaying the physical demands inherent to training and participation in a charity sport event shapes whether and how much to donate (Filo et al., 2020b; Palmer et al 2021). There is evidence that displays of pain and effort involved in training and competition are linked to higher donations (Palmer et al., 2021). Crafting stories that speak to the moral worthiness and passion of the charitable subject through displays of bodily suffering can assist charity sport event participants in leveraging their unique relationship with donors.

Similarly, detailed updates on the outcomes and impact of the fundraising initiative can be provided by charity sport event participants to donors. While charity sport events generally communicate broader outcomes of the event to constituents (e.g., amount of money raised, number of participants, percentage of funds going to mission-related activities), opportunity exists for this communication to be extended. Boswell and Handley (2016) describe effective impact reporting as encompassing communicating needs fulfilled, activities undertaken, outcomes produced, evidence collected, and lessons learnt. In the context of charity sport events, online peer-to-peer fundraisers can emphasise evidence collected and lessons learned in their updates to donors. The evidence collected can be bolstered through testimonials from benefactors from the event. An example would be talking to a cancer survivor at a cancer-based charity sport event about what the event means to them, and then sharing this with donors. Lessons learned can include communicating successes and challenges experienced during an individual's fundraising process, and articulating what they would do differently.

Employing effective impact reporting could offset concerns that charity sport event donors too easily drift from ongoing causes after a single donation, with limited sustained emotional, moral, or material investment. Using available technological affordances, fundraising activities based around sport events can explore ways to go beyond singular

transactional exchanges (e.g., donations given simply to witness the occasion) and strive to establish ongoing, long-term relationships with potential donors across multiple points of engagement.

4.8 Limitations

Limitations of the current research are acknowledged. First, the interviews were conducted within 12 months of the interviewee's online donation on behalf of a charity sport event participant. Within that 12-month time period, select interviewees may have been more inclined to describe the donation experience more positively or negatively due to the passage of time. This maturation effect could include interviewees who forgot about short-term inconveniences in the donation process leading to a more positive perception, or interviewees who were not satisfied with follow-up communication from the event participant, leading to a more negative perception of the donation experience. The impact of time and what happened in the aftermath of the online donation was not accounted for within the current research.

Second, the interviewees were recruited based upon an online donation to a charity sport event within the previous 12 months, however, they were asked to describe their attitudes and perspectives on the process of donating online on behalf of a charity sport event process broadly in some places. This sampling criteria could have led to bias on the part of the interviewee wherein their most recent donation experience had outsized influence on their responses overall.

Third, and related to the point above, the number of online donations an individual had made on behalf of a charity sport event participant was not controlled for within the current research. One could speculate that an individual who has donated across a number of different events and causes to a variety of different event participants would have a different perspective than an individual who has donated once in the previous 12 months. Within the current research, these individuals would have comprised the same sample. Similarly, the

amount of money donated was not accounted for in recruiting interviewees. This led to a sample of some individuals who had donated \$10 alongside an individual who had donated \$2,500. Again, one could presume that individuals who donated such different amounts would hold different expectations and attitudes. Lastly, we acknowledge that data were collected for the current research prior to the COVID-19 global pandemic. As noted above, COVID-19 has had a pronounced impact on the charitable sector, and in particular, the delivery of charity sport events with a steep increase in events and donations taking place online. This can obviously shift consumer perceptions of online peer-to-peer fundraising solicitations and how charities deliver future events with virtual events bringing new innovations and potential benefits. Charity sport events, even if they have a physical event, will most likely now keep a virtual dimension, as it provides flexibility for participants and expands market reach for charities.

4.9 Future Research

Building upon the current findings, and cognisant of the limitations of our research, future research can be designed. First, longitudinal research can be conducted with a sample of charity sport event donors. This longitudinal data can assess whether and how donor perspectives of online peer-to-peer fundraising mechanisms change over time. This longitudinal work could also account for ongoing changes in the online peer-to-peer fundraising and donation processes (i.e., new technological developments) and determine how these developments have impacted donors positively or negatively. By accounting for new technological developments, future research can investigate the impact of rate of adoption (e.g., early adopters, laggards, innovators) (Dedehayir et al., 2020) on donor perceptions of these ongoing changes to explore whether a predisposition to adopt or resist overlays the perceptions and experiences of charity sport event donors. Collecting data over an extended period of time could also result in having a sample that includes individuals who

have stopped donating. Data collected from these former donors could be insightful and allow researchers to uncover factors that lead to discontinuation of donation behaviour.

