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Abstract

Sport events benefiting a charitable cause have emerged as meaningful experiences for participants. These charity sport events may allow event sponsors to shape perceptions of corporate image among event participants. Using the Psychological Continuum Model (PCM) as the theoretical framework, the factors that contribute to participants’ perceptions of event sponsors are examined. The influence of this image of event sponsors on behavioral outcomes among participants is also investigated. A post-event questionnaire was administered to participants in a sport event (N=672) to investigate the relationships among motives, sponsor image, event attachment, purchase intent, and future participation intent. Results reveal that recreation and charity motives contribute to event attachment, while charity motives and event attachment contribute to sponsor image. Significantly, sponsor image and attachment contribute to purchase intent for event sponsors’ products. Finally, sponsor image does not influence future participation intent, while event attachment does. The results illustrate the discrete roles that sponsor image and attachment play in sport consumption activities. Suggestions are made for the strategic selection and marketing of events by potential sponsors to most effectively leverage event sponsorship opportunities.
The Antecedents and Outcomes of Attachment and Sponsor Image within Charity Sport Events

Sport events benefiting a charitable cause have a large participant base from which to draw. In 2005, over 260 million Americans over the age of seven participated in sport more than once (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). While sport participation continues to represent a prominent aspect of leisure and recreation, there has also been a pronounced shift towards support of charitable causes for both individual consumers and corporations (King, 2001). Consumer priority has shifted towards heightened ethical, social, and spiritual sensitivity, while corporate executives have recognized consumers’ desire to align with products that provide meaning (Ebenkamp & Stark, 1999).

The established popularity of sport participation, along with this consumer shift towards social awareness, places an emphasis on sport event sponsors to align with events that elicit meaning for participants. This has the added bonus of assisting sponsoring organizations in shaping their corporate image (Gwinner & Eaton, 1999).

The current study examines the factors that contribute to perceptions of sponsor image along with participant attachment to sport events, as well as the influence of attachment and sponsor image on participant behavior.

The number of charitable organizations in the United States continues to rise. Between 1996 and 2004, the number of registered public charities increased 53% from 535,888 to 822,817 (National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2004), reaching 904,313 in 2006 (National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2007). Increasingly, these charities are turning to sport participation as a means to raise funds (King, 2001).

Beyond participant donations and fundraising, these charity sport events are bolstered by corporate support and sponsorship. Projections for 2008 had $11.6 billion spent on the sponsorship of sport along with an additional $754 million on festivals, fairs, and
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annual events (Cause Marketing Forum, 2008). The large participant base in place combined with the wide array of prospective charities to support, and the high dollar expenditures on sponsorship, bring forth a challenge to corporate sponsors to align with successful and meaningful events in order to maximize their return on investment.

The purpose of this research is two-fold: first, the factors that contribute to event attachment and sponsor image in the sport event context are examined; second the influence of event attachment and sponsor image on sponsor product purchase intent and future event participation intent is explored. The 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay serves as the research context as it allows individuals to participate in a sport event aligned with a corporate sponsor, while event proceeds benefit a charitable cause.

This manuscript is divided into three sections. First, the theoretical framework is introduced leading to a review of motives for event participation and sponsor image. Second, the research methods employed are described. Finally, the results are detailed along with implications, limitations, and directions for future research.

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

This research utilizes Funk and James’s (2001, 2006) Psychological Continuum Model (PCM) as the theoretical basis. The PCM is founded upon the notion that both individual and social situational factors work together in the development of recreation participation (Funk & James, 2006). The PCM conceptualizes the variety of ways consumers relate to a sport object in terms of four stages along a vertical continuum: awareness, attraction, attachment, and allegiance.
Each stage represents an upgraded level of psychological connection that the consumer feels towards the object (Funk & James, 2001). The PCM was selected for the current research because of its focus on the psychological relationship an individual forms with a sport object (Funk & James, 2001). The framework is one of the few stage-based models that examine movement both up and down, which is relevant to event participation and attrition. The PCM was developed for application to all sport, and is considered theoretically sound for understanding both active and passive participation (Stewart, Smith, & Nicholson, 2003).

In their evaluation of theoretical frameworks for examining active recreation participation, Beaton and Funk (2008) argue that the PCM is a sound choice to guide research on participation in physically active leisure. Six theoretical frameworks applicable for understanding the development of physically active leisure were compared. The authors suggest that the PCM provides an integrated foundation that can be used to improve the research-practice dynamic, while allowing for thorough testing of policies, programs, and interventions. The PCM can be used for both passive and active forms of recreation participation, and recent application in understanding decision making for active sport participation has proved instructive (Funk, Toohey, & Bruun, 2007). The current research represents application of the PCM framework in the sport event context.

The PCM advances processes that operate within and among awareness, attraction, attachment, and allegiance outcomes. The awareness process occurs through socialization via friends and media leading to an individual obtaining the knowledge that a sport event will be occurring, or awareness outcomes. From there, the attraction process involves this knowledge that the sport event exists interacting
with perceived hedonic motives, dispositional needs, and social situational factors that
drive event participation. The interaction among these motives, needs, and factors
evolves into individual preference for the event based on the event’s ability to provide
benefits and satisfy needs. Preference for the event along with the satisfaction of the
needs and motives driving event participation are considered attraction outcomes.

The needs and motives satisfied through event participation can take on
greater meaning for the participant, interacting with their self-concept, while aligning
with core values, demonstrating the attachment process. The attachment process
produces attachment outcomes, which include increased importance for the motives
that drive participation, and for the event overall, as well as the event taking on
emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning for the participant. Funk and James
(2006) suggest that these attachment outcomes may form, grow stronger, and
feedback into the attachment process, eventually leading to allegiance, or loyalty to
the event. In this case, allegiance outcomes reflect the durability and overall impact of
attachment outcomes (Funk & James, 2006).

