

Bond University
Research Repository



An empirical investigation of the role of camaraderie, cause, competency, and participation motives in the development of attachment to a charity sport event

Filo, Kevin; Funk, Daniel C.; O'Brien, Danny

Published in:
Managing Leisure

DOI:
[10.1080/13606719.2014.885715](https://doi.org/10.1080/13606719.2014.885715)

Licence:
Unspecified

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

Recommended citation(APA):
Filo, K., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien, D. (2014). An empirical investigation of the role of camaraderie, cause, competency, and participation motives in the development of attachment to a charity sport event. *Managing Leisure*, 19(4), 245-262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13606719.2014.885715>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

1 Running Head: CHARITY SPORT EVENTS AND ATTACHMENT

2
3 **An Empirical Investigation of the Role of Camaraderie, Cause, Competency and**
4 **Participation Motives in the Development of Attachment to a Charity Sport Event**
5

6
7 Kevin Filo

8 Griffith University

9 Daniel C. Funk

10 Temple University and

11 Griffith University

12 Danny O'Brien

13 Bond University
14
15
16
17
18

19 Please address correspondence to:

20 Kevin Filo, Ph.D.
21 Griffith Business School
22 G27 3.32
23 Gold Coast Campus
24 Southport QLD 4222
25 Australia

26 Email: k.filo@griffith.edu.au

27

1 **This paper examines the factors that contribute to the meaning participants hold for**
2 **charity sport events. Specifically, the paper investigates the role of three value-laden**
3 **constructs; along with participation motives, to understand participant attachment to a**
4 **charity sport event. An online questionnaire was given to participants in the Lance**
5 **Armstrong Foundation (LAF) LIVESTRONG Challenge (n=568) following the event. Data**
6 **analysis revealed two recreational event motives, three motives for charitable giving, and**
7 **three value-laden constructs contribute to attachment to the charity sport event. In**
8 **addition, the results revealed the value-laden constructs make a stronger contribution to**
9 **event attachment than the participation motives. Suggestions are made for increasing the**
10 **meaning held for the event through community building, calls to action, and customization.**

11

12 **Keywords:** Charity sport events, attachment, motivation, meaning

INTRODUCTION

1
2
3 A number of factors have contributed to the popularity of charity sport events. Certain
4 marathons, walks, runs, and cycling events sponsored by voluntary organizations have been
5 highlighted as critical components in enhancing host community prestige while promoting
6 healthy lifestyle behaviors (Edwards & Tsouros, 2008). Meanwhile, charitable organizations face
7 challenges in obtaining donations through traditional means. In the face of the global financial
8 crisis and the subsequent drop in individual donations to charity, consumers have become more
9 strategic in how they support charities (Charities Aid Foundation, 2011).

10 To address these challenges, charitable organizations have looked toward sport events as
11 rallying points for increasing support. Charity sport events represent participatory sport events in
12 which individuals pay a registration fee and/or reach a fundraising minimum to take part in a
13 structured physical activity with all, or a portion of, event proceeds benefitting a specific charity
14 (Filo, Spence, & Sparvero, In Press). As charity sport events reflect one time or occasional
15 experiences in which individuals participate during their free time (Filo et al., In Press), charity
16 sport events embody project based leisure (e.g., Stebbins, 2005). Charity sport events need to
17 both attract people and differentiate themselves from other fundraisers. These needs require
18 event managers to better understand why the public might associate with particular events, and
19 what their engagement means (Escalas & Bettman, 2005). Accordingly, developing an
20 understanding of the factors that cultivate a meaningful charity sport event experience is
21 warranted.

22 This research examines the factors that explain how participants derive meaning from a
23 charity sport event. Motives driving event participation are assessed, along with the role of three
24 factors (camaraderie, cause, and competency) in the development of attachment. Attachment is

1 reflected through emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning held for a charity sport event.
2 The current study responds to Wilson's (2006) suggestion that research on non-major sport
3 events is limited; and also addresses the call by Chalip (2006) and others for research exploring
4 how stakeholders can capitalize on the positive feelings and meanings derived from events.

5 The current research extends the findings of existing research that linked motivation and
6 meaning (e.g. Alexandris, Funk, & Pritchard, 2011), as well as research that examined meaning
7 derived from charity sport events (e.g. Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2009, 2011; Won, Park, Lee, &
8 Chung, 2011). Specifically, this research extends previous related work through the quantitative
9 assessment of three additional factors: camaraderie, cause and competency. These three factors
10 have been previously uncovered in a qualitative exploration of attachment to a charity sport
11 event (e.g. Filo et al., 2009). Accordingly, the contribution of this research is a quantitative
12 investigation of how meaning is developed at charity sport events.

13 **Research Context**

14 The event context used in the study is the Lance Armstrong Foundation (LAF)
15 **LIVESTRONG** Challenge in Austin, Texas where participants supported a specific charity by
16 engaging in physically challenging sports activity: walking, running, cycling. The
17 **LIVESTRONG** Challenge typifies a popular participatory sport event aligned with a renowned
18 charity (i.e., LAF). The event's social atmosphere, central charitable component and alignment
19 with sport provide an ideal context for the examination of camaraderie, cause and competency,
20 as well as the development of attachment to a charity sport event.

21 **LITERATURE REVIEW**

22 The review of literature encompasses four sections. First, the factors that contribute to
23 charity sport event attachment are explained. Second, motives for event participation are

1 reviewed; recreational event motives and motives for charitable giving are advanced as factors
2 leading to event attachment. Next, the concept of values is highlighted as a mechanism to
3 introduce the value-laden constructs assessed in this research. Finally, attachment is presented as
4 the outcome variable, concluding with the research question and hypothesis advanced.

5 **Understanding Attachment: The Meaning of Association**

6 In order to utilize the charity sport event research context, a framework is needed that
7 accounts for the different facets of a charity sport event (i.e. the physical activity or sport, social
8 atmosphere, and the benefiting charity) from which participants may derive meaning. The
9 Psychological Continuum Model (PCM) (Funk & James, 2001; 2006) represents such a
10 framework, given its applicability to participatory sport and event contexts (Filo et al., 2011;
11 Funk, Beaton, & Pritchard, 2011)).