Beyond the possibility of collecting data from former donors, the stakeholders included in the sample can be broadened. This can include: peer-to-peer fundraisers, long-time donors, first-time donors, charity sport event managers, and charity benefactors. Collecting data from these various groups can provide a more complete perspective on the online peer-to-peer fundraising process, its antecedents, and its outcomes and impact. The data collected can provide insights and best practices for fundraising initiatives beyond charity sport events.

Third, the qualitative data collected in the current research can be expanded. Quantitative data can be collected from the stakeholders outlined above. The employment of quantitative data collection via online questionnaire administration could also better facilitate obtaining longitudinal data. Quantitative data could be employed to investigate potential relationships between attitudes (and experience with) online fundraising and donation behaviour and intention among charity sport event donors. In addition, experimental research utilising different fundraising and donation solicitation scenarios presented to donors online could be designed to determine effective mechanisms for securing donations. Lastly, in the context of online peer-to-peer fundraising within charity sport events and COVID-19, donor attitudes and behaviour towards fundraising solicitations in the context of online virtual events should be investigated. This can include collecting both qualitative and quantitative data to determine how perceptions have evolved as a result of the changing landscape.

5.0 Conclusion

The current research applied DIT with sociological approaches to technology to investigate charity sport event donor understandings and experiences of the online peer-to-peer fundraising process. Themes were developed via semi-structured interviews with 24

charity sport event donors who had made a donation online on behalf of a charity sport event participant: technological detachment, technology eases pressure, saturated market, and cause integrity. These themes underscore increased complexity and, in some instances, a decreased relative advantage derived from the online peer-to-peer fundraising environment. The findings highlight the importance of a relational understanding of people and technology that acknowledges the impact of diverse social and technical contexts. It is hoped that the current research inspires further examination of charity sport event donors and the impact of technological developments on the peer-to-peer fundraising process.

References

- Alberta Cancer Foundation (2019, August 17). *The Enbridge® Ride to Conquer Cancer® presented by Evraz announces \$5.9 million raised in annual event, collectively raising over \$80.9 million in 11 Years*. <https://www.albertacancer.ca/the-enbridge-ride-to-conquer-cancer-presented-by-evraz-announces-5-9-million-raised-in-annual-event-collectively-raising-over-80-9-million-in-11-years/>
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924-973.
- Berger, J. (2016). *Contagious: Why things catch on*. Simon and Schuster.
- Blouin, M. C., Lee, R. L., & Erickson, G. S. (2018). The impact of online financial disclosure and donations in nonprofits. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 30(3), 251-266.
- Boswell, K., & Handley, S. (2016). Result! What good impact reporting looks like. Retrieved from:
<https://www.scrt.scot/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Result-What-good-impact-reporting-looks-like.pdf>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Bruns, A. & Schmidt, J. H. (2011) Produsage: A closer look at continuing developments. *New Review of Hypermedia and Multimedia*, 17(1), 3-7.
- Carey, J. W., Morgan, M., & Oxtoby, M. J. (1996). Intercoder agreement in analysis of responses to open-ended interview questions: Examples from tuberculosis research. *CAM Journal*, 8(3), 1-5.
- Castillo, M., Petrie, R., & Wardell, C. (2015). Friends asking friends for charity: The

- importance of gifts and audience. *Available at SSRN 2658294*.
- Clark, C. (1997) *Misery and company: Sympathy in everyday life*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Clarke, C., & Tooker, L. (2018). Social finance meets financial innovation: Contemporary experiments in payments, money and debt. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 35(3), 3-11.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). Mapping the field of mixed methods research.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications.
- Dahlin, E. (2014). The sociology of innovation: Organizational, environmental, and relative perspectives. *Sociology Compass*. 8(6), 671 -687.
- Daigo, E., & Filo, K. (2020). Using a sport event to create a sense of community: Charity sport event manager perspectives. *Event Management*, 24(1), 57-74.
- Dedehayir, O., Ortt, R. J., Riverola, C., & Miralles, F. (2020). Innovators and early adopters in the diffusion of innovations: A literature review. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 21, 85-115.
- Filo, K., Fechner, D., & Inoue, Y. (2020a). Charity sport event participants and fundraising: An examination of constraints and negotiation strategies. *Sport Management Review*, 23(3), 387-400.
- Filo, K., Fechner, D., & Inoue, Y. (2020b). The donors supporting charity sport event participants: An exploration of the factors driving donations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 1(aop), 1-12.
- 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(5), 501-525.
- Funk, D. C. (2019). Spreading research uncomfortably slow: Insight for emerging sport