The current research focuses specifically on the attachment process. Event
participants have already demonstrated awareness and attraction to the event through
their registration and participation. However, these participants, particularly those in
their first year of participation, may not demonstrate consistent commitment or
allegiance to the event. Funk and James (2006) contend that the attachment process
requires additional development, and this research responds to this suggestion through
an examination of factors that may contribute to attachment.

Attachment

Attachment is considered a universal human experience that occurs throughout
the lifecycle (Schultz, Kleine, & Kerman, 1989), which provides an opportunity for
both self-expression as well as connection to others (Wallendorf & Arnould, 1988).

Funk and James (2006) define attachment in the sport context as an individual
assigning emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning to a sport object. Attachment
is conceived of as a dynamic process in which a sport object can be used by an
individual to develop strong attitudes and self-expression (Funk & James, 2006). An
individual’s relationship with a sport object has been found to provide a sense of
attachment (Trail, Anderson, & Fink, 2000) through a connection with various facets
of that object (Robinson & Trail, 2005). In the sport event context, an individual may
feel attached to the event based on their connection to, and relationship with, aspects
of the event such as the sport activity, the other participants, or the benefitting charity
(e.g., Filo, Funk, & O’Brien, 2008, 2009). Consequently, an individual may be driven
to participate in a charity sport event based upon motives that reflect their connection
with these sport and charity-oriented facets.

As outlined above, the PCM framework suggests the motives that drive event
participation can interact with a participant’s self-concept and values, taking on
greater meaning and significance in the participant’s life. This leads to the event
taking on emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning. To further refine the
attachment process in the sport event context, a better understanding of the motives
satisfied through sport event participation is needed.

Recreation Motivation

Motivation is defined as, “an internal factor that arouses, directs, and
integrates a person’s behavior” (Iso-Ahola, 1982, p. 230). Prominent within the PCM
framework is a discussion of core motives for sport and recreation participation.
Research has uncovered a variety of motives that drive event participation based on a
number of different frameworks including Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Getz, 1991;
Maslow, 1954), Iso-Ahola’s escape-seeking model (Iso-Ahola, 1980, 1982; Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987), and the premise of push-pull factors (Crompton, 1979; Crompton & McKay, 1997; Zhang & Lam, 1999).

The hierarchy of needs states that physiological needs must be satisfied before higher order social and personal needs (Maslow, 1954). Getz (1991) suggests that events and festivals can satisfy an individual’s physical, social, and personal needs. In challenging the hierarchy of needs, Iso-Ahola (1980, 1982) believes there are two motivational forces for tourism: seeking and escaping. Leisure and recreation participation are means to satisfy these needs as they represent opportunities for self-determination, sense of competency or mastery, challenge, learning, exploration, relaxation, and social interaction (Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987).

The concept of push-pull factors builds on this notion advancing push motives as the escaping motivational force and pull motives as the seeking motivational force (Crompton & McKay, 1997). Push factors include motives such as escape, socialization, and knowledge seeking (Crompton, 1979; Zhang & Lam, 1999). Most notably, Beard and Ragheb (1983) advanced four dimensions of leisure motivation: intellectual, social, escape, and competency motives; related to leisure needs. Each of these four dimensions has been highlighted in the existing literature on motivation (Crompton, 1979; Crompton & McKay, 1997; Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987; Zhang & Lam, 1999) and active sport participation (Frederick & Ryan, 1993; Kavussanu & Roberts, 1996; Kilpatrick, Hebert, & Bartholomew, 2005; Koivula, 1999; Laverie, 1998).

These dimensions represent core factors that can drive event participation in general and are relevant to the sport event context in particular (Funk et al., 2007).

However, additional consideration in the form of contextual motives related to the
benefiting charity may also serve to fulfill needs within consumers and lead to participation (Funk & James, 2004). With regard to these sport events, the charitable component represents one such aspect as factors related to charitable giving may serve as motivation contributing to event participation.

Charitable Giving Motivation

Giving to charity is a complex decision driven by a variety of motives. Dawson (1988) examined consumer donations to medical research and suggested that reciprocity is an important motivating factor. Reciprocity has also been found to be a significant motivating factor for charitable donations among young professionals (Kottasz, 2004). Reciprocity involves an individual giving to charity because he or she has benefited from, or anticipates benefiting from, the charity’s central activities (Dawson, 1988). Research has also suggested motives related to inherent needs of donors such as self-esteem and the need to help others (Amos, 1982; Hibbert & Horne, 1996; Marx, 2000; Ritzenheim, 2000).

Within the sport management literature, motivation for donations to college athletic programs has received considerable attention (e.g., Stinson & Howard, 2004, 2007, 2008). Athletic programs allow universities to strengthen relationships with alumni, and attract donations. Similarly, sport events allow charitable organizations to foster connections with stakeholders and constituents, as well as generate funds through donations. A number of the motives uncovered in the literature on donor motivation in college athletics are applicable to the charity sport event context.

In the athletic domain, a factor that significantly influences donations is the desire to improve and/or support an athletic program (Gladden, Mahony, & Apostolopoulou, 2004; Staurowsky, Parkhouse, & Sachs, 1996). This suggests that donors want to be affiliated with a successful institution and see the donation as a way
to help the institution towards success. Athletic success has been found to have a pronounced influence on institutional giving (Stinson & Howard, 2004, 2008), with athletic success representing a key element towards attracting new donors (Stinson & Howard, 2007). Indeed, lesser known and unsuccessful charities are less likely to have donors or members who identify with their organization (Fisher & Wakefield, 1998). The desire to improve the charity seems to be relevant as donors may view their donation as an opportunity to improve the charitable organization’s standing. Factors related to charitable giving represent contextual motives that can be satisfied through participation in a sport event benefiting a charitable cause.

The core and contextual motives outlined above have been examined in the charity sport event context. Intellectual, social, and competency motives along with the motives of reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others, and desire to improve the charity have been found to contribute to attraction to a charity sport event (Filo et al., 2008). The PCM framework suggests the motives and needs that foster attraction to an event can take on enhanced meaning, while interacting with the participant’s self-concept and values, leading to the event taking on emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning (Funk & James, 2006). Emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning represents attachment to the event.

