Journal of Contemporary Athletics
Volume 15, Number 2
ISSN: 1554-9933

COMPARING CONSUMERS OF DIFFERENT DISABILITY SPORTS: A QUANTITATIVE EXAMINATION OF THE MOTIVES OF POWER CHAIR SOCCER AND WHEELCHAIR BASKETBALL SPECTATORS

Michael Cottingham[1,*], Laura Miller[2], Richard Mohn[3], Don Lee[1], and Scott Douglas[3]
[1]University of Houston, TX, USA
[2]California University of PA, USA
[3]University of Southern Mississippi, MS, USA

INTRODUCTION

The study at hand investigates an unknown area of disability sport promotion. Specifically, it strives to comprehend spectator perceptions of athletes exhibiting various levels of function or physical disability across two different disability sports, wheelchair basketball and power wheelchair soccer. Although consumer behavior in disability sport has been academically explored to some extent, the current body of knowledge lacks research where multiple sporting events are used to not only gauge spectator response, but to test existing consumer behavior scales developed for that purpose and ultimately, for purposes of marketing. The purpose of this study is to assess spectator motives for power chair soccer and wheelchair basketball using motivations drawn from reputable consumer scales. Thus, this study is significant in that it will deepen the understanding of how spectators perceive athletes of various sports and physiological functions. Additionally, it will help examine the applicability of current accepted and universal consumer behavior scales across multiple sport events. Ultimately, it will be of practical use to sport promoters wishing to more effectively appeal to consumers in diverse sport settings. Before delving into what is unknown about disability sport-specific behaviors, it is prudent to assess existing research and its relevance to the actual study.

* Corresponding Author's E-mail: mcotting@central.uh.edu

DISABILITY SPORT CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

In order to develop support for disability sport, conventional wisdom would suggest that efforts be made to examine consumer behavior. Evaggelinou and Grekinis (1998) conducted the first true study on spectators attending a disability sporting event. Findings indicated that the majority of spectators did not have a disability; in fact, 96% were not disabled athletes, and 76% did not personally know any of the competitors. In addition, only 28% of the spectators were first time attendees. While these findings were interesting, the study measured relationship *to* and experience *with* disability, rather than motivation and experiential factors related to attendance. Thus, their reasons for attending remain unknown, giving rise to the need to further investigate consumer motivations in disability sport contexts.

Spectator motivations in disability sport have significant overlap with motivations in non-adaptive sport contexts (Cottingham, et al., 2013; Cottingham, et al., 2014; Wilson, 2015; Yamashita & Muneda, 2019). That is to say, characteristics such as drama, violence, escape and socialization are universal. However, these studies also indicate that there are characteristics fully unique to disability sport spectatorship, such as inspiration and the supercrip narrative. In turn, these motivations may cause people to perceive a sport fully differently than if the athletes were able-bodied (Wann & Cottingham, 2015).

For example, practitioners have known for some time that disability sport spectators internalized their sport differently, with many focused on the supercrip narrative and inspiration (Cottingham et al., 2015), and athletes with disabilities echo these sentiments (Bantjes et al., 2019; Hargreaves & Hardin, 2009). These studies noted that practitioners and the media frame disability sport in a paternalistic fashion, focusing on an overcoming narrative rather than athleticism, a frustrating reality for athletes. While these studies present a greater understanding of disability sport, they make no comparisons between differing disability sports. Due to the tendency to make broad generalizations using limited data, readers may be making an inaccurate assumption- namely, that disability sport is homogeneous. Just as a spectator of able-bodied basketball may have different motivations from able-bodied golf, spectators of disability sports may differ broadly. Alternatively, spectators of disability sport may be attracted to those characteristics unique to disability and in turn, become fans of disability sport.

Most Prevalent Motives

After a review of literature, motives were identified that had the greatest impact on spectatorship. Some of these spanned across non adaptive sports while others focused on adaptive sport contexts.

