FANSHIP: A MEASURE OF HEDONIC INTENSITY AND ITS MEDIATING EFFECT ON CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR IN SPORTS.

Robin D. Pentecost*
Lecturer
Griffith Business School
Department of Marketing
Logan Campus,
Queensland 4131, Australia
Ph: +61 7 3382-1095
Fax: +61 7 3382-1981
Email r.pentecost@griffith.edu.au

Mark T Spence
Professor of Marketing
Bond University
Gold Coast
Australia
Ph. +61 7 5595-2276
Fax. +61 7 5595-2200

*Please send all correspondence to the first author.
Abstract

The purpose of this research was to assess the effect of hedonism on sports consumption given its production of affective reactions in sports fans. Adapting conceptualizations proposed by Hunt et al (1999) a Personal Fanaticism Scale (PFS) was tested against Involvement (Zaichowsky, 1985), sports fans’ motivations (Wann et al. 1999) and two behavioural factors: namely intentions and years attended. Exploratory factor analysis shows fanship to be distinct from involvement. Regression analysis on motivations adds support to this theory with physiological arousal having a significant relationship with fanship, but not with involvement. A significant relationship was found between fanship and attendance: the greater the PFS, that is, the greater the intention to attend and actual days attended. Such results indicate that the PFS would be an applicable tool for marketers and managers to assess the level of hedonism felt by their consumers and to assist in developing marketing strategies, and advertising campaigns.
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Executive Summary

Sports have the ability to produce highly affective reactions (Pham, 1992). While consumer choice literature has provided both theoretical and empirical accounts of how affect and emotions influence consumer choices (see Shiv and Fedorikhin, 1999) this has been predominantly in the broad spectrum of marketing in general. More research is required into understanding the interaction and differences between the heart and mind in the sports marketing arena. The broad purpose of this article is to add to the growing body of research in the consumer decision making literature as applied to the sports marketplace.

Borrowing from conceptualisations advanced by Hunt, Bristol and Bashaw (1999), this paper tests a parsimonious scale to capture the level of hedonism (for this paper termed fanship) rather than the involvement that a consumer has with sports events. To achieve this, this paper proposes that fanship is not the same as involvement, and differences will lie between each both perceptually and behaviourally.

Using a multi stage approach, firstly reliability and validity tests were undertaken to assess the psychometric properties of the scales used. For the second stage regressions were conducted using Involvement and Fanship as the dependent variables with 8 sports fan motivations used as the independent variables to evaluate potential differences between each of the dependent variables. Regressions were also conducted for the third and final stage to test for a mediating effect of fanship on Involvement and Behaviour.

Results of the Factor analysis found Fanship to be a separate and distinct construct from Involvement. Supporting this finding was the fact that regression analysis found physiological arousal to have a significant effect on Fanship but not on
Involvement, suggesting hedonic pleasure to be captured in the Fanship construct but not in the Involvement construct. Further results indicate a significant relationship between fanship and behaviour; that is, the greater the level of personal fanship, the greater the intentions to attend and actual days attended with fanship mediating the involvement-behaviour relationship.

Introduction

“One of its cleverness, however, decision theory is somewhat crippled emotionally and thus detached from the emotional and visceral richness of life.”

(George Loewenstein, 1996, p. 289).

Early research purports consumers distinguish between market offerings according to their relative hedonic emotive or utilitarian cognitive value (Hirschman and Holbrook 1982; Batra and Ahtola 1991; Mano and Oliver 1993). Hedonic value, sometimes called experiential consumption, relates to consumption pursued as an intrinsically valued end in itself, rather than an extrinsically valued means to some other end (Holbrook 1999). The benefit provided by the hedonic offering has been described as the experience of pleasure in consumption (Assael, Pope, Brennan and Voges, 2007). Hence, while the cognitive utilitarian consumption may be perceived of as functional, the hedonic emotive experience of consumption is auto-eclectic in that the pleasure felt by the consumer is its own reward (Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

Holbrook and others have insisted that all products and services have some degree of hedonic experiential value (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; Holbrook, Chestnut, Oliva and Greenfield, 1984; Holbrook 1999, 2000; Addis and Holbrook 2001). It has also been suggested that this consumption value may be the key for
understanding consumer value and even the new emerging economy (Pine and Gilmore; 1998, 1999; Poulsson, and Kale, 2004). Addis and Holbrook (2001) reveal how the consumption experience can range from being mundane and hardly noticeable to a very significant part of the value for the customer, and that it corresponds to the degree of hedonic value. When applied to the sports marketplace this would suggest strongly differing levels of hedonic value when attending such events as sporting events have the potential to create highly polarised affective states in consumers (Pham, 1992).

