

Examining core and contextual motives for charity sport event participation

Contact details

Name author(s): Kevin Filo (1) & Daniel C. Funk (2)

Institution(s) or organisation(s): University of Massachusetts (1); Griffith University (2)

City and country: Amherst, MA, USA (1); Gold Coast, Australia (2)

Email address for correspondence: kfilo@sportmgt.umass.edu

Aim of paper and research questions

The popularity of participatory sport events with specific ties to charities has increased. Despite this popularity, limited research has investigated factors that drive participation and contribute to the meaning and importance held for these events. This paper examines the role of participation motives in the development of sport event attachment across two different charity sport event contexts. Specifically, this research addresses the following research questions:

- Research Question 1: How do recreational participation motives contribute to attachment to a charity sport event?
- Research Question 2: How do charity motives contribute to participant attachment to a charity sport event?

Literature review

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. This research focuses specifically on attachment within the framework. In the sport event context, research has uncovered a variety of motives that interact and contribute to participant attachment to the event (e.g., Filo, Funk & O'Brien, 2008). This research introduces intrinsic motives related to recreation participation and charitable giving as core and contextual motives that are not only satisfied through participation in charity sport events, but also lead to attachment to the event. The authors investigate the relative contribution of four recreation motives and four motives for charitable giving to attachment to the event to determine if differences exist in the influence of each motive based upon the prominence of the charitable cause within the event.

Research design and data analysis

Following the collection of pilot data, online questionnaires were given to participants in an event with a prominent charitable component (the 2007 Lance Armstrong Foundation (LAF) LIVESTRONG Challenge; N=568), along with an event with a less pronounced charitable aspect (the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay; N=689) following each event. The questionnaires measured four recreation motives: Intellectual, Social, Escape, and Physical (Beard & Ragheb, 1983); four motives for charitable giving: Reciprocity, Self-Esteem, Need to Help Others, and Desire to Improve the Charity (Dawson, 1988; Gladden et al., 2004) and Event Attachment (Funk & James, 2006). Within each study, the data was utilised to facilitate confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), reliability analysis, and multiple regression analysis (Conlon, 2003; Hair, Babin, Anderson & Tatham, 2006; Pedhazur, 1982).

Results

Confirmatory factor analyses and reliability analyses across each study revealed that the motives are both valid and reliable. Multiple regression analysis revealed that one recreation motive

(Social; $b = .21$) and four motives for charitable giving (Reciprocity; $b = .21$, Self-Esteem; $b = .10$, Need to Help Others; $b = .21$, and Desire to Improve the Charity; $b = .27$) contribute to attachment to the 2007 LAF LIVESTRONG Challenge, with 46.7% of the variance explained overall ($F(8,559) = 63.14$). Meanwhile, four recreation motives (Intellectual; $b = .15$, Social; $b = .15$, Physical; $b = .16$, and Escape; $b = .08$) and three motives for charitable giving (Reciprocity; $b = .14$, Self-Esteem; $b = .12$, and Desire to Improve the Charity; $b = .11$) contribute to attachment to the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay, with 35% of the variance explained overall ($F(8,680) = 47.91$).

Discussion and conclusion

The findings demonstrate that 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. Collectively, these findings uncover a difference in the relative contribution of these motives based upon the event context. Sport events provide the environment for individuals to satisfy needs and receive benefits through participation. Charity related events pull individuals seeking to support a charitable endeavour with which they identify, while events with less of a charitable focus pull individuals seeking to engage in sport and recreation. This research provides insight into how event managers can develop profiles of event participants based upon the distinct motives driving participation and contributing to attachment (Funk & James, 2004). It is hoped that this research leads to further examination of the meaning elicited by sport events, as well as the core and contextual factors that contribute to this meaning.

References

- Beard, J.G., & Ragheb, M.G. (1983). Measuring leisure motivation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 15, 219-228.
- Conlon, E. (2003). *Advanced research methods workbook*. Gold Coast: Griffith University.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R.L. (2006). *Multivariate Analysis* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Pedhazur, E.J. (1982). *Multiple regression in behavioral research* (2nd ed.). New York: CBS College Publishing.