

Fundraising Through Running Events

-

“How do Public Benefit Institutions raise funds through running events and why are there differences in ‘success’?”

Twente University

Master thesis Public Administration

Track: Public Management

By: Ties Obers - s1245082 – tiesobers@gmail.com

Supervisors:

Dr. Pieter-Jan Klok

Prof. dr. Hans de Groot

Final Version

03-07-2013

Nederlandse Samenvatting – Dutch Summary

In deze masterthesis is onderzocht ‘Hoe werven ‘Algemeen Nut Beogende Instellingen’ fondsen door middel van hardloopevenementen en waarom zijn er verschillen in ‘succes’?’.

In de huidige bestuurskunde is een verschuiving zichtbaar dat (semi) publieke diensten niet alleen door de staat of markt geleverd worden, maar ook door de zogenaamde ‘derde sector’ of ‘civil society’. Dit uit zich bijvoorbeeld in het regeringsprogramma ‘Van burgerparticipatie naar overheidsparticipatie’ (Rijksoverheid, 2011), waarin burgers gestimuleerd worden om zelf verantwoordelijkheid te nemen voor problemen in hun gemeenschap. Dit kan bijvoorbeeld door een bepaald ‘goed doel’ financieel te steunen. Deze ‘goede doelen’ leveren (semi) publieke diensten die de overheid niet kan of wil leveren en waarbij men het niet wenselijk acht dat ze met winstbejag op de markt geleverd worden. De belastingdienst duidt deze goede doelen als Algemeen Nut Beogende Instelling (ANBI) aan.

De ANBI’s zijn bij het behalen van hun doelen vaak afhankelijk van inkomsten uit vrijwillige donaties. Als er meer publieke diensten geleverd gaan worden door de ‘derde sector’ kan dit betekenen dat er meer ANBI’s ontstaan en zij meer donaties moeten zien binnen te halen.

Een interessant fenomeen hierin is het fondsenwerven via (o.a. hardloop) evenementen. De deelnemer van een evenement besluit (of is vereist) de activiteit te koppelen aan een fondsenwervende inspanning voor een ANBI. Dit maakt een onderzoek naar hoe de ANBI’s fondsenwerven via hardloopevenementen interessant. Meer kennis over het onderwerp en enige ‘succes’ verklarende factoren kan leiden tot meer geworven fondsen en tot meer geleverde (semi) publieke diensten.

Dit onderzoek is opgebouwd uit twee delen. Het eerste deel is een contentanalyse van de websites van hardloopevenementen (N=14) en ANBI’s (N=53) met als doel te beschrijven hoe deze verschillende partijen het fondsenwerven via hardloopevenementen vorm geven. Het tweede deel bestaat uit een serie semi-gestructureerde interviews (N=11) met mensen die verantwoordelijk waren voor het fondsenwerven via hardloopevenementen voor een ANBI. Het doel van dit deel was een verdere beschrijving en het testen van hypothesen gevormd uit het theoretisch kader en de resultaten van de contentanalyse.

ANBI’s worden doorgaans op drie manieren betrokken bij hardloopevenementen: 1) ze zijn ‘het’ goede doel van een bestaand evenement, ook wel voorkeurs-ANBI genoemd en krijgen een klein bedrag per deelnemer. 2) Ze nemen deel aan een bestaand evenement, door startbewijzen te kopen en te verkopen tegen speciale voorwaarden (bijvoorbeeld: een fondsenwervingsinspanning). 3) De ANBI organiseert zelf een evenement.

‘Succes’ uit zich uiteindelijk in een zo hoog mogelijke netto opbrengst en is opgebouwd uit: 1) het aantal deelnemers, 2) keer het gemiddelde bedrag opgehaald per deelnemer, 3) min de gemaakte kosten.

Verschillen in hoe ANBI’s fondsenwerven door hardloopevenementen kunnen verschillen in success verklaren. Zo lijkt het dat ANBI’s die hogere minimum bedragen vragen, meer fondsenwerven. ANBI’s die naast een minimum bedrag aan fondsenwerving ook om kostendekking vragen en/of om voorschotten en machtigingen vragen, lijken minder kosten te hebben. ANBI’s die

meedoen aan evenementen die uitverkocht zijn, lijken het makkelijker te hebben om deelnemers te werven, aangezien deze uit schaarste bij de ANBI uitkomen. ANBI's die hun deelnemers op verschillende manieren faciliteren, bijvoorbeeld met een online fondsenwervingsplatform of contactmomenten, lijken meer fondsen te werven. ANBI's die goed gebruik maken van hun netwerk (groot, sterk en vernieuwend) lijken meer fondsen te werven.

Evenement deelnemers hebben verschillende motivaties, die onder te verdelen zijn in evenement motivatie en fondsenwerving motivatie. Evenement motivatie lijkt erg belangrijk te zijn in de keuze om aan een bepaald evenement tegen een bepaalde prijs mee te doen. Als men daarbij een hogere fondsenwerving motivatie heeft lijkt men meer fondsen te werven.

De bovenstaande factoren dragen allen bij tot 'succes'. Een vast recept is echter niet voorhanden, en elke ANBI zal andere keuzes moeten maken om tot een ideale mix van ingrediënten te komen.

Summary

In this master thesis, it has been researched *“How do Public Benefit Institutions raise funds through running events and why are there differences in ‘success’?”*

In current public administration, a transformation can be seen that public services are not only supplied by the state or the market, but also by the so called ‘third sector’ or ‘civil society’. This shows, for example, in the government program ‘from citizen participation to government participation’ (Rijksoverheid, 2011), where civilians are stimulated to take responsibility for their own community. This can be done, for example, by supporting a ‘charity organization’ with money. These charity organizations supply (semi) public services the government cannot or will not supply, and which are not regarded suitable to be delivered on the market. These charity organizations, amongst others, are indicated by the Dutch tax authority as ‘Public Benefit Institution’ (PBI), and receive certain tax advantages. For achieving their higher goals, PBIs are often dependent on funds from voluntary donations. If there would be more services supplied by the ‘third sector’, this could imply to create more PBIs, who need to raise more funds.

An interesting phenomenon in this sense is fundraising through (running) events. The participant of an event decides, or is required, to connect the event to a fundraising effort for the PBI. This makes a research on how PBIs raise funds through running events relevant. More knowledge on this matter and some ‘success’ explaining factors could lead to more funds raised and more public services delivered.

This research is designed in two parts. The first part contains a content analysis of PBIs’ (N=53) and running events’ (N=14) websites, with the goal of describing how these different actors shape fundraising through running events. The second part consisted of a series of semi-structured interviews (N=11) with people who were responsible for the fundraising through running events for a certain PBI. The goal of this part was to further describe and test some hypotheses formed out of the theoretical framework and results of the content analysis.

PBIs are usually involved with running events in three methods; 1) They are the ‘preferred PBI’ of an existing event, and receive a small amount per participant. 2) They participate at an existing event, by buying starting tickets which they resell under special condition (like a fundraising effort). 3) The PBI organizes an event by itself.

‘Success’ eventually results in an as high as possible net amount raised, which is built out of: 1) the amount of participants, 2) times the mean amount raised per participant, 3) minus all costs made.

Differences in how PBIs raise funds through running events can explain differences in ‘success’. It seems that PBIs that ask higher minimum amounts to be raised, raise more funds. PBIs that ask their participants to cover costs next to asking a minimum amount to be raised and/or ask for down payments or direct debit authorizations, seem to have fewer costs. PBIs that participate at events that are sold out seem to recruit participants easier, due to scarcity. PBIs that facilitate their participants on various ways, for example with an online fundraising platform or contact moments, seem to raise more funds. PBIs that make proper use of their network (large, strong en renewing), seem to raise more funds.

Event participants have different motivations, that can be categorized in event motivation and fundraising motivation. Event motivation seems to be important to participate at a certain event for a certain price. Those with a higher fundraising motivation seem to raise more funds.

The factors above all contribute to 'success'. A set recipe is not available though, and every PBI shall need to make different choices to come to an ideal mix of ingredients.

Preface

“Exerting yourself to the fullest within your individual limits: that’s the essence of running, and a metaphor for life.” Haruki Murakami

The quote above comprises much of the motivations I have had in order to come to this thesis. At a certain moment in 2009 I realized that I was not exerting myself at all and I was not even close to my individual limits. I decided to make a change, to find out where my limits would be. The path I ran upon eventually led to the University of Twente, and the Public Administration master program. Finishing feels like a small victory, I feel I have accomplished my goals. It is something to celebrate. Still I do not have the feeling that I have reached my limits, and I am therefore looking forward to a new race.

The quote above is rather individualistic. And in a metaphor of life, a sense of community must not be forgotten. I feel it is the sense of community that makes people run for charity. It entails individuals exerting themselves to their fullest, in order to enable other to do the same. People run for charity to cure illnesses, to ensure basic needs for those in help.

With this thesis I have exerted myself to the fullest within my individual limits, hoping to enable more funds to be raised through running events, to enable more people to exert themselves to the fullest.

As much as I would like to support others, I am grateful for my supporting community. Thanks for everybody who has enabled me to finish this thesis; Saar Mooij, Frans Obers, Jacintha Obers, Giel Obers, Martijn Beukhof, Sjaak Drieënzig, Noortje van ‘t Klooster, Pieter-Jan Klok, Hans de Groot, all my other friends and family, and those who have consented to an interview.

Content

1. Introduction	p. 8
2. Research Design	p. 9
3. Limitations	p. 10
4. Conceptual Framework	p. 11
5. Theoretical Framework	p. 13
6. Study I	
6.1 Goals	p. 16
6.2 Methods	p. 16
6.3 Results	p. 18
7. Study II	
7.1 Goals	p. 28
7.2 Hypotheses	p. 28
7.3 Methods	p. 30
8. Analysis	p. 32
8.1 Hypotheses	p. 32
8.2 Overall conclusions	p. 44
8.3 Other results	p. 45
9. Discussion	p. 47
10. References	p. 50

Appendixes:

I. Overview Events and PBIs	p. 56
II. Summary Interview Le Champion	p. 70
III. Data Sharing	p. 72

1. Introduction

You are looking at a Public Management master thesis, titled: ‘Fundraising Through Running Events - *“How do Public Benefit Institutions raise funds through running events and why are there differences in ‘success’?”*’. The thesis dives into the phenomenon of running for charity, and researches how ‘public benefit institutions’ (PBIs) organize themselves in raising funds at running events.

PBIs supply (semi) public goods and services, but are not under direct control of the state. They therefore balance between the public-private sphere, and can be considered the main actors in civil society. A thriving civil society is, according to Putnam (1995) needed for civic trust and civic engagement.

The latter is a focus point for the Dutch government in the recent years. As an example the program ‘from civic participation to governmental participation’ (van burgerparticipatie naar overheidsparticipatie) entails a shift from the government taking initiatives, to citizens taking initiatives (Rijksoverheid, 2011). This would imply more public services to be delivered by PBIs.

For most of the (semi) public goods supplied by PBIs there is no direct compensation. PBIs cannot raise taxes as governments can, they depend for their funding on other parties such as charitable givers, company sponsors, and government subsidies and have to be creative to generate enough funds to achieve their goals. A recent phenomenon in this sense is raising funds through running events, where PBIs organize, participate or are linked to running events in order to raise funds.

This research aims at creating a larger understanding of this phenomenon in order for PBIs to raise more funds to deliver their public services. The research has a two study design. First a content analysis of running events’ and PBIs’ websites in order to get an initial description of the phenomenon and form hypotheses corresponding with the theoretical framework. Then a set (n=11) of semi-structured interviews with PBIs’ representatives to further and deeper describe the phenomenon and test the earlier formed hypotheses. There are three main actors at play in this phenomenon; the event organization, the PBI and the event participant. In the scope of the master Public Management, the choice was made to concentrate on the former two, institutionalized actors as units of observation, even though the latter might host more factors in explaining ‘success’. ‘Success’ in this respect leads to the higher goal of raising as much funds as possible and can be built by goals as ‘number of participants’, ‘amount raised per event participant’, and ‘time and cost efficiency’.

A summary has been provided right before this introduction in both English as Dutch and gives a glimpse on the research design, literature framework, study results and conclusions. For those more interested, an elaboration on the overall research design (Chapter 2.) and its limitations (Chapter 3.) has been prepared, followed by the conceptual (Chapter 4.) and theoretical framework (Chapter 5.). After this, these two studies (Chapters 6. And 7.), their goals, their methods and their results are discussed followed by testing hypotheses in the analysis section (Chapter 8.) and a discussion (Chapter 9.) on the implications of the results.

2. Design

The goal of this research is to describe a phenomenon; ‘PBIs raising funds through running events’ and to explain why there are differences in ‘success’ within this phenomenon. Hence the main research question is:

“How do Public Benefit Institutions raise funds through running events and why are there differences in ‘success’?”

To answer this question the research design comprises a theoretical framework and two studies of data gathering and analyzing.

The theoretical framework will first conceptualize the main concepts of the research question (PBIs, fundraising, running events and success), then will elaborate on the scope of this thesis within the Public Management master course, and will finally incorporate existing and possibly relevant literature regarding the research topic.

The first data gathering study (further named ‘Study I’) entails a content analysis of both running events’ as PBIs’ websites. The goal of Study I is to get an initial understanding of how running events facilitate PBIs to raise funds at their events, how PBIs organizes their fundraising accordingly and to form some preliminary hypotheses based on the results and theoretical framework.

The sample of events (n=14) is purpose sampled with the goal of maximum variation regarding size, running distance, location and possible peculiarities.

The sample of PBIs (n=53) consists for a larger part of PBIs that participated at the 2012 Dam tot Damloop (further also shortened to ‘Damloop’). This event is the largest running event in The Netherlands and has the highest amount of participating PBIs which makes it an excellent opportunity to compare the PBIs’ fundraising approaches and results. The sample is completed with a few PBIs that do raise funds at running events, but did not participate at the Dam tot Damloop 2012. The data gathered are of both qualitative and quantitative nature. Further elaboration on the methods and samples used can be found in the respective chapter.

The second data gathering study (further named ‘Study II’) comprises a set (n=11) of semi-structured interviews with PBI representatives responsible for fundraising at running events and an interview with a representative of the Dam tot Damloop organization. The goal of Study II is to further describe how PBIs raise funds at running events and to test the preliminary hypotheses formed after Study I. The sample of PBIs is selected towards maximum variation in order to get a deeper understanding of differences and the reasons behind these. The data gathered are mostly qualitative although quantitative data missing in Study I can be added as well. Further elaboration on the methods and samples used can be found in the respective chapter.

The final analysis consists of the results of both Study I and II, and will then be used for reflection on the existing theory, proposals for further research and recommendations for professionals in the discussion.

3. Limitations

This study has various limitations which should be accounted for when using it. The limitations can be found in the research design and methods used, as well as in the execution of the research.

The research design entails two studies, which can cause researcher bias, as the researcher might be influenced by the results of the first study while retrieving and/or analyzing data of the second study. In this case, it could be that possible important factors explaining 'success' could be ignored in Study II, as they did not appear in Study I.

This also implies that when mistakes are made in Study I, it could directly influence the results of Study II.

The research design is focused towards a measurement based on the 2012 Dam tot Damloop. There are only a few PBIs added to this larger sample of Dam tot Damloop participants. The generalizability of the results to the level of all PBIs in The Netherlands can therefore be questioned. Generalization across borders must be questioned as well, as there can be cultural factors, for example, that influences the results.

The research design is a mix of unobtrusive (Study I) and obtrusive (Study II) research. A limitation of unobtrusive research is of course the dependence of others' data. There are enough data variables that are not complete as not every PBI published complete information on their website. This missing data can be added for those PBIs that are interviewed, but that will still leave missing data due to the small N of the interviews. This could have been repaired by conducting a survey at the entire population, which was initially planned, but not executed due to time constraints.

In Study I, the gathered data has validity limitations. For instance, the 'amount of funds raised' variable, uses amounts as projected on PBIs websites, although it is not clear how these amounts are calculated. Are they net or brut amounts?, are they rounded?, estimated?, etc. This can be regarded as an instrumentation threat to internal validity. An example of lacking validity: the Dam tot Damloop website indicated that 49 PBIs would participate at the race, later it was discovered that only those PBIs with more than 5 teams were mentioned and that in reality, around 80 teams participated. Another threat to internal validity in Study I is selection: although the entire population of PBIs that participated at the Dam tot Damloop 2012 with more than 5 teams was analyzed, not all of them published all desired information on their websites. Maybe only those PBIs that are happy about their results published them, which would leave disappointing results out of the analysis.

The sampling in Study II is open to selection bias. Although the sampling was focused towards maximum variation, participation is voluntary and some PBIs declined participation. In this sense it could be that those who rejected participation have some knowledge they wish not to share, or that those who did participate have certain values that influences results.

The interviews themselves could be influenced by researcher bias: the researcher has participated at the Dam tot Damloop as a FREP himself which might influence him. Study I further influenced the researcher and can have caused him to conduct the interviews in a particular way. During the interviews there could have been a researcher effect where the researcher unconsciously influenced the answers of the respondent, for example by facial expressions or the way he asked questions.

As the respondents were asked rather than observed on how they managed the fund raising process, there could be a discrepancy between the theory-in-use and espoused theory (Argyris, 1976). Theory-in-use in this context is how they actually are managing the fundraising process and espoused theory is how they say they are managing the fundraising process.

A final limitation in this thesis is language, all data gathered was Dutch in its original form and has therefore been translated by the researcher for this thesis. In translation, some words might have lost their intentional meaning and/or might have gained unintentional meaning.

The limitations as described above were thoroughly examined by the researcher and were taken into account while executing the research. The conclusions, discussion and recommendations were formulated with consideration of the limitations and can therefore be used confidently.

4. Conceptual Framework

This research will investigate PBIs' performance on fundraising through running events. A conceptualization of PBIs, fundraising, running events and what is performance in this sense will be given first, then a further theoretical framework will be presented.

Public Benefit Institutions (Algemeen Nut Beogende Instellingen – ANBI)(PBI) are institutions that have received a special status by the Dutch Tax Authority, because their activities are considered to be of public interest (Belastingdienst, 2012). PBIs need to fulfill certain demands, like acting out of the public interest, being a non-profit organization, fulfilling certain integrity demands and having a decent balance between costs and spending. If they comply, these institutions receive a set of tax related benefits.

This group was chosen as it is already a pre-selected group of charities and foundations that serve the public interest in a proper way and are held accountable for some of their actions. The PBIs can be quite diverse in their nature, they can be religious related, charities focused on international development, foundations aiming to raise funds for healthcare related research etc.

Fundraising is the activities those PBIs execute in order to receive funds with which they can employ their core activities. In other words; the activities to generate input, in order to create outputs/outcomes. As such, the effort put into fundraising can be seen as input and the amount raised as output/outcome. There can therefore be efficiency and effectiveness on both activities (fundraising and core activities) and they are interrelated as effort put into fundraising cannot be spend on the core activities, the fundraising activities should therefore be executed efficiently in order to also generate efficiency and effectiveness on the core activities. This will be further discussed in the performance part.

Fundraising in this setting is not only the PBIs search for funds, but also the fundraising event participants' (FREPs) effort in participating (running) and raising funds. The FREP and the PBI therefore engage in a certain relationship.

Running events are organized events where people run a certain distance. These events differ in for example; location, price, number of participants, professionalism etc. For example, the 'Dam tot Damloop' is a running event from the city center of Amsterdam to the city center of Zaandam, costs € 21,- (for a normal participant, PBIs pay € 35,- per participant), has around 50.000 participants and has several professional athletes participating. In contrast, the 'Bommelasloop' is a smaller running event in a rural part of Enschede, costs € 5,- and has fewer than a thousand participants which are almost all local. Which running events will be used in this research will be further explained in the sampling methods part of Study I.

As mentioned before, fundraising can be seen as generating funds, in order to execute core activities. The PBIs' performance is likely to be seen through the execution of these core activities, but the fundraising performance has great influence on the execution of these core activities and can therefore be seen as important.

What will be researched is the performance in fundraising through running events, performance then, is a set of measurements. The ultimate performance is a high net amount of funds raised. This is build by an amount of participants, times the mean amount of funds raised per participants, minus the costs made in the process.

