

Examining Motivation for Charity Sport Event Participation: A Comparison of Recreation-Based and Charity-Based Motives

Kevin Filo

Griffith University

Daniel C. Funk

Temple University and Griffith University

Danny O'Brien

Griffith University

Abstract

This paper examines the role of recreation motives and motives for charitable giving in the development of participants' attachment to a charity sport event across two different events. Online questionnaires were administered within a pilot study, and then given to participants in the 2007 Lance Armstrong Foundation (LAF) **LIVESTRONG** Challenge (N=568) and the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay (N=689). Regression analysis revealed both recreation-based and charity-based motives contribute to attachment to the events. The findings also demonstrate that the charity-based motives make a stronger contribution for the 2007 LAF **LIVESTRONG** Challenge, while recreation-based motives make a stronger contribution for the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay. Suggestions are made for the creation of participant profiles based upon the motives.

KEYWORDS: Charity sport events, motivation, attachment

Kevin Filo, is a lecturer with Griffith University's School of Tourism, Leisure, Hotel and Sport Management. His research interests examine that synergy that exists between sport and charity.

Daniel C. Funk is a professor and Washburn Senior Research Fellow for the School of Tourism and Hospitality at Temple University and a professor of Sport Marketing in the Griffith Business School, Gold Coast, QLD, Australia. His research examines sport involvement.

Danny O'Brien is a senior lecturer with Griffith University's School of Tourism, Leisure, Hotel and Sport Management. His research interests are in event leverage and sustainability issues related to sport tourism.

Address correspondence to Kevin Filo, Ph.D., Griffith Business School, G27 3.40, Gold Coast Campus, Southport QLD 4222, Australia, Email: kfilo@griffith.edu.au

Charity sport events represent special events which include some form of physical exertion where participants raise funds for a charitable organization based upon the activity performed. These events complement more traditional marketing tools employed by charitable organizations such as direct mail, advertising, outbound telemarketing, billboards, and websites. Charity sport events continue to increase in popularity and have become tremendously successful fundraising mechanisms for charitable organizations (King, 2001; Pringle & Thompson, 1999). Charity sport events are an effective means to raise funds for a cause while promoting an active and healthy lifestyle through exercise (USA Fundraising, 2009).

The popularity and success of charity sport events has placed importance on the role of these events in the overall operation of the charity, as well as within communities. It is estimated that over 50% of social service organizations in the United States rely upon contributions from special events (Higgins & Lauzon, 2003). Furthermore, mass sport event participation represents one potential population-based intervention that may increase physical activity across a range of fitness levels (Murphy & Baumann, 2007).

As charity sport events become increasingly popular and integral, emphasis must be placed on determining the factors that drive participation and contribute to a meaningful event experience. Existing research in the charity sport event context has uncovered differing primary motivations (physical fitness versus cause-related), calling for additional attention to market segmentation within cause-related events (Scott & Solomon, 2003). The current research extends this notion through an examination of four recreation motives and four motives for charitable giving across two distinct charity sport event contexts. This examination allows for an evaluation of whether the role of the various motives differ based upon the relative prominence of the charitable component within the two event contexts.

The purpose of this research is three-fold. First, this research examines the contribution of recreation motives to participant attachment to a charity sport event. Second, the contribution of motives for charitable giving to participant attachment to a charity sport event is examined. Third, this research compares the relative influence of these motives on participant attachment across separate event contexts.

In addressing these research purposes, the Psychological Continuum Model (PCM) serves as the theoretical framework (Funk & James, 2001; 2006). The PCM is based upon the notion that a combination of individual and social situational factors work in conjunction toward the development of allegiance within sport consumers. The PCM outlines the variety of ways participants relate to a sport property, in the case of this research, a charity sport event, in terms of four stages: awareness, attraction, attachment, and allegiance. Each stage represents an enhanced psychological connection between the individual participant and the sport event (Funk & James, 2001). The current research advances recreation and charity-based motives as factors contributing to enhanced meaning and importance for a charity sport event. This enhanced meaning and importance underscores attachment to the charity sport event.

Three events served as the research setting: The 2006 Lance Armstrong Foundation (LAF) **LIVESTRONG** Challenge, The 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay,

and the 2007 LAF LIVESTRONG Challenge. The 2006 LAF LIVESTRONG Challenge served as the research setting for the collection of pilot data. The 2007 LAF LIVESTRONG Challenge is an established charity sport event in which the charitable component of the event is featured prominently. All proceeds from the event benefit the LAF's mission to inspire and empower individuals living with cancer. The charitable cause is highlighted throughout all event marketing communication, as well as the registration process. In addition, the charity maintains a strong presence and high visibility on the event grounds. Finally, beyond the minimum requirement, participants are encouraged to raise funds on behalf of the charity as part of their registration.

The 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay is a highly successful sport event with a less prominent charitable affiliation. Only a portion of event proceeds benefit The Capital Area Food Bank of Texas. This designated charity receives minimal emphasis within event marketing communication and registration, and has a limited presence at the event. Meanwhile, additional fundraising is not required. Use of these research settings facilitated comparison of the influence of the different motives based upon the relative prominence afforded to the charitable aspect of each respective event.

This manuscript is divided into three sections. First, a review of the literature introduces the theoretical framework employed, and explores recreation motives and motives for charitable giving, leading to three research questions. Second, the methods used to address these research questions are described. Finally, the results are discussed, leading to conclusions about theoretical and managerial implications, limitations, and directions for future research.

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

This research employs the Psychological Continuum Model (PCM) (Funk & James, 2001; 2006) as the theoretical framework. The PCM advances processes that operate within and among awareness, attraction, attachment, and allegiance outcomes. The awareness process involves various socializing agents such as media and peers, introducing a sport event to a participant, leading to the realization that the sport event exists. Next, the participant assesses the perceived hedonic motives and dispositional needs that can be satisfied through event participation as part of the attraction process. Hedonic motives are pleasure-based interests such as the need to socialize and escape from one's daily routine, while dispositional needs reflect psychological requirements such as the need for stimulation (Funk & James, 2001). The interaction among these perceived needs and motives, along with the knowledge of the sport event's existence, evolves into attraction outcomes. Attraction outcomes include preference for the event fostered through event participation satisfying these needs and motives (Funk & James, 2006).

Next, the motives satisfied through event participation can take on enhanced meaning for the individual, interacting with the individual's self-concept and values. Collectively, the interaction among motives, values, and self-concept reflects the attachment process. The attachment process results in specific attachment

outcomes. These outcomes are embodied in stronger attitudes and a more meaningful connection towards the sport event. Funk and James (2006) suggest these attachment outcomes may form, grow stronger, and feedback into the attachment process, facilitating allegiance, or higher level commitment to the event. Allegiance outcomes reflect attachment outcomes enhanced through persistence and resistance to change (Funk & James, 2001; 2006).

The PCM has been endorsed as a viable mechanism for examining sport event participation. Stewart, Smith, and Nicholson (2003) advocate the PCM as a theoretically sound framework for understanding active participation. Beaton and Funk (2008) argue that the PCM is a sound choice to guide research on participation in physically active leisure. With regard to active recreation, the framework has also been applied to an examination of motives for marathon participation (Funk, Toohey, & Bruun, 2007).

This research focuses specifically on attachment within the PCM framework. Event participants have already demonstrated awareness and attraction through their registration and participation. However, these individual participants may not demonstrate consistent commitment or allegiance to the event. Attachment has been highlighted as the most diverse and increasingly complex stage of the PCM framework (Beaton, Funk, & Alexandris, 2009). In highlighting the meaningful, strong, and dynamic connection inherent to attachment, Funk and James (2006) suggest attachment is revealed through an object taking on emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning. To operationalize these different facets of meaning, importance held towards the sport object is used to measure emotional meaning; sign, or symbolic value of the sport object, is used to assess symbolic meaning; and knowledge of the sport object is used to measure functional meaning (Funk & James, 2006).

Attachment represents an important outcome in the sport and leisure contexts. Filo, Funk, and Alexandris (2008) uncovered the role of attachment in mediating the relationship between consumer trust and loyalty to sport franchises and fitness centers. In addition, the attitude strength inherent to attachment can contribute to persistence, resistance, and behavioral intention (Alexandris, Funk, & Pritchard, *in press*; Funk, Haugtvedt, & Howard, 2000). In the charity sport event context, Filo, Funk, and O'Brien (2010) revealed that attachment to a charity sport event contributes to outcomes such as sponsor image, purchase intent for event sponsors' products, and perhaps most importantly for event managers, future event participation intent.

