AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE COLLEGE TRANSPLANT FAN

James T. Reese, Ed.D., State University of New York College at Cortland
Christopher R. Moberg, Ph.D., Ohio University

INTRODUCTION

A recent research study focused on the special challenges facing professional sports organizations in attracting fans to games in markets with high percentages of transplants in the population (Clark, Schimmel, & Synowka, 2002). Individuals who have relocated, but still support sports teams outside their new local geographic area are referred to as "transplant fans" for the purposes of this study. However, the challenge of marketing to transplant fans is not limited to professional franchises. Many college athletic departments must contend with student bodies comprised of a high percentage of students who relocate when they attend college. For the purpose of this study they will be referred to as transplant students. There are two types of transplant students. The first type has typically grown up as a devoted fan of college athletic teams different from the institution they attend and have maintained that affiliation. Essentially, these transplant students are much more avid fans of this other institution than where they currently attend. The second type of transplant student originally was a devoted fan of the institution they attend or has developed into a devoted fan of their school. These transplant students are much more avid fans of the institution they currently attend than other collegiate teams. With the advent of the Internet and an increasing number of college football and basketball games on television each week, it is easier for fans to follow their teams and maintain their loyalty and interest. Many students are choosing to stay at home to watch their favorite team play rather than walking across campus to watch their institution's teams play.

Even if students at a particular university gain admission to football or basketball games for free, attracting transplant students to games is just as important to college athletic departments as professional sports organizations. Increased student attendance at college sporting events drives merchandise, concessions, and parking revenue and can indirectly increase attendance by paying customers (university employees and local residents) by helping to create a more attractive, energetic, and winning atmosphere at games. Without question, finding methods of attracting more students who are lifelong fans of other schools is an important challenge facing many athletic departments across the country.

When looking at the sport marketing literature, little guidance for athletic departments on overcoming the challenges presented by transplanted student fans can be found. Two main streams of research have emerged in sports marketing – one on sports fans and another on the reasons for watching and following sports (Quick, 2000; James & Ridinger, 2002). While this research has helped develop profiles of fans and explain more about the motives for being fans (James & Ridinger, 2002), empirical research on transplanted student fans does not exist.

The main goal of this exploratory research is to identify the similarities and differences in characteristics and motives between college students whose favorite team is their university's sports team and those who are fans of another team. This research should provide insights for athletic departments to use in developing promotional and marketing strategies to increase satisfaction among loyal fans and attract transplants to more games.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This section will begin with a brief overview of the two streams of sport marketing research identified by James and Ridinger (2002). It will conclude with a discussion of previous research on transplant fans and on other studies with comparisons made by fan characteristics.

RESEARCH ON SPORT FANS

Early research in the sports marketing literature focused on fans and tried to identify the economic and business factors that were positively related to sports attendance (Graham, 1992; Hansen & Gauthier, 1989; Zhang, Smith, Pease, & Jambor, 1997) and the relationship between demographic variables and attendance or following of sports (Baade & Tiehan, 1990; Randl & Cuneen, 1994; Stotlar, 1995). The impact of winning and team performance on attendance also received considerable attention in this track (Greenstein & Marcum, 1981; Lapidus & Schibrowsky, 1996). Because much of this early research treated fans homogeneously, recent research has suggested categorizing fans into different typologies and then identifying the differences in the economic, business, demographic, and other factors among the fan categories (Quick, 2000). This type of research should provide sports marketers with a more detailed analysis of different market segments.

Another popular thread in this area has been on the effect of team or sport identification on fan behaviors or attitudes. Research in this area has shown that fans with strong team or sport identification attend more games (Murrell & Dietz, 1992), attribute a higher likelihood of future success for their favorite team (Wann & Dolan, 1994), have more enduring commitment to their team (Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1999), and that college students with a strong identification to the university's teams report higher levels of satisfaction, enjoyment, and involvement with the university (Wann & Robinson, 2002). A recent study by Wann and Waddill (2007) used disposition theory, which predicts fans enjoy watching their team perform well and watching a rival perform poorly, to evaluate fan reactions to events in individual sports.