12 The PCM advances processes that operate within and among awareness, attraction,
13 attachment, and allegiance outcomes (Funk & James, 2006). This research focuses specifically
14 on the attachment stage within the PCM. Attachment outcomes are represented by the event
15 taking on emotional, symbolic and functional meaning for the participant (Funk et al., 2011). In
16 describing these outcomes, the contribution of a variety of psychological inputs is highlighted
17 (Funk & James, 2006). These inputs can include motives satisfied through event participation
18 (Alexandris et al., 2011; Filo et al., 2011), as well as a participant's values (Funk & James,
19 2001). The role of motives satisfied through charity sport event participation is reviewed next,
20 followed by a discussion of values.

21 **Motives for Event Participation**

22 Motive refers to the specific factors or needs that induce an individual to act (Howell,
23 1961). The current study advances motives as the hedonic and dispositional needs driving charity

1 sport event participation (e.g. Funk & James, 2001). In charity sport events, a variety of
2 recreation-based and charity-based motives are satisfied through participation (Bennett,
3 Mousley, Kitchin, & Ali-Choudhury, 2007). Beard and Ragheb's (1983) four dimensions of
4 leisure motivation: intellectual, social, escape, and physical, relate to constructs cited in the
5 existing literature on sport and recreation motivation (e.g. Crompton, 1979; Crompton & McKay,
6 1997). Each motivation dimension also aligns with specific motives driving individuals to
7 participate in charity sport events.

8 In addition, factors established in the literature on individual motives for giving to charity
9 (e.g. Amos, 1982; Marx, 2000; Ritzenheim, 2000), including reciprocity, self-esteem, the need to
10 help others, and desire to improve the charity, relate to charity sport events. Collectively, these
11 four motives represent motives for charitable giving satisfied through charity sport event
12 participation. These specific recreational event motives and motives for charitable giving
13 contribute to attachment to a charity sport event and ultimately, fulfil needs within individuals
14 and lead to participation (Filo, et al., 2011).

15 Within the PCM framework, the attachment process involves these outcomes (i.e.,
16 recreational event motives and motives for charitable giving) taking on enhanced worth, as well
17 as the event eliciting greater meaning (Filo et al., 2011). However, these motives do not
18 represent the sole input within the attachment process. Funk and James (2001) indicate that an
19 individual's values interact with motives leading to attachment.

20 **The Values behind Association**

21 Values are concepts or beliefs related to select outcomes or behaviors that transcend
22 specific contexts, direct decision-making, and are ordered by relative importance (Schwartz &
23 Bilsky, 1987). Values are an important means to understanding motivation and have been linked

1 closely with individual behavior (Kahle & Kennedy, 1989); emotions (Laverie & Kleine, 1993);
2 and attitudes towards brands (Perkins & Reynolds, 1988). Furthermore, values are critical in
3 segmenting individuals (Kahle, Beatty, & Homer, 1986), and the relative importance of different
4 values varies based upon individual motivation (Tsiotsou, 2007).

5 Questions have emerged over the most effective means to measure an individual's values
6 (Alwin & Krosnick, 1985). These concerns stem, in part, from the abstract nature of values
7 (Madrigal & Kahle, 1994). This, combined with the paucity of value-based work within the
8 PCM, suggests the utility of exploring the role of values in the development of attachment.

9 In an effort to explore values and attachment in the charity sport event context, Filo et al
10 (2009) conducted interviews with charity sport event participants uncovering three themes:
11 camaraderie, cause and competency. Filo and colleagues conclude that these three themes align
12 with distinct values and underlie the meaning participants hold for the charity sport event,
13 heavily influencing decisions to participate. This corresponds with Schwartz and Bilsky's
14 (1987) conceptualization of values as concepts that direct decision making and can transcend
15 specific contexts.

16 Camaraderie relates closely to the values of warm relationships with others, sense of
17 belonging, fun and enjoyment in life, and excitement (Kahle et al., 1986); and is embodied in the
18 emotional meaning participants hold for a charity sport event. Cause links with self-fulfillment
19 and being well-respected (Kahle et al., 1986); and aligns with the symbolic meaning held for a
20 charity sport event. Finally, competency reflects the sense of accomplishment value (Kahle et
21 al., 1986); and represents a charity sport event's functional meaning for a participant.

22 The current research advances camaraderie, cause and competency as value-laden
23 constructs that contribute to an individual's attachment to a charity sport event in conjunction

1 with recreational event motives and motives for charitable giving. To further introduce the
2 contribution of these factors, attachment is reviewed next, leading to the research question and
3 hypothesis.

4 **Attachment**

5 Funk and James (2006) define attachment as “a process that occurs when an individual
6 assigns emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning to ideas, thoughts, and images related to a
7 sport object” (p.196). The attachment process involves the contribution of motives satisfied
8 when an individual’s existing values begin to emerge. Supporting this notion, participation
9 motives have been found to contribute to attachment to a charity sport event (Filo et al., 2011).
10 However, to date, work examining the contribution of values to attachment within the PCM has
11 only been conceptual.

12 Attachment is embodied in heightened intrinsic importance for the sport object, which
13 continues to be influenced by situation-based, extrinsic factors (Funk & James, 2001). Similarly,
14 in outlining the meaning of importance, two separate elements have been advanced: instrumental
15 and enduring (Bloch & Richins, 1983). Instrumental importance relates to an individual’s desire
16 to achieve extrinsic goals through the use of a product; while enduring importance reflects a
17 product’s relationship with an individual’s central needs and values. The motives satisfied
18 through charity sport event participation (recreational event motives and motives for charitable
19 giving) reflect situation-based, extrinsic factors. Values, reflected in the constructs of
20 camaraderie, cause and competency, may represent enduring importance. In contributing to
21 participant attachment, enduring values may make a stronger contribution than the situation-
22 based motives.

1 Attachment has been assessed as an outcome based upon attitudes (e.g., Beaton et al.,
2 2009). However, attitudes may vary and little is known about the sub-dimensions of attachment.
3 Meanwhile, Filo and colleagues (2009) suggest that the value-laden constructs of camaraderie,
4 cause and competency are sub-dimensions of attachment, but empirical research linking these
5 constructs with attachment is needed. Based upon these shortcomings and suggestions, the
6 current research examines the role of camaraderie, cause and competency along with
7 participation motives related to recreation events and charitable giving, in the development of
8 attachment. The following research question and hypothesis are advanced:

9 *Research Question:* How do camaraderie, cause, competency, along with recreational
10 event motives and motives for charitable giving, contribute to attachment to a charity
11 sport event?