- management scholars. *Journal of Sport Management*, 33(1), 1-11.
- Gao, Q. (2016) *Empirical Studies of Online Crowdfunding*, PhD Thesis, University of Arizona. <http://hdl.handle.net/10150/620871>
- Goodwin, A., Snelgrove, R., Wood, L., & Taks, M. (2017). Leveraging charity sport events to develop a connection to a cause. *Event Management*, 21(2), 175-184.
- Halupka, M. (2014). Clicktivism: A systematic heuristic. *Policy & Internet*, 6(2), 115-132.
- Hookway, N. (2019). *Everyday moralities: Doing it ourselves in an age of uncertainty*. Routledge: London.
- Hyndman, N. (2017). The charity sector—changing times, changing challenges. *Public Policy and Money Management*, 37, 149-153.
- Hyysalo, S. (2009). User innovation and everyday practices: Micro-innovation in sports industry development. *R&D Management*, 39(3), 247-258.
- i Naudí, S. A., Sanromà, J. C., Martín, R. S., Medina, F. X., Rovira, M. M., & Torné, S. M. (2019). Exploring charity sport events in Barcelona province: A phenomenon on the rise, albeit with pending issues. *Retos: nuevas tendencias en educación física, deporte y recreación*, 35, 229-235.
- Joyce, C. (2020, June 23). *From live to virtual: How TFN transformed its events*. Fundraising & Philanthropy Magazine. <https://www.fpmagazine.com.au/how-tfn-transformed-a-live-event-into-a-virtual-event-374589/>
- Kellison, T. B., & Hong, S. (2015). The adoption and diffusion of pro-environmental stadium design. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 15(2), 249-269.
- Lietz, C. A., Langer, C. L., & Furman, R. (2006). Establishing trustworthiness in qualitative research in social work: Implications from a study regarding spirituality. *Qualitative social work*, 5(4), 441-458.
- Lin, A., & Chen, N. C. (2012). Cloud computing as an innovation: Perception, attitude, and

- adoption. *International Journal of Information Management*, 32(6), 533-540.
- MacKenzie, D., & Wajcman, J. (1999). *The social shaping of technology*. Open university press.
- McLeod, J. (2020). Where to from here? The outlook for philanthropy during COVID-19. JB Were.
- <https://www.jbwere.com.au/content/dam/jbwere/documents/where-to-from-here-the-outlook-for-philanthropy-during-covid-19-pdf.pdf>
- Meer, J. (2011). Brother, can you spare a dime? Peer pressure in charitable solicitation. *Journal of Public Economics*, 95(7-8), 926-941.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. sage.
- Min, S., So, K. K. F., & Jeong, M. (2019). Consumer adoption of the Uber mobile application: Insights from diffusion of innovation theory and technology acceptance model. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 36(7), 770-783.
- Moeller, S.D., (2002) *Compassion fatigue: How the media sell disease, famine, war and death*. New York: Routledge
- Mollick, E. (2014). The dynamics of crowdfunding: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), 1-16.
- Neves, B. B., & Mead, G. (2020). Digital technology and older people: Towards a sociological approach to technology adoption in later life. *Sociology*, 0038038520975587.
- Oreg, A., Greenspan, I., & Berger, I. E. (2020). When the gift is halfhearted: A socio-cultural study of ambivalence in a charity sport event. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*.
- Palmer, C. (2020) *Fitness Philanthropy: Sport, charity and everyday giving*. NY: Cambridge

Scholar Press.

Palmer, C., Filo, K., & Hookway, N. (2021). Fitness philanthropy: Exploring a movement at the nexus of leisure, charity and events. *Sociology of Sport Journal*.

Park, Y., & Chen, J. V. (2007). Acceptance and adoption of the innovative use of smartphone. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 107(9), 1349-1365.

Rogers, E. M. (1995). Diffusion of Innovations: Modifications of a model for telecommunications. In *Die diffusion von innovationen in der telekommunikation* (pp. 25-38). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Rogers, E. M. (2002). Diffusion of preventive innovations. *Addictive Behaviors*, 27(6), 989-993.

Ruiz-Junco, N. (2017). Advancing the sociology of empathy: A proposal. *Symbolic Interaction*, 40(3), 414-435.

Sanson-Fisher, R. W. (2004). Diffusion of innovation theory for clinical change. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 180, S55-S56.

Sarker, S., & Wells, J. D. (2003). Understanding mobile handheld device use and adoption. *Communications of the ACM*, 46(12), 35-40.

Seifried, C., Katz, M., & Tutka, P. (2017). A conceptual model on the process of innovation diffusion through a historical review of the United States Armed Forces and their bowl games. *Sport Management Review*, 20(4), 379-394.

Shih, Y. Y., & Fang, K. (2004). The use of a decomposed theory of planned behavior to study Internet banking in Taiwan. *Internet research*, 14(3), 213-223.