Beyond the factors that contribute to participant attachment, the relevance of attachment to event sponsors requires further examination. Research suggests that positive consumer response to a sport event transfers to event sponsors (Crimmins & Horn, 1996). The current research examines the contribution of attachment and motives to positive consumer response to event sponsors, in the form of sponsor image. This research then examines if sponsor image, in turn, influences the
likelihood of purchasing sponsors’ products, and repeat participation intent. The
case concept of sponsor image is reviewed next.

Sponsor Image

The concept of corporate, or company, image has been examined from a
variety of marketing perspectives. Image can be defined as the sum of beliefs,
attitudes, and impressions that a consumer or group of consumers holds for a
company (Barich & Kotler, 1991). An image of a sponsoring company exists in
individuals’ minds, and a single company does not have a universal corporate image
(Brown & Dacin, 1997). This is due, in part, to the fact that a company faces a variety
of audiences (e.g., consumers, the media, employees). The current research focuses on
the consumer audience, specifically, participants within a charity sport event
sponsored by the company.

A greater emphasis has been placed on corporations evaluating and monitoring
image to ensure that this element can be leveraged effectively. Individual perception
of products and services are influenced by image, and image should serve a critical
role within an organization’s marketing communication (Dichter, 1985). Image can be
used as a marketing tool to provide an organization with the opportunity to
differentiate from competitors, enhance the perceived value of an organization’s
products and services, and attract and retain customers (Howard, 1998). Overall,
research suggests that image can impact consumer product judgments and responses
in a positive manner (Keller & Aaker, 1992).

The concept of image is particularly relevant to sponsorship. Improvement of
corporate image is a distinct objective of sponsorship, and sponsorship can have a
positive, long-term impact on corporate image (Rajaretam, 1994). Nonetheless, this
effect can differ based on the company, as well as the type of sponsorship (Javalgi,
Taylor, Gross, & Lampman, 1994). Projecting a favorable image is relevant to the sport event sponsorship context, and identifying effective sport sponsorship opportunities is a challenge for corporations (e.g., Meenaghan & Shipley, 1999; Wilber, 1988). Abratt, Clayton, and Pitt (1987) suggest that the sponsorship of sport can improve an organization’s image through community involvement, building goodwill, and building or altering awareness. Meanwhile, Marshall and Cook (1992) identify enhancing corporate image as a factor driving corporations towards sport sponsorship.

Winters (1986) suggests that corporate image is influenced by three factors: business conduct, social conduct, and contributions. Social conduct reflects care about the public good, while contributions is based upon perceptions of a company’s donations to charity. Both social conduct and contributions are relevant to the current research. Participatory sport events aligned with a charitable cause represent properties in which the community is brought together through physical activity in support of a designated charity. Sponsoring companies’ respective images can be enhanced as a result of alignment with the event and these aspects.

For the purposes of this research, sponsor image is regarded as participants’ favorable views of event sponsors as a result of their involvement with the event. Favorable views of event sponsors may be based upon factors such as the charitable component of the event, the event’s role in the community, and the overall meaning participants hold for the event. While corporate image has been previously evaluated as multidimensional (Javalgi et al., 1994), this research focuses on perceptions based upon sponsorship, or sponsor image. Thus, a portion of overall corporate image is assessed (Johnson & Zinkham, 1990).
The effects of sport sponsorship on corporate image and purchase intention have been researched previously (Stotlar, 1993). Pope and Voges (2000) revealed that sponsorship of sport has a direct relationship with both corporate image and intention to purchase the sponsoring company’s products. The current research builds on the relationship between sport sponsorship and sponsor image by examining the relationships among motives, participant attachment, sponsor image, purchase intent towards event sponsors, and future participation. Through this examination, the following hypotheses are advanced:

**Hypothesis 1:** Recreation motives and charity motives will contribute to event attachment.

**Hypothesis 2:** Charity motives and event attachment will contribute to sponsor image within a sport event.

**Hypothesis 3:** Sponsor image and event attachment will contribute to the outcome of increased sponsor product purchase intent.

**Hypothesis 4:** Sponsor image and event attachment will contribute to the outcome of increased likelihood of future event participation intent.

**Method**

**Participants**

A questionnaire was completed by a sample of participants (N=672) in the 2007 3M Half Marathon and Relay in Austin, Texas. This event, in its 13th year of existence, represents an established participatory sport event aligned with a charity, in which a portion of the event revenue benefits the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas. The event organization does not reveal the exact amount of revenue that is given to the selected charity to event participants. 3M is a technology company with a worldwide presence in markets such as consumer and office, health care, and safety
services, and a multi-division U.S. headquarters in Austin, Texas. In addition to involvement with the Half Marathon and Relay promoting the city’s active lifestyle, 3M has nonprofit partnerships in Austin with organizations including Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Literacy Austin, and Meals on Wheels.

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), which provided additional exposure to, and information concerning, event sponsors. According to the event organizers, the audience for the 3M Half Marathon and Relay was predominantly white and affluent, between the ages of 25-50, and comprised of 60% males and 40% females.

Respondents included 383 females and 289 males ranging in age from 18 to 65 with the majority (70%) between the ages of 25-44. Thirty-seven percent had a monthly household income between US$3,500 and US$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% in their second year of participation.

Materials

Participants were given a multi-attribute questionnaire that included: (a) 12 items to measure Recreation motives of Escape, Competency, Socialization, and Intellectual (Beard & Ragheb, 1983); (b) 12 items to measure Charity motives of Reciprocity, Self-Esteem, Need to Help Others, and Desire to Improve the Charity (Dawson, 1988; Gladden et al., 2004; Ritzenheim, 2000); (c) nine items to measure
Event Attachment using Functional Knowledge, Emotional Importance, and Symbolic Expression (Funk & James, 2006); and, (d) three items to measure Future Event Participation Intent. All items were measured on 7-point Likert scales (anchored by 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). To measure participants’ perceptions of the image of sponsors (Sponsor Image), two Likert scale items using 7-point scales (1 = not at all favorable, 7 = extremely favorable) were used to assess how sponsorship of the event caused participants to view 3M and how sponsorship of the event caused participants to view other sponsoring companies. To measure Sponsor Product Purchase Intent, two Likert items using 7-point scales (1 = not at all likely, 7 = extremely likely) were utilized.