Affective reactions formed by sports events are not the means to an end but the intrinsically valued end in itself (Holbrook 1999), whereby the pleasure offered by the consumption becomes interpreted within the context of the consumer’s life (Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Assael, Pope, Brennan and Voges, 2007). To this end, several authors have advanced either conceptually (Hunt et al. 1999) or empirically (see Arnett and Laverie, 2000; Mahony and Madrigal 2000; Funk, Mahoney, Nakazawa and Hirakawa, 2001; Funk, 2002; Clowes and Tapp, 2003) methods to decompose sports fans into segments, thereby fine-tuning an otherwise catch-all definition of “a fan as an enthusiastic devotee of some particular sports consumptive object” (Hunt, et. al., 1999, p. 440). To capture such generalisability, for this research such affect is termed fanship and is defined as the level of self-perceived hedonic relationship a consumer has with a given consumption experience. This paper looks at such a fan or devotee, both psychologically and behaviourally.

Affect, arousal and cognitive processing

Affective reactions to a situation are often referred to as arousal (Clark, 1982, Pavelchak, Antil, and Munch, 1988, Pham, 1992). Within the sports marketplace
Wann and Branscombe (1993) termed such a reaction as eustress: the physiological stimulation created by the event. Arousal can be thought of as a feeling state varying along a continuum from drowsiness to frenzied excitement (Mehrabian and Russell, 1973, Russell, 1981, 1983; Humphreys and Revelle, 1984). The implication being that such arousal can influence information processing, with heightened arousal narrowing the information process due to more selective cueing.

Two explanations can be found for this narrowing. First, as arousal cues more arousal-related material to be recalled from memory and into a person’s consciousness, the amount of external information processing is reduced due to the short-term memory only having a limited processing capacity and relying on more heuristic processing (Newell and Simon, 1972; Simon, 1982; Worth and Mackie, 1987; Higgins and Sorrentino, 1990). Secondly, as a person’s autonomic nervous system generates implicit internal cues, these compete for the cognitive space in the short-term memory, thereby limiting the amount of external cues into the processing system (Mandler, 1975). The overall implication of these two theories is that arousal has an effect on cognitive processing, with affective cues inhibiting information recall.

**Fanship and Involvement**

A person’s involvement with an event plays a part in information processing. Involvement is a well established concept in consumer behaviour and refers to a person’s perceived relevance of an object based on the person’s inherent needs, values and interests. Zaichowsky (1985), in her seminal paper on involvement, states that this motivational state is governed by the perceived relevance of the object. Therefore, if personal relevance can differ between consumers so too can the levels of involvement.
Petty, Cacioppo, and Schumann (1983) in their theory of involvement posit that when consumers have high involvement with an issue then there will be more cognitive central route processing rather than the lesser involved peripheral route. Similar to affective arousal, such differing levels of involvement then affect mental processing (Celsi and Olson, 1988; Fiske and Taylor, 1991).

Although involvement and arousal are strongly related, they can each have distinct effects on consumer information processing given that attitudes can have three different hierarchies: learning (cognitive – affective – conative), emotional (affective – conative – cognitive), and low involvement (conative – affective – cognitive) (Pham, 1992; Sheth, Mittal and Newman, 1999). Borrowing from Pham (1992), this research is based on the view that involvement may be conceptualised as different from fanship with fanship taking on more affective information processing and preceding cognitions. Where affective arousal precedes cognition (e.g. emotional and low involvement) such arousal drives the information processing structure and subsequent behaviour irrespective of cognitions. Thus, one may be a fan of a specific event but not highly knowledgeable about those who are participating in it. For example, an expatriate living in another country away from their favourite team may still attend the same sports events irrespective of who is playing due to their love of the game rather than their love of the team. That is, one may be a fan of the sport but have little involvement with the teams playing as they have little personal relevance to the viewer.