RESEARCH ON MOTIVES FOR WATCHING AND FOLLOWING SPORTS

While research on sports fans has provided valuable insights into the who, what, and when of sports fan behaviors and the impact of sports marketing on fan behaviors, it has contributed very little to understanding why fans watch or follow particular sports or teams (James & Ridinger, 2002). Consequently, another research stream has emerged that examines the reasons, or motives, behind fan behaviors and consumption. Research in this area has examined the motives and influences for becoming a sports fan (Kahle, Kambara, & Rose, 1996; Kolbe & James, 2000; Wann, 1995) and which motives explain the most variance in team identification (Fink, Trail, & Anderson, 2002). Recently, Funk, Ridinger, and Moorman (2004) developed the Sport Interest Inventory, which examines the antecedents of involvement and motives for professional sports teams. Eighteen antecedents were identified that explained the four central tenets of involvement in sports teams: attraction (basketball interest, wholesome environment, style of play, excitement, entertainment value, family bonding, basketball knowledge, and customer service), self-expression (interest in player, interest in team, supporting women's opportunity in sport, players serving as role models, community pride, and drama), risk (vicarious achievement and escape), and centrality to lifestyle (bonding with friends and interacting with other spectators).

Importantly, much of the research in this stream has tried to identify the motives that explain fan behaviors and choices for watching and following sports and to develop multi-item scales to measure these motives (Kahle et al., 1996; Wann, 1995). Recently, Trail and James (2001) developed the Motivation Scale for Sport Consumption (MSSC), which appears to overcome some of the weaknesses in earlier motivation scales and demonstrates stronger reliability and validity. The nine motives for following sports assessed in the MSSC are achievement,

acquisition of knowledge, aesthetics, drama, escape, family, physical attractiveness of participants, quality of the physical skills of participants, and social interaction.

RESEARCH ON TRANSPLANTED FANS

The challenge of the transplanted fan is extremely important to sports franchises in popular cities experiencing tremendous population growth, such as Atlanta, Charlotte, or Phoenix, and at many universities without a strong regional or national fan base but many students who arrive on campus with strong fan loyalties to other college teams. Recently, Clark et al. (2002) examined the challenges facing the Atlanta Hawks because of the high number of transplants in Atlanta. They used image theory to explain the barriers facing the Hawks and recommended the use of strong loyalty programs to overcome the barriers inherent in a fan base with long relationships to other teams. While this study presents a good theoretical beginning for examining transplant fans, it did not empirically measure the attitudes, characteristics, behaviors, or motives of transplant fans.

Other related research, although not specifically focused on transplant fans, has studied sport consumption and behavior in group settings. Previous research has examined the similarities and differences between groups of fans based on several grouping variables, including gender (Dietz-Uhler, Harrick, End, & Jacquemotte, 2000; James & Ridinger, 2002; Swanson, Gwinner, Larson, & Janda, 2003), level of sport team identification (Wann & Robinson, 2002; Wann & Schrader, 1996), and preferences for types of sports (Wann, Schrader, & Wilson, 1999). To date, no research has used transplants as a grouping variable or extensively examined the characteristics, behaviors, and motives of transplants. This research provides a first step at uncovering more information about transplant fans by comparing transplant students that identify with their university's sports teams and those that do not.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Due to the exploratory nature of this study, research questions will be used instead of hypotheses. This research will try to identify differences among student transplant fans on a relatively thorough list of variables that have been examined in the sport marketing literature in the past 20 years.

Research Question #1: Do transplant students who are fans of their school's teams attend more sporting events than transplant students who are fans of another school?

It makes sense that students who are fans of their own school's teams would attend more games than other students. In fact, previous research has indicated that higher levels of team sport identification are positively related to attendance at sporting events and willingness to spend more on tickets to events (Wakefield, 1995; Wann & Branscombe 1993). It is also important to confirm whether the findings of this previous research applies to the attendance at university sporting events based on the types of transplant students under study in this research.

Research Question #2: Are transplant students who are fans of their own school's sports teams stronger fans of sports (in general) than transplant students who are fans of another institution?

Again, prior research offers little evidence on this question. On one hand, it could be argued that no difference in sport fandom would exist between the two transplant groups just because one group chose their home school as their favorite sports team. On the other hand, it is conceivable that students who arrive at college as fans of another team may consider

themselves stronger fans of sports than transplants that adopt their home university as their favorite team.