12 *Hypothesis:* Camaraderie, cause and competency will mediate the relationship between
13 recreational event motives and motives for charitable giving with attachment.

14 **METHOD**

15 **Participants**

16 A questionnaire was completed online by a sample of participants in the **LIVESTRONG**
17 Challenge in Austin, Texas (n=568). The organization indicated that the audience for this event
18 was predominantly white (80%), affluent, and between the ages of 30-50. According to the
19 event organizers, the participant base for the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge comprised of 60% males
20 and 40% females.

21 The sample of participants ranged in age from 18 to 70 with 46.3% between the ages of
22 40-64. Thirty-five per cent had obtained at least a Bachelor's Degree, and 74.6% selected White

1 as their ethnicity. In addition, 31.5% of respondents indicated that they had participated in the
2 previous year's LIVESTRONG Challenge, and 13.2% indicated they were a cancer survivor.

3 **Materials**

4 Participants were administered an online questionnaire that included:

5 (a) eight Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *never true* to [7]
6 *always true* to measure four recreational event motives: intellectual, social, physical, and escape
7 (Beard & Ragheb, 1983);

8 (b) seven Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *strongly disagree*
9 to [7] *strongly agree* to measure four motives for charitable giving: reciprocity, self-esteem,
10 desire to improve the charity, and need to help others (adapted from Dawson, 1988; Gladden,
11 Mahony, & Apostolopoulou, 2004);

12 (c) six Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *strongly disagree* to
13 [7] *strongly agree* to measure event attachment, which is multi-dimensional comprised of
14 knowledge of the event, event importance, and self-expression to reflect emotional, symbolic and
15 functional meaning (Alexandris et al., 2011; Dimanche, Havitz, & Howard, 1991);

16 (d) three Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *strongly disagree*
17 to [7] *strongly agree* to measure camaraderie;

18 (e) three Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *strongly disagree*
19 to [7] *strongly agree* to measure cause; and

20 (f) three Likert scale items using seven-point scales anchored with [1] *strongly disagree*
21 to [7] *strongly agree* to measure competency.

1 These 30 items were added to an existing survey administered by the LAF to assess event
2 satisfaction, behavior, and activity within the cancer community. A small selection of
3 demographic questions was also included in the questionnaire. This did not include gender.

4 The use of Likert scales introduces potential complications. These complications can
5 include respondents being subject to central tendency biases; acquiescence responding; and
6 social desirability biases (Baron, 1996). However, Likert scales have been endorsed for both
7 parametric and nonparametric analysis (Clason & Dormody, 1994). In addition, Likert scales
8 have been used previously within this research context (e.g., Filo et al., 2011). Hence, Likert
9 scales were deemed suitable for the current study.

10 The LAF placed restrictions on the number of items that could be included on the survey
11 due to its existing length. These restrictions meant that the researchers were limited to eight
12 items for recreational event motives and motives for charitable giving, combined with the six
13 items used to assess event attachment and nine items developed to assess camaraderie, cause and
14 competency. With regard to the motives for charitable giving, a clerical error by the LAF
15 resulted in one of the two items to assess need to help others, “I give to the Lance Armstrong
16 Foundation because their goals are consistent with my principles” being omitted from the
17 instrument. This clerical error resulted in need to help others being assessed as a single-item
18 construct.

19 The nine items developed to measure camaraderie, cause and competency had not yet
20 been tested empirically. To develop these items, steps suggested by Churchill (1979) were
21 followed. First, the domain of each construct was specified through definitions derived from the
22 qualitative data uncovered (Filo et al., 2009). Second, sample items were generated. The items
23 developed were then given to two academic researchers for editing, before further refinement.

1 Finally, the measure was purified through data analysis techniques such as calculating reliability
2 coefficients, conducting factor analysis, and assessing validity. A list of the definitions
3 developed for camaraderie, cause and competency is included in Table 1. A complete list of the
4 items used to address each construct examined can be found in Table 2.

5 -----
6 Insert Table 1
7 -----

8 -----
9 Insert Table 2
10 -----

11 **Procedures**

12 An e-mail including a link to the online questionnaire was submitted to 4,000 registered
13 participants by a representative from the LAF. The e-mail was sent one day following the event,
14 and the questionnaire was made available for 12 days. The questionnaire took approximately 20
15 minutes to complete. A total of 568 completed questionnaires were deemed usable for a
16 response rate of 14.2%.

17 **RESULTS**

18 Correlations, means, standard deviations, and Cronbach alphas were calculated for all
19 constructs. These calculations included the three value-laden constructs; four recreational event
20 motives; four motives for charitable giving; and event attachment. The correlations among the
21 constructs are shown in Table 3, while the means, standard deviations and Cronbach alphas are
22 included in Table 4. The Cronbach alphas were calculated for all constructs since they used
23 multi-item scales, and ranged from $\alpha = .69$ to $\alpha = .93$, indicating the items used to measure the
24 constructs were reliable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). A Cronbach alpha was not calculated for
25 need to help others as this was a single-item construct. The mean scores ranged from 4.50 to

1 6.32, with competency revealing the highest mean score, followed by need to help others
 2 (M=6.12). A one-sample *t*-test with a 4.0 midpoint revealed that all constructs were significantly
 3 higher than the 4.0 midpoint ($p < .05$).

4 -----
 5 Insert Table 3
 6 -----

7 -----
 8 Insert Table 4
 9 -----

10 **Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

11 Two confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) using AMOS 7.0 (Arbuckle, 1994) were
 12 conducted to evaluate the items employed to assess the value-laden constructs, and the
 13 relationship between the value-laden constructs and attachment (Conlon, 2003; Hair, Black,
 14 Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). The findings uncovered by Filo and colleagues (2009)
 15 informed preconceived thoughts on the structure of the data, thus CFA was required (Hair et al.,
 16 2006). A CFA was not conducted for the recreational event motives and motives for charitable
 17 giving as these motives have been used previously (Beard & Ragheb, 1983, Dawson, 1988; Filo
 18 et al., 2011; Gladden et al., 2004).

19 The first CFA evaluated whether the items developed to assess the value-laden constructs
 20 revealed three factors as suggested by Filo and colleagues (2009). As recommended by Gerbing
 21 and Anderson (1988), a second CFA was used to examine the relationship between the value-
 22 laden constructs and attachment using a composite approach and *z*-scores as indicators. CFA
 23 was deemed appropriate for these examinations as it allows for the direct testing of theory
 24 founded upon specific expectations of the researcher (Thompson, 2004).