See the Appendix for a complete listing of the items used to assess Recreation Motives, Charity Motives, and Event Attachment. The Appendix also includes the items used to assess Sponsor Image, Sponsor Product Purchase Intent, and Future Event Participation Intent. The questionnaire also included a battery of demographic and behavioral questions such as number of hours spent training and number of previous events in which the respondent had participated.

Procedures

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.

Analysis

A two-step procedure was used to evaluate the relationship between the constructs of interest (Gerbing & Anderson, 1988). The first stage examined the
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discrete nature and consistency of 40-items used to represent 14 constructs of Escape, Competency, Socialization, Intellectual, Reciprocity, Self-Esteem, Need to Help Others, Desire to Improve the Charity, Functional Knowledge, Emotional Importance, Symbolic Expression, Sponsor Image, Future Event Participation Intent, and Sport Product Purchase Intent. See variance extracted estimates, item loadings, and alpha coefficients reported in the Appendix.

The second stage employed factor score estimates to create nomological constructs of a) Recreation Motivation from Escape, Competency, Socialization, and Intellectual; b) Charity Motivation from Reciprocity, Self-Esteem, Need to Help Others, Desire to Improve the Charity; and c) Event Attachment from Functional Knowledge, Emotional Importance, and Symbolic Expression (See Table 1). The nomological approach allows for a macro examination of these constructs and their relationship to other key constructs through structural equation modelling (e.g., Iwasaki & Havitz, 2004). The use of structural equation modelling to simultaneously test the relationships between the constructs offers “a more satisfactory approach to construct validation” (Diamantopoulos & Winklhofer, 2001, p. 272).

Results

Measurement Details: Stage One

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using AMOS 4.1 (Arbuckle, 1994) to examine the psychometric properties of the constructs investigated in the study. The CFA is used to determine the construct validity of the conceptual variables to know how well those variables represent the underlying idea. Per Tabachnick and Fidell’s (1996) recommendation, respondents with missing data points were deleted from the analysis. This procedure eliminated 13 subjects. A
covariance matrix taken from the remaining respondents, employing maximum
likelihood discrepancy, was used as the input data (N = 672).

The CFA examined the relationships between the 40 observed variables and 14
first order latent variables *Escape* (ESC), *Socialization* (SOC), *Competency* (CPC),
*Intellectual* (INL), *Reciprocity* (RPC), *Self-Esteem* (SES), *Need to Help Others*
(NHO), *Desire to Improve Charity* (DIC), *Functional Knowledge* (FK), *Emotional
Importance* (EI), *Symbolic Expression* (SE), *Sponsor Image* (SI), *Future Event
Participation Intent* (FEPI), and *Sponsor Product Purchase Intent* (SPPI). All latent
constructs were measured with 3-items with the exception of SI and SPPI which were
measured with 2-items. See the Appendix.

Hu and Bentler’s (1998) two-index combinational presentation strategy was
utilized to examine the measurement model tested in the CFA. The two indices Root
Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and Standardized Root Mean
Squared Residual (SRMR) along with the recommended cut off values RMSEA (≤
.06) and SRMR (≤ .06) were utilized to reduce the number of Type I and Type II error
rates that occur in model specification regardless of sample size (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

The analysis indicated the 40-items assessing the 14 constructs offer an
acceptable fit to the data, $\chi^2 = 1885.85/df = 649; \text{RMSEA} = .05; \text{SRMR} = .05$ (Hu &
Bentler, 1999). Parameter estimates and accompanying $t$ tests corroborate significant
connections between each scale item and its respective latent construct ($p < .01$). The
items used to measure each of the 14 constructs revealed average variance extracted
ranging from .49 (SES) to .90 (SPPI). Average variance extracted represents the
average percentage of variation among the items representing a latent construct (Hair,
Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006), and it is recommended that at least 50% of
the variance is explained (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). Internal consistency coefficients for
each construct ranged from $\alpha = .74$ (SES) to $\alpha = .96$ (FEPI), which is within acceptable levels of internal consistency for applied research (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). A reliability coefficient represents the amount of measurement error present where a value of 1 is indicative of zero error (Hair et al., 2006). Refer to the Appendix for a complete listing of average variance extracted (AVG) and internal consistency coefficients ($\alpha$).

Inspection of the correlation matrix presented in Table 2 revealed moderate correlations between the 14 constructs and of the 92 potential relationships all were below $r = .75$ (i.e., DIC-NHO). Two tests of discriminant validity were used to assess the discrete nature of the constructs. The first test employed Fornell and Larcker’s (1981) test of discriminant validity and revealed that the average variance extracted by each of the items representing a construct exceeded the squared correlation between each construct. The second discriminant validity test examined the change in chi-square values resulting from fixing covariance between construct pairs to 1.0 (Burnkrant & Page, 1982). Support was determined if changes in chi-square exceeded the baseline by 3.84 ($p < .05$) in the pairwise comparisons. The smallest chi-square difference observed was 16.50, indicating strong support for discriminant validity between each construct (cf. Hightower, Brady, & Baker, 2002).

Measurement Details: Stage Two

The second stage used summary estimates (i.e., factors scores) from each of the constructs to assess Recreation Motives, Charity Motives, and Event Attachment to develop a nomological measurement model (Gerbing & Anderson, 1988). The structure used 18-indicators to reflect 6-latent constructs: (a) Recreation Motives with the four indicators: ESC, SOC, CPC, and INL; (b) Charity Motives with the four indicators: RPC, SES, NHO, and DIC; (c) Event Attachment with the three indicators:
Sponsor Image with two indicators: SI1 and SI2; (e) Sponsor with two indicators: SPPI1 and SPPI2; and (f) Future Event Participation Intent with three indicators: FEP11, FEP12, and FEP13. Table 1 shows the results of the confirmatory factor analysis. Table 3 shows correlations, means, and standard deviations for the six constructs. See Figure 1 for a depiction of this model.

Confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS revealed an acceptable fit $\chi^2 = 434.18/df=120; \text{RMSEA} = .06; \text{SRMR} = .05$ (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Parameter estimates and accompanying t tests substantiated connections between scale items and their respective constructs as significant ($p < .01$). The items used to measure each of the 11 constructs revealed average variance extracted ranging from .43 (RM) to .90 (SPPI), indicating one construct below the .50 benchmark (RM) (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). Overall, internal consistency estimates for each construct were satisfactory, as they ranged from $\alpha = .74$ (RM) to $\alpha = .96$ (FEPI) (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). See Table 1 for average variance extracted and Table 3 for internal consistency estimates.

Tests of discriminant validity (i.e., Burnkrant & Page, 1982; Fornell & Larcker, 1981) were conducted and indicated the discrete nature of each construct. These results provided support for the nomological measurement model to be employed to test a structural model developed from the hypotheses.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 and 3

Structural Test: Stage 2

A structural test simultaneously examined the measurement model developed in Stage 2 and a structural model that tests the hypothesized relationships between the latent constructs (Diamantopoulos & Winklhofer, 2001). Structural Equation
Modelling (SEM) is a good statistical technique to examine complex and multidimensional variables because it allows complete and simultaneous tests of all relationships (Ullman, 2001). SEM can utilize both observed and unobserved (i.e., latent) variables to examine relationships hypothesized (Byrne, 1998). In addition, SEM can also isolate the error associated with each variable, and thus provide error free estimates of the relationships specified by the four hypotheses.

The structural test began with the specification of a model to create a statistical statement of relationships between latent variables RM, CM, EAT, SI, SPPI, and FEPI as determined by the hypotheses tendered. Model specification included the measurement model from Stage 2 and a structural model that specifies the relationships among the six latent variables. The objective of simple structural equation modelling was to examine how well linear relationships between these variables are represented in a meaningful and parsimonious way with the data from the 3M Half Marathon and Relay.

The structural model specified Recreation Motives and Charity Motives factors act as formative sources for Event Attachment. Charity Motives and Event Attachment act as formative sources for Sponsor Image. Sponsor Image and Event Attachment subsequently influence outcomes of Sponsor Product Purchase Intent and Future Event Participation Intent (See Figure 1).

AMOS 4.1 tested this sequence and noted an acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 448.91/df = 127, \text{RMSEA} = .06, \text{SRMR} = .05$) (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Additional fit measures were employed to examine the structure of relationships and yielded an
acceptable fit (GFI = .93, NFI = .95, TLI = .95) (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hair et al., 2006; Kline, 1998). Figure 1 provides the standardized regression weights for each of the model’s proposed links. Results largely support the connections proposed in the hypotheses. Recreation Motives (β = .55) and Charity Motives (β = .21) explain 46% of the variance in the formation of Event Attachment. For Sponsor Image, Charity Motives (β = .34) and Event Attachment (β = .20) account for 21% of the variance. In terms of outcomes, Sponsor Image (β = .61) and Event Attachment (β = .19) explain 48% of the variance in Sponsor Product Purchase Intent. Event Attachment (β = .50) alone explained 25% of the variance in Future Event Participation Intent. The Sponsor Image → Future Event Participation Intent link was not supported (β = -.01; p = .89).

Discussion

Overall the results introduce four main findings. First, recreation motives and charity motives contribute to event attachment. Second, charity motives and event attachment contribute to sponsor image. Third, sponsor image and event attachment contribute to sponsor product purchase intent. Fourth, event attachment contributes to future event participation intent while sponsor image does not. It should be noted that while the hypothesized measurement and structural model demonstrated an acceptable fit for these data, the structural equation modelling procedure does not establish causal relationships, but shows, “whether the causal assumptions embedded in the model match a sample of data” (Bollen, 1989, p. 4). An important next step is to validate the proposed model by fitting to other event data samples.

The contribution of recreation and charity motives in the development of attachment demonstrates motives related to leisure including escape, social, competency, and intellectual, along with motives related to charitable giving such as
reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others, and desire to improve the charity play a part in a sport event taking on enhanced importance and greater meaning for participants. This suggests individuals placed greater meaning on the event because it provided an opportunity to escape from their daily routine, socialize with others, and challenge themselves physically and intellectually. Also, participants place greater meaning on the event because it provided an opportunity to support a charity from which they had benefited, enhanced their sense of self-worth, improved the lives and well-being of others, and pushed the charity towards success.

In addition, the data revealed that recreation motives make a relatively stronger contribution to this meaning and importance than charity motives. Overall, this finding provides support for Hypothesis 1. The recreation motives relate to the physical, social, and personal needs that can be satisfied by events (Getz, 1991). The contribution of both recreation and charity motives demonstrates that events can satisfy both core and contextual motives (Filo et al., 2008). Furthermore, this finding aligns with the notion that motives satisfied through event participation can take on enhanced meaning within the attachment process, leading to the event taking on emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning (Funk & James, 2006).