Drama and Knowledge

Trail and James (2001) identify drama and acquisition of sport knowledge as primary motives that influence spectators' consumption of sport (able-bodied context). The authors define drama as the closeness of games, with the implication that some spectators prefer or enjoy games with close scores. Knowledge is presented as awareness of the sport itself. This factor was initially tested in collegiate sport, but has since been examined in the contexts of mixed martial arts (Kim et al., 2008), professional baseball (Trail & James, 2001), and

professional hockey (Casper et al., 2009). These factors were also included in the Motivation Scale for Disability Sport Consumption, the most comprehensive scale for disability sport spectatorship (Cottingham et al., 2015).

Inspiration

Thrash and Elliot (2003) emphasize that inspiration is a reflexive experience where an individual observes an external experience, internalizes it, and acts differently. Schantz and Gilbert (2001) report that the use of inspiration is commonly associated with those with disabilities, as media outlets focus on the disability sport narrative and portray athletes as "supercrips," a term often used for someone who overcomes disability in an inspiring way (McPherson et al., 2016; Shelton & Waddell, 2020). Because supercrip is a stereotype based on placing low expectations on an individual with a disability, athletes are aware and uncomfortable being perceived as such (Hargreaves & Hardin, 2009). Cottingham et al., (2015) and Chatfield and Cottingham (2017) examined inspiration empirically and found that spectators do in fact undergo a reflexive experience; they at least state that they engage in life differently by being more active or purposeful when observing wheelchair basketball.

Disability Community

Mackelprang and Salsgiver (1999) justify that disability is not simply a physical, mental or psychological experience but instead, at least in part, an environmental barrier. Barriers provide a shared sense of challenge and difficulty. Confronting these barriers by way of social movements create shared experiences, which in turn foster communities. These communities develop cultures and subcultures, such as those with physical disabilities or those who engage in disability sport. To date, the disability community and spectators' attachment have not been studied empirically, but have only been identified in the literature as a theoretical construct.

Athleticism

Athleticism was first examined as a motivation for consumers to attend sport under the term "aesthetic value." The expression was initially coined by Wann (1995), who stated that for some spectators, sport was in fact a form of art. Trail and James (2001) used alternative terms, specifically "physical skills" and "aesthetics" to describe the strength, beauty and skill related to collegiate sport. When Cottingham et al., (2015) examined Trail & James' physical skills and aesthetics factors, they noted that these were perceived as the same type of motivation for spectators viewing wheelchair basketball. Thus, the two were combined into a single factor that can be considered the base factor of athleticism.

Charity

Charitable giving is most often associated with monetary donations; however, one may also support a charity through volunteering time, creating good will in the community, and having compassion towards others. Moreover, the factors that may influence a person to support a charity are diverse and may include specific demographics, certain personality traits, brand image of the charity, the degree of similarity or proximity between the donor and a charity's beneficiaries, feelings of guilt about not giving to charity, and pleasurable emotions of calmness, self-worth and physical warmth resulting from making a donation (Core & Donadson, 2010; Fenton et al., 1993; Sargeant, 1999).

Individuals are motivated to attend and participate in charity sporting events because they provide an opportunity to give to charity, enhance their self-esteem, improve the lives and well-being of others, and improve the overall standing of the organization (Filo et al., 2008). An opportunity to learn more about the cause supported by the event is another important motivator, for it can provide knowledge and connect participants with others who share similar experiences and backgrounds related to the cause (Filo et al., 2008; Higgins & Hodgins, 2008, Snelgrove & Wood, 2010). Lastly, while the environment of a specific event being offered has been found to be a predictor of participation in a charity event (Wharf-Higgins & Hodgins, 2003), the desire to support others remains a strong motivator for participation in charity sport events overall (Filo et al., 2008; Scott & Solomon, 2003; Snelgrove & Wood, 2010; Wharf et al., 2003).

The term "charity" has been attached to disability sport through a model known as The Charity Model (Tapiwa & Jonathan, 2013). The charity model views people with disabilities as victims of their impairment who need special services and support (Barton, 1998). Individuals who adopt this model may identify persons with disabilities by their losses, which then propagate pity and charity. Disability sport practitioners are uncomfortable with using an angle of charity to produce resources, but do so because it can be effective (Cottingham et al., 2015). While the charity model has often involved empirical measure of a theoretical construct, charity has never been tested in a sporting event. Accordingly, it is important to include charity as a possible motivating factor for spectator support and attendance at disability sporting events.