Additional research in the charity sport event context has uncovered a variety of motives that interact and contribute to participant attachment to the event (e.g., Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2008). Furthermore, Alexandris and colleagues (2011) provide additional evidence of a link between motives for sport participation and attachment to the recreation activity (i.e., activity attachment). Similarly, the current research advances event attachment as an attitudinal strength construct revealed through emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning held for a charity sport event among participants.

The current research examines needs related to recreation participation and charitable giving as motives that are not only satisfied through participation in

charity sport events, but also take on greater meaning and interact with an individual's self-concept and values. This leads to the event taking on emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning, or event attachment. A discussion of recreation motives and motives for charitable giving within the charity sport event context follows.

Motivation

Prominent within the PCM framework is a discussion of core motives for sport and recreation participation. Motives for sport event and recreation participation have been examined through a number of different frameworks (e.g., Crompton, 1979; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Maslow, 1954). In advancing the hierarchy of needs, Maslow (1954) states that physical needs must be satisfied before higher order social and personal needs. This framework was applied to leisure and recreation as parallels were drawn between anomie and Maslow's need of love and belongingness, along with ego-enhancement and self-esteem (Pearce, 1982).

The application of the hierarchy of needs to leisure and recreation evolved to a more complex explanation of leisure behavior. Iso-Ahola (1980) suggested that a combination of needs drive leisure behavior, and in this context social needs become more important than physical needs. Iso-Ahola (1982) advanced two motivational forces: seeking, the desire to obtain intrinsic rewards through leisure; and escaping, the desire to remove oneself from the normal environment. Mannell and Iso-Ahola (1987) expanded upon this perspective stating that leisure activities provide escape, along with self-determination, sense of competency, challenge, learning, exploration, relaxation, and social interaction. Crompton (1979) advanced an additional two dimensional approach to recreation motivation, the concept of push-pull. The push-pull concept describes push motives as the escaping motivational force, while pull motives relate to the seeking motivational force (Crompton & McKay, 1997). In applying the push-pull concept, a variety of different push factors have been introduced such as: escape, socialization, knowledge seeking (Crompton, 1979; Crompton & McKay, 1997; Zhang & Lam, 1999).

By integrating the literature on leisure and recreation motivation with psychological theories of stimulus seeking, stimulus avoidance, and competence-effectance, Beard and Ragheb (1983) advanced four dimensions of leisure motivation: intellectual, social, escape, and competency. These dimensions of leisure motivation appear to be relevant across a variety of sport event contexts, and each relate to the variety of motives covered in the existing motivation research. Intellectual motivation relates to individuals' drive to participate in activities that involve mental action and exploration. This motive reflects the opportunity to learn about oneself afforded by a sport event, and relates to seeking (Iso-Ahola, 1982), learning (Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987), and knowledge seeking (Zhang & Lam, 1999). The intellectual motive has also been revealed as a motivating factor for recreational sport participation (Alexandris & Carroll, 1997). Social motivation states that individuals participate in sport events with friends and family, to meet new people, or to reunite with past participants. The social motive has been identified as a contributing factor among recreational runners (Clough, Shepherd, & Maughan, 1990). This motive also aligns with enhancement of human relation-

ships and external socialization (Crompton, 1979; Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987; Zhang & Lam, 1999).

The escape motive involves event participants' need to remove themselves from their daily routine. Escape from an individual's busy life has been cited as a motive among recreational tennis participants (Casper & Andrew, 2008). Meanwhile, escape from stress is a motivating factor for a variety of sport and physical activities including exercise (Ebben & Brudzynski, 2008), and high-risk sports (Woodman, Hardy, Barlow, & Scanff, 2010). This motive relates to anomie as driven by getting away from daily routine (Dann, 1977), and has also been cited in a variety of leisure and recreation motivation research (Crompton, 1979; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987). Finally, competency motivation reflects participants' need to achieve and compete. This motive corresponds with sense of competency/mastery (Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987) and evaluation of self (Crompton, 1979).

The motives outlined above represent factors that may contribute to sport event participation in general, and are relevant to the charity sport event context in particular. However, additional consideration in the form of motives related to supplementary aspects of the event may also serve to fulfil needs within participants (Funk & James, 2004). In the charity sport event context, the charitable component of the event represents one such aspect as factors related to charitable giving may serve as motivation.

Similar to recreation motivation, motives for charitable giving have been examined from a variety of different perspectives. Research on individual motivation for giving to charity (e.g., Dawson, 1988; Marx, 2000) as well as U.S.-based research on donations to university athletic departments (e.g., Gladden, Mahony, & Apostolopoulou, 2004; Staurowsky, Parkhouse, & Sachs, 1996) have revealed a diverse set of motives relevant to the charity sport event context. These motives include reciprocity, self-esteem, the need to help others, and the desire to improve the charity. Each of these motives has been uncovered in the existing literature, and each applies to the charity sport event context.

Reciprocity relates to the notion that an individual participates in a charity sport event because they have benefited from, or anticipate benefiting from, the charitable organization. Reciprocity has been found to influence donations to medical research (Dawson, 1988), and also represents a significant motivating factor towards charitable giving among young professionals (Kottasz, 2004). Self-esteem portrays the improved sense of self-worth an individual experiences as a result of supporting a charitable cause through charity sport event participation. Self-esteem also influences donations to medical research (Dawson, 1998) and charitable organizations (Marx, 2000).

The need to help others reflects the altruistic ideal that giving to a charitable cause via charity sport event registration fees assists in improving the lives and well-being of others. The need to help others has been cited as a determining factor in individual donations to charity (Ritzenheim, 2000). Finally, the desire to improve the charity suggests that charity sport event participants feel their donation will push the charity towards success. The desire to improve the charity aligns with individual desire to improve and support an athletic program (Gladden et al.,

2004). Success and overall quality of the organization have been found to have a pronounced impact on giving within athletic programs (Daughtrey & Stotlar, 2000; Stinson & Howard, 2004; 2007), as well as within the arts (Bhattacharya, Rao, & Glynn, 1995).

As highlighted above, motives represent needs fulfilled by consumers through charity sport event participation. These recreation motives and motives for charitable giving identified above have been examined in the charity sport event context. In a qualitative examination of charity sport event participation, Filo and colleagues (2008) uncovered these motives, and determined an interaction occurs among the charitable component and select recreation motives, leading to attachment to a charity sport event. These recreation motives and motives for charitable giving were then assessed quantitatively and found to contribute to attachment to a charity sport event (Filo et al., 2010). With the motives uncovered and their collective contribution to attachment revealed, a logical next step is to evaluate whether the influence of each motive differs based upon the event context. To facilitate this evaluation, a comparison across two charity sport events can be made.

Recreation-Based and Charity-Based Motives and Charity Sport Events

The current research advances recreation motives of intellectual, social, competency, and escape as recreation-based factors that drive charity sport event participation, and contribute to attachment to the event. Meanwhile, motives for charitable giving, including reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others, and desire to improve the charity, reflect charity-based motives that also drive charity sport event participation and contribute to event attachment. As noted above, these motives have been uncovered within the charity sport event context (Filo et al., 2008), and contribute to attachment to charity sport events (Filo et al., 2010). However, the relative influence of these motives across different charity sport events has not been examined. The current research extends research on motivation within charity sport events through a comparison across two distinct research contexts: The 2007 LAF **LIVESTRONG** Challenge and The 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay.

These two events were selected for this research for two reasons. First, both events represent established charity sport events in which at least a portion of event proceeds benefit a designated charity. Second, the events were selected based upon a distinguishing characteristic: the relative prominence of the charitable component of the event. As noted above, the 2007 LAF **LIVESTRONG** Challenge is an event in which all proceeds benefit the designated charity, and this charity is featured throughout event marketing communication and operations. Meanwhile, the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay is an event in which only a portion of proceeds benefit the designated charity, and this charity is not featured within event marketing communication.

