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The purpose of this study was to explore the influence of an athlete on donor behavior and the mediating role of donors’ level of trust. Further, the moderating role of personal involvement on the relationship between certain athlete-related factors (i.e., identification with an athlete and athlete image) and trust was examined. A conceptual framework based on previous research is proposed and tested. The findings suggest that identification with an athlete, athlete image, trust toward the athlete, and personal involvement with the cause positively influenced donor behavior. The results also suggest that the donors’ level of trust mediates the relationship between athlete-related factors and donor behavior. As well, personal involvement moderates the relationship between identification with an athlete and trust toward the athlete. The findings are discussed in terms of theory and practice, and suggestions for future research are forwarded.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

A disastrous earthquake struck Haiti on January 12, 2010, which affected approximately 3 million people (i.e., more than 200,000 people died, 300,000 were injured, and 1 million became homeless; THE WASHINGTON POST, 2010; BBC, 2010). Immediately following this event, rescue efforts began from all around the world. People in the United States donated more than $1 billion for relief efforts (CNN, 2010). Similarly, when Hurricane Katrina struck the Gulf Coast of the U.S. in 2005, and the Asian tsunami and an earthquake in Pakistan also occurred, American individuals, corporations, and foundations donated more than $7 billion for recovery (Giving USA Foundation, 2010). Historically, charitable giving in the U.S. increases about one-third as fast as the stock market and makes up about 2.2% of gross domestic product (GDP; Giving USA Foundation, 2009). Donating money to charitable organizations to support a cause has become an important part of most Americans’ lives. According to the Independent Sector (2001), 89% of households in the U.S. participated in charitable giving in 2001 and the average annual donation was $1,620. The Giving USA Foundation (2009) also reported that individual donations for charitable causes in the U.S. totaled approximately $314 billion in 2007 and $308 billion in 2008.

Not only individuals but also corporations, foundations, and nonprofit organizations play a significant role in charitable giving. According to the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS; 2009), more than 1.5 million nonprofit organizations currently exist in the U.S. (i.e., 997,579 public charities, 118,423 private foundations, and 453,570 other types of nonprofit organizations, such as chambers of commerce, fraternal organizations, and civic leagues), which have more than 10 million employees, making up approximately 7% of the total U.S. labor force.
In sport, many professional athletes have donated money, raised funds, and volunteered through private and public charitable organizations or through programs developed by their respective leagues (e.g., NBA Cares, Baseball Tomorrow Fund, Hockey Fights Cancer, NFL Charities, etc.). Among these programs, the NBA Cares initiative is perhaps the most well-known. In October 2005, the NBA Cares initiative was established by the teams, current and former players, and the league office. Based on the NBA’s long-standing tradition of charitable work, the program seeks to address social needs in the U.S. and around the world. Since its inception, the NBA has noted that “. . . players and teams have raised more than $115 million for charity, provided more than one million hours of hands-on service, and built more than 460 places where kids and families can live, learn, or play in communities around the world” (NBA, 2010).

The Major league baseball (MLB) also launched a joint initiative with its players association, titled the “Baseball Tomorrow Fund” (BTF), to foster youth baseball in the U.S. The BTF provides an average of 40 grants per year and approximately $1.5 million annually to promote youth participation in baseball and softball through new field construction, coach training workshops, and uniform and equipment donations. Similarly, the National Football League’s (NFL) member teams have established the nonprofit charitable organization, “NFL Charities”, which supports education and youth services and sports-related medical research. As well, the National Hockey League (NHL) and its players association established a joint initiative called “Hockey Fights Cancer” to raise funds for cancer research, children's hospitals, player charities, and local cancer organizations. Many other organizations involved with various sports also serve their own communities (i.e., MLS W.O.R.K.S., WNBA Cares, etc.).
Given this push for league-wide corporate social responsibility (CSR), numerous athletes have followed suit. Many athletes participate in fundraising for causes to which they possess a high degree of affinity, or ones that are so visible (e.g., the earthquake in Haiti and Katrina relief) that their involvement could spur additional fundraising activities (Wilson, Glier, Kepner, & Shpigel, 2005). Following the Haitian earthquake, 96 nonprofit organizations raised more than $1 billion for recovery (USA TODAY, 2010). Among them, the NFL and its players union donated $500,000 to both the American Red Cross and the Partners in Health; the NBA (and its union) and the MLB contributed $1 million, and the NHL donated $100,000 toward relief efforts (CBC, 2010). In terms of specific NBA stars, Kevin Garnett donated $1.2 million to Katrina victims (Krawczynski, 2005), Dwight Howard and Samuel Dalembert donated $100,000 for children in Haiti, and Tiger Woods provided $3 million to help the recovery (Gonzalez, 2010; USA TODAY, 2010). Other professional athletes also participated in similar efforts based on their interests (e.g., Gary Sheffield, Jason Giambi, Deion Sanders, Chris Duhon, LeBron James).

According to the USA TODAY (2001), more than 350 public charities and private foundations are connected to professional teams or athletes. For example, Michael Jordan has been involved with several charities and many charitable organizations, including the Michael Jordan Charity International Golf Tournament, the James R. Jordan Boys and Girls Club, and the Family Life Center (White, 2006). Andre Agassi has been involved with community-based programs that provide help for abused and neglected children through a variety of venues, including a shelter, an educational facility, and a Boys and Girls Club. College athletes also associate themselves with charitable organizations. Tim Tebow, former University of Florida (UF) star, also started a charity program called “First and 15” with other UF students to raise funds for the Uncle Dick’s Orphanage in the Philippines and the Shands Hospital Pediatric
Cancer Center in Gainesville, FL. In sum, professional athletes’ involvement with charitable organizations and programs is one of the many ways in which they give back to their communities. Fundraising, donations, and volunteering by these athletes probably encourages others to become interested in their causes and donate money because of the athletes’ community visibility and "high profile" stature.

**Statement of Problem**

Although numerous researchers (e.g., Billing, Holt, & Smith, 1985; Staurowsky, Parkhouse, & Sachs, 1996; Verner, Hecht, & Fansler, 1998; Mahony, Gladden, & Funk, 2003) have examined the motives for charitable giving in sport, limited research has been conducted to explore the effects of specific athletes on donor behavior. While research on donor behavior in sports began to take root a few decades ago and many valuable studies have been conducted, several areas of donor behavior research in sport management still need to be explored.

First, previous donor behavior studies in sport have yet to focus on the connection between athletes and donor behavior in comparison to other contexts, such as spectator sports, sports fans’ behavior, endorsements, and brand- and team-related intentions. Since numerous athletes are involved with charitable giving and they possess the power to influence change, it will be useful for those who are planning to establish a charitable organization or raise funds to examine the relationship between athletes and donor behavior. Second, previous donor behavior studies in sport have failed to examine the important issue of how trust among donors influences their giving behavior. Examining trust should enable researchers to establish a more comprehensive framework to explain sport-related donor behavior. In addition, the impact of trust on donor behavior will assist directors of charitable organizations to better plan successful fundraising strategies. Third, there is limited empirical evidence indicating how athletes influence donor behavior because most donor behavior research has primarily focused on donors’
motives for charitable giving. Therefore, the empirical research on the relationship between athletes and donor behavior in the sport context will enhance and expand the general knowledge of donor behavior.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to expand knowledge of donor behavior in sport by analyzing several important factors such as identification with an athlete, athlete image, personal involvement, and trust. In particular, this study will explore how identification with an athlete and athlete image influence the level of trust and donor behavior. As well, the moderating role of personal involvement with the cause will be examined. To achieve this desired purpose, a conceptual framework is developed to answer the following research questions (Figure 1-1):

1. How does identification with an athlete influence donor behavior with regard to athletes who participate in sport-related charitable programs?
2. How does the athlete’s image affect donor behavior when an athlete represents a certain charitable organization or program?
3. Does personal involvement moderate the relationship between athlete-related factors and trust toward the athlete?
4. Does the level of trust toward an athlete matter when they plan to help others through a charitable organization represented by the athlete?

**Hypothesis Development**

Currently, there is little research on how a professional athlete influences the attitudes, perceptions, and donor behaviors related to philanthropy. From a managers’ perspective, how people perceive an athlete is an important issue in order to raise funds and promote future donations. Although researchers have addressed donor perceptions, motivations, and behaviors
in various sport contexts (e.g., Leslie & Ramey, 1988; Mahony, Gladden, & Funk, 2003; Gladden, Mahony, & Apostolopoulou, 2005), donor behavior in professional sport is still lacking. Accordingly, to better understand and expand knowledge regarding donor behavior, different theories and approaches are essential for both academicians and practitioners to illuminate this phenomenon.

According to identity theory, an individual’s concept of self is composed of multiple role-identities (Stryker & Burke, 2000). Stryker (1980) explained that various social structures have an impact on an individual’s social behavior. Later, Burke (1991) examined the identity process as “a set of meanings applied to the self in a social role or situation defining what it means to be who one is” (p.837). Consequently, these two tracks of identity theory have been unified to help scholars better understand the influence of internal and external factors on an individual’s beliefs, which play significant roles in creating an individual’s identity (Stryker & Burke, 2000). Previous research has revealed that athlete identification positively influences sport fan behavior such as attending games, paying more for tickets, purchasing team-related products, endorsements, and behavioral intentions (e.g., Fink, Trail, & Anderson, 2002; Kamins, Brand, Hoeke, & Moe, 1989; Carlson & Donavan, 2008). Additionally, highly identified fans often evaluate the performance or abilities of their teams or athletes favorably and positively (Branscombe & Wann, 1994), which is an antecedent of trustworthiness (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). That is, an individual who is highly identified with an athlete will be more likely to think positively about the ability of the athlete. In light of these works, the following is proposed:

H1: Identification with an athlete will positively influence the donors’ level of trust toward the athlete.
Dichter (1985) suggested that image has a significant impact on how people perceive certain characteristics. Researchers have found that brand image can positively influence consumer brand loyalty (e.g., Gladden & Funk, 2001; Bauer, Sauer, & Exler, 2005) and positive corporate image can lead to consumer trust (Flavian, Guinaliu, & Torres, 2005). In the advertising literature, since athlete endorsers have their own image, researchers have recognized that these individuals have a power to increase awareness of products, improve product image, and ultimately bolster consumer purchase intentions (e.g., Ohanian, 1991; Till, 2001; Jowdy & McDonald, 2002). Along with previous research, the assumption can be made that athletes can make people change their perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors due to the athletes' “high profile” stature (i.e., image). This lead to the development of the second hypothesis:

H2: An athlete image will positively influence the donors’ level of trust toward the athlete.