Research Question #3: Do transplant students who are fans of their school's teams report higher levels of satisfaction, enjoyment, and involvement in their university than transplant students who are fans of another school?

This research question builds on the research of Wann and Robinson (2002) who found that student identification with the team was correlated with higher levels of satisfaction, enjoyment, and involvement with their university. Based on these results, the transplant students who identify their home university as their favorite team should report significantly higher levels of satisfaction, enjoyment, and involvement with their university than other transplant students.

Research Question #4: Do transplant students who are fans of their school's teams report higher levels of identification with the school's teams than transplant students who are fans of another school?

Again, the natural assumption would be that students whose favorite team is their home university would report significantly higher levels of team identification, but this natural assumption should be tested to ensure that this perception is accurate.

Research Question #5: Do transplant students who are fans of their school's teams demonstrate different motives for following sports than transplant students who are fans of another school?

Motives for following sports have been receiving more attention in the literature. Recently, Fink et al. (2002) examined which motives were most salient in sport team identification, while James and Ridinger (2002) compared differences in motives between male and female sports fan. However, recent research on motives has not examined similarities and differences in motives among types of transplants. The results of this research question, whether there are significant differences or not, will provide guidance for marketing personnel in athletic departments.

METHOD

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

A three-page questionnaire was developed to examine the research questions. In the first section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to identify their favorite college basketball and college football team. Level of sport fandom in general, of college football, and of college basketball were measured with a 9-point item (1 = Not a Fan at All and 9 = Extremely Loyal Fan) used by James and Ridinger (2002). Surveys were distributed in the spring quarter, so students were asked how many of the university's home football and basketball games they had attended in the previous school year. They were also asked how many college basketball and football games they attended in the previous year at other schools. The final set of questions in the first section asked students their level of enjoyment and satisfaction with the university, whether the university has met their expectations, and whether they have been extremely involved in the university. The four items were asked with a 7-point Likert scale used by Wann and Robinson (2002).

The second section of the questionnaire contained three versions of the Sport Spectator Identification Scale (SSIS) first developed by Wann and Branscombe (1993). The SSIS is a tested and reliable instrument that uses seven items to measure the cognitive, affective, and

behavioral response of fans to sports teams. Respondents were asked to complete the SSIS for the university's football team, basketball team, and for all other sports at the school.

The third section of the questionnaire contained a modified version of the Motivation Scale for Sport Consumption (MSSC) developed by Trail and James (2001). The MSSC measures motivations behind sport spectator consumption behavior. As previously mentioned, the nine motives for following sports assessed in the MSSC are achievement, acquisition of knowledge, aesthetics, drama, escape, family, physical attractiveness of participants, quality of the physical skills of participants, and social interaction. Because the questionnaire was being distributed by college professors to college students in classes, it was decided that the physical attractiveness items should be excluded from the survey. This step has been taken by other researchers when deemed appropriate (Fink et al., 2002). In addition, the third item on the escape motive was eliminated because it referenced only attending events in the summer. Two of the items for the family motive section were also eliminated because they asked about going to games with a spouse and children. They were replaced by an item about going to games with friends.

The final section of the questionnaire contained demographic questions, including age, gender, hometown, ethnicity, grade point average, and whether they played varsity sports in high school and college.

DATA COLLECTION

Questionnaires were distributed in fifteen different classes at a medium-sized public university in a traditional small college town and relatively isolated from any major media market or population base. Although approximately 90% of the students are from the state, few are from the county where the university resides. Although non-probability sampling was used, attempts were made to collect data from students in multiple colleges within the university. A total of 284 questionnaires were collected. Because the purpose of this research was to make comparisons by type of transplants, seven surveys were eliminated because the respondents' hometown was in the same county as the university. Another four surveys were deemed unusable because of excessive missing information, leaving an analysis sample of 273.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

The analysis sample was largely representative of the population of students at the university. Approximately 56% of the respondents were female and the average age of the respondents was 20.68 years of age. Ethnicity was representative as well with 94.4% of the respondents listing Caucasian as their ethnicity and only 5.6% from one of several minority groups. Just fewer than 90% of the respondents were from the home state of the university, with an average grade point average of 3.23.