**Hypothesis 1**: Involvement is conceptually distinct from Fanship.

Fanship and Motivation
Motivation to process information regarding an object or event is often considered a proxy for involvement (Petty, Cacioppo, and Schumann, 1983; Celsi and Olson, 1988; Pham 1992). However, motivations may differ between those who are more focused on the experience of the event and those who are there to watch their heroes. Where more cognitive motivations may be captured by involvement for those who follow the event this may not be so for those who are just there for the experience itself (Holbrook 1999). Therefore, some may attend because of their cognitive involvement with the event while others are there for some other type of emotional reaction or experience.

Within the sports marketplace Wann and Branscombe (1993) termed such a reaction as eustress: the physiological stimulation created by the event. Such a reaction consists of a positive form of stress that stimulates and energises the individual (Wann, Schrader and Wilson, 1999). Such arousal can be perceived of as a feeling state varying along a continuum from drowsiness to frenzied excitement (Mehrabian and Russell, 1973, Russell, 1981, 1983; Humphreys and Revelle, 1984). This continuum can be applied to the sports marketplace given that sporting events can create extremes of affective states in consumers (Pham, 1992) whereby some consumers may attend primarily for the affective state suggesting that some consumers of sport may look for such an emotive form of arousal when attending a sports event irrespective of their level of involvement. This would then imply that those seeking more emotive reaction with the event would differ from those who have a more cognitive involvement and leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 2:** Eustress will have a significantly greater relationship with fanship than involvement.
Fanship and Behaviour.

In sports sponsorship there is a need to better understand the factors affecting the processing of information and their effectiveness. Differing from traditional advertising due to the high linkage between both the medium and the message, companies have turned to sports sponsorship in an effort to cut through the clutter and the increasing costs associated with traditional communication media (Meenaghan, 1996; Madrigal, 2001). Understanding the sports consumer and its consequences is of importance to sports marketers for a variety of reasons, not merely direct financial gain. Sports programs remain a major context for promotional messages through either sponsorship or advertising, thus influencing and even depicting consumption related behaviour. For instance, a fan may purchase products after their sports hero is seen using the product, thereby influencing consumer expenditures.

It therefore seems reasonable to assume that the level of fanship would influence a variety of factors relevant to marketers. It is proposed that fanship affects behavioural characteristics such as intentions and actual attendance at events (Laverie and Arnett 2000). By assessing levels of fanship against such variables the value of fanship to marketers can be evaluated. This leads to the following hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 3a:** Fanship will have a significant positive relationship with Intentions.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Fanship will have a significant positive relationship with Years Attended.

Fanship and Mediation

Holbrook and others insist that all products and services have an experiential value component (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; Holbrook et. al. 1984). Such
research reveals the consumption experience ranges from being mundane and hardly noticeable to a very significant part of consumer value. Bigne, et. al. (2008) found such hedonic or experiential consumption to be positively linked to satisfaction and loyalty and may even be the key for understanding consumer value given that such a value may mediate consumer behaviour (Holbrook and Batra, 1987). The affective state generated (e.g. pleasure) when consuming an event such as sports (Pham, 1992) is then likely to influence consumer behaviour (e.g. attendance). The question is whether involvement is antecedent to the degree of hedonic value or fanship one has towards the event or do they run parallel? Previous literature would suggest that from a sequential perspective, it is likely that hedonic value such as fanship will intercede between involvement and behaviour (see Holbrook and Batra 1987). That is, hedonic intensity (fanship) will have a mediating effect on years attended. To test this theory the following hypothesis is given:

**H4:** Fanship will have a mediating effect on Involvement and Years Attended.

**Methodology.**

Testing of the above hypotheses involved three stages. First, reliability and validity tests were undertaken to assess the psychometric properties of the scale. Reliability tests were applied to assess the internal consistency of the multi-item constructs. For this test constructs were deemed to be reliable when the Cronbach Alpha (α) ≥.70 (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Validity of the Fanship and Involvement constructs was established through exploratory research using principle axis factor analysis with orthogonal rotation. Similar to principal components analysis (PCA), principal axis factor analyses (PAF) uses only common or shared variance with both error variance and unique variance being estimated and removed from the
analysis (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996). The advantage of PAF is that the estimation of parameters has generally been found to reproduce correlations better than those using PCA (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994).