The contribution of charity motives and event attachment to sponsor image suggests that motives related to charitable giving such as reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others, and desire to improve the charity influence participants’ favorable opinions of event sponsors. In addition, the emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning held for the event impacts perceptions of event sponsors. This suggests that participants were more likely to hold favorable opinions of event sponsors if s/he satisfied motives for charitable giving and ascribed emotional, symbolic and functional meaning to the event. Overall, this provides support for Hypothesis 2.
Notably, the stronger relative contribution of charity motives versus event attachment highlights the charitable component of the event in fostering opinions regarding image of the event sponsors. This supports the notion that sponsorship of sport can impact sponsor image through event-specific aspects such as community involvement and the building of goodwill (Abratt et al., 1987). Also, the formative role event attachment has on sponsor image suggests the expression of connection to others (Wallendorf & Arnould, 1988) can help build favorable public opinions for event sponsors. Furthermore, this provides evidence of attachment’s role in the development of attitudes (Funk & James, 2006), and connections (e.g., favorable opinions) with different aspects of a sport object (e.g., sport event sponsors) (Robinson & Trail, 2005). This also supports the notion that favorable consumer response to a sport event transfers to event sponsors (Crimmins & Horn, 1996).

The contribution of sponsor image and attachment to sponsor product purchase intent implies that both elements are important aspects for corporations to consider in the selection of event sponsorship opportunities. This contribution suggests that participants were more likely to indicate they would purchase sponsor products if they perceive favorable opinions of event sponsors, while ascribing emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning to the event. This finding provides support for Hypothesis 3. Sponsor image demonstrated a relatively stronger formative influence, while event attachment had both a direct impact as well as an indirect impact through its influence on sponsor image. Corporations can not only benefit from the favorable views generated through their event sponsorship, but can also benefit through alignment with events that hold greater meaning with participants.

The relationship between sponsor image and sponsor product purchase intent reveals that sponsor image may represent an effective mechanism for attracting and
retaining customers (Howard, 1998). This demonstrates that sponsor image can have a positive influence on product judgments and responses among consumers (Keller & Aaker, 1992). Furthermore, this finding provides additional evidence of the relationship among sport sponsorship, image, and intention to purchase sponsoring company’s products (Pope & Voges, 2000). The contribution of attachment to sponsor product purchase intent suggests that increased faithfulness to brands associated with the event could be an additional outcome of the event taking on emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning (Funk & James, 2006).

Finally, sponsor image does not influence a participant’s intention to participate in the event in the future, while event attachment does impact future participation intent. This suggests that a participant is more likely to indicate he/she will participate in the event in the future if they ascribe emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning to the event. Overall, these findings demonstrate partial support for Hypothesis 4, however the hypothesis is not fully supported as sponsor image does not influence future event participation intent. From an event management standpoint, sponsor image diminishes in importance in that it does not serve to retain participants, introducing implications for the marketing of sponsorship activities, and events overall. The contribution of attachment to future event participation intent reveals the event has taken on greater importance (Funk & James, 2001, 2006) as reflected in participants’ willingness and interest in repeat participation. Accordingly, event managers may want to emphasize and highlight the connection participants feel towards their event as a means to attract and retain participants.

Theoretical Implications

The findings introduce a number of theoretical implications. First, this research represents further refinement of attachment within the sport event context.
The results reveal that recreation and charity motives satisfied through event participation (Filo et al., 2008) take on enhanced importance and contribute to the event taking on greater meaning (Funk & James, 2006). Furthermore, the results highlight a stronger contribution from recreation motives, relative to charity motives in the development of event attachment in the sport event context.

Second, the findings advance factors that contribute to sponsor image in the sport event context. Charity motives including reciprocity, self-esteem, need to help others and desire to improve the charity, along with event attachment, lead to favorable opinions of event sponsors. The influence of charity motives aligns with the relevance of contributions, or a company’s donations to charity, to an organization’s image (Winters, 1986). However, additional variance could be explained that will further account for the diverse nature of sponsor image (Javalgi et al., 1994). The influence of event attachment on sponsor image corresponds with increased complexity of the sport event’s associative network among participants and increased links to secondary aspects of the event, which underlie attachment (Funk & James, 2001).

Finally, this research presents two behavioral intent outcomes resulting from event attachment: sponsor product purchase intent and future event participation intent. Event attachment influences future event participation intent, and to a lesser degree, sponsor product purchase intent. In the sport event context, these behavioral intentions could be viewed as characteristics of attached participants within the PCM framework.

Managerial Implications

The findings of this research introduce a variety of implications for sport event managers. First, in the recruitment and solicitation of event sponsors and corporate
partners, event managers can highlight the contribution of sponsor image to consumers’ intention to purchase sponsors’ products. Sport sponsorship and partnerships provide a corporation with benefits including media access and exposure, improved employee morale, and access to specific target markets (Slack & Amis, 2001). The current research suggests that favorable perceptions of the sponsors’ image, along with consumer purchase intent are additional benefits. Sponsor image appears to be an element of public goodwill that results from sponsorship (Levy, 2004), which can be communicated to event sponsors to bolster the attractiveness of the sponsorship opportunity.

Second, with attracting and retaining participants as a means to enhance event sustainability, event managers can emphasize event attachment. Sponsor image did not contribute to future event participation, and as a result it is not evident that participant perceptions of event sponsors influence individuals’ decision to participate. Therefore, event managers should promote the meaning the event holds for participants, and the relationship participants share with the event, throughout all marketing communication to leverage event attachment towards increased participation. This resonates well with the findings of Chalip (1992), who argues for the more strategic use of multiple narratives, embedded genres, and layered symbols in the planning, design, and promotion of sport events.

Also, the contribution of charity motives to sponsor image highlights the relevance of the charitable component of the event to the overall sponsorship opportunity. To enhance the visibility and resonance of their image, sponsoring organizations can communicate the philanthropic aspect of their partnership. A ready made vehicle for doing so comes in the form of sponsors’ incorporation of event imagery into their advertising. While Chalip (2004) argues this can render longer-term
benefits to event hosts in terms of the exposure provided the event and host region,

O’Brien and Chalip (2007) suggest such tactics can also be used to target social

change outcomes in host communities. Clearly, in light of the findings of the current

research, it would appear that sponsors’ alignment with the charitable components of

sport events, and their strategic use of this alignment in advertising and promotions,

has the potential to deliver benefits to multiple stakeholders.