The management team for each event provided further confirmation of this distinction. The event management team for the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge cited correspondence and feedback from previous event participants affirming participant belief in the prominence of the charitable aspect, as well as supporting the

charity's role in drawing participants. On the other hand, management for the 3M Half Marathon and Relay conveyed evidence that the charitable aspect of the event is less important. The Director of Public Relations and Research for this event stated, "What we have found through primary research in the past is that no one runs because of the charity. Most people think it's nice, but they run because this is their sport, or they are getting fit, or are training in up to run a marathon or something" (Personal communication, January 22, 2007).

Based upon this distinguishing characteristic, these events were deemed worthy research contexts for comparison. This research examines the influence of recreation-based and charity-based motives, while exploring the notion that a charity sport event with a highly visible charitable aspect may elicit a stronger influence from the charity-based motives due to the event's alignment with charity and philanthropy. Specifically, this research advances the following research questions:

Research Question 1: How do recreation-based motives of intellectual, social, escape and physical contribute to participant attachment to a charity sport event?

Research Question 2: How do charity-based motives of reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others, and desire to improve the charity contribute to participant attachment to a charity sport event?

Research Question 3: Does the relative contribution of these motives to participant attachment to a charity sport event differ based upon the event context?

Method

To address the research questions advanced, quantitative data were collected within a pilot study, and then across two studies. The pilot data were collected via an online questionnaire administered to charity sport event participants in advance of an event. The objective of this pilot study was to evaluate the reliability of the items employed for each motive, as well as to confirm that the motives were present.

Study 1 also utilized the collection of quantitative data through an online questionnaire administered to charity sport event participants during the two weeks following the event. This study assessed the contribution of motives to event attachment to determine the relative contribution of the individual motives. Likewise, Study 2 made use of quantitative data via an online questionnaire administered to charity sport event participants following the event. The objective of this study was to again assess the contribution of motives to event attachment and determine the relative contribution of the individual motives. However, a separate event with a less pronounced charitable component served as the research setting. The two distinct research settings facilitated comparison between the two events to evaluate whether the contribution of the motives would differ across event contexts based upon the relative prominence of the event's charitable component. An overview of the pilot study is provided below. Following this description, the Participants, Materials, and Procedures employed within Studies 1 and 2, respectively, are detailed.

Pilot Study

A questionnaire was completed online by a sample of registrants in the 2006 LAF LIVE**STRONG** Challenge ($N=186$). Participants were given a questionnaire that included: (a) 12 Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *never true* to [7] *always true* to measure four recreation motives: Intellectual, Social, Competency, and Escape (Beard & Ragheb, 1983); (b) 12 Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *strongly disagree* to [7] *strongly agree* to measure four motives for charitable giving: Reciprocity, Self-Esteem, Desire to Improve the Charity, Need to Help Others (Dawson, 1988; Gladden et al., 2004); six Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *strongly disagree* to [7] *strongly agree* to measure Event Attachment. Event Attachment is multi-dimensional, comprised of knowledge of the event, event importance, and self-expression to reflect emotional, symbolic and functional meaning (Alexandris et al., 2011; Funk & James, 2006). An online questionnaire was deemed appropriate for pilot data collection as registration for the 2006 LAF LIVE**STRONG** Challenge was also conducted online.

Correlations, means, standard deviations, and Cronbach alphas were calculated for the eight motives and event attachment. The Cronbach alphas ranged from $\alpha = .75$ to $\alpha = .93$, indicating the items used to measure the constructs were reliable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). A one-sample *t*-test with a 4.0 midpoint was utilized to assess whether participants agreed that each motive was a factor driving event participation (e.g., Funk, Filo, Beaton, & Pritchard, 2009). This analysis revealed that all motives were significantly higher than the 4.0 midpoint with the exception of Reciprocity ($M = 3.78$). However, this one-sample *t*-test revealed that Reciprocity was also not significantly lower than the midpoint value ($p < .05$). Thus, participants did not disagree that Reciprocity was a factor driving event participation, and the authors elected to include this construct within Study 1 and Study 2. Overall, these findings suggest that the constructs were reliable, and participants agreed that these motives were ascribed to their reasons for participation in the event. With this established, Study 1 and 2 assessed these constructs further. The Participants, Materials, and Procedures for Study 1 and 2 are detailed next.

Participants

Study 1. A questionnaire was completed online by a sample of participants in the 2007 LAF LIVE**STRONG** Challenge in Austin, Texas ($N=568$). The 2007 LAF LIVE**STRONG** Challenge in Austin, Texas was one of three LIVE**STRONG** Challenge events organized by the LAF that year. Participants could choose among a 5K walk or run, a 10K run, a 10-, 40-, 70-, or a 100-mile cycling ride. Walk and run participants were required to pay a \$50 registration fee, while ride participants were required to pay the \$50 registration fee as well as a \$250 fundraising minimum.

The organization indicated that the audience for this event was predominantly white (80%), affluent, and between the ages of 30-50 (personal communication, September 24, 2007). The 2007 event was comprised of 60% males and 40% females. The sample of participants ranged in age from 18 to 70 with 46.3% between the ages of 40-64. Thirty-five percent had obtained at least a bachelor's degree,

and 74.6% selected White as their ethnicity. In addition, 31.5% of respondents indicated that they had participated in the 2006 **LIVESTRONG** Challenge, and 13.2% indicated that they were a cancer survivor.

Study 2. An online questionnaire was completed by a sample of participants ($N=672$) in the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay in Austin, Texas. This event represents a recognized participatory sport event aligned with a charity, in which a portion of the event revenue benefited the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas. The event was in its thirteenth year. Participants chose between a half marathon and a two-person half marathon relay. Individual participants were required to pay a \$40 registration fee in advance, or \$80 on race day, while relay team participants paid \$80 in advance, or \$120 on race day. The event attracted over 4,000 participants. The majority of participants registered via the internet (www.3mhalfmarathon.com).

The sample was 57% female and 43% male, and respondents ranged in age from 18-65 with the majority (70%) between the ages of 25-44. Thirty-seven percent had a monthly household income between U.S. \$3,500 and U.S. \$10,000, 70% lived with a partner at home, 47% had children, and 86% had obtained at least a bachelor's degree. Ninety-eight percent of the sample had previously participated in the event, with 47% of these multiyear participants in their second year of participation. The sample characteristics align with the demographic profile of the event. According to event organizers, the event attracted an affluent, family-oriented participant base with 50/50 male/female ratio, and the majority of participants between ages 30-50 (personal communication, February 7, 2007).

Materials

Study 1 and study 2. Participants were administered an online questionnaire that included: (a) eight Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *never true* to [7] *always true* to measure four recreation motives: Intellectual, Social, Competency, and Escape (Beard & Ragheb, 1983); (b) seven Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *strongly disagree* to [7] *strongly agree* to measure four motives for charitable giving: Reciprocity, Self-Esteem, Desire to Improve the Charity, Need to Help Others (Dawson, 1988; Gladden et al., 2004); (c) six Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *strongly disagree* to [7] *strongly agree* to measure Event Attachment (Alexandris et al., 2011; Funk & James, 2006). Within Study 1, these items were added to an existing survey administered by the LAF to assess event satisfaction, behavior, and activity within the cancer community. A small selection of demographic questions was also included on the questionnaire by the LAF. This did not include Gender.

The LAF placed restrictions on the number of items that could be included on the survey due to its length. As a result, the researchers were limited to two items for each of the eight motives to go with the six items used to assess Event Attachment. A clerical error with the LAF resulted in one of the two items to assess Need to Help Others, "I give to the Lance Armstrong Foundation because their goals are consistent with my values" being omitted from the instrument, resulting in Need to Help Others being assessed as a single-item construct. For the purposes of this research, the Competency motive was renamed Physical. As an objective of Study

2 was to replicate the design of Study 1 in a separate context, the exact same items were employed to assess each construct. References to the event were changed to reflect the 3M Half Marathon and Relay, while references to the benefiting charity were altered to reflect the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas.

The items developed for each of the four recreation motives were based upon the items employed by Beard and Ragheb (1983). The statement, "One of my reasons for participating in the LIVESTRONG Challenge/3M Half Marathon and Relay is..." preceded each of the eight items. The items employed to measure Reciprocity and Self-Esteem were adapted from research examining donations to medical research (e.g., Dawson, 1988). Meanwhile, the items utilized for Desire to Improve the Charity were adapted from Gladden and colleague's (2004) investigation of donations to University athletic departments, which uncovered a motive based upon pushing the athletic department towards success through financial support. Finally, the item included to assess Need to Help Others: "I give to the Lance Armstrong Foundation because I feel a need to help others," was adapted from research by Ritzenheim (2000) on motivating donors, as well as the qualitative findings of Filo and colleagues (2008). As noted above, the items for each of the four recreation motives and motives for charitable giving have previously been applied and assessed within the charity sport event context (e.g., Filo et al., 2010). A complete list of the items used to address each construct examined in Study 1, with the exception of the single item for Need to Help Others, can be found in Table 1.