1 Six fit indices were used to evaluate how well the measurement model fit the data
 2 collected: χ^2 /degrees of freedom (df), Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA),
 3 Normal Fit Index (NFI), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and
 4 Standardised Root Mean Squared (SRMR) (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Bollen, 1989; Hair et al.,
 5 2006; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996). Fit statistics for this model were χ^2 /df =
 6 9.86; RMSEA = .12; SRMR = .05; GFI = .91; NFI = .92; and CFI = .93. The χ^2 /df exceeded the
 7 recommended value of three, however, this could be attributed to the large sample size (Marsh,
 8 Balla, & McDonald, 1988). The RMSEA did not fall between .05 and .08, however it is
 9 suggested that smaller values for RMSEA suggest reasonable fit (Thompson, 2004). The SRMR
 10 is below the .06 recommendation (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Meanwhile, all three fit indices
 11 reflecting absolute proportions of the covariances (NFI, GFI, CFI) are above the recommended
 12 .90. Overall, these statistics suggest acceptable fit (e.g., Hair et al., 2006).

13 Next, the second stage CFA examining the relationship between two latent variables:
 14 value-laden constructs and event attachment, and six manifest items was conducted ($\chi^2 = 120.04$;
 15 df = 8). The *T* values for each scale item within the model are reported in Table 6 and ranged
 16 from 13.47 to 25.14. The individual item reliabilities for the latent factors are reported in Table
 17 6 in the form of standardized path coefficients. The factor loadings ranged from a low of $r = .60$
 18 to a high of $r = .93$ with one item under the .707 benchmark: functional meaning, $r = .60$ for
 19 attachment. The squared multiple correlations for this item did not exceed the .50 benchmark
 20 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1998).

21 -----
 22 Insert Table 6
 23 -----

1 Fit statistics for this model were $\chi^2/df = 15.01$; RMSEA = .15; SRMR = .04; GFI = .93;
2 NFI = .94; and CFI = .94. The χ^2/df exceeded the recommended value of three and the RMSEA
3 did not fall between .05 and .08, however, this could again be attributed to the large sample size
4 (Marsh et al., 1988). The SRMR is below .06 and the three fit indices reflecting absolute
5 proportions of the covariances are above the recommended .90. Overall, the fit statistics suggest
6 acceptable fit (Hair et al., 2006). The analyses established that the factors are reliable and valid.
7 In addition, the fundamental structure of the variables demonstrated that value-laden constructs
8 and attachment are related but distinct.

9 The first CFA demonstrated that the items developed for camaraderie, cause, and
10 competency were reliable and in line with the conceptual approach. In addition, the second CFA
11 highlighted that the composite for camaraderie, cause and competency (value-laden constructs)
12 and charity sport event attachment are related constructs, but distinct from one another. Based
13 upon these results, mediation analysis was conducted to evaluate the contribution of camaraderie,
14 cause and competency and motives to charity sport event attachment.

15 **Mediation Analysis**

16 A three-step test of mediation was conducted using multiple linear regressions (MLR) to
17 examine the relationships (e.g. Baron & Kenny, 1986). First, an examination of the impact of
18 camaraderie, cause and competency on event attachment was performed. Second, the impact of
19 the four recreational event motives and four motives for charitable giving on camaraderie, cause
20 and competency was assessed. Third, the effect of camaraderie, cause and competency, along
21 with the recreational event motives and motives for charitable giving, on event attachment was
22 assessed. In this instance, multiple mediators (i.e. camaraderie, cause and competency) were
23 advanced (Morse, Calsyn, Allen, & Kenny, 1994).

1 Results of the mediational analysis revealed that:

- 2 • camaraderie ($b = .38$) and cause ($b = .42$) contribute to event attachment with 60.7% of
3 the variance explained $F(3, 564) = 292.67$.
- 4 • intellectual ($b = .09$), social ($b = .32$), reciprocity ($b = .16$), self-esteem ($b = .18$), need to
5 help others ($b = .08$), and desire to improve the charity ($b = .23$) contribute to
6 camaraderie with 50.0% of the variance explained $F(8, 559) = 71.53$.
- 7 • social ($b = .13$), physical ($b = .17$), reciprocity ($b = .13$), self-esteem ($b = .11$), need to
8 help others ($b = .18$), and desire to improve the charity ($b = .24$) contribute to cause, with
9 40.0% of the variance explained $F(8, 559) = 48.13$.
- 10 • camaraderie ($b = .25$), cause ($b = .36$), competency ($b = .08$), social ($b = .08$), physical (b
11 $= -.14$), reciprocity ($b = .11$), need to help others ($b = .12$), and desire to improve the
12 charity ($b = .11$) each contribute to event attachment, with 66.4% of the variance
13 explained overall $F(11, 556) = 102.92$.

14 The results of the mediational analysis are summarized in Table 7.

15 -----
16 Insert Table 7
17 -----

18 The steps within the mediational analysis reveal the following. First, camaraderie and
19 cause account for 60.7% of the variance in event attachment, while competency does not
20 contribute to event attachment alongside these other two value-laden constructs. Second,
21 camaraderie, cause, competency, social, physical, reciprocity, need to help others, and desire to
22 improve the charity account for 66.4% of the variance in event attachment. These results
23 indicate that the unique contribution of the additional motives, along with competency, is 5.7%.
24 Camaraderie and cause account for more variance in event attachment than these motives.

1 (reciprocity, need to help others, and desire to improve the charity), contribute to event
2 attachment.

3 The hypothesis was advanced that camaraderie, cause and competency will mediate the
4 relationship between recreational event motives and motives for charitable giving with
5 attachment to a charity sport event. Results revealed that camaraderie and cause mediate
6 motives in contributing to attachment. Camaraderie and cause fully mediate one motive for
7 charitable giving (self-esteem). In addition, camaraderie and cause partially mediate one
8 recreational event motive (social) and three motives for charitable giving (reciprocity, need to
9 help others, desire to improve the charity). Camaraderie and cause contribute to attachment to
10 the charity sport event on their own.

11 By encouraging attachment to a charity sport event, the contribution of the value-laden
12 constructs and motives represents a process whereby a variety of inputs leads to a stronger
13 psychological connection to the event that serves as an expression of the individual. As it relates
14 to Bloch and Richins' (1983) conceptualization of the meaning of importance, the relationship
15 between the value-laden constructs and motives suggests motives align with instrumental
16 importance, or behavior as a means to satisfy extrinsic goals. This alignment relates closely to
17 motives as hedonic and dispositional needs satisfied through event participation (Funk & James,
18 2001).