Other measurements of performance in running events consider non-tangible aspects as visibility and the relationship between the PBI and its stakeholders. This latter aspect will be used in this research as well. The relationship between a charity and its stakeholders is considered vital, one of these stakeholders is the volunteer (Bruning & Lambe, 2009; Bussel & Forbes, 2008; Kong & Farrel, 2010) as which the running event participants can be considered. What exactly is a good relationship should result in the research.

5. Theoretical Framework

The Dutch government has decided to leave more and more (semi) public services to be provided by the public itself. For example, the program ‘from civic participation to governmental participation’ (van burgerparticipatie naar overheidsparticipatie) entails a shift from the government taking initiatives and citizens participating to making initiatives work, to citizens taking initiatives and the government participating to making initiatives work (Rijksoverheid, 2011). Next to this, there is a discrepancy between the preferences of the government and at least that part of the country’s (or municipality’s) citizens that did not vote on the political parties in charge. As an example, there is a current debate (November 2012) on the government funding for international development, the budget will be decreased by the government, and several opposition parties do not agree. PBIs can fulfill needs from citizens that the government cannot or will not fulfill. Looking at funds for international development, those who believe that the government does not supply enough funds, can supply their own funds to PBIs focused on international development. As the government aims to shift ‘from citizen participation to government participation’ there is more need for PBIs to fulfill needs in society.

Andreoni (1989) adds a possible explanation why PBIs exist, the author suggest that even when all public services are provided by governments, people are still willing to donate money to charities. This to receive the ‘warm glow feeling’ of giving, with which Andreoni (1989) suggests that there is no such thing as ‘pure’ altruism. Rose-Ackerman (1996) continues with this proposition, and formed three profiles of impure altruists;

1. The giving gives a positive feeling. If another would give an amount to the same charity it would not give a good feeling. So the good feeling is only caused by the giving.
2. The beneficiary is well regarded also when others donate, but the own donation gives an extra boost; a so called ‘warm glow’.
3. The giver is so impressed by the charity, that they feel they need to give something to justify this feeling.

Rose-Ackerman (1996) adds other factors that influence the way people behave altruistically; people tend to give as few as accepted and relate this to the acceptance of people in their environment, people often feel morally obliged to give and people think of their image when giving.

Another question that arises is why fundraising through running events has become so popular? Running itself has known an immense increase of popularity in The Netherlands since the new millennium and this can be considered as the ‘second running wave’ (Van Bottenburg, 2006)(the first running wave appeared in the 1970’s). Van Bottenburg (2006) explains this running wave by four developments;

1. There is a higher demand for physical well-being, like; fitness, thinness, being muscled and being healthy, as this is having bigger social meaning and appreciation
2. Especially for woman who have extra demand to remain youthful and thin
3. Sports organizations and commercial parties react to this development to meet this demand
4. The barrier to join these sports is being lowered by the professionalization of the sports organizations and commercial parties.

Next to the running wave, a wave of running events has occurred as well (Van Bottenburg and Hover, 2009), the amount of bigger running events has risen with 60% between 2000 and 2005 when around 1.3 million people participated, and these figures are still increasing.

Nettleton and Hardy (2006) indicate the growing popularity of charity fundraising through these events. They state that there is no 100% welfare state (in the UK), which leaves charities space to fulfill needs, and that *“This increasingly popular spectacle serves as an indicator of present-day social relationships and broader cultural and ideological values that pertain to health. It highlights*

contemporary discourses on citizenship; 'active citizens' can ostentatiously fulfill their rights and responsibilities by raising money for those 'in need'." (Nettleton and Hardy, 2006, p. 441). Next to these individual factors, Nettleton and Hardy (2006) describe how charities can subscribe to a number of starting tickets for the London Marathon, for a certain amount of years. As the demand for those tickets is always higher than the supply, the charities have the position to ask for a certain amount of funds to be raised in exchange for the starting ticket.

Filo (2008) indicates seven motivational factors to participate in a running event as a fundraiser. These are divided in motivational factors for participating in the running event; intellectual, social and competence. And motivational factors for fundraising; reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others and desire to improve the charity.

The intellectual motive is formed by knowledge gathered by preparing for the event and by the information shared between participants. Social motives are about making new contacts and maintaining existing relationships. Competency motives are related to the sport achievement, like completing a certain distance or setting a new record time.

Reciprocity is a motive of people that have profited from the charity or expect to do so. Self-esteem is about feeling good about oneself by giving to a charity. Need to help others can be considered as individual's needs to 'do something' and to 'make a difference'. Finally the desire to improve the charity is a motive of people that feel they want to contribute to the charity itself in improving its activities.

Harbaugh (1997) describes how setting certain 'standards' in terms of amounts to be donated, makes people meet these standards. People intending to donate less, would then donate more, but people intending to donate more would lower their amount to this standard, except if there would be another standard that is higher and closer to their intended amount. Harbaugh (1997) also indicates that people donate in order to receive certain benefits next to the 'warm glow feeling', like prestige. Claiming prestige is regarded 'not done', but needs to be awarded by the charity, combining a 'standard' to awarding prestige is considered an effective way of raising more funds.

Raising funds through running events brings several managing difficulties. Speckbacher (2003) indicates that the relationship between a PBI's manager and volunteers cannot be considered as being a principal-agent relationship. As volunteers are not paid, most of the management control practices cannot be used, and the question can even be 'who should control who?' as the volunteer is investing his/her time, and generally wants this investment to be well spend eventually.

In a sense, FREPs can be both considered as sort of an employee, looking at management control, as well as part of the forum that holds the PBI accountable for its actions.

In terms of management control, Merchant (2007) formulated three questions; *"... do our employees understand what we expect from them?"*, *"... will they try consistently hard and try to do what is expected of them ..."*, and *"... are they capable of doing a good job?"* (Merchant, 2007, p.6-7). These questions can still be asked, and the control tools can be used up to a certain extent, but the main difference is which party is the paying party and therefore the possible consequences of control compliance.

In this sense, the CLEAR Framework, (Lowndes, Pratchett and Stoker, 2006) which was designed as a diagnostic tool of citizen participation, can be applied as well. Especially when the PBI is looking for more in the relationship with its FREP than a mere cash transaction. CLEAR is an acronym of; Can do, Like to, Enabled to, Asked to and Responded to. Translating the framework to the FREP's fundraising activities; 'Can do' would relate to the individual resources/skills a FREP has to participate at the event and successfully raise funds. 'Like to' relates to the willingness/engagement a FREP has to raise funds for this particular PBI. 'Enable to' would relate to how the PBI provides a sort of infrastructure that creates better/more participation in fundraising activities. 'Asked to' relates to the efforts the

PBI makes to acquire inputs from the FREP. And 'Responded to' relates to the responsiveness of the PBI to inputs from the FREP's.

As the fundraising running event participant invests his effort, without expecting anything tangible in return, it is imaginable that he/she will hold the PBI accountable for what they will eventually do with this invested effort. Bovens (2005) describes this as being part of the 'forum' to which the PBI holds accountability. When the PBI lacks accountability information or are considered not to perform sufficiently, the FREP might choose to quit. It would therefore be most efficient when both parties are satisfied.

According to Kaplan (2003), volunteers can also be considered as customers, as they require something in return of their time. This can be a 'warm glow feeling' of helping somebody out, or certain skills or prestige in order to improve oneself socially or professionally (Bussel & Forbes, 2008). There can be a difference in how the relationship is valued between the charity and the fundraisers, a fundraiser can perceive the relationship as good, while the charity can find it insufficient as the fundraiser can be interested in a brief relationship without strong ties, while the charity might be looking for a long-term relationship with strong ties (Bussel & Forbes, 2008).

Theory on social networks is interesting for this study as well. According to Granovetter (1973), there can be strength in strong but also in weak social ties, the use of social networks could be of importance when looking at the recruitment of participants and those participants' fundraising efforts. Would strong ties enforce the fundraising efforts made by participants, would weak ties give access to a wider network and therefore more resources, or both?

A final note will be written about the possible use of this research by PBI's fundraising managers. This research could be used as a simple benchmark on the performance as conceptualized before, the goal is to identify explanatory variables to enable PBI's to learn and improve their practices (De Groot, 2012).

6. Study I

6.1 Goal

The goal of Study I is to supply a preliminary description of the phenomenon of fundraising through running events. To achieve this goal there will be a content analysis of running events' and PBIs' websites. The main goal of analyzing running events' websites is to gather information whether the events facilitate fundraising at their event or not, and if so, how. There will also be given a description of the characteristics of different running events as this might influence the fundraising aspect.

The goal of analyzing PBIs' websites is to find out how they raise funds through running events, to find out how much funds they raise and to find differences between PBIs in order to form hypotheses for Study II. In order to compare differences, a similar moment of observation is needed, the Dam tot Damloop 2012 was chosen as the event with most PBIs participating.

6.2 Methods and sampling

As mentioned, a content analysis was used to achieve the earlier mentioned goals. Content analysis is: "... *the study of recorded human communications.*" (Babbie, 2010, p. 333). The communications in this sense are the information running events and PBIs share. The data gathered, therefore are dependent on how much information was shared by these actors. The researcher assumed that most relevant information would be shared, due to the public character of the actors and therefore public accountability reasons. The analysis of the PBIs websites was mainly concentrated at their activities concerning the Dam tot Damloop 2012, as this is the main moment of observation that would enable comparison. Other possibly relevant information has been taken into analysis as well.

The data retrieving was done partly quantitative and partly qualitative. An SPSS dataset was created for the quantitative data, which would exist of variables like: 'total amount raised', 'type of PBI', 'type of platform used' etc. Next to this, all interesting information, both quantitative and qualitative, would be noted down in for example the following manner:

Dam tot Damloop

The Dam tot Damloop is the event with the highest amount of participants (43.310 on the 10EM distance) and the event with most fund raising activities in The Netherlands. The Dam tot Damloop is a 10EM race from the Amsterdam city center to the Zaandam city center. There is also a smaller 4EM race through Zaandam, a Ladies Run (also 4EM) and a kidsrun. Starting tickets for individual participants are usually sold out little time after the sale starts, there are quite a lot of starting tickets reserved for business and charity teams. In 2012 there were 78 PBI's that had multiple charity teams, which totaled 439 teams of 10 persons each, totaling 4.390 persons running to raise funds. These runners always start early in the race (the start is dispersed in order to have more fluid distribution on the track), which is found an advantage for those who want to set a record time (as they won't need to surpass loads of people). The PBIs also have a stand in the 'charity village' where they can present themselves to other runners. In the 2011 edition a total of € 612.000,- has been raised.

Next to the PBIs participating, the Dam tot Damloop has a PBI as preferred charity, in 2012 'Stichting Witte Bedjes' (and 'Dance for Life' for the Ladies Run), which is put central in different communications and for which individuals can make a donation when buying their starting ticket.

The Dam tot Damloop promotes the use of the 'Alvarum' website as a platform to raise funds (Damloop, 2012c).

Run4Schools

Run4Schools is a PBI that raises money for sports education on primary schools in South African townships. As in the name, Run4Schools mainly tries to raise money through running events. They are the main PBI at the 'Letterenloop' and 'Amsterdamse Heuvelloop' and participates in the New York Marathon, the Two Oceans Marathon and the Dam tot Damloop (5 teams). For the New York Marathon 2012 (which was eventually cancelled due to a storm) 10 people participated and as a team their goal was to raise € 10.000,-, so € 1.000,- per person. The 'Two Oceans Marathon' is a ½- and 56km Ultra- Marathon in Kaapstad, South Africa. There are 40 people participating in various distances and Running4Schools goal is to raise € 56.000,-. These last two mentioned events have their own websites, where the participants can raise funds, for the Damloop, no such website was found. Participants for the Damloop should raise € 100,-, this includes the starting ticket and a running shirt, Run4Schools mentions that they have received the starting tickets and running shirts sponsored, this would be an important influence with regard to the actual amount raised (Run4Schools, 2012a, Run4Schools 2012b, Run4Schools, 2012c).

The complete overview of all researched running events and PBIs can be found in Appendix I.

The sample of running events (N=14) is sampled towards maximum variation, some of them were known by the researcher, others were not. The events were selected on characteristics as amount of participants, location, PBI involvement, running distance and possible peculiarities.

The sample of PBIs consists of the entire population (N=49) of participating PBIs of the 2012 Dam tot Damloop that had more than 5 teams, and were mentioned as PBI on the Dam tot Damloop website. The sample was completed with (N=4) PBIs that did not participate at the Dam tot Damloop, but do raise funds through running events. The sample as such was selected to be able to have a good moment of observation and comparison, the four added PBIs that did not participate at the 2012 Damloop were meant to illustrate other PBIs' activities.

6.3 Results

Running Event Characteristics

There are numerous running events held in The Netherlands, each weekend there are events organized throughout the country. These events can be small scale and organized by a local athletics club, or can be large and organized by a professional organization. In between, there are various hybrid forms.

Running events differ from each other in factors like; distance(s), cost, setting (scenery), atmosphere, number of participants, charity involvement etc.

Running events differ in the distance that is being run and the various options offered regarding distance. Some events have ranging distances from, for example, 5km till a full marathon. Other events only cover a single distance. Most events have a main distance and one or more side distances, as an example: the Rotterdam Marathon has the marathon (42,195 km) as its main distance, next to a 5km, a 10km and a kids run (Marathon Rotterdam, 2012a).

Cost relates to the price a participant must pay to enter the event. This can range from a couple of euro for small scale events till, for example, € 21,- for the Egmond Half Marathon (PWN Egmond Halve Marathon, 2012) and € 70,- for the Rotterdam Marathon (Marathon Rotterdam, 2012b). These prices sometimes do not include a time-tracking system, which must be purchased separately (if not personally owned) and sometimes do include things like medals, finish photos, souvenir T-shirts etc. If these latter are not included in the price they are often offered optionally for an extra price.

The setting of the event is where the event takes place. This could be; a city center, suburbs, nature, a combination of these, or even inside a hospital (VUMC Gebouwenloop, 2012). The setting of the event probably influences other factors; a run through a historical city center could be more appealing than a run through suburbs and could therefore attract more participants. A run through a city will on the other hand cost a lot more than a run through a forest as a city run requires road blocks, permits, security etc.

Atmosphere entails things like; music, bands and audience along the track, but also the 'vibe' between participants. Some perceive a mass event with lots of crowds and happenings as a good atmosphere, while a small run through a serene rural landscape could be perceived as a good atmosphere as well.

The number of participants at running events varies a lot: the Dam tot Damloop 2012 had 43.310 participants on its main 10EM (English Mile) distance (Damloop, 2012) and is the largest event in The Netherlands. There are numerous small scale running events, like the Bommelasloop, November 2012, which had 396 participants on 4 distances (uitslagen.nl, 2012). Several running events have a restriction on how many people can participate, and could therefore be sold out.

A final, and for this study most interesting, factor is the extent to which the event is involved with some sort of charity. Some events have a main charitable cause (later indicated as: preferred PBI), which they give special attention and the opportunity to collect funds at the event, sometimes it is possible to pay an extra amount of money for the starting ticket which goes to the charity.

Sometimes charities can join a charity competition and/or have different starting times (to have a relative smooth flow of runners, events often disperse starting times).

Running events facilitating fundraising

As can be seen from the running events described above, most running events involve PBIs in some way, often only one PBI that is the preferred PBI of the event or a particular event's edition. The PBI receives the opportunity to raise funds at the event, have some visibility and there is often a possibility for participants to donate upon registration.

It is unclear which party approaches which, so whether the event's organization picks a PBI or that PBIs contact event organizers.

The three events (Dam tot Damloop, PWN Halve Marathon van Egmond and Helden Race) that have charity teams, and facilitate PBI's in their fund raising activities are connected, the Dam tot Damloop and PWN Halve Marathon van Egmond have the same organization; 'Le Champion' and both use the 'Alvarum' fundraising platform that also organizes the Helden Race. It seems that this kind of PBI involvement raises high funds for the PBIs, but would probably only work under certain circumstances, one of which would be as Nettleton and Hardy (2006) describe about the London Marathon, a higher demand than supply of starting tickets. At the 'Helden Race' the demand is not that big (several hundred participants) but the event is limited to fundraising participants.

The visibility of PBIs' presence is also varying, at the VUMC Gebouwenloop it is clear that the preferred PBI is 'Stichting Leukemie.nl' and that the profits will be donated to this PBI, at the Dam tot Damloop, PWN Egmond Halve Marathon and Helden Race, it is also clearly mentioned on the websites that there are various charity teams and preferred PBIs. The Kerstmannenloop Amersfoort though, did not mention their preferred PBI on their website or at registration, but had a PBI present (not prominently) at the event. The 7 Heuvelenloop did have a PBI but at an initial analyses of their website, this was not found, only through a following 'google' search, the researcher found such information.

Some events organize something extra with the PBIs, like prizes for those who raised the most funds (Helden Race) a lottery for those who raised funds (Midwinter Marathon) and a quiz in cooperation with the PBI (7 Heuvelenloop). It is unclear what result these actions have.

As mentioned before, some events give the possibility to donate to a PBI upon registration, others (like the Bommelasloop) give an amount of the fixed registration costs to a PBI, and others combine these two. It would be interesting to know how much participants donate themselves, and whether they would give more or less when there is a fixed amount given.

PBIs raising funds at running events

First, some general results on PBIs raising funds at running events will be presented, then the results that are Dam tot Damloop specific.

Preferred PBIs

Some events have a preferred PBI, who are given the opportunity to be present and raise funds at the event. The PBIs often receive a set amount of money per participant (like € 0,50), or the participants are asked to donate a small amount upon registration, or a combination of these two. In

these settings, large events should raise more funds than small events.

As can be seen at the events analyzed, not all events have a preferred PBI. It could therefore be an opportunity for PBIs to contact these events. The question though, is whether PBIs contact the events, the other way around, or perhaps both are possible.

Organizing their own fundraising running event

Some PBIs organize their own fundraising running event(s), like the Cliniclowns who organize the Sumo Race and the Rodeneuzenloop, KiKa that organized 5 events at different cities, and Amnesty International that has its small scale event. Organizing an own event could be very beneficial when organization costs are relatively low, and the participants pay a profitable fee and/or raise extra funds. Organizational capabilities are probably essential though, and a certain risk is involved. Looking at the Cliniclowns' Rodeneuzenloop, which was first organized in two towns, but one was canceled due to a lack of participants, confirms a part of the risk involved.

Type of PBI

All PBIs analyzed were categorized in different sectors which are Healthcare, International Development and Others. Healthcare is the largest sector (45,3%), as was expected when looking at Nettleton and Hardy (2006) who linked running for charity to *“broader cultural and ideological values that pertain to health”*(p.441). Still the Healthcare sector was barely larger than the International Development sector (37,7%, although these could also be involved in healthcare issues). PBI's that did not belonged to these sectors comprised of 17% (see Table 1).

PB Sector	Frequency	Percent
Healthcare	24	45,3
International Development	20	37,7
Others	9	17
Total	53	100

Table 1. Public Benefit Sectors

Encouraging individuals to raise funds

Next to participating at running events and organizing their own running events, most PBIs encourage individuals to initiate their own actions. This could be participating at a random running event. Several PBIs have fundraising platforms that individuals can use, they would not need to contact the PBI itself. Other PBIs want individuals to first contact them, and some are unclear about procedures. When individuals would start their own actions, this would be very beneficial for the PBIs as it would not cost them much effort. It is unclear though how often this happens, how much would generally be raised by this means and what kind of factors would make differences in amounts raised.

Dam tot Damloop and Other Event Participation

It was found that a majority of the Dam tot Damloop participating PBIs did not actively participate at other running events. It could be that individuals were participating out of their own initiative, in this matter only coordinated actions from the PBI itself count as participation. 17 (34,7%) PBI's also participated at other events, 32 (65,3%) did not (see Table 2).