Smith, K. (15, November 2017). *A few good tools for peer-to-peer fundraising*.

Philanthropy News Digest. <https://philanthropynewsdigest.org/columns/techsoup-pnd/a-few-good-tools-for-peer-to-peer-fundraising>

Spelman, E. V. (1998). *Fruits of sorrow: Framing our attention to suffering*. Beacon Press.

- Swasy, A. (2016). A little birdie told me: Factors that influence the diffusion of Twitter in newsrooms. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 60(4), 643-656.
- Tanaka, K. G., & Volda, A. (2016). Legitimacy work: Invisible work in philanthropic crowdfunding. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 4550-4561).
- Teo, H. H., Tan, B., & Wei, K. K. (1995). Innovation diffusion theory as a predictor of adoption intention for financial EDI. *ICIS 1995 Proceedings*, 14.
- Vesterlund, L. (2003). The informational value of sequential fundraising. *Journal of Public Economics*, 87(3-4), 627-657.
- Walter, K., Cobb, J., Masterson, S., Mendez, R., Thomas, R., Turschic-Carbone, T. (2019). *2019 Blackbaud peer-to-peer fundraising study*. Blackbaud.
<https://hub.blackbaud.co.uk/i/1149689-peer-to-peer-fundraising-study-2019/1?>
- Won, D., Park, M., Lee, K. Y., & Chung, J. (2011). Factors affecting participation in charity sport events involving a low intensive physical activity. *International Journal of Leisure and Tourism Marketing*, 2(3), 248-257.
- 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.
- Wu, R. (2019, September 18). *Peer-to-peer fundraising primer for nonprofits*. CauseVox.
<https://www.causevox.com/blog/peer-to-peer-fundraising-primer/>
- Younkin, P., & Kashkooli, K. (2016). What problems does crowdfunding solve?. *California Management Review*, 58(2), 20-43.

Table 1

Example interview questions and related adoption of innovation factor

Example Question	Adoption of Innovation Factor
Do you think your donation impacted the benefitting charity and made a difference? How so?	Relative Advantage
What benefits did you obtain as result of your donation (e.g., prizes, gifts, access, etc.)?	Relative Advantage
How do you feel that the process for requesting donations has changed over the years?	Compatibility
What is the best approach a charity sport event participant can take towards requesting a donation in advance of an event?	Compatibility
Can you describe how the charity sport event fundraiser's ask – that is, the way s/he made the request - impacted your decision to donate?	Complexity
Beyond the monetary amount of this donation, were there any costs (e.g., time, etc) to you associated with your donation?	Complexity
How were you recognised and acknowledged for your donation (e.g., by the charity sport event participant, by others in your peer network)?	Observability
How did this recognition (or lack thereof) impact you?	Observability

Table 2

Interviewee demographic profile, donation amount, and Charity Sport Event donated to

Name	Highest Education Level	Age	Gender	Donation Amount	Charity Sport Event Donated To
Anna	Bachelors	78	F	\$100	Ride to Conquer Cancer
Bill	High School	68	M	\$50	Fun Run
Carla	Bachelors	31	F	\$11-\$50	City2Surf
Charlotte	TAFE*	60	F	\$11-\$50	Fun Run
Carol	Bachelors	35	F	\$11-\$50	Relay for Life
Donna	TAFE*	35	F	\$11-\$50	Running Festival
Davis	Postgrad	53	M	\$50	Ride to Conquer Cancer
Edward	TAFE*	38	M	\$76-\$150	Melbourne Marathon
Fred	Bachelors	39	M	\$150+	Beyond Blue Fundraiser
Gordon	Bachelors	57	M	\$11-\$50	Great Cycle Challenge
Hugh	Bachelors	41	M	\$60	Great Cycle Challenge
Khloe	High School	54	F	\$20	Breast Cancer Triathlon
Kirstin	TAFE*	40	F	\$20	Relay for Life
Kathleen	Bachelors	31	F	\$25	5km Fun Run
Leslie	Bachelors	35	F	\$50	Big Walk
Lucy	PhD	38	F	\$10	Fun Run
Leah	Bachelors	33	F	\$10	Angel Care Bike Ride
Melissa	Bachelors	33	F	\$60	Relay for Life
Mary	Postgrad	33	F	\$10	SA Fun Run
Madeline	TAFE*	43	F	\$200	Melbourne Marathon
Nate	Postgrad	43	M	\$11-\$50	School Fun Run
Peter	Postgrad	51	M	\$11-\$50	Mater Chicks in Pink
Stephen	Postgrad	28	M	\$76-\$150	Walk
Stanley	Postgrad	53	M	\$250	Fun Run

*Technical and Further Education: a tertiary vocational qualification offered in Australia