Procedures

Study 1. An e-mail including a link to the online questionnaire was submitted to 4,000 registered participants by an LAF representative. The e-mail was sent one day after the event, and the questionnaire was made available for 12 days following the event. The questionnaire took approximately 20 minutes to complete. A total of 568 completed questionnaires were deemed usable for a response rate of 14.2%. An online questionnaire was once again considered suitable for data collection as registration for the 2007 LAF LIVESTRONG Challenge was conducted online. All usable, completed questionnaires were then transferred to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 14.0 and Amos 6.0 (Arbuckle, 1994) for analysis.

Procedures

Study 2. The questionnaire was administered online one week following the event. Participants were sent an e-mail with a link to the questionnaire. The e-mail was sent to 3,500 participants, with 672 usable questionnaires returned for a response rate of 19.2%. The questionnaire was available to participants for two weeks following the initial e-mail. An online questionnaire was deemed suitable for data collection as registration for the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay was also conducted online.

Data Analysis

Study 1 and study 2. Data were analyzed in three stages. First, the data from Study 1 and Study 2 were combined into a single data set to conduct a confirma-

tory factor analysis using Amos 6.0 (Arbuckle, 2005). Confirmatory factor analysis uses theory as a basis to specify factors predicted to influence scores on measured variables (Conlon, 2003). Second, descriptive statistics including correlations, means, standard deviations and Cronbach alphas for the four recreation motives, four motives for charitable giving, and Event Attachment were calculated.

Third, two multiple regression analyses were conducted utilizing the data from Study 1 and Study 2, respectively. Regression analysis allows for the analysis of the variability of a dependant variable (e.g., event attachment) by examining information available on one or more independent variables (e.g., intellectual, social, physical, escape, reciprocity, self-esteem, desire to improve the charity, and need to help others motives) (e.g., Pedhazur, 1982). The analyses involved more than one independent variable. As a result, multiple regression analysis was employed taking into account the correlations between independent variables, and measuring the effect of each independent variable (Miles & Shevlin, 2001). The sample size of each study ($N=568$; $N=672$) met the recommended number of 15 data points per predictor ($x=8$) needed for multiple regression analysis (Stevens, 1992). The regression analyses for Study 1 and Study 2 addressed Research Question 1 and Research Question 2. From there a comparison of the beta coefficients within each regression analyses was made to address Research Question 3. The results of each stage of data analysis are detailed next.

Results

Results are presented separately in the following three stages. First, the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) employing the recreation motives and motives for charitable giving along with event attachment is highlighted. Second, descriptive statistics, correlations and reliability measures for all constructs are revealed. Third, results of multiple linear regression analyses are shown.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using AMOS 7.0 (Arbuckle, 1994) to examine the psychometric properties of the 20 manifest items and seven motives and Event Attachment constructs. Need to Help Others (NTHO) was excluded from this model as it was a single-item construct. Data were examined to test assumption of normality and presence of outliers. There were no missing data points or outliers but the data were nonnormally distributed reflecting a positive skewness. Hence, a covariance matrix taken from respondents in both studies was used as the input data ($N = 1257$) and maximum likelihood estimation was used as it is a robust estimation technique for violations of normality (Hair et al., 2010). A covariance matrix taken from respondents in both studies, employing maximum likelihood discrepancy, was used as the input data ($N = 1257$). The measurement model specified the relationship between two manifest items and 10 latent constructs: *Intellectual* (INL), *Social* (SOC), *Physical* (PHY), *Escape* (ESC), *Reciprocity* (RPC), *Self-Esteem* (SES), *Desire to Improve Charity* (DTIC), *Emotional Meaning* (EM), *Symbolic Meaning* (SM), and *Functional Meaning* (FM). The measurement model also specified that first order latent constructs of EM, SM, and FM represent a second order construct: *Event Attachment*.

Table 1 presents *T* values for each item and ranged from 17.03 to 66.71. The individual item reliabilities for each latent factor are reported in Table 1 in the form of standardized path coefficients. The standardized factor loadings ranged from $\beta = .65$ to a high of $\beta = .97$ with only one item under the $\beta = .707$ benchmark: SES2 $\beta = .65$. The items used to measure each construct revealed average variance extracted ranging from .55 (SES) to .92 (EM). Average variance extracted represents the average of the squared standardized factor for items of a latent construct and all constructs were above the 50% threshold (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Hair et al., 2010). Average variance extracted above .50 indicates convergent validity (Dillon & Goldstein, 1984). An additional test of discriminant validity was conducted and revealed that the average variance extracted by each of the items representing motive constructs, as well as event attachment, exceeded the squared correlation among these constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). These results provide evidence that the items intended to measure a latent construct explained more variance in that construct than could be explained by its correlation to other constructs.

Fit indices were used to evaluate how well the measurement model fit the data collected to determine whether particular paths in the model are significant (Netemeyer, Bearden, & Sharma, 2003). The selection of fit indices remains the subject of ongoing debate but most researchers advocate selecting at least one index from each of the three classifications: absolute fit, incremental fit and parsimony of fit (Hair et al., 2010; Kline, 2010). Hence five indices were selected: Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Normal Fit Index (NFI), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Standardised Route Mean Squared (SRMR). Fit statistics for this first measurement model were ($\chi^2 = 956.47/df = 139$); RMSEA = .07; SRMR = .04; GFI = .93; NFI = .95; and CFI = .96. The χ^2/df was above the recommended threshold but results are due to the large sample size (Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988). Gulliksen and Tukey (1958) state that, "if the sample is large, the χ^2 test will show that the data are significantly different from those expected on a given theory even though the difference may be so very slight as to be negligible or unimportant on other criteria" (p. 96). The relatively high χ^2 and corresponding χ^2/df , combined with a RMSEA value over .05 suggest that the model may not represent close fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1992). Meanwhile, the other fit indices indicate satisfactory fit (e.g., Hair et al., 2010; Kline, 2010).

Descriptive Statistics

The correlations, means, standard deviations, and Cronbach alphas for the eight motives measured, as well as Event Attachment, within Study 1 and Study 2 combined are reported in Table 2. The Cronbach alphas were calculated for the constructs since they used multi-item scales, and ranged from $\alpha = .70$ to $\alpha = .93$, indicating the items used to measure the constructs were reliable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). A Cronbach alpha was not calculated for Need to Help Others as this was a single-item construct. The mean scores ranged from 3.61 to 6.13, with Physical revealing the highest mean score, followed by Need to Help Others ($M = 5.11$). A one-sample *t*-test with a 4.0 midpoint revealed that one motive was significantly lower than the 4.0 midpoint: Reciprocity ($M = 3.61$) ($p < .05$) indicating on average the sample did not agree this motive was ascribed to a reason for event

Table 1

Study 1 & 2 Combined: Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Individual Scale Items, Factor Loadings, Path Coefficients, and T-values for the Motives and Event Attachment (N=1257)