Participation at other events	Frequency	Percent
Yes	17	34,7
No	32	65,3
Total	49	100

Table 2. PBIs participating at the Dam tot Damloop also participating in other events

Use of Fundraising Platform

Quite some PBIs have an online fundraising platform that participants can use. There are various 'brands' used; 'Alvarum', 'Just Giving', 'Geef.nl/ Geefsamen.nl/ Geefgratis.nl', and 'iGive', some PBIs have their own platform. As can be seen in Table 3, 28,3% of the PBIs do not use a fundraising platform, which means they work with other means like sponsor forms and direct bank transfers. When PBIs use fundraising platforms, they could also still use other means in combination with the fundraising platform. Why PBI's do or do not use these fundraising platforms is not entirely clear, but they generally cost money, which could explain why PBIs prefer another way of raising funds. The different fundraising platforms will be discussed separately.

Online Fundraising Platform	Frequency	Percent
Their own	13	24,5
Others	26	49,1
None	14	26,4
Total	53	100

Table 3. What kind of fundraising platform do PBI's use

Dam tot Damloop

Amounts to be raised

About all PBIs have set an amount of funds that should be raised by the event participants, € 100,- is the mode (n=19), the NCFS has set the highest amount (€ 750,-), Anak Filippijnen and Childslife asked its participants to raise funds, but did not set a minimum amount and for quite some PBIs, no information was found.

Amount Requested in €	Frequency	Percentage
0	2	5,9
50	1	2,9
100	19	55,9
125	1	2,9
150	6	17,6
200	1	2,9
250	2	5,9
300	1	2,9
750	1	2,9
Sub-total	34	100
Missing	19	
Total	53	

Table 4. Minimum amounts requested to be raised

Participation Costs

Most PBIs did not ask for participation costs, as they covered it with the requested amount to be raised. Some though (N=10), did ask the participants to pay participation costs, which ranged between € 25,- and € 100,-. It looks like PBIs pay € 350,- per team (as with the PWN Egmond Half Marathon), so participation per participant would cost € 35,- (which is asked by 3 PBIs). Other possible costs are those for running shirts, food, drinks and general organizational costs. Reasons why certain PBIs ask for participation costs and others do not were not found. It could be easier for PBIs to find participants when these do not need to pay participation costs personally. It could be that PBIs do not want donations to be spend at these things. Or that PBIs wants the costs (and risks) to be covered by the user.

Down payment

Some PBIs ask for a down payment to cover the participation costs, like Europa Kinderhulp that asks for a down payment of € 25,-. They want this down payment because there were quite some last minute cancellations with people that did not pay anything (Europa Kinderhulp, 2012).

Business Relations

Some PBIs had relationships with business companies who filled teams for the PBI. It is not entirely clear what kind of arrangements were made in this sense. It is known that a 'Marktplaats' employee was running for the Lornah Kiplagat Foundation, without knowing it beforehand. This could be an exception, or Marktplaats has bought themselves in. It could also be that the employees of these businesses still need to raise funds. Either way, these kinds of relationships can be beneficial for fundraising efficiency, as it enables to recruit multiple participants at once and can establish a sort of principal-agent relationship between a representative of the business company and the PBI, reducing agency costs at the PBI side.

Recruiting Participants

The above is also part of recruiting participants. How this is done is not entirely clear, what is known is that the Dam tot Damloop website mentions PBIs to have starting tickets and the PBIs presents themselves there. PBIs mostly mention it on their own website as well, and they presumably send out newsletter by email where they also mention their Dam tot Damloop (or other event) participation.

Amount of teams at Damloop

The amount of teams different PBIs had at the Dam tot Damloop varied from 2 to 20. Each team consists of 10 persons. The Dam tot Damloop organization offers the PBIs so called 'club card' membership. 'Gold club card' members have 20 teams, 'silver club card' members 10 teams and 'bronze club card' members 5 teams, these memberships are valid for at least 3 years. PBIs can also participate without membership, but these teams are limited. Logically, more teams results in more participants that raise funds and would therefore lead to more funds raised overall. The overall cost will go up as well as all teams need to be paid, and more participants brings more agency cost to enable and check if the participants have raised enough funds.

Amount of participants

It was noted that not every PBI had as much participants as their amount of teams would suggest. The NCFs for example had 11 teams and therefore should have had 110 participants, but mentioned

only 55 participants, Energy4All had 20 teams but mentioned 180 participants, Amref Flying Doctors had 10 teams but only 64 participants. A team costs the PBI € 350,-, which would come down to € 35,- per participant, in the case of Amref Flying Doctors for example, this would total € 1.260,- spend on starting tickets that are not used.

On the other hand, there were also PBIs that mentioned more participants than would be possible looking at the amount of teams. Save the Children for example mentioned 90 participants, while having 6 teams. Whether they have received extra starting tickets, individual participants joined them, or other factors were at play, is unclear.

Running Shirt

About all PBIs offer their participants running shirts. Most often, these are included in the amount participants should raise, sometimes it is included in the costs the participant should pay.

Leukemie.nl offers to either borrow the running shirt for free, or buy it for € 20,-.

Shirt sponsoring

Run4Schools mentions they have received their running shirts sponsored. Whether more PBIs have some sort of shirt sponsoring is unclear. The running shirts themselves could cost quite a bit, and for those PBIs with 200 participants, a € 5,- (which is unlikely cheap) running shirt would already bring € 1.000,- of costs, it would therefore make a difference in the total amount raised.

Besides sponsoring the running shirts as a product, it would be thinkable that business companies would sponsor PBIs in order to have their logo on the running shirt. Participants are likely to wear these running shirts after the event as well, and could then benefit the visibility of such a company as well as its corporate social responsibility.

Mentioned on Damloop website

As earlier mentioned, a small number of PBIs participated, but were not mentioned on the Dam tot Damloop website. It is not clear why these PBIs were not mentioned and others were, whether this was a choice of the PBI or the Damloop organization. Looking at the amount of teams mentioned that were allocated to the 49 PBIs, these were the same amount (462) as did actually participate. Looking at certain PBIs that had mentioned less participants, it could be possible that the 30 not mentioned PBIs received left-over teams from the other 49.

Amount of funds raised

Out of the 49 participating PBIs only 18 amounts of funds raised at the Dam tot Damloop were found. Others might not have published results yet but will do it later (for example in their year report), or have chosen not to publish them. The amounts found range from € 1.500,- (Anak Filipijnen) to € 55.000,- (NCFS) (see table 4 below). At first sight, the amount of teams do not seem to explain variance in the amounts raised when comparing PBIs with 10 or 20 teams, those with 5 teams seem to raise less funds, with some outliers.

PBI	Amount Raised	Amount of Teams
Nederlandse Cystic Fibrosis Stichting (NCFS)	55000	11
Stichting Spieren voor Spieren	48102	20
Metakids	42601	10
Dance4Life	40000	10
Stichting Energy4All	36006	20
Ninos de Guatemala	35000	20
Stichting Terre	27715	5
War Child	24000	20
Stichting Hartekind	18000	5
NSGK (Nederlandse Stichting voor het Gehandicapt Kind)	17200	10
Eye Care Foundation	17000	10
Stichting Europa Kinderhulp	12500	10
Stichting DoCare	12300	20
Save the Children	12102	6
Stichting Leukemie.nl	7500	5
Stichting Todos	5500	5
Hivos	2419	5
Stichting Anak Fillipijnen	1500	5

Table 5. Amounts Raised by PBI at the Dam tot Damloop 2012

It is unclear how these amounts have been established, are they all funds raised minus all costs made or are the costs not subtracted?

The amounts have been calculated as raised per participant as well. Table 6 shows the total amounts raised divided by the amount of teams the PBIs should have according to the Damloop website. Table 7 shows the total amount raised divided by the actual number of participants according to the PBIs website.

Total Funds Raised / Amount of Teams =

	Raised_participant
PBI Dance4Life	400,00
Eye Care Foundation	170,00
Hivos	48,38
Metakids	426,01
Nederlandse Cystic Fibrosis Stichting (NCFS)	500,00
Ninos de Guatemala	175,00
NSGK (Nederlandse Stichting voor het Gehandicapt Kind)	172,00
Save the Children	201,70
Stichting Anak Filipijnen	30,00
Stichting DoCare	61,50
Stichting Energy4All	180,03
Stichting Europa Kinderhulp	125,00
Stichting Hartekind	360,00
Stichting Leukemie.nl	150,00
Stichting Spieren voor Spieren	240,51
Stichting Terre	554,31
Stichting Todos	110,00
War Child	120,00

Table 6. Amount of funds raised by PBI divided by the team number of participants

Amount Funds Raised / True Amount Participants=

	Raised_participant2
PBI Dance4Life	125,00
Eye Care Foundation	195,40
Nederlandse Cystic Fibrosis Stichting (NCFS)	1000,00
Save the Children	134,47
Stichting Energy4All	200,03

Table 7. Amount of funds raised by PBI divided by the true amount of participants

A series of calculations has been made to compare the means of funds raised per participant according to the amount of teams PBIs should have. The means are calculated for groups of PBIs according to different characteristics.

In table 8, PBIs that did and did not ask for extra costs to be paid next to the amount to be raised are compared, there is not a large difference found.

Other costs?	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Yes	213,75	4	201,05
No	226,39	14	151,53
Total	223,58	18	157,23

Table 8. Means for groups that did/did not ask extra costs

In table 9 the means are compared according to the amount of teams each PBI would have. It looks like the PBIs that have 20 teams have lower means than those with 10 or 5 teams.

Teams	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
5	208,78	6	206,47
6	201,70	1	
10	258,60	5	142,49
11	500	1	
20	155,41	5	67,65
Total	223,58	18	157,23

Table 9. Means according to amount of teams

Table 10 shows the different means for the different groups of public benefit sectors, the mean for PBIs in healthcare is quite higher than the mean for PBIs in international development.

PB Sector	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Healthcare	315,29	10	151,12
Int. Development	106,65	7	64,81
Others	125	1	
Total	223,58	18	157,23

Table 10. Mean per public benefit sector

Table 11 shows the different means of PBIs grouped based on their use of a fundraising platform, those using a fundraising platform, but do not have their own seems to raise fewer than those not using a fundraising platform or those using their own.

Fundraising Platform	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Their own	252,49	6	176,62
Others	193,74	9	117,36
None	255,27	3	262,73
Total	223,58	18	157,23

Table 11. Means per use of a fundraising platform

The next comparison of means has been made according to whether PBIs also participate at other events or not, which can be seen in table 12. It shows a higher mean at those PBIs not participating at other events.

Other events	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Yes	191,30	5	151,53
No	235,99	13	163,60
Total	223,58	18	157,23

Table 12. Means for PBIs that do/do not participate at other events

A final comparison has been made by those PBIs that do and do not encourage individuals to raise funds, although the latter group is quite small (n=2) it shows a quite large difference; the PBIs encouraging individuals to raise funds out of their own initiative seems to raise more, see table 13.

Encourage Fundraising	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Yes	240,69	16	158,15
No	86,69	2	54,18
Total	223,58	18	157,23

Table 13. Means for PBIs that do/do not encourage individuals to raise funds

7. Study II

7.1 Goal

Study II will try to further describe how PBIs raise funds through running events. This will be done by semi-structured interviews with PBIs fundraising managers. This to discover the reasons, motivations and trade-offs behind the choices PBIs have made to raise funds through running events, why and how. It will also give the opportunity to get into the relationship of the PBI with the FREP. Both aspects could then, together with existing theory, lead to explaining ‘success’ of different approaches PBIs use.

Next to this more descriptive part, following Study I and the Theoretical Framework, some hypotheses have been formed as well, in order to test theory created after these two parts. The method of semi-structured interviews does not have high empirical value as a quantitative study with a larger sample would have, and does not have the common statistical tests to accept or reject hypotheses. The hypotheses are therefore used to describe how these relations interact, and whether it would be presumable or not that the hypotheses could be accepted.

The hypotheses will be discussed in the analysis, additional relevant information that can be applied to certain hypotheses will be discussed there respectively.

7.2 Hypotheses

These hypotheses are formed towards three dependent variables; cost, income and number of fundraising event participants (FREPs). Cost is a combination of invested time and money, as both are limited (for one PBI probably more than for the other), and for both choices will have to be made on what to spend it on, not only to generate income, but also to spend it on the PBIs’ main activities. Income is the amount of money that has been transferred to the PBI, for the FREP it is indicated as ‘amount of funds raised’, income could therefore be measured per FREP, per group of FREPs (for example when participating at another party’s event) and per event (when there are no FREPs and the event organization transfers an amount of money to the FREP). Number of FREPs is the amount of event participants that have raised funds for the PBI (FREPs), this then influences the total income a PBI will receive.

In Study I it has been found that certain running events (of all sizes) have a preferred PBI to which they donate a certain amount per participant, or where participants can donate a certain amount themselves. It looks like PBIs have about no costs in these arrangements. It could be though that they have to invest (mostly time) in order to become a preferred PBI. Still, this form of fundraising will probably cost less than the other forms; organizing an own event, or participating at an existing event. Therefore the first hypothesis is as follows:

H1: Becoming the preferred PBI of a running event will involve fewer costs than participating at another party’s running event, which will involve fewer costs than organizing an own running event.

Looking at the three forms of fundraising and income, it looks like organizing an own event results in the highest amount of (total) funds raised, the KiKa events are good examples, as some of them

resulted in more than € 100.000,-, although not a running event the 'Alpe d'HuZes' (cycling event) is another well known example of a single event resulting in a high amount of funds raised. Cliniclowns though have cancelled one of their own events, cancellation might be easier to do with an own event, than at another's event where there are contractual agreements. It could be that own events are only organized when they generate high amounts of funds raised, this would probably be influenced by the costs of organizing an own event. Having an own event generally differs from being the preferred PBI of another party's event in the amount per event participant (mostly included in the ticket price of participation) transferred to the PBI. When being the preferred PBI of an event, this is mostly only a small amount of for example 1 euro, which depends on what the event organization seems suitable. When organizing an own event, it is possible for a PBI to reserve a higher amount (of the ticket price) per participant, and also to set a fundraising requirement. The difference between organizing an own event and participating at another party's event can be found in the amount of participants, that is generally limited at another party's event, and the differences in requirements, as all participants at an own event will be FREPs, which is not the case at another party's event where there are also normal starting tickets and other PBIs with starting tickets (and other requirements). Hence the following hypothesis:

H2: Organizing an own fundraising running event will result in a higher total income than participating at another party's running event, which will result in a higher total income than being a preferred PBI of another party's running event.

Nettleton & Hardy (2006) indicate that PBIs are very successful at the London Marathon, as there is a scarcity for starting tickets, and PBIs have a certain amount of starting tickets to supply. Those who want to participate at the event are then willing to raise a certain amount of funds, and thus become a FREP. It seems that this is true for the Dam tot Damloop, as compared to other Dutch events, as well. This results in the following hypothesis:

H3: Scarcity for normal starting tickets leads to a higher amount of FREPs when PBIs do have the possibility to buy starting tickets.

In line with Filo's (2008) event and fundraising motivational factors, as can be found in the theoretical framework, it seems that the FREPs who participate with a PBI out of scarcity have mainly event motivation. FREPs with more fundraising motivation though are logically expected to raise more funds, fundraising motivational factors are reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others and desire to improve the charity.

H4: FREPs where the fundraising motivational factors are more present than event motivational factors raise higher amounts of funds per FREP.

In Study I, it looks like Health sector related PBIs raise more than other sectors (mostly International Development), this could well be related to the higher sense of reciprocity Dutch citizens would have with the Healthcare PBIs than other PBIs. It is therefore hypothesized that:

H5: Compared with other PBIs, PBIs in the Healthcare sector have more participants with reciprocal motivation.

Harbaugh (1997) has written that setting certain standards for donators (as in a minimum of € 100,- to appear on a donators list for example), makes these donators meet the standards, where

they otherwise would donate less. This is likely to be of influence for FREPs as well, in regard to the minimum amount required to be raised in order to participate, especially when they have mainly event motivation, and would not raise more than initially asked for. Although setting higher standards may have other effects as well, the hypothesis is as follows:

H6: PBIs that set higher standards of amount to be raised required to participate have a higher income per FREP.

In the theoretical framework, some parallels have been made that a FREP could be considered as a sort of employee, as well as a sort of participating citizen. Merchant (2007, p. 6-7) asks the following questions in order to find where management control from employer to employee is needed: “... do our employees understand what we expect from them?”, “... will they try consistently hard and try to do what is expected of them ...”, and “... are they capable of doing a good job?”. Lowndes et. al. (2006) have formulated the CLEAR (Can do, Like to, Enabled to, Asked to and Responded to) framework, (local) governments can use to endorse citizen participation. The bottom line of these two can probably be applied in the relation between a PBI and FREP as well, which is a sort of control and a sort of facilitation. The control mainly concentrates on ensuring that participants pay and raise the minimum requested funds, facilitation concentrates on enabling the participants to raise more funds. The hypothesis is therefore:

H7: PBIs that use control and facilitation have a higher income per FREP.

Network theory is of importance as well, as can be found in the theoretical framework. Granovetter (1973) stresses the strength of both strong as weak ties. The various complications of different kinds of networks is hard to predict, it can be thought that a clique around a PBI will be highly committed to raise funds, but that they may have trouble finding more participants. Having a bunch of weak ties as participants, may then result in a lower commitment to raise funds as they might be missing something like peer pressure. Probably; the larger (and more diverse) the network (of both social as professional relations), the better, as it will give opportunity to cherry pick participants. What would be the best composition of network contacts still remains the question. The hypothesis goes as follows:

H8: PBIs with a larger network have more FREPs, FREPs with stronger ties to the PBI raise more funds than those with weak ties, and a closed network leads to saturation of participants and donators over time.

7.3 Methods and sampling

As already indicated, in order to achieve the goals as described, a set of (N=11) semi-structured interviews have been held. Semi-structured interviews were chosen as they would enable to achieve a deeper understanding of the observed parties, their motivations and actions. The interviews were held according to a theme list, which consisted of general descriptive themes as ‘how do you raise funds through running events’ and themes that were retrieved from the theoretical framework or Study I, like ‘do you think there is a difference between online and offline fundraising?’. There were three overarching themes, first the introduction, then the management of the fundraising process and finally the participants and the relationship with them. In the introduction, the study was shortly introduced with careful attention not to prime the respondents

to certain answers, the respondent then introduced him/herself and the PBI they represented. After this introduction the interview was directed towards the fundraising through running events. First global questions were asked about motivation and a general 'how do you raise funds at running events?', then more specific questions would be asked about; events the PBI participated at, costs they would make, income they would receive etc. This then moved into the third overarching theme, the participant. Questions were asked about how participants were recruited, what major differences between participants are, whether these differences would explain 'success' etc. As they were semi-structured interviews, there was space to leave the themes and go into other possible interesting subjects. At the end of the interview, respondents were asked if they would have anything to add, and whether they would have questions themselves. As all PBIs were different, the interviews were quite different as well; some would be very active and knowledgeable in the subject, others not at all, the length of interviews therefore also varied between 30 minutes and just over an hour.

All interviews were recorded and transcribed. The transcriptions were used for analysis. The analysis was twofold, on the one hand the analysis focused on testing the hypotheses, on the other hand the analysis was focused towards further description. The transcriptions were therefore first coded towards testing the hypotheses, then coded again for thematic analysis. The main difference being that for the latter the original themes of the interview were discarded and themes were recreated towards relevant data originated out of the interviews. The coding was done using the WEFT QDA software program.

The interviews were conducted in Dutch language, as the working language for this thesis is English, all data that would end up in the report is translated. The translations were focused on representing the spoken words as much as possible, although for readability some slight adjustments have been made.

The hypotheses were tested with the qualitative data retrieved in the interviews and the quantitative data retrieved in Study I, when possible extra quantitative data was retrieved in the interviews. As mentioned before, the goal of testing the hypotheses is not to make empirical claims, as this would be difficult given the kind of data, moreover its goal is to further describe and indicate certain relations.

Sampling was performed towards maximum variation, which implied that PBIs that had raised high amounts were sampled, but also those that raised low amounts. PBIs that are very active, in various events, and PBIs that only participated at the Damloop. In the sampling process, a primary selection was made and cooperation was requested, this resulted in some positive replies and some negative. The PBIs that declined cooperation were then replaced by other PBIs who should keep a maximum variation in the sample, who were requested to cooperate and the process continued like this until a fulfilling sample was reached.