A few of the demographic characteristics of the sample were slightly non-representative. Breakdown by year in school was 12.1% freshman, 32.0% sophomore, 25.7% junior, 25.7% senior, and 4.4% graduate students, leaving freshmen underrepresented in the sample. Also, 27.7% of the students reported membership in a sorority or fraternity, which is slightly higher than the approximate 20% of the overall student population. Finally, students from the College of Business represented the majority of respondents (37.6%), with Communications (18.1%), Arts and Sciences (15.9%), and Education (14.4%) next. Although these are the four largest colleges on campus, business majors represent approximately 10% of the student population and Arts and Sciences about 25%.

While a few of the sample's characteristics are slightly non-representative of the population, the average respondent in this study is largely representative of the typical student that attends the university.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE MEASURES

Before examining the research questions, the validity and reliability of the multi-item measures used in the questionnaire was assessed. First, each of the SSIS scales was evaluated – the results can be found in Table 1. All three scales demonstrated strong validity and internal reliability. The seven items for the football SSIS had factor loadings ranging from .705 to .926 and loaded on the first factor that explained 68.94% of the total variance. The basketball SSIS had factor loadings ranging from .651 to .935, with a first factor that explained 71.49% of the total variance. The SSIS for other sports at the university had factor loadings ranging from .642 to .914, with 67.03% of the total variance explained by the first factor. Each of the scales demonstrated strong internal consistency and the ability to be summed for one overall measure with coefficient alphas of .9207, .9310, and .9136 respectively (Table 1).

Because the MSSC was modified to accommodate the nature of the sample in this study, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the 22 MSSC items used in this questionnaire. As Table 2 indicates, the MSSC demonstrated strong validity. Each of the variables loaded on the appropriate factor and the 8 factors explained 88.05% of the total variance.

The only problem was that one of the drama items had a factor loading below .40 (.362). In addition, when a reliability analysis was conducted on the drama scale, the results indicated that the coefficient alpha for the sub-scale would improve to .8558 from .8026 if this item were deleted, so it was removed from the scale when calculating the importance of drama to each respondent. Reliability analysis on the other seven sub-scales of the MSSC revealed no other problems with specific items. In fact, the internal consistency of the 8 sub-scales was quite strong as the coefficient alphas in Table 2 range from .8514 to .9478 (Table 2).

RESULTS

Respondents were asked two open-ended questions, one for their favorite college basketball team and the other for their favorite college football team. Respondents were placed into two groups based on their answers to each of these questions. For basketball, those students who indicated that the home university was their favorite team were placed in one group, with all other students placed in the other group. Comparisons between these two groups using t-tests on all the variables under consideration in the research questions were conducted. This process was repeated based on the answers to the football question. Therefore, two sets of t-tests, or means comparisons, were conducted for each research question, one for basketball and another for football. For the football t-tests, there were 21 respondents who identified the university as their favorite team and 213 another school. For basketball, the sample sizes were 33 for the home team fans and 183 for other teams.

***Research Question #1**: Do transplant students who are fans of their school's teams attend more sporting events than transplant students who are fans of another school?*

Students were asked six questions related to attendance at sporting events. They were asked the number of basketball, football, and all other sporting events they attended in the past year at their home school. They were also asked the number of basketball, football, and other sporting events they attended in the past year at other universities.

According to the results in Table 3, there is no significant difference in the number of home basketball, football, or other home games/events attended by type of transplant fan.

However, those students whose favorite college basketball team was not their home school attended significantly more basketball and football games at other universities, and students who are fans of another football team reported attendance of significantly more football games at other universities (Table 3).

***Research Question #2**: Are transplant students who are fans of their own school's sports teams stronger fans of sports (in general) than transplant students who are fans of another institution?*

Students were asked three questions about their perceptions of their level of fandom. They were asked for their level of fan loyalty for college football, college basketball, and for sports in general (Table 4).

The results in Table 4 clearly demonstrate that those students who are fans of college basketball and football teams at other universities rate their level of fandom as significantly higher on all three fandom questions than those students who are fans of the home school's teams. These results indicate that transplant students who are fans of their home school's teams are weaker fans than other transplant students, not stronger.