Finally, the finding that sponsor image does not influence future event

participation intent has implications for both event managers and sponsors. Day

(2000) describes the importance of business partners understanding the needs and

goals of one another, and highlights a focus on mutual benefits among collaborative

partnerships. Future event participation intent represents a mutual benefit of

sponsorship in that it results in additional, repeat exposure for the sponsoring

organization along with participant retention for the event organization. Event

sponsors can look to determine how they can assist event managers in achieving

future event participation. Collaboration between event sponsors and managers would

introduce relationship marketing to the partnership to assist in achieving competitive

advantage and mutually desired outcomes (Cousens, Babiak, & Bradish, 2006).

Limitations

Limitations of the current research should be recognized. First, the items used
to assess Sponsor Image and Sponsor Product Purchase Intent had not been previously
tested. Future work is needed to expand and further refine these scales. Second, due to
logistical issues such as individuals registering without providing an e-mail address,
or individuals providing an incorrect e-mail address; the link to the online
questionnaire was administered to 3,500 participants. The event attracted an audience
of over 4,000 participants leaving a little more than 500 individuals out of the sample
overall. Also, the sample comprised of 57% females, while the event drew an
audience comprised of 60% males. Thus, difference in the gender make up for the
sample versus the event audience is acknowledged.

Furthermore, an additional delineation among sponsorship levels was not
provided. The items used to assess Sponsor Image addressed the title sponsor and “a
sponsoring company,” without attempting to differentiate among the event’s sponsors,
and it is likely that the inputs and outcomes vary across sponsors based on exposure.
Finally, the use of online administration is a limitation in that select individuals may
not have been able to complete the questionnaire in the allotted time due to lack of
familiarity with, or accessibility to, the Internet. Online administration was
nonetheless deemed suitable for the current research as the event’s participant base
reflects a young, Internet-savvy segment, as well as the fact that registration for the
event was conducted online.

Future Directions

Using the findings of this research as a starting point, a number of future
studies can be conducted. In order to validate the model advanced by this research,
additional samples of data across a variety of sport event contexts could be used to fit
the model. Second, qualitative data could be collected at the event exploring
participants’ views of event sponsors and their relationship with the event. With the
expectation that event experiences would vary across participants, semi-structured
interviews could be conducted with participants (Veal, 2006) to better understand the
meaning the event and sponsors hold in participants’ lives. Furthermore, participant
awareness of the sponsors could be examined, along with spectator perceptions and
awareness of the sponsors.
The current research assessed sponsorship outcomes (i.e., SPPI) in terms of behavioral intent, rather than a more tangible behavioral outcome (i.e., dollars spent). Future research could allow for cost-benefit calculation, as well as estimation of return on investment for sponsors, through the examination of dollars spent by event participants and revenue generated immediately following the sponsorship. This would allow sponsors to assess the influence of sponsor image within sponsorship in more material terms.

Next, data can be collected from event sponsors examining their strategies for selecting sponsorship opportunities, as well as the outcomes sought through event sponsorship. This research could provide insight into organizations’ attitudes towards shaping image via sport sponsorship, as well as their views on collaboration and mutually derived benefits through sport event sponsorship (Cousens et al., 2006). Furthermore, the event examined in the current research did include a benefiting charity, however, only a portion of event proceeds went to this charity, and the charitable cause did not figure prominently throughout event marketing communication. Future work can examine events with a more focal charitable component to determine if the overall meaning the event holds, as well as the favorable perceptions of event sponsors, are more pronounced amongst participants.

Finally, delineation was not made regarding the aspect of the event, or sponsors’ involvement in the event, which made the strongest relative contribution to participant perceptions of event sponsors. Participants may have viewed involvement in an event advocating an active and healthy lifestyle as most favorable, while others may have felt the alignment with the charity was more favorable. Future research can look to specify, and perhaps compare, the different facets of charity sport events that shape participant perceptions of event sponsors.
Conclusion

This research uncovers the factors that contribute to event attachment and sponsor image for event sponsors, along with the influence of these two factors on sponsor product purchase intent and future event participation intent. Recreation motives and charity motives contribute to event attachment, while charity motives and event attachment contribute to sponsor image. In addition, both sponsor image and attachment influence participants’ intent to purchase event sponsors’ product, while attachment influences individuals’ intent to participate in the event in the future. It is hoped that this research leads to further exploration of perceptions of sponsor image in the charity sport event context to assist corporations in developing strategies for the selection and optimization of sport event sponsorship opportunities. Furthermore, additional work can be done on the different aspects of the event that contribute to sponsor image. This can assist event managers in developing successful strategies for attracting event sponsors.
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Appendix

Multi-Attribute Scales to Measure Recreation Motives, Charitable Giving Motives, and Event Attachment (N = 672)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Motives</th>
<th>α / β</th>
<th>AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Escape (ESC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC1 – One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to relax mentally</td>
<td>α = .83</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC2 - One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to avoid the hustle and bustle of daily activities</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC3 - One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to relieve stress and tension</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization (SOC)</strong></td>
<td>α = .86</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC1 - One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to interact with others</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC2 - One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to meet new and different people</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC3 - One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to gain a feeling of belonging</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competency (CPC)</strong></td>
<td>α = .83</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM1 - One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to challenge my abilities</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM2 - One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to improve my skill and ability in doing the activity</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM3 - One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to keep in shape physically</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual (INL)</strong></td>
<td>α = .90</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INL1 - One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to learn about myself</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INL2 - One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to expand my knowledge</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INL3 - One of my reasons for engaging in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relays is to discover new things</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charity Motives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocity (RPC)</strong></td>
<td>α = .89</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC1 - The activities of the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas have improved the quality of life of people who are close to me</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC2 - I feel indebted to the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas for helping my family and friends in the past</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC3 - The Capital Area Food Bank of Texas has been responsible for improving the quality of life of people close to me</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Esteem (SES)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES1 - Other people will think more highly of me if I donate time or money to the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas</td>
<td>α = .74</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES2 - I have a good feeling after making a gift to the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES3 - People who are most respected by society are those who give to charitable organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Need to Help Other (NHO)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHO1 - Giving to the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas provides my life with greater purpose</td>
<td>α = .88</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHO2 - I give to the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas because their goals are consistent with my values</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHO3 - I give to the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas because I feel a need to help others</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Desire to Improve Charity (DIC)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIC1 - Giving to the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas allows me to support a quality charity</td>
<td>α = .83</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC2 - Giving to the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas allows me to enhance the prestige of the charity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC3 - Giving to the Capital Area Food Bank of Texas allows me to push the organization towards success</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Event Attachment</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Knowledge (FK)</strong></td>
<td>α = .92</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK1 - I possess a great deal of knowledge about the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relay</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK2 - Compared to other events, I consider myself an expert on the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relay</td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK3 - If I were to list everything I know about the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relay, the list would be quite long</td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Emotional Importance (EI)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI1 - The 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relay is important to me</td>
<td>α = .95</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI2 - Being a participant in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relay is very important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI3 - Compared to other events, the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relay is very important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Symbolic Expression (SE)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE1 - Participating in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relay says a lot about who I am</td>
<td>α = .92</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE2 - Participating in the 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relay gives a glimpse of the type of person I am</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3 - People who are most respected by society are those who give to charitable organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sponsorship and Charity Sport Events