19 Meanwhile, value-laden constructs relate to enduring importance. The value-laden
20 constructs of camaraderie, cause and competency may represent existing beliefs and this
21 representation indicates that they can become a constant in a participant's life (e.g., Bloch &
22 Richins, 1983), which can be activated and engaged by the event. The enduring nature of these

1 value-laden constructs supports their stronger contribution to event attachment and their
2 influence on the contribution of specific motives to event attachment.

3 Similarities exist between camaraderie and the social motive; competency and the
4 physical motive; and cause and need to help others. These similarities suggest that the
5 development of attachment within the PCM may be based upon the integration of overlapping
6 factors. The results of the current study suggest inter-dependence among these factors in the
7 charity sport event context. This inter-dependence indicates the formation of attachment to a
8 charity sport event may not be based solely on the satisfaction of recreational event motives and
9 motives for charitable giving; but rather, when these motives are satisfied in the presence of
10 camaraderie, cause and competency, attachment develops. The relationship between motives
11 and the value-laden constructs appears to be mutually supporting.

12 **Managerial Implications**

13 The results of the current study have implications for the managers of events and
14 charities. Strategies can be implemented to increase the emotional, symbolic and functional
15 meaning participants hold for the event through leveraging camaraderie, cause and competency.
16 Implementing these strategies will allow managers to improve the event experience, while
17 assisting with participant recruitment and retention. Camaraderie can be leveraged for
18 community building through the event (Sparvero & Chalip, 2007).

19 Community can be fostered through the event via supplemental event activities. Filo et
20 al. (In Press) revealed that ritual occasions reflected one component of the community fostered
21 through charity sport events. Charity sport events can implement customs such as the national
22 anthem or the reading of the charity's mission statement prior to the start of the event to promote
23 camaraderie.

1 With regard to socialization in informal gathering spaces, Sparvero and Chalip (2007)
2 suggest organizing individuals to gather in public areas. Charity sport event managers can work
3 closely with local business to develop incentives for event participants to patronize and spend
4 time in nearby cafes or pubs throughout the event weekend. O'Brien (2007) highlighted how
5 small-scale regional events can engage local business through alignment with, and celebration of,
6 the socio-cultural fabric of the community. In the case of the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge, event
7 managers can leverage the active and healthy image associated with Austin, Texas and partner
8 with local businesses that reflect this image (e.g. organic cafes, running and cycling retailers,
9 health food stores) to organize gatherings.

10 Cause can be leveraged through calls to action for participants. Charity managers can
11 strive to ensure that opportunities for volunteer registration are made available on the event
12 grounds in an effort to involve participants in the administrative aspects of the charity. In
13 addition, any signatures required for lobbying efforts of the charitable organization could be
14 collected. Furthermore, Sparvero and Chalip (2007) identify cause-related marketing as an
15 effective means for organizations to address social issues. Accordingly, charity sport event
16 managers can invite all cause-related marketing partners to the event.

17 Competency can be leveraged through customised training programs provided by event
18 managers to allow event participants to maximize their physical achievement. Customisation has
19 been cited as an integral managerial lever for bolstering attachment (Funk & James, 2001), while
20 service quality has been revealed to influence active leisure involvement (Alexandris, Douka, &
21 Balaska, 2012). These programs could take place year-round to facilitate interaction between
22 individual participants and the charity.

1 Event managers may solicit greater support through increased fundraising and raised
2 awareness of the charity's mission and activities. Accordingly, strategies employed to enhance
3 the meaning participants derive from a charity sport event reflect social marketing (e.g., Bagozzi,
4 1975), wherein event managers produce a meaningful event experience in exchange for the
5 support of individual participants.

6 **Limitations and Delimitations**

7 Some limitations for the current study should be recognized. A limitation related to
8 questionnaire distribution, involves the LAF sending the e-mail link to participants. Respondents
9 have been found to be biased positively to surveys generated by an organization to which a
10 connection exists (Albaum, 1987). However, this distribution method was required to adhere to
11 research ethics conditions, while the LAF required that the survey was administered by the
12 organization to protect the participant database. The relatively low number of items used to
13 assess each construct represents an additional limitation. This limitation can be attributed to the
14 restrictions in place by the event organization. In addition, relying exclusively on Likert scale
15 items reflects a limitation. Beyond the considerations noted above regarding potential
16 respondent bias, statements with a negative orientation could be included to cross check
17 responses. The lower level response rate should also be acknowledged as a limitation. The
18 response rate can be attributed to the fact that an incentive was not utilized to induce responses
19 (Deutskens, Ruyter, Wetzels, & Oosterveld, 2004)

20 Delimitations of the current study should also be recognized. First, the celebrity appeal
21 afforded to the LAF was not examined. At the time of data collection, the organization still bore
22 the name of its founder, and Lance Armstrong represented the face of the charity. The influence
23 of Armstrong's celebrity was beyond the scope of the current study. Next, the current study does

1 not seek to delineate between individuals in their first year of participation and individuals who
2 have participated in the event for multiple years. This is because the researchers believe that
3 ascribing meaning to a charity sport event may not be temporal. For instance, an individual in
4 their first year of participation recently diagnosed with cancer may attribute greater meaning to a
5 cancer-based charity sport event compared to an individual in his or her fifth year who does not
6 share such a direct connection with the cause. This belief was upheld by a one-way analysis of
7 variance (ANOVA) conducted for the motives, value-laden constructs, event attachment and
8 repeat participation. Repeat participation assessed whether the individual had participated in the
9 LIVESTRONG Challenge previously, creating two groups: first-year participants and multi-year
10 participants. No significant differences were found for any of the constructs examined across
11 these two groups.

12 **Future Directions**

13 Using the results of the current study as a starting point, a number of future studies can be
14 conducted. First, the contribution of camaraderie, cause and competency to the event taking on
15 emotional, symbolic, and functional meaning may be indicative of a subculture (e.g., Gibson,
16 Willming, & Holdnak, 2002). Charity sport event participants appear to be connected because
17 they are both activity enthusiasts and charity enthusiasts. This joint enthusiasm is reflected in the
18 contribution of the motives driving participation, and the crossover between leisure and charity
19 within the value-laden constructs. Further exploration of the charity sport event subculture can
20 be conducted to investigate the characteristics of this segment.