Population Segmentation

Motivational factors vary across populations, sports, and events. Likewise, if disability is not homogenous, as Peters (2000) contends, then it is appropriate to assume that neither are disability sports nor their fans. Despite this contention, the only sports that have been examined are wheelchair basketball and rugby, sports which are very similar due to their origin (Gumbert, 2004).

Contexts

Because they might not be familiar to the readers, it is appropriate to explain the selected sport contexts.

Power Soccer

Power soccer is a competitive team sport played on a basketball court. All participants use motorized chairs that cannot exceed speeds of 10 kilometers per hour. An enlarged soccer ball is propelled down the court by players who have specially designed bumpers attached to the front of their chairs. The duration of the game is 40 minutes, split into two halves with a break in between. Currently, there are 56 teams in the United States Power Soccer Association (USPSA).

Power soccer does not have a single origin. Simultaneously and independently, French and Canadian recreation and disability service professionals in the late 1970s developed power soccer for individuals who use motorized wheelchairs. With the growth of wheelchair

basketball, health care professionals realized that recreational opportunities should be made available for those who did not use manual chairs. The disabilities these individuals have include quadriplegia, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, among others. In order to provide programming for these individuals, French professionals began spreading "Powerchair Football" to European countries while the Canadians shared their "Power Soccer" with the United States and Japan. While these sports were similar in spirit, there were slight differences in the games. The various rules of the sport were debated and consolidated into a single sport in 2005, and the consolidated form of power soccer was adopted by the USPSA. Academic research on power soccer is quite limited. To date, only a single study exists on perspectives of spectators attending power soccer events. This study qualitatively explored the motivations of spectators of a power soccer event and found that those attending had dispersant feelings about paternalistic motives such as inspiration and the supercrip narrative, from investment to revulsion (Cottingham et al., 2015).

Wheelchair Basketball

Wheelchair basketball emerged in 1946 and collegiate wheelchair basketball in 1977. Currently, all college wheelchair basketball teams are members of the Intercollegiate Division (ID), and their games are among the most well attended in the United States. While there are over 300 registered wheelchair basketball teams in the United States with five being female only, the number of college programs has shown modest growth over the last ten years, ranging from seven to fifteen. The ID requires that all member institutions maintain academic progress for student athletes and that all athletes meet both NCAA and institutional academic requirements, despite the fact that wheelchair basketball is not currently an NCAA recognized sport. While some of those with more affecting disabilities may be eligible to play wheelchair basketball, many would not because they lack the musculature to propel a manual wheelchair. Consequently, most participants of wheelchair basketball tend to have paraplegia, amputations, or permanent injuries or maladies which impact lower extremities.

METHODS

Instrumentation

The most impactful specific consumer behavior motives in the context of disability were identified by an extensive literature review, which revealed the following top influential motives: inspiration, escape, charity, knowledge and athleticism. A full list of items is noted on Table 1.

Events

Data were collected at two separate events. The first was a regular season collegiate wheelchair basketball tournament held in the northeast, although technically the games were not tournament format. Instead, each team played two games over three days to meet regular season requirements in a cost-effective way, with the goal of being able to qualify for postseason play. Four men's teams and three women's teams were in attendance. All athletes

had disabilities and were full time college students in good academic standing with their respective universities. The games were open to the public and admission was free.

The second data collection site was a regular season power soccer tournament held in the Midwest. Again, the format was not tournament style, but each team played two to four games in order to determine post season qualification and seeding. All athletes had physical disabilities and used motorized chairs as their primary method of mobility. The games were open to the public and admission was free.