8. Analysis

In this analysis the earlier formed hypotheses will be discussed by what the interviewed PBIs have corresponded in regard to the particular themes. An overview of results of the tested hypotheses can be found in the ‘overall conclusions’ section. As there was information retrieved during the interviews that is relevant to this study, but could not be discussed at one of the hypotheses, there are a few headings added to discuss this information. These can be found after the overall conclusions.

8.1 Hypotheses

H1: Becoming the preferred PBI of a running event will involve fewer costs than participating at another party’s running event, which will involve fewer costs than organizing an own running event.

In respect to this hypothesis the PBIs were asked whether they organized their own events, participated at others’ events and/or were preferred PBI at an others’ event, and how they organized this, including costs involved.

For all three presented situations, there are examples of PBIs not paying one dime. The question then is: ‘who’s paying?’. In the case of the ‘Runs for KiKa’ the event is presented as something organized by KiKa, in reality the event is organized by another party and the majority of the funds raised will be transferred to KiKa. The costs are then covered by taking a cut of the funds raised, which can be regarded as sort of ‘no cure no pay’ costs.

*“... and like I said, we have the production of those events, it’s just a lot of work, so that’s why there’s Emolife, who only organizes fundraising events, also for other charities...”
KiKa/Emolife*

In a sense this is done to shift risk from the PBI to another organization:

*“I: So that KiKa wouldn’t have any risk if no person, nobody would show up?
R: Exactly, and just, you know, when it doesn’t work, right, the tickets, they’re all events that needs to be build, that you can leave them easier...” KiKa/Emolife*

This can also be seen at Run4Schools, although slightly different. People affiliated to Run4Schools organized their own event to raise funds, called it ‘Letterenloop’ and installed Run4Schools as their preferred PBI.

*“... and then there’s the Letterenloop, it’s an own run, I don’t know if you’ve read about it, or saw it?
I: Yes, I read a bit about it, is it an own run as in, you are organizing it, or?
R: Well, you should not really say ‘you’, as in run4schools, we are the charity, but it comes from volunteers who were inspired by run4schools, have been in Africa with their own eyes and asked ‘what can I do?, well OK, we’ve got our own contacts, lets organize a little run ...”
Run4Schools*

Becoming a preferred PBI is said to be granted easier to those PBIs that are better known, which would at least cost effort.

“... that you are being asked to associate your name to it, and a certain amount will go to you?”

R: No, never, I think our brand awareness is not high enough for that.” Dokters van de Wereld

The relationship as presented in the hypothesis is therefore not correct, regarding the costs made by PBIs. KiKa has outsourced the organization of its own events. The costs and risks are therefore shifted to this organization who takes a cut of the funds raised. The costs are more a sort of reduced income. The Cliniclowns did not give information on how they organized their own events and what costs were involved. It is therefore not possible to indicate what costs are involved with organizing an own event.

Costs made for participating at an others' event can vary, participating at the New York City Marathon for example is also outsourced by KiKa. Cliniclowns, Bas van de Goor Foundation and Run4Schools also participate at the New York City Marathon, their costs are mainly in time for recruiting, organizing, controlling and facilitating the participants. The costs of the travel package, including starting ticket, have been shifted to a travelling agency that would be paid by the participant directly. As this is often part of the amount raised, it can be seen as reduced income as well. The PBIs participating at the Damloop all have costs in time spend as mentioned above. Most PBIs have costs in buying starting tickets and running shirts, Run4Schools got both sponsored, and Anak Fillipijnen did not have a running shirt.

The costs of becoming a preferred PBI were first regarded to be minimal. Some PBIs like the Hartstichting, Spieren voor Spieren and Cliniclowns indicate they do put effort in becoming a preferred PBI, by contacting events and trying to use network contacts. As the quote above shows, Dokters van de Wereld has indicated that becoming a preferred PBI is easier granted when the brand awareness of the PBI is higher. This was also acknowledged by Bas van de Goor Foundation, who indicated they were becoming better known and therefore received grants of becoming a preferred PBI. When this would be the case it would imply that there could be quite some costs (probably mainly effort) to achieve higher brand awareness and therefore to become a preferred PBI. Hulphond Nederland indicated they put no effort into it, as the respondent did not think it would have any use.

Time wise there are differences in who organizes the activity and what kind of participant is recruited. Some PBIs indicate that there are volunteers who are (partly) organizing the activity, which would save time. KiKa outsources the complete organization of the Runs for KiKa and New York City Marathon, which makes it cost hardly any time at all. There were also some fundraising professionals that indicated that they organize everything, and that it costs a lot of time. Time was said to be mostly invested in the communications with participants, when a PBI sells multiple tickets to a group (like a company) it can save some time by installing one contact person.

In terms of risk some PBIs know how to avoid any costs. They have things like starting tickets and running shirts sponsored, or know how to shift the costs directly to the participant while not having any risk. Especially at the Damloop it can be seen that some PBIs invest € 50,- per participant, while

not sure if they can sell all tickets. Niños de Guatemala for example had 200 starting tickets and t-shirts, costing about € 50,- in total. They only had about 140 participants, which would mean that around € 3000,- of costs were made without a return. A comparable situation occurred at Amref, but as the VvAA organized the event and paid everything for Amref, there were no such costs for Amref.

In conclusion, the relationship as stated in the hypothesis is not necessarily true, it depends largely on whether PBIs can shift costs to other parties. In all three scenarios, the costs can be shifted, when becoming a preferred PBI or participating at an others' event, the event organizational costs are surely for another party, but KiKa's 'Runs for KiKa' show that an own events' cost can be taken care of by a third party as well. The VvAA took all organization and costs on itself for Amref's participation at the Damloop, there are no costs for Amref in this case. Becoming a preferred PBI seems to be random, but some PBIs indicate they put effort (and thus cost) in it, and it is said that a higher brand awareness is needed to become preferred PBI, which could also involve costs. These costs would then be made in the past and not invested for a specific event.

H2: Organizing an own fundraising running event will result in a higher total income than participating at another party's running event, which will result in a higher total income than being a preferred PBI of another party's running event.

Looking at the results of participating at the New York Marathon of KiKa and Cliniclowns and the results of their own events, it is clear that the New York City Marathon summed a higher income. Being a preferred PBI could in certain cases also bring a higher income than participating at an event, looking at Run4Schools, they have raised € 5.000,- at the Dam tot Damloop, at least € 8.500,- at the Letterenloop, and at least € 56.000,- at the 2Oceans Marathon. Income in these cases is a result of the number of participants times the mean amount income per participant, this sum is not too difficult, and explains why being a preferred PBI of an event with 20.000 participants that gives 1 euro per participant raises more than participating at an event with 50 FREPs that yield 100 euro. The questions to be asked is then; how many people can participate and how much can be earned per participant? Assuming that being a preferred PBI of an event does not yield much more than a few euro per participant, 100.000 participants that would bring 5 euro per participant is needed to match KiKa's income of the 2012 New York Marathon, which was around € 500.000,- (net). At the Dam tot Damloop, amounts raised per PBI varied quite a bit, Spieren voor Spieren raised around € 40.000,-, Bas van de Goor Foundation around € 2.500,- and Anak Fillipijnen € 1.500,-. These latter two amounts are then easier to surpass with being a preferred PBI than the former, as an example Spieren voor Spieren raised € 20.000,- at the Hilversum City Run. The relationship as described in the hypothesis therefore does not seem to be currently existent.

How the income was constructed at the Damloop was quite diverse as well. Some PBIs, like Anak Fillipijnen, Hulphond Nederland, Run4Schools, KiKa and Bas van de Goor Foundation, just asked a set amount like € 100,-, they knew their costs were for example € 50,- and therefore calculated to raise another € 50,- of funds per participant next to covering the costs, how this participant would get the money was of no concern. Others like Hartstichting, VvAA/Amref, Dokters van de Wereld and Spieren voor Spieren, set a minimum amount to be raised. This could also have been € 100,- and the scenario of above would be broadly the same, except that setting a minimum implies more is possible on which the PBI was hoping. The way the participant should gather money was different, as the participant was asked to raise funds. Another method, as Niños de Guatemala conducted, is setting a certain amount of costs, € 50,- for example, and setting a minimum amount to be raised,

€ 100,- for example. The divide usually implies that the participant pays the € 50,- of costs he brings and that his raised money will be fully transferred to the PBI.

At the New York City Marathon, these latter two approaches can be found as well but in larger amounts. Cliniclowns for example asks € 5900,- to be raised, this includes all costs as flights, hotel, training and starting ticket. They also offer the possibility to pay all costs yourself, and to raise an amount of € 3300,-. The income for the Cliniclowns is the same, but its resources are different.

In conclusion, the relationship as represented in the hypothesis is not existent in practice. Income depends on the amount of FREPs times the funds they have raised. KiKa's participation at the New York Marathon has been most effective so far, with a relatively low amount of FREPs that raised a high amount per FREP.

H3: Scarcity for normal starting tickets leads to a higher amount of FREPs when PBI's do have the possibility to buy starting tickets.

This hypothesis was measured by asking PBIs what different events they participated at, how they organized it and if they noticed differences, for example in recruiting FREPs.

In the interviews there were various reports of PBIs that found it more difficult to recruit FREPs for events that were not sold out. Spieren voor Spieren indicated that when the Egmond Half-Marathon sold out, they received more applications.

“Because Egmond was also sold out at a given moment, and then, suddenly, a bunch of people came who said like ‘hey we want to participate’ and they ended up at us.” Spieren voor Spieren

Dokters van de Wereld and Hulphond Nederland indicated that recruiting participants for the Amsterdam (Half) Marathon was more difficult than for the Dam tot Damloop, although they did not directly associate this to scarcity. Anak Fillipijnen indicated that the Amsterdam (Half) Marathon is not interesting as everybody can get tickets. VvAA/Amref indicated that scarcity at the Damloop makes it easier to sell their tickets and that it became harder to sell them when the Damloop organization created more starting tickets overall.

A possible exception in this relation could be the 2Oceans Marathon, where Run4Schools participates in, this is a so called Ultra Marathon of 56km in South-Africa, and is not sold out. Run4Schools participated with 38 FREPs (Run4Schools, 2013). But although it is not sold out, and the tickets themselves are not scarce, the entire package of flight tickets, accommodation and starting ticket is not an easy to buy product which makes the Run4Schools package somewhat scarce.

In conclusion, the relationship as represented in the hypothesis seems to be accurate.

H4: FREP's where the fundraising motivational factors are more present than event motivational factors raise higher amounts of funds per FREP.

To test this hypothesis, answers of multiple questions were used. These were for example ‘how do you recruit participants?’, ‘what are the motivations of participants?’, ‘are there participants that are particularly involved?’ and ‘do different participants raise different amounts of funds?’. To properly test this hypothesis, the unit of observation should be shifted from the PBI towards the FREP. At this

moment we have primarily tested the perception of the fundraising managers, while the true motivations of FREPs might be different.

It seems that people mostly participate as a FREP at events like the New York Marathon (Cliniclowns, KiKa, Bas van de Goor Foundation, Run4Schools) and the 2Oceans Marathon (Run4Schools) out of event motivational factors. These FREPs are required to raise the higher amounts of funds per FREP compared to, for example, FREPs at the Dam tot Damloop, Heldenrace and Runs for KiKa. It then seems to be the initial willingness to meet these requirements mainly originates out of motivation to participate at the event.

“R: Well, yeah, that’s a good one, that’s a good question, if you’d look at the 2Oceans for example, I think it’s primarily the event, cause, I’m just going to say it like I think it is, you’ve got a certain ego, ‘I want to run that most beautiful marathon once’ or ‘I want to have run New York once’, and, well then it’s very proximate that there’s an appealing charity organization, for that person than, and whether it’s KiKa, or Run4Schools, or Artsen Zonder Grenzen, or whatever, I personally think everybody’s got that ego like ‘oh the Dam tot Damloop, I’ve got to have participated once’, so that’s, yeah, I think it’s just a bit, primarily for yourself, the event, yes.” Run4Schools

“... and next to that it’s a fact, the New York Marathon, why we’ve specifically selected it, is because it’s on the wish-list of people, like ‘I want to have run that one once’, you can equally well, there are people who ask ‘why don’t you do a marathon in The Netherlands?’, but that has, even though it’s the same distance, not the same attractive power, that’s a bit the difference, people are willing to take this step, while they wouldn’t for something in The Netherlands.” KiKa/Emolife

When looking at the Dam tot Damloop and Runs for KiKa though, several PBIs indicate a difference between those FREPs that have mainly event motivation and just meet the fundraising requirements and FREPs that also, or to a greater extent, have fundraising motivation.

“Cause that’s where you make big differences, people that really want to make an effort for a charity, they easily raise 300-400 euro, easy in one month. People who think like ‘I’ve got a ticket from a charity and it costs me 50 euro, because I want to participate and set a good time for myself, and I don’t care if a child in Guatemala goes to school’, boldly said. Those people also participate, and you really need to activate them...” Niños de Guatemala

It also seems that it is not relevant whether fundraising motivation is more present than event motivation, it looks like more of both is best. As the following Spieren voor Spieren quote will show, the respondent reports a difference between motivations, somebody is said to have fundraising motivations and the respondent then gives an example of someone for whom the event is a true challenge:

“R: They’re people that were involved with Spieren voor Spieren in some way or another and who consciously participate for Spieren voor Spieren in our team. There is a difference with the runners I just mentioned; ‘We don’t have starting tickets, we need to participate, oh, Spieren voor Spieren has tickets, let’s participate with them, I’ll raise 100 euro and it’s OK’. That’s a completely different motivation than people who report themselves at us

beforehand, like ‘I’m really going to make an effort, I normally run 4km, now I’ll run 16, a performance for myself’, and they link it to raising funds.” Spieren voor Spieren

Motivation is also said to be able to change over time, that people at first only participate out of event motivation, but by the process of the event and the fundraising get involved with the PBI and develop more fundraising motivation.

“... and actually it’s like that at all our events. It’s naturally nice if a lot of people participate, and what you encounter is that when people get involved, and see what you’re doing, we’ve got a lot of contact in the preparations, and then the Damloop takes place, this and that is going to happen, so and so, than you’ll encounter that people are getting involved, and then it’s possible that people are going to something in their own environment, or start an action, or if they hear something like ‘they’re looking for a charity’, that’s how you get in touch with different things...” Bas van de Goor Foundation

Anak Fillipijnen and Dokters van de Wereld both attempted to participate at the Helden Race, a running event organized by fundraising platform Alvarum. The event took place in the Amsterdamse Bos and comprised of a 6km track, participants were required to raise at least € 200,-. Both PBIs indicated that they did not find any participants, and that the event was not very special, running through the Amsterdamse Bos is always possible and 6km is not challenging. This points at event motivation that was missing for people to participate.

Company participants are regarded to generally have less fundraising motivation. As their employer pays the whole package, they often participate for free and without additional requirements. It occurred that there were participants who did not realize they were running on behalf of a PBI. This of course is no necessary condition, company teams could be involved with the PBI as well, and it could be that the participants convinced their company to participate, instead of the other way around.

In conclusion, the relationship as stated in the hypothesis seems existent when comparing FREPs at the same event, in ceteris paribus conditions. When comparing between events (the factor ‘event’ is left out of the ceteris paribus condition), it seems that at some events there is a higher event motivation than at other events, and that at events where event motivation is highest (as the NYC Marathon) the most funds are raised.

H5: Compared with other PBI’s, PBI’s in the Healthcare sector have more participants with reciprocal motivation.

This hypothesis was tested by asking questions like; ‘are there participants that are particularly involved?’, ‘are there patients participating?’ and ‘are there people with special connections to your target countries that participated?’. As also mentioned at the previous hypothesis, this hypothesis is tested with a unit of observation which is not the unit of analysis, and actually tests the perception of the fundraising managers. To fully test this hypotheses the unit of observation should also be the FREP.

Only the Hartstichting and Bas van de Goor Foundation indicate they have quite some FREPs with reciprocal motivation. The Bas van de Goor Foundation is special in this sense, as its main goal is to support patients with diabetes in sports. Their FREPs therefore also get extensive medical guidance.

“Well, there are obviously big differences between participants with and without diabetes, it’s a big difference ... you have to imagine that you’re going to participate in a triathlon, and the state of people who are participating in a triathlon, than you also need to properly manage your diabetes, and that’s, that requires a lot of guidance ... so we take care of these preconditions ... and you’ll understand that people with diabetes have are preferred by us, that they’ll be taken care of extra well, especially because there’s also a complete medical team that comes along...” Bas van de Goor Foundation

Most other PBIs indicate that they do have participants with reciprocal motivation but find it hard to quantify it and indicate they are only a few. For the PBIs in the international development sector, the FREPs with reciprocal motivation are mainly people who volunteered for the organization and are therefore also known to have a reciprocal relation. Both Cliniclowns and Niños de Guatemala indicated that there are also family members of employees participating, this may be regarded as an indirect reciprocal relationship. The PBIs in the healthcare sector may have more FREPs with a reciprocal relationship, as in family members of patients, or patients themselves, these then might not identify themselves as having a reciprocal relationship.

In conclusion, the relationship as described in the hypothesis could be present, but remains unclear. A study involving FREPs is needed to properly test this relationship.

H6: PBIs that set higher standards of amount to be raised required to participate have a higher income per FREP.

This hypothesis was measured by comparing the amounts to be raised required to participate with the mean amounts raised according to the former amounts. The data was mainly collected during Study I, and added with data collected during Study II, hence the larger sample analysed. This data, as represented in the tables below, are results of the 2012 Dam tot Damloop.

The amounts requested and the mean amounts raised as represented in Table 13 and 14 are amounts requested and raised at the Damloop 2012. They can be somehow misleading, the ‘amounts requested’ are the amounts the PBIs asks their FREPs to raise. Some PBIs ask additional costs and consider the ‘amount to be raised’ as pure net fundraised. Others ask a certain amount to be raised which includes cost, meaning that the net amount of this ‘amount requested’ is lower. In the ‘amounts raised’ it could be possible that some PBIs have indicated brut amounts, and other net amounts. The table 14 below is also computed with the amount of starting tickets the PBI would have had, not with the actual amount of participants, as there were too many missing values for the latter. This also misleads the mean income per FREP, as it will go up when there are fewer participants. It is thought that higher amounts requested results in fewer FREPs, which would imply that the correlation between amount requested and amount raised would be stronger. Table 15 gives a representation of amounts raised per FREP of PBIs whos amount raised and total amount of participants is known.

Report

Raised_participant5

Amountrequested	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
,00	102,5	2	102,5
50,00	85,0	1	..
100,00	162,6	10	92,5
125,00	170,0	1	..
150,00	201,0	5	126,5
750,00	500,0	1	..
Total	179,6	20	121,4

Table 14. Mean amount of funds raised per starting ticket according to the amount requested

Report

Raised_participant2

Amountrequested	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
,00	250,0	1	..
100,00	50,0	1	..
125,00	195,4	1	..
150,00	169,1	4	47,6
750,00	1000,0	1	..
Total	271,5	8	301,1

Table 15. Mean amount of funds raised per FREP according to amount requested

The 0 as can be found in the tables above are subject to discussion. They are set at 0 as the agreement to which a participant should oblige to participate is paying a certain amount of costs, next to this they were asked/expected to raise funds, but no minimum amount was indicated. Even though there was no agreement to raise a minimum amount of funds, there was most probably a social expectation by the PBI that would pressure FREPs to raise funds. In the following quote Niños de Guatemala indicates that they have not set a strict amount to be raised in order to get more participants:

*“I: OK, raising the 300 euro, you gave it as a guideline, but it was a bit, well, not really strict?
 R: No, in the beginning we adjusted it from ‘we expect you to’ to ‘it would be nice if’, because we noticed that people would loose interest.” Niños de Guatemala*

Tables 13 and 14 than show a correlation between amount required and mean amount raised, with some exceptions, like the 0 of Niños de Guatemala. Looking at Harbaugh (1997) it cannot be said that participants generally stop raising funds when they have accomplished the required amount. It is necessary to have the FREP as unit of observation to state this. But as can be found in hypothesis 4, there are differences between people with different motivations, and it looks like those participants that have primarily event motivation and few fundraising motivation seem not to exceed the required amount, while those with more fundraising motivation are regarded to raise more.

In conclusion, the relationship as can be found in the hypothesis seems to be existent. Also because if a minimum amount is required, there should not be lower amounts than the minimum.