Scale Item	Factor Loadings	Path Coefficients	T-values
Intellectual (INL) (AVE = .82)			
to expand my knowledge	.94	1.14	39.67
to discover new things	.87	.85	39.67
Social (SOC) (AVE = .80)			
to interact with others	.86	.86	37.64
to meet new and different people	.93	1.20	37.64
Physical (PHY) (AVE = .62)			
to improve my skill and ability in doing the activity	.76	1.02	17.21
to keep in shape physically	.81	.98	17.22
Escape (ESC) (AVE = .66)			
to avoid the hustle and bustle of daily activities	.71	1.15	17.03
to relieve stress and tension	.91	.87	17.03
Reciprocity (RPC) (AVE = .88)			
The activities of the Lance Armstrong Foundation have improved the quality of life of people who are close to me	.92	.95	50.29
The Lance Armstrong Foundation has been responsible for improving the quality of life of people close to me	.96	1.05	50.26
Self-Esteem (SES) (AVE = .55)			
Other people will think more highly of me if I donate time or money to the Lance Armstrong Foundation	.82	1.43	22.15
People who are most respected by society are those who give to charitable organisations	.65	.70	22.16
Desire to Improve the Charity (DTIC) (AVE = .62)			
Giving to the Lance Armstrong Foundation allows me to enhance the prestige of the charity	.84	1.30	24.28
Giving to the Lance Armstrong Foundation allows me to push the organisation towards success	.72	.88	39.67
Event Attachment (AVE = .65)			
<i>Functional Meaning</i> (AVE = .79)	.80	.93	28.18
I possess a great deal of knowledge about the LIVESTRONG Challenge	.85	.77	35.02
If I were to list everything I know about the LIVESTRONG Challenge, the list would be quite long	.93	1.30	35.52
<i>Emotional Meaning</i> (AVE = .92)	.90	1.34	25.38
The LIVESTRONG Challenge is important to me	.97	1.00	66.71
Being a participant in the LIVESTRONG Challenge is very important to me	.95	1.01	66.77
<i>Symbolic Meaning</i> (AVE = .85)	.71	1.13	22.06
You can tell a lot about a person by whether or not he or she participates in the LIVESTRONG Challenge	.98	1.22	37.02
Participating in the LIVESTRONG Challenge gives a glimpse of the type of person I am	.85	.82	37.02

Factor Loading = Standardized Regression Weight

Path Coefficient = Unstandardized Regression Estimate

Table 2

Study 1 & 2 Combined: Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations and Reliability Measures for Recreation Motives, Motives for Charitable Giving, and Event Attachment (N=1257)

Construct	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	M	SD	Cronbach Alpha
1. INL	1									4.59	1.77	.90
2. SOC	.65*	1								4.89	1.62	.89
3. PHY	.21*	.24*	1							6.13	1.00	.76
4. ESC	.29*	.29*	.38*	1						4.48	1.68	.78
5. RPC	.50*	.48*	-.04	.10*	1					3.61	1.99	.93
6. SES	.36*	.40*	.10*	.21*	.53*	1				4.17	1.54	.70
7. NTHO	.43*	.46*	.07*	.14*	.56*	.53*	1			5.11	1.70	
8. DTIC	.38*	.43*	.16*	.22*	.48*	.66*	.64*	1		4.66	1.45	.76
9. Event Attachment	.55*	.57*	.15*	.23*	.62*	.55*	.56*	.56*	1	4.77	1.34	.90

* Correlations are significant $p < .05$

participation. Inspection of the correlation matrix in Table 2 revealed significant and theoretically consistent correlations between the motives with the exception of Physical and Reciprocity, which was not significant. Next, descriptive statistics for Study 1 and Study 2 were calculated individually.

Study 1

The correlations, means, standard deviations, and Cronbach alphas for the eight motives measured, as well as Event Attachment within Study 1 (2007 LAF LIVESTRONG Challenge) are reported in Table 3. Within Study 1, the Cronbach alphas were calculated for the constructs since they used multi-item scales, and ranged from $\alpha = .70$ to $\alpha = .87$, indicating the items used to measure the constructs were reliable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). A Cronbach alpha was not calculated for Need to Help Others as this was a single-item construct. The mean scores ranged from 4.50 to 6.12, with Need to Help Others revealing the highest mean score, followed by Physical ($M = 6.00$). A one-sample t-test with a 4.0 midpoint revealed that all motives were significantly higher than the 4.0 midpoint ($p < .05$).

Study 2

The correlations, means, standard deviations, and Cronbach alphas for the eight motives measured, as well as Event Attachment within Study 2 (2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay) are reported in Table 4. For Study 2, the Cronbach alphas were calculated for the constructs since they used multi-item scales, and ranged from $\alpha = .69$ to $\alpha = .87$, indicating the items used to measure the constructs were reliable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The mean scores ranged from 2.28

Table 3

Study 1: Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations and Reliability Measures for Recreation Motives, Motives for Charitable Giving, and Event Attachment (N=568)

Construct	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	M	SD	Cronbach Alpha
1. INL	1									5.55	1.33	.89
2. SOC	.54*	1								5.77	1.18	.89
3. PHY	.32*	.42*	1							6.00	1.12	.81
4. ESC	.26*	.25*	.44*	1						4.50	1.73	.76
5. RPC	.23*	.20*	.11*	.09*	1					5.23	1.29	.93
6. SES	.05	.15*	.19*	.18*	.28*	1				4.95	1.41	.77
7. NTHO	.25*	.20*	.16*	.10*	.34*	.35*	1			6.12	1.05	
8. DTIC	.18*	.22*	.22*	.22*	.39*	.65*	.46*	1		5.25	1.19	.69
9. Event Attachment	.28*	.37*	.19*	.17*	.46*	.44*	.56*	.49*	1	5.60	.92	.86

*Correlations are significant $p < .05$

Table 4

Study 2: Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations and Reliability Measures for Recreation Motives, Motives for Charitable Giving, and Event Attachment (N=689)

Construct	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	M	SD	Cronbach Alpha
1. INL	1									3.81	1.69	.87
2. SOC	.55*	1								4.17	1.56	.85
3. PHY	.33*	.31*	1							6.24	.88	.70
4. ESC	.39*	.39*	.32*	1						4.46	1.64	.80
5. RPC	.23*	.21*	.03	.17*	1					2.28	1.38	.81
6. SES	.27*	.28*	.17*	.27*	.36*	1				3.52	1.32	.69
7. NTHO	.22*	.28*	.18*	.19*	.28*	.42*	1			4.27	1.68	
8. DTIC	.27*	.35*	.23*	.24*	.27*	.56*	.61*	1		4.17	1.47	.78
9. Event Attachment	.42*	.43	.34*	.34*	.31*	.38*	.33*	.40*	1	4.09	1.24	.86

* Correlations are significant $p < .05$

to 6.24, with Physical revealing the highest mean score, followed by Escape ($M = 4.46$). A one-sample t -test with a 4.0 midpoint revealed that the three motives were significantly lower than the 4.0 midpoint: Reciprocity ($M = 2.28$), Self-Esteem ($M = 3.52$), and Intellectual ($M = 3.81$) ($p < .05$).

Multiple Regression Analysis

Study 1. Results of the multiple regression analysis for Study 1 revealed that the Social ($b = .21$) motive contributed to Event Attachment. Meanwhile, Reciprocity ($b = .21$), Self-Esteem ($b = .10$), Need to Help Others ($b = .21$), and Desire to Improve the Charity ($b = .27$) motives also contribute to Event Attachment, with 46.7% of the variance explained overall. The results also demonstrate that Reciprocity, Self-Esteem, Need to Help Others and Desire to Improve the Charity motives make a stronger contribution to Event Attachment than the Social motive $F(8,559) = 63.14$. The results of this multiple regression analysis are summarized in Table 5.

Study 2. Results of the multiple regression analysis revealed that Intellectual ($b = .15$), Social ($b = .15$), Physical ($b = .16$), and Escape ($b = .08$) motives contribute to Event Attachment. Meanwhile, Reciprocity ($b = .14$), Self-Esteem ($b = .12$), and Desire to Improve the Charity ($b = .11$) motives also contribute to Event Attachment. In addition, the results demonstrate that Intellectual, Social, Physical, and Escape motives make a relatively stronger contribution to Event Attachment than Reciprocity, Self-Esteem, and Desire to Improve the Charity motives $F(8,680) = 47.91$. The results of the multiple regression analysis are summarized in Table 6.

Study 1 and Study 2 conducted multiple linear regression analysis to examine the relative contribution of the recreation motives and motives for charitable giving across two separate charity sport event contexts. A comparison of these findings, along with the results from Study 1 and 2 combined, is detailed in Table 7. The results of these multiple regression analyses reveal that both recreation motives and motives for charitable giving contribute to Event Attachment, however the relative contribution of individual motives differs across event contexts. A discussion of these findings is next.