21 Next, in outlining the development of attachment to an object, Funk and James (2001,
22 2006) describe contribution from attraction outcomes, an individual's values, and the
23 individual's self-concept. The current study examined the contribution of recreational event

1 the contribution of select recreational event motives and motives for charitable giving to
2 attachment. Insight into how event managers can bolster the meaning held for charity sport
3 events among participants to enhance event sustainability is conveyed through suggested
4 strategies leveraging camaraderie, cause, and competency. The current study may lead to further
5 examination of the meaning elicited by charity sport events to uncover mechanisms by which
6 event managers can optimize the synergy between participation and charity.

7

References

- 1
2 Albaum, G. (1987). Do source and anonymity affect mail survey results? *Academy of Marketing*
3 *Science Journal*, 15(3), 74–81.
- 4 Alexandris, K., Douka, S., & Balaska, P. (2012). Involvement with active leisure participation:
5 Does service quality play a role? *Managing Leisure*, 17, 54-66.
- 6 Alexandris, K., Funk, D. C., & Pritchard, M. (2011). The impact of constraints on motivation,
7 activity attachment, and skier intentions to continue. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 43, 56-
8 79.
- 9 Alwin, D. F. & Krosnick, J. A. (1985). The measurement of values in surveys: A comparison of
10 ratings and rankings. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 49, 535-552.
- 11 Amos, O.M. (1982). Empirical analysis of motives underlying individual contributions to
12 charity. *Atlantic Economic Journal* 10(4), 45-52.
- 13 Bagozzi, R. P. (1975). Marketing as exchange. *Journal of Marketing*, 39, 9-32.
- 14 Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the*
15 *Academy of Marketing Science*, 16, 74-94.
- 16 Baron, H. (1996). Strengths and limitations of ipsative measurement. *Journal of Occupational*
17 *and Organizational Psychology*, 69, 49-56.
- 18 Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986), The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social
19 psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of*
20 *Personality and Social Psychology* 51, 1173-1182.
- 21 Beard, J. G., & Ragheb, M. G. (1983). Measuring leisure motivation. *Journal of Leisure*
22 *Research*, 15, 219-228.

- 1 Beaton, A. A., & Funk, D. C. (2008). An evaluation of theoretical frameworks for studying
2 physically active leisure. *Leisure Sciences, 30*, 53-70.
- 3 Beaton, A. A., Funk, D. C., & Alexandris, K. (2009). Operationalizing a theory of participation
4 in physically active leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*, 177-203.
- 5 Bennett, R., Mousley, W., Kitchin, P., & Ali-Choudhury, R. (2007). Motivations for
6 participating in charity-affiliated sporting events. *Journal of Customer Behaviour, 6*,
7 155-178.
- 8 Bloch, P. H., & Richins, M. L. (1983). A theoretical model for the study of product
9 importance perceptions. *Journal of Marketing, 47*, 69-81.
- 10 Bollen, K. A. (1989). *Structural equations with latent variables*. New York: Jon Wiley and
11 Sons.
- 12 Chalip, L. (2006). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 11*, 109–
13 127.
- 14 *Charities Aid Foundation: World giving index 2011: A global view of giving Trends* (2011).
15 Retrieved February 8, 2012 from:
16 http://www.cafonline.org/pdf/World_Giving_Index_2011_191211.pdf
- 17 Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs.
18 *Journal of Marketing Research, 16*, 64-73.
- 19 Clason D. J., Dormody T. L. (1994). Analyzing data measured by individual Likert type
20 items. *Journal of Agricultural Education 35*, 31–35.
- 21 Conlon, E. (2003). *Advanced research methods workbook*. Griffith University: Gold Coast.
- 22 Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*, 408-
23 424.

- 1 Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of*
2 *Tourism Research*, 24, 425-439.
- 3 Dawson, S. (1988). Four motivations for charitable giving: Implications for marketing strategy to
4 attract monetary donations for medical research. *Journal of Health Care Marketing*, 8(2),
5 31-37.
- 6 Deutskens, E., Ruyter, K. D., Wetzels, M., & Oosterveld, P. (2004). Response rate and response
7 quality of internet-based surveys: An experimental study. *Marketing Letters*, 15, 21-36.
- 8 Dimanche, F., Havitz, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1991). Testing the involvement profile (IP)
9 scale in the context of selected recreational and touristic activities. *Journal of Leisure*
10 *Research*, 23, 51-66.
- 11 Edwards, P. & Tsouros, A. D. (2008). *A healthy city is an active city: A physical activity*
12 *planning guide*. Copenhagen, Denmark: World Health Organization.
- 13 Escalas, J. & Bettman, J. (2005). Self construal, reference groups, and brand meaning. *Journal*
14 *of Consumer Research*, 32, 378-389.
- 15 Filo, K., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien, D. (2009). The meaning behind attachment: Exploring
16 camaraderie, cause, and competency at a charity sport event. *Journal of Sport*
17 *Management*, 23, 361-387.
- 18 Filo, K., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien, D. (2011). Examining motivation for charity sport event
19 participation: A comparison of recreation-based and charity-based motives. *Journal of*
20 *Leisure Research*, 43, 491-518.
- 21 Filo, K., Spence, K., & Sparvero, E. (In Press). Exploring the Properties of Community among
22 Charity Sport Event Participants. *Managing Leisure*.

- 1 Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable
2 variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39-50.
- 3 Funk, D. C., Beaton, A., & Pritchard, M. (2011). The stage-based development of physically
4 active leisure: A recreational golf context. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 43, 268-289.
- 5 Funk, D. C., & James, J. (2001). The psychological continuum model: A conceptual framework
6 for understanding an individual's psychological connection to sport. *Sport Management*
7 *Review*, 4, 119-150.
- 8 Funk, D. C., & James, J. (2006). Consumer loyalty: The meaning of attachment in the
9 development of sport team allegiance. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20, 189-217.
- 10 Gerbing, D. W. & Anderson, J. C. (1988). An updated paradigm for scale development
11 incorporating unidimensionality and its Assessment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25,
12 186-192.
- 13 Gibson, H., Willming, C., Holdnak, A. (2002). "We're gators...Not just gator fans": Serious
14 leisure and University of Florida football. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34, 397-425.
- 15 Gladden, J. M., Mahony, D. F., & Apostolopoulou, A. (2004). Toward a better understanding of
16 college athletic donors: What are the primary motives? *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 13,
17 194-208.
- 18 Guo, C. (2007). When government becomes the principal philanthropist: The effects of public
19 funding on patterns of nonprofit governance. *Public Administration Review*, 67, 458-
20 473.
- 21 Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate*
22 *Analysis* (6th Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

