UK Sports Volunteering Research Network

- Seminar on 19th March 2015
- Presentation from Angela Benson but interpreted by and presented by Geoff Nichols.
- All material in these slides belongs to the authors.
- For more information about the SVRN please see the website http://svrn.group.shef.ac.uk or contact the secretary at Fiona.Reid@gcu.ac.uk.

Research in association with Dr Tracey J Dickson; Prof. Deborah A Blackman; Prof. Simon Darcy and Anne Terwiel.

AIM

There is a significant gap in the literature around mega – multi sport event volunteers who give their time for events such as the Olympics and Paralympic Games

Purpose of this study was to address that gap

This research is part of a large study which is around volunteering legacy and the extent to which it becomes part of a nation’s social/human capital

LONDON 2012

- Terry Ryall, Chief Executive of vInspired who in her Blog just after the London 2012 Games stated “Wouldn’t it be great to have a national driver with a simple vision for a volunteering legacy that we can feel part of, and that can co-ordinate our efforts of the voluntary sector so we can all do our bit for the bigger picture? I hope sincerely that someone somewhere has been beavering away and I can’t wait for the big reveal!” (Ryall, 2012: np). vInspired is a charity that helps young people discover the value of volunteering – for themselves and for others

Methods and the politics of research

- Research co. ‘Neilson’ – paid LOCOG £10m to be the official researcher - no plans to research the volunteers
- Benson et al offered to share their questionnaire – as used in Vancouver 2010
- Benson modified it with 2 more questions
- Neilson administered it - by e mail – only possible with access to LOCOG data base
Methods and the politics of research

• LOCOG insisted it be sent out 2 days after the Games
• Benson et al did the analysis – which appears in the DCMS legacy report
• They could not check their sample with the personal ‘social inclusion’ characteristics of Gamesmakers – as LOCOG would not reveal this.

Methods and the politics of research

• Someone – it appears from LOCOG – leaked the results to Alexander - University of Missouri – who submitted her Phd using them.
• And then published them in
• Making it appear she did the research herself!
  • The journal editor does not seem bothered – neither does the University

Methods and the politics of research

• One purpose may be to have measured a ‘legacy’
• 45% indicated they expected to increase their volunteering in the next 12 months – but this will be influenced by the timing of the survey?

Observations - GN

• By limiting the way the survey was conducted and not releasing other data on Gamesmakers – LOCOG restricted results
• If the purpose was to evaluate a legacy – a follow-up would have been run 12 months later
• leaking the data could happen again. How can LOCOG be accountable for this – when it no longer exists? Challenge for future research

Methods

• E. survey of motivations of the 2012 Games Makers - 11,451 responses
• 2 days after Games
• Motivation measured by adaption of Special Event Volunteer Motivation scale
• compared with responses from 2010 Vancouver Games – 2,066 responses
• principal component analysis of to produce 8 components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH DESIGN</th>
<th>Vancouver 2010</th>
<th>London 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved and supported by</td>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>IPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country support</td>
<td>VANOC</td>
<td>LOCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Approval</td>
<td>University of Canberra</td>
<td>University of Canberra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Adaptation of the SEVMS tested at the Sydney World Masters Games, 2009</td>
<td>Same adaptation of the SEVMS used in Vancouver 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation item scale</td>
<td>5-point Likert</td>
<td>5-point Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey instrument distribution</td>
<td>A link to a survey hosted on SurveyMethods was emailed to volunteers by VANOC. The data was then exported to SPSS for analysis</td>
<td>Emailed directly to volunteers via LOCOG research team. The data was then exported to SPSS for analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey timing</td>
<td>1 month prior to the Games</td>
<td>Two days after the Paralympics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers surveyed</td>
<td>Olympic and Paralympic volunteers</td>
<td>Olympic and Paralympic volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer population</td>
<td>29,106 (67%)</td>
<td>70,000 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size and response rate</td>
<td>1,066 (10.8%)</td>
<td>11,451 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for motivation items</td>
<td>87-91</td>
<td>318-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>PCA, with Direct Observ, with loadings &gt;= 0.5</td>
<td>PCA, with Direct Observ, with loadings &gt;= 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VOLUNTEER PROFILES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver 2010</th>
<th>London 2012</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-squared (X²), df, significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>.62, 1, p=.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 years London only</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Excludes 0-16 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years London only</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Excludes 16-34 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;64 years</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part time</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed casually</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired or pensioner</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulltime student</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulltime carer or parent</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed &amp;/or looking for work</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>Excludes ‘other’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously volunteered</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Motivation items: means and rankings**

- Top 20 variables for both games were the same with very similar rankings
- Top ranking was “it was the chance of a lifetime”
- Significantly different from previous research - ranked 8th or lower
- The bottom six variables also had similar rankings across the two events
- BUT – difficult to tell how real are the differences due to rescaling, timings of survey (VC was month prior to Games)

**London 2012 Motivations**

Principal Components Analysis

1. Transactional (exchange ..I give, you receive)
2. Altruistic (give..give..give)
3. It’s all about the Games (focus on the event)
4. Traditional (vol a lot, family, community)
5. Availability (availability / time free)
6. Application (of skills)
7. Rewards (pressies!!)
8. Variety (desire for change, new)

**VANCOUVER 2010 Motivations**

Principal Components Analysis

1. It’s all about the Games (focus on the event)
2. Transactional (exchange ..I give, you receive)
3. Variety (desire for change, new)
4. Application (of skills)
5. Availability (availability / time free)
6. Altruistic (give..give..give)
7. Traditional (vol a lot, family, community)
8. Rewards (pressies!!)

**Observations**

- Same 2 highest motivational clusters for each event
- strength of ‘it’s all about the games’ shared
- Allows LOCOG to adopt a primarily ‘programme management’ approach.
- Motivations could be related to age, employment status etc.
What's original about this research

This is the first research that:

- Enables comparison of winter and summer Olympic and Paralympic Games volunteers;
- Has substantial sample sizes in relation to the variables;
- Applies higher item loadings to strengthen the analysis and involves the use of the same instrument across events.

Challenges of this research

- Accessing OCOGs to undertake research
- OCOG requirements - Scaling, and timings differences
- Post event surveys to measure legacy
- Replication and longitudinal studies is a real problem!
- If you then put this across other events (e.g. FIFA world cups, Commonwealth Games) – challenges are even more exacerbated!
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