Table 5

Study 1: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Recreation and Charity Motives Predicting Event Attachment (N=568)

Construct	B	SE B	β
INL	.01	.03	.02
SOC	.17	.03	.21*
PHY	-.04	.03	-.05
ESC	.01	.02	.01
RPC	.15	.02	.21*
SES	.07	.03	.10*
NTHO	.18	.03	.21*
DTIC	.19	.03	.27*

* $p < .05$

Table 6

Study 2: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Recreation and Charity Motives Predicting Event Attachment (N=689)

Construct	B	SE B	β
INL	.11	.03	.15*
SOC	.12	.03	.15*
PHY	.22	.05	.16*
ESC	.06	.03	.08*
RPC	.12	.03	.14*
SES	.11	.04	.12*
NTHO	.04	.03	.06
DTIC	.09	.04	.11*

* $p < .05$

Table 7

Comparison of Multiple Linear Regression Results for Study 1 & 2 Combined, Study 1, and Study 2

Study Motive	Study 1 Beta	Study 2 Beta
INL	.02	.15*
SOC	.21*	.15*
PHY	-.05	.16*
ESC	.01	.08*
RPC	.21*	.14*
SES	.10*	.12*
NTHO	.21*	.06
DTIC	.27*	.11*
Adjusted R ²	.47	.35
F Value	63.14	47.14

* $p < .05$

Discussion

Overall, the results introduce four main findings. First, recreation motives and motives for charitable giving contribute to attachment to charity sport events. Second, social, reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others, and desire to improve the charity motives contribute to attachment to a charity sport event, in which the charitable cause is featured prominently. Third, intellectual, social, physical, escape, reciprocity, self-esteem, and desire to improve the charity motives contribute to attachment to a charity sport event with a less prominently featured charitable aspect. Fourth, the motives for charitable giving make a stronger contribution to attachment for an event with a more prominent charitable cause, while the recreation motives make a stronger contribution to attachment to an event with a less prominent charitable cause.

Research question 1 examined the role of recreation motives in the development of attachment to a charity sport event. Study 1 revealed that one recreation motive (social) contributes to attachment to the 2007 LAF **LIVESTRONG** Challenge, while Study 2 revealed that four recreation motives (intellectual, social, physical, escape) contribute to attachment to the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay. This contribution was revealed through significant beta weights within regression analysis. These findings suggest that the more likely the participant agreed that he or she was driven to participate by intellectual, social, physical, and escape motives, the more emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning a participant ascribed to the event.

Research question 2 examined the role of motives for charitable giving in the development of attachment to a charity sport event. Study 1 revealed that four motives for charitable giving (reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others, desire to improve the charity) contribute to attachment to the 2007 LAF **LIVESTRONG** Challenge, while Study 2 revealed that three motives for charitable giving (reciprocity, self-esteem, desire to improve the charity) contribute to attachment to the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay. This contribution was revealed through significant beta weights within regression analysis. These findings suggest that the more likely the participant agreed that he or she was driven to participate by reciprocity, self-esteem, and desire to improve the charity motives, the more emotional, symbolic and functional meaning a participant ascribed to the event. Notably, need to help others represented the only motive for charitable giving that did not contribute to attachment across both studies. This could be attributed to the limited presence of the charitable cause within the marketing communication for the 3M Half Marathon and Relay. This limited presence may impact participant belief that improving the lives and well being of individual constituents of the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas contributes to the event taking on emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning.

Research Question 3 examined the relative contribution to event attachment made by recreation and charity-based motives respectively, based on the event context. Results from Study 1 suggest a stronger contribution from the motives for charitable giving. Collectively, the magnitude of the beta weights for reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others, and desire to improve the charity was larger

than the beta weight for the social motive. Results from Study 2 suggest a stronger contribution from the recreation motives for an event with a less prominent charitable cause. Collectively, the magnitude of the beta weights for intellectual, social, physical, and escape motives was larger than the beta weights for reciprocity, self-esteem, and desire to improve the charity. Furthermore, two of the motives for charitable giving with significant beta weights revealed relatively low mean scores within Study 2 (significantly lower than the 4.0 midpoint) suggesting minimal presence.

Overall, these results provide additional evidence that recreation motives and motives for charitable giving are present and contribute to attachment to the event (Funk & James, 2006). The presence and contribution of the recreation motives provides support for leisure motives accounting for participation in leisure activities (Beard & Ragheb, 1983). The contribution of motives such as social, reciprocity, need to help others, and desire to improve the charity reflect attachment as a means toward self-expression as well as a connection with others (Wallendorf & Arnould, 1988). Additionally, the contribution of physical, as well as that of desire to improve the charity, aligns with attachment to a charity sport event as a reflection of what individuals believe can be achieved (Kleine & Baker, 2004). Meanwhile, the contribution of the social motive underscores the importance of social interaction in the development of meaning and attachment (Kyle, Mowen, Absher, & Havitz, 2006). Overall, the contribution of each of the eight motives to event attachment across the two studies provides additional support for the relationship between motives and attachment in the charity sport event context (Filo et al., 2008; 2010). Collectively, these findings suggest event attachment has formed based in part on the contribution of these motives (Funk & James, 2001; 2006).

Theoretical Implications

The results of this research introduce a variety of important theoretical implications. First, suggestions have been made for the employment of the PCM framework to physically active sport and recreation participation (e.g., Beaton & Funk, 2008; Stewart et al., 2003). This research responds to these suggestions by relating the PCM across multiple sport events, involving participants within different sport activities. This speaks to the adaptability of the framework to different contexts. Further research applying this framework to the sport event context can follow. In particular, the PCM aligns closely with charity sport events through the emphasis on the psychological connection an individual shares with a sport object, revealed here through the meaning participants derive from both the sport and the charitable cause, as well as the event overall.

Next, the findings of this research provide substantiation to the suggestion that attraction outcomes serve as inputs to the attachment process (Funk & James, 2006). The motives driving event participation were found to contribute to event attachment within both Study 1 and Study 2. The need for social interaction has been suggested as a motive satisfied as part of attraction (Funk, Mahony, & Ridinger, 2002), and outcomes such as socialization are proposed to contribute to attachment (Funk & James, 2006). The relative contribution of the recreation motives

and motives for charitable giving to attachment across both charity sport event contexts provides evidence of this. Attachment is revealed through a strengthening of attitudes toward an object (Beaton & Funk, 2008), reflected in emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning held for the object (Funk & James, 2006). The findings of this research suggest that Event Attachment is revealed when the motives driving participation, and satisfied within the attraction stage, bind together to create emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning held for an event.

In addition, this research represents quantitative assessment of the motives uncovered within existing research in the charity sport event context (e.g., Filo et al., 2008). Specifically, this research examined motives for charitable giving and/or donations to University athletic departments in the recreation context. The adaptation of items to assess Reciprocity, Self-Esteem, Need to Help Others, and Desire to Improve the Charity motives reflects a theoretical contribution of this research through further substantiation of the findings of Filo and colleagues (2010). These items and constructs provide a sound starting point for further quantitative assessment of motives for charitable giving driving participation in recreation activities.

Managerial Implications

The results of the current research also introduce a variety of implications for charity sport event managers. First, charity sport event managers can segment the participant base using the motives examined within this research as a guide. Importance has been placed on allowing consumer usage behavior to dictate how consumer groups are identified and targeted (Pritchard & Funk, 2006). The recreation motives and motives for charitable giving can be used to develop participant profiles through segmentation. Future research can utilize these different motives, as well as the broader categories of recreation and charity-based motives, as segmentation variables. This shares similarities with enduring involvement-based consumer research, which employs facets to develop involvement profiles (Havitz & Dimanche, 1999). Additionally, utilizing the involvement construct can facilitate the application of stage matching participants within the PCM framework to understand event participant behavior, while attempting to promote increased participation (Beaton et al., 2009).

Segmenting different markets among a charity sport event's participant base can then lead to effectively leveraging the different motives based upon the type of event. Recreation industry professionals can employ divergent marketing strategies to facilitate participation in community events that can increase physical activity patterns. Managers of charity sport events with a more pronounced charitable cause should look to leverage the motives for charitable giving. Specifically, need to help others and desire to improve the charity can be emphasized in marketing communications and event augmentations showcasing the charitable advances that can be made for both individual constituents and the organization overall.