Table 1. Primary Scale

Group	Factor
Drama	
1	I enjoy the drama in close games.
2	I enjoy when the outcome of the game is undecided until the end.
3	I enjoy the uncertainty of close games.
Inspiration	
1	I enjoy watching because the athletes are heroic.
2	I enjoy watching wheelchair basketball/power soccer because the athletes achieve more than is expected of them.
3	The athletes are courageous when showing an ability to work through their disabilities.
4	It is inspirational to see the athletes overcome their disabilities.
5	I enjoy seeing people with disabilities live independent lives.
Charity	
1	I view wheelchair basketball/power soccer programs as charities.
2	I feel as if I am donating my time by attending.
3	When I attend wheelchair basketball, I feel like I am helping others.
4	Attending is as act of kindness on my behalf.
Escape	
1	The game provides an escape from routine activities.
2	The game provides a diversion from life's problems.
3	The game provides distraction from everyday activities.
Disability Community	
1	I understand how disability impacts game play.
2	Being a fan of wheelchair basketball/power soccer enhances the image of the disability community.
3	I am a fan of wheelchair basketball/power soccer to show support for the disability community.
Disability Sport Knowledge	
1	I have a basic understanding of how adaptive equipment performs.
2	I am knowledgeable about wheelchair basketball/power soccer.
3	I know the rules of wheelchair basketball/power soccer.
Athleticism	
1	I enjoy that the athletes possess a great level of physical fitness.
2	I enjoy that the athletes possess a great level of physical skill.
3	The athletes' superior skills are something I appreciate while watching.

Data Collection

Surveys provided to participants included an informed consent form per IRB requirements. Upon completion of the survey, the consent form was separated in order to eliminate the ability to identify subjects. Data were collected at both events before games, at half times, and after games. While researchers were present at most games, the home team's games were the only events which had substantial spectator attendance.

Study Participants

While the demographics were not the focus of this study, they merit attention. At both events, female spectators identified in this study outnumbered males; 60.2% of power soccer spectators and 65.2% of wheelchair basketball spectators were female. The wheelchair basketball spectators tended to be much younger, with 43.5% aged 18-22 while only 16% of power soccer spectators coincided with that age bracket. Subsequently, the wheelchair basketball spectators' incomes were lower, with 54.1% reporting lower than $40,000 while only 44% of power soccer spectators were within the same income bracket. These findings probably relate to the fact that the wheelchair basketball tournament was a collegiate event, with college students the most natural fan base. Both groups of spectators identified low rates of personal mobility impairments (9.1% for wheelchair basketball and 5.8% power soccer), and both groups had a sizable portion of spectators who did not know someone with a mobility impairment (37.7% for wheelchair basketball and 26.6% for power soccer). Finally, a substantially larger percentage of spectators of wheelchair basketball (29%) said that they had tried the sport at least once, vs. only 3.2% of power soccer spectators who made the same claim. Anecdotal discussions with practitioners indicated the possible reason for this was because wheelchair basketball teams often run public events in which potential spectators can try the equipment in order to make them more comfortable and knowledgeable about the sport.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted on both samples. The wheelchair basketball CFA with 24 items under seven factors resulted in a model with adequate fit, $\chi^2_{231} = 318.8$, TLI = .90, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .07 with 90% CI: .07-.09. In examining the correlations between the factors, two high correlations were observed: disability community and inspiration at .82 and drama and athleticism at .80. Alternative models where each set was combined into a single factor were tested. The model with disability community and inspiration as one factor fit significantly worse, $\Delta\chi^2_6=20.6$, $p <. 01$. The model with drama and athleticism as one factor also fit significantly worse, $\Delta\chi^2_6 = 22.0$, $p < .01$. The wheelchair basketball correlation matrix and factor loadings can be found on Tables 2 and 3 respectively.

Two tests were employed to measure the reliability of the scales: Cronbach's coefficient alpha (a) values and average variance extracted (AVE). The standard value of .70 was adopted as a threshold for a and CR (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The benchmark value for AVE was equal to or greater than .50, as suggested by Bagozzi and Yi (1988). Cronbach Alpha values ranged from .766 (Disability Community) to .960 (Athleticism).

Table 2. Wheelchair Basketball Correlation Matrix

Factors	Drama	Escape	Community	Knowledge	Athleticism	Inspiration	Charity
Drama	1.000						
Escape	0.217	1.000					
Community	0.511	0.273	1.000				
Knowledge	0.160	-0.209	-0.028	1.000			
Athleticism	0.797	0.274	0.564	0.135	1.000		
Inspiration	0.636	0.151	0.819	-0.194	0.619	1.000	
Charity	0.027	0.280	0.412	-0.046	-0.054	0.321	1.000