- 1 Hightower, R., Brady, M. K., & Baker, T. L. (2002). Investigating the role of the physical
2 environment in hedonic service consumption: An exploratory study of sporting events.
3 *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 697-707.
- 4 Howell, R. F. (1961). Legislative motive and legislative purpose in the invalidation of a civil
5 rights statute. *Virginia Law Review*, 47, 439-467.
- 6 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:
7 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-56.
- 8 Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: A
9 rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9, 256-262.
- 10 Kahle, L. R., Beatty, S. E., & Homer, P. (1986). Alternative measurement approaches to
11 consumer values: The list of values (LOV) and values and life style (VALS). *Journal of*
12 *Consumer Research*, 13, 405-409.
- 13 Kahle, L. R., & Kennedy, P. (1989). Using the list of values (LOV) to understand consumers.
14 *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 6, 5-12.
- 15 Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Bolger, N. (1998). Data analysis in social psychology. In D. T.
16 Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.). *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (p. 233-
17 265) (4th Edition). New York: McGraw Hill.
- 18 Kottasz, R. (2004). How should charitable organisations motivate young professionals to give
19 philanthropically? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 9,
20 9-27.
- 21 Laverie, D. A. & Kleine, R. E. (1993). Linking emotions and values in consumption
22 experiences: An exploratory study. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20, 70-75.

- 1 Madrigal, R. & Kahle, L. R. (1994). Predicting vacation activity preferences on the basis of
2 value-system segmentation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32, 22-28.
- 3 Marsh, H. W., Balla, J. R., & McDonald, R. P. (1988). Goodness-of-fit indexes in confirmatory
4 factor analysis: The effect of sample size. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 391-410.
- 5 Marx, J. D. (2000). Women and human services giving. *Social Work*, 45, 27-38.
- 6 Morse, G. A., Calsyn, R. J., Allen, G., & Kenny, D. A. (1994). Helping homeless mentally ill
7 people: What variables mediate and moderate program effects. *American Journal of*
8 *Community Psychology*, 22, 661-683.
- 9 Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York, NY:
10 McGraw-Hill.
- 11 O'Brien, D. (2007). Points of leverage: Maximizing host community benefit from a regional
12 surfing festival. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 7, 141-165.
- 13 O'Brien, D., & Chalip, L. (2007). Executive training exercise in sport event leverage.
14 *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1, 296-304.
- 15 Perkins, W. S., & Reynolds, T. J. (1988). The explanatory power of values in preference
16 judgments: Validation of the means-end perspective. *Advances in Consumer Research*,
17 15, 122-126.
- 18 Pitts, B. G. & Stotlar, D. K. (2002). *Fundamentals of Sport Marketing* (2nd Edition).
19 Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- 20 Ritzenheim, D. N. (2000). One more time: How do you motivate donors? *New Directions for*
21 *Philanthropic Fundraising*, 29, 51-68.
- 22 Sargeant, A. (1999). Charitable giving: Towards a model of donor behaviour. *Journal of*
23 *Marketing*, 15, 215-238.

- 1 Schwartz, S. H. & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human
2 values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 550-562.
- 3 Sparvero, E. & Chalip, L. (2007). Professional teams as leverageable assets: Strategic creation of
4 community value. *Sport Management Review*, 10, 1-30.
- 5 Stebbins, R. A. (2005). Project-based leisure: Theoretical neglect of a common use of free time.
6 *Leisure Studies*, 24, 1-11.
- 7 Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd Edition.). New York:
8 Harper Collins.
- 9 Thompson, B. (2004) *Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis*. Washington DC:
10 American Psychological Association.
- 11 Tsiotsou, R. (2007). An empirical based typology of intercollegiate athletic donors: High and
12 low motivation scenarios. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement, and Analysis Marketing*,
13 15, 79-92.
- 14 Wilson, R. (2006). The economic impact of local sport events: Significant, limited, or otherwise?
15 A case study of four swimming events. *Managing Leisure*, 11, 57-70.
- 16 Won, D., Park, M., Lee, K-Y, & Chung, J. (2011). Factors affecting participation in charity sport
17 events involving a low intensive physical activity. *International Journal of Leisure and*
18 *Tourism Marketing*, 2, 248-257.
- 19 Woolf, J., Heere, B., & Walker, M. (In Press). Do charity sport events function as 'brandfests' in
20 the development of brand community? *Journal of Sport Management*.
- 21
22

1 Table 1
 2
 3 Definitions, for Camaraderie, Cause, and Competency (Filo et al., 2009)
 4

Construct	Definition
Camaraderie	The sense of solidarity and belonging described by the participants. Individuals revealed that by participating, they felt they were being a part of something bigger than themselves and were contributing to a large group trying to find a solution. The participants revealed that they enjoyed being surrounded by like-minded individuals and felt that there was a friendship along with sharing a common cause with their fellow participants.
Cause	The event represents a way to make a difference in the world by raising awareness and supporting a worthy cause. In addition, the event allowed participants to find inspiration as well as inspire others.
Competency	The event, and the training the required, was viewed as a physical challenge that was enjoyable and contributed to participant attachment. Individuals felt a connection to the physical activity inherent to participation.

5

6

7

1 Table 2

2

3 Individual Items for Recreational Event Motives, Motives for Charitable Giving, Event
4 Attachment, Camaraderie, Cause, and Competency

5

Recreational Event Motives (Adapted from Beard & Ragheb, 1983)

ONE OF MY REASONS FOR ENGAGING IN THE LIVESTRONG CHALLENGE IS...