***Research Question #3**: Do transplant students who are fans of their school's teams report higher levels of satisfaction, enjoyment, and involvement in their university than transplant students who are fans of another school?*

Students who are fans of the home basketball team report a significantly higher level of enjoyment with the university. There were no significant differences between the groups of basketball fans on satisfaction, expectations, or involvement. However, there were significant differences on all four questions between the two groups of football fans. Students who are fans of the home football team report significantly higher levels of satisfaction, involvement, and enjoyment with the university, and are more likely to agree that the university has met their expectations (Table 5).

***Research Question #4**: Do transplant students who are fans of their school's teams report higher levels of identification with the school's teams than transplant students who are fans of another school?*

Respondents were given three versions of the SSIS, one each for basketball, football, and all other sports at the university. The results in Table 6 demonstrate that no significant differences in level of sport identification between types of transplant fans were found on any of the three SSIS measures (Table 6).

***Research Question #5**: Do transplant students who are fans of their school's teams demonstrate different motives for following sports than transplant students who are fans of another school?*

Results in Table 7 indicate that motives for following sports are consistently more salient for those students whose favorite basketball and football teams are from another university. In the comparison of basketball fans, there was a significant difference on all of the motives except for the social motive. For achievement, knowledge, aesthetics, drama, escape, family, and physical skills, basketball fans of another school reported significantly higher levels of motives than fans of the home school.

In the football fan comparison, four of the motives were significantly different between types of football fans (aesthetics, drama, escape, and family). However, the results were consistent with the basketball fan comparisons. In each case, the football fans of another school reported significantly higher levels of motives than fans of the home school.

LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH

Clearly, the results of this research have limited external validity. The athletic teams for the university under study in this research all compete at the Division I level for a mid-major conference in a state with one predominant school in a major conference and an extremely large fan base. While this presents a perfect environment to examine the nature of transplant student fans, it certainly does not represent the characteristics of other universities across the country facing similar challenges regarding transplants. This study should be replicated at other Division I schools, including major conferences, and at Division II, III, and NAIA schools to determine if these findings accurately reflect the nature of transplanted fans at other universities and colleges.

One limitation of this research is the relatively small size of the home university fan groups (n = 21, 33), particularly the football group with its sample under 30. While the total sample size of 273 is relatively large and produced Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin scores of sampling adequacy over .9 for each factor analysis conducted, the low percentage of students at the university who list their school as their favorite team made it challenging to reach sample sizes of 30. However, even though the results of the football t-tests should be considered with caution, it should be noted that significant differences were still found on several football t-tests.

Another possible limitation is the question that was used to measure a respondent's favorite team. It is possible that many of the respondents that identified another school as their favorite team would have rated the home school equally high as the school listed, or at least a close second. Using an interval measure would have improved the research. However, for this exploratory study on transplant fans, it was decided to simply identify their favorite team so that it could be used as a grouping variable to compare types of college student transplant fans.

IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study provide some interesting information on college transplant fans, some expected and some not. The results of the first two research questions, when viewed together, are compelling. First, there was no difference in the number of home athletic events or games attended by the two types of transplant students, which is surprising. It was not surprising to find that those students that listed another school as their favorite team generally attended more basketball and football games at another university during the year. With the high number of schools in the state with Division I sports and the popular state university less than two hours away, these results make sense.

An explanation for the results in the first research question may be found in the results for the second. On all six t-tests comparing the level of sport fandom, students that identified another school as their favorite team rated their level of fandom as significantly higher than those that cheer for their home university. Even though they do not list the home school as their favorite team, they attend the same number of home events and games as the fans of the university's team, even as they attend a significantly higher number of games away from the university. Clearly, this could be explained by their higher fan ratings, indicating that many may still enjoy attending home events and games because they are bigger fans of college basketball, football, and sports in general than those fans that list the home school as their favorite team.

The results of the third research question in Table 5 generally support the findings of Wann and Robinson (2002). Wann and Robinson found positive and significant correlations among sport team identification ratings and satisfaction, enjoyment, and involvement with the university. Although this research used the respondent's favorite team as a grouping variable, the results indicate that cheering for your university's teams is related to significantly higher levels of satisfaction, enjoyment, involvement, and met expectations than those students who list another school as their favorite. While the results generally support Wann and Robinson's research, one could argue that these results are surprising given the lack of difference in attendance found in the first research question.