Table 3. Basketball Confirmatory Factor Analysis

		Component						
Factor		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Drama								
1.	I enjoy the drama in close games.	0.823						
2.	I enjoy when the outcome of the game is undecided until the end.	0.654						
3.	I enjoy the uncertainty of close games.	0.714						
Inspiration								
1.	I enjoy watching because the athletes are heroic.						0.757	
2.	I enjoy watching wheelchair basketball/power soccer because the athletes achieve more than is expected of them.						0.702	
3.	The athletes are courageous when showing an ability to work through their disabilities.						0.861	
4.	It is inspirational to see the athletes overcome their disabilities.						0.846	
5.	I enjoy seeing people with disabilities live independent lives.						0.716	
Charity								
1.	I view wheelchair basketball/power soccer programs as charities.							0.646
2.	I feel as if I am donating my time by attending.							0.737
3.	When I attend wheelchair basketball, I feel like I am helping others.							0.670
4.	Attending is as act of kindness on my behalf.							0.803
Escape								
1	The game provides an escape from routine activities.		0.964					
2.	The game provides a diversion from life’s problems.		0.486					
3.	The game provides distraction from everyday activities.		0.857					

		Component						
Factor		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disability Community								
1.	I understand how disability impacts game play.			0.561				
2.	Being a fan of wheelchair basketball/power soccer enhances the image of the disability community.			0.773				
3.	I am a fan of wheelchair basketball/power soccer to show support for the disability community.			0.874				
Disability Sport Knowledge								
1.	I have a basic understanding of how adaptive equipment performs.				0.755			
2.	I am knowledgeable about wheelchair basketball/power soccer..				0.850			
3.	I know the rules of wheelchair basketball/power soccer.				0.910			
Athleticism								
1.	I enjoy that the athletes possess a great level of physical fitness.					0.921		
2.	I enjoy that the athletes possess a great level of physical skill.					0.929		
3.	The athletes' superior skills are something I appreciate while watching.					0.972		

In contrast, the power soccer CFA with 24 items under 7 factors resulted in a non-positive definite covariance matrix, which is an inadmissible solution. Inspecting the correlation matrix of the latent variables showed that disability community and inspiration were correlated at .94. These two factors were combined and the subsequent model fit was poor χ^2_{237} = 376.7, TLI (.81), CFI (.84), and RMSEA (.09, 90% CI .07-.10). Examination of the standardized residual covariance matrix and modification indices showed that athleticism 3 (The athletes' superior skills are something I appreciate while watching) had a strong relationship with several other latent variables. Removal of athleticism 3 decreased the AIC from 503 to 448 and so the revised model was retained. The model fit (χ^2_{215} = 326.4) was still poor, but better, for the TLI (.84) and CFI (.86), and adequate for the RMSEA (.08, 90% CI .06-.10). The power soccer correlation matrix and factor loadings can be found on Tables 4 and 5 respectively.

Table 4. Power Soccer Correlation Matrix

Factors	Drama	Escape	Knowledge	Athleticism	Inspiration/ Community	Charity
Drama	1.000					
Escape	0.128	1.000				
Knowledge	0.537	0.247	1.000			
Athleticism	0.344	0.505	0.490	1.000		
Inspiration/ Disability Community	0.751	0.270	0.590	0.317	1.000	
Charity	-0.342	0.460	0.024	0.256	-0.349	1.000