The effect on the amount of FREPs should be taken into consideration and a balance should be found.

H7: PBIs that use control and facilitation have a higher income per FREP.

This hypothesis was measured in respect to a wide array of questions that could have possible influence. First of all general questions as: ‘How do you raise funds at running events?’ generated responds regarding how payments are conducted or what kind of actions the PBIs execute to facilitate their FREPs to raise funds. Further questions were more specific as: ‘how and when do the participants pay?’, ‘do they need to give some kind of warranty or down payment?’, and ‘what happens when a participants cancels just before the event?’ for control. For facilitation the questions could be like ‘do you have an online fundraising platform?’, ‘do you also facilitate offline fundraising?’ and ‘how did you facilitate your participants in fundraising?’.

Looking at control, it is mainly ensuring participants to meet the requirements and make sure they pay. There are incidental reports of participants not paying even though they have participated, and more frequent reports of participants that cancel short time before the event and who have not paid anything. This is a serious risk for PBIs as some have € 50,- costs per starting ticket. Some PBIs have the cost of participation and the minimum amount to be raised paid via direct debit authorization if not paid in the regular manner. Others have a waiting list with replacement participants, this though does not cover the initial risk of not selling all starting tickets.

I: But they do sign something, that they need to pay, or?

R: No, no

I: But they all do pay, or does it happen that people..?

R: Last year there were 3 that didn't pay, so...

I: So the majority pays normally? And those 3, they also ran or?

R: Yes, and that's of course a bit sad, ...” VvAA/Amref

I: And yes, because you had those 100 tickets, did you lose them easily?

R: Yes, that wasn't a problem, although on a given moment I thought, when you get a wave of cancellations of people who are over-trained or whatever, then I thought 'Oh shit, we've got quite some left', which I found a pity.” Hulphond Nederland

Looking at all interviewed PBIs and how they control: Amref/VvAA gave its Damloop participants the time to pay/transfer the raised funds until after the race, their participants generally paid although there were a few that did not pay, but did participate (as can be found in the quote above). There were also about 10 to 15 people who cancelled after first consenting to participate, and did not pay anything. There was no down payment or direct debit authorization.

Anak Fillipijnen had a set price that should be paid, they indicated that they did not install a down payment or direct debit authorization and that it took quite some correspondence to get all payments in. One person ended up not paying and not participating.

Bas van de Goor Foundation indicated that for the Damloop, participants needed to pay a set price, and that they had to correspond and monitor to get all payments in, no down payment or direct debit authorization was used. No problems were reported though. For the New York City Marathon all risks were transferred to the participants and travelling agencies. They did monitor if everybody collected the required amount. For one person who did not collect the required amount, an

exception was made in agreement with other participants that raised more funds.

Cliniclowns did not participate at the Damloop. At the NYC Marathon, they transferred all risk to the participants and travelling agency. They monitored closely if everybody would raise enough funds and also created a sort of social group between the participants that monitored (and encouraged) each other.

Dokters van de Wereld indicated that Damloop participants should have transferred their raised funds at least 4 days before the event, else they would not receive the starting ticket and running shirt, which were handed over at the day of the event. They also monitored and contacted people whether there was any fundraising activity.

The Hartstichting required their participants to make a down payment of € 50,- and to have raised a minimum of € 50,- four weeks before the Damloop. If they would not meet these demands the starting ticket would be given to someone else.

Hulphond Nederland had a set amount to be paid, payment was possible until after the event, which they indicated was not working that well.

KiKa's information did not include the Damloop, as the interviewed person did not organize that event. For the NYC Marathon, KiKa transferred all risks to the participants, traveling agency and Emolife (who organized the event). Participants were monitored closely whether they have raised enough funds before certain deadline data (e.g. cover all traveling costs before a certain date).

Niños de Guatemala had their Damloop participants pay € 50,- in costs right away, they did monitor whether participants would raise funds, but did not have any requirements and therefore sanctions. Run4Schools had their Damloop participants pay a set price, which needed to be paid two weeks before the Damloop, else it would be given to someone else. For the 2Oceans and NYC Marathon, they had risks transferred to the participants and traveling agencies and monitored how much funds were raised.

Spieren voor Spieren had to constantly monitor their participants whether they have raised sufficient funds, and contacted them when it was not sufficient. Ultimately three weeks before the event they needed to have collected the minimum required funds.

Comparing the influence of control on results is difficult, as constructing a clear variable for control is not possible. It can be seen in the Amref/VvAA, Anak, and Hulphond cases that insufficient control might lead to reduced income. It can also be said from the Spieren voor Spieren and Dokters van de Wereld examples that monitoring and contacting all participants could involve costs in time, which might be reduced by installing direct debit authorizations. Certain control could also be negative for the results, as some PBIs have deadlines of raised amounts weeks before the event, the participant might stop raising funds after this deadline, while he/she would be most exited in these weeks before the event.

Where control is mostly used to ensure that the participants do at least that what is expected, and meet the minimal requirements, facilitation is used to enable them to meet these requirements and possibly more. Facilitation could come in various forms, one of those is facilitating the fundraising act by means of an online fundraising platform which was used by Run4Schools (although not at Damloop), KiKa, Cliniclowns, Bas van de Goor Foundation (not at Damloop), Dokters van de Wereld, Niños de Guatemala and Anak Fillipijnen. These platforms enable FREPs to create an own page on a website where sponsors can donate the PBI for which the FREPs are participating, the FREPs can easily share this webpage via email and social media and raise funds accordingly. These online platforms are said to be very effective.

*“R: Yes, well, we’ve got, we’ve made a page, Dam tot Dam 2012, and the Half Marathon, and a link is given in the email with instructions, so they could click on it and click on their own page, why you are participating and a photo.. I really hear, I hear positive stories about it, that it’s really easy, that people were amazed that they achieved their target with one email.”
Dokters van de Wereld*

The quantitative data also suggests a positive relationship as Table 15 shows, those PBIs with an online platform have higher means of funds raised per participant than those without an online platform. Those PBIs who have their own online platform seem to have higher means of funds raised per participant than PBIs that use a general platform.

Report

raised_participant4

Fundraising Platform	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Their own	223,7	8	159,7
Others	192,6	11	105,1
None	166,8	6	193,5
Total	196,4	25	142,6

Table 16. Means of funds raised per starting ticket according to the kind of fundraising platform

While facilitating in online fundraising seems to have very positive effects on the results, it is sometimes said to exclude offline fundraising. This while online fundraising would not reach certain target groups (like grandmothers without a pc) and does not demand a direct reply which a face to face ask for funds would. The Hartstichting for example offers both;

“I: And those activity pages, they can share them via facebook and that sort of things?

R: Yes, they can share everything, sure, and people can control it directly, the advantage is that you don’t need to come with money yourself. And there are also runners that can easily with a sponsor form, when they have a birthday they can use it, and others do it online.

I: So that’s a bit 50/50, or?

R: Yes something like that, it’s getting more popular such a page, a year ago we started it, there were three persons, now they’re becoming more and more. Last year there was the... (event name), I don’t know if you know it, but it was held just once, there were really a lot of people there who made an action page with us, they though like ‘that’s easy’...” Hartstichting

The forms of facilitating could be quite diverse, and could be related to the CLEAR framework (Lowndes et. al., 2006) in various ways. Several PBIs (Spieren voor Spieren, Run4Schools, Cliniclowns, KiKa, Bas van de Goor Foundation) have organized a running clinic for example, which initially seems to respond to ‘Can do’ and ‘Like to’, by investing in training for the FREPs so they can run better, in an activity they like and commits them to the PBI. It could, though, also respond to ‘Enabled to’, ‘Asked to’ and ‘Responded to’ when the PBI would interact with its participants during the clinic, enable them to raise funds by giving tips and tricks, asking them directly to put in extra effort and respond to the questions and ideas the FREPs might have. Spieren voor Spieren, Bas van de Goor Foundation and Amref/VvAA indicated that they also use famous people to stimulate their FREPs, which can be seen as a form of ‘Like to’. The online fundraising platforms and offline sponsor forms can be linked to ‘Enabled to’, just as promotional material. Bas van de Goor Foundation enables their participants

to go to the (local) press, by offering a media toolkit. Other forms of facilitation are mainly linked to 'Like to', think of presents for the best fundraiser, a pasta party before the event, a goody bag and food after the event.

The effects of the forms of facilitation on results is (except for the fundraising platforms) unclear, Amref/VvAA did have a famous person in their team, but still could not sell all its tickets. Niños de Guatemala paid much attention to facilitation by organizing running clinics, a pasta party and a social drink, but also did not sell all its tickets.

In conclusion, it seems that the relationship as described in the hypothesis is present. Control reduces risk and prevents losses. Without proper facilitation a FREP might not raise as much funds as would be possible.

H8: PBIs with a larger network have more FREPs, FREPs with stronger ties to the PBI raise more funds than those with weak ties, and a closed network leads to saturation of participants and donators over time.

The measurement here is also mostly based on perception, there was no measurement of network size and strength and no measurement of the relationship with the amounts of participants or funds raised. Questions asked were for example 'how do you recruit participants?', 'do those participants that are more closely involved raise more funds?', 'do you see a pattern in amount of funds raised at participants that have participated more often?' etc.

Most PBIs indicated the relationships as suggested. As for having more FREPs, Spieren voor Spieren for example, indicated that they gained more FREPs each year as the network grew with each participant, who'd inspire others to participate. Bas van de Goor Foundation indicated that their network was growing by hospital contacts and organizing summer camps for diabetic children, which also reflects on the amount of FREPs they attract. Amref/VvAA indicated that they first were only open for participants that were VvAA members, when they decided to also let others participate, their amount of FREPs grew. Anak Filipijnen and Run4Schools indicated that they first approached people in their network to participate:

"R: So I received those 50 tickets, and, then indeed I just contacted all our donators, people in my environment, so the first 20 tickets were sold very quickly, and then a sort of dead period came..." Anak Filipijnen

"... and then I enthuse friends, family, business relationships, that's a kind of, it gives some result, and then I say to Ties, Ties for example 'hey are coming along to run the two oceans?'" Run4Schools

Cliniclowns indicates that FREPs are keeping each other sharp to raise funds and interchange experiences on meetings, which indicates strong ties with the PBI and between FREPs, and that it helps to raise more funds;

"I: OK, and you already said, it's a small group and everybody is quite close, do you think it has an influence on the effort they put into the fundraising, or?"

R: Well, they are mutually occupied with it, yes, they also really keep an eye on each other, looking at fundraising, stimulating each other.

I: And how does that show?

R: Well it shows on meetings, they're talking to the one that has raised the most, to see if they can get advice, and they interchange ideas, yes." Cliniclowns

Niños de Guatemala also indicated that those FREPs who have strong ties as they have done volunteer work for the organization raise more funds:

"I: And do you see that the people who volunteered are more involved?

R: Yes, absolutely.

I: And raise more funds?

R: Yes, the raise a bit more, that's what visible, that the runners, that the involved who raise the most, that they are the people who either have done volunteering or have personal, the brother or sister or friend of people in the board, really the inner circle of people who want to go for it." Niños de Guatemala

The above could also be linked to hypotheses 4 and 5, fundraising motivation and reciprocity can probably be linked to stronger network ties.

That there can be a saturation of donators is confirmed by Spieren voor Spieren, Dokters van de Wereld and Anak Filipijnen;

"R: Yes, you'll encounter that people who participate more often, a certain tiredness, of keeping asking for money..." Dokters van de Wereld

"R: Yes, perhaps in my own circle, because I'm fishing in the same pond for 10 years, that's perhaps a cause, that's why we really need people from the outside, and with this Damloop we certainly have 30 new names..." Anak Filipijnen

In conclusion, the relationships as represented in the hypothesis seem to be existent. Network contacts have been said to be the main source of FREPs. Those FREPs that are more involved with the PBI (and thus have stronger ties) are said to raise funds. Finally, it has been indicated that FREPs amounts raised reduce over time when participating consecutively.

8.2 Overall conclusions

Out of the tested hypotheses we can conclude that there is no necessary relationship between the type of PBI involvement in an event (preferred PBI, participating, own event) and cost and income. Cost is in a large part influenced by the ability of a PBI to transfer cost to other parties. Income is the result of the amount of FREPs times the amount of funds raised per FREP, participating at the New York City Marathon has now resulted in the highest income.

Scarcity at an event leads to a higher amount of FREPs participating when PBIs do have tickets. At non sold out events, it is regarded harder to recruit FREPs.

Ceteris paribus, FREPs that have higher fundraising motivation raise higher amounts of funds. When excluding the factor 'event' though, it can be seen that event motivation could thrive people to raise higher amounts in order to participate at more popular events.

It is not clear if Healthcare PBIs have more FREPs with reciprocal motivation, FREPs should be studied to properly assess this relationship.

A higher amount requested to be raised generally leads to a higher amount raised, which indicates that PBI's should not just expect FREPs to raise higher amounts as initially expected. PBIs should keep in mind that higher amounts requested could influence the amount of FREPs participating.

Control reduces the risk of FREPs not meeting the requested amount, not paying costs or cancelling at the last moment and therefore results in higher income and fewer costs. Proper facilitation could cause FREPs to raise more than the minimum amount requested.

Networks seem to be the largest source of FREPs. FREPs with stronger ties seem to raise more funds. It should though be taken into account that closed networks could lead to saturation, it is therefore wise to attract new network contacts.

8.3 Others

As indicated in the introduction of the analysis, there were some additional relevant results retrieved from the interviews, which could not be discussed in the hypotheses, these are:

Motivation

The motivation why PBIs are raising funds is clear; they need funding to achieve their goals. Why they do this at running events is the question. Several PBI representatives have indicated that they are runners and that this was a co-factor to decide to participate at running events with the PBI. Others indicated that they joined in when they saw the successes of other PBIs.

For several of the interviewed PBIs running (or at least sports) is a main activity directly relating to the higher goals of the PBI. Spieren voor Spieren can be translated into 'Muscles for Muscles' their goal is to use healthy muscles to raise funds for research to help ill muscles. Spieren voor Spieren once originated out of the Dutch World Cup football team, who would donate a certain amount per goal scored. Run4Schools was founded by an ultra distance runner who worked in South-Africa for a certain period. He decided to use his (and others') running activities to start a project to endorse sport activities in poor regions of Cape Town. The Bas van de Goor Foundation's main goal is to enable diabetics to sport. They organize summer camps for children with diabetes and 'challenges' as the Damloop and New York City Marathon where diabetics get extra guidance. The Hartstichting indicated that they see running as healthy for the heart and therefore promote it, but are also very cautious as running can be risky for the heart as well.

Recruiting Participants and Price

For the recruitment of participants about all PBI representatives indicated that they activated network contacts, and that this network would grow with each event. Price setting was named as being a consideration for recruiting participants, Anak Filipijnen set priority at selling all starting tickets, and thought this would be easier by setting a low price. Dokters van de Wereld has mentioned they would raise the price for the 2013 edition, but are somewhat scared that it might influence the amount of participants. Other methods used were setting advertisements on google and the Damloop website, these were said to help to a certain extent as well. Recruiting participants is said to have two bigger waves, one when the starting tickets are sold, which is generally around

the 1st of April, and one just before the event. The normal starting tickets are generally sold out very quickly, people are then searching for the tickets and end up at the PBIs.

As just mentioned, some PBIs choose for a certain amount to be raised or paid because they wanted as much participants as possible. Others have mentioned they have set a certain price as they thought it was around average. Amref/VvAA has deliberately set a relatively high price (€ 250,-) as they thought their target group was wealthy. Dokters van de Wereld has indicated that they are going to set the price to a symbolic amount, where each participant raises € 250,- which is the price for a child's operation.

Time and means of recruitment

At the Damloop, the normal tickets are normally sold out within few hours at the Saturday around April 1st. Most PBIs start their recruitment after this date by contacting their network contacts, newsletters and website promotion. It is possible to have an ad on the Damloop website, where possible participants are directed towards. Other channels are used as well, like: inschrijven.nl and marktplaats.nl. The former is the main website where people subscribe for running events, the latter is the main website where people trade tickets when they cannot participate.

Use of Damloop tickets for non-fundraising

While approaching PBIs for the interviews, the researcher approached two PBIs with just one Dam tot Damloop team (10 participants), they both indicated not to have raised funds, but to just participate as a sort of 'business team'. This might be considered a pity as other PBIs would have been eager to do raise funds in order to achieve their higher goals.

9. Discussion

In the following discussion the results from this study will be discussed in regard to their implication on existing theory, what future research is needed and what recommendations can be made to professionals.

Implications on theory

When looking at the theory as discussed in the theoretical framework and in constructing the hypotheses, most results were in accordance with the theory. At two pieces of theory implications have been found.

When looking at the FREPs motivational factors as described by Filo (2008), it seems that there can be an event motivational factor added. Filo (2008) now describes three event motivational factors: intellectual, social and competence. The intellectual motive is formed by knowledge gathered by preparing for the event and by the information shared between participants. Social motives are about making new contacts and maintaining existing relationships. Competency motives are related to the sport achievement, like completing a certain distance or setting a new record time. The event motivational factor that could be added is; gaining an experience. As can be found in certain interviews, participants want to participate at events with a certain fame or status, rather than a more anonymous event. Think of the New York City Marathon, rather than the Enschede Marathon. Or the Dam tot Damloop, rather than the Ten Miles at the Florijn Winterloop. There is a higher motivation for those events as participants want to gain the experience of the ‘most notorious’, ‘most beautiful’, ‘most challenging’ etc. event.

Harbaugh (1997) mentions that donators are likely to meet certain standards of amounts to be donated and are not likely to donate less or more. In respect to amounts to be raised, FREPs are bound to meet the requirements to receive a starting ticket, but often show they are willing to raise more than required. This can be derived out of the mean amounts raised in contrast to the minimal amounts required and by interviewee reporting, to truly analyze FREPs fundraising behavior they need to be the unit of observation.

Further Research

Further research in this field could concentrate on the FREP and its donators instead of the PBI, as they are eventually making the decisions which will lead to them participating and raising as much funds as possible. When their motivations and actions are known, PBIs could align their strategies to this. It could for example investigate the above mentioned possible relationships that would explain why Healthcare PBIs have more participants and raise more funds.

This research can also be partly replicated as such that it can focus on the PBIs that participated at the 2013 Dam tot Damloop. Combining that with this research would make a longitudinal study. It would for example allow a more *ceteris paribus* comparison if a PBI that did not use an online platform decided to use one, and kept other factors the same. It would then be advisable to monitor the process more closely, as in: checking on how PBIs approach the event while in process and checking the results after the event. This could reduce some missing data, though probably not enough, for which it would be wise to conduct a survey with all participating PBIs.

Follow up research could also be held towards event organizers, what are their motivations to relate PBIs fundraising to their event? And how can they best facilitate this?

Recommendations for professionals

As can be found in the research design and limitations sections, there are multiple threats to validity. There is also no empirical proof in the research's results. Following Pfeffer and Sutton (2006) in their book on 'evidence based management': *"When leaders make choices based on dubious knowledge, they put their organization at risk."* (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2006, *Front Flap*). It is not stated that this thesis can be considered as dubious knowledge, it does give certain clues towards explaining reality, but there are few 'hard facts'. The following recommendations should therefore be approached with caution, mainly used for consideration and preferably measured within the organization to assess their efficacy with evidence. Recommendations are given for PBI's fundraising professionals and representatives, and for event managers.

PBI representatives

A first recommendation made is to reconsider the use of a running shirt, many PBIs pay quite substantial costs (up to € 25,-) for a running shirt, while their net amount of funds raised is € 50,-. The costs are substantial, and can be questioned. It could of course be a good tool for visibility purposes, but will FREPs also wear the shirt at other events? Will they only participate if they receive a running shirt, which would make it a 'Like to' factor in Lowndes et. al.'s (2006) CLEAR Framework? Either yes or no, are these costs worth the benefit? It seems that running shirts are also used out of a sort of isomorphism (Di Maggio and Powell, 1983) 'because everybody does it', while some PBIs get them sponsored and can look at its use in another way.