Varimax rotation was used to maximise high correlations and minimise low ones. It was not used to improve the quality of the mathematical fit of the model as rotated orthogonal solutions are mathematically similar to the un-rotated solution (Cliff, 1966; Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996). Such a rotation minimises correlations between factors through equating the structure elements in the columns rather than the rows thus helping improve the interpretability and utility of the solution (Kaiser, 1958; Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994).

One of the main considerations for factor analysis is the complexity of the items used (Comfrey and Lee, 1992; Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996). Referring to the number of factors to which each item correlates, the stronger the relationship to a specific factor the less the complexity of that particular item. Comrey and Lee (1992) suggest that a loading in excess of .71 (accounting for at least 50% shared variance) should be considered excellent whilst loadings in excess of .63 (accounting for 40% shared variance) are considered very good. Given the exploratory nature of this research the .63 will be the cut-off point.

For the second and third stages regression analysis was applied. Regression analysis was conducted in order to determine the influence a range of independent variables have on a dependant variable (Mendenhall & Sincich, 1996; Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black 1998; Field, 2005). For the second stage motivations were regressed on both Involvement and Fanship to evaluate the influence of motivations on each of these dependent variables. For the third and final stage to test for a mediating effect a
three variable model was applied. Using a three variable model (independent variable, dependent variable, and mediator) the path diagram for such a test is shown as:

INSERT DIAGRAM 1 HERE

To test for mediation three regressions are required. Firstly, Involvement is regressed on Fanship, secondly, Involvement is regressed on Years Attended, and thirdly, both Involvement and Fanship are regressed on Years Attended. Thus, the mathematical models for testing such regressions may be written as:

\[ Y_{(Fan)} = X_1 \text{ (model 1)} \]
\[ Y_{(A)} = X_1 \text{ (model 2)} \]
\[ Y_{(A)} = X_1 + X_2 \text{ (model 3)} \]

Where:

\[ Y_{(Fan)} = \text{Level of Fanship} \]
\[ Y_{(A)} = \text{Years attend the event} \]
\[ X_1 = \text{Involvement} \]
\[ X_2 = \text{Fanship} \]

Fanship will function as a mediator when: 1) Involvement has a significant relationship with Fanship, 2) Involvement has a significant relationship with Years Attended the event, and 3) when the previously significant relationship between Involvement and Years Attended becomes non-significant with the addition of Fanship (Baron and Kenny 1986).

As the mediating tests must by design indicate a correlation between attitudes and importance, collinearity cannot be ignored. Such collinearity results in reduced power in the test coefficients (Baron and Kenny 1986). Thus, it is important to assess
not only the coefficients but also their absolute size in an effort to assess for a
significant change in the variable. Using the mediating regressions the final step in
stage 3 was the use of the Sobel test (Sobel, 1982) as measures of added significance
using the unstandardised beta weights and their standard error.

\[
\text{Sobel test equation:} \\
z\text{-value} = \frac{a \times b}{\sqrt{b^2 s_a^2 + a^2 s_b^2}}
\]

Where:

\( a \) = unstandardised beta weight for the association between IV and mediator.

\( s_a \) = standard error of \( a \).

\( b \) = unstandardised beta weight for the association between the mediator and
the DV (when the IV is also a predictor of the DV).

\( s_b \) = standard error of \( b \).

Sample

Using a field study approach to increase the generalisability of the findings
participants for the study were attendees at a 4 day women’s International Tennis
Tournament in Australia. Such an approach was undertaken to increase the external
validity of the research (Pedhazur and Schmelkin, 1991), that is, what happens in the
“real” world. The sample consisted of 201 individuals (70 male, 122 female, and 9
people who did not answer the gender question). Average age was 40.3 years with a
standard deviation of 13.9.