Personal involvement refers to “an individual’s perceived relevance of an object based on inherent needs, values, and interests” (Zaichkowsky, 1985, p. 324). Numerous researchers have studied involvement in terms of their own interests, especially in consumer behavior and philanthropy (e.g., Berens, van Riel, & van Bruggen, 2005; Barnes & McCarville, 2005; Bienstock & Stafford, 2006; Bennett, 2009). Previous findings suggest that involvement plays a critical role for people to make purchase decisions (e.g., Grau & Folse, 2007), and to become interested in philanthropy (e.g., Bennett, 2009). Additionally, researchers have found that those individuals who suffer from disease, or are related to those who are suffering, are more likely to donate than those with no association (e.g., Berens et al. 2005; Bruce, 1998; Nichols, 1991). Since involvement is an important predictor of affective, cognitive, and behavioral intentions, the
current study argues that those who have high level of involvement will be more likely to show high level of trust.

H3a: Personal involvement will moderate the relationship between identification with athlete and the donors’ level of trust toward an athlete.

H3b: Personal involvement will moderate the relationship between athlete image and the donors’ level of trust toward an athlete.

Trust is “a willingness to rely on an exchange partner in whom one has confidence” (Moorman, Zaltman, & Deshpande, 1992, p.315). Numerous researchers suggest that trust is one of the most critical elements for relationships to be successful (Berry, 1995; Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Previous findings indicate that trust plays significant role both in interpersonal and interorganizational relationships (e.g., Crosby & Stephens, 1987; Garbarino & Johnson, 1999). For example, trust was found to be an important factor in the interaction and communication between buyer and seller (Crosby & Stephens, 1987) and consumers’ trust influenced people to have positive attitude toward the quality and reliability of products or services a company provides. Several studies investigated the role of trust in the donor behavior dynamic, and found that trust had a significant influence on donor behavior (Andaleeb & Basu, 1995; Sargeant & Lee, 2004). For instance, people who have high level of trust are more likely to donate more money to charitable causes (Bekkers, 2003), and major donors tend to have higher level of trust than regular donors (Waters, 2008). These findings imply that when an athlete is connected to philanthropy, trust should be a key element on such relationships. Based on previous findings, the following is proposed:

H4: The donors’ level of trust toward an athlete will positively influence donor behavior.
H5: The donors’ level of trust toward an athlete will mediate the relationship between athlete-related factors and donor behavior.

Figure 1-1. Conceptual Framework
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This review of literature begins with the definition, history, and consequences of several constructs included in the proposed conceptual framework. Specifically, donor behavior, identification, image, trust, and personal involvement are discussed.

Donor Behavior

A donor is “a person, organization, corporation, or foundation that makes a gift” (Ciconte & Jacob, 2005, p. 566). Numerous studies have addressed donor perceptions, motivations, and behaviors in various contexts, including higher education (e.g., Leslie & Ramey, 1988; Hunter, Jones, & Boger, 1999; Clotfelter, 2001), athletics (e.g., Mahony, Gladden, & Funk, 2003; Gladden, Mahony, & Apostolopoulou, 2005; Verner, Hecht, & Fansler, 1998; Ostlund & Brown, 1985), and religion (Jackson, Bachmeier, Wood, & Craft, 1995). For example, Clotfelter (2001) found that alumni who contributed large amounts to a college tended to have higher income, participated in extracurricular activities, been mentored, and were satisfied with their undergraduate experience.

Efforts to systematically understand the structure of donor behavior have also been made. The donor behavior studies in the sport literature stem from the athletic donor motivation research conducted by Billing, Holt and Smith (1985). These authors identified four key motives for donor motivation: (1) social (i.e., participating in sports with family and friends), (2) philanthropic (i.e., providing athletic scholarships), (3) success (i.e., the value associated with victories, and (4) benefits (i.e., tax deductions). Based on their findings, the authors developed an instrument (i.e., Athletic Contributions Questionnaire, ACQUIRE), to measure athletic donor motivation. Building on Billing et al., Staurowsky, Parkhouse, and Sachs (1996) revised and expanded the ACQUIRE scale by incorporating Birch and Veroff’s (1966) paradigm of human
motivation. In addition, recognizing that the ACQUIRE lacked a theoretical basis, Staurowsky et al. combined donor behavior with motivation in building their theoretical model, the ACQUIRE-II, which consists of Benefit, Philanthropic, Power, Social, Success 1, and Success 2.

Based on social cognitive theory, Verner, Hecht, and Fansler (1998) developed the Motivation of Athletic Donors (MAD-1) scale to measure athletic donor motivation. Through an extensive review of literature and interviews with athletic donors, they identified twelve dimensions of athletic donor motivation (i.e., participating in secondary events, public recognition, giving of time and energy, inside information, priority treatment, philanthropy, collaboration, create, change, curiosity, power, and loyalty). More recently, Mahony, Gladden, and Funk (2003) developed the Donor Motivation Scale to explore the relative importance among donor-related factors. They identified ten factors to predict motivation and found that success-related factors, priority seating, and psychological commitment were among the strongest motivations for athletic donors.

General donor studies (not related to athletics) have also been conducted to account for the antecedents of donor behavior. For example, Lee, Piliavin, and Call (1999) sampled blood donors, charitable donors, and volunteers finding that personal expectations, parental modeling, personal norms, past behavior, and role identity as a donor influenced donor intentions. Jackson, Bachmeier, Wood, and Craft (1995) tested the influence of religious and associational ties on volunteering and charitable giving. They revealed that people who are actively involved with religion or associational groups gave more time and money to charity programs. Further, Barnes and McCarville (2005) examined donor behavior in relation to non-profit organizations. Their results demonstrated that donors were more positively influenced by tangible benefits (i.e., monetary value), intangible benefits (i.e., feeling of belonging to a group, status, or socializing),
and purposive incentives (i.e., philanthropic feeling) than by opportunity-based factors (i.e.,
experience or financial benefits).

Although previous studies have found key motives for donors, other factors that influence
donor behavior are lacking. Since numerous professional athletes and teams initiate their own
non-profit organizations or participate in social responsibility programs for the causes in which
they are interested, such as community development, youth health, and/or youth education, the
influence of these athletes on donor behavior and motivation has become more important.

Identity Theory

Mead (1934) wrote about social and social psychological issues, which fostered the
beginnings of identity theory. He recognized that individuals act differently based on the
identities they assume in different relationships. As Mead’s concepts of “society” and “self” have
attracted considerable attention from researchers, identity theory has been divided into two
categories: identity theory and social identity theory.

Identity theory posits that an individual’s concept of self is composed of multiple role-
identities (Stryker & Burke, 2000). Stryker and Burke (2000) noted the following:

(Identity) is composed of four central components: the identity standard, or the set of
(culturally prescribed) meanings held by the individual which define his or her role
identity in a situation; the person’s perceptions of meanings within the situation, matched
to the dimensions of meaning in the identity standard; the comparator or the mechanism
that compares the perceived situational meanings with those held in the identity standard;
and the individual’s behavior or activity, which is a function of the difference between
perceptions and standard (p. 287).

Similarly, Ervin and Stryker (2001) found that the multiple role-identities have different levels of
identity salience based on an individual’s valuation of each role and that identity salience
positively influences future behavior.

Tajfel and Turner (1986) expanded identity theory to social identity theory, which
primarily focuses on the society where an individual belongs. The idea of social identity theory is
based on social psychological theory of intergroup relationships – that is – a sense of belonging to a social category (e.g., race, nationality, or sport team). Social identity theory posits that a self-concept consists of both a personal identity and a social identity. The personal identity is comprised of unique aspects of the person, such as abilities and interests, whereas social identity is composed of distinct group categories, such as demographic (e.g., gender, race, nationality) or organizational membership (e.g., school, religion, sport team; Turner, 1982).

The basic assumptions of both identity theory and social identity theory are that people perceive themselves based on a structured society in which they belong. Although both theories focus on how people act, think, and feel in their societies, the purpose of identity theory is to explain how people perceive their roles when they face certain situations. Conversely, social identity theory emphasizes the behavior that is determined by the society to which a person is tied. In Stryker’s (1980) establishment of identity theory, he explained that social structures influence an individual’s social behavior. Similarly, Burke (1991) examined the identity process and defined identity as “a set of ‘meanings’ applied to the self in a social role or situation defining what it means to be who one is” (p.837). Burke focused on the internal factors of identity, such as stress or anxiety, whereas Stryker examined the external factors of identity. Consequently, these two tracks of the identity theory became unified, leading to a clearer understanding of how both internal and external factors influence the individual belief system and create an individual’s identity (Stryker & Burke, 2000). In other words, Stryker and Burke assumed that these two important factors influence an individual’s identity standard and perceptions of situational meaning and, ultimately, behavior (Braunstein, 2006).

**Identity Theory in the Sport-related Literature**

Several studies in marketing, business, advertising, sport-related literatures have used identity theory to explain people’s behaviors, attitudes, or feeling. Especially in the sport-related
literature, many scholars have applied identity theory to consumption behaviors, including team identification, fan identification, and identification with individual athletes (e.g., Fink, Trail, & Anderson, 2002; Trail, Anderson, & Fink, 2005; Kwon, Trail, & Lee, 2008, Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Wann & Branscombe, 1995; Wann & Dolan, 1994; Sutton, McDonald, Milne, & Cimperman, 1997; Carlson & Donavan, 2008). More specifically, Fink et al. (2002) found that fans with strong team identification, which is an important source of sport fans’ behavior, are more likely to attend games, pay more for tickets, spend more money on team merchandise, be satisfied, and stay loyal to the team. Trail, Anderson, and Fink (2000) defined identification as “an orientation of the self in regard to other objects including a person or group that results in feelings or sentiments of close attachment” (p. 165-166). Based on this, Trail and James (2001) developed the Team Identification Index (TII) to measure an individual’s cognitive connection with the team.