Table 5. Power Soccer Confirmatory Factor Analysis

		Component					
Factor		1	2	3	4	5	6
Drama							
1.	I enjoy the drama in close games.	0.561					
2.	I enjoy when the outcome of the game is undecided until the end.	0.624					
3.	I enjoy the uncertainty of close games.	0.889					
Inspiration/ Disability Community							
1.	I enjoy watching because the athletes are heroic.					0.645	
2.	I enjoy watching wheelchair basketball/power soccer because the athletes achieve more than is expected of them.					0.753	
3.	The athletes are courageous when showing an ability to work through their disabilities.					0.677	
4.	It is inspirational to see the athletes overcome their disabilities.					0.767	
5.	I enjoy seeing people with disabilities live independent lives.					0.730	
6.	I understand how disability impacts game play.					0.696	
7.	Being a fan of wheelchair basketball/power soccer enhances the image of the disability community.					0.547	
8.	I am a fan of wheelchair basketball/power soccer to show support for the disability community.					0.679	
Charity							
1.	I view wheelchair basketball/power soccer programs as charities.						0.772
2.	I feel as if I am donating my time by attending.						0.605
3.	When I attend wheelchair basketball, I feel like I am helping others.						0.441
4.	Attending is as act of kindness on my behalf.						0.823
Escape							
1.	The game provides an escape from routine activities.		0.731				
2.	The game provides a diversion from life's problems.		0.805				
3.	The game provides distraction from everyday activities.		0.842				
Disability Sport Knowledge							
1.	I have a basic understanding of how adaptive equipment performs.			0.776			
2.	I am knowledgeable about wheelchair basketball/power soccer.			0.814			
3.	I know the rules of wheelchair basketball/power soccer.			0.832			
Athleticism							
1.	I enjoy that the athletes possess a great level of physical fitness.				0.835		
2.	I enjoy that the athletes possess a great level of physical skill.				0.847		

Two tests were employed to measure the reliability of the scales: Cronbach's coefficient alpha (a) values and average variance extracted (AVE). The standard value of .70 was adopted as a threshold for a and CR (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The benchmark value for AVE was equal to or greater than .50, as suggested by Bagozzi and Yi (1988). Cronbach Alpha values ranged from .704 (Drama) to .87 (Inspiration/Disability Community).

DISCUSSION

Differences in Model Fit

Interestingly, the data collected from the wheelchair basketball event showed a much better model fit than those from the power soccer event. Literature would suggest two explanations for this outcome, both drawing on the crucial role of physiological function and its resulting impact on spectator reactions.

Differences in Physiological Function

The first explanation is that much of the scale employed was developed from able-bodied sport consumer behavior literature. Historically, the medical model favors paraplegics over quadriplegics, disabled men over disabled women, disabled whites over disabled blacks, and invisible disabilities over visible disabilities (Gouvier et al., 1991). Peers (2012) bolsters this belief, illustrating that athletes with disabilities further this trope. If we are to believe Gouvier et al.,'s assertions, then our system is simply set up where wheelchair basketball, a sport with more physiologically functional athletes, will have a closer relationship and subsequently a more similar spectatorship to able-bodied sports when compared to their power chair using counterparts.

Secondly, the factors examined in this study, specifically those related to the supercrip image, inspiration, and charity, were identified in sport settings where the athletes were more physiologically functional, such as wheelchair basketball and rugby. Studies such as Hargreaves and Hardin (2009) focused on inspiration and the supercrip image, while articles such as Brittain (2004) and Roy (2007) addressed perceptions of disability sport as a charity. While all of these studies were paramount in the development of this and previous consumer behavior studies in disability sport, they were all aimed at more functional athletes with disabilities. Simply put, there is not enough research on less functional disability sport.

Utilizing studies from non-adaptive sport (e.g., Trail & James, 2001; Wann, 1995), theoretical and qualitative research on disability sport (e.g., Brittain 2004; Hardin & Hardin, 2003; Hargreaves & Hardin, 2009), and previous consumer behavior studies in disability sport (Cottingham et al., 2015; Wilson, 2015) we can develop an appropriate model to effectively understand wheelchair basketball consumers. However, since none of this research focuses on spectators or sports for those with more acute disabilities, we lack the means to create a better model to understand power

soccer consumers. Moreover, because the model fit is so different, we may assume that the experiences of power soccer spectators are different from those of wheelchair basketball spectators.

These differences may be due to a perception of disability based on hierarchy (Antonak & Livneh, 1991) or perhaps wheelchair basketball is more similar to basketball, an able-bodied sport of greater cultural familiarity to the majority of spectators. If the reason i s the former and sports with less physiologically functional athletes are perceived in accordance with the hierarchy, then practitioners have a much more difficult job of promoting the inherent value of the participants. However, if the latter proves a more accurate explanation, then practitioners must focus on the promotion of the athletes' skill and athleticism as these are factors that drive fan education and sport consumption (Cottingham et al., 2013).