Another interesting finding was that there were no significant differences between types of transplant fans and their sport team identification scores for basketball, football, and other sports. It would be natural to assume that students whose favorite team is the home university would naturally have a higher SSIS score for the home team.

Finally, the results of the fifth research question are interesting and seem to support the findings of the second research question on level of fandom. It appears that the salience of several motives is higher for fans of other schools, as a significant difference was found on 11 of 16 t-tests on the eight motives. These results, when combined with the significantly higher ratings of sport fandom, indicate that transplant fans of other schools care more about sports than the fans of the home school.

When examining the results of this research, profiles of the two types of transplant fans can be developed. A general description of the transplant fan with a favorite team at another university is that they attend the same number of home games and identify with the university's home teams as strongly as fans of the home school. They also describe themselves as much stronger fans of basketball, football, and other sports, and have stronger motives for following and watching sports. On the other hand, fans of the home university are not strong fans of sports and attend the same number of home events as other transplant fans. But, they do report higher levels of met expectations, satisfaction, involvement, and enjoyment with the university.

The real value to these profiles is how, and whether, they can be utilized by universities and athletic departments. Because higher levels of satisfaction, enjoyment, and involvement with the university increase the likelihood that alumni will return to campus, become involved in classes, recruit a university's students, and make donations, these results support the need for the central administration to support athletic programs on campus. While it is clear that this support should be kept in perspective relative to the university's broader mission, the results offer support that intercollegiate sports add value to the rich university experience and appear to be positively related to a student's enjoyment and satisfaction with the school.

As for the athletic department, it is less clear how these results can be used. One important conclusion is that athletic departments should not ignore those students that arrive on campus as devout fans of another school. In fact, it appears that any efforts spent trying to change their loyalties to the home school may be unwise because these fans are attending the same number of games as other fans. It appears they are willing to attend home sporting events because of their higher level of sport fandom and the motives they have for following sports. Therefore, athletic departments should focus their attention on creating an environment around home events and games that maximize the ability of students to savor or enjoy sporting events because of the motives that are important to them. In particular, athletic departments should focus on the four motives that were significantly higher in both sets of means tests in Table 7 – aesthetics of sporting events, drama, escape, and time spent with family and friends.

While the athletic department has less influence over the drama of "close" games, it can market and promote athletic events by emphasizing the aesthetics, escape from stress and every day worries, and the time spent with family and friends.

It appears that the typical student that identifies the home university as their favorite team is not a big fan of sports and does not derive the same value from following or watching sports as other transplant fans. Thus, it is possible that they identify with the home school as their favorite team because either they arrive on campus with no favorite team or they quickly replace their favorite team when they arrive on campus with the home school because their level of fandom and interest is weak. While the athletic department can certainly develop programs to reach students as they arrive on campus to get them interested in the university's sports teams, their time and resources may be more efficiently and effectively utilized by focusing on students who consider themselves strong fans of sports and derive higher levels of benefits for following and watching sports, regardless of which team they identify as their favorite team while they are on campus.

REFERENCES

Baade, R.A., & Tiehan, L.J. (1990). An analysis of major league baseball attendance: 1969-1987. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, *14*(2), 14-32.

Clark, J.S., Schimmel, K., & Synowka, D. (2002). Root, root, root for the home team? An image theory explanation of fan behavior in transplant-heavy markets. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, *11*(1), 61-64.

Dietz-Uhler, B., Harrick, E.A., End, C., & Jacquemotte, L. (2000). Sex differences in sport fan behavior and reasons for being a sport fan. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *23*(3), 219-231.

Dietz-Uhler, B. & Murrell, A. (1999). Examining fan reactions to game outcomes: A longitudinal study of social identity. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 22(3), 15-27.

Fink, J.S., Trail, G.T., & Anderson, D.F. (2002). Environmental factors associated with spectator attendance and sport consumption behavior: Gender and team differences. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, *11*(1), 8-19.