Trail et al. (2005) found that strong team identification leads to self-esteem responses, which ultimately influences conative loyalty toward the team, and that an individual who shows high level of team identification is more likely to support the team. Team identification also explained the concept of “basking in reflected glory” (BIRGing) and “cutting off reflected failure” (CORFing; Kwon et al., 2008). BIRGing is the behavior that reflects people’s strong association with successful others, whereas CORFing is the behavior that reflects people’s trying to disassociate from unsuccessful others (e.g., Hunt, Bristol, & Bashaw, 1999; Snyder, Lassegard, & Ford, 1986). Those fans who have strong identification with a team are less likely to CORF and more likely to BIRG.

Highly identified fans tend to have higher self-esteem, less depression, and less alienation than those who have low identification with a team (Branscombe & Wann, 1991). Accordingly,
team identification boosts self-esteem, decreases the level of depression, and is positively related to a positive expectation toward life, while it is negatively related to negative feelings. Wann and Branscombe (1995) also found that team identification had a positive influence on knowledge about the sport, players, and team history, and fans with high level of team identification showed positive attitudes toward others who support the same team. In addition, Wann and Dolan (1994) found that fans who identify strongly with a team tend to evaluate the team’s performance positively and to display a positive attitude toward the game itself.

Sutton, McDonald, Milne, and Cimperman (1997) divided sports fans into three groups—social fans, focused fans, and vested fans—based on their level of team identification. They found that fans with a high level of team identification showed reduced price sensitivity and performance-outcome sensitivity. Carlson and Donavan (2008) found that a fan’s identification with a celebrity athlete has a positive influence on endorsement and brand- and team-related intentions.

**Relationship between Identification and Trust**

Researchers have found a relationship between identification and trust in numerous fields, including management (e.g., Ole Borgen, 2001; Fuller, Matzler, & Hoppe, 2008; Maguire & Phillips, 2008; Restubog, Hornsey, Bordia, & Esposo, 2008; Keh & Xie, 2009; Han & Harms, 2010), organizational behavior (e.g., Lee, 2004; Connaughton & Daly, 2004; Puusa & Tolvanen, 2006; Wang, Shieh, & Wang, 2008), psychology (e.g., Voci, 2006), and sport-related fields (e.g., Wann & Polk, 2007; Zhang & Won, 2010). Lewicki and Bunker (1996) classified trust into three different types of trust—calculus-based trust, knowledge-based trust, and identification-based trust—and found that, of the three, identification-based trust is the highest level of trust since it is developed “as one both knows and predicts the other’s needs, choices, and preferences and also
shares some of those same needs, choices, and preferences as one’s own” (p. 123). They argued that strong identification allows an individual to think, feel, and respond like the other.

In the management literature, Borgen (2001) found that strong identification with an organization plays a significant role in trust-making operations, especially in cooperative organizations. Fuller, Matzler, and Hoppe (2008) found that identification with the community to which an individual belongs has a positive influence on trust. Their study revealed that identification with a car community had a positive influence on trust toward the brand of the car, which eventually influenced people’s participation on the community. Maguire and Phillips (2008) found a relationship between identification with an organization and trust in a study of employees in a newly merged organization. They revealed that employees’ trust toward the organization decreased after the merger because they no long felt a strong identification with the organization. In other words, vague identification of the organization weakens people’s identification, and weak identification undermined trust. More recently, Keh and Xie (2009) argued that companies should build a trustworthy identity because consumers are more likely to feel strong identification with trustworthy companies. Han and Harms (2010) also found that team identification plays critical role in reinforcing trust toward organization.

Lee (2004) found that trust has a positive impact on continuous improvement efforts when employees feel a strong identification with the organization. Additionally, Connaughton and Daly (2004) found that identification with the team leader was positively related to trust toward that leader. Moreover, Puusa and Tolvanen (2006) studied the relationships among organizational identity, identification with organization, trust, and commitment. They found that organizational identity has a positive influence on an individual’s level of organizational
identification, which created trust toward the organization. In sum, they concluded that one’s level of trust affected their commitment to the organization.

In sport, Wann and Polk (2007) found a relationship between team identification and trustworthiness. They also found that highly identified fans regarded, not only other fans of their team, but also all individuals as trustworthy. Zhang and Won (2010) noted a significant association between fan identification and trust in internet shopping. The results demonstrated that trust in internet shopping was correlated with psychological attachment (i.e., team identification), both of which are the antecedents of intention to purchase licensed sport merchandise (LSM). In this respect, an individual who identifies strongly with an athlete will be more likely to think and feel positively about the athlete’s ability, which will lead to the high level of trust toward him or her.

**Image**

Beach and Mitchell (1987) proposed image theory as a way to determine how an individual makes decisions by regarding representation of the decision-makers goal. According to image theory, there are four different images: (1) self-image, (2) trajectory image, (3) action image, and (4) projected image. Self-image consists of an individual’s principles, such as personal beliefs, basic values, and ethics, which one regards as clearly desirable and true. These principles are indispensable guides for an individual in setting goals and taking action. Trajectory image consists of an individual’s goals, which work as an agenda for the future and the pursuit of one’s self-image, and guide the decision-maker to make progress. Action image consists of an individual’s plans that help him or her to achieve his or her goals. Finally, projected image consists of an individual’s anticipated events and states, which allow him or her to “anticipate what will happen (events and states) if he or she adopts a specific plan or if continues to behave
in the present vein” (p. 204). These images help an individual in determining what decisions (i.e., plans) to make, evaluating them before implementation, and setting rules for implementation.

While image theory focuses on how people make decisions based on images, others have focused on image as a concept and identified how it relates to other research variables. Considerable attention has been devoted to this aspect in various fields including marketing (e.g., Dichter, 1985; Reynolds, 1965; Keller, 1993; Martin, 1996; Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Baker, Grewal, & Parasuraman, 1994), advertising (e.g., Ohanian, 1991; Kamins, 1990), psychology (e.g., Greenberg, 1983; Beach & Mitchell, 1987), general business (e.g., Dowling, 1988; Gotsi & Wilson, 2001; Bromley, 2000; Nguyen & Leblanc, 2001), and management (e.g., Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). These scholars have also worked to define image in regard to a brand (i.e., product), a store, or a corporation. In the marketing literature, for example, Reynolds (1965) defined image as “the mental construct developed by the consumer on the basis of a few selected impressions among the flood of total impression” (p. 69). Dichter (1985) noted that image “describes not individual traits or qualities, but the total impression an entity makes on the mind of others” (p. 75) and highlighted that image has a significant influence on how people perceive things. Jain and Etgar (1976) described store image as consumers’ summarized information about a store and its characteristics, and consumers’ feelings toward or impressions of the store. This literature supported the idea that various images exist and the following sections elucidate these additional aspects.

**Brand Image**

Keller (1993) proposed a customer-based brand equity model to determine how consumers react to a brand. According to the model, brand knowledge consists of brand awareness—which includes brand recognition and brand recall—and brand image, which includes four different brand associations: type, favorability, strength, and uniqueness. Keller
described brand image as “perceptions about a brand as reflected by the brand associations held in consumer memory” (p. 3) and explained that customer-based brand equity is formed when a customer is familiar with the brand and has favorable, strong, and unique brand associations in his or her memory. Some have found a strong relationship between brand image and consumers’ beliefs, attitudes, and intentions (e.g., Reynolds, 1965; Graeff, 1997; Ferrand & Pages, 1999; Bauer, Sauer, & Schmitt, 2005). Specifically, Graeff (1997) found a relationship between brand image and consumers brand evaluation which positively influenced consumer attitudes and purchase intentions. Ferrand and Pages (1999) also found that a positive brand image of a sport organization increased the financial value of the organization (e.g., sponsorship, ticket sales, and merchandise sales), and effected consumer behavior (e.g., season ticket sales).

In the sport literature, brand image has been used primarily to examine the brand images of sports teams (e.g., Gladden & Funk, 2001, 2002; Ross, 2006; Ross, James, & Vargas, 2006; Ross, Russell, & Bang, 2008). Gladden and Funk (2001, 2002) examined the relationship between brand associations of a professional team and sport consumers’ brand loyalty toward the team. The authors developed the Team Association Model (TAM), based on Keller’s model, to understand brand management in sport. They found that the brand image of a team positively impacted sport consumers’ brand loyalty toward the team. For their part, Ross (2006) explained brand image in a sport setting, finding that spectator-based brand equity, which consisted of brand awareness and brand associations, positively influenced sport spectators’ loyalty toward the team, merchandise sales, ticket sales, and other factors. Later, Ross, James, and Vargas (2006) developed the Team Brand Association Scale (TBAS) to measure professional sport team brand associations. The validity and psychometric properties of the scale was further confirmed by Ross, Russell, and Bang (2008). Other researchers have found a strong association between the brand
image of a sport team and its fans’ loyalty toward the team (Bauer, Stokburger-Sauer, & Exler, 2008).

**Corporate Image**

LeBlanc and Nguyen (1996) defined corporate image as “the result of an aggregate process by which the public compares and contrasts the various attributes of firms” (pp. 45-46). Kennedy (1977) argued that corporate image consists of two key factors: the functional component and the emotional component. While the functional component can be measured easily because of its tangible attributes, the emotional component is hard to measure because it is derived from an individual’s feeling or attitude toward a corporation, and is strongly related to psychological factors (Nguyen & Leblanc, 2001).

Previous findings have revealed that corporate image positively influenced financial performance (Shapiro, 1982) and consumer attitude (Andreassen & Lindestad, 1998; de Ruyter & Wetzel, 2000; Bhattacharya & Sen, 2003; Nguyen & Leblanc, 2001). Shapiro (1982) found that companies with positive images are more likely to increase their achievements, such as product sales and market share. Nguyen and Leblanc (2001) also found a positive link between corporate image and consumer loyalty toward the firm. They revealed that customers tend to show high levels of loyalty toward a company that has a favorable corporate image. In addition, Andreassen and Lindestad (1998) indicated that a positive corporate image leads to customer satisfaction, loyalty toward the company, and a high level of perceived quality and product value. Further, de Ruyter and Wetzel (2000) found that customers have a positive perceived quality of the products of a company for which they hold a positive image.