Intellectual

to expand my knowledge

to discover new things

Social

to interact with others

to meet new and different people

Physical

to improve my skill and ability in doing the activity

to keep in shape physically

Escape

to avoid the hustle and bustle of daily activities

to relieve stress and tension

Motives for Charitable Giving

Reciprocity (Adapted from Dawson, 1988)

The activities of the Lance Armstrong Foundation have improved the quality of life of people who are close to me

The Lance Armstrong Foundation has been responsible for improving the quality of life of people close to me

Self-Esteem (Adapted from Dawson, 1988)

Other people will think more highly of me if I donate time or money to the Lance Armstrong Foundation

People who are most respected by society are those who give to charitable organizations

Need to Help Others (Adapted from Ritzenheim, 2000)

I give to the Lance Armstrong Foundation because I feel a need to help others

Desire to Improve the Charity (Adapted from Gladden et al., 2004)

Giving to the Lance Armstrong Foundation allows me to enhance the prestige of the charity

Giving to the Lance Armstrong Foundation allows me to push the organization towards success

Event Attachment (Adapted from Dimanche et al., 1991; Funk & James, 2006)

I possess a great deal of knowledge about the LIVESTRONG Challenge

If I were to list everything I know about the LIVESTRONG Challenge, the list would be quite long

The LIVESTRONG Challenge is important to me

Being a participant in the LIVESTRONG Challenge is very important to me

You can tell a lot about a person by whether or not he or she participates in the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge

Participating in the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge gives a glimpse of the type of person I am

Camaraderie

Participating in the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge allows me to develop warm relationships with others

Participating in the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge provides me with a sense of belonging
I feel solidarity towards the other participants in the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge

Cause

Participating in the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge provides me with a sense of self-fulfilment

Participants in the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge are well-respected by others as a result of their participation

Participating in the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge is inspiring

Competency

Participating in the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge is a physical challenge for me

Participating in the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge is exciting

Participating in the **LIVESTRONG** Challenge provides my life with fun and enjoyment

1

2

1 Table 3

2

3 Correlations for Camaraderie, Cause, Competency, Recreational Event Motives, Motives for
 4 Charitable Giving, and Event Attachment (N=568). Average Variance Extracted Included in the
 5 Diagonal

6

Construct	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Camaraderie	.68											
2. Cause	.74*	.57										
3. Competency	.58*	.71*	.63									
4. Intellectual	.38*	.31*	.36*	.80								
5. Social	.51*	.36*	.39*	.53*	.81							
6. Physical	.31*	.34*	.38*	.32*	.41*	.68						
7. Escape	.23*	.18*	.19*	.26*	.25*	.44*	.64					
8. Reciprocity	.41*	.37*	.31*	.23*	.20*	.11*	.09*	.86				
9. Self-Esteem	.46*	.41*	.23*	.05	.15*	.19*	.18*	.28*	.63			
10. Need to Help Others	.39*	.43*	.37*	.25*	.20*	.16*	.11*	.34*	.34*			
11. Desire to Improve the Charity	.54*	.51*	.34*	.18*	.22*	.22*	.22*	.39*	.65*	.46*	.48	
12. Event Attachment	.72*	.74*	.59*	.28*	.37*	.19*	.17*	.46*	.44*	.48*	.34*	.78

7

8

1 Table 4
 2
 3 Means, Standard Deviations and Reliability Measures for Cause, Camaraderie, Competency,
 4 Recreational Event Motives, Motives for Charitable Giving, and Event Attachment (N=568)
 5

Construct	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach Alpha
Camaraderie	5.48	1.13	.86
Cause	6.00	.89	.77
Competency	6.32	.82	.86
Intellectual	5.55	1.33	.89
Social	5.77	1.18	.89
Physical	6.00	1.12	.81
Escape	4.50	1.73	.76
Reciprocity	5.23	1.29	.93
Self-Esteem	4.95	1.41	.77
Need to Help Others	6.12	1.05	*
Desire to Improve the Charity	5.25	1.19	.69
Event Attachment	5.60	.92	.86

6

7 *not measured due to single item construct

1 Table 5
 2 Results of Confirmatory Factory Analysis: Individual Scale Items, Factor Loadings, Path
 3 Coefficients, and T-Values for Camaraderie, Cause and Competency (N=568)
 4

Scale Item	Factor Loadings	Path Coefficients	T-Values
Camaraderie (AVE = .68)			
Participating in the LIVESTRONG Challenge allows me to develop warm relationships with others	.80	1.18	19.48
Participating in the LIVESTRONG Challenge provides me with a sense of belonging	.89	1.20	22.82
I feel solidarity towards the other participants in the LIVESTRONG Challenge	.77	.85	19.48
Cause (AVE = .57)			
Participating in the LIVESTRONG Challenge provides me with a sense of self-fulfilment	.82	1.43	19.83
Participants in the LIVESTRONG Challenge are well-respected by others as a result of their participation	.69	.98	17.49
Participating in the LIVESTRONG Challenge is inspiring	.76	.70	19.83
Competency (AVE = .63)			
Participating in the LIVESTRONG Challenge is a physical challenge for me	.61	.91	15.28
Participating in the LIVESTRONG Challenge is exciting	.89	1.06	15.57
Participating in the LIVESTRONG Challenge provides my life with fun and enjoyment	.85	1.09	15.28

5

6

1 Table 6
 2
 3 Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Individual Scale Items, Factor Loadings, Path
 4 Coefficients, and T-values for Value-laden Constructs and Event Attachment (N=568)
 5

Scale Item	Factor Loadings	Path Coefficients	T-values
Value-laden Constructs (AVE = .70)			
Camaraderie	.80	.65	19.95
Cause	.93	.86	25.14
Competency	.76	.58	19.86
Event Attachment (AVE = .53)			
Emotional meaning	.79	.62	13.61
Symbolic meaning	.78	.60	13.47
Functional meaning	.60	.36	13.61

6

7

1 Table 7

2

3 Summary of Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis for Camaraderie, Cause and Competency
 4 along with Intellectual, Social, Physical, Escape, Reciprocity, Self-Esteem, Need to Help Others,
 5 and Desire to Improve the Charity Motives Predicting Event Attachment (N=568)

6

	Step 1	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	
	Camaraderie	Cause	Attachment	Attachment	
	Beta	Beta	Beta	Beta	Interpretation
Intellectual	.09				
Social	.32	.13	.21	.08	Partial
Physical		.17		-.14	
Escape					
Reciprocity	.16	.13	.21	.11	Partial
Self-esteem	.18	.11	.11		Full
Need to Help Others	.08	.18	.21	.11	Partial
Desire to Improve the Charity	.23	.24	.28	.12	Partial
Camaraderie				.25	Mediator
Cause				.36	Mediator
Competency				.08	Mediator
Adjusted R ²	.50	.40	.47	.66	
F-Value	71.53	48.13	63.14	102.92	

7