Funk, D.C., Ridinger, L.L., & Moorman, A.M. (2004). Exploring origins of involvement: Understanding the relationship between consumer motives and involvement with professional sports teams. *Leisure Sciences*, *26*(1), 35-62.

Graham, P. (1992). A study of the demographic and economic characteristics of spectators attending the U.S. men's clay court championships. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, *1*(1), 25-29.

Greenstein, T.N., & Marcum, J.P. (1981). Factors affecting attendance of major league baseball: Team performance. *Review of Sport and Leisure*, *6*(2), 21-34.

Hansen, H., & Gauthier, R. (1989). Factors affecting attendance at professional sport events. *Journal of Sport Management*, *3*(1), 15-32.

James, J.D., & Ridinger, L.L. (2002). Female and male sport fans: A comparison of sport consumption motives. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *25*(3), 260-278.

Lapidus, R.S., & Schibrowsky, J.A. (1996). Do the hot dogs taste better when the home team wins? *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, *9*(1), 1-11.

Kahle, L.R., Kambara, K.M., & Rose, G.M. (1996). A functional model of fan attendance motivations for college football. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, *5*(4), 51-60.

Kolbe, R.H., & James, J.D. (2000). An identification and examination of influences that shape the creation of a professional team fan. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, *3*(1), 23-37.

Murrell, A.J., & Dietz, B. (1992). Fan support of sports and team: The effect of common group identity. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *14*(1), 29-39.

Quick, S. (2000). Contemporary Sport Consumers: Some implications of linking fan typology with key spectator variables. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, *9*(3), 149-156.

Randl, J., & Cuneen, J. (1994). Demographic characteristics of racetrack fans. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, *3*(1), 47-52.

Stotlar, D. (1995). Sports grill demographics and marketing implications. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, *4*(3), 9-16.

Swanson, S.R., Gwinner, K., Larson, B.V., & Janda, S. (2003). Motivations of college student game attendance and word-of-mouth behavior: The impact of gender differences. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, *12*(3), 151-162.

Trail, G.T., & James, J.D. (2001). The motivation scale for sport consumption: Assessment of the scale's psychometric properties. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *24*(1), 108-127.

Wakefield, K.L. (1995). The pervasive effects of social influence on sporting event attendance. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, *19*, 335-351.

Wann, D.L. (1995). Preliminary investigation of the sport fan motivation scale. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, *19*, 377-396.

Wann, D.L., & Branscombe, N.R. (1993). Sports fans: Measuring degree of identification with their team. *International Journal of Sports Psychology*, *24*, 1-17.

Wann, D.L., & Dolan, T.J. (1994). Attributions of highly identified sports spectators. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *134*(6), 783-792.

Wann, D.L., & Robinson, T.N. (2002). The relationship between sport team identification and integration into and perceptions of a university. *International Sports Journal*, *6*(1), 36-44.

Wann, D.L., & Schrader, M.P. (1996). An analysis of the stability of sport team identification. *Perceptual Motor Skills*, *82*(1), 322.

Wann, D.L., Schrader, M.P., & Wilson, A.M. (1999). Sport fan motivation: Relationships with team identification and emotional reactions to sporting events. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *22*(1), 114-139.

Wann, D.L., & Waddill, P.J. (2007). Examining reactions to the Dale Earnhardt crash: The importance of identification with NASCAR drivers. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *30*(1), 94-109.

Zhang, J.J., Smith, D.W., Pease, D.G., & Jambor, E.A. (1997). Negative influence of market competitors on the attendance of professional sports games: The case of a minor league hockey team. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, *6*(3), 34-40.

TABLE 1

Factor Loadings for Three SSIS Scales

Measure and Variable	Football loadings	Basketball loadings	Sports loadings
Importance that team wins	.842	.891	.827
Importance of being a fan	.898	.921	.906
How strongly do you see yourself as a fan	.926	.935	.914
How strongly do your friends see you as a fan	.865	.868	.865
How closely do you follow the team	.822	.858	.813
Display the team's name or insignia	.705	.651	.642
Dislike of greatest rivals	.728	.759	.729