Instrument
Five items were used to measure Fanship. These ranged from their perception of themselves as a general sports fan (“I am an avid [name of event] fan”), to their perceived degree of fanaticism (“I am fanatical about [name of event]”), to how others may perceive them as a fanatic of the sports event (“My friends would consider me a [name of event] fanatic”). Given that involvement can possess cognitive components (Shank and Beasley, 1998) two questions centered on the degree of general knowledge a person have with the event (“I carefully follow what is happening in the [name of event] world” and “Compared to most people, I know a lot more about [name of event] than they do”). All statements were measured using a 5 point scale anchored with 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree).

The scale for Involvement was modified from Zaichkowsky’s (1985) multi-item involvement construct. Shank and Beasley’s (1998) adaptation of the 8-item involvement construct was operationalised using 5-point semantic differential scales. Three items measured affective involvement (Boring / Exciting, Uninteresting / Interesting, Unappealing / Appealing), whilst the 5 remaining items measured cognitive involvement (Useless / Useful, Not Needed / Needed, Irrelevant / Relevant, Unimportant / Important, Worthless / Valuable).

Motivation was measured using the Sports Fan Motivation Scale (SFMS) developed by Wann et al. (1999). This instrument was designed to measure eight different motives of sports fans (eustress, self-esteem, escape, entertainment, aesthetic, group affiliation, and family). This was operationalised using 5-point Likert scales anchored by 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree).

Results

Validation and Psychometric Testing of the PFS Scale
Reliability

Table 1 shows all constructs to be reliable ($\alpha \geq .70$) except for group affiliation ($\alpha = .65$). This construct was removed from further analysis.

<INSERT TABLE 1 HERE>

Whilst internal consistency is important for scale analysis, discriminant validity tests were conducted to test hypothesis 1 through analysis of the psychometric properties of the Fanship and Involvement constructs.

Discriminant Validity tests.

Two factors accounting for 62% of the variance in the model were extracted (35% Involvement, 27% fanship). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test for sampling adequacy indicate sufficient sample size (KMO >.8) (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black, 1998). Factor loadings for the individual items varied from .64 to .84 with items loading strongly onto their respective factor, indicating very good convergent validity for each construct. Table 2 and diagram 1 show the factor loadings and perceptual mapping of the Fanship and Involvement constructs.

<INSERT TABLE 2 HERE>

<INSERT DIAGRAM 2 HERE>
The above results suggest Fanship to be separate from Involvement. Using orthogonal rotated factor analysis, items were found to load on their respective construct with a corresponding low loading on the other construct. The perceptual map displays this perceptual difference between these constructs. Given these findings, hypothesis 1 is supported. The five items used to measure the Fanship construct were then aggregated and averaged to create a single item for use in further analysis. The same was done for the Involvement construct.

Fanship, Involvement and Motivations

Regression analyses (table 3) shows the effect of different motivations on Fanship and Involvement. Both Aesthetics and Entertainment were found to have a significant effect (sig < .05) on both constructs. However, Eustress (physiological arousal created by the event: Wann and Branscombe, 1993) was found to have highly significant effect on Fanship (sig < .01) but no effect on Involvement. Economic (motivation through being able to bet on the event) had a significant negative effect on fandom only. These findings give support for hypothesis 2.

<INSERT TABLE 3 HERE>

Fanship, Involvement and Behaviour

Fanship and Involvement were regressed against intentions to attend the event and also how many times the respondent had actually attended the event. Results show both Fanship and Involvement to have a significant effect on intended behaviour (p < .05) though Involvement was found to have a greater effect (B = .516) while Fanship had a lesser effect (B = .178). Table 4 also shows Fanship to have a positive
effect on actual attendance while Involvement had an insignificant effect. Hypothesis 3a and 3b are supported.

**INSERT TABLE 4 HERE**

**Mediation Tests**

Results of the mediation test show Fanship to mediate the Involvement-Attendance relationship. Involvement was found to have significant relationship with Fanship \((p < .001)\) and Years Attended \((p < .01)\). However, Involvement had no significant influence \((p > .05)\) on Years Attended when Fanship was entered into the regression equation. Fanship on the other hand had a significant relationship with Years Attended \((p < .000)\). The Sorbel tests support this finding \((Sorbel Test stats: 3.782; p < .000)\). Hypothesis 4 is supported.