Throughout the event registration process, the needs of the charitable organization and core constituents should be detailed. This can convey to potential participants that help is needed, while registration and participation provides a means

to provide this assistance. Furthermore, following the event, communication is recommended that updates participants on the outcomes achieved as a result of the event. Managers should inform participants of the amount of money raised by the event, as well as provide participants with specifics on how these funds will be spent. Storytelling can be integrated within this event marketing communication to tell individual stories of constituents benefitting from the money raised and corresponding projects launched. Social media platforms can be leveraged to bolster this communication. Micro-blogging initiatives such as Twitter can be utilized to make brief announcements regarding event outcomes, while viral videos can be developed to create a narrative behind the objectives achieved as a result of the event. This follow-up communication would correspond with Chalip's (1992) recommendation of the use of multiple narratives in sport event promotion. This messaging could also enhance and further stimulate the 'warm glow' effect that results from individuals experience as a result of voluntary donations to charity (Harbaugh, Mayr, & Burghart, 2007).

Managers of sport events with a less pronounced charitable aspect can leverage the recreation motives. Specifically, intellectual and physical motives can be focused on through emphasizing supplementary aspects of the sport experience (Bristow & Schneider, 2003). Ancillary events organized outside of the event parameters (e.g., Chalip, 2006; O'Brien & Chalip, 2007; 2008) can be promoted to facilitate participants learning more about the charity and destination. Furthermore, training programs employing online forums can foster the community of participants (Szmigin & Reppel, 2004), while promoting the recreational aspects of the event.

While promoting and leveraging these motives, charity sport event managers can attempt to increase attachment among participants, while fostering allegiance to the event. Relationship marketing represents an effective means to bolster attachment among consumers (Sheth & Parvatiyar, 1995). Specifically, Funk and James (2001) highlight structural and customization bonding as levels of relationship marketing that can facilitate movement from attachment to allegiance. Employing these managerial levers will allow charity sport event managers to tailor the event experience and develop services for the different participants based upon the relevant motives for the different segments. Bolstering attachment and fostering allegiance would strengthen an individual's psychological connection with the charity sport event. This stronger psychological connection can lead to increased likelihood of engaging in activities related to the event, as well as increased engagement with sponsors, among event participants (Beaton, Funk, Ridinger, & Jordan, 2011)

Limitations

Limitations of this research should be acknowledged. First, the number of items used to assess each construct was limited due to restrictions put in place by the charity sport event organizers. Additional research can be conducted using three to five items to measure each motive to provide a more robust assessment of each construct. Second, the data provide a snapshot of the motives driving charity sport event participation. This snapshot examined the motives' relative influence

following event participation. Motivation may be altered after direct experience (i.e., event participation), and the aftermath of the event may complicate original motivation. Thus, longitudinal data collected before, during and after a charity sport event could provide a more comprehensive assessment of the relative contribution of different motives to event attachment.

Future Directions

Using the current research as a starting point, a number of future studies are warranted. First, the recreation motives and motives for charitable giving examined within this research explained 55.7% of the variance in Event Attachment across both studies. Additional variance could be explained by expanding the motives introduced and assessed. Specifically, tourism-based motives related to the destination could be examined and further account for the variance in event attachment. Uncovering destination-specific motives that pull participants to the event (e.g., Crompton, 1979) could allow for collaboration between charity sport event managers and tourism operators to enhance event sustainability. Also, motives related to enjoyment, weight management, and positive health have been uncovered within the sport and exercise settings (e.g., Kilpatrick, Hebert, & Bartholomew, 2005), and these motives are relevant to the charity sport event context. Future research can incorporate these motives to expand the examination of motivation to participate in charity sports events, as well as potentially explain additional variance.

Beyond an expansion of the independent variables, future research could further investigate the dependant variable within this research. The current research assessed participants' levels of event attachment using a unidimensional scale. Differences could exist across the three components of meaning (i.e., emotional, functional, symbolic) and the relative contribution of recreation-based and charity-based motives. This research could provide charity sport event managers with insight regarding which motivating factors impact specific facets of meaning. This would allow for more detailed customization of event marketing communication.

Next, the events examined within the current research both benefitted a charitable cause to a degree. Future research could explore an event that does not benefit a charity at all. This investigation could substantiate a lack of significant contribution from the motives for charitable giving. In addition, the current research represents initial steps towards the categorization of charity sport events. As noted throughout this manuscript, the 2007 LAF **LIVESTRONG** Challenge and the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay differ based upon the relative prominence of the charitable component. These two charity sport event contexts can be categorized as events aligned with a specific charity as full beneficiary versus events aligned with differing charities as partial beneficiaries. Additional categories of charity sport events that can be identified and compared through further research related to the sport, both in terms of activity (i.e., running, cycling, swimming, walking, etc.) and intensity (i.e., 5K, half marathon, full marathon, triathlon, etc.); as well as charity (i.e., public health, environmental, social service, etc.).

Finally, existing research has uncovered a variety of motives driving charity sport event participation (e.g., Bennett, Mousley, Kitchin, & Ali-Choudhury, 2007;

Filo et al., 2008), and the current research has examined the relative contribution of these motives to attachment. Future research can now examine potential outcomes of these motives and attachment. Charity sport events have broader social goals to raise awareness of the charitable cause and advance social change on behalf of the charity's constituents. In addition, sport events provide an inherent sense of community, which can be leveraged to advance change within an event host community's social issues agenda (O'Brien & Chalip, 2007; 2008). The role of motives and attachment in facilitating social change and achieving the broader goals of charity sport events through engaging and empowering participants (e.g., Scheyvens, 1999; Williams, 2005) is worthy of exploration.

Conclusion

This research investigates the relative contribution of four recreation motives and four motives for charitable giving to participant attachment across two separate event contexts. Specifically, the findings reveal one recreation motive and four motives for charitable giving contribute to attachment to the 2007 LAF **LIVESTRONG** Challenge. In addition, the findings reveal four recreation motives and three motives for charitable giving contribute to attachment to the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay. Collectively, these findings uncover a difference in the relative contribution of these motives based upon the event context. The motives for charitable giving make a stronger contribution for the event with a more pronounced charitable component, while recreation motives make a stronger contribution for the event with a less prominent charitable aspect.

This research provides insight into how charity sport event managers can market to event participants based upon the distinct motives driving participation and contributing to event attachment. It is hoped that this research leads to further examination of the meaning elicited by sport events, as well as the factors that contribute to this meaning across event contexts. This could allow event managers to effectively leverage event attachment through the promotion and development of the different event facets with which participants may align.

References

- Alexandris, K., & Carroll, B. (1997). Motives for recreational sport participation in Greece: Implications for planning and provision of sport services. *European Physical Education Review, 3*, 129-143.
- Alexandris, K., Funk, D. C., & Pritchard, M. (2011). The impact of constraints on motivation, activity attachment, and skier intentions to continue. *Journal of Leisure Research, 43*, 56-79.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (1994). AMOS: Analysis of moment structures. *Psychometrika, 59*, 135-137.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16*, 74-94.
- Beard, J. G., & Ragheb, M. G. (1983). Measuring leisure motivation. *Journal of Leisure Research, 15*, 219-228.

- Beaton, A. A., & Funk, D. C. (2008). An evaluation of theoretical frameworks for studying physically active leisure. *Leisure Sciences, 30*, 53-70.
- Beaton, A. A., Funk, D. C., & Alexandris, K. (2009). Operationalizing a theory of participation in physically active leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*, 177-203.
- Beaton, A. A., Funk, D. C., Ridinger, L., & Jordan, J. (2011). Sport involvement: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Sport Management Review, 14*, 126-140.
- Bennett, R., Mousley, W., Kitchin, P., & Ali-Choudhury, R. (2007). Motivations for participating in charity-affiliated sporting events. *Journal of Customer Behaviour, 6*, 155-178.
- Bhattacharya, C. B., Rao, H., Glynn, M. A. (1995). Understanding the bond of identification: An investigation of its correlates among art museum members. *Journal of Marketing, 59*, 46-57.
- Bristow, D., & Schneider, K. (2003). The sport fan motivation scale: Development and testing. *The Marketing Management Journal, 13*, 115-121.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1992). Alternate ways of assessing model fit. *Sociological Methods & Research, 21*, 230-258.
- Casper, J. M., & Andrew, D. P. S. (2008). Sport commitment differences among tennis players on the basis of participation outlet and skill level. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 31*, 201-219.
- Chalip, L. (2006). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 11*, 1-19.
- Chalip, L. (1992). The construction and use of polysemic structures: Olympic lessons for sport marketing. *Journal of Sport Management, 6*, 87-98.
- Clough, P., Shepherd, J., & Maughan, R. (1990). Motives for participation in recreational running. *Journal of Leisure Research, 21*, 279-309.
- Conlon, E. (2003). *Advanced research methods workbook*. Griffith University: Gold Coast.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*, 408-424.
- Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*, 425-439.
- Dann, G. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 4*, 184-194.
- Daughtrey, C., & Stotlar, D. (2000). Donations: Are they affected by a football championship? *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 9*, 185-193.
- Dawson, S. (1988). Four motivations for charitable giving: Implications for marketing strategy to attract monetary donations for medical research. *Journal of Health Care Marketing, 8*(2), 31-37.
- Dillon, W. R., & Goldstein, M. (1984). *Multivariate analysis: Methods and applications*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Ebben, W., & Brudzynski, L. (2008). Motivations and barriers to exercise among college students. *Journal of Exercise Physiology, 11*(5), 1-11.
- Filo, K., Funk, D.C., & Alexandris, K. (2008). Exploring the impact of brand trust on the relationship between brand associations and brand loyalty in sport and fitness. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing, 3*, 39-57.