**Athlete Image**

In the advertising literature, numerous studies have dealt with matching celebrity endorsers’ images with brands or products. Most of these studies stem from four frameworks: (1)
the Source Attractiveness Model (McGuire, 1968), (2) the Image Transfer Model (McCracken, 1989), (3) the Source Credibility Model (Ohanian, 1990, 1991), and (4) the Image Match-Up Hypothesis (Kamins, 1990). According to the Source Credibility Model, celebrity spokesperson’s perceived image has a significant influence on the persuasiveness of his or her message and any change in consumer attitude (Ohanian, 1990, 1991). The Image Transfer Model suggests that the ability to transfer the symbolic properties and cultural meanings of the celebrity to the product image is most important factor in the success of the endorser (McCracken, 1989). The Image Match-Up Hypothesis focuses on the congruence between the image of the celebrity and the image of the product, which ultimately affects consumers’ evaluations toward the product. Thus, these studies emphasize the endorsers’ images because they play an important role in consumers’ creating positive attitudes and behavioral intentions toward the products endorsed. In other words, these studies assumed that an endorser (e.g., expert, celebrity, sports star, etc.) has his or her unique image which can influence people’s attitudes and behaviors.

Using an athlete as an endorser can be effective in influencing not only consumer behavior, but also sport-related consumption behaviors (e.g., Till, 2001; Jowdy & McDonald, 2002; Fink, Cunningham, & Kensicki, 2004; Carlson & Donavan, 2008). For example, Till (2001) found a strong relationship between an athlete endorser and the endorsed product, and Jowdy and McDonald (2002) found that an athlete endorser has the power to increase awareness of the product or brand, improve product or brand image, and influence consumers’ purchase intention. More recently, studies have adapted the brand image to an individual or an athlete to find why people feel a strong attachment to “human brands” and to understand consumers’ perceptions toward an athlete as a brand itself (see Thomson, 2006; Arai & Ko, 2010).
Based on previous research findings, we may conclude that, because of the athletes’ community visibility and "high profile" stature (i.e., image), he or she can make people change their beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. In other words, an athlete who has positive image can significantly influence people’s level of trust toward the athlete, which ultimately affects donor behavior.

**Personal Involvement**

Involvement is considered an important element in understanding people’s perception, attitude, and behavior, especially in the literature on consumer behavior and philanthropy (Laurent & Kapferer, 1985; Berens, van Riel, & van Bruggen, 2005; Barnes & McCarville, 2005; Bienstock & Stafford, 2006; Grau & Folse, 2007; Bennett, 2009). Numerous researchers have defined involvement in terms of individual interests. For example, Zaichkowsky defined involvement as “an individual’s perceived relevance of an object based on inherent needs, values, and interests” (1985, p. 324). Gabbott and Hogg defined involvement as “a motivational variable reflecting the extent of personal relevance to the individual in terms of basic goals, values and self-concept” (1999, p. 160). Jain and Srinivasan also noted that involvement is “an unobservable state of motivation, arousal, or interest evoked by a particular stimulus” (1990, p. 594). Furthermore, according to Engel (1987), involvement refers to the “degree of pertinence and relevance of the cause to the individual” (p. 48). These definitions emphasize that involvement plays a significant role in determining people’s attitude, perception, and behavior.

According to Mowen (1995), involvement is a multi-dimensional factor that has distinct characteristics: (1) self-expressive importance, (2) hedonic importance, (3) practical relevance, and (4) purchase risk. Zaichkowsky’s (1985) personal involvement inventory (PII) and Laurent and Kapferer’s (1985) consumer involvement profile (CIP) are the scales most widely used to measure this multi-dimensional factor. The PII was initially developed as a 20-item scale to
measure the involvement construct and, a decade later, Zaichkowsky (1994) revised the scale and reduced the 20 items to 10 that can be divided into two subscales (i.e., cognitive and affective dimensions). While the PII focuses on the cognitive and affective dimensions of involvement, the CIP focuses on the antecedents of involvement, such as the product’s pleasure value, the product’s sign or symbolic value, risk importance, and probability of purchase error. Laurent and Kapferer (1985) argued that consumers tend to behave differently based on the five antecedents of involvement.

As noted, involvement plays a significant role in determining people’s decisions to purchase a product and/or participate in a philanthropic cause. In the advertising literature, involvement has a positive influence on cause-related marketing (CRM) strategies. Grau and Folse (2007) noted that numerous companies used CRM campaigns to obtain positive outcomes because consumers who show high involvement with a cause tend to have positive attitudes and participation intentions. The results of their study showed that highly involved people are more likely to participate in campaigns than those who have low involvement. While consumers with high involvement are more likely to support a company’s CRM campaign, Grau and Folse (2007) argued that companies should focus on consumers with low involvement as well since these consumers can be influenced by messages that are positively framed by the CRM campaign.

Specifically in donor behavior dynamics, involvement seems to influence frequency of contribution and amount of contribution (Tsiotsou, 1998, 2004). The frequency of contribution, especially to an educational institution, is determined by involvement of alumni (Blakeley, 1974; Webb, 1989). In addition, according to Tsiotsou (1998, 2004), a donor who is highly involved with a university athletic program is more likely to make a large contribution to that program. In other words, a donor’s level of involvement with an athletic program is a significant predictor to
distinguish donors who make large contributions from those who make small contributions. More recently, Bennett (2009) found that personal involvement with giving to charity is positively related to people’s impulsive donation decisions when they are browsing charity Web sites. The results of the study showed that typical impulsive donors share several characteristics, including prior knowledge of hospices, regular donation to charities, and a sense of personal involvement with giving to charity.

Furthermore, Bennett (2003) noted that “personal involvement with an issue has the potential to affect substantially an individual’s attitudes and (donor) behavior towards a particular good cause” (p. 14) and Berens, van Riel, and van Bruggen (2005) found that involvement has a moderating effect on the relationship between CSR and product attitude. In sum, based on these previous findings, we assume that personal involvement will moderate the relationship between athlete-related factors and trust toward the athlete, which may in turn affect donor behavior.

**Trust**

In most cases, trust is an essential factor for successful relationships (Moorman, Zaltman, & Deshpande, 1992; Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Berry, 1995; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Garbarino & Johnson, 1999; Sargeant & Lee, 2002). According to Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpande (1992), trust is “a willingness to rely on an exchange partner in whom one has confidence” (p. 315). The authors further argued that trust consists of a belief that is based on an exchange partner’s expertise, reliability, and intentionality, and a behavior intention that indicates reliance on a partner. Morgan and Hunt (1994) also conceptualized trust as existing “when one party has confidence in the exchange partner's reliability and integrity” (p. 23). Both definitions emphasize the importance of confidence in developing trust.
The idea of trust has drawn additional attention from the social exchange literature. For example, Berry (1995) argued that trust plays a critical role in relationship marketing, especially when building a service-based relationship with customers because of intangible characteristics of service. Berry highlighted three factors as important to the development of trust: opening lines of communication, service guarantees, and a higher standard of conduct. Morgan and Hunt (1994) also found that trust was among the most important factors in successful relationship marketing, noting that commitment and trust are key factors in relationship marketing, especially when cooperative relationships are required. While some researchers have focused on the concept of trust within interpersonal relationships (e.g., Crosby & Stephens, 1987; Crosby, Evans, & Cowles, 1990), others have focused on trust within interorganizational relationships (e.g., Garbarino & Johnson, 1999; Gwinner, Gremler, & Bitner, 1998). Crosby and Stephens (1987) suggested that trust is a key factor in the interaction and communication between buyer and seller, and Garbarino and Johnson (1999) found that customers’ trust toward a firm helps them to develop positive attitudes toward the quality and reliability of products or services the firm provides.

In terms of donor behavior, trust should play a significant role in the donor intentions dynamic. Indeed, Andaleeb and Basu (1995) indicated that the high level of trust that individuals have in blood banks positively influences donor behavior. Sargeant and Lee (2004) found that, although commitment mediated the relationship between trust and donor behavior, trust had a significant influence on donor behavior. Further, Bekkers (2003) suggested that people who have a high level of trust tend to donate more money to charitable causes, and Waters (2008) revealed that major donors—those who gave more than $5,000 per year—showed higher level of trust toward the fund-raising organization than other donors.
To conclude, previous studies have shown that donors’ level of trust toward a person or an organization has a significant and positive impact on their perceptions and behaviors. In line with those findings, it is reasonable to suggest that there is a strong association between donors’ level of trust toward an athlete and donor behavior.
CHAPTER 3
METHOD

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of an athlete on donor behavior, the moderating effect of personal involvement, and the mediating role of donors’ trust toward the athlete in such a relationship. This chapter explains the quantitative methods and procedures that were used to analyze these relationships: (1) sampling and procedures, (2) instruments, (3) pilot study, and (4) data analysis for main study.

Sample and Procedures

The population consisted of actual and potential donors, aged 18 or older, who donate or are willing to donate money to a nonprofit organization represented by Dwight Howard (i.e., the Dwight Howard Foundation). The sample comprised actual and potential donors living in Orlando, Florida region of the U.S. and data were collected from attendees of the National Basketball Association (NBA) games during the 2010-2011 season. Generally, two sampling methods were used: (1) probability sampling and (2) non-probability sampling. While probability sampling provides equal odds of being selected, non-probability sampling does not. Those who actually donated and potential donors (who attended the games) formed the non-probability samples and people living in Orlando belonged to the probability samples.

After proposing this study, the requisite documents were sent to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for data collection approval. The researcher traveled to Orlando, Florida, on game days and asked game attendees to participate in this survey. If people agreed to participate, the researcher briefly explained the purpose of the study. In addition, the researcher sent online survey questionnaires to people living in Orlando. The questionnaire required approximately 10 minutes to complete.
Instruments

The questionnaire was intended to examine the following: (1) identification with an athlete, (2) athlete image, (3) trust toward the athlete, (4) personal involvement, (5) donor behavior, and (6) demographics.

Identification with the Athlete

Based on two previous studies (Trail, Robinson, Dick, & Gillentine, 2003; Robinson, Trail, & Kwon, 2004), the points of attachment index (PAI) scale was used to measure identification with the athlete. The PAI consisted of seven subscales, which include identification with (1) the players, (2) the team, (3) the coach, (4) the community, (5) the sport, (6) the university, and (7) level of sport. Each subscale contained three items with a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). For this study, one subscale from the PAI scale, identification with the player (athlete), was slightly modified, for example, “I identify with (athlete)”, “I am a big fan of (athlete)”, and “I consider myself a fan of (athlete)”.