**<INSERT TABLE 5 HERE>**

**Discussion.**

It was the broad objective of this research to further understand the decision making process in the sports marketing arena with the findings supporting the value of assessing hedonic consumption in a sporting context. Adapting a conceptualization proposed by Hunt et al (1999), a personal fanaticism scale (PFS) was used to measure this hedonic value and then tested for both reliability and validity along with motivational and behavioural factors. Factor analysis found Fanship to be a separate and distinct construct from Involvement. Further regression analysis supports this finding in that motivational physiological arousal was found to have a significant
effect on Fanship but not on Involvement. This suggests that hedonic pleasure in the form of arousal is captured in the Fanship construct but not in the Involvement construct, in that, Eustress, the physiological arousal created by the event, was found to have a significant relationship with fanship but not with involvement. This would imply that there is some motivational aspect not captured by involvement. Results indicate a significant relationship between fanship and behaviour; that is, the greater the level of personal fanship, the greater the intentions to attend and actual days attended.

Implications

The degree of fanship may provide a useful segmentation tool. Consistent with the Petty, Cacioppo and Schumann, (1983) central and peripheral routes to persuasion model where levels of involvement affect information processing, levels of hedonism / fanship may also influence information processing and behaviour. The importance of this may be reflected in the message attached to a promotional campaign. For example, those with higher levels of fanship may prefer the event to be promoted as an “experience” while those with lesser levels may respond more to a functional approach (central route) to persuasion.

In summary, sports’ marketing is big business. To provide greater effectiveness and efficiency in the sports marketplace, sports marketers must have a greater understanding of their consumers to help refine and define both the product and communication strategies. The objective of this study was to develop a generic scale to capture hedonism that may be applied to a variety of contexts in an effort to help provide a means of segmenting consumers. Results using a sporting context indicate internal validity and applicability of the scale; however, further research is
required to further test the psychometric properties and the generalisability of the scale to other events consumption behaviours.
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Diagram 1: Mediating Path Diagram

Involvement -> Fanship -> Years Attended
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fanship</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self esteem</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustress</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group affiliation</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Factor loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Factors 1</th>
<th>Factors 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am an avid tennis fan (<em>avid</em>).</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I carefully follow what is happening in the tennis world. (<em>follow</em>)</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to most people, I know a lot more about tennis than they do. (<em>know</em>)</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am fanatical about tennis. (<em>fanatical</em>)</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends would consider me a tennis fanatic. (<em>friends</em>)</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring / Exciting (<em>exbo</em>)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninteresting / Interesting (<em>inun</em>)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless / Valuable (<em>vawo</em>)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappealing / Appealing (<em>apun</em>)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless / Useful (<em>usus</em>)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Needed / Needed (<em>neno</em>)</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant / Relevant (<em>reir</em>)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant / Important (<em>imum</em>)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance explained</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagram 2: Factorial Plot.
Table 3: Motivation Regressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA Tests</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>**12.712</td>
<td>**9.537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Coefficients | Self esteem | B | .061 | .000 |
|             |             | t | .718 | .001 |
| Eustress     | B           | .313 | - .096 |
|             | t           | **3.344 | -1.138 |
| Escape       | B           | .015 | .016 |
|             | t           | .210 | .238 |
| Economic     | B           | - .191 | .097 |
|             | t           | *-2.021 | 1.333 |
| Aesthetic    | B           | .238 | -.142 |
|             | t           | **3.341 | -*2.600 |
| Entertainment| B           | .217 | -.310 |
|             | t           | *2.046 | **-3.881 |
| Family       | B           | -.095 | -.037 |
|             | t           | -1.775 | -.886 |

* sig < .05; ** sig < .01;
Table 4: Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intentions</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>3.874</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fanship</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual attendance</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fanship</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>4.118</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Mediation Regression Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t-stat</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equation 1</strong>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>9.745</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equation 2</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equation 3</strong>&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanship</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>4.118</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Dependent variable: Fanship (R² = .355; F = 94.969; sig < .001)

<sup>b</sup> Dependent variable: Actual Attendance (R² = .042; F = 8.600; sig < .01)

<sup>c</sup> Dependent variable: Actual Attendance (R² = .137; F = 13.223; sig < .001)