TABLE 2

Analysis of MSSC Scale

Measure and Variable	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
Achievement		
I feel like I have won when my favorite team wins	.814	.9248
I feel a personal sense of achievement when my team does well	.856	
I feel proud when my team plays well	.714	
Knowledge		
I regularly track statistics of specific players	.834	.9283
I usually know my favorite team's win/loss record	.763	
I read the box scores and team statistics regularly	.850	
Aesthetics		
I appreciate the beauty inherent in the game	.768	.9478
There is a certain natural beauty to sporting events	.824	
I enjoy the gracefulness associated with sporting events	.730	
Drama		
I enjoy the drama of a "one-run" game	.362	.8026a
I prefer a "close" game rather than a one-sided game	.805	
A game is more enjoyable when outcome decided at very end	.859	

Table 2 (Continued)
Analysis of MSSC Scale

Measure and Variable	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
Sports represent an escape from day-to-day activities	.664	.8808
Sports are a great change of pace from what I normally do	.823	
Family		
I like going to sporting events with family	.829	.8514
I like going to sporting events with friends	.618	
Physical Skills		
The physical skills of athletes is something I appreciate	.522	.9294
Watching a well-executed performance is something I enjoy	.523	
I enjoy a skillful performance by my favorite team	.453	
Social		
Interacting with other fans is very important	.690	.9009
I like to talk to other people near me at sporting events	.881	
Sporting events are great opportunities to socialize	.830	

[a]Cronbach's Alpha was .8558 after first item was eliminated.

TABLE 3

Mean Comparisons of Attendance Behaviors

Attendance Variable	Football			Basketball		
	Favorite Home School	Favorite Other School	Prob.	Favorite Home School	Favorite Other School	Prob.
Home football games	2.28	1.45	.112	1.88	1.52	.288
Home basketball games	3.19	2.10	.247	2.79	2.33	.445
Home other events	1.76	1.64	.883	1.45	1.77	.656
Other football	.143	.958	.000**	.485	.940	.062*
Other basketball	.523	.714	.597	.364	.842	.087*
Other sporting events	.238	.991	.350	.424	1.12	.315

*p < .10. **p < .05.

TABLE 4

Mean Comparisons of Sports Fandom Perceptions

	Football			Basketball		
Sport Fandom Variable	Favorite Home School	Favorite Other School	Prob.	Favorite Home School	Favorite Other School	Prob.
College football	3.71	6.18	.000*	4.09	6.36	.000*
College basketball	3.57	5.41	.002*	3.61	5.86	.000*
Sports in general	4.71	6.45	.010*	4.42	6.71	.000*

*p < .05.

TABLE 5

Mean Comparisons of University Perceptions

University Variable	Football			Basketball		
	Favorite Home School	Favorite Other School	Prob.	Favorite Home School	Favorite Other School	Prob.
Satisfaction with university	6.05	5.41	.030**	5.67	5.46	.388
Enjoy attending university	6.43	5.97	.096*	6.33	5.96	.094*
University met expectations	5.95	5.37	.065*	5.67	5.38	.284
Overall involvement is high	5.38	4.59	.066*	.482	4.66	.570

*p < .10. **p < .05.

TABLE 6

Mean Comparisons of SSIS Ratings

	Football			Basketball		
SSIS Variable	Favorite Home School	Favorite Other School	Prob.	Favorite Home School	Favorite Other School	Prob.
Football	26.67	23.37	.375	25.24	23.78	.515
Basketball	26.67	24.31	.407	26.22	25.51	.921
Other sports	23.29	22.02	.616	19.64	22.99	.105

TABLE 7

Mean Comparisons of Motives

Motive Variable	Football			Basketball		
	Favorite Home School	Favorite Other School	Prob.	Favorite Home School	Favorite Other School	Prob.
Achievement	12.71	14.33	.158	12.27	14.60	.033**
Knowledge	9.90	11.47	.249	8.06	12.23	.000**
Aesthetics	10.52	14.12	.003**	10.55	14.50	.002**
Drama	9.57	11.62	.057*	9.42	11.75	.006**
Escape	6.90	9.29	.005**	6.85	9.60	.001**
Family	8.95	10.70	.054*	8.70	10.88	.003**
Physical Skills	14.67	16.45	.196	13.58	16.76	.006**
Social	14.00	14.75	.577	14.06	14.92	.423

*p < .10. **p < .05.