- Filo, K., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien, D. (2010). The antecedents and outcomes of attachment and sponsor image within charity sport events. *Journal of Sport Management, 24*, 623-648.
- Filo, K., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien, D. (2008). It's really not about the bike: Exploring attraction and attachment to the events of the Lance Armstrong Foundation. *Journal of Sport Management, 22*, 501-525.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*, 39-50.
- Funk, D. C., Filo, K., Beaton, A. A., & Pritchard, M. (2009). Measuring the motives of sport event attendance: Bridging the academic-practitioner divide to understanding behavior. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 18*, 126-138.
- Funk, D. C., Haugtvedt, C. P., & Howard, D. R. (2000). Contemporary attitude theory in sport: Theoretical considerations and implications. *Sport Management Review, 3*(2), 124-144.
- Funk, D. C., & James, J. (2006). Consumer loyalty: The meaning of attachment in the development of sport team allegiance. *Journal of Sport Management, 20*, 189-217.
- Funk, D. C., & James, J. (2004). The fan attitude network (FAN) model: Exploring attitude formation and change among sport consumers. *Sport Management Review, 7*, 1-26.
- Funk, D. C., & James, J. (2001). The psychological continuum model: A conceptual framework for understanding an individual's psychological connection to sport. *Sport Management Review, 4*, 119-150.
- Funk, D. C., Mahony, D. F., & Ridinger, L. L. (2002). Characterizing consumer motivation as individual difference factors: Augmenting the Sport Interest Inventory (SII) to explain level of spectator support. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 11*, 33-43.
- Funk, D. C., Toohey, T., & Bruun, T. (2007). International sport event participation: Prior sport involvement; destination image; and travel motives. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 7*, 227-248.
- Gladden, J. M., Mahony, D. F., & Apostolopoulou, A. (2004). Toward a better understanding of college athletic donors: What are the primary motives? *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 13*, 194-208.
- Gulliksen, H. & Tukey, J. W. (1958). Reliability for the law of comparative judgment. *Psychometrika, 23*, 95-110.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. (2010). *Multivariate analysis* (7th Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Harbaugh, W. T., Mayr, U., & Burghart, D. R. (2007). Neural responses to taxation and voluntary giving reveal motives for charitable donations. *Science, 316*, 1622-1625.
- Havitz, M. E., & Dimanche, F. (1999). Leisure involvement revisited: Drive properties and paradoxes. *Journal of Leisure Research, 31*, 122-149.
- Higgins, J. W. & Lauzon, L. (2003). Finding the funds in fun runs: Exploring physical activity events as fundraising tools in the nonprofit sector. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 8*, 363-377.

- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1980). *The social psychology of leisure and recreation*. Dubuque, IA; Wm. C. Brown.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: A rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9, 256-262.
- Kilpatrick, M., Hebert, E. & Bartholomew, J. (2005). College students' motivation for physical activity: Differentiating men's and women's motives for sport participation and exercise. *Journal of American College Health*, 54, 87-94.
- King, S. (2001). Breast cancer, corporate philanthropy, and the market for generosity. *Social Text* 69, 19(4), 115-143.
- Kleine, S. S., & Baker, S. M. (2004). An integrative review of material possession attachment. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 2004, 1-35.
- Kline, R. B. (2010). *Principles and practices of structural equation modeling* (3rd Edition). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kottasz, R. (2004). How should charitable organisations motivate young professionals to give philanthropically? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 9, 9-27.
- Kyle, G. T., Mowen, A. J., Absher, J. D., & Havitz, M. E. (2006). Commitment to public leisure service providers: A conceptual and psychometric analysis. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 38, 78-103.
- Mannell, R. C. & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1987). Psychological nature of leisure and tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14, 314-331.
- Marx, J. D. (2000). Women and human services giving. *Social Work*, 45, 27-38.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Marsh, H. W., Balla, J. R., & McDonald, R. P. (1988). Goodness-of-fit indexes in confirmatory factor analysis: The effect of sample size. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 391-410.
- Miles, J., & Shevlin, M. (2001). *Applying regression and correlation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, N. M., & Bauman, A. (2007). Mass sporting and physical activity events--are they "bread and circuses" or public health interventions to increase population levels of physical activity? *Journal of Physical Activity & Health*, 4(2), 193-202.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Bearden, W. O., & Sharma, S. (2003). *Scaling procedures: Issues and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Brien, D., & Chalip, L. (2007). Executive training exercise in sport event leverage. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1(4), 296-304.
- O'Brien, D., & Chalip, L. (2008). Sport events and strategic leveraging: Pushing towards the triple bottom line. In A. Woodside & D. Martin (Eds.), *Advancing tourism management* (pp. 318-338). Cambridge, MA: CABI Publishing.
- Pearce, P. L. (1982). The social psychology of tourist behaviour. *International Series in Experimental Social Psychology*, 3. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Pedhazur, E.J. (1982). *Multiple regression in behavioral research* (2nd ed.). New York. CBS College Publishing.

- Pringle, H., & Thompson, M. (1999). *Brand spirit: How cause-related marketing builds brands*. Chichester, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Pritchard, M. P., & Funk, D. C. (2006). Symbiosis and substitution in spectator sport. *Journal of Sport Management, 20*, 297-320.
- Ritzenheim, D. N. (2000). One more time: How do you motivate donors? *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising, 29*, 51-68.
- Scheyvens, R. (1999). Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities. *Tourism Management, 20*, 245-249.
- 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*, 43-66.
- Sheth, J.N. & Parvatiyar, A. (1995). Relationship marketing in consumer markets: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science 23*, 225-271.
- Staurowsky, E. J., Parkhouse, B., & Sachs, M. (1996). Developing an instrument to measure athletic donor behaviour and motivation. *Journal of Sport Management, 10*, 262-277.
- Stevens, J. (1992). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale. L. Erlbaum.
- Stewart, B., Smith, A. C. T., & Nicholson, M. (2003). Sport consumer typologies: A critical review. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 4*, 206-216.
- Stinson, J. L., & Howard, D. R. (2007). Athletic success and private giving to athletic and academic programs at NCAA institutions. *Journal of Sport Management, 21*, 235-264.
- Stinson, J. L., & Howard, D. R. (2004). Scoreboards vs. mortarboards: Major donor behaviour and intercollegiate athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 13*, 129-140.
- Szmigin, I., & Reppel, A. E. (2004). Internet community bonding: The case of mac-news.de. *European Journal of Marketing, 38*, 626-640.
- USA Fundraising (2009). How to plan a Thon Fundraiser. Retrieved November 5, 2009 from: <http://www.usafundraising.com/how-to-plan-a-thon-fundraiser.html>.
- Wallendorf, M., & Arnould, E. J. (1988). "My favorite things": A cross-cultural inquiry into object attachment, possessiveness, and social linkage. *Journal of Consumer Research, 14*, 531-547.
- Williams, A. (2005). Consumer social responsibility. *Consumer Policy Review, 15*, 34-35.
- Woodman, T., Hardy, L., Barlow, M., & Le Scanff, C. (2010). Motives for prolonged engagement high-risk sports: An agentic emotion regulation perspective. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 11*, 345-352.
- Zhang, Q. H., & Lam, T. (1999). An analysis of mainland Chinese visitors' motivations to visit Hong Kong. *Tourism Management, 20*, 587-594.