Athlete Image

Since a generally accepted scale to measure the image of an athlete does not exist, adopting the corporate image scale and modifying it was appropriate for the current study. To measure the athlete’s image, Nguyen and Leblanc’s (2001) scale (which is used to measure corporate image) was employed. Their scale contains three items with a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The three items needed to be modified from their original wording because the scale was developed to measure corporate image. The items were modified as follows: “I have always had a good impression of (athlete)”; “In my opinion, (athlete) has a good image in the minds of people (both fans and non-fans)”; and “I believe that (athlete) has a better image than other athletes.”
Trust toward the Athlete

The measurement for donors’ level of trust toward the athlete used three items from Palmatier, Dant, and Grewal (2007). Considering that they used this scale to examine customers’ level of trust toward sellers, the scale was modified and rephrased as follows: “(Athlete) is an athlete that stands by his/her word”; “I can rely on (athlete) to keep the promises he/she makes to his/her fans”; and “(Athlete) is a sincere person.” While Palmatier et al. used a 5-point scale, the items in the current study were measured using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Personal Involvement

Zaichkowsky’s (1994) personal involvement index (PII) was used to measure personal involvement with the cause. The PII was developed as a 20-item semantic differential scale but was later condensed into 10 items for validity and reliability reasons. The revised PII consisted of 10 semantic differential items scored on 7-point scales, including important/unimportant, interesting/boring, relevant/irrelevant, exciting/unexciting, means a lot to me/means nothing, appealing/unappealing, fascinating/mundane, valuable/worthless, involving/uninvolving, and needed/not needed.

Donor Behavior

Donor behavior was divided into two sections, one for potential donors who are willing to donate in the future and the other for actual donors who are currently participating in donation. Three items measuring behavioral intention from the theory of planned behavior, developed by Ajzen (1991), were used to measure intention to donate for the potential donors: “I will donate to the (organization/foundation)”; “I intend to donate to the (organization/foundation)”; and “I am determined to donate to (organization/foundation).” The questions for actual donors differed slightly from the items for potential donors: “I will donate to the (organization/foundation)"
continuously”; “I intend to donate to the (organization/foundation) continuously”; and “I am
determined to keep donating to the (organization/foundation).”

Demographics

A demographic information section was included at the end of the questionnaire.
Participants were classified by age, gender, ethnicity, occupation, income level, level of
education, and previous experience with donation. In addition, at the beginning of the survey,
participants were asked if they knew whether the athlete had his or her own foundation (or
nonprofit organization).

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted before the main study to test appropriateness of the items
and factors, to determine the appropriate sample size, and to discover potential problems before
using the proposed data analysis technique. Participants totaled 80 undergraduate students
majoring in sport management at the University of Florida. Participants were asked to complete
the questionnaire, which consisted of four main parts (i.e., athlete-related factors, personal
involvement, trust toward the athlete, and intention to donate) by following standard procedures
in accordance with the IRB protocols.

Before testing the proposed framework, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted
using AMOS 18.0 to find which variables will be correlated with which factors, and which
factors are correlated with one another. The hypothesized measurement model for independent
variables (i.e., identification with an athlete, athlete image, personal involvement, and trust) and
dependent variable (i.e., donor behavior) was supported by the CFA. The fit of the model to the
data was adequate with the chi-square statistic \( \chi^2(199, N = 80) = 1.53 \), showing that the model
is correct and acceptable. The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) also indicates
an acceptable fit (.084; Brown & Cudeck, 1992). Additionally, the comparative fit index (.91)
value was acceptable within the context of the model. Comparisons of squared correlations among constructs were employed for discriminate validity which should be less than .85 (Kline, 2005). The correlation matrix for the model is presented in Table 3-1. For the internal consistency and construct reliability respectively, Cronbach’s alpha value and average variance extracted (AVE) were examined. Although identification (.79) and image (.76) were less than the suggested cut-off value of .80, other three factors were greater than .80. All average variance extracted (AVE) values exceeded the recommended 0.50 cutoff (Fornell & Larker, 1981; Table 3-2).

To test the proposed conceptual framework, regression analyses were conducted using SPSS 18.0. The researcher used Baron and Kenny’s (1986) guideline with Sobel’s (1982) test as a post hoc analysis to analyze the mediating role of trust, and followed Aiken and West’s (1991) guideline to test the moderating effect of personal involvement. The influence of identification with an athlete on trust toward the athlete was significant ($\beta = .56, p < .05$), as was athlete image on trust toward the athlete ($\beta = .71, p < .05$). Trust toward the athlete also had a significant influence on intention to donate ($\beta = .25, p < .05$). The following is the results for testing the mediating role of trust on the relationship between identification with an athlete and intention to donate, and between the athlete’s image and intention to donate.

The first analysis of mediation showed that the influence of identification with an athlete on trust toward the athlete was significant ($\beta = .56, p < .05$), as it was on intention to donate ($\beta = .24, p < .05$). The second analysis showed that trust toward the athlete had a significant influence on intention to donate ($\beta = .25, p < .05$). The third analysis indicated that when trust toward the athlete was controlled, the influence of identification with an athlete on intention to
donate was not significant ($\beta = .17, p > .05$). That is, trust toward the athlete mediates the relationship between identification with an athlete and intention to donate.

The mediating role of trust toward the athlete on the relationship between the athlete’s image and intention to donate is as follows: (1) the first analysis showed that the influence of athlete’s image on trust toward the athlete ($\beta = .71, p < .05$) and on intention to donate ($\beta = .28, p < .05$) was significant, (2) the second analysis indicated that trust toward the athlete was significantly related to intention to donate ($\beta = .25, p < .05$), and (3) the third analysis revealed that when trust toward the athlete was controlled, the influence of the athlete’s image on intention to donate was not significant ($\beta = .20, p > .05$). In other words, trust toward the athlete mediates the relationship between the athlete’s image and intention to donate.

To test the moderating effect of personal involvement on the relationship between athlete-related factors and trust toward the athlete, the researcher conducted a moderated regression analysis by following Aiken and West’s (1991) guideline. The first-order effects (i.e., identification with an athlete and personal involvement) were entered in the first step; and the interaction term (i.e., identification with an athlete $\times$ personal involvement) was entered in the second step. Since the influence of identification with an athlete $\times$ personal involvement on trust toward the athlete was significant ($\beta = .59, p < .05$), there were moderating effects of personal involvement on the relationship between identification with an athlete and trust toward the athlete.

To test the moderating effect of personal involvement on the relationship between the athlete’s image and trust toward the athlete, a moderated regression analysis was used. The first-order effects (i.e., the athlete’s image and personal involvement) were entered in the first step; and the interaction term (i.e., the athlete’s image $\times$ personal involvement) was entered in the
second step. Since the effect of the athlete’s image × personal involvement on trust toward the athlete was not significant ($\beta = 1.17, p > .05$), there were no moderating effects of personal involvement on the relationship between the athlete’s image and trust toward the athlete.

**Data Analysis for Main Study**

The data gathered from the survey for the main study were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, v. 18.0). Data analyses were conducted in the following order. First, preliminary analyses (e.g., outliers, normality, CFA, and reliability) were employed. Second, descriptive statistics for the participant were analyzed. Third, the conceptual framework was analyzed based on tests of the hypotheses of this study. Fourth, the mediating role of donors’ level of trust toward the athlete on the relationship between athlete-related constructs and donor behavior was analyzed. Finally, the moderating effect of personal involvement on the relationship between athlete-related factors and donor behavior was analyzed.

**Preliminary Analyses**

Before analyzing the data for the main study, normality of the data were examined by the skewness and kurtosis values. Skewness is described as the degree to which a frequency distribution is asymmetrical (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Kurtosis relates to the size of a distribution’s tails. “Leptokurtic” refers to distributions with relatively large tails; those with small tails are refers “platykurtic”. “Mesokurtic” refers to a distribution with the same kurtosis as the normal distribution (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). A CFA was conducted using AMOS 18.0 for optimally matching the observed and theoretical factor structures for a given data set to determine the “goodness of fit” of the predetermined factor model. Additionally, for inter-item reliability assessments of five instruments, Cronbach’s alpha score and average variance extracted (AVE) values were examined.
Descriptive Statistics

Various descriptive statistics were used with SPSS 18.0, including central tendency (i.e., mean, median, and mode) and measures of variability (e.g., standard deviation, range, etc.), to examine the basic characteristics of the data.

Testing Hypotheses

To test the hypotheses, means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations were tested for all variables. To test the relationship between independent variables (i.e., identification with the athlete, athlete’s image, athlete’s reputation, and donors’ level of trust toward the athlete) and a dependent variable (i.e., donor behavior), regression analysis was used. Generally, regression analysis is a statistical technique designed for modeling and analyzing several variables, specifically the relationship between one or more independent variables and a dependent variable.

To test the mediating role of trust toward on the relationship between the athlete-related variable and donor behavior, Baron and Kenny’s (1986) guideline with Sobel’s (1982) test as a post hoc analysis were used. According to these researchers, a variable serves as a mediator if it fulfills the following conditions: (1) the independent variable should have significant influence on both the mediator and the dependent variable, (2) the mediator should have significant influence on the dependent variable, and (3) when the mediator is controlled, the independent variable should not have significant influence on the dependent variable.