#### Sponsor Image (SI)

- **SI1** - How favorably does sponsorship of this event cause you to view 3M?
  - Mean: 5.29
  - Standard Deviation: 1.47
  - Reliability: $\alpha = .92$

- **SI2** - How favorably does sponsorship of this event cause you to view a sponsoring company?
  - Mean: 5.29
  - Standard Deviation: 1.41
  - Reliability: $\alpha = .93$

#### Future Event Participation Intent (FEPI)

- **FEPI1** - It is highly likely that I will participate in the 2008 3M Half Marathon & Relay
  - Mean: 5.77
  - Standard Deviation: 1.48
  - Reliability: $\alpha = .96$

- **FEPI2** - The probability is high that I will participate in the 2008 3M Half Marathon & Relay
  - Mean: 5.93
  - Standard Deviation: 1.43
  - Reliability: $\alpha = .99$

- **FEPI3** - The likelihood of me participating in the 2008 3M Half Marathon & Relay is very high
  - Mean: 5.84
  - Standard Deviation: 1.50
  - Reliability: $\alpha = .97$

#### Sponsor Product Purchase Intent (SPPI)

- **SPPI1** - How likely are you to purchase 3M products as a result of the race?
  - Mean: 4.61
  - Standard Deviation: 1.60
  - Reliability: $\alpha = .95$

- **SPPI2** - How likely does sponsorship of this event influence you to use or purchase a sponsoring company’s products?
  - Mean: 4.15
  - Standard Deviation: 1.59
  - Reliability: $\alpha = .92$

**Notes:**
- $\beta$: standardized multiple regression coefficients for manifest variables
- AVG: average variance extracted by the manifest variable for each construct
Table 1

Measurement Results for Recreation Motives, Charity Motives, Event Attachment, Sponsor Image, Sponsor Product Purchase Intent, and Future Event Participation Intent (N = 672)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Motives (RM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Social (SOC)</td>
<td>3.94 (1.48)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Escape (ESC)</td>
<td>4.67 (1.49)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Competency (CPC)</td>
<td>6.23 (0.86)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Intellectual (INL)</td>
<td>3.92 (1.66)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Motives (CM)</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Reciprocity (RPC)</td>
<td>2.17 (1.32)</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Self-Esteem (SES)</td>
<td>3.87 (1.24)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Need to Help Others (NHO)</td>
<td>4.00 (1.52)</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Desire to Improve Charity (DIC)</td>
<td>4.50 (1.38)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Attachment (EAT)</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Functional</td>
<td>3.40 (1.49)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Emotional</td>
<td>4.20 (1.58)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Symbolic</td>
<td>4.30 (1.56)</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Image (SI)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ SI1 - How favorably does sponsorship of this event cause you to view 3M?</td>
<td>5.29 (1.47)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ SI2 - How favorably does sponsorship of this event cause you to view a sponsoring company?</td>
<td>5.29 (1.41)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Event Participation Intent (FEPI)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ FEPI 1 - It is highly likely that I will participate in the 2008 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relay</td>
<td>5.77 (1.48)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ FEPI 2 - The probability is high that I will participate in the 2008 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relay</td>
<td>5.93 (1.43)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ FEPI 3 - The likelihood of me participating in the 2008 3M Half Marathon &amp; Relay is very high</td>
<td>5.84 (1.50)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Product Purchase Intent (SPPI)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ SPPI 1 - How likely are you to purchase 3M products as a result of the race?</td>
<td>4.61 (1.60)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ SPPI 2 - How likely does sponsorship of this event influence you to use or purchase a sponsoring company’s products?</td>
<td>4.15 (1.59)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:
β: standardized regression coefficients for manifest variables.
AVG: average variance extracted by manifest variables for each construct.
Table 2

Correlation Matrix for Reciprocity, Self-Esteem, Desire to Improve the Charity, Need to Help Others, Socialization, Competency, Escape, Intellectual, Emotional Importance, Functional Knowledge, Self-Expression, Sponsor Image, Future Event Participation Intent, Sponsor Product Purchase Intent (N = 672)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RPC</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>DIC</th>
<th>NHO</th>
<th>INL</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>ESC</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>FK</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>FEPI</th>
<th>SPPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHO</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INL</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEPI</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPPI</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05
Table 3

*Correlation Matrix for Recreation Motives, Charity Motives, Event Attachment, Sponsor Image, Sponsor Product Purchase Intent, and Future Event Participation Intent (N = 672)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>EAT</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>SPPI</th>
<th>FEPI</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAT</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPPI</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEPI</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p > .05
Figure Captions

*Figure 1.* Structural Test for Formative Sources of Sponsor Image, Attachment, and Outcomes
Figure 1

*S p > .05*