Finally, it is important to briefly discuss that a primary difference between these fans was detected. Specifically, while spectators of power soccer typically had not played the sport, wheelchair basketball spectators often had. Cottingham et al., (2014) remarked that it is not uncommon to have spectators try out wheelchair basketball equipment. These experiences were distinguished as being highly influential to fan support. Future research should examine if more tactile experience with sports such as power soccer would bring spectator motivations in line with more traditional sports where these factors performed well.

LIMITATIONS

The primary limitation of this study is that data were collected at a single power soccer event and a single wheelchair basketball event. This study should be replicated to determine the precision of these findings. In addition, there is simply minimal previous research on power soccer spectators, rendering the scale applied in this study unable to examine specific spectator motives as thoroughly as you might in other sport contexts. Finally, a more robust sample size would be more valuable for analysis, but there are inherent challenges in surveying spectators who are attempting to enjoy a sporting event. Future studies may ask spectators to complete a survey online when they return home.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research should focus on why spectators of power soccer have different motivations than those of wheelchair basketball. In addition, efforts should be made to examine what different motives, if any, are expressed by power soccer spectators. Understanding these differences and identifying what motives directly impact sport consumption of power soccer will allow promoters to better retain current fans and attract more spectators. Finally, future research should examine how to effectively utilize motives identified in this study to positively impact spectatorship of wheelchair basketball and power soccer events.

REFERENCES

Antonak, R. F., & Livneh, H. (1991). A hierarchy of reactions to disability. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research, 14*(1), 13-24.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16*(1), 74-94.

Bantjes, J., Swartz, L., & Botha, J. (2019). Troubling stereotypes: South African elite disability athletes and the paradox of (self-) representation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 47*(4), 819-832.

Barton, L. (1998). The politics of special educational needs. London: Falmer.

Brittain, I. (2004). Perceptions of disability and their impact upon involvement in sport for people with disabilities at all levels. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 28*(4), 429-452.

Casper, J. M., Kanters, M. A., & James, J. D. (2009). Perceptions of constraints to NHL spectatorship. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing, 5*(1-2), 55-72. Chatfield, S. L., & Cottingham II, M. (2017). Perceptions of Athletes in disabled and non-disabled sport contexts: A descriptive qualitative research study. *The Qualitative Report, 22*(7), 1909-1924.

Core, J. E., & Donaldson, T. (2010). An economic and ethical approach to charity and to charity endowments. *Leukemia & Lymphoma, 68*(3), 261-284.

Cottingham, M., Byon, K. K., Chatfield, C., & Carroll, M. S. (2013). Examining the influence of relationship to disability on the motivations of wheelchair basketball spectators. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 33*(3). Retrieved from http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/3345/3270.

Cottingham, M., Pate, J. R., & Gearity, B. (2015). Examining 'inspiration': Perspectives of stakeholders attending a power wheelchair soccer tournament. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies, 4*(1), 59-88.

Cottingham, M., Phillips, D., Hall, S. A., Gearity, B. T., & Carroll, M. S. (2014). Application of the motivation scale for disability sport consumption: An examination of intended future consumption behavior of collegiate wheelchair basketball spectators. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 37*(2), 117.

Evaggelinou, C., & Grekinis, D. (1998). A survey of spectators at the International Stoke Mandeville Wheelchair Games. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly, 15*(1), 25-35.

Fenton, N., Golding, P., & Radley, A. (1993). *Charities, media and public opinion*. Loughborough, United Kingdom: Loughborough University of Technology, Department of Social Sciences.

Filo, K. R., Funk, D. C., O'Brien, D., Dwyer, L., & Fredline, L. (2008). It's really not about the bike: exploring attraction and attachment to the events of the Lance Armstrong Foundation. *Journal of Sport Management, 22*(5), 501-525.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39-50.

Gouvier, W. D., Steiner, D. D., Jackson, W. T., Schlater, D., & Rain, J. S. (1991). Employment discrimination against handicapped job candidates: An analog study of the effects of neurological causation, visibility of handicap, and public contact. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 36*(2), 121.

Gumbert, W. (2004). Blaze Sports Wheelchair Rugby Manual. Retrieved from http://www.blazesports.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/BSA-Wheelchair-Rugby-Manual.pdf

Hardin, J. (2003). Marketing the acceptably athletic image: Wheelchair athletes, sport-related advertising, and capitalist hegemony. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 23*(1), 108-125.