To test the moderating effect of personal involvement on the relationship between athlete-related factors and trust toward the athlete, a moderated regression analysis was used. A moderator is a kind of interacting variable that should be analyzed in the following order: (1) the controls should be entered in the first step (excluded for this study because of non existence of controls); (2) the first-order effects (i.e., identification with an athlete or athlete image with personal involvement) should be entered in the second step; and (3) the interaction term (i.e.,
identification with an athlete $\times$ personal involvement or athlete image $\times$ personal involvement) should be entered in the final step. To reduce the threat of multicollinearity, the independent variables and subsequent interaction term should be centered (Aiken & West, 1991). According to Aiken and West (1991), the interaction is supported if the final step is significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>.543**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.557**</td>
<td>.709**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.297*</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>.242*</td>
<td>.278*</td>
<td>.252*</td>
<td>.555**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>1.366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$\lambda$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>I identify with (athlete)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I consider myself a fan of (athlete)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I consider myself a fan of (athlete)</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>I have always had a good impression of (athlete)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my opinion, (athlete) has a good image in the minds of people</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe that (athlete) has a better image than other athletes</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Unimportant/Important</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boring/Interesting</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unexciting/Exciting</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means nothing/Means a lot to me</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unappealing/Appealing</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mundane/Fascinating</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthless/Valuable</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uninvolving/Involving</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not needed/Needed</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Dwight Howard is an athlete that stands by his word</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can rely on Dwight Howard to keep the promises he makes to his fans</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwight Howard is a sincere person</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to</td>
<td>I will donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate</td>
<td>I intend to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am determined to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

This chapter contains the results of the data analyses conducted for the current study. Based on the results of the pilot study, data for the main study were collected using the previously described instruments. Specifically, five scales were adapted from previous research to measure the athlete-related factors (i.e., identification with an athlete and an athlete’s image), personal involvement, donors’ level of trust, and donor behavior among the NBA game attendees and people living in Orlando, Florida. The results are discussed in the following order: (1) preliminary analyses, (2) descriptive analyses, and (3) hypotheses testing.

Preliminary Analyses

Skewness and kurtosis values were examined to determine the normality of the data before the main study. Although skewness values for almost all variables (except intention to donate which ranged from .005 to .156) were negative, they were in an acceptable range (ranging from -1.222 to -.553). Negative skewness indicates that a small probability of a large loss is offset by a large probability of a small gain. Kurtosis values for all variables were also shown to have an acceptable range (from -.923 to 1.364), representing that the data is normally distributed. A CFA was conducted using AMOS 18.0 to predict how well the items represent the proposed latent constructs. As noted, a CFA is a theory-testing model which is to determine the “goodness of fit” of the predetermined factor model by optimally matching the observed and theoretical factor structures for a given data set. According to Gorsuch (1983), “confirmatory factor analysis is powerful because it provides explicit hypothesis testing for factor analytic problems…Confirmatory factor analysis is the more theoretically important-and should be the much more widely used-of the two major factor analytic approaches” (p. 134).
Initially, the hypothesized measurement model for the latent constructs (i.e., identification, image, involvement, trust, and intention to donate) was not supported by the CFA. That is, the data was not within the parameters associated with a good fitting model, providing the basis for model trimming. The chi-square statistic was $\chi^2(199, N = 305) = 4.17$, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was .102, and the comparative fit index (CFI) was .93. However, when two personal involvement items were removed (i.e., important/unimportant and interesting/boring), the fit of the model to the data was acceptable. The chi-square statistic was $\chi^2(179, N = 305) = 3.97$, the RMSEA was .098, and the CFI was .94. Since personal involvement scale has ten items, it may be inflated the RMSEA value. Comparisons of squared correlations among constructs also were employed for discriminate validity. Kline (2005) suggested that discriminate validity can be established if correlations among constructs are less than .85. The correlation matrix is presented in Table 4-1. In order to assess inter-item reliability for five instruments, Cronbach’s alpha and average variance extracted (AVE) values for each factor were employed. For items to be reliable, Cronbach’s alpha values should be greater than the suggested cut-off value of .80 for internal consistency (Nunnally, 1978) and average variance extracted (AVE) values should greater than the recommended 0.50 cut-off (Fornell & Larker, 1981). The values for Cronbach’s alpha and AVE for the main study were more than .80 and .50, respectively (Table 4-2).

**Descriptive Analyses**

In total, 324 questionnaires were obtained. Among them, 19 were returned incomplete (participants explained that they did not have enough time to complete the survey before going into the arena to see the game). Therefore, 305 usable questionnaires were used for the subsequent analyses.
Demographics

Demographic characteristics of respondents are provided in Table 4-3. The majority of the respondents were men (83.7%). The average age of the respondents was 39 (M = 39.13, SD = 12.45), and 46.8% of respondents were Caucasian, 25.5% were Hispanic, 16.8% were African American, and 10.5% were Asian/Pacific Islander. Among the respondents, 56.4% had a college degree and 21.1% had a professional/graduate degree. Additionally, 60.2% of respondents donated less than $100 in 2010 and 68.2% donated to other nonprofit organizations.

Athlete-related Factors

A general summary of means and standard deviations of athlete-related factors are presented in Table 4-4. The means of athlete-related factors (identification with an athlete and athlete image) for Dwight Howard ranged from 4.78 to 5.50. Standard deviations ranged from 1.40 to 1.76. These scores indicated that most of respondents identified with Dwight Howard and they perceived Dwight Howard’s image positively and favorably. The items related to athlete image had a higher mean (M = 5.41, SD = 1.37) on the 7-point Likert-type scale than the items for identification with an athlete (M = 5.03, SD = 1.53). The item “In my opinion, Dwight Howard has a good image in the minds of people” had the highest mean (M = 5.50, SD = 1.44) and the item “I identify with Dwight Howard” had the lowest mean (M = 4.78, SD = 1.76).

Personal Involvement

Table 4-5 presents the descriptive statistics for the personal involvement construct. The means of all 10 items for the Dwight Howard Foundation were above 4 on the 7-point semantic differential scale and ranged from 4.78 to 5.43. Standard deviations ranged from 1.40 to 1.51. These scores reflected that most respondents felt strong involvement with the Dwight Howard Foundation. The item “Not needed/Needed” had the highest mean score (M = 5.43, SD = 1.51).
and the item “Means nothing/Means a lot to me” had the lowest mean score (M = 4.78, SD = 1.44) among 10 personal involvement subscales.

**Trust toward the Athlete**

Descriptive statistics for the donors’ level of trust toward the athlete are shown in Table 4-6. The means of all items of respondents’ level of trust toward Dwight Howard were above 5.00 on the 7-point Likert-type scale, which indicated that the most respondents had a high level of trust toward Dwight Howard. The mean scores ranged from 5.04 to 5.19 and standard deviations ranged from 1.33 to 1.46. The item “Dwight Howard is an athlete that stands by his word” had the highest mean score (M = 5.19, SD = 1.45) and the item “I can rely on Dwight Howard to keep the promises he makes to his fans” had the lowest mean score (M = 5.04, SD = 1.37).

**Intention to Donate**

Table 4-7 presents the descriptive statistics for respondents’ intention to donate. The means of all items for people’s intention to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation were below 4.00 on the 7-point Likert-type scale and ranged from 3.42 to 3.64. Standard deviations ranged from 1.72 to 1.77. These scores reflected that only some of the respondents were willing to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation. The item “I will donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation” had the highest mean score (M = 3.64, SD = 1.72) and the item “I am determined to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation” had the lowest mean score (M = 3.42, SD = 1.77) among three subscales for donors intention to donate.

**Hypotheses Testing**

To test the hypotheses, regression analysis was employed. Regression analysis was used first to test the relationship between independent variables (i.e., identification with an athlete, athlete image, personal involvement, and trust toward the athlete) and dependent variable (i.e.,
intention to donate), and then to test the mediating role of trust on the relationship between athlete-related factors and intention to donate by following Baron and Kenny’s (1986) guideline with Sobel’s (1982) test as a post hoc analysis. Finally, a moderated regression analysis was used to test the moderating effect of personal involvement on the relationship between athlete-related factors and trust toward the athlete.

**Regression Analysis**

The regression analysis results are presented in Table 4-8. The results revealed significant influences of identification with an athlete ($\beta = .41, p < .05$), athlete image ($\beta = .36, p < .05$), personal involvement ($\beta = .55, p < .05$), and trust toward the athlete ($\beta = .40, p < .05$) on intention to donate. Hypothesis 1 predicted that identification with an athlete will positively influence the donors’ level of trust toward the athlete. The results indicated that identification with an athlete had a significant influence on trust toward the athlete ($\beta = .87, p < .05$), supporting hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 2 predicted that athlete image will positively influence the donors’ level of trust toward the athlete. The results also showed that the influence of athlete image on trust toward the athlete was significant ($\beta = .88, p < .05$), supporting hypothesis 2. Hypothesis 4 predicted that the donors’ level of trust toward the athlete will positively influence donor behavior (i.e., intention to donate). Hypothesis 4 was supported by regression analysis as well ($\beta = .40, p < .05$; Tables 4-8 and 4-9).

**Mediation Analysis**

As noted earlier, to test the mediating role of trust toward the athlete on the relationship between athlete-related factors and intention to donate, the researcher followed Baron and Kenny’s (1986) guideline with using Sobel’s (1982) test as a post hoc analysis. Hypothesis 5 predicted that the donors’ level of trust toward the athlete would mediate the relationship between athlete-related factors and donor behavior. To test mediation, three-step regression
analysis was conducted two times. The first three-step test was conducted to find the mediating role of trust on the relationship between identification with an athlete and intention to donate.

The first step showed that the influence of identification with an athlete on trust toward the athlete was significant ($\beta = .87, p < .05$), as it was on intention to donate ($\beta = .41, p < .05$). The second step showed that trust toward the athlete had a significant influence on intention to donate ($\beta = .40, p < .05$). The third step indicated that when trust toward the athlete was controlled, the influence of identification with an athlete on intention to donate was significant ($\beta = .24, p < .05$) but less significant than the relationship between identification with an athlete and intention to donate. In other words, although the influence of identification with an athlete was not completely negated, it was significantly reduced. Thus, trust toward the athlete partially mediates the relationship between identification with an athlete and intention to donate (Figure 4-1).

The second mediation test of trust for the relationship between athlete image and intention to donate was as follows: (1) the first step showed that the influence of athlete image on trust toward the athlete ($\beta = .88, p < .05$) and on intention to donate ($\beta = .36, p < .05$) was significant; (2) the second step indicated that trust toward the athlete was significantly related to intention to donate ($\beta = .40, p < .05$); and (3) the third step revealed that when trust toward the athlete was controlled, the influence of athlete image on intention to donate was not significant ($\beta = .04, p > .05$). Therefore, trust toward the athlete mediates the relationship between the athlete’s image and intention to donate (Figure 4-2).