The second recommendation is related to the FREPs' payment, risk aversion and reducing monitoring costs. Multiple PBIs have no clear agreement with their FREPs when the transfer of funds is due and/or what consequences there will be when the funds have not been delivered. Some PBIs have indicated that their FREPs can transfer their funds until after the event, this gives FREPs the advantage of more time, but contains a risk that FREPs cancel at the last moment without transferring funds to even cover costs. Other PBIs `have deadlines before the event, but then spend a lot of time on monitoring and communicating that FREPs should raise enough funds. These risks and monitoring costs could be reduced by installing down payments and/or direct debit authorizations. When a FREP would make a down payment of the actual costs made for this FREP, there would at least be no loss made when the FREP decides to cancel. With a direct debit authorization, FREPs pledge to a certain amount of funds to be raised at a certain moment in time, the PBI then only needs to monitor at this time, and when the funds have not been raised, the direct debit will be used.

Regarding fundraising tools, it is recommended to use both on- as offline tools. The online fundraising tools are said to be very effective to reach a large network. On the other hand, there are still people who have no access to internet, and it is said that face to face contact with direct transfer (by cash or direct debit authorization) of funds is more effective to let people donate. With respect to online fundraising tools, there are quite some different platforms and companies offering possibilities, with different options and different prices. It would be wise to compare those options and prices.

Most PBI's start recruiting FREPs for the Damloop after the Damloop sells its normal starting tickets. It should be considered to start before, as a participant who did get one of the scarce tickets is sure not to become a FREP, while someone who wants a ticket might be tempted by becoming a FREP and not to put effort in to buying normal starting tickets. In terms of recruitment it is recommended to use all communication channels as soon as possible, especially the Dam tot Damloop website, which is not used that much, while participants without tickets are directed towards it.

In terms of recruitment it is regarded that the bigger a network gets, the easier it becomes to recruit FREPs. It is also regarded as a time intensive job, of which certain fundraisers were questioning if it was efficient use of time. To increase the size of a network, and reduce the fundraisers' time, it can be considered to use volunteers or interns to guide the organization of participation at an event, when possible. This relates to strengthening ties, which is a good idea considering results that indicate that more involved FREPs raise more funds.

When looking at Lowndes et. al.'s (2006) CLEAR framework, it looks like most facilitation activity is concentrated towards 'Like to' and 'Enable to', it is recommended that PBIs also pay attention to 'Asked to' and 'Responded to', especially in line with one of Filo's (2008) fundraising motivational factors, which is 'desire to improve the charity'. With 'Asked to' think of asking people directly to become more involved and for example help organizing an event on a voluntary basis. 'Responded to' mainly concentrates on taking the FREP and its possible input seriously, it could therefore be wise to first create a format (for example a survey after the event) where FREPs can give their input, and then seriously respond to this input.

This recommendation may be obvious, and not very concrete, but must be mentioned. Focus on recruiting as much FREPs as possible, who together raise as much funds as possible, while investing the fewest costs as possible against the fewest risk as possible. In a sense, 'success' is a recipe that will vary between PBIs. Setting a minimum amount to be raised that is too low, will result in fewer funds raised. Setting a minimum amount to be raised that is too high, will result in fewer participants and a lower total amount. A balance must be found.

Finally, the balance must also be found between this particular way of fundraising through running events and other ways of fundraising. It is not researched whether fundraising through running events is more or less efficient than other ways of raising funds.

Event managers

Event managers are recommended to involve PBIs in their running event. For example out of corporate social responsibility motivations. Large scale running events typically require some burden on society by means of road blocks, administrative and safety costs. Although a moral judgment; running events could do something for society in return.

Large scale, high profile running events can incorporate PBI involvement to the example of the Dam tot Damloop. When the normal tickets are sold out, or close to sold out, the event can create extra scarcity for normal tickets, by reserving tickets for PBIs and/or reducing the amount of normal tickets. Smaller running events that are unlikely to be sold out are recommended to install a preferred PBI. PBIs could increase the number of participants by promoting an event in their network.

10. References

Literature

- Andreoni, J. (1989). Giving with Impure Altruism: Application to Charity and Ricardian Equivalence. *Journal of Political Economy*, 1989, 97 (6), pp 1447-1458
- Argyris, C. (1976). Single-Loop and Double-Loop Models in Research on Decision Making. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 21(3), pp. 363 – 375.
- Belastingdienst (2012). Algemeen Nut Beogende Instellingen. Retrieved from: <<http://www.belastingdienst.nl/wps/wcm/connect/bldcontentnl/belastingdienst/zakelijk/bijzonder_e_regelingen/goede_doelen/algemeen_nut_beogende_instellingen/>> on 13-11-2012
- Babbie, E. R. (2010). *The practice of social research*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bottenburg, M. (2006). *De tweede loopgolf*. 's Hertogenbosch: W.J.H. Mulier Instituut
- Bottenburg, M. & Hover, P. (2009). *Evenementenlopers in beeld*. 's Hertogenbosch: W.J.H. Mulier Instituut
- Bovens, M. (2005). *Public Accountability*. The Oxford Handbook for Public Management, Chapter 8
- Bruning, S.D. & Lambe, K. (2009). Relationship building and behavioral outcomes: Exploring the connection between relationship attitudes and key constituent behavior. *Communication Research Reports*, 19 (4), pp. 327-337
- Bussel, H. & Forbes, D. (2008). Developing Relationship Marketing in the Voluntary Sector. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 15 (1/2), pp. 151-174
- De Bono, E. (1985). Serious creativity. *Journal for quality and participation*, 12-18.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American sociological review*, 147-160.
- Fillo, K. (2008). *The Importance of Charitable Cause in Motivation for Participation in a Sport Event*. PhD dissertation at the Griffith Business School, Gold Coast, Australia
- Granovetter, M.S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (6), pp 1360-1380
- Harbaugh, W.T. (1997). What do donations buy? A model of philanthropy based on prestige and warm glow. *Journal of Public Economics*, 67, pp. 269-284
- Kaplan, R.S. (2001). Strategic Performance Management and Management in Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 11 (3), pp. 353-370
- Kong, E. & Farrell, M. (2010). *The Role of Image and Reputation as Intangible Resources in Non-Profit Organisations: A Relationship Management Perspective*. Proceedings of the 7th

International Conference on Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Management & Organisational Learning. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong China, 11-12 November 2010

Lowndes, V., Pratchett, L., and Stoker, G. (2006). Diagnosing and Remediating the Failings of Official Participation Schemes: The CLEAR Framework. *Social Policy & Society*, 5 (2) pp. 281-291

Merchant, K. A. & Van der Stede, W. (2007). *Management Control Systems*. Pearson Education Limited

Nettleton, S. & Hardy, M. (2006). Running away with health: the urban marathon and the construction of 'charitable bodies'. *Health*, 10 (4), pp 441-460

Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (2006). *Hard facts, dangerous half-truths, and total nonsense: Profiting from evidence-based management*. Harvard Business Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of democracy*, 6(1), 65-78.

Rose-Ackerman, S. (1996). Altruism, Non-Profits and Economic Theory. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34, pp. 701-728

Rijksoverheid (2011). *Van burgerparticipatie naar overheidsparticipatie*. Retrieved on 25-06-2012 from: << <http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/democratie-en-burgerschap/van-burgerparticipatie-naar-overheidsparticipatie> >>

Speckbacher, G. (2003). The Economics of Performance Management in Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 13 (4), pp. 267-281

Webpages

Amnesty International (2012). Dam tot Damloop. Retrieved from: <http://www.amnesty.nl/damtotdamloop#sponsoramnestyinternational> on 18-12-2012

Amref Flying Doctors (2012). Dam tot Damloop. Retrieved from: <http://www.amref.nl/actueel/archief/dam-tot-damloop-2012-een-toptijd-voor-iedereen/?keywords=damloop> on 18-12-2012

Anak (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.anak.nl/> on 21-12-2012

Bas van de Goor Foundation (2012a). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.bvdgf.org/> on 19-12-2012

Bas van de Goor Foundation (2012b). We run2change diabetes. Retrieved from: <http://www.bvdgf.org/> on 19-12-2012

Belastingdienst (2012). Algemeen Nut Beogende Instellingen. Retrieved from: <<http://www.belastingdienst.nl/wps/wcm/connect/bldcontentnl/belastingdienst/zakelijk/bijzonder_e_regelingen/goede_doelen/algemeen_nut_beogende_instellingen/>> on 13-11-2012

Bommelasloop (2012). Bommelasloop. Retrieved from: http://www.rekreatiesporttwente.nl/?page_id=47 on 27-12-2012

Childslife (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from <http://www.childslife.nl/> on 18-12-2012

Clinicclowns (2013). Loop voor Clinicclowns. Retrieved from: <http://www.loopvoorclinicclowns.nl/> on 2-1-2013

Cuey Machar Secondary School Foundation (2012). Retrieved from: <http://www.cmsf.nl/index.php> on 19-12-2012

Cursa el Corte Ingles. (2013) Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.cursaelcorteingles.cat/en.html> on 24-04-2013

Damloop (2012). Statistieken. Retrieved from: <http://www.damloop.nl/statistieken/> on 12-12-2012

Damloop (2012b). Goede doelen. Retrieved from: <http://www.damloop.nl/goede-doelen/goede-doelen-2012/> on 18-12-2012

Damloop (2012c). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.damloop.nl/> on 17-12-2012

Dance 4 Life (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.dance4life.nl/nl/home/home/> on 18-12-2012

Danikerbosloop (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.danikerbosloop.nl/index.php> on 28-12-2012

DoCare (2012). Dam tot Damloop. Retrieved from: <http://www.docare.nl/188/> on 17-12-2012

Energy4All (2012). Loop mee in de Dam tot Damloop. Retrieved from: <http://www.energy4all.nl/actueel/nieuwsberichten-2011/242-loop-mee-in-dam-tot-damloop-voor-energy4all.html> on 17-12-2012

Europa Kinderhulp (2012). Dam tot Damloop. Retrieved from: <http://ekhdamloop.wordpress.com/> on 19-12-2012

Eye Care Foundation (2012). Dam tot Damloop. Retrieved from: <http://www.eyecarefoundation.nl/actie/dam-tot-damloop-2012> on 18-12-2012

Florijn Winterloop (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.florijnwinterloop.nl/> on 27-12-2012

Hartekind (2012). Dam tot Damloop groot succes. Retrieved from: <http://www.hartekind.nl/2012/10/02/dam-tot-damloop-groot-succes/#more-2516> on 20-12-2012

Hartstichting (2012). Dam tot Damloop. Retrieved from: http://www.hartstichting.nl/actueel/activiteiten_kalender/dam_tot_damloop_2012 on 16-12-2012

Heppie (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.heppie.nl/> on 21-12-2012

Hivos (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.hivos.nl/> on 20-12-2012

ICS (2012). Dam tot Damloop. Retrieved from: <http://www.ics.nl/nieuws/83/dam-tot-damlopers-sponsorbijdrage-on-19-12-2012>.

Johan Cruijff Foundation (2012). Dam tot Damloop. Retrieved from: <http://www.cruyff-foundation.org/smartsite.net?id=2446> on 20-12-2012

Kerstloop (2012). Persbericht. Retrieved from: <http://www.kerstloopamstelveen.nl/persbericht.html> on 27-12-2012

KiKa (2012). Run for KiKa. Retrieved from: <http://www.runforkika.nl/> on 19-12-2012

Leukemie.nl (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.leukemie.nl/> on 20-12-2012

Lopen voor het Leven (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.lopenvoorhetleven.nl/index.php/nl/> on 20-12-2012

Lornah Kiplagat Foundation (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.lornahkiplagatfoundation.nl/> on 16-12-2012

Maastrichts Mooiste (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://maastrichtsmooiste.nl/> on 28-12-2012

Make a Wish (2012). Dam tot Damloop. Retrieved from: <http://www.damloopmakeawish.nl/> on 19-12-2012

Malaika Kids (2012). Damloop. Retrieved from: <http://www.malaika-kids.nl/articles/418> on 20-12-2012

Marathon Rotterdam (2012a). Evenementen. Retrieved from: <http://www.marathonrotterdam.nl/evenement> on 12-12-2012

Marathon Rotterdam (2012b). Marathon. Retrieved from: <http://www.marathonrotterdam.nl/lopers/marathon-on-12-12-2012>

Metakids (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.metakids.nl/> on 18-12-2012

Midwinter Marathon (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.midwintermarathon.nl/> on 27-12-2012

MS-Anders (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.ms-anders.nl/> on 21-12-2012

NCFS (2012). Evenementen. Retrieved from: <http://www.ncfs.nl/index.php?id=001967> on 20-12-2012

Nederlands Kanker Instituut – Antoni van Leeuwenhoek Ziekenhuis (2012). Loop voor het NKI-AVL Fonds. Retrieved from: <http://www.nki.nl/Ziekenhuis/Over/Steun+het+NKI-AVL/Loop+voor+het+NKI-AVL+Fonds.htm> on 17-12-2012

Niños de Guatemala (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from:

<http://www.ninosdeguatemala.org/paginas/index/nl> on 17-12-2012

No Kidding (2012). Acties en initiatieven. Retrieved from: [http://www.no-](http://www.no-kidding.nu/acties_en_initiatieven)

[kidding.nu/acties_en_initiatieven](http://www.no-kidding.nu/acties_en_initiatieven) on 18-12-2012

NOS (2012). Kerstmannen lopen voor goed doel. Retrieved from: [http://nos.nl/artikel/454032-](http://nos.nl/artikel/454032-kerstmannen-lopen-voor-goed-doel.html)

[kerstmannen-lopen-voor-goed-doel.html](http://nos.nl/artikel/454032-kerstmannen-lopen-voor-goed-doel.html) on 27-12-2012

NSGK (2012). Damloop. Retrieved from: [http://www.nsgk.nl/actueel/nieuws/damlopers-halen-](http://www.nsgk.nl/actueel/nieuws/damlopers-halen-17200-euro-op-voor-nsgk)

[17200-euro-op-voor-nsgk](http://www.nsgk.nl/actueel/nieuws/damlopers-halen-17200-euro-op-voor-nsgk) on 20-12-2012

PWN Egmond Halve Marathon (2012a). Halve Marathon. Retrieved from:

<http://www.pwnegmondhalvemarathon.nl/halvemarathon/> on 12-12-2012

PWN Egmond Halve Marathon (2012b). Aanmelden goede doelen. Retrieved from:

<http://www.pwnegmondhalvemarathon.nl/aanmelden-goede-doelen/> on 29-12-2012

Rainbow Homes (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.partnershipfoundation.nl/nl> on 21-

[12-2012](http://www.partnershipfoundation.nl/nl)

Right To Play (2013). Homepage. Retrieved from:

<http://www.rightrightto.com/netherlands/Pages/Home.aspx> on 3-1-2013

Run4Schools (2012a). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.run4schools.nl/> on 20-12-2012

Run4Schools (2012b). Run2Oceans4Schools. Retrieved from: <http://www.run2oceans4schools.nl/> on 20-12-2012

Run4Schools (2012c). Runnym4Schools. Retrieved from: <http://www.runnym4schools.nl/> on 20-12-2012

Run4Schools (2013). Verslag Leslie Pangemanan. Retrieved from:

<http://www.run4schools.nl/nl/verslag-leslie-pangemanan> on 24-04-2013

Save the Children (2012). Damloop. Retrieved from: [http://www.savethechildren.nl/actie-](http://www.savethechildren.nl/actie-nieuwsbericht/Dam-tot-Dam-Loop)

[nieuwsbericht/Dam-tot-Dam-Loop](http://www.savethechildren.nl/actie-nieuwsbericht/Dam-tot-Dam-Loop) on 20-12-2012

Serious Request (2012). Bommelasloop. Retrieved from:

http://www.kominactie.nl/rst_request_sportief_twente_67e_bommelasloop on 27-12-2012

SOS Kinderdorpen (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: www.soskinderdorpen.nl/ on 21-12-2012

Specsaver Steunt (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://stichtingspecsaverssteunt.specsavers.nl/>

on 19-12-2012

Spijeren voor Spijeren (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.spijerenvoorspijeren.nl/> on 17-

12-2012

Sukaisa (2012). Afgeronde evenementen. Retrieved from:

http://www.sukaisa.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=5&Itemid=13 on 20-12-2012

Team Gambia (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.gambiateam.nl/> on 20-12-2012

Terre (2012). Ikretthetwel. Retrieved from: <http://ikretthetwel.nl/> on 20-12-2012

Todos (2012). Todos Acties. Retrieved from: <http://www.todos.nl/acties/todos-acties/> on 20-12-2012

Uitslagen.nl (2012). Bommelasloop, 18 november 2012. Retrieved from: <http://www.uitslagen.nl/> on 12-12-2012

Uitslagen.nl (2013). Dam tot Damloop 2012, Goede Doelen Team Uitslagen. Retrieved from:

<http://evenementen.uitslagen.nl/2012/damloop/> on 4-1-2012

Verhuisdieren.nl (2013). Sporten voor dieren. Retrieved from:

<http://www.verhuisdieren.nl/Vrienden/Sporten-voor-dieren> on 2-1-2013

VUMC Gebouwenloop (2012). Gebouwenloop. Retrieved from:

<http://www.vumc.nl/afdelingen/gebouwenloop/> on 12-12-2012

Warchild (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.spierenvoorspielen.nl/> on 17-12-2012

Wielewaal (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <https://www.wielewaal.nl/?page=1> on 21-12-2012

Witte Bedjes (2013). Homepage. Retrieved from:

<http://www.stichtingwittebedjes.nl/index.php?page=homepage> on 2-1-2013

World Runners (2013). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.worldrunners.nl/> on 2-1-2013

Zevenheuvelenloop (2012). Algemeen. Retrieved from:

<http://www.zevenheuvelenloop.nl/algemeen-2012> on 12-12-2012

ZZF (2012). Homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.zzf.nl/index.php> on 21-12-2012

Appendix I – Overview analyzed events and PBIs

Dam tot Damloop

The Dam tot Damloop is the event with the highest amount of participants (43 310 on the 10EM distance) and the event with most fund raising activities in The Netherlands.

The Dam tot Damloop is a 10EM race from the Amsterdam city center to the Zaandam city center, there is also a smaller 4EM race through Zaandam, a Ladies Run (also 4EM) and a kidsrun. Starting tickets for individual participants are usually sold out little time after the sale starts, there are quite a lot of starting tickets reserved for business and charity teams. In 2012 there were 78 PBI's that had multiple charity teams, which totaled 439 teams of 10 persons each, totaling 4 390 persons running to raise funds. These runners always start early in the race (the start is dispersed in order to have more fluid distribution on the track), which is found an advantage for those who want to set a record time (as they won't need to surpass loads of people). The PBI's also have a stand in the 'charity village' where they can present themselves to other runners. In the 2011 edition a total of € 612.000,- has been raised.

Next to the PBI's participating, the Dam tot Damloop has a PBI as preferred charity, in 2012 'Stichting Witte Bedjes' (and 'Dance for Life' for the Ladies Run), which is put central in different communications and for which individuals can make a donation when buying their starting ticket. The Dam tot Damloop promotes the use of the 'Alvarum' website as a platform to raise funds (Damloop, 2012c).

Helden Race

The Helden Race is an event organized by the earlier mentioned 'Alvarum' fundraising platform. In 2012 this event was held three times in different Dutch cities; Amsterdam, The Hague and Eindhoven, as well as in cities all over Europe. The event entails a run of 6KM, participants are required to raise at least 200,- for a PBI. There are also various prizes awarded like for those who raise the most funds and who have the most impressive outfit.

The The Hague edition had 200 participants for 33 PBI's and raised a total of around 100.000,-.

The Eindhoven edition had 500 participants and donators and raised 13.000,-.

The Amsterdam edition had 400 participants for 60 PBI's who raised 168.000,-.

Kerstmannenloop Amersfoort

This is an event the researcher participated in. The Kerstmannenloop is a so called 'social run' which implies that there is no competitive element. The run is about 5km through the city center of Amersfoort, about 1500 people participated who all received a Santa Claus outfit. Participation costs 10,-. While subscribing and preparing for the race, I had no notion of a PBI raising funds. During the run there were some banners present of the 'Astmafonds' but no other notion of PBI's and their fundraising activities. Afterwards was reported that 1150,- was raised for the 'Astmafonds' (NOS, 2012).

Florijn Winterloop - Woudenberg

Is a small scale running event with three different distances for adults; 5km, 10km and 10em. In total there are around 2000 participants, participation costs 7,50. The Florijn Winterloop has a preferred PBI, which is 'Villa Joep', on the homepage of the events website, there is no information provided about this PBI, only by looking further on the site, info about this PBI could be found. There

is an amount of 2,- requested as a donation while subscribing for the event (Florijn Winterloop, 2012).

Present at the event, the researcher looked at the involvement of the PBI at the running event. The researcher found some flyers and banners at the event centre, but could not find a stand or representatives of the PBI, the researcher did not see anybody raising funds for the Villa Joep PBI.

Bommelasloop - Enschede

The Bommelasloop is another small scale running event with different distances; 7,4, 11,2, 16,4, and 21,1. In total there were 396 participants. The preferred PBI was the Red Cross (Rode Kruis) although the funds raised were given through the 'Serious Request' fundraising (a big radio and television event, which raised about 12 million in total in 2012), for each participant, 1,- was donated and there was the opportunity to give some extra at the event. There was 55,- raised at the event and 445,- with subscriptions. The Bommelasloop also created a webpage on the Serious Request website, where people could donate after the event as well (Bommelasloop, 2012, Serious Request, 2012).

Kerstloop Amstelveen

Is a small scale running event with three distances: 10km, 5km and 2,5km. Participation costs is 6, 4 and 2,- respectively. A couple of hundred people participated in 2011. There is no PBI involved in this run (Kerstloop Amstelveen, 2012).

Midwinter Marathon – Apeldoorn

The Midwinter Marathon is an event with 4 distances; 8km, 18,5km, 27,5km and 42,2km. The participation costs vary from 10,- (8km) to 35,- (42,2km). The Midwinter Marathon's main sponsor is a large health insurance company. They have a preferred PBI which is KiKa, at subscribing for the event, a donation is asked. Next to this, the event will offer a fundraising platform for individuals to raise funds and offers prizes (lottery) for those who raise funds (Midwinter Marathon, 2012).

Danikerbosloop

Is a small scale running event (about 2-300 participants in 2011) with two distances, 5em and 10em. Participation costs 6,-. No PBI is involved in this event (Danikerbosloop, 2012).

Roermond City Run

Is a running event through the city centre of Roermond on the Queensday Dutch Holiday. There are 3 distances (in 2012 there were 2), 5km, 10km and 10em. Participation costs 15,- for the 10em, the other distances are a bit cheaper. In 2012, there were about 1600 participants. No PBI is involved in this event (Roermond City Run, 2012).

7 Heuvelenloop

Is a 15km running event in Nijmegen and its surrounding 7 hills. The 7 Heuvelenloop is one of the larger Dutch running events, and had 26 440 in 2012, the cost of participating is 22,25. The 7 Heuvelenloop emphasize durability and have a relationship with the UMC St. Radboud, who founded the 'Lopen voor het Leven' PBI. It is possible to 'round up' the registration costs and donate an amount to this PBI, they also organized a quiz-question (with prizes, not clear how this helps in fundraising) and promote the PBI on their website (although it was not found initially). There is no 'charity competition' or something similar. PBI's could of course organize their own actions around this race (Zevenheuvelenloop, 2012).

Maastrichts Mooiste

Is a running event through the Maastricht city center and its surroundings. It has multiple distances; 5, 10 and 15km, the 15 km being the main distance.

Maastrichts Mooiste seems to have a designated charity 'Stichting all4sports' but it is not registered as a PBI. This organization is the organizing organization of the event. The amount of participants of Maastrichts Mooiste, is 1110 on the 15k which is the main distance but this number is not complete, in total almost 10.000 people participated in various distances (including kids runs). Participation costs 15,- (Maastrichts Mooiste, 2012).

Marathon Rotterdam

The Rotterdam Marathon is one of the more famous running events and attracted, next to the 7541 participants of the marathon, a crowd of 925 000 in 2012. Participating at the marathon costs 70,-. They have a preferred PBI; the Sophia Children's Hospital. At registration, it is possible to donate an amount to this PBI. There is no special charity run, or other info on fundraising at this event, although there would be individuals that take their own initiative (Marathon Rotterdam, 2012b).

PWN Egmond Halve Marathon

Is a half Marathon through the beach and dunes of Egmond aan Zee, and one of the more popular events in the Netherlands (almost 16 000 participants in 2012). PWN is the organization that maintains the dunes and its nature. The Egmond Half Marathon is organized by the same organization as the Dam tot Damloop. As with the Dam tot Damloop, the Egmond Half Marathon has charity teams of 10 persons, that start just after competitive runners, the 2013 edition will be the first time these charity teams participate, there are now 8 PBI's participating, while maximum 15 could participate. A team (of 10 persons) for the Half Marathon costs the PBI 350,-, this includes starting tickets, webpages on the 'alvarum' fundraising platform, a stand at the event area and promotion on the events' website (PWN Egmond Halve Marathon, 2012b).

Normal starting tickets are sold out, and costs 21,-.

Next to the charity teams, the Egmond Half Marathon has a preferred PBI, which is 'Simavi', for which it is possible to donate an amount when registering (PWN Egmond Halve Marathon, 2012a).

VUMC Gebouwenloop

The VUMC Gebouwenloop is a running event through the buildings of the VU Hospital. The track is 5km and could be ran 2 times (thus a 10km run). The number of participants is maximum 800, participation costs 10,-, of which 2,- is donated to the preferred PBI; Stichting Leukemie.nl (who then funds research projects at the VUMC), donating more is possible at registration, the total amount raised was 6 500,- (VUMC Gebouwenloop, 2012).

PBI's*Hartstichting*

The 'Hartstichting' is a PBI concerned with providing information about and conducting research on hearth diseases. They have had 20 teams at the Dam tot Damloop 2012 (200 participants). They are the main PBI of the Sylvestercross Soest, where a voluntary contribution is asked from every runner next to the payment of the starting tickets. Next to this they are involved at other events, and offer the possibility to start your own action, for example at a running event.

For the Dam tot Damloop, participants needed to collect 100,-, it is unclear whether they would need

to pay the entrance ticket separate. A running shirt is offered for free.

How the money should be collected is not entirely clear, but the Hartstichting has its own website where money can be donated online (Hartstichting, 2012).

Lornah Kiplagat Foundation

The Lornah Kiplagat Foundation is a PBI in International Development and aims to improve Kenyan girls education. Lornah Kiplagat is a professional athlete which gives this PBI's relationship with running events an extra dimension.

The LKF participates at several events with teams and has individuals that raise funds at other events as well. It is not clear how the LKF recruits participants.

At the Dam tot Damloop, the LKF had 20 teams, some of these teams were filled by companies.

There is no amount mentioned participants should raise.

Charitable givers can donate via the geef.nl website which issues 10% of the amount donated (Lornah Kiplagat Foundation, 2012).

Nederlands Kanker Instituut – Antoni van Leeuwenhoek Ziekenhuis

The NKI-AVL is a hospital specialized in cancer and cancer research, they have a foundation for which they raise funds. There is limited information on the website, it seems they are not involved in other running events than the Dam tot Damloop.

At the Dam tot Damloop 2012, the NKI-AVL had 20 teams. People should raise at least 200,- and try to reach 500,-. The price of the starting ticket is included, as well as a T-Shirt. To raise this amount, participants could get a personal fundraising webpage, on which site exactly is unclear (NKI-AVL, 2012).

Niños de Guatemala

Niños de Guatemala (NDG) is a PBI focused on improving primary education in Guatemala.

Niños de Guatemala participated at the Dam tot Damloop with 20 teams, they do not seem to actively participate in other running events.

For the Dam tot Damloop, NDG installed a fee of 50,- including the starting ticket, a t-shirt and free food and drinks. Next to this fee, participants are requested to raise funds in their network, but there's no specific target mentioned on their own website, on the Damloop website (Damloop, 2012) it is mentioned that at least 300,- should be raised. To raise funds, participants can create their own page on the 'alvarum' website. An amount of 35 000,- has been raised at the Dam tot Damloop. NDG seems to be an organization that specifically aims to involve students and younger people in their activities (Niños de Guatemala, 2012).

Stichting DoCare

This PBI aims at giving HIV/Aids prevention education in developing countries.

DoCare participated at the Dam tot Damloop 2012 with 20 teams and raised 12 300,-. There is limited information on their website on how they have recruited participants and what were the demands and/or tools provided to raise funds.

DoCare does not seem to participate in other running events. They do offer free training programs in preparation for the event (DoCare, 2012).

Stichting Energy4All

Energy4All is a PBI concerned with metabolism illnesses. They have numerous events mentioned on their website, it seems they actively endorse individuals (and organizations) to initiate fund raising

activities. In regard to running events, it seems there is no collective activity except for the Dam tot Damloop. Energy4All had 20 teams and collected 36 005,81,- Energy4All requested its participants to raise at least 150,- (for the 2011 edition, no info found on the 2012 edition), the starting ticket and a running shirt are included. To raise funds, Energy4All has its own webpage/software where people can donate. Energy4All mentioned that 180 people have participated, while they would have 200 tickets (Energy4All, 2012).

Stichting Spieren voor Spieren

Stichting Spieren voor Spieren is a PBI that aims to let people use their muscles for the benefit of those with muscle illnesses. The nature of this PBI could explain why they are involved with quite some events. These events could be participated by individuals out of their own initiative, they could be small events organized out of own initiative and events with organization by Spieren voor Spieren. These are teams participating at the Dam tot Damloop and the Egmond Halve Marathon and the 'Spieren voor Spieren City Run' in Hilversum. For both the Egmond Halve Marathon and the Dam tot Damloop, Spieren voor Spieren asks 100,- of funds to be raised. This includes a starting ticket, a sports bag and a running shirt. Spieren voor Spieren uses 'alvarum' to offer participants an online fundraising tool. Spieren voor Spieren also awards prizes to those who raised the most funds. The Spieren voor Spieren City Run asks for a voluntary donation to Spieren voor Spieren when subscribing. The 2012 edition raised 31 000,- (Spieren voor Spieren, 2012).

Warchild

Warchild is a PBI focused on giving children in (former) war areas a future. They offer individuals the opportunity to start their own initiatives and some of these are running events (participants). It does not seem that they actively organize participation at running events other than the Dam tot Damloop. At the Dam tot Damloop they've had 20 teams (200 participants), and raised about 24 000,-. There is no information found on the amounts Warchild asks to participate, other costs etc. Warchild does use an online program that enables participants to raise funds, but it is unclear which one (Warchild, 2012).

Amnesty International

Is a PBI that promotes human rights. Amnesty International has its own small scale sponsor run running event and participates in the Dam tot Damloop organized. It is also seems to be possible for individuals to organize fundraising through other running events although this is not actively promoted through their website. At the Dam tot Damloop, Amnesty International had 10 teams. They asked each participant to raise at least 100,-, a starting ticket and running shirt were included. It is not clear whether Amnesty facilitates its FREPs in its fundraising facilities or not. There is no amount raised known for 2012, in 2011 they have raised around 12 000,-. How much was raised with their own event is unclear as well. Amnesty uses the 'geefsamem' fundraising platform (Amnesty International, 2012).

Amref Flying Doctors

Amref Flying Doctors is a PBI that focuses on improving healthcare in Africa. Amref does not seem to be involved with other running events besides the Dam tot Damloop, although they offer individuals the opportunity to raise funds and initiate their own activities. At the Damloop they had 10 teams,

but only 64 participants (so 26 starting tickets left). Amref requested participants to raise at least 250,- this would be doubled by the VvAA (Vereniging van Arts en Auto). This amount included a starting ticket, running shirt, training and personalized training schedule. Amref used the 'Alvarum' fundraising platform (Amref Flying Doctors, 2012).

Dance 4 Life

This PBI aims at reducing HIV/Aids in the world. As is in the name, Dance 4 Life mostly raises funds at/by dance events. They encourage individuals to initiate their own fundraising activities, which could be running. They have organized participation at the Dam tot Damloop and have 10 charity teams, but because of ties with business teams they claim to have had 320 participants, who raised 40 000,-.

For the charity teams, a minimum of 150,- is requested to be raised, this includes the starting ticket and a running shirt. Dance4Life uses the 'Alvarum' fundraising platform. Dance4Life is also the preferred PBI at the Dam tot Dam Ladies Run, a sub-distance within the overall Dam tot Damloop program, for every participant of this ladies run, a small amount will be transferred to Dance 4 Life (Dance 4 Life, 2012).

Eye Care Foundation

The Eye Care Foundation is a PBI concerned with improving Eye Care in developing countries. Eye Care Foundation encourages people to raise funds out of own initiative and organizes 10 teams to participate in the Dam tot Damloop, although only 87 people participated in 2012 (13 people less than possible) who raised about 17.000,-. The minimum amount requested was 125,-, it is unknown whether the starting ticket was included or not. The Eye Care Foundation offers the possibility to create a personal fundraising webpage at the 'Just Giving' website (Eye Care Foundation, 2012).

Hulphond Nederland

Hulphond Nederlands is a PBI that aims at supporting and improving the use of help dogs for disabled persons. Hulphond Nederland encourages people to raise funds out of their own initiative. Next to that they participated at the Dam tot Damloop with 10 teams. Hulphond Nederlands asks 30,- from each participant to cover the starting ticket costs and supplies a running shirt, next to this they ask to raise at least 50,-. Hulphond Nederland offers the possibility to create a personal webpage on their website, but also uses sponsor forms participants can use. In this latter case, the participants receive money from their sponsors, add them to the sponsor form and transfers this money to Hulphond Nederland (Hulphond Nederland, 2012).

Metakids

Is a PBI focused on raising funds for children metabolism illnesses research. Metakids encourages people to raise funds out of their own initiative and gives the opportunity to create a personal webpage on their website to raise funds. Metakids had 10 teams participating at the Dam tot Damloop who raised 42 601,-. Metakids is also linked as charitable cause to the Energy Run in the Eemshaven, this resulted in 5 130,-

There has no information been found on how much money the FREP's were requested to raise or what would be included in this price (Metakids, 2012).

No Kidding

Is a PBI that want to create awareness about and stop child abuse. No Kidding encourages people to raise funds out of their own initiative and gives the opportunity to create a personal webpage on

the 'alvarum' and 'geefsaamen.nl' websites. No Kidding participated with 10 teams at the Dam tot Damloop and will participate at the Egmond ¼ Marathon with 2 teams. No information was found on requirements for the Dam tot Damloop, it was mentioned that several companies participated in relationship with No Kidding. For the Egmond ¼ Marathon an amount of 100,- is asked to cover costs as starting ticket, running shirt and organization and an amount of 100,- is asked to be raised as funds (No Kidding, 2012).

Childslife

Childslife is a PBI that wants to improve education in developing countries. Childslife encourages people to raise funds out of their own initiative and gives the opportunity to create a personal webpage on the 'Justgiving' website. There is no information found about other running events than the Dam tot Damloop. At the Dam tot Damloop, Childslife had 10 teams. Childslife asked participants to pay 35,- to cover starting ticket costs and a running shirt, next to this, participants had to raise funds, though no minimum amount was provided (Childslife, 2012, Damloop, 2012b).

Europa Kinderhulp

Europa Kinderhulp is a PBI focusing on offering holidays to children with special needs. Europa Kinderhulp does not actively promote fund raising initiatives on their website, but do promote people to become a volunteer to host holiday places for children. There is only information found on the Dam tot Damloop in regard to running events. At the Damloop, Europa Kinderhulp had 10 teams participating, and an average amount of funds raised was set at 125,- so the total amount is estimated at around 12 500,-. Participants for Europa Kinderhulp were requested to raise 100,- which included a starting ticket and running shirt. Europa Kinderhulp indicates that the costs for organization, starting ticket and running shirt are 55,-. They require a deposit of 25,- as they have encountered sudden cancellations which implied severe costs in the year before. Participants can use the 'alvarum' website to raise funds (Europa Kinderhulp, 2012).

KiKa

This PBI aims to reduce (cure) children's cancer. KiKa is a very active PBI concerning running events, they have a special 'run for KiKa' website, organize their own runs and participate at multiple events like the Dam tot Damloop and the New York Marathon. KiKa encourages individuals to initiate their own fundraising activities and uses webpages on their own website. KiKa organized 5 running events themselves in 2012, in Rotterdam (112 505,-), Ede (78 783,-), Eindhoven (60 288,-), Spaarnwoude (111 338,-) and Groningen (34 995,-). KiKa participated with 10 teams at the Dam tot Damloop 2012, but unfortunately, no further information was found (KiKa, 2012).

Stichting Specsaver Steunt

This PBI is a foundation created by the Specsavers retail chain, where for every bought product a certain amount will be donated to this foundation, this will then be given to a local initiative of each shop. It does not seem that this PBI encourages people to raise funds out of their own initiative and they do not seem to be involved in any other running event. There is no information found about how this PBI organized its participation at the Dam tot Damloop (Stichting Specsavers Steunt, 2012).

Wereld Kanker Onderzoek Fonds

The Wereld Kanker Onderzoek Fonds is a foundation that funds cancer prevention research around the world. The Wereld Kanker Onderzoek Fonds encourages people to raise funds out of their

own initiative and gives the opportunity to create a personal webpage on their website. Individuals have participated in various running events and the Wereld Kanker Onderzoek Fonds participated with 10 teams at the Dam tot Damloop. Participants had to raise a minimum of 250,- and would receive a starting ticket and running shirt in return. The amount raised in 2012 is not known, in 2010 an amount of 23 000,- has been raised (Wereld Kanker Onderzoek Fonds, 2012).

Bas van de Goor Foundation

The Bas van de Goor Foundation is a PBI that aims to promote and support people with diabetes to sport. Because of this there are quite some events mentioned on their website, where those with diabetes can subscribe for, this is more of a community though and these people generally do not raise funds. For the Dam tot Damloop, the Bas van de Goor Foundation had 5 teams, both people with as without diabetes can join. People need to raise or pay themselves 100,-, which covers a starting ticket, running shirt and a donation to the foundation. Participants can create a personal page on their website, but not for fundraising reasons, only to share experiences in sporting with diabetes. The Bas van de Goor Foundation also participates at the New York Marathon, participants should raise 4 219,50 (100,- per kilometer) of which 59% is costs and 41% is a donation to the foundation, for this event the participants do have a personal page on which they can raise funds (Bas van de Goor Foundation, 2012a, Bas van de Goor Foundation 2012b).

Cuey Machar Secondary School Foundation (CMSF)

CMSF is a PBI that created and maintains a secondary school in South-Sudan. CMSF does not explicitly state that individuals can initiate their own activity, their volunteers are mostly students from the Radboud University Nijmegen. They do not seem to be involved with more running activities apart from the Dam tot Damloop. For the Dam tot Damloop, CMSF had 5 teams. They require participants to pay 50,- for the starting ticket and a running shirt and to raise 100,- as funds. CMSF also had some famous people participating, arranged a warm up led by Edwin van der Sar (famous retired football player) and was sponsored by a Zaandam gym where its participants could take a shower or sauna after the event. It is possible to donate money via the CMSF website, but there are no personal pages for participants they could use to raise funds (CMSF, 2012).

Dokters van de Wereld

Is a PBI focusing on better medical care in developing countries. Dokters van de Wereld encourages people that would like to take some initiative to contact the PBI first. Dokters van de Wereld was active in a couple of running events; The Amsterdam ½ Marathon, The Amsterdam ‘Helden Race’ and the Dam tot Damloop. For the Dam tot Damloop, Dokters van de Wereld had 5 teams, participants were asked to raise 150,- this included the starting ticket and running shirt. Dokters van de Wereld used the ‘alvarum’ website as an online tool to facilitate fundraising (Dokters van de Wereld, 2012).

ICS

Is an international development PBI that invests in social entrepreneurship and the maintenance of childrens’ rights. ICS encourages people to raise funds out of their own initiative and gives the opportunity to create a personal webpage on the ‘geefsamen’ website. ICS had 5 participating teams at the Dam tot Damloop. Each participant was requested to raise 100,-, this included the starting ticket and a running shirt. To raise funds, participants could use the ‘geefsamen’ website (ICS, 2012).

Make a Wish

Make a Wish is a PBI that wants to make wishes of life threateningly ill children come true. Make a Wish encourages people to raise funds out of their own initiative and wants those people to first contact the organization, Make a Wish also uses the 'alvarum' website, but not fully as it seems. Make a Wish is only organizing the Dam tot Damloop participation in terms of running events. They require each participants to raise at least 150,-. They have provided each participant with a sponsor form to keep track on who has donated money, but want the money transferred by the participant (Make a Wish, 2012).

Revalidatiefonds

The Revalidatiefonds is a PBI concerned with people revalidating from severe trauma and chronic illnesses. The Revalidatiefonds does not have information on their website about individuals that want to initiate fundraising actions, there are no running events mentioned either. On the Dam tot Damloop website is information found on participation requirements, which is at least 100,- including the starting ticket and a running shirt. It is mentioned that the fundraising can be done through sponsor forms and via an online platform but not which one (looks like it's 'justgiving'), the Revalidatiefonds had 5 teams participating (Dam tot Damloop, 2012b, Revalidatiefonds, 2012).

Run4Schools

Run4Schools is a PBI that raises money for sports education on primary schools in South African townships. As in the name, Run4Schools mainly tries to raise money through running events. They are the main PBI at the 'Letterenloop' and 'Amsterdamse Heuvelloop' and participates in the New York Marathon, the Two Oceans Marathon and the Dam tot Damloop (5 teams). For the New York Marathon 2012 (which was eventually cancelled due to a storm) 10 people participated and as a team their goal was to raise 10 000,-, so 1 000,- per person. The 'Two Oceans Marathon' is a ½- and 56km Ultra- Marathon in Kaapstad, South Africa. There are 40 people participating in various distances and Running4Schools goal is to raise 56 000,-. These last two mentioned events have their own websites, where the participants can raise funds, for the Damloop, no such website was found. Participants for the Damloop should raise 100,-, this includes the starting ticket and a running shirt, Run4Schools mentions that they have received the starting tickets and running shirts sponsored, this would be an important difference with regard to the actual amount raised (Run4Schools, 2012a, Run4Schools 2012b, Run4Schools, 2012c).

Gambia Team

Gambia Team is a PBI that joins the Amsterdam – Dakar Car Rally, in order to raise funds for development projects in Gambia. Team Gambia does not offer the possibility to raise funds as an individual. They do not seem to be active in any other running events than the Dam tot Damloop. Participants at the Dam tot Damloop are requested to raise 100,-, starting ticket and running shirt are included, there is no online website for fundraising (Dam tot Damloop, 2012b, Team Gambia, 2012).

Stichting Hartekind

Is a PBI that supports children with heart diseases in living a normal life. Hartekind encourages people to raise funds out of their own initiative and uses the 'geefsaamen' website where individuals can create their own webpage. They are mainly active in ice skating events. In regard to running, they participate with 5 teams at the Dam tot Damloop, ask participants to raise 100,- including starting ticket and running shirt, the total amount raised was around 18 000,- (Hartekind, 2012).

Stichting Leukemie.nl

Is a PBI that focuses on raising funds for research and giving information about leukemia. Leukemie.nl encourages people to initiate their own fundraising activities, but does not use any online fundraising platform. Leukemie.nl is very active in regard to running events, they have their own 'Loop Organisatie Leukemiestichting' (LOL), which is 'running organization leukemiafoundation' in English (LOL is something like 'fun') and therefore promote 'lopen voor de LOL' / 'running for fun'. They are the preferred PBI for the 'Halve van Hoogland' and 'VUMC Gebouwenloop' events, and participated with 5 teams at the Dam tot Damloop. Participants at the Dam tot Damloop were asked to pay 35,- to cover cost for the starting ticket and could either borrow a running shirt or buy one for 20,-, next to this they were asked to raise at least 100,-. Stichting Leukemie.nl did not use an online fundraising platform, but does use 'geefgratis' on their website (Leukemie.nl, 2012).

Lopen voor het Leven

Lopen voor het Leven is a PBI that concentrates on fundraising through running events, they donate the funds raised to another PBI: KWF Kankerbestrijding, and to specific cancer research projects. Lopen voor het Leven does mention individuals can organize their own fundraising actions, but do not elaborate how. Lopen voor het Leven also mentions they will organize their own running event. Lopen voor het Leven had participants in different running events, including the New York City Marathon and the Dam tot Damloop. No clear requirements are found for both events, it is published that the NYCM participants raised 30 353,87. Lopen voor het Leven was also the preferred PBI of the 2012 '7 Heuvelenloop' (Lopen voor het Leven, 2012).

Sukaisa

Sukaisa is a PBI that aims to improve primary education in Kenya. Sukaisa does not mention the opportunity to initiate fund raising activities. They were active in the Dam tot Damloop with 5 teams and participated at the 'Helden Race' with 100 people, where they raised 37 104,-. There is no amount published on the Dam tot Damloop fundraising. Participants were required to raise at least 300,- (according to own website, presumably including starting ticket) or 100,- (according to the Dam tot Damloop website, excluding ticket). Sukaisa uses the 'Alvarum' website to raise funds (Dam tot Damloop, 2012b, Sukaisa, 2012).

Stichting Terre

Stichting Terre is a PBI concerned with the RETT Syndrome. Terre encourages individuals to initiate actions, but do not use an online platform. Terre is so far only involved with the Dam tot Damloop, regarding running events. There is no information found on minimum amounts to be raised. The total amount raised was 27 715,34, Terre has a special website for this event, but no atomized donation software (so people should do it manually through e-banking) (Stichting Terre, 2012).

Stichting Todos

Todos is a PBI aiming to help children in developing countries to develop themselves and to create awareness with children in The Netherlands about children in developing countries. Todos encourages individuals to employ fundraising initiatives, and uses the 'Alvarum' fundraising platform. Todos was active in the Dam tot Damloop and Helden Race running events, they have raised about 2 200,- at the Helden Race and 5 500,- at the Dam tot Damloop. Unfortunately, no information is available on the asked requirements to participate (Todos, 2012).

Hivos

Is one of the bigger PBI's concerned with international development and human rights. Hivos encourages people to join in activities, but does not explicitly mention the possibility to initiate individual actions. Hivos is not actively present at running events except the Dam tot Damloop, at which they participate with 5 teams. Hivos asks its participants to raise 150,- including starting ticket and running shirt. Hivos is the only one so far that explicitly mentioned raising less than the required amount is no big problem (Hivos, 2012).

Johan Cruijff Foundation

Is a PBI that aims to get Dutch children to exercise. JCF encourages people to raise funds out of their own initiative and gives the opportunity to create a personal webpage on their website. As an organization JCF is only involved at the Dam tot Damloop regarding running events. They have 5 teams, and the goal to raise 5 000,-. No extra information is found on participation requirement (Johan Cruijff Foundation, 2012).

Nederlandse Cystic Fibrosis Stichting (NCFS)

Is a PBI that supports cystic fibrosis patients. NCFS encourages people to raise funds out of their own initiative but does not seem to have an online platform to raise funds. NCFS has individuals participating at several events and participates at the Dam tot Damloop. The Damloop participation is organized by volunteers/others, that created a new PBI 'run for your son', which donates the funds raised to the NCFS. Participants are required to pay 100,- to cover costs for the starting ticket, a running outfit (shirt and short) and training. Next to this they are asked to raise a minimum of 750,- (which participants should guarantee), which is quite high compared to other PBI's. NCFS had 11 teams participating, but only 55 participants (although it could be a sub-team?), who raised 55 000,- which is also quite high (NCFS, 2012), (Run for your son, 2013).

Nederlandse Stichting voor het Gehandicapte Kind (NSGK)

Is a PBI that supports handicapped children. Encourages own initiatives, uses 'geefsamen' website. Only organized running at Damloop, others can organize themselves at other events. 100,- requested, starting ticket and running shirt included. 10 teams, 17 200,- funds raised (NSGK, 2012).

Malaika Kids

Orphans in Tanzania. Encourages own initiative. Uses 'iGive', but on an own website. Organized participation only at Damloop. 5 teams, 100,- funds to be raised plus 25,- costs of starting ticket and running shirt. Funds raised 6 011,- and 19 participants (Dam tot Damloop, 2012b, Malaika Kids, 2012).

Rainbow Homes

Is a PBI that offers shelters to homeless children in India. Not encouraging to start own initiatives. No fundraising platform. Only Damloop. 45,- cost of starting ticket, plus raising 100,-. 15 teams (Rainbowhomes, 2012).

Save the Children

Wants to improve the future of children worldwide. Encourages individuals to initiate actions, uses the 'Alvarum' platform. Running only Damloop. 6 teams, 90 participants. 150,- with starting ticket and running shirt. Amount raised 12 102,- (Save the Children, 2012).

SOS Kinderdorpen

Is a PBI that wants to shelter homeless kids. They encourage individuals to initiate actions and use the 'Justgiving' platform. They participated at the Dam tot Damloop and the Utrecht Marathon (5km distance). For both events they asked participants to raise 100,-, which included the starting ticket (SOS Kinderdorpen, 2012).

Stichting Anak Filippijnen

Is a PBI that supports children in Philippine slums. Anak encourages individuals to start their own fundraising actions and uses the 'Alvarum' platform. They participated in the Dam tot Damloop and the Heldenrace. For the Damloop they asked participants 50,-, for a starting ticket and a small amount for the PBI, next to this they asked participants to collect funds. The Heldenrace requires 200,- to be raised in order to participate (Anak, 2012)

Stichting Heppie

Heppie supports Dutch children with problems (like poverty, disease etc.). They encourage people to initiate actions, but do not seem to have an online platform in use. They participated at the Damloop with 5 teams, but no further information could be found (Heppie, 2012).

Stichting Hirda

Is a PBI concerned with development of Somalia. No further information has been found.

Stichting MS-Anders

Is a PBI concerned with the MS disease. They encourage individuals to initiate their own fundraising actions and use the 'geef.nl' platform. They participated in the Dam tot Damloop with 5 teams, unfortunately, there is no information about which amount to be raised was required, it is mentioned that this unknown amount would include the starting ticket and a running shirt (MS-Anders, 2012).

Stichting Wielewaal

Wielewaal is a PBI that organizes holidays for handicapped children. They encourage individuals to initiate their own activities, and have fundraising pages on their own website. 2012 was their 'Year of Walking' and requested people to raise funds through walking/running events. These were mostly individuals participating at certain events. As an organization they participated at the Dam tot Damloop with 5 teams. The requested amount to be raised was not indicated, but a starting ticket and running shirt would be included (Wielewaal, 2012).

Stichting Zeldzame Ziekte Fonds

ZZF is a PBI concerned with rare diseases. They encourage individuals to raise funds and use the 'justgiving' website as a fundraising platform. Several running events are on ZZF's event calendar, it seems they participate as an organization at least the Egmond ½ Marathon and the Dam tot Damloop (5 teams), unfortunately, no information is known about amounts raised and other requirements (ZZF, 2012).

Stichting Wittebedjes

Wittebedjes is a PBI that focuses on improving the life of sick and handicapped children in the Amsterdam area. Wittebedjes is founded and still linked to 'Het Parool' a newspaper that is also a major sponsor of the Damloop. Wittebedjes is the preferred PBI at the Dam tot Damloop, for which a

donation is asked upon registration, an amount of the sale of the official Damloop running shirt is donated and has 5 teams at the Damloop (not mentioned at the Damloop website, but mentioned at the Wittebedjes website). Wittebedjes does not seem to encourage individuals to start fundraising actions and does not use a fundraising platform (Wittebedjes, 2013).

Others

As mentioned before, some PBI's did participate at the event according to the results list, but were not mentioned on the Dam tot Damloop website, these are; Stichting Chivombo, Stichting Macheo Nederland, St. Partnership Foundation, oneMen, Ronald McDonald Huis AMC, Move 4 Kids, Stichting Cucu, Orange Babies, HealthFoundation, Stichting CIEE Amsterdam, Stichting Los Cachorros, Stichting GIST, Niños del Futuro Nederland, Stichting AfroNed, 125 jaar Leger des Heils, Serve the City Amsterdam, 1% Club, Fairfood International, Stichting Caya Cama Ecuador, Stichting Kik'r, Stichting NedPhO, Mooncake Foundation, Stichting de Regenboogboom, SOVEC, Fonds Gehandicaptensport, Stichting Mimpi, Neurofibromatose Vereniging, Alzheimer Nederland, Merlin Entertainments and Aids Foundation East-West (Uitslagen.nl, 2013).

Non Dam tot Damloop

Cliniclowns

Cliniclowns is a PBI that sends clowns to hospital in order to offer sick children some distraction. Cliniclowns is quite active in raising funds through running events, they participate in the New York Marathon and organizes the 'SumoRace' and 'Rodeneuzenloop'. Cliniclowns has a special website for running events that also serves as a fundraising platform.

For participation at the New York City Marathon, an amount of 3 300,- needs to be raised when all other costs will be paid separate, or 5 900,- needs to be raised including other costs like starting ticket, flight, accommodation and training.

The SumoRace is a small scale running event where participants run a relatively small distance in a inflatable 'Sumo' suit. Participation at the SumoRace costs 35,- (or 15,- if you already own a Sumo-suit) and requires 200,- to be raised.

The 'Rodeneuzenloop' is a running event where a marathon distance (42,2km) must be ran by teams from 4-8 people. Participation costs 20,- per person and a team is required to raise 1 100,- in total. In 2012, two editions were planned, one in Woudenberg and one in Enschede, the Enschede edition was cancelled though, due to not enough participants (Cliniclowns, 2013).

World Runners

Is a PBI focused on raising funds for children in developing countries through running events. They are currently the preferred PBI at two running events; Astrea Run and Toprun van het Noorden, both in the Groningen area. They do not seem to be active with participating at running events, nor do they encourage individuals to raise funds out of their own initiative (Worldrunners, 2013).

Verhuisdieren.nl

Is a PBI that mediates between people that want to get rid of their pet and people who want a pet, in order to prevent animals from going to the asylum. Verhuisdieren.nl is active at two running events, the Helden Race and the PWN Egmond Halve Marathon. For the PWN Egmond Halve Marathon, Verhuisdieren.nl requires participants to raise at least 100,-, this includes a starting ticket. Participation at the Helden Race requires 300,- to be raised (Verhuisdieren.nl, 2013).

Right To Play

Is a PBI that organizes sports and playing facilities for children in developing countries. Right To Play encourages individuals to take fundraising initiatives, and especially through sport events. Right To Play organizes its own cycling and ice skating event and participates in the 2013 PWN Egmond Halve Marathon, with 2 teams. Participants are required to raise 120,-, this includes the starting ticket and a running shirt. Right To Play uses the 'Alvarum' fundraising platform. Right To Play also announced they will be active at the Dam tot Damloop 2013 as a preferred PBI next to Wittebedjes and Dance4Life, whether they will also participate with teams remains unclear (Right To Play, 2013).

Appendix II – Summary Interview Le Champion

The interview with ‘Le Champion’ was held to gather information from the event point of view and in the hope that they could also provide information (as in data and insights) on PBI’s.

Le Champion is the organization that organizes various bicycle, walking and running events, mainly in the region of Noord-Holland. The more famous events are the Dam tot Damloop, Amsterdam Marathon and Egmond Half Marathon.

The interview began with an introduction of the researcher and the study, followed by an introduction of the respondent. The respondent was a woman around 30-40 years old, her official and main job was ‘volunteer-coordinator’ for all events, next to this she was responsible for the charity competitions at various events, which was a minor part of her job. The respondent has this job for about 4 years, the charity competition exists for about 6 years.

The respondent immediately jumps to the conclusion that the main reason the Dam tot Damloop is so successful for PBI’s is scarcity of starting tickets:

“... in 2009 we had a double Dam tot Damloop, it existed 25 years and then we also had a ‘by night’ edition. Dubbel amount of runners that could participate, and afterwards it was again reduced to a one day, from that moment on, we’re talking about the 2010 edition, the starting tickets are normally sold out in two hours. And mainly because you have this trump, it becomes interesting for the PBI’s, cause they could buy teams and because you create scarcity which causes that participants can only participate via PBI’s.”

She then explains the procedure how PBI’s could participate and the creation of so called club cards. At first, PBI’s should enroll together with the normal participants, and because the participant was not sure that the PBI would acquire a team, the participant also tried for himself to subscribe, which was not beneficial for the PBI as it lost potential runners. Some PBI’s therefore asked for more certainty, which resulted in the club card system, where a PBI contractually attaches itself to the PBI for 3 years. This enables PBI’s to, for example, approach sponsors and companies. These club cards are then in three forms, gold, silver and bronze. Gold club card members have 20 teams, Silver 10 and Bronze 5.

The initial awarding of these club cards was conducted by means of a lottery (PBI’s could subscribe for one of the three cards), although those PBI’s that were already participating in the earlier editions were granted a club card without lottery out of loyalty. PBI’s that do not have a club card could still buy teams, but at the moment that the general sale starts and based on who comes first until the teams are sold out. Club card members can buy more teams as well. All organizations will be controlled on their PBI status after enrollment.

Club cards are valid for three years (so the first period contained the years 2011, 2012 and 2013), and can be renewed for another 3 years. Club cards that will not be renewed will be granted by a new lottery to other PBI’s.

Both club card holders as regular participants have cancellation terms, which were given to the researcher. Not a lot of PBI’s though cancel teams, even when they do not use some of them. It is not allowed for PBI’s to hand their teams over to other PBI’s, although there is no control upon it. For Le Champion it’s most important to sell the starting tickets:

“I: But can you perhaps see, like ‘al starting tickets send to that PBI have been used’ or is that not possible for you?”

R: In that sense we’re not going to control it, as it is not that interesting for us, for us it is important that those 110 starting tickets are sold. How the PBI’s deal with those, well... that’s for the PBI to decide.”

As there was one team that had 11 teams, so 110 possible participants, that indicated only having 55 participants, it could be that this PBI paid for 5,5 teams while not using them. One team costs 325,-. The respondent indicated that for many PBI’s a company is sponsoring the starting tickets, and that it might be possible that the PBI’s have a reluctant attitude towards not using starting tickets because of this.

The researcher has earlier concluded that there are quite some PBI’s not mentioned on the website. The respondent explained that only PBI’s that participate with at least 5 teams are mentioned on the website. In total there were 76 different PBI’s that participated (49 were on the website). Those PBI’s with at least 5 teams were then responsible to provide their own text for the website.

Regarding the preferred PBI’s, the respondent answers that this is mostly a choice of their sponsors:

“R: Yes, at every event we have, it’s possible to donate to a charity. The question then is ‘which charity’, cause everybody wants that. It also has to do with the sponsor.”

For the Dam tot Damloop’s preferred PBI for example (Wittebedjes), ‘Het Parool’ (main sponsor) is the founder. The respondent indicates that quite some PBI’s call, to check the possibilities to become preferred PBI. The respondent also indicates that for other events, they try to find PBI’s with whom they feel a connection, for example because the PBI is involved with sports. The participants can then choose to donate to this PBI upon registration, Le Champion does not reserve a certain amount per sold starting ticket for the PBI.

In other events than the Dam tot Damloop, there is no club card system, according to the respondent mainly because there is no scarcity.

Le Champion promotes Alvarum as a fundraising platform, mainly to endorse a more ‘modern’ way of fundraising as they had ‘old fashioned’ sponsor forms on their website before. Why they promote Alvarum and not another fundraising platform remains unclear.

Regarding differences between PBI’s, the respondent has indicated a few things. She gave the example of Spieren voor Spieren, who gave a sports bag with all kinds of goods to their participants after the event, these goods were fully sponsored. Another PBI had massage facilities after the race. She indicated that some PBI’s have companies that support them, PBI’s have paid personnel, and other PBI are ‘operating out of the living room’. The respondent also sees a difference between PBI’s that are participating for a longer time and PBI’s that have just started. Quite some PBI’s do not publish their results.

Overall, the respondent did not have a lot of data (to share), they had no record of exact numbers of participants, teams used, etc.

Appendix III - Data Sharing

In the scope of this thesis, a certain amount of data has been collected. An SPSS dataset containing information on running events and PBIs, as well as a set of recordings and transcriptions of interviews. This data will be saved by the author and can be used for further scientific purposes upon request.

Please contact the author at:

tiesobers[at]gmail.com