Hardin, M., & Hardin, B. (2004). The "supercrip" in sport media: Wheelchair athletes discuss hegemony's disabled hero. *Sociology of Sport Online, 7*(1).

Hardin, B., Hardin, M., Lynn, S., & Walsdorf, K. (2001). Missing in action? Images of disability in Sports Illustrated for Kids. *Disability Studies Quarterly 21*(2).

Hargreaves, J., & Hardin, B. (2009). Women wheelchair athletes: Competing against media stereotypes. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 29*(2).

Higgins, J. W., & Hodgins, A. (2008). The grape escape – a FUNdraising bike tour for the Multiple Sclerosis Society. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 19*(2), 49-67.

International Paralympic Committee Annual Report. (2008). *International Paralympic Committee Annual Report.* Bonn, Germany.

International Wheelchair Rugby Federation. (2008, June). Annual General Meeting, Burnaby, Canada.

International Wheelchair Rugby Federation. (2010, June). Annual General Meeting, Vancouver, Canada.

Kim, S., Greenwell, T. C., Andrew, D. P., Lee, J., & Mahony, D. F. (2008). An analysis of spectator motives in an individual combat sport: A study of mixed martial arts fans. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 17*(2), 109-119.

Mackelprang, R. W., & Salsgiver, R. O. (1999). *Disability: A diversity model approach in human service practice*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

McPherson, G., O'Donnell, H., McGillivray, D., & Misener, L. (2016). Elite athletes or superstars? Media representation of para-athletes at the Glasgow Commonwealth Games. *Disability and Society, 31*(5), 659-675. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2016.1197823.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Peters, S. (2000). Is there a disability culture? A syncretisation of three possible world views. *Disability & Society, 15*(4), 583-601.

Peers, D. (2012). Interrogating disability: the (de) composition of a recovering Paralympian. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 4*(2), 175-188.

Roy, E. C. (2007). Aiming for inclusive sport: The legal and practical implications of United Nation's Disability Convention for Sport, Recreation and Leisure for People with Disabilities. *Entertainment and Sports Law Journal, 5*, 1.

Sargeant, A. (1999). Charitable giving: Towards a model of donor behaviour. *Journal of Marketing Management, 15*(4), 215-238.

Schantz, O., & Gilbert, K. (2001). An ideal misconstrued: newspaper coverage of the Atlanta Paralympic Games in France and Germany. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 18*(1).

Shelton, S. S., & Waddell, T. F. (2020). Does 'inspiration porn' inspire? How disability and challenge impact attitudinal evaluations of advertising. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 1-19.

Scott, A., & Solomon, P. J. (2003). The marketing of cause-related events: A study of participants as consumers. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 11*(2), 43-66.

Snelgrove, R., & Wood, L. (2010). Attracting and leveraging visitors at a charity cycling event. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 15*(4), 269-285.

Tapiwa, M., & Jonathan, M. (2013). An assessment of the effects of local cultures on sports participation by disabled pupils in Masvingo urban primary schools in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Asian Social Science, 3*(2), 370-385.

Thrash, T., & Elliot, A. (2003). Inspiration as a psychological construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(4), 871-889.

Trail, G. T. & James, J. (2001). The motivation scale for sport consumption: Assessment of the scale's psychometric properties. *Journal of Sport Behaviour, 24*, 108-127.

Trail, G., Robinson, M., Dick, R., & Gillentine, A. (2003). Motives and points of attachment: Fans versus spectators in intercollegiate athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 12*(4), 217-227.

Wann, D. (1995). Preliminary validation of the sport fan motivation scale. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 19*(4), 377.

Wann, D. L., & Cottingham, M. (2015). The impact of team identification and knowledge of an athlete's physical disability on spectators impressions of players. *Journal of Contemporary Athletics, 9*(3), 161.

Wilson, J. L. (2015). *Disability sport: A consumer behavior analysis* (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Woman's University).

Yamashita, R., & Muneda, M. (2019). What motivates wheelchair basketball spectators? Analysis of moderating effects on intention to attend Tokyo 2020 Olympic Paralympic Games. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science*, 201909.