**Moderation Analysis**

To test hypotheses 3a and 3b, moderated regression analysis was conducted to find the moderating effect of personal involvement on the relationship between athlete-related factors and trust toward the athlete. Since a moderator is a kind of interacting variable, a variable serves as a moderator if the results of analysis are satisfied in the following order: (1) the controls should be
entered in the first step (excluded because of non existence of controls); (2) the first-order effects (i.e., identification with an athlete or athlete image with personal involvement) should be entered in the second step; and (3) the interaction term (i.e., identification with an athlete × personal involvement or athlete image × personal involvement) should be entered in the final step. To reduce the threat of multicollinearity, the independent variables and subsequent interaction term should be centered (Aiken & West, 1991). According to Aiken and West (1991), the interaction is supported if the final step is significant.

The first moderated regression analysis was employed to find the moderating effect of personal involvement on the relationship between identification with an athlete and trust toward the athlete. Following the guideline of Aiken and West (1991), identification with an athlete and personal involvement were entered together in the first step; and the interaction of identification with an athlete × personal involvement was entered in the second step. The results showed that the influence of identification with an athlete × personal involvement on trust toward the athlete was significant ($\beta = -.35, p < .05$). Therefore, personal involvement moderates the relationship between identification with an athlete and trust toward the athlete.

The second moderated regression analysis was conducted to find the moderating effect of personal involvement on the relationship between athlete image and trust toward the athlete. The analysis also followed Aiken and West’s (1991) guideline. The results indicated that the influence of the athlete’s image × personal involvement on trust toward the athlete was not significant ($\beta = .01, p > .05$). Thus, there was no moderating effect of personal involvement on the relationship between athlete image and trust toward the athlete. The results of the moderating effect of trust indicate that highly involved people with a high level of identification with the athlete tend to have a strong level of trust toward the athlete compared to less involved people.
with a low level of identification with the athlete. The results of the two moderated regression analyses are presented in Tables 4-10 and 4-11.
Table 4-1. Correlation matrix for main study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>.833**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.866**</td>
<td>.881**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.623**</td>
<td>.602**</td>
<td>.633**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>.406**</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.551**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 4-2. Summary result for reliability assessments (Cronbach’s Alpha & AVE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>λ</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>I identify with (athlete)</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I consider myself a fan of (athlete)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I consider myself a fan of (athlete)</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>I have always had a good impression of (athlete)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my opinion, (athlete) has a good image in the minds of people</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe that (athlete) has a better image than other athletes</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Unimportant/Important</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Boring/Interesting</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unexciting/Exciting</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means nothing/Means a lot to me</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unappealing/Appealing</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mundane/Fascinating</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthless/Valuable</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uninvolving/Involving</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not needed/Needed</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Dwight Howard is an athlete that stands by his word</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can rely on Dwight Howard to keep the promises he makes to his fans</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwight Howard is a sincere person</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to</td>
<td>I will donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate</td>
<td>I intend to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am determined to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-3. Descriptive statistics for the demographic variables (n = 305)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49-58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59-68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>Less than $25K</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25K ~ $50K</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50K ~ $75K</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$75K ~ $100K</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100K ~ $150K</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than $150K</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-3. Descriptive statistics for the demographic variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional/graduate degree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience (2010)</td>
<td>Less than $100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100 ~ $300</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$300 ~ $500</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$500 ~ $700</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$700 ~ $1000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than $1000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate to other non-profit organization</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-4. Descriptive statistics for athlete-related factors (n = 305)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification with an athlete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I identify with Dwight Howard</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself a fan of Dwight Howard</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself a fan of Dwight Howard</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have always had a good impression of Dwight Howard</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion, Dwight Howard has a good image in the minds of people</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that Dwight Howard has a better image than other athletes</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-5. Descriptive statistics for personal involvement (n = 305)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant/Important</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring/Interesting</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexciting/Exciting</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means nothing/Means a lot to me</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappealing/Appealing</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundane/Fascinating</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless/Valuable</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninvolving/Involving</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not needed/Needed</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors and items</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust toward an athlete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Howard is an athlete that stands by his word</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can rely on Dwight Howard to keep the promises he makes to his fans</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Howard is a sincere person</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-7. Descriptive statistics for intention to donate (n = 305)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to donate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am determined to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-8. Summary result for regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification with an athlete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>59.905</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>45.193</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust toward the athlete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>57.584</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>132.113</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: Intention to donate

Note. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05
Table 4-9. Summary result for regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification with an athlete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>909.493</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>1048.624</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: Trust toward the athlete

Note. *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$
Table 4-10. Summary result for moderated regression analysis testing the effect of personal involvement on the relationship between identification with an athlete and trust toward the athlete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>490.078</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with an athlete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>21.591</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>4.291</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>7.145</td>
<td>.008**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with an athlete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>11.951</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>4.408</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID $\times$ PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>-2.673</td>
<td>.008**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent variable: Intention to donate
Note. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05
Table 4-11. Summary result for moderated regression analysis testing the effect of personal involvement on the relationship between athlete image and trust toward the athlete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>576.907</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>23.879</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>4.935</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>10.785</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMG $\times$ PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent variable: Intention to donate
Note. *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$
Figure 4-1. Results of the test for mediation on the relationship between identification and intention to donate

Note. ** p < .05
Note. A Decrease in the boldness of the lines denotes a change in significance.
Figure 4-2. Results of the test for mediation on the relationship between image and intention to donate

Note. ** p < .05
Note. A Decrease in the boldness of the lines denotes a change in significance.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This chapter begins with discussion and interpretation of the data analyses conducted for the current study. The general aim of this study was to expand awareness and knowledge of donor behavior in the sport industry by analyzing several critical factors, which include identification with an athlete, the athlete’s image, personal involvement, and trust toward the athlete. Particularly, the primary purpose of this study was to explore how identification with an athlete and the athlete’s image influences the level of trust toward the athlete, which in turn affects donor behavior, and the moderating role of personal involvement in such relationships.

To find those relationships, the conceptual framework was developed based on previous research findings on donor behavior in various literatures. This chapter consists of six sections: (1) instrumentations, (2) descriptive findings, (3) hypotheses testing, (4) implications, (5) limitations and future research, and (6) conclusion.

Although many valuable donor behavior studies have been conducted (e.g., Billing et al. 1985; Mahony et al., 2003), limited research has been conducted to find the impact of an athlete on donors’ attitudes, perceptions, and behavior compared to other contexts such as consumer behavior or advertising. High level of identification with an athlete and positive image of an athlete are shown to have significant influences on people’s attitudes and behavioral intentions (e.g., Fink et al., 2002; Carlson & Donavan, 2008; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Flavian et al., 2005). Additionally, personal involvement and trust have a positive impact on an individual’s perception, attitude, and behavior (e.g., Zaichkowsky, 1985; Bennett, 2003; Waters, 2008).

Instrumentations

For inter-item reliability assessments of five instrumentations, Cronbach’s alpha was employed. In this analysis, the data were found to be normal, independent, and properly
distributed. Inter-item reliability of the instrumentations used in this study was very consistent with previous research. For example, in terms of identification with an athlete, we used one of the seven subscales in the PAI. The results of the current study and previous studies (e.g., Trail et al., 2003; Robinson et al., 2004) showed that Cronbach’s alpha scores of each item was greater than the suggested cut-off value of .80 for internal consistency. Other scales used in this study (i.e., athlete image, personal involvement, trust toward the athlete, and intention to donate) also were found to have greater value of Cronbach’s alpha than the suggested .80 cut-off value. In other words, the instruments used in this study proved reliable and could add contributing evidence to support using those scales in future research.

**Descriptive findings**

Overall, the examination of athlete-related factors (i.e., identification with an athlete and athlete image) shows general positivity in potential donors’ level of trust toward the athlete, and the donors’ level of trust also is related positively to people’s intention to donate. While previous donor behavior studies focused primarily on donors’ motivation in college athletics, higher education, or religion, this study took a different approach by examining the effect of an athlete on donor behavior. For example, previous research on athletic donor motivation focused only on those who make contributions to a college based on several key motives (e.g., Billing et al., 1985; Staurowsky et al., 1996; Verner et al., 1998). This study, however, focused on antecedents of donor behavior, especially in professional sport settings by finding the influence of athletes on donor behavior.

Additionally, we emphasized the important issue of how the donors’ level of trust toward an athlete influences their giving behavior when the athletes are involved in promoting donors’ philanthropic behavior. Since trust plays significant role in both interpersonal and interorganizational relationships (e.g. Crosby & Stephens, 1987; Crosby et al., 1990; Garbarino
& Johnson, 1999; Gwinner et al., 1998), donors’ level of trust would be critical elements in donor behavior dynamics when athletes are related to donation. Lastly, as previous research findings suggested (e.g., Tsiotsou, 1998, 2004; Webb, 1989; Bennett, 2009), personal involvement was associated positively with people’s intention to donate to a nonprofit organization represented by a professional athlete.

**Hypotheses Testing**

Seeing that numerous professional athletes are actively involved with charitable giving and helping others who need their support, athletes are among the most important factors in people’s decisions to make philanthropic moves. The results of the current study showed that athlete-related factors positively affected people’s intention to donate. People who are highly identified with an athlete were more likely to make contributions to his/her non-profit organization. The results of the study are consistent with previous studies that people with strong identification with an athlete or a sport team were more likely to show positive behavior outcomes, such as attending more games, paying more for tickets, or spending more money on team merchandise (Fink et al., 2002), or more likely to support the team (Kwon et al., 2008). Moreover, if people perceive the athlete’s image more positively and favorably, they were willing to donate their money to the organization. This result supported the previous image-related studies which revealed that an athlete’s image has a positive influence on increased awareness of the product or brand, improved product or brand image, and consumers’ purchase intention (e.g., Jowdy & McDonald, 2002; Fink et al., 2004; Carlson & Donavan, 2008).

In addition, people who had a high level of trust toward the athlete and/or were highly involved with the athlete’s foundation were more likely to donate to the organization. For example, if people believe that the athlete is trustworthy or they have some kind of association with the athlete’s non-profit organization, they will be more likely to donate their time or money.
This finding also supported the previous research of Bruce (1998) and Nichols (1991). They found that individuals who suffer from disease or are related to those who are suffering will be likely to donate more than those who have no such association.

In this study, one of the major findings is that people’s level of trust toward the athlete mediates the relationship between athlete-related factors and intention to donate. That is, people with a high level of identification with the athlete tend to have a high level of trust toward the athlete and, in turn, are more likely to participate in a donation program represented by the athlete. Further, if people perceive the image of the athlete favorably, they are more likely to have higher level of trust toward the athlete, which ultimately affects their intention to donate to his/her non-profit organization. Previous donor behavior studies regarding the donors’ trust level indicated that people who have a high level of trust tend to donate more money to charitable causes (Bekkers, 2003) and make large contributions to fund-raising organizations (Waters, 2008). In line with those findings, the results of the current study provide additional support for previous findings. In other words, people’s level of trust plays as an important role when people are planning to donate their money to a non-profit organization, especially to the foundation initiated or supported by a professional athlete to whom they feel strong attachment.

Consistent with suggestions in the personal involvement literature (e.g., Grau & Folse, 2007; Blakeley, 1974; Webb, 1989; Tsiotsou, 1998, 2004), two athlete-related factors (i.e., identification with an athlete and athlete image) were used to examine the moderating effect of personal involvement on people’s level of trust toward the athlete. Analysis of the moderating effect of personal involvement shows interesting results. While identification with an athlete has a strong and meaningful association, there is a statistically significant increase in trust toward the athlete as personal involvement increased. This may indicate that the level of identification with
the athlete increased the level of trust toward the athlete as the potential donors’ level of personal involvement increased. In other words, individuals who have strong attachment to the athlete seem more likely to trust the athlete than those who have low involvement with weak attachment when they have some kind of associations with the non-profit organization. However, individuals with low identification with the athlete may be more influenced by their level of personal involvement to feel trustworthiness toward the athlete than those with a high level of identification.

**Implications**

The results of this study produce several important implications for both academia and practitioners. For academicians, this research contributes toward enhancing and expanding the general knowledge of donor behavior in the sport context. As noted earlier, previous studies overlooked the influence of a professional athlete on donor behavior and the important issue of donors’ level of trust when people are planning to participate in charitable giving. While numerous researchers tried to find the motives for charitable giving in college athletics and higher education, this study focused on the antecedents of donor behavior in professional sport setting. The results from the conceptual framework suggest that identification with an athlete, athlete image, and trust toward the athlete can be viewed as important factors when people consider donating their money to charitable causes of their interests. Furthermore, by showing the mediating role of trust when a professional athlete is involved in donations, the current study strongly suggests developing a comprehensive research plan for donor behavior studies. Lastly, by uncovering a statistically significant moderating effect of personal involvement on athlete-trust outcome, this study supports the possibility of developing cross-pollinated research designs with constructs used in sport management literature to better understand dynamics in the sport industry.
Regarding practitioners, this study also is notable for several reasons. First, organizational managers should consider choosing an appropriate professional athlete before initiating a new non-profit organization because people who feel strong attachment to the athlete will be more likely to donate their time and money. Further, the positive and favorable image of the athlete will influence people’s intention to donate. Second, making people feel the athlete is trustworthy should be considered as a strategic investment for organizational managers. When people feel strong level of trust toward a professional athlete, they will be more likely to participate in the charitable giving programs. Additionally, managers should aware that while image of an athlete can be fluctuate relatively in short period of time, people’s level of trust toward the athlete take relatively a long period of time to be built. Therefore, managers should consider building a positive image of an athlete first, and maintain that positive image for people to feel the athlete is trustworthy in order to foster frequency and amount of donors’ contributions. Lastly, organizational managers should develop and initiate appropriate philanthropic programs by considering people’s interests and needs. People become interested in charitable giving not only because of the athlete’s community visibility and "high profile" stature, but also because they feel a community needs for the philanthropic program or are highly related to the philanthropic cause. In short, practitioners should identify factors that influence donor behavior and understand donor motivations in order to raise more money and promote further donations. Turning for advice to academic experts and paying attention to rich literature on donor behavior would be essential starting points to determine effective strategies.

**Limitation and Future Research**

The following limitations should be considered for this study: (1) the only one athlete (i.e., Dwight Howard, the Orlando Magic professional basketball player) and one non-profit organization (i.e., the Dwight Howard Foundation) was selected to assess the proposed
conceptual framework of the current study. With this in mind, the potential donors’ intention to
donate may differ from other organizations represented by other professional athletes; (2) this
study measured people’s intention to donate. While people say they intend to donate to their
cause of interests, in reality, many do not; (3) although several trips were made to collect data from
not only attendees on game days but also general citizens of Orlando on non-game days and off-
site, the current research model may differ from the situation in other cities and different non-
profit organizations represented by other athletes. Future studies should offer a clearer picture of
how people incorporate athlete-related factors into their potential and actual donor behavior.

The results of this study suggest that the athlete-related factors (i.e., identification with an
athlete and the athlete’s image) are positively related to people’s level of trust toward the athlete,
which may in turn affect their intention to donate. However, several ideas for future research
should be considered. Future research may provide better understanding of donor behavior
dynamics, especially in professional sport. Because many professional athletes are actively
involved with philanthropic programs for a cause of their interest, the gender or ethnicity of the
athletes, or what sport they play may influence people’s level of attachment and perceived image
of the athletes. Other motives for people’s donations to nonprofit organizations also should be
considered in future studies. People may donate not because they identify with the athlete, the
athlete’s positive image, or trustworthiness of the athlete, but for such reasons as peer pressure,
community development, or previous experiences. Finally, future research needs to pay attention
to the qualitative aspects of donor behavior. To fully understand why people donate their time
and money to their cause of interests, qualitative research (e.g., in-depth interview) in this area
needs to be done.
Conclusion

The current results indicate that when people perceive a professional athlete as trustworthy and feel strong attachment to him/her because they regard his/her image positively, they are more likely to donate their time and money to a cause of interest. The findings also indicate that individuals who are highly involved with a certain cause of interest are more likely to make philanthropic moves. Therefore, this study suggests that in order to raise more money and promote people’s future donations, researchers and sport industry practitioners should explore more fully the proposed framework in this study and develop better precise fund-raising strategies for their charity programs.
Dear Participants:

I am a master’s student in the sport management program at the University of Florida. As part of my scholarly work, I am conducting a study to explore how identification with the athlete, the athlete’s image, and personal involvement will influence the level of trust toward the athlete which may ultimately affect the donor behavior. This survey is about your perception and expectation toward your donation and donor behavior for charity programs represented by a professional athlete.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. There are no physical and psychological risks associated with participating in completing this questionnaire. However, you may refuse to answer certain questions or discontinue your participation at any time without penalty. Participants will not receive any benefits by participating in this survey. There is no compensation for participating in this study.

Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your responses will be anonymous and there will be no identifying markers that will link you to the questionnaire you complete. The data will be reported statistical information. I am grateful for your time and deeply appreciated your assistance with this study.

If you have any questions about this research protocol, please contact me at Minhong Kim (619-957-9980; e-mail: minong9980@ufl.edu). Questions or concerns about your rights as research participant may be directed to the UFIRB office, University of Florida, Box 112250, Gainesville, FL 32611, (352) 392-0433.

I have read the procedure described above for the study. I voluntarily agree to participate in the study and I have received a copy of this description.

Participants: ______________________  Date: ______________________
Principal Investigator: __Minhong Kim___  Date: ________________
The Dwight D. Howard Foundation

The Dwight D. Howard Foundation, Inc. is proactive in working with youths to encourage a desire for excellence in every aspect of their lives. It is a faith-based organization reaching out to strengthen family relationships by providing a family base to assist youths with everyday life issues and how to transition through them.

PART I: Please circle the number that best represents how strongly you disagree or agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I identify with Dwight Howard.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have always had a good impression of Dwight Howard.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dwight Howard is an athlete that stands by his word.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In my opinion, Dwight Howard has a good image in the minds of people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am a big fan of Dwight Howard.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I can rely on Dwight Howard to keep the promises he makes to his fans.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I consider myself a fan of Dwight Howard.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dwight Howard is a sincere person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I believe that Dwight Howard has a better image than other athletes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To me, the Dwight Howard Foundation is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexciting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means nothing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Means a lot to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappealing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Appealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fascinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninvolving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Involving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direction: If you are currently donating to the Dwight Howard Foundation, please answer PART II. If you are not, please answer PART III.

PART II: Please circle the number that best represents how strongly you disagree or agree with the following statements.

1. I will donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation continuously.  
   | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
2. I intend to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation continuously.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
3. I am determined to keep donating to the Dwight Howard Foundation.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |

PART III: Please circle the number that best represents how strongly you disagree or agree with the following statements.

1. I will donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
2. I intend to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
3. I am determined to donate to the Dwight Howard Foundation.  
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | |
PART IV: Please respond to the following questions by printing in the space.

Your Age: ___________ years old

Gender:  
  a. Male  ☐  
  b. Female ☐

Ethnicity:  
  a. Caucasian ☐  
  b. African-American ☐  
  c. Hispanic ☐  
  d. Asian/Pacific Islander ☐
  e. Other ___________ ☐

Marital Status:  
  a. Single ☐  
  b. Married ☐

Household Income: (Annual)  
  a. Less than $25K ☐  
  b. $25K ~ $50K ☐  
  c. $50K ~ $75K ☐  
  d. $75K ~ $100K ☐  
  e. $100K ~ $150K ☐  
  f. More than $150K ☐

Highest Level of Education  
  a. High school ☐  
  b. Some college ☐  
  c. College degree ☐  
  d. Some graduate school ☐  
  e. Professional/graduate degree ☐
  f. Other ___________ ☐

How much did you donated in 2010?  
  a. Less than $100 ☐  
  b. $100 ~ $300 ☐  
  c. $300 ~ $500 ☐  
  d. $500 ~ $700 ☐  
  e. $700 ~ $1000 ☐  
  f. More than $1000 ☐

If you are currently donating to the Dwight Howard Foundation, how long have you been donated to this organization/foundation?  
  a. Less than 1 year ☐  
  b. 1 ~ 2 years ☐  
  c. 2 ~ 3 years ☐  
  d. 3 ~ 4 years ☐  
  e. 4 ~ 5 years ☐  
  f. More than 5 years ☐

Do you also donate to other organizations?  
  a. Yes ☐  
  b. No ☐

Thank